should not remain neglected. Its brilliant allusiveness not only reveals the author's knowledge of sympotic tradition but also proves that he was a talented[30] writer.

University of Poznań KRYSTYNA BARTOL
ifkuam@amu.edu.pl

[30] That he was also poetically talented is proven by the inscription with the epigram composed by him. On the epigram see L. Robert, 'Inscriptions grecques nouvelles de la Bactriane', *Comptes rendus de l'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres* (1968), 448–9 (= L. Robert, *Opera minora selecta. Épigraphie et Antiquités grecques* V [Amsterdam, 1989], 542–3).

FERIMUS

Cicero seems to have avoided the first-person plural of the present indicative of *fero* and of its compounds: a search on the PHI Latin Texts CD 5.3 (1991) shows only one occurrence of *ferimus*, none of *adferimus, auferimus, conferimus*, or similar compound forms. Since *fero* and its numerous compounds are common words, this is unlikely to be coincidence. Of course, some forms will be rare because an author will have had little occasion to use them; Cicero may, for instance, have wanted to say 'let us endure' or 'we shall endure' more often than 'we are enduring'. The table below (which compares words with similar meanings) suggests that this is not the explanation for the extreme rarity here.[1]

Occurrences in Cicero

ferimus	1	*feremus*	9	*feramus*	13
patimur	5	*patiemur*	3	*patiamur*	10
gerimus	5	*geremus*	1	*geramus*	4

Of the three forms, the future indicative occurs least frequently in most verbs; so it is no surprise that this is the case for *patiemur* and *geremus* too. Beyond that, there is no general pattern of usage. But in proportion to the frequency of its word, only *ferimus* seems to be avoided. The reason for this is not obvious; perhaps doubts about the correct form could have been created by *fers*, *fert*, *fertis*. Without actually believing that *fermus* could be correct, speakers may have felt uneasy with *ferimus* (especially since occasions for using it would in any case have probably been too infrequent to establish its legitimacy beyond question).[2]

The only instance of *ferimus* in Cicero is at *Flac.* 2–3: *non sum arbitratus quemquam amicum rei publicae, postea quam L. Flacci amor in patriam perspectus esset, novas huic inimicitias nulla accepta iniuria denuntiaturum. sed quoniam, iudices, multa nos et in*

[1] Again a search of the PHI disk in the text of Cicero. The *ad Herennium*, letters by writers other than Cicero (*Att.* 8.11c; *ad Brut.* 25[1.17].2) and quotations (*Att.* 1.16.10) have been removed from the figures.

[2] For an example of doubts about the correct form causing avoidance in Latin, cf. E. Dickey, '*O egregie grammatice*: the vocative problems of Latin words ending in *-ius*', *CQ* 50 (2000), 548–62, particularly 553–6.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.296 Published online by Cambridge University Press

nostris rebus et in re publica fefellerunt, ferimus ea quae sunt ferenda. Editions and commentaries print *ferimus* without remark;[3] but *feremus* would be an easy conjecture here.

If Cicero avoided *ferimus* and the ending *-ferimus* in compounds, we should expect that others did so too. In authors up to Apuleius, the PHI disk shows a total of only twenty instances of *ferimus* (including Cic. *Flac.* 3), thirty-seven of *-ferimus* in compounds: Plaut. 5, Ter. 1, *Rhet. Her.* 2, Cic. 1, Varro 4, Ps. Varro *Sent.* 1, Publil. 1, Rut. Lup. 1, Verg. 7, Ov. 3, Livy 8, Sen. iun. 1, Curt. 1, Plin. *HN* 2, Sil. 2, Iuv. 1, Quint. *Inst.* 5, (Ps.) Quint. *Decl. Min.* 1, *Decl. Mai.* 4, Tac. 1, Plin. *Ep.* 1, Pompon. (*Dig.* 18.1.67) 1, Gell. 1, Apul. 2. It is clear that several authors, such as Plautus, Livy, Virgil, and Quintilian, were quite happy to use the form. Did others avoid it? If avoidance of the form varies from author to author, it may be difficult to be sure, in the case of any particular writer, that its absence (or near absence) is due to more than chance. For Cicero, where we have more text to work with, we can be more confident than for authors with shorter surviving works in which the form does not occur, such as Lucan or Valerius Flaccus or even Statius. One case where we should certainly expect to find *ferimus,* if it was regarded as a legitimate form, is the younger Seneca. The PHI disk gives one instance only, at Sen. *Ben.* 4.3.1:[4] *si recipiendi spe tribueremus, locupletissimo cuique, non dignissimo daremus; nunc vero diviti importuno pauperem praeferimus.* This text, printed by Hosius (from whose edition it finds its way into Basore's Loeb) and (with the addition of *bonum* before *pauperem*) by Gertz, turns out to be a manuscript conjecture. The oldest manuscript *N* (now generally regarded as the only authoritative manuscript) has either *praeferamus* (also the reading of the majority of other manuscripts) or *praeferam*, the text printed by Préchac,[5] who unlike Gertz attributes *praeferamus* to a second hand. Presumably *praeferimus* replaced *praeferamus* because of a feeling that after the unreal condition (*si recipiendi spe tribueremus*) has been rejected (*nunc vero,* 'but in fact'), we should expect an indicative rather than a potential subjunctive (that is, 'given the choice between a poor man and an importunate rich man, we would prefer the poor man'). The argument does not seem decisive and in any case need not apply to *praeferam* (Préchac translates, 'Je préférerai'). Both *praeferam* and *praeferamus* give a superior clausula to *praeferimus*.[6]

Munich NIGEL HOLMES
nigel.holmes@thesaurus.badw.de

[3] I have consulted the editions of C. W. F. Mueller (Leipzig, 1896), A. C. Clark (Oxford, 1909), L. Fruechtel (Leipzig, 1933), A. Boulanger (Paris, 1938), F. Zucker (Milan, 1963), C. MacDonald (London and Cambridge, MA, 1977), the commentaries of A. Du Mesnil (Leipzig, 1883) and T. B. L. Webster (Oxford, 1931).

[4] I cite the editions of M. C. Gertz (Berlin, 1876), C. Hosius (Leipzig, 1914), F. Préchac (Paris, 1926), and J. W. Basore (London and Cambridge, MA, 1935).

[5] Gertz reports *praeferam* as a conjecture of Gruterus.

[6] The observation in this article, if it should be original, is not mine, but develops a remark made to me by a Thesaurus colleague, Oleg Nikitinski, who drew my attention to the fact that *afferimus* (a word much used by the *TLL*) is not Ciceronian.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.296 Published online by Cambridge University Press