

ENIM TULLIANUM

'Ist die zweite Stelle des Satzes bereits durch ein anderes Enklitikon besetzt, so tritt *enim* auch in klassischer Prosa oft an die 3. und 4. Stelle zurück' (Hofmann-Szantyr¹). How often, and in what circumstances, does *enim* in Cicero² occupy any place but the second? The answer to this question is sometimes relevant to the establishment of the text.

And the answer is: there are many instances which fall into categories A and B below; in all other categories, C-G below, there are comparatively few.

A. Where the first word is a preposition. This calls for no comment except that, once only, *enim* is in fourth place: *Att.* 13.32.3 'de C. Tuditano enim' (Cicero's normal practice is to put an enclitic like *enim* after the praenomen³). As an extension of this use we may regard one instance where a monosyllable precedes the preposition:⁴ *Orat.* 206 'non ad unam enim rem'; similar to this would be *Fin.* 2.48 'si ad honestatem enim' if that, the reading of the oldest manuscript (A), is right ('si enim ad hon-' other manuscripts, Madvig, Schiche).

B. Where the second word is *est* or, much more rarely, another form of *esse*. One might infer from the usual books of reference⁵ that *sunt* was as frequent as *est*, but this is not so; and other forms are very rare indeed. The following figures are, I believe, approximately correct:

	<i>est</i>	<i>sunt</i>	<i>erat</i>	<i>fuit</i>	<i>sit</i>	<i>erit</i>	<i>es</i>	<i>sum</i>
Speeches	78	5-6	2-5	1	—	—	—	—
Rhetorica	57	7	—	1	—	—	1	—
Philosophica	165	3	—	—	2	1	—	—
Letters	59	4	—	—	—	—	1	?1

The doubtful instance of *sunt* is *Mil.* 79 'liberae sunt enim nostrae cogitationes', where the manuscripts are divided between this and the usual 'liberae enim sunt'; modern editors generally accept the former.

The three doubtful instances of *erat*⁶ are:

- (i) *Phil.* 1.37 'satis erat enim', the reading of the oldest manuscript (V), and generally preferred to 'satis enim erat'.
- (ii) *Ver.* 4.108 'tanta erat enim auctoritas'; the two classes of manuscripts

¹ *Lat. Syntax u. Stilistik* (1965), p. 508. See also Kühner-Stegmann, *Ausf. Gramm.* ii.133 ff., and Friedrich's article in *Thes. L. L.* v. 2. 574-7 (referred to below as *Thes.*).

² In Caesar, according to Meusel's *Lexicon*, there are only three instances, two after a prepositional phrase and one after *unus quisque*.

³ Kühner-Stegmann loc. cit.135, Anm. 4.

⁴ I have listed *qua de re* and *quam ob rem* under C below. At *Att.* 12.17, 'mihi

ante enim aedilitatem', not even the most conservative editor would stomach the paradosis, and *enim* is always placed after *mibi*.

⁵ With the exception of F. Hand, *Tursellinus* (Leipzig, 1829-45) ii.401.

⁶ I ignore *Att.* 5.21.12 'et erat enim', where this paradosis is universally corrected to 'etenim erat' because classical Latin does not allow a word to intervene between connective *et* (or *nec/neque*) and *enim*; see *Thes.* 575.35 ff.

(α and β) and modern editors are divided between this and 'tanta enim erat'.

- (iii) *Dom.* 117 'opus erat enim auctoritate'; this is an emendation, but seems a certain emendation, of 'posuerat enim auctoritatem'.

The two other instances of *erat* before *enim* are *Q. Rosc.* 28 'quid erat' and *Phil.* 3. 21 'necesse erat'. The instances of *fuit* are *Cael.* 56 'quae fuit' and *de Orat.* 2. 25 'hic fuit'; of *sit*, *Ac.* 2. 112 'cum sit' and *Fin.* 4. 5 'qui sit'; of *erit*, *Tusc.* 5. 50 'quod erit'; of *es*, *de Orat.* 2. 31 'exorsus es' and *Fam.* 15. 4. 11 'tu es'.

The purported instance of *sum* is *Att.* 15. 26. 5, where the manuscripts read 'curiosus enim'. Modern editors agree that *sum* must be inserted. To insert it before *enim* (with Tyrrell and Shackleton Bailey) produces a result which cannot be paralleled in Cicero (although Pliny, *Ep.* 1. 8. 2, has 'petiturus sum enim'). Since the choice is free, *sum* should (with Wesenberg) be inserted after *enim*.

Not included in the figures given above are two passages in which *enim*, preceded by *est*, is in fourth place; these are *Att.* 13. 9. 2 'si quid est enim offensionis' and *Parad.* 23 'quae vis est enim'. Also not included is *Orat.* 128 'duae res sunt enim quae bene tractatae' etc.; so the oldest manuscript (A), but the other branch (L) of the tradition has 'duo sunt quae bene tractata' etc., and O. Seel⁷ may well be right in adopting this.

Outwith these two categories there is a maximum of fifty-three instances, or purported instances, of *enim* in third or fourth place. They may be classified as follows:

C. The words before *enim* cohere so closely as almost to form one word. The following occur (once only, except where a figure is given): *eius modi*, *iam dudum* (2⁸), *iam pridem*, *nibilo minus*, *non nibil*, *non modo* (3), *nunc demum*, *qua de re*, *quam ob rem*, *qua re*, *qui minus*, *quo modo* (3), *quo usque*, *simul atque*, *si quando*, *si quis/quid/qua* (3).

D. The word before *enim* is a pronoun. Of the seven instances offered by the manuscripts all but two occur in the Letters. These two can be quickly eliminated:

- (i) *Man.* 20 'potest hoc enim dici'. This reading appears to be peculiar to E (cod. Erfurtensis) and rightly rejected by editors.
- (ii) *Orat.* fr. xiv 21 Schoell = xv. 20 Puccioni 'qu . . . enim non . . . atentem adversarium'. In this lacunose passage Schoell's supplements, 'qu<i>d ego> enim non <admirer in>at<i>entem adversarium', would be unparalleled in the speeches and should not be adopted.

The instances from the Letters⁹ are:

- (i) *Fam.* 13. 67. 1 'non te enim fugit'. This is the best attested instance and

⁷ Edition of *Orator* (Heidelberg, 1952).

⁸ One of these two is Hand's emendation of *Att.* 4. 5. 1 '<i>iam> dudum enim circumrodo', which has been adopted by

the two most recent critical editions.

⁹ I ignore *Att.* 6. 1. 11 'nec ego enim', which has as good authority as 'nec enim ego' but is not classical Latin; see n. 6 above.

- may be accepted the more readily because the first word is *non*; see *Thes.* 575. 64 ff.
- (ii) *Q. fr.* 1. 2. 6 'certo scio te enim fecisse cum causa'. This is the *paradosis* (*certo enim scio te* and *certo scio enim te* are isolated variants). It has been accepted without question by all editors, including myself, but I now doubt whether it is right. Even if we follow *Thes.* (576. 48) in saying that *enim* here is 'quasi tertio loco' because *certo scio* belong closely together, this remains a unique example of *enim* intruded into an accusative and infinitive construction which is preceded by the main verb. Cicero's invariable practice elsewhere is shown by *Fam.* 7. 13. 2 'scio enim te non esse', 9. 15. 5; *Att.* 15. 29. 2 'scio enim te familiarem esse', 15. 27. 1; *Q. fr.* 3. 5. 2. No doubt in origin the accusative in this construction was the object of the main verb,¹⁰ but one could hardly adduce this in support of the *paradosis*. Probably *enim* has (as frequently elsewhere) been misplaced; or perhaps it should be deleted as an erroneous dittography after *te*.
- (iii) *Att.* 5. 21. 9 'rapit hominem enim Postumius' (I include this here because *hominem* = *eum*). The manuscripts vary. It could be argued that this reading is better attested than 'enim hominem', and it was therefore adopted by Sjögren and his followers; but the two most recent critical editions prefer 'enim hominem'.
- (iv) *Att.* 14. 6. 1 'odiosa illa enim fuerant'. Although this is better attested than 'enim illa', I think that Shackleton Bailey (alone among editors) is right in adopting the latter.
- (v) *Att.* 15. 29. 2 'σκοπὸς †hoc est enim† huic nostro nihil praeberē'. In his Oxford Text Shackleton Bailey wisely obelizes, but in his annotated edition¹¹ he emends *hoc* to *huic*: 'his [Quintus senior's] aim in view is to avoid having to give our young man [Quintus junior] a penny'. Apart from the question of the postponed *enim*, the resulting sentence contains a remarkable example of a double *hic* (non-corresponsive) referring to two different people. If the old emendation of *hoc* to *hic* were adopted, the nearest parallels would be *Att.* 13. 9. 2 and *Parad.* 23 (listed under B above), but 'σκοπὸς hic est' does not form so close a unit as 'si quid est' or 'quae vis est'; and one might well query *hic*, which must have some emphasis, being placed in the unemphatic position. Much better to delete *hoc* (with Mueller), or even to delete both *hoc* and *enim*; the fact that a common contraction for *enim* resembled the letter H may have something to do with the corruption.¹²

My conclusion is that, outwith the Letters, Cicero never allows a pronoun to displace *enim* from its enclitic position in the sentence; and that, even in the Letters, the purported instances are very few indeed and nearly all either to be rejected or at least to be regarded as doubtful.

¹⁰ Hofmann-Szantyr 353 f.

¹¹ vi. 148.

¹² As it may well have at *Att.* 13. 33. 2

'puto te aliquid fecisse, †H† in Capitolio'; see Sjögren-Thörnell-Onnerfors ad loc.

E. The first word is a monosyllable¹³ forming a natural unit with the second. The following occur (once only, except where a figure is given): *non ius, non libet, et*¹⁴ *formae, vel binae, quid habet, quae potest* (2), *quae tanta, quam multi* (5), *hoc ipsum*. One could extend this category to include the three-word unit at *Ac.* 1.26 'hoc quoque utimur enim' if that reading is accepted.¹⁵

F. The first word is a dissyllable forming a natural unit with the second. The following occur (once only): *eius rei, meo iure, aures ipsae, ea praedicunt, nihil dicam* (so the paradosis at *Flac.* 103, with a variant *nihil*¹⁶ *enim dicam*). Into this category would have to be fitted *Quinct.* 92 'ea res nunc enim', but that is not so natural a unit, and although it is the reading of the Turin palimpsest (P or T) I think that A. Klotz¹⁷ was right in following the rest of the tradition, which has 'ea res enim nunc'.

G. There remain only two instances:

- (i) *Sen.* 31 'tertiam iam enim aetatem'. This is the reading of P (Parisinus 6332), but the paradosis is 'iam enim tertiam aetatem', which should be adopted.
- (ii) *Att.* 14. 2. 2 '†processit enim sed minus diutius sermone enim† sum retentus'. In this corrupt passage it is clear, from our examination of Cicero's use of *enim*, that a sentence beginning 'eius sermone enim' is improbable, and that one beginning 'diutius sermone enim' is impossible.

University of Aberdeen

W. S. WATT

¹³ Cf. *Thes.* 575. 26 ff.

¹⁴ Corresponsive, not connective; see n. 6 above.

¹⁵ See Plasberg (ed. maior, Leipzig, 1908) ad loc. I think that Halm's *iam* for

enim may well be right.

¹⁶ *Thes.* 575. 71 suggests *nil* for *nihil* in order to obtain a monosyllable as first word.

¹⁷ Teubner, 1923.