

TULLIANA

I

Agr. 2.53. 'Te volo curare ut mihi Sinopae praesto sis auxiliumque adducas, dum eos agros quos <tu> tuo labore cepisti ego mea lege vendam.' an Pompeium non adhibebit? in eius provincia vendet manubias imperatoris?

So the passage is constantly mispunctuated. What follows the supposed quotation is not two questions but one, the first part being the equivalent of a *μέν* clause. Failure to see this has led to the suggested insertion of *cum* before *in*.

II

Flacc. 37. Haec . . . laudatio obsignata erat creta illa Asiatica . . . qua utuntur omnes non modo in publicis sed etiam in privatis litteris quas cotidie videmus mitti a publicanis, saepe uni cuique nostrum.

The note on this passage by Mr C. Macdonald in *CQ* N.S. 29 (1979), 217 f., rests on a misinterpretation of the Latin (which is evident also in his Loeb translation). *Litterae* are first divided into *publicae* and *privatae*; the latter are then subdivided into business letters sent by *publicani* (obviously to other *publicani*) and personal letters sent to individuals in Cicero's audience; the slight inconcinnity involved in the mention of the senders in the first case and the recipients in the second is unobjectionable. As du Mesnil pointed out in his edition,¹ '*saepe* steht in Ggs. zu *cotidie*'; the two words are not 'repetitive'. Cicero does not mean 'private letters which the majority of his audience had apparently been receiving from *publicani*', and there is no reference to the Asiatic tax contract of 61 BC.

III

Pis. 72. Nimis magna poena te consule constituta est sive malo poetae sive libero.

The 'malus poeta' is Cicero himself, exiled during Piso's consulship (58 BC) 'because of his verses' (according to the allegation which Cicero puts into Piso's mouth). *libero* has caused trouble, surely unnecessarily; it was correctly explained by Abram² as referring to 'libertas in loquendo'. This use of *liber* is illustrated by some (but not all) of the passages with which this one keeps company in *Thes.L.L.* s.v. 1284.48 ff. Cicero might have said *glorioso*, but prefers a milder word.

¹ Leipzig (Teubner), 1883.

orationum Ciceronis (Lutet. Paris., 1631).

² *Commentarius in tertium volumen*

IV

N.D. 2.150. Quam vero aptas . . . manus natura homini dedit! digitorum enim contractio facilis facilisque porrectio propter molles commissuras et artus nullo in motu laborat.

So apparently all manuscripts and editors, but the latter sentence cries out for re-punctuation and one small emendation. Punctuate after *porrectio* and read *laborant* (sc. *digiti*). 'The fingers open and close with equal ease; the flexibility of the joints enables them to perform every motion without difficulty' (Rackham's Loeb translation adapted to this reading).

V

Brut. 91. 'Quid igitur' inquit 'est causae,' Brutus 'si tanta virtus in oratore Galba fuit, cur ea nulla in orationibus eius appareat? quod mirari non possum in iis qui nihil omnino scripti reliquerunt.' 'Nec enim est eadem,' inquam 'Brute, causa non scribendi et non tam bene scribendi quam dixerint.'

On *dixerint* the editors record no manuscript variant and make no comment. Yet the subjunctive is inexplicable, unless one assumes that Cicero has broken the ordinary rules of grammar out of consideration for his clausula. And there is a second reason for suspecting the text: the verb has no satisfactory subject. The meaning is clear: 'qu'on n'écrit pas aussi bien qu'on parle', Martha (Budé); 'for not writing as well as one speaks', Hendrickson (Loeb). Bring the text into line with these translations by reading *dixeris*; examples of *dixeris* so used are found at *de Orat.* 2.252, 301; 3.202, 203.

VI

Fam. 7.17.2. sic ei [sc. Caesari] te [sc. Trebatium] commendavi et tradidi ut gravissime diligentissimeque potui. quod ille ita et accepit et mihi saepe litteris significavit . . . mea commendatione sese valde esse commotum.

ita et *MG*: grate et *R*

Some sense has been extracted from *ita*; 'in the same spirit' is the rendering of Tyrrell-Purser and others. But it fits ill with what precedes, and one sympathizes with the desire for an adverb which has given rise to the reading of *R*. I suggest <am>ice accepit, comparing *Amic.* 88 'haec accipienda amice'.

VII

Fam. 8.2.1 [Caelius]. Certe, inquam, absolutus est (me †repraesentare† pronuntiatum est), et quidem omnibus ordinibus.

Such is the unanimous reading of the manuscripts; all emendations based on the erroneous belief that *M* reads *repraesentante* can be dismissed. Caelius finds

Messalla's acquittal incredible, but assures Cicero that it really is a fact because he was himself present and heard the verdict pronounced. I would say 'unmistakably pronounced' and read *me praesent<e cl>are*, comparing Suet. *Aug.* 98.4 'versum . . . clare pronuntiavit'.

VIII

Fam. 9.8.2. Posthac autem, mi Varro, quam plurima, si videtur, et de nobis inter nos . . . ; atque utinam quietis temporibus . . . haec inter nos studia exercere possemus!

Professor Shackleton Bailey³ points out that the talks which Cicero envisages between himself and Varro were philosophical, not personal; he therefore deletes *de* and takes *nobis* as dat. commodi ('between ourselves and to please ourselves'). However he says that he would prefer to read *et nobiscum et inter nos*, comparing 9.3.1 (also to Varro, in a similar context) 'nostra nobiscum aut inter nos cessatio' ('our idleness, whether by ourselves or in one another's company'). The latter suggestion gives much the better (and indeed convincing) sense, but still fails to explain the presence of *de* in the paradosis. So perhaps *et idēq nobis <et> inter nos*. There is proportionately more Greek in the letters to Varro than in those to any other correspondent⁴ in the *Fam.* collection. With *plurima* I supply 'studia erunt'.

IX

Fam. 10.1.1. me patria sollicitat in primisque, mi Plance, expectatio consulatus tui, quae ita longa est ut optandum sit ut possimus ad id tempus rei publicae spiritum ducere. quae potest enim spes esse in ea re publica in qua . . . armis oppressa sunt omnia . . . ?

Shackleton Bailey inserts *magis quam sperandum* after *optandum*, because he does not believe that *optandum* by itself could legitimately yield this sense. I think there is a more satisfactory solution: read *optandum <vix> sit*, and compare *Att.* 11.19.1 'est autem unum quod mihi sit optandum . . . ; quod nulla equidem habeo in spe, sed quia tu leviter interdum significas, cogis me sperare quod optandum vix est.'

X

Fam. 10.21.4 [Plancus]. Accessit eo ut milites eius [sc. Lepidi] . . . conclamarent . . . pacem se velle neque esse cum ullis pugnaturus, duobus iam consulibus singularibus occisis, tot civibus pro patria amissis.

'These soldiers of Lepidus are deploring the fact that citizens had fought one

³ In his edition (Cambridge, 1977); see also his Penguin translation.

⁴ I ignore 7.32 (to Volumnius) and 13.15 (to Caesar) as being very special cases.

another. . . . From their point of view the fallen at Mutina on both sides fell, *not for their country* [my italics] . . . , but in a political quarrel which should have been avoided' (Shackleton Bailey).⁵ Precisely; so read <non> *pro patria*. Cicero believed⁶ that those who fell on the republican side died 'pro patria' and 'pro salute et libertate populi Romani'; but these soldiers took the more simple-minded view that one dies in battle 'pro patria' only in a war against a foreign enemy. The phrase *pro patria amissis* has been called 'absurdum',⁷ and 'hardly a credible expression from so good a stylist as Plancus',⁸ but it does not seem difficult to believe that Plancus used *amissis* as synonymous with *mortuis* or *occisis*.

Aberdeen

W. S. WATT

⁵ PCPS 5 (1958-9), 14 f.

1840), 32.

⁶ *Phil.* 14.30 and 38.

⁸ Shackleton Bailey, loc. cit.

⁷ Wesenberg, *Emendationes* (Hauniae,