Classical Quarterly 63.1 277–291 (2013) Printed in Great Britain
doi:10.1017/S0009838812000602

NOTES ON THE TEXT OF CICERO'S *PHILIPPICS*[*]

In these notes it will be argued that our text of Cicero's *Philippics* may be improved in nearly a score passages by printing manuscript readings that editors have repeatedly spurned.[1] If my detailed arguments are accepted, this article will have also a wider import, serving as a reminder that when a manuscript tradition is bifid both branches should be taken seriously, even if one branch is in general more corrupt than the other, and showing how modern technology may be harnassed as a powerful aid in the study of Cicero's idiom.

If late hybrids are discounted, the dozens of surviving manuscripts of the *Philippics* may be divided into two classes. In one stands V = Vatican, Archivio S. Pietro H 25, *s.* ix, in more or less glorious isolation.[2] The other, whose earliest member dates from *s.* x, is known as D (for *decurtati*); the *siglum* may serve also for the lost parent of the class. All readings of D to be discussed in this article can be ascribed without difficulty to this parent, and the identity and individual readings of its best descendants need not concern us.[3] Shared corruptions prove that V and D derive from a common lost

* An oral version of this paper was read at the Scuola Normale Superiore, Pisa in March 2012; I am grateful to Prof. G.B. Conte for the invitation and for the audience for their comments. I thank also Prof. M.D. Reeve (to whom I owe my interest in these problems) and Dr D.H. Berry for improving an earlier draft of these notes; further refinements were suggested by *CQ*'s anonymous referee and its editor, Prof. B.J. Gibson; and Prof. P. Kruschwitz gave advice on the problems of 1.26–7.

[1] I have consulted the following editions of the *Philippics* (some including notes or commentary): C. Halm (Zurich, 1856, part of Halm's revision with J.G. Baiter of J. Caspar Orelli's edn of the speeches; this edn made important advances over its predecessors); A.C. Clark (Oxford [OCT], 1901, 1918[2]); A. Boulanger and P. Wuilleumier (Paris [Budé], 1959–60, 2 vols. [Boulanger only for 1–4]); P. Fedeli (Leipzig [Teubner], 1982); D.R. Shackleton Bailey (Chapel Hill, 1986 and, revised by J.T. Ramsey and G. Manuwald, Cambridge MA, 2009); W.K. Lacey (2 only, Warminster, 1986); J.T. Ramsey (1–2 only, Cambridge, 2003); G. Manuwald (3–9 only, Berlin, 2007, 2 vols.); G. Magnaldi (Alessandria, 2008 = Minima Philologica 5). References to these works are by name of editor or commentator alone. Note additionally that Magnaldi, *Parola* = G. Magnaldi, *Parola d'autore, parola di copista: usi correttivi ed esercizi di scuola nei codici di Cic.* Phil. *1.1–13.10* (Alessandria, 2004 = Minima Philologica 2); on the arguments of this book see the review of M.D. Reeve, *Gnomon* 83 (2011), 27–31.

[2] Bernkastel-Kues C 52, *s.* xii, contains excerpts made originally by Sedulius Scottus; it derives from V.

[3] Very occasionally I have suppressed a variant in a major witness to D, where reconstruction of what stood in D itself is uncontroversial. For the purposes of this article all the prefaces to the editions of Clark, Fedeli and Magnaldi provide more than sufficient information, as does the discussion by M. D. Reeve and R.H. Rouse, in L.D. Reynolds (ed.), *Texts and Transmission* (Oxford, 1983), 74–8. For important work on the transmission see e.g. A.C. Clark, 'The textual criticism of Cicero's *Philippics*', *CR* 14 (1900), 39–48; 'The textual criticism of Cicero's *Philippics*, and of the orations before Caesar', ibid. 249–57, at 249–51; *The Descent of Manuscripts* (Oxford, 1918), 162–211; H.M. Hine, Review of Fedeli, *CR* NS 34 (1984), 36–9, at 36–8; and G. Magnaldi, 'Le *Filippiche* di Cicerone: lo stemma dei *codices decurtati*', *RHT* NS 3 (2008), 59–87. No one has yet investigated all witnesses to D with the aim of establishing which are eliminable and which are not. However, those used by editors have

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ancestor.[4] V stops at 13.10, and before that point there are passages for which one or other of V or D is defective, but for most of 1.1–13.10 the broad outline of the method that editors should adopt is uncontroversial: they should print either V's reading or D's or, in those passages where their common ancestor was corrupt, a conjecture.

Of the general characteristics of V and D there has been agreement for long among editors. V, although containing much nonsense, is an 'honest' MS, in that its text contains very few readings that derive from scribal attempts to remove inherited corruption;[5] D, by contrast, was 'dishonest', often presenting readings that are the result of late antique or mediaeval scribes' attempts to correct or improve the text.[6] Lest my defence of some spurned readings of D should suggest naivety, I cite here three simple examples of D's dishonesty. At **1.21** editors print *de ui et maiestatis damnati*, *maiestatis* being Halm's conjecture for *maiestates* in V and *de maiestate* in D. Although D's reading makes sense, it offers an expression (*de maiestate*) not attested in Cicero. By contrast, Halm's conjecture offers well paralleled standard idiom (cf. 1.23 *legibus ... quae iubent ei, qui de ui, itemque ei, qui maiestatis damnatus sit, aqua et igni interdici*, to look no further) and accounts for the readings of both V and D: *maiestates* is a slight corruption which must have stood also in the archetype; *de maiestate* is D's faulty attempt to correct *maiestates*. At **1.34** editors print *Vtinam, M. Antoni, auum tuum meminisses! de quo tamen audisti multa ex me eaque saepissime*: *eaque* is the easy and stylish conjecture of Faernus; V has *aquae*; and D omits the word (presumably finding *aquae* in its parent but being unable to make sense of it).[7] At **2.21**, where C. wonders what people would have thought if Antony had killed Clodius on the occasion of his chasing him: *Quidnam homines putarent, si tum occisus esset, cum tu illum in foro inspectante populo Romano gladio insecutus es negotiumque transegisses, nisi se ille in scalas tabernae librariae coniecisset ...* For *gladio* (V, *Schol. Bob.* ad *Mil.* 40 [p.123 Stangl]) D had *gladio stricto*; this makes good sense but could be right only if V and the Scholiast are united in coincidental omission, or if the Scholiast took his text from an ancestor of V. It is easier to believe that D made a banalizing conjecture.

Although V and D each present many corruptions, their common ancestor seems to have presented a text in good condition, and therefore, when both are present, modern editors have been able to print relatively few conjectures. Usually it is obvious which of V or D is right, and editors agree on the majority of choices that have to be made; and, despite the fact that D has been subject to interpolation, all, including Giuseppina Magnaldi, rightly adopt a very substantial number of readings from it. However, there remains a significant minority of passages in which the readings of both V and D make good sense, and for many of these it is hard to produce decisive arguments in favour of one or the other. In consequence there is some variation in the readings which editors adopt from each of V and D. Shackleton Bailey was slightly more

been thoroughly studied, and it is very unlikely that a comprehensive study would make any difference to the editing of the text (especially where V is extant, which it is for the greater part of the text).

[4] See e.g. Fedeli, pp. viii–ix (with better examples than Clark, *Descent* [n. 3], 173).

[5] More colourfully Clark, *Descent* (n. 3), 168 writes '[t]he scribe was an ignoramus, who wrote without understanding and reproduced nonsense with fidelity' and (170) '[t]he writer of *V* was capable of anything'; but one should be cautious about criticizing a scribe whose exemplar is no longer extant.

[6] For a good succinct characterization, see Shackleton Bailey, pp. xiii–xiv.

[7] R.G.M. Nisbet, Review of Boulanger and Wuilleumier, *CR* NS 11 (1961), 135–6, at 136, points out that Faernus alternatively conjectured *atque*, and that V twice elsewhere has *aquae* for *atque*. This conjecture could be right, but, although C. has *ac* five times before *saepe*, he never has *atque*, and the corruption seems to go back beyond V.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

hospitable than his predecessors to the readings of D. More recently Magnaldi, whose knowledge of the textual problems and MSS of the *Philippics* and the bibliography pertaining to them is more profound than that of any previous scholar, has argued that D is far more dishonest than editors have realized, that this dishonesty stems from the attempts of late antique *grammatici* to emend the text, and that in consequence many more readings of V should be adopted.[8] A full analysis of Magnaldi's contentions would involve much *ad feminam* argument and would do little more than restore a previously accepted consensus; it suffices here to say that she overstates her case and exalts V to an undeserved pinnacle in which it often seems to be improbably immune to the corruptions that beset even the most honest of MSS.[9] It is to be hoped that subsequent editors will restore many of the readings of D that she has ejected.

In this article I shall champion readings of D which have been unjustifiably rejected by all or many recent editors, and not just Magnaldi:[10] in some of the passages to be discussed V presents readings of unacceptable Latinity; in others, although V offers Latin that is in itself acceptable, D offers better Ciceronian idiom; and in others D offers readings that are for various reasons attractive and unlikely to have been produced by corruption. For some of the passages to be discussed I adduce evidence that it has been easy to find only in recent years when computers have been able to search through Latin literature. Indeed, most of my parallels have been gleaned from such searches: any merit which this article may have in establishing a few new facts about Ciceronian idiom comes not from hard work in reading Latin in a search for parallels but from being open-minded towards the possibility that D may have been right where it has generally been thought wrong and from being willing to embrace modern technology to establish its correctness.

1.26–7. Cicero says that some of his fears relate to the future. He requests Dolabella, once his son-in-law, not to be angry with him:

atque haec dico de futuris, quod est amicorum ante dicere ea quae uitari possint: quae si facta non erunt, refelletur oratio mea. loquor de legibus promulgatis, de quibus est integrum uobis, demonstro uitia: tollite! denuntio uim: arma remouete!

(27) Irasci quidem uos mihi, Dolabella, pro re publica dicenti non oportebit. Quamquam te quidem id facturum non arbitror (noui facilitatem tuam): conlegam tuum aiunt in hac sua fortuna, quae bona ipsi uidetur (mihi, ne grauius quippiam dicam, auorum et auunculi sui consulatum si imitaretur, fortunatior uideretur) – sed eum iracundum audio esse factum.

haec *V*: ego haec *D* ‖ noui *V*: noui enim *D* ‖ esse factum *V*: factum *D*

In the first crux, if D and not V transmits what C. wrote, then *ego* in this position in the sentence must carry some emphasis. Often an emphatic pronoun takes its emphasis from an explicit or implicit contrast. Here the implicit contrast is made clear by *uobis* and *uos* in the following two sentences: *Cicero* champions the future of the Republic (*pro re publica dicenti*, in which *dicenti* looks back to *dico*), which *Dolabella and Antony* threaten; *he* advises against laws, which it is still open to *Dolabella and Antony* not to force on the people.

V's coupling *atque haec* is (it need hardly be said) found scores of times in C., but D's reading is paralleled at *Div. Caec.* 33 *atque ego haec quae in medio posita sunt*

[8] See her forceful statement at p. xl, which includes 'Date queste caratteristiche della tradizione manoscritta, ho scelto di stampare ovunque possibile il testo offerto da **V**'.

[9] Compare the remarks of Reeve (n. 1), *passim*.

[10] Unless otherwise stated it should be assumed in my discussions that editors follow V.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

commemoro; sunt alia magis occulta furta, quae ille, ut istius credo animos atque impetus retardaret, benignissime cum quaestore suo communicauit and *Q Fr.* 1.2.9 *atque ego haec tam esse quam audio non puto*. In addition, he has *atque ego ... dico* at *2Verr.* 3.79 *atque ego nunc eum frumenti numerum et eas pecunias publice decumanis ab Herbitensibus datas esse dico* and *Sest.* 8 *atque ego de Antonio nihil dico praeter unum, numquam illum illo summo timore ac periculo ciuitatis neque communem metum omnium nec propriam non nullorum de ipso suspicionem aut infitiando tollere aut dissimulando sedare uoluisse*; he uses *ego* with *dico* over a score of times in the speeches; and he has the juxtaposition *ego haec* in a dozen other passages.[11]

A champion of V may point out truly that *ego* is not entirely necessary here, but the same is true of *Sest.* 8; there is no good reason for D to have interpolated;[12] and since D's reading corresponds to C.'s style it should be printed.

In the second *crux* there is nothing obviously wrong with V's reading, but D's is supported by passages in which C. uses *enim* after *noui* and *cognoui*. Particularly comparable to ours are the following in which he states that he knows someone's character: *Att.* 2.24.1 *ac ne sis perturbatus; noui enim te et non ignoro quam sit amor omnis sollicitus atque anxius*; *Fam.* 1.9.22 *His ego consiliis, si te praesentem habuissem, ut opinio mea fert, essem usus isdem; noui enim temperantiam et moderationem naturae tuae, noui animum cum mihi amicissimum ...*; 5.11.1 *Grata tibi mea esse officia non miror; cognoui enim te gratissimum omnium*; *Lig.* 12 *'Ego uero istud non postulo' inquies. ita me hercule existimo, Tubero. noui enim te, noui patrem ...*; *Sen.* 1 *licet enim mihi uersibus eisdem adfari te, Attice, quibus adfatur Flamininum 'ille uir haud magna cum re, sed plenus fidei'; quamquam certo scio non ut Flamininum 'sollicitari te Tite sic noctesque diesque', noui enim moderationem animi tui et aequitatem*; note too Sen. *Dial.* 12.14.2 *Prior pars mihi leuiter perstringenda est; noui enim animum tuum nihil in suis praeter ipsos amantem*. Less close but still parallel are *Att.* 5.5.1, *Fam.* 13.1.4, 14.5.1. In late antiquity Ambrose and Augustine often used (*cog*)*noui enim*. That D had interpolated a late antique manner of speech, or that it had interpolated *enim* to clarify the parenthesis,[13] is less likely than that it faithfully preserved a characteristic manner of Ciceronian utterance. If so, V's omission of *enim* is of a kind that is extremely common in MSS of all Latin authors.[14]

In the third *crux* Reeve (n. 1), 30 has pointed out that D's reading, adopted by e.g. Shackleton Bailey and Ramsey, ought once again to be right: it gives a clausula consisting of a cretic + trochee, whereas V offers an unwelcome triple trochee.

2.19. C. contrasts his own use of force against Catiline with Antony's surrounding of the senate:

Quid est enim dementius quam, cum rei publicae perniciosa arma ipse ceperis, obicere alteri salutaria?

rei publicae perniciosa arma ipse *V*: ipse rei publicae perniciosa arma *D*

[11] At e.g. *2Verr.* 2.26, 3.29, and *Prov. cons.* 8 *ego* comes close to *dico*, as it would here if D's reading is accepted.

[12] Magnaldi, *Parola* 150 n. 49 offers this (unlikely) explanation: 'Con l'aggiunta di *ego* si intende verisimilmente puntualizzare l'antitesi con 1.27.'

[13] Thus Magnaldi, *Parola* 139 and 191.

[14] To give just a few examples, in studying the relatives of Petrarch's MS of Quintus Curtius Rufus (Paris lat. 5720), I have found that even in the small portions of text that I have been collating several make omissions of *enim*: at 5.5.1 it is omitted by Toledo 49–9; at 7.1.35 by a host of MSS including Rome, Angelica 2177 and Rome, Casanatense 1085; and at 7.2.39 by Trento, Com. 1659, and Vat. Ottob. lat. 2009.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

D's word order may be supported by the following arguments. First, in a sentence in which *dementius* shows that the primary contrast is between *ipse* and *alteri* (there is a secondary contrast between *perniciosa* and *salutaria*), it is preferable to place *ipse* rather than *rei publicae* in the emphatic position after *cum*. Second, *cum* is followed by a part of *ipse* on about 179 occasions in the Ciceronian corpus (with the collocation *cum ipse* itself accounting for about 80 instances, including *Phil.* 2.42).

Analogies for the word order given by D may be found at *2Verr.* 5.106 *fit clamor et admiratio populi tantam esse in homine impudentiam atque audaciam ut aut aliis causam calamitatis attribueret quae omnis propter auaritiam ipsius accidisset, aut cum ipse praedonum socius putaretur, aliis proditionis crimen inferret*; *Prov. cons.* 27 *sum Cn. Pompei uirtutem et animi magnitudinem admiratus, quod cum ipse ceteris omnibus esset omni honore antelatus, ampliorem honorem alteri tribuebat quam ipse erat consecutus*; *Fam.* 5.12.8 *accedit etiam ut minor sit fides, minor auctoritas, multi denique reprehendant et dicant uerecundiores esse praecones ludorum gymnicorum, qui, cum ceteris coronas imposuerint uictoribus eorumque nomina magna uoce pronuntiarint, cum ipsi ante ludorum missionem corona donentur, alium praeconem adhibeant, ne sua uoce se ipsi uictores esse praedicent*; *Lig.* 7 *apud quem igitur hoc dico? nempe apud eum ... qui me cum ipse imperator in toto imperio populi Romani unus esset, esse alterum passus est*.

Unless future editors can adduce good parallels or analogies for V's reading, they should adopt that of D.

2.26. Cicero states that, because of their family history, the two Bruti would hardly have needed his advice and urging:

etenim si auctores ad liberandam patriam desiderarentur illis actoribus, Brutos ego impellerem, quorum uterque L. Bruti imaginem cotidie uideret, alter etiam Ahalae? hi igitur his maioribus ab alienis potius consilium peterent quam a suis et foris potius quam domo?

hi igitur his *V*: his igitur *D* || maioribus *V*: maioribus orti *D*

At first glance V's *hi igitur his* seems self-evidently right: to emphasize the inappropriateness of the Bruti seeking advice from himself, C. repeats forms of *hic* in polyptoton. However, when one asks how common is the collocation *hi igitur* in extant Latin and then finds that it is unattested elsewhere before Christian texts of the third century A.D. onwards, and when one finds that the same is true for *hae igitur*,[15] that *ii igitur* is first attested even later,[16] that *eae igitur* is not attested at all, one concludes that the awkwardness of pronouncing such collocations led to their avoidance in classical Latin and that V's reading imports a gross solecism. By contrast, D's reading is quite acceptable: *his igitur* is found hundreds of times in classical Latin and more than a score of times in C. (first at *Inv. rhet.* 2.158), and on close inspection one sees that there is no need to emphasize the Bruti as well as their ancestors. If D's reading was corrupted to *hi[s] igitur*, then *maioribus* would need qualification and progressive corruption could easily have occurred.

I am less inclined to disagree with recent editors in their rejection of D's *orti*. If V is right to omit it, then *his maioribus* is to be explained as combining elements of both ablative of description and ablative of attendant circumstances; if D was right to have it, then *his maioribus* is a separative ablative used to signify origin. The best argument

[15] First at Tert. *Adv. Valent.* 37 (*CSEL* 37, p. 211.7; *CCSL* 2.2, p. 778).
[16] First at Rufin. Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 6.9.8 (p. 541.11 Schwartz-Mommsen).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

in defence of D's reading is that *maioribus ortus* may be paralleled at *Off.* 1.116, Hor. *Sat*. 1.5.55, 1.6.10, Sen. *Ben.* 4.30.4, Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.71, Tac. *Ann.* 12.37.1, 14.35.1, Mar. Vict. *Rhet.* 1.24 (Halm, *Rhet. min.* p. 216.36). However, the hexametric rhythm that *orti* gives to the close of the colon tells against it (at *Off.* 1.116 C. used the inoffensive order *orti maioribus*), and it could be a banalizing intrusion: Magnaldi, *Parola* 192 compares the presence of *dici* at 2.19, *accepisti* at 2.74 and *uolumus* at 12.12, in all of which she argues that D has added a verb;[17] we may also compare the addition of *stricto* at 2.21 (discussed above).

2.75. Pompey's children fight against Caesar in Spain in order to recover their country:

Cn. Pompei liberi tum primum patriam repetebant. esto, fuerit haec partium causa communis. repetebant praeterea deos patrios, aras, focos, larem suum familiarem, in quae tu inuaseras.

deos patrios *Faernus*: deos partios *V*: deos penates patrios *D*

Faernus' conjecture is a very slight adaptation of V's reading, but it is D's reading that is probably right. That *di penates* is standard Latin needs no illustration. That *di* could be qualified by both *penates* and *patrii* in asyndeton (as with D's reading) is shown by *2Verr*. 4.17 *Tametsi lex est de pecuniis repetundis, ille se negat pecuniam repetere quam ereptam non tanto opere desiderat: sacra se maiorum suorum repetere abs te dicit, deos penatis te patrios reposcit*. Very closely analogous are the following passages, all of which exhibit a connecting particle rather than asyndeton and some of which have a different word order: *Sull.* 86 *Quam ob rem uos, di patrii ac penates, qui huic urbi atque huic rei publicae praesidetis …*; *Har. resp.* 37 *haruspices haec loquuntur an patrii penatesque di?*; *Sest.* 45 *uos, penates patriique dei* ; Nep. *Them.* 7.4 *hos postquam Athenas peruenisse ratus est, ad magistratum senatumque Lacedaemoniorum adiit et apud eos liberrime professus est: Atheniensis suo consilio, quod communi iure gentium facere possent, deos publicos suosque patrios ac penates, quo facilius ab hoste possent defendere, muris saepsisse neque in eo quod inutile esset Graeciae fecisse* (understand *deos* with *suos*); and Liv. 1.47.4 *di te penates patriique et patris imago et domus regia et in domo regale solium et nomen Tarquinium creat uocatque regem*.

So common is the expression *di patrii* that it is hard to see that D would have felt any need to interpolate. Magnaldi, *Parola* 161 wonders whether D's reading reflects a school exercise in which the question 'What were the *di patrii* called?' was asked;[18] but it is not clear why D should have been concerned with such a question (let alone with recording the answer), and it is much easier to argue that V has an omission.

3.22. C. has been listing some remarks of Antony which, he claims, display his oratorical incompetence. He then comments sarcastically on the reward of land given by Antony to his teacher of rhetoric:

En cur magister eius ex oratore arator factus sit, possideat in agro publico campi Leontini duo milia iugerum immunia, ut hominem stupidum magis etiam infatuet mercede publica.

sit *del. Faernus* ‖ publico *V*: publico p. r. *D*

[17] In arguing thus Magnaldi follows the consensus of most recent editors. One may wonder whether D's reading gives inferior sense at 2.19 and 12.12 but in none of these passages does it make for better prose rhythm. See also Magnaldi's edn, p. xxxiv.

[18] See also her remarks on p. 152 and p. xxxiv of her edn.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Faernus' deletion of *sit* was urged by Cobet ('Vitiosum est asyndeton sed *sit* expungendum'),[19] has been accepted by Boulanger–Wuilleumier, Fedeli, Shackleton Bailey and Magnaldi, and is probably right, since it makes the second part of the sentence follow more logically on the first. D's *publico populi Romani* has been adopted by no editor and appears to involve two difficulties: first, the expression seems tautologous; second, the presence of a further expression in the genitive (*campi Leontini*) straight after *populi Romani* seems inelegant.

The first difficulty is illusory. In formal writing *publicus* is often reinforced by *populi Romani*. The expression *res publica populi Romani* is found at *Phil.* 2.94 and often elsewhere, but note also *2Verr.* 4.88 *publicum populi Romani signum*; *Deiot.* 37 *publicis populi Romani litteris monumentisque*; *Lex agr.* (*CIL* 1^2.585 = M.H. Crawford, *Roman Statutes* [London, 1996], no. 2) 89 *uectigalia publica populi Romani*; Liv. 1.32.6 *ego sum publicus nuntius populi Romani*; 8.9.4 *pontifex publicus populi Romani*; 10.7.5 *sacra publica populi Romani*; 23.17.2 *bonaque eorum iussit publica populi Romani esse*; 26.47.2 *opifices ad duo milia hominum erant; eos publicos fore populi Romani edixit*; 38.45.7 *istud publicum populi Romani bellum et non tuum priuatum latrocinium*. This reinforcement is commonly found, as in our passage, in the context of *ager publicus*: *2Verr.* 3.13 *perpaucae Siciliae ciuitates sunt bello a maioribus nostris subactae; quarum ager cum esset publicus populi Romani factus, tamen illis est redditus*; *Lex agr.* 1 *quei ager poplicus populi Romanei ... fuit*; 4, 5, 15 (also in many supplements and in many other passages coupled with *locus* [e.g. 13 *quei ager locus publicus populi Romanei ... fuit*]); Liv. 3.71.7 *agrum de quo ambigitur finium Coriolanorum fuisse captisque Coriolis iure belli publicum populi Romani factum*; 3.72.6, 28.46.5, 31.4.2, 40.38.3, 44.16.7. Note also Cic. *Leg. agr.* 2.38 *quicquid igitur sit extra Italiam quod publicum populi Romani factum sit L. Sulla Q. Pompeio consulibus aut postea, id decemuiros iubet uendere*; 2.39 *primum hoc quaero, ecqui tandem locus usquam sit quem non possint decemuiri dicere publicum populi Romani esse factum*; 2.40 *regnum Bithyniae, quod certe publicum est populi Romani factum*. Magnaldi, *Parola* 161 dismisses *populi Romani* as the answer to a grammarian's question ('To whom does the *ager publicus* belong?'); we have seen that it is standard Latin idiom.[20]

The second difficulty is real but eased if one takes *campi Leontini* with *duo milia iugerum*, as at C.'s earlier reference to this land (*Phil.* 2.43 *duo milia iugerum campi Leontini Sex. Clodio rhetori adsignasti*). If C. did write D's reading he would have intended *possideat in agro publico populi Romani* to make a colon, and *campi Leontini* probably to make a colon of its own but perhaps to be taken in one breath with *duo milia iugerum immunia*.

Although D shows evidence elsewhere of being an interpolated text, there is no obvious reason why a late antique or early mediaeval scribe should either have thought that *publico* needed explication or been familar with the expression *ager publicus populi Romani*; it is much easier to believe that its reading is true.

3.25. Cicero explains his commendation of the tribunes for providing the senate with an armed guard:

Qui enim periculo carere possumus in tanta hominum cupiditate et audacia?

periculo carere *V*: carere metu et periculo *D*: metu et periculo carere *Fedeli*

[19] C.G. Cobet, 'Ad Ciceronis Philippicas', *Mnemosyne* NS 7 (1879), 113–79, at 135.
[20] See too Magnaldi, edn, p. xxxiv.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Here the reign of V's reading has not been uninterrupted: Fedeli prints his own conjecture, which includes an important element of D's reading, and he has been followed by Shackleton Bailey; Hine championed D's reading,[21] and he has been followed by Manuwald and by Manuwald and Ramsey in their revision of Shackleton Bailey. Hine, Manuwald and Ramsey are probably right; but Magnaldi, *Parola* 144–5 and in her edition has returned to V, and the arguments in favour of D therefore need to be set out more precisely.

First, *carere metu et periculo* makes excellent sense. Although 'How are we able to lack fear and danger' sounds stilted to the modern English ear (which prefers the more positive 'feel safe'), mention of fear suits the context, and the Romans were happy enough to use expressions of this kind: *Mil.* 5 *Quid enim nobis duobus iudices laboriosius, quid magis sollicitum, magis exercitum dici aut fingi potest, qui spe amplissimorum praemiorum ad rem publicam adducti, metu crudelissimorum suppliciorum carere non possumus?*; Ov. *Ars am.* 3.92; Sen. *Phaedr.* 243; Quint. *Decl. min.* 271.12.[22] Second, the coupling of *metus* and *periculum* is common both generally in Latin and in C. in particular (e.g. *2Verr.* 1.39, 5.14, 5.80, 5.137; *Clu.* 104; *Leg. agr.* 2.45; *Mur.* 52; *Sest.* 35; *Div.* 2.58; *Phil.* 7.27). Third, D's reading is to be preferred to V's because *metu et periculo* provides a better balance to *cupiditate et audacia* than just *periculo* alone: as Dr Berry kindly points out, *metus* (fear of the loss of one's property) is produced by *cupiditas* (the greed of other people), whereas *periculum* (physical danger) is produced by *audacia* (reckless violence).[23] Fourth, it is more likely that *metu et* was omitted in error by V or an ancestor than that it was deliberately interpolated into D. Magnaldi thinks that '*metu et periculo* è una tipica locuzione ciceroniana qualcuno può averla memorizzata e annotata qui'; [24] but this kind of argument, on which Magnaldi has often to fall back, reads like special pleading in the face of standard Ciceronian idiom, and why should anyone have felt that *periculo* needed further explication?

Hine stated that, compared to Fedeli's conjecture, 'D's word order gives a much commoner rhythm'. It offers a double cretic at the end of the colon, Fedeli's conjecture the less favoured cretic + iambus.[25] Fedeli's conjecture has the advantage of accounting for the readings of both V and D but the disadvantage of postulating corruptions in both; since D's reading is quite acceptable, it is safer to print it and postulate a double corruption in V.

9.4. C. discusses the placing of statues on the *rostra*:

Lars Tolumnius, rex Veientium, quattuor legatos populi Romani Fidenis interemit, quorum statuae steterunt usque ad meam memoriam in rostris. iustus honos: eis enim maiores nostri qui ob rem publicam mortem obierant pro breui uita diuturnam memoriam reddiderunt.

meam *V*: nostram *D*

V's reading imputes an expression to C. that is certainly extraordinary and probably arrogant. Roman politeness demanded a reference to the collective memory of the

[21] Hine (n. 3), 39.

[22] Dott. M. Mistretta reminds me of Hor. *Carm.* 2.14.13–14 *frustra cruento Marte carebimus | fractisque rauci fluctibus Hadriae*; Nisbet and Hubbard have a good note on the verb (R.G.M. Nisbet and M. Hubbard, *Horace: Odes Book II* [Oxford, 1978], 231).

[23] Magnaldi, *Parola* 145 misunderstands this point.

[24] Ibid.

[25] Manuwald writes of its having a trochee + cretic. However, she appears to think that with D's reading the colon ends at *periculo*; sense shows that it ends at *possumus*.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

audience or readership and not a limiting first person singular. Indeed, the expression *ad meam memoriam* seems to be found nowhere else in ancient Latin, while *ad memoriam meam* is found only three times, and then in late writers, and in the quite different context of bringing something to one's mind.[26] By contrast, D's *ad nostram memoriam* is attested in a score of passages, including three from C.: *Inv. rhet.* 2.1 *is* (i.e. Zeuxis) *et ceteras conplures tabulas pinxit, quarum nonnulla pars usque ad nostram memoriam propter fani religionem remansit*; *Leg. Man.* 54 *Rhodiorum, quorum usque ad nostram memoriam disciplina naualis et gloria remansit*; ibid. *populus Romanus, cuius usque ad nostram memoriam nomen inuictum in naualibus pugnis permanserit*; *Leg.* 2.56 *Eodemque ritu in eo sepulcro quod haud procul a Fontis ara est regem nostrum Numam conditum accepimus gentemque Corneliam usque ad memoriam nostram hac sepultura scimus esse usam*; Sall. *Iug.* 114.2 *illique et inde usque ad nostram memoriam Romani sic habuere, alia omnia uirtuti suae prona esse, cum Gallis pro salute, non pro gloria certare*; Nep. *Them.* 10.3 *Huius ad nostram memoriam monumenta manserunt duo: sepulcrum prope oppidum, in quo est sepultus, statua in foro Magnesiae*; Liv. 6.38.13 *et quod usque ad memoriam nostram tribuniciis consularibusque certatum uiribus est, dictaturae semper altius fastigium fuit*; Plin. *HN* 30.13, 35.19; Tac. *Germ.* 42.2; *Prol. ad Paul. epist.* (*PL* 68 col. 414.2), Mar. Vict. *Rhet.* 1.3 (twice), 2.1 (Halm, *Rhet. min.* pp. 166.33–4, 167.39–40, 258.23); Censorinus, *DN* 20.11; Aur. Vict. *Caes.* 37.5; SHA 17.24.6, Sulp. Sev. *Chron. praef.* 1; Eutrop. *praef.* 1.6.1; and Rufin. Euseb. *Hist. eccl.* 7 *capit.* (p. 633.16 Schwartz–Mommsen).

The best defence of *meam* would be that C. was by now so old that he might wish to stress what he, but few others, could remember. Such a defence would hardly counterbalance the lack of parallels. Nor does the use of *mea* with *memoria* in other contexts and cases offer any real support for V's reading: the contexts of *De or.* 2.122, *Fam.* 2.1.2, 5.8.2, *Amic.* 104, *Att.* 13.31.4 and *Phil.* 13.11 are entirely different; at *Sest.* 36 and *Phil.* 7.6 C. does use *mea memoria*, where he could perhaps have used *nostra memoria*, but there is an appropriate emphasis on his personal recollection (the same could be said of Varro, *Rust.* 2.1.14); the best support would be *Ad Brut.* 1.15.10 *nullum enim bellum ciuile fuit in nostra re publica omnium quae memoria mea fuerunt, in quo bello non, utracumque pars uicisset, tamen aliqua forma esset futura rei publicae: hoc bello uictores quam rem publicam simus habituri non facile adfirmarim, uictis certe nulla umquam erit*, but again C.'s personal recollection is emphasized, and the personal nature of the letter makes the context different from a speech or treatise. The Elder Pliny regularly uses *nostra aetas* (in various cases) but at *HN* 12.57 varies it with *mea aetate* and at *Epist.* 2.14.3 the Younger Pliny writes *At hercule ante memoriam meam (ita maiores natu solent dicere) ne nobilissimis quidem adulescentibus locus erat nisi aliquo consulari producente* (*sc.* in the centumviral court; the parenthesis refers not to Pliny's expression but explains how he knows what happened before his own adolescence), but these passages hardly compensate for the lack of parallels for *ad meam memoriam*. C. and others qualify *memoria* with *nostra* so often that illustration is not needed.

Since words are often corrupted into synonyms or near synonyms, the corruption in V is easily explained.[27]

9.10–11. C. praises Ser. Sulpicius Rufus:

[26] See August. *Trin.* 15.22 (*CCSL* 50A, p.519), Rufin. Clem. *Recognitiones* 1.1.2 (p. 6 Rehm and Paschke) and Boeth. *Quomodo substantiae*, Loeb edn. p. 38 line 8.

[27] Magnaldi, *Parola* 210 explains the variants in this way but thinks that it is D that is corrupt.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

omnes ex omni aetate qui in ciuitate intellegentiam iuris habuerunt si unum in locum conferantur, cum Ser. Sulpicio non sint comparandi. nec enim ille magis iuris consultus quam iustitiae fuit. (11) ita ea quae proficiscebantur a legibus et ab iure ciuili semper ad facilitatem aequitatemque referebat, neque instituere litium actiones malebat quam controuersias tollere.

ita ea quae *V*: itaque quae *D*

This problem is more complex than it may appear. At first glance V's *ita ea quae* seems attractive, since it allows such a translation as: 'For indeed he was as expert in dispensing justice as he was on points of law. Accordingly such matters which took their starting point from the statutes or matters of civil law he used always to judge by the criteria of ease of management and equity …'. However, those living in the digital age are able to discover that *ita ea quae* is a collocation not found in Latin before Augustine and that even the simpler *ita ea* is attested before Augustine only at Vitr. 6.5.1 and Gai. *Inst.* 3.179. This discovery makes it hard to believe that V's reading is right.

D's *itaque quae* may seem a little harder, since *itaque* ('therefore') may seem too emphatic. Nevertheless, it may be defended as an example of *itaque*'s being used to illustrate a general proposition:[28] the general proposition is introduced in the sentence beginning *nec enim*, and the sentence introduced by *itaque* gives two illustrations of this. And D's reading is much easier to parallel. The following passage is precisely parallel to ours, in that *itaque* comes first in its sentence, *quae* is neuter nominative plural, and the antecedent *ea* (on which it depends) is omitted but would have been in the accusative: Vitr. 9.7.7 *itaque quae nobis tradita sunt et a quibus sint inuenta, dicam*. Others are very similar, but the omitted *ea* would have been in the nominative: *Off.* 1.143 *sed potest eadem esse prudentiae definitio de qua principio diximus; hoc autem loco de moderatione et temperantia et harum similibus uirtutibus quaerimus. itaque quae erant prudentiae propria suo loco dicta sunt; quae autem harum uirtutum de quibus iam diu loquimur, quae pertinent ad uerecundiam et ad eorum approbationem quibuscum uiuimus, nunc dicenda sunt*; Varro, *Rust.* 3.9.9 *itaque quae ante aut post nata sunt et etiam prima eo tempore, non supponenda* (but animals and not abstract concepts are being discussed). Others differ from the previous category only in that *quae* is not nominative neuter plural: Varro, *Rust.* 2.2.3 *itaque quae id non habent, maiores nostri apicas appellabant ac reiciebant*; Vitr. 2.10.2; Sen. *Ep.* 108.23. In the following passages the antecedent *ea* is found later in the sentence: *Luc.* 99 *itaque quae contra sensus contraque perspicuitatem dicantur ea pertinere ad superiorem diuisionem, contra posteriorem nihil dici oportere*; *Off.* 2.17 *itaque quae in rebus inanimis quaeque in usu et tractatione beluarum fiunt utiliter ad hominum uitam, artibus ea tribuuntur operosis, hominum autem studia ad amplificationem nostrarum rerum prompta ac parata uirorum praestantium sapientia et uirtute excitantur*; and Sen. *Ep.* 86.8 *itaque quae concursum et admirationem habuerant cum dedicarentur, ea* (Reynolds: *et* uel *haec* codd.) *in antiquorum numerum reiciuntur, cum aliquid noui luxuria commenta est, quo ipsa se obrueret*. At Liv. 5.10.10 *ea* is again found but *quae* is neuter accusative plural. These facts about usage suggest that, despite its slight awkwardness, D's reading should be adopted.

9.12. Cicero has been discussing the honours that should be given to Ser. Sulpicius Rufus and now mentions the devotion of his son Servius:

[28] See *TLL* 7.2.530.65–531.2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Multum etiam ualuisse ad patris honorem pietas fili uidebitur; qui quamquam adflictus luctu non adest, tamen sic animati esse debetis ut si ille adesset. est autem ita adfectus ut nemo umquam unici fili mortem magis doluerit quam ille maeret patris. et quidem etiam ad famam Ser. Sulpici fili arbitror pertinere, ut uideatur honorem debitum patri praestitisse.

Et quidem *V*: equidem *D*

Manuwald, p. 1079, explains Cicero's thought at the beginning of the passage thus:

> [F]urther points … in Sulpicius' honour are the character and conduct of his son, who is a model of *pietas* (*sc*. towards his father); his absence due to *luctus* proves Cicero's claim to be true … Nevertheless, Cicero asks the senators to act as if he were present, which probably means to honour his family appropriately.

And then she explains the sentence which has the MS variants: 'Cicero describes the situation just outlined from the opposite perspective, by turning from the effects of the son's grief on the father to the son himself: it contributes to his own reputation if he is seen to have paid his father the honour he deserved.' All this is just. She does not discuss the reading of D but explains the text of V thus:

> *et* intensified by *quidem* adds a sentence or a phrase by marking it as a reinforcement of the preceding one (cf. K.-St. I 802–4). In this sequence, the ensuing *etiam* is not combined with the preceding two words and does not serve to connect the sentences as well; instead, it emphasizes an individual (the next) term or phrase (cf. *Nat. D.* 2.36; on the combination of *et* and *etiam* cf. K.-St. II 7–8).

If V's text is to be defended, this is probably the best defence one can make. However, even if *etiam* is not to be taken with *et quidem*, it is troubling that *Nat. D.* 2.36 *is autem est gradus in quo rerum omnium natura ponitur; quae quoniam talis est ut et praesit omnibus et eam nulla res possit inpedire, necesse est intellegentem esse mundum et quidem etiam sapientem* is one of only two passages in which V's collocation *et quidem etiam* is attested before the Middle Ages. The other is Zeno of Verona, *Tract.* 2.7 (*CCSL* 22, p. 171) *At ego non pertimescam, sermonis publici quae de me fabuletur inuidia; non enim nuptias condemno, sed nuptiis meliora praepono, et quidem etiam apostolo hortante sic Paulo: 'dico autem innuptis et uiduis: bonum est illis, si sic perseuerauerint sicut ego; si autem non fuerint continentes, nubant: melius est enim nubere quam uri'*. Were *et quidem etiam* sound in our passage it would have to introduce a new sentence, which is as much contrasting as additional (Manuwald's 'from the opposite perspective' is somewhat at odds with her 'a reinforcement of the preceding one'); but in the other two passages there is no contrast, merely an emphatic addition.

D's *equidem etiam* is entirely idiomatic and is to be preferred. Kühner–Stegmann 1.805 have this to say about *equidem*: 'Es unterscheidet sich von *quidem* nicht bloß durch die stärkere Bedeutung, sondern auch dadurch, daß es auf einen ganzen Gedanken, nicht, wie quidem, auf einen einzelnen Begriff bezogen wird'. Here, as we have seen, we have a new thought. After remarking that in several authors it is confined almost entirely to the first person, they go on to say: 'Es wird also am häufigsten in solchen Versicherungen gebraucht, welche sich auf den Redenden beziehen, daher wird es sehr oft mit den Verben *puto*, *credo*, *arbitror*, *duco*, *spero*, *scio*, *uideo*, *mihi uideor* verbunden.' And whereas Cicero never uses *quidem* to link two sentences in which the first person present *arbitror* is the main verb of the second,[29] *equidem* is found eight

[29] There are several sentences in which *quidem* and *arbitror* are found together, but in all *quidem*

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

times with *arbitror*, with some link to the previous sentence always implicit. A good example is *Tusc.* 5.121 *sed quoniam mane est eundum, has quinque dierum disputationes memoria comprehendamus. equidem me etiam conscripturum arbitror – ubi enim melius uti possumus hoc, cuicuimodi est, otio? –, ad Brutumque nostrum hos libros alteros quinque mittemus, a quo non modo inpulsi sumus ad philosophiae scriptiones, uerum etiam lacessiti.*

When *etiam* appears in close proximity to *equidem*, it usually goes not with *equidem* but with a word in the sentence that needs emphasizing, normally placed after it (as *conscripturum* is in the example above). In striking contrast to the collocution *et quidem etiam*, Cicero has the juxtaposition *equidem etiam* often, especially in his later writing: *De or.* 2.362; *Sen.* 26; *Amic.* 101 *Vicissim autem senes in adulescentium caritate acquiescimus, ut in uestra, ut in Q. Tuberonis; equidem etiam admodum adulescentis P. Rutili, A. Vergini familiaritate delector* (this illustrates in brief compass the appearance of a new thought in the second sentence); *Div.* 1.80; *Fin.* 4.13, 5.2; *Off.* 1.37; *Att.* 14.11.1, 15.16a; *Fam.* 15.4.14 (perhaps also *Att.* 5.10.3; *Fam.* 4.7.4). From other authors note Plin. *Ep.* 6.4.3; August. *Ep.* 266.2; and Prisc. *Inst.* 12.18, *Gramm. Lat.* 2, p. 587.20 Keil (in which last the verb is not first person).

11.12. Cicero refers to the gifts made by Antony to Decidius Saxa and Cafo:

his quasi praeter dotem quam in ciuilibus malis acceperant agrum Campanum est largitus Antonius, ut haberent reliquorum nutriculas praediorum. quibus utinam contenti essent! ferremus, etsi tolerabile non erat, sed quiduis patiendum fuit ut hoc taeterrimum bellum non haberemus.

essent *V*: esse possent *D*

That V's reading is possible is at once obvious: there are many instances in Latin of *contentus esse* not dependent on the verb *posse* (for just one from Cicero, see *Att.* 6.1.3). However, throughout his career Cicero liked to couple *contentus esse* and *posse*; see *Quinct.* 12; *2Verr.* 1.3, 1.40; *Clu.* 149; *Leg. Man.* 14 *nam ceterarum prouinciarum uectigalia, Quirites, tanta sunt ut eis ad ipsas prouincias tutandas uix contenti esse possimus, Asia uero tam opima est ac fertilis ut et ubertate agrorum et uarietate fructuum et magnitudine pastionis et multitudine earum rerum quae exportentur facile omnibus terris antecellat*; *De or.* 1.249, 3.146 *Tum Caesar 'unum' inquit 'me ex tuo sermone maxime, Crasse, commouit, quod eum negasti, qui non cito quid didicisset, umquam omnino posse perdiscere; ut mihi non sit difficile periclitari et aut statim percipere ista, quae tu uerbis ad caelum extulisti, aut, si non potuerim, tempus non perdere, cum tamen his nostris possim esse contentus'*; *Orat.* 174; *Deiot.* 29; *Att.* 12.19.1, 12.25.1; *Fin.* 1.39 *nam si ea sola uoluptas esset quae quasi titillaret sensus, ut ita dicam, et ad eos cum suauitate affl ueret et illaberetur, nec manus esse contenta posset nec ulla pars uacuitate doloris sine iucundo motu uoluptatis*, and *Luc.* 54. As the examples quoted in full make clear, he uses this expression even in the subjunctive mood, even though the potentiality inherent in the subjunctive might sometimes seem to make the addition of *posse* redundant.[30]

(with or without *ne*) limits only an individual word. See e.g. *Tusc.* 1.99 *utrum autem sit melius, dii inmortales sciunt, hominem quidem scire arbitror neminem*, where it points the contrast between *hominem* and *dii immortales*.

[30] Magnaldi, *Parola* 212 writes 'L'aggiunta di *possent* mira probabilmente a reinforzare l'ottativo', but she wrongly imagines that it was a scribe rather than C. himself who felt the need for the reinforcement.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

One reason why C. was willing to use *posse* in this way even in the subjunctive is that it sometimes gave him a better clausula (here a molossus + trochee + spondee as opposed to five heavy syllables);[31] the same principle underlies his use of e.g. *esse uideatur*, even in passages where the *uideatur* is largely redundant. However, D's reading is not only rhythmically preferable but also more likely to have been corrupted to *essent* than vice versa, both psychologically and on palaeographical grounds (*ESSEPOSSENT* > *ESSENT*, with *saltus oculi* from one *SSE* to the other).[32]

For a parallel corruption see Liv. 27.27.5, where the *codex Puteaneus* rightly reads *euadere possent*; 'Spirensian' witnesses, wrongly followed by some recent editors, have *euaderent*.[33]

11.13. Amidst general talk of the indebtedness of Antony's henchmen, C. makes fun of the obscure P. Decius:

uidi etiam P. Deci auctionem, clari uiri, qui maiorum exempla persequens pro alieno se aere deuouit. emptor tamen in ea auctione inuentus est nemo. hominem ridiculum qui se †exercere† aere alieno putet posse, cum uendat aliena.

uidi *V*: uide *D* || clari *V*: clarissimi *D* || maiorum *V*: maiorum suorum *D* || exercere *V*: exire *D*: exserere *Halm*: emergere ex *Müller*: expedire *Cobet*

Shackleton Bailey, in his textual appendix (p. 388), has argued that D's *clarissimi* should be adopted: 'The sarcasm depends on the superlative, Cicero's standard way of referring to particularly distinguished senators. He does not so use *uir clarus*.' Shackleton Bailey does not cite parallels, but from many possibilities, see 11.10 and *Cat.* 4.13.[34] However, Magnaldi, *Parola* 252–3, in part following Fedeli, points to the use of *uir clarus* at 9.4, 9.11 and 13.41 and writes 'Sebbene *clari* sia qui [s. 13.411] rinforzato da *magni*, ciò non sembra sufficiente per stampare in 11.13 il superlativo *clarissimi*, nato probabilmente, come in 1.3 *clara* per *praeclara*, da un'esercitazione scolastica sul grado degli aggettivi.' Her argument has two weaknesses. First, the variants *clarus* and *clarissimus* are very likely to have a graphic origin and there is no need to invoke a scholastic exercise. Second, here (as elsewhere) she forgets that D's reading is equipollent with that of V on the stemma; although the demonstrable presence of some interpolation in D should make editors cautious, its readings do not have to be considered only when V is obviously corrupt. Here *clarissimus* gives both C.'s standard idiom and is rhetorically more pointed.

D's *uide* is rightly spurned by editors. Its *suorum* has suffered the same fate, and Magnaldi, *Parola* 166, noting that in a few other passages D seems to interpolate pronouns and possessive adjectives, specifically describes it as a characteristic banalization of this group. However, C.'s joke about Decius' devoting himself to debt depends upon knowledge of the self-sacrificial devotions made by the Decii Mures in the fourth and third centuries. It is highly improbable either that this Decius was related to these famous men or that C.'s contemporaries imagined that he was. Adoption of D's reading

[31] See conveniently e.g. R.G.M. Nisbet, *M. Tulli Ciceronis In L. Calpurnium Pisonem oratio* (Oxford, 1961), p. xvii or D.H. Berry, *Cicero Pro P. Sulla oratio* (Cambridge, 1996), 51.

[32] This last point is made briefly by Reeve (n. 1), 30.

[33] See S.P. Oakley, 'Notes on the text of Livy, books 26–30', in P. Millett, S.P. Oakley and R.J.E. Thompson (edd.), *Ratio et Res Ipsa: Classical Essays Presented to James Diggle on his Retirement* [*CCJ* Suppl. 36] (Cambridge, 2011), 167–80, at 171.

[34] A complete list is provided by M. Gelzer, *The Roman Nobility*, tr. R. Seager (Oxford, 1969), 40–4. See too Berry's note (op. cit., n. 31) on *Sull.* 3.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

both sharpens C.'s irony on this point and allows a more pointed contrast with the three instances of *alienus* in the passage, esp. the first (in which *aere alieno* has a double reference: to Decius' debt and to someone else's money). The argument that D has made a banalizing insertion may be countered by the observation that *suorum* could easily have been omitted by V or an ancestor through homoioteleuton (*maiorvm suorvm*).

A decisive resolution of the final *crux* (in which V reads *exercere*) is not possible. I observe merely that D's reading, adopted only by Wuilleumier, is just conceivable if indebtedness is regarded as a kind of bondage (note Liv. 7.19.5 *sorte ipsa obruebantur inopes nexumque inibant*: C. could perhaps be reversing this use of *inire*), but the corruption in V would then be a little surprising; that V's reading is impossible; that Halm's conjecture is a characteristically intelligent attempt to make sense of V's reading, which, however, is unsupported by precise parallels; that Müller's conjecture is likewise unsupported by precise parallels and is further from the paradosis; and that *exsoluere* (perhaps not conjectured before) + direct object + *aere alieno* has precise parallels at Liv. 6.14.11 and 37.54.8.[35]

13.5. Cicero says that peace with Antony and his followers is impossible:

cum hoc quae pax potest esse? hostis si esset externus, id ipsum uix talibus factis, sed posset aliquo modo. maria, montes, regionum magnitudines interessent; odisses eum quem non uideres. hi in oculis haerebunt et, cum licebit, in faucibus; quibus enim saeptis tam immanis beluas continebimus?

id *V*: tamen id *D*

The sentence for which variants are here reported is well translated by Shackleton Bailey, who adopts V's reading: 'If he were a foreign enemy, it would indeed be difficult after such doings, but it would be possible somehow or other.' If one follows D, one could replace 'indeed' with 'still indeed'.

Although V's reading gives good sense, D's is the *lectio difficilior* and the less likely to have been produced by banalization.[36] More importantly, it is well paralleled. The best parallels are three further passages in which C. uses the construction *si ... tamen id ipsum*: cf. *Planc.* 5 *nam si tantummodo mihi necesse esset contra Laterensem dicere, tamen id ipsum esset in tanto usu nostro tantaque amicitia molestum*; *Tull.* 5 *nunc cum coactus dicam, si quid forte dicam, tamen id ipsum uerecunde modi<ce>que faciam, tantum ut, quoniam sibi me non esse inimicum potuit priore actione Fabius iudicare, nunc M. Tullio fidelem certumque amicum esse cognoscat*; *Att.* 12.44.4 *tu mihi, etiam si nihil erit quod scribas, quod fore ita uideo, tamen id ipsum scribas uelim te nihil habuisse quod scriberes, dum modo ne his uerbis*. Analogous are those passages in which C. uses the construction *si ... tamen id* but with no reinforcing *ipsum*: *2Verr.* 2.155 *qui si te publice laudarent, tamen id more potius suo quam merito tuo facere uiderentur*; *Clu.* 126; *Brut.* 111; *Fin.* 1.2, 3.21 (note too Plaut. *Mil.* 747). Other passages in which *tamen id ipsum* is found are worth citing, since they show C.'s willingness to

[35] The verb is used in the context of *aes alienum* also at e.g. [Caes.] *B. Al.* 49.1, Sen. *Ben.* 6.19.5, Plin. *Ep.* 3.11.2 and Macrob. *Sat.* 2.4.23. Prof. Conte suggests to me that *eximere* would be palaeographically easier, but I have found no parallels.

[36] *CQ*'s referee is not entirely convinced and suggests that *tamen* could have been interpolated as a result of D's taking *si* in the sense of *etsi*. Although I still believe D's reading to be right, I record the objection.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press

use this collocation: *2Verr.* 4.36; *Planc.* 31, *De or.* 3.138 *quid Pericles? de cuius dicendi copia sic accepimus, ut, cum contra uoluntatem Atheniensium loqueretur pro salute patriae seuerius, tamen id ipsum, quod ille contra populares homines diceret, populare omnibus et iucundum uideretur*; *Nat. D.* 2.23 (note too that C. uses *hoc tamen ipsum* at *Att.* 11.5.2). However, I have ignored such passages as *Att.* 1.13.1, where the collocation is found but *tamen* is to be taken closely with a preceding *neque* or *sed* or *uerum*.

Sense should always be paramount in solving textual problems, but the evidence of an author's usage is often decisive when two readings make sense. In this article I have tried to show that new facts about Ciceronian usage may still be discovered, and that modern technology removes much of the pain involved in such discovery.

Emmanuel College, Cambridge S.P. OAKLEY
spo23@cam.ac.uk

https://doi.org/10.1017/S0009838812000602 Published online by Cambridge University Press