Cicero is polemicizing against the Peripatetic doctrine that one may entertain emotions, but in moderation. He cites the example of P. Rutilius, said by Fannius (*FRH* 5 = 6 Peter) to have committed suicide upon learning of the defeat of his brother Lucius in consular elections.[9] Conceding that the suicide was an excessive reaction, Cicero proceeds by a *sorites*-style enquiry to determine when such action would be appropriate: what if the death of his children came on top of that event? The answer of the hypothetical Peripatetic is that that would be a new source of depression (*aegritudo*), but a moderate one (*modica*). In Cicero's response, *tamen* concedes his opponent's point per se, but he argues that the loss of the children would be made great 'by addition' (*accessio<ne>*), not that 'a great addition (*accessio*) would have been made', i.e. Cicero is arguing for the cumulative impact of the several events, not for the scale of one individual event. It would be all too easy for a scribe not attending closely to the argument to take *accessio* (rather than *aegritudo*) as the subject and drop the *-ne*.

Los Angeles ANDREW R. DYCK
doi:10.1017/S0009838817000040

TEXTUAL NOTES ON CICERO'S *PHILIPPICS*

(1) qua re flecte te, quaeso, et maiores tuos respice atque ita guberna rem publicam ut natum esse te ciues tui gaudeant: sine quo nec beatus nec c[l]arus nec †unctus† quisquam esse omni<no> potest. (1.35)

The base text cited, here and in the following passages, is P. Fedeli's Teubner.[1] In this case he adopts Clark's *carus* for *clarus* and Muretus's *omnino*. To be happy (*beatus*) is the goal of human life, as ancient philosophers agreed, and so is emphasized as the first predicate, Cicero just having argued from the example of Caesar's assassination that intimidation is no path to happiness. The other two predicates perhaps go back to the 'path of glory' which Cicero has defined this way: *carum esse ciuem, bene de re publica mereri, laudari, coli, diligi gloriosum est* (§33). Hence Clark's *carus*, a quality that necessarily implies a positive valuation by one's fellow-citizens. The problem is the third predicate. One can understand why, in light of the foregoing example of Caesar, Muretus's *tutus* is adopted by recent editors (Shackleton Bailey, Ramsey, Magnaldi). However, for one's fellow-citizens to rejoice that one has been born is no prerequisite for one's safety (merely their willingness to abide by the laws). Surely what one needs is another of the qualities of the person who achieves true glory, viz. *laudatus*.

[9] Pliny, on the other hand, assigns the death to natural causes (*HN* 7.122). F. Münzer, *RE* s.v. 'Rupilius 4' places the elections in 131 or 130; they should in any case be placed shortly before the death of Africanus, whose support for the candidate is attested (*Amic.* 73).

[1] (Leipzig, 1986^2). Other cited editions: A.C. Clark (Oxford, 1918^2); G. Magnaldi (Alessandria, 2008); G. Manuwald (Berlin and New York, 2007); J.T. Ramsey (Cambridge, 2003); D.R. Shackleton Bailey (Chapel Hill, 1986, repr. with slight revisions by J.T. Ramsey and G. Manuwald [Cambridge, MA and London, 2009]).

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881700026X Published online by Cambridge University Press

The corruption is not a difficult one, *l* dropping out after *c*,[2] *a* read as *u* and *u* as *n;* *d* could easily be taken for *ct* and the now extraneous *at* dropped.

(2) cum inde Romam proficiscens ad Aquinum accederet, obuiam ei processit, ut est frequens municipium, magna sane multitudo. at iste operta lectica latus per oppidum est ut mortuus … quid Anagnini? qui, cum essent deuii, descenderunt ut istum, tamquam si esset consul, salutarent. incredibile dictu, sed †cum uinus† inter omnis constabat neminem esse resalutatum, praesertim cum duos secum Anagninos haberet, Mustelam et Laconem, quorum alter gladiorum est princeps, alter poculorum. (2.106)

A description of Antony's procession through Italy. None of the many previous proposals[3] has satisfactorily restored the corrupt matter. I suspect that *cum* is intrusive from the preceding or following line and that *uinus* conceals *ad unum*: 'incredible to say, but all to a man agreed that no one returned their greeting …'.[4] *ad* may have dropped out following *sed.*

(3) foedera interea facta, regna data, populi prouinciaeque liberatae, ipsarumque rerum falsae tabulae gemente populo Romano toto Capitolio figebantur. quibus rebus tanta pecunia una in domo coaceruata est ut, si hoc genus †pene in unum† redigatur, non sit pecunia rei publicae defutura. (5.12)

Magnaldi has brought us a step closer to unravelling this passage by seeing that the transmitted *hoc genus pene* relates to the preceding *pecunia*. A correction has evidently been inserted in the wrong place, *pene* being a corruption of *pecunia*. She thus reads, very plausibly, *tanta <hoc genus> pecunia* ('so much money of this type') and deletes the following *hoc genus pene in unum*. This deletion, however, leaves the *si*-clause incomplete. What is required is a public receptacle for the money. The solution perhaps lies in Orelli's *in aerarium* for *in unum* (adopted by none of the recent editors), corrupted by truncation of the beginning of the word and by misreading of *arium* as *unum*.

(4) magnus est in re publica campus, ut sapienter dicere Crassus solebat, multis apertus cursus ad laudem. (14.17)

The mention of Crassus without praenomen seems unlikely, since there were several prominent bearers of the name. Halm proposed *L. Crassus* in his apparatus, Clark printed *M. Crassus* in his text, pointing to *dicerem* of MS t (the eleventh-century Tegernsee codex) as a variant for the preceding *dicere* and presuming that it alone preserved, in this form, the missing initial, and was followed by Shackleton Bailey. Clark's solution is unlikely, however.[5] Though Cicero's relations with M. Crassus during the latter's lifetime varied with political circumstances, after Crassus' death Cicero was in no mood to praise the man. Rather, he excoriated a thinly disguised Crassus under the sixth Stoic paradox ('the sage alone is rich'), and he speaks openly of Crassus' greed and venality in *De officiis* (1.25, 3.73). On the other hand, as Elizabeth Rawson has pointed out, Cicero calls L. Crassus *sapientissimus* more frequently (seven times) than

[2] Is the *l* in the transmitted *clarus* perhaps an example of reinsertion in the wrong place by a 'corrector'?

[3] Duly registered in Fedeli's apparatus criticus. Shackleton Bailey and Ramsey, too, resort to cruces. Magnaldi ingeniously suggests that *cum uinus* conceals *comminus*, which she would insert prior to *consulem* (Faernus's conjecture, which she adopts, for *consul*), with a comma following *esset*. But the adverb is unnecessary, and the interruption of the phrase *tamquam si esset consul* implausible.

[4] Cf. *OLD* s.v. *unus* 2b.

[5] It is rejected, but without argument, by Fedeli and Magnaldi, who print the transmitted text.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881700026X Published online by Cambridge University Press

any other statesman.[6] A plausible context for the statement can also be suggested, viz. the speech Crassus delivered in 106 promoting the Servilian Law, which removed the juries from control of the *equites* and restored them to the senators, a speech Cicero once described as his *a pueritia magistra* (*Brut.* 164). The speech was evidently quite varied in content and manner (ibid.), but the point was to show the greatness of the Senate (and hence its worthiness to be the source of jurors). The stress on the field of honours (and hence membership of the Senate) being open to many citizens would counter any claim from opponents that the Senate was a narrowly exclusive body. *Crassus* alone being the transmitted text, restoration must begin from that base, and in uncial script *L* and *C* are sometimes sufficiently similar to make a saltation error plausible.[7]

Los Angeles ANDREW R. DYCK
doi:10.1017/S000983881700026X

CAREFREE IN CORFU? HORACE, *EPISTLES* 1.2.31

nos numerus sumus et frugis consumere nati,
sponsi Penelopae nebulones Alcinoique
in cute curanda plus aequo operata iuuentus,
cui pulchrum fuit in medios dormire dies et
ad strepitum citharae cessatum ducere curam.
ut iugulent hominem, surgunt de nocte latrones:
ut te ipsum serues, non expergisceris?

We are ciphers, born to eat bread, the worthless suitors of Penelope and the young men of Alcinous' court, all too concerned with keeping their skin attractive, who thought it a fine thing to sleep till midday and * * * To murder a man, thieves get up at night; to save yourself, won't you wake up?

A.E. Housman begins his discussion of this passage as follows:[1]

I summarise Bentley's arguments against the above reading of v. 31 presented by most MSS. In the first place 'cessatum ducere' is itself a strange and scarcely intelligible substitute for 'lenire' or 'solari'; secondly the youth of Phaeacia did not 'bring care to cease' (if that is what the words mean), inasmuch as they knew nothing of care except from hearsay; thirdly to soothe care by music is no reproach to anyone, and Horace himself carm. iv 11 35 asks for a song because 'minuentur atrae carmine curae'.

He agrees with Bentley in rejecting *curam* (which actually has better manuscript support) in favour of *somnum*, but, although he approves of Bentley's change to *cessantem* in so far as it substitutes sense for nonsense, he thinks that it does not reflect the manuscripts

[6] E. Rawson, *Roman Culture and Society* (Oxford, 1991), 31.
[7] I would like to thank the Editor and the journal's reader for helpful comments on an earlier draft.
[1] A.E. Housman, 'Horatiana', in J. Diggle and F.R.D. Goodyear (edd.), *The Classical Papers of A.E. Housman* (Cambridge, 1972), 1.151-2.

https://doi.org/10.1017/S000983881700026X Published online by Cambridge University Press