

TULLIANA

PRO CAELIO

The following editions are referred to: Schütz (1815), Clark (1908), Cousin (1962).

5. Idemque [sc. Caelius's fellow townsmen] nunc lectissimos viros, et nostri ordinis et equites Romanos, cum *legatione* ad hoc iudicium et cum gravissima atque ornatissima laudatione miserunt.

I have punctuated the sentence to make it clear that *et nostri ordinis* does not mean "appartenant même à notre ordre" (Cousin).

Legatio here cannot have its usual sense of "a delegation," because the *lectissimi viri* were themselves the delegation. It must mean a document officially appointing these men as *legati* of the *municipium* ("avec mandat de les représenter," Cousin), just as *laudatio* means a laudatory document or testimonial. This concrete sense of *legatio* is not mentioned in the dictionaries or by J. Lebreton, *Études sur la langue et la grammaire de Cicéron* (Paris, 1901; repr. Hildesheim, 1965), p. 53. It occurs again at *Pro Plancio* 22 "isdemque nunc ex municipiis adsunt equites Romani publice cum *legatione* (et) testimonio," where the old insertion of *et* is certainly right; failure to recognize this sense of *legatio* has led some editors (including A. Klotz) to delete the word and others to mistranslate (e.g., "des chevaliers romains, en délégation officielle, apportant leur témoignage," Grimal). Similar passages are *Pro Archia* 8 "adsunt Heraclienses legati, nobilissimi homines; huius iudici causa cum mandatis et cum publico testimonio venerunt"; *In Verrem* act. pr. 7 "videt etiam tot tam gravis ab amicissimis civitatibus *legationes* cum publicis auctoritatibus ["official documents"] convenisse."

42. Parcat iuventus pudicitiae suae, ne spoliēt alienam, ne effundat patrimonium, ne faenore trucidetur, ne incurrat in alterius domum atque *familiam*, ne probrium castis, labem integris, infamiam bonis inferat . . .

Familiam is the reading of the lost Cluniacensis; all extant manuscripts read *famam* (or *fanum*, a corruption thereof). Only Schütz and Clark have adopted *familiam* (and it is preferred by O. Prinz in *TLL* 7.1:1086. 32), although it is indubitably right. The objections to *famam* are: (a) that it does not fit with *domum*; (b) that it involves an undesirable anticipation of *infamiam bonis inferat*. With *familiam*, the picture is not that of a young blood like the one in Terence (*Ad.* 88–91) who "fores effregit atque in aedis inruit / alienas; ipsum dominum atque omnem familiam / mulcavit usque ad mortem; eripuit mulierem / quam amabat"; the meaning of *incurrere in alterius familiam* was correctly explained by Schütz as "aliorum servos aut ancillas pellicere, inprimis ad libidinem"; compare *In Verrem* 4. 20 "multas familias totas in perpetuum infamis tuis stupris flagitiisque fecisti." The combination of *domus* and *familia* (usually in that order) is a very common one: see the passages listed in *TLL* 6:245. 76–84, especially *Rhet. Her.* 4. 51 "in omnis amicos atque inimicos . . . incursitans, aliorum famam depeculans, . . . aliorum domum (et) omnem familiam perfringens."

PHILIPPIC 2

The following editions are referred to: Halm (1856), Mayor (1861), Clark (1917).

27. Quid? duos Servilios—Casca dicam an Ahalas?—et hos auctoritate mea censes excitatos potius quam caritate rei publicae?

The punctuation after *quid* is due to Halm; it is obviously right, and has been adopted by all modern editors except (perhaps by an oversight) Clark. Before Halm editors printed *quid duos Servilios?*; this makes the accusative inexplicable. It was perhaps the result of the misinterpretation of the passage that this Ciceronian instance of *et* = *etiam* has failed to get into the reference books; it could have been listed together with the other three instances (*Quinct.* 94, *Nat. D.* 1. 83, *Ad Brut.* 26 [= 1. 18]. 3) of *et hic* in *TLL* 5.2:909. 3.

40–41. Te . . . L. Rubrius Casinas fecit heredem. . . fratris filium *praeterit*, Q. Fufi, honestissimi equitis Romani suiue amicissimi. quem palam heredem semper factitatur ne *nominat quidem*: te, quem numquam viderat, . . . fecit heredem.

praeterit V, *praeteriit* D
nominat quidem V, *nomen quidem perscripsit* D

The proper punctuation after *amicissimi* is a full stop (or at least a semicolon), not a comma, because it is at this point, and not at *praeterit*, that there is a break in the sense. Apparently all editors and translators subsequent to Halm have been misled by his note: “omnia sana sunt, modo cogites *filium* ad Q. Fufi repetendum esse. nominat Cicero duos filios, alterum fratris L. Rubrii, alterum amicissimi eius, Q. Fufi, quos ambos ab eo, ut Antonio gratificaretur, praeteritos esse conqueritur.” But there is only one son in question, as was seen by Münzer (*RE* 7.203. 67; cf. 1A.1170. 49); this is the son of Q. Fufius, the latter being the *frater* of the testator L. Rubrius; whether *frater* means “brother” (an adoption being involved) or “half-brother” or “cousin” it is impossible to tell. The function of the sentence beginning (*eum*) *quem palam* is to contrast with the parallel sentence which follows, *te quem* etc.; it is for the sake of this contrast that Cicero repeats the idea of *praeterit* in *ne nominat quidem*.

As for the text, one might hesitate between V’s *praeterit* (which is supported by the present tense of *nominat*) and D’s *praeteriit*, but D’s *ne nomen quidem perscripsit* (a bad clausula) should be rejected as an attempt to ease the construction by someone who misconstrued the passage in the same way as Halm. All the suggestions for change which have been made since the sixteenth century are vain.

45. Orabat [sc. Curio filius] ut se contra suum patrem, si sestertium sexagiens *peteret*, defenderem.

“*Petere* in such a context means ‘demand’; it would not be used of a plea *ad misericordiam* from son to father” (D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *HSCP* 83 [1979]: 282). Servius (on Virgil *Aen.* 9. 192) says “*petere* . . . est cum aliquid humiliter

et cum precibus postulamus." This is certainly one meaning of the word; and if it can be used, as it is by Plautus (*Curc.* 68), of someone "touching" a friend for a loan, it can surely also be used of a son trying to "touch" his father for money to pay off his debts.

49. Postea sum cultus a te [sc. M. Antonio], tu a me *observatus* in petitione quaesturae.
obseruatus D, *ouatus* V

"I know of no parallel for *observatus* of services or attentions rendered by a senior man like Cicero to a junior like Antony before his Quaestorship", writes D. R. Shackleton Bailey (*HSCP* 83 [1979]: 283), who therefore thinks that *adiutus* is a likely emendation. This argument, and this very emendation, go back to the sixteenth century; to counter them H. Ferrarius (*Emendationes in Philippicas Ciceronis*, Venetiis, 1542) quoted *De oratore* 1. 239 "cum aedilitatem P. Crassus peteret [ca. 143 B.C.] eumque maior natu et iam consularis Ser. Galba [cos. 144 B.C.] adsectaretur" (*adsectatio* being one form of *observantia*). Whatever the validity of the parallel, *observare*, in the context of canvassing for office, need not denote a very high degree of service or attention; "der *observans* zeigt seine Aufmerksamkeit in einem respectvollen Benehmen, in der genauen Beobachtung der äusseren Zeichen der Ehrerbietung, ein rein äusserlicher Begriff der ceremoniellen Höflichkeit" (Seyffert-Müller, *Lael.* [Leipzig, 1876], p. 191). Nine years after the event, Cicero might well have made the claim he here makes about his "services" to Antonius's candidature for the quaestorship if he had done no more than be seen strolling with him in public; cf. *Mur.* 70 "neque enim fieri potest neque postulandum est a nobis [sc. senatoribus] aut ab equitibus Romanis ut suos necessarios candidatos adsectentur totos dies; a quibus si domus nostra celebratur, si interdum ad forum deducimur, si uno basilicae spatio honestamur, diligenter observari videmur et coli."

There is little doubt that *observatus* is the paradosis; and none of the suggested emendations is both palaeographically convincing and equally satisfactory in sense.

55. Omnia perfecit [sc. Antonius] quae senatus salva re publica ne fieri possent *perfecerat*.

The paradosis *perfecerat* remained unquestioned until 1865; since then it has been almost universally either obelized or replaced by a conjecture (*profecerat*, *confecerat*, *effecerat*, *providerat*, *prospexerat* have all been either read or suggested). Presumably objection has been taken to the repetition of the verb, but the repetition may well be intentional ("succeeded in *doing* all that the senate . . . had succeeded in *preventing*," Mayor).

If emendation were required, Clark's *profecerat* would be palaeographically the easiest, but Cicero never attaches a *ne* clause to this verb; he attaches an *ut* clause in seven passages only, always preceded by a neuter like *tantum*, *hoc*, *nihil aliud*, or *quid nisi*. (The same is true of Caesar.)

67-68. At idem aedis etiam et hortos—o audaciam immanem! tu etiam ingredi illam domum ausus es, tu illud sanctissimum limen intrare . . . ?

I have punctuated so as to make it clear that there is an anacoluthon. Cicero intended to follow *aedis et hortos* with a verb like *occupavit*, but after the indignant exclamation there is not only a change from the third to the second person but also a change of formulation: *occupavit* is replaced by *ingredi* (and *intrare*) *ausus es*, and *aedis et hortos* is repeated in *domum* (and *limen*). The construction is obscured, in every text I have seen, by a full stop after *hortos*; it was particularly unfortunate that the editor of Cicero who divided up the text into sections should have made a new section begin at this point (with *o*).

107. qui dies ille conlegae *tui* fuit cum . . .

This genitive of the person with exclamatory¹ *qui(s) dies* seems to be unique. Elsewhere, if the person concerned is expressed, the dative is used; so at 90: "qui tibi dies ille, M. Antoni, fuit!"; Statius, *Silv.* 1. 2. 209 (*tibi*), *Theb.* 1. 165 (*tibi*); Val. Flacc. 3. 697 (*terris Achaeis*). In our passage it is not quite certain that *tui* (the reading of the D manuscripts) is the paradosis, since V has merely *tu*; perhaps, here also, the dative (*tuo*) should be read.

BRUTUS

The following editions are referred to: Lambinus (1566), Schütz (1815), Orelli (1826), Jahn (3 Aufl., 1865), Friedrich (i.e., Piderit–Friedrich, 1889), Wilkins (1903), Kroll (i.e., Jahn–Kroll, 1908), Martha (1923), Douglas (1966).

9–10. Quorum memoria et recordatio . . . iucunda sane fuit cum in eam nuper ex sermone quodam incidissemus. nam cum inambularem in xysto et essem otiosus domi, M. ad me Brutus, ut consueverat, cum T. Pomponio *venerat*.

"*Venerat* . . . bezeichnet . . . die dem Gespräche vorausgehende Zeit" (Kroll). It is much more likely, as was pointed out by Fleckeisen (*Neue Jahrb. f. Phil.* 127 [1883]: 208), to be an assimilation of *venit* to the ending of *consueverat*. This type of error appears to have been particularly frequent in the Laudensis; the most startling instance is at 162, where *περίοδον* has become *perhiodorum* because of the preceding *verborum*. Here are some other disputed passages in which this scribal tendency has not been sufficiently borne in mind:

73. †*quod aequalis fuerit*†: the last word may, as Madvig (*Adv. crit.* 3. 101) thought, be an assimilation of *fuit* to the *fuerit* which precedes *quod*. (Here, as often, Wilkins's apparatus is in error.)

79. *triumvir* has become *triumvirum* (which has wrongly been defended as an archaism).

162. †*defensione iuncta*†: the former word may have been influenced by the preceding *Caepione*.

1. Not (as Clark) interrogative; see Housman, *Classical Papers*, ed. J. Diggle and F. R. D. Goodyear (Cambridge, 1972), pp. 1211–12.

175. *versabatur* has become *versaretur* because of the preceding *implicaretur*.

175. †*itam*† may have been influenced by the preceding *scientiam*.

323. *superior viderer* (so I would read with Lambinus) has become *superiores videremur* because of the preceding *essemus*.

40. neque ipse poeta hic [sc. Homerus] tam *idem* ornatus in dicendo ac plane orator fuisset.

The difficulty of *idem* lies not in the fact that it separates *tam* from *ornatus* but in the combination *ipse . . . hic . . . idem*. If these three words go together, their order is certainly un-Ciceronian; indeed it would appear from *TLL* 7.1:203. 25–31 (cf. 7.2:356. 58–62) that, in pre-Christian Latin, the order is always *idem ipse*, not *ipse idem*. If, on the other hand, it were suggested that *idem* couples *ornatus* and *plane orator* (cf. 158 “idem et perornatus et perbrevis”), I should regard that as impossible for the very good reason given by Koch (*RhM* 16 [1861]: 485): “da die Worte *ac plane orator* nur eine Steigerung des Begriffes *ornatus in dicendo* enthalten, so ist *idem* nicht an seinem Platz, das nur bei entgegengesetzten oder wenigstens einigermassen verschiedenen adjectivischen Begriffen steht”; Latin does not say (e.g.) “idem vir bonus ac plane optimus.”

The word must be either deleted or emended. The only emendation worth considering, although by no means certain, is Koch’s *valde*. This has apparently not been reported in any edition since 1889, possibly because in that year Friedrich damned it in two words, “graphisch unmöglich”; in fact it assumes little more than the disappearance of *ua* after *tā*. There are thirteen other instances of *tam valde* in Cicero, one of them (*Div.* 2. 81) with an adjective (*vulgate*).

293. Attico Lysiae Catonem nostrum comparabas, magnum me hercule hominem . . . sed oratorem? sed etiam Lysiae similem? quo nihil potest esse *pictius*.

The only sensible comment on *pictius* in the current editions is that of Douglas: “a surprising judgement on Lysias.” Instead of trying to explain the word, editors should have adopted the obvious emendation, which was published as long ago as 1905: “The absurdity of *pictius* is obvious from other passages in which Cicero writes of Lysias. Read *perfectius* (which suffered from abbreviation); and cf. *Brut.* 35 ‘Lysias . . . quem iam prope audeas perfectum dicere’ ” (J. S. Reid, *Hermath.* 13 [1905]: 356).

297. “Longi sermonis initium *pepulisti*,” inquam “Attice, remque commovisti nova disputatione dignam, quam in aliud tempus differamus.”

pepulisti vulg., *depulisti* L

Pepulisti is a correction which has been almost universally accepted, but it cannot be right. It is taken to mean “den Anstoss geben” (Jahn and others), “tu as mis en branle” (Martha), but whether it is regarded as a metaphor from rowing (Orelli) or from music-making (“strike the first chord,” Douglas) it is equally unconvincing; moreover it is condemned by the clausula which it produces. What should be

substituted for *depulisti* I do not know; possibly a compound of *ferre* like *protulisti* or Lambinus's *attulisti* or Schütz's *intulisti*. The word should be obelized.²

W. S. WATT

Aberdeen, Scotland

2. I am very grateful to Professor R. G. M. Nisbet for commenting on the suggestions made in this article.

MAMURRA'S NEXT GORGE

parum expatrat an parum elluatus est ?
 paterna prima lancinata sunt bona,
 secunda praeda Pontica, inde tertia
 Hibera, quam scit amnis aurifer Tagus:
 nunc Galliae timetur et Britanniae. 20
 quid hunc malum fovetis ? aut quid hic potest
 nisi uncta devorare patrimonia ?

Such is R. A. B. Mynors' Oxford text (revised impression, 1967) of Catullus 29. 16–22. In "Mamurra's Fourth Fortune" (*CP* 72 [1977]: 320–22), E. Badian suggested that line 20 should be emended in this way:

nunc Galli(c)ae timetur et Britanni(c)ae.

It is Mamurra's fourth fortune, after his patrimony and his Pontic and Spanish fortunes (all guzzled up), which is in jeopardy; fear is felt, not for Gaul and Britain, but for Mamurra's Gallic and British booty (sc. *praedae ex praeda*, 18).

Having discovered such booty, with tiny supplements of palmary stature, Badian surely ought to have jettisoned the feeble *timetur*, for polite fear is quite out of place in this poem of outraged, rhetorical questions (*Quis hoc potest videre . . . ? haec videbis et feres? et ille nunc . . . perambulabit . . . ? eone nomine . . . ut . . . ducenties comesset . . . ? quid est alid sinistra liberalitas ?*). Inevitably, unless Mamurra's patrons can be shamed to intervene (an unlikely possibility, given the rhetoric), his Gallic and British booty will feed the man's voracious appetites, just as his patrimony and Pontic and Spanish booties have fed them in the past. Another expression of outrage, not a confession of fearful concern, would seem to be needed here.

It will be recalled that in V the line read:

hunc gallie timet et britannie

While the fifteenth-century emendation of *hunc* to *nunc* bothers those readers who believe that Catullus composed the poem in pure iambic trimeters, *nunc* does sound just right ("first . . . second . . . then third . . . now"); if it is right,