

XVI. The Basis of the Text in Book X of Pliny's Letters *

S. E. STOUT

INDIANA UNIVERSITY

In the last years of the fifth century A.D. a manuscript of the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan was discovered, we do not know where or by whom. This manuscript was descended from an ancestor that had received the attention of an editor who had grouped the 121 letters of the collection into 73 units, each consisting of a letter of Pliny with the reply of Trajan if the reply had been preserved. To facilitate reference to these units he had affixed Roman numerals, I to LXXIII, to each in order. He also placed at the head of each unit a lemma that indicated its contents. Between the last line of each unit and the first line of the next the space of one line was used to receive this lemma and numeral. For example, in the line between the 26th and 27th units was written *De lacu Nico-medensium XXVII*. No address, such as *C. Plinius Traiano*, which is supplied editorially in modern editions, was found in the letters of this manuscript.

This discovery came to the attention of some scholar who knew the *Letters* of Sidonius Apollinaris (ca. 430–80), whose enthusiasm for the letters of Pliny had awakened interest anew in their author. This scholar conceived the idea of combining the Pliny-Trajan correspondence with the nine books of Pliny's *Letters* that were known to Sidonius in a new edition to be entitled *C. PLINII SECUNDI*

* The following *sigla*, used in the discussion of Book X, are for convenience listed here:

A — First printed edition, by Avantius, of *Ep.* 10.41–121 (1502).

a — First complete edition, by Aldus, of *Ep.* I–X (1508).

Ber. — Edition by Beroaldus of *Ep.* 10.41–121 and *Panegyricus* (1503).

Cat. — Edition by Catanaeus of 8½ books and *Ep.* 10.41–121 (1506).

*Cat.*² — Revised edition of Catanaeus (1518).

I — Complete manuscript copy of **P**, made by Iucundus.

I — Manuscript copy of portions of **P**, made by Iucundus for Budé, still preserved in the Bodleian Library.

i — Textual notes by Budé, made in the Bodleian volume.

P — Manuscript of *Ep.* I–X, found in Paris by Iucundus ca. 1502, used by Aldus in 1508, then lost.

Z — Earliest manuscript of the ten-book family (ca. 490).

EPISTOLARUM LIBRI NUMERO DECEM. His manuscript began what has since Keil been known as the ten-book family of Pliny manuscripts. In Book X of this new edition, which I shall refer to as **Z**, the editor preserved the 73 units of the lately found manuscript, with the lemmata and numerals.

Some time between 1499 and 1506, probably not before 1502, the Italian scholar Fra Giacondo of Verona discovered in or near Paris a minuscule manuscript of the ten books of Pliny's *Letters*, which had descended from **Z**. This manuscript is now referred to as **P**. It had only a brief history of a half-dozen years after it was discovered, but made important contribution to our knowledge of the text of the *Letters*. Giacondo first made a complete copy of **P**, to which I shall refer as *I*. He intended to use *I* in preparing his projected edition of the *Letters*, but upon his return to Italy in 1506 his attention was required by other pressing matters and he turned Manuscript *I* over to his friend Aldus Manutius, the publisher, who used it in preparing the text of his edition of the *Letters* which was published at Venice in November 1508, the earliest printed edition that contained ten books. This edition is now referred to as **a**. Manuscript *I* disappeared after **a** was published. Manuscript **P** itself, having been secured by the Venetian Senator Mocenicus, who was ambassador from Venice at the court of Louis XII at this time, was taken to Venice by him in 1508 and given to Aldus some time before **a** was published. It was perhaps used to some extent by Aldus in the last stage of the preparation of the text for his edition. No trace of **P** has ever come to light since the publication of the edition of Aldus. Fortunately a direct copy of portions of **P** or *I*, made by Giacondo for the French scholar Budé before 1506, is still preserved in a volume in the Bodleian Library of Oxford University. The manuscript portions of this volume may be referred to as **I**; in discussions of the text of Pliny the volume is sometimes referred to as the *Bodleian Volume*. In the manuscript portions of this volume we have our most direct evidence for any part of the text of **P**.

This summary statement of portions of the history of the text of the *Letters* as a whole has seemed to me to be necessary as a background for the more detailed history of the text of Book X. For documentation and discussion of the statements in the above three paragraphs the reader must be referred to Stout, *Scribe and Critic at Work in Pliny's Letters*, "Indiana Univ. Publ.," Humanities Ser. No. 30 (Bloomington 1954) 54-80, and *passim*.

In May 1502 Ioannes Tacuinus di Tridino published at Venice *C. Plini Iunioris ad Traianum Epistole .46. nuper reperte cum eiusdem responsis*. This volume, containing only letters 41–121 of Book X, was edited by a respected scholar, Avantius; in textual discussions it is now referred to as **A**. Tacuinus, a well established printer at Venice since about 1480, had counted it a privilege to publish in 1495 *Hieronimi avancii Veronensis artium doctoris in Val. Catullum & in Priapeias Emendationes*, including in the volume three occasional orations of Avantius; in 1496 he had Avantius revise for a second printing the *Ausonius* which the firm had published in 1494; in January 1499 he took out a privilege to publish an edition of Lucretius by Avantius, but for some unknown reason this volume was published by Aldus in December 1500; in May 1500 Tacuinus published an edition of Tibullus, Catullus, and Propertius by Avantius; and now in May 1502 he brought out the *Epistole .46. nuper reperte*.

In a letter to Bembo prefixed to this edition Avantius describes his source as follows: "Petri Leandri industria ex Gallia Plinii iunioris ad Traianum epistolas licet mancas depravatasque habuimus; quas pro virili mea castigatas impressorum beneficio emitendas censuimus."

Leander's manuscript had originally consisted of exactly the same 73 units that were found in the parent of this portion of **Z**, and with the same lemmata and numbering inserted in the same manner. Its text and that of this portion of **P**, which descended from **Z**, clearly go back to an identical source, our only source for any portion of the Pliny-Trajan correspondence.

It has been assumed¹ that Leander's manuscript was derived directly or indirectly from **P**. That this can no longer be accepted is shown by the fact that in 10.58.7 the words *vel non admonita persuasio*, containing the subject of a *cum*-clause, were not in **P** but are preserved in the Leander manuscript. All modern editors accept the words as part of the original text. That the lost words were an exact line in an ancestor of **P**, perhaps of its immediate parent, is shown in 10.38.2 by the misplacement in **P** of a line of this ancestor, in which the words had stood as follows:

¹ See E. T. Merrill, "On the Early Printed Editions of Pliny's Correspondence with Trajan," *CP* 5 (1910) 452 f. His article in *CP* 10 (1915), "The Tradition of Pliny's Letters," also touches upon various points discussed in this paper.

(ne) et incohaverint
 aquae ductus et relinquerint
 quid itaque compereris per
 fer in notitiam meam.

In the manuscript copy of this portion of **P**, which is found in the Bodleian Volume, and in **a**, which was based upon **P** or *I*, the complete copy of **P**, the order of these words in **P** is shown to have been as follows: "(ne) et incohaverint quid itaque compereris per aquae ductus et relinquerint fer in notitiam meam." Catanaeus, in his second edition (1518), keenly restored the correct order of words in this sentence.

Although Avantius in his dedicatory epistle tells Bembo that he has emended the text of the Leander manuscript "pro virili mea" before having it printed, it is clear that his work as editor can hardly have gone farther than an occasional modernization of the spelling or an attempt to recover a word that had become a meaningless group of letters through error in copying them. For example, in 10.87.2 *exegiut*, two words in the original text, appears as *exuit* in **A**. An ignorant or inattentive scribe had probably copied the letters into the Leander manuscript as *exeguit*. *iu* and *ui* are easily confused in reading many manuscripts, and if this group of letters was caught as one word, *-uit*, a frequent ending in verbs, is an easy correction of the supposed error of a previous scribe. Avantius may be responsible for dropping *-eg-* from *exeguit* to give a possible word form. But on the whole the text of **A** is a faithful copy of Leander's manuscript. For this reason, where the two texts differ, its readings have met the requirements of competent critics more often than those of Aldus.² It should be kept in mind however that we do not have the manuscript of Leander, but an edited printed copy of it. Some of the readings of **A** undoubtedly show errors of typesetter or editor.

In 1503 Beroaldus republished the text of Avantius at Bologna with many emendations. These were made by conjecture only, without access to any manuscript. In 1506, at Milan, Catanaeus also republished these same letters, embodying some of the new readings of Beroaldus and adding many conjectures of his own. He also had no manuscript of these letters. Our only evidence there-

² See Stout, *Scribe and Critic* 72-73, for a list of forty readings in which all modern editors prefer the readings of **A** over those of **a**.

fore for the readings of the Leander manuscript comes from the Avantius edition of letters 41–121.

The next publication of this correspondence was by Aldus in 1508 as Book X of his complete edition of the *Epistolae*. His text gave all of the 121 letters of this book. In preparing his text Aldus had before him, besides the editions of Avantius, Beroaldus and Catanaeus, the complete transcript (*I*) of **P**, which had been given to him by Giacondo in 1506, and eventually, in 1508, **P** itself. He evidently worked chiefly from the edition of Catanaeus (1506) and *I* or **P**. When his text agrees with a conjecture of Catanaeus, it cannot safely be assumed that he is giving us the reading of **P**. He also introduced emendations of his own. Though he had the complete text of this correspondence in **P**, his text must be used with caution as evidence for the readings of that manuscript. He did however correct, mainly from **P**, almost thirty miscopyings that stood in the Leander manuscript. Examples are *datumque* **a** for *dictumque* **A** in 10.56.4, where open *a* had been read as *ic*, and *sic ut* **a** for *sinit* **A** in 10.81.6, where *cu* had been misread as *ni*. Each of these errors is frequent in copying from some minuscule scripts.³

In 1518 Catanaeus published a careful revision of his first edition. In this he adopted many readings from **a** and gave up many of his own conjectures which he had printed in his first edition. An editor who is tempted to adopt a conjecture made by Catanaeus in his first edition should always examine the passage in his second edition. See, for example, the comment on 10.86A and 86B below (245). The second edition of **a** (1518) shows no real revision. Aldus himself had died in 1515.

For 10.4–40 the best evidence for the readings of **P** is found in Manuscript **I**, the unedited copy of these letters noted above (234).

Budé quotes a few times from Book X in his *Annotationes in Pandectas* (Paris 1508). At this time he had not seen the edition of Catanaeus (1506) nor that of Aldus (1508). His quotations therefore represent the text of **A** or **P** or his own conjecture from these texts. He also made textual notes in his desk copy of the *Letters*, the Bodleian Volume. Some of these are from *I* or **P**, some are merely his own conjectures, others he copies from the Aldine or the Catanaean editions after he saw these. His textual notes are designated by the signum **i**; they give some help if used with proper caution.

³ See Stout, *op. cit.* 82.

The first thing required of a text critic in Book X is to determine the text of Leander's manuscript and **P**. Comparison of these two findings will in most cases give the text of the common source of these two manuscripts, which is our only real evidence for the text in Book X. Many failures of modern editors to find and agree upon the text in this book have been caused by lack of diligence and care in these two steps. This compels resort to conjecture too soon, opening a field in which brilliance and erudition shine but usually go wrong. Good text criticism must start from the manuscript evidence, and usually becomes no longer good when it gets far away from it. With only one source for the text, however, in Book X, and with the evidence for its readings indirect and far from adequate, it is inevitable that critics should find more difficulty and attain less reliable results in this book than in the other books of the *Letters*.

I will now examine some readings of this book upon which critics are still divided and in which I think a consideration of the history of the text affords help.

* * *

In 10.8 Pliny tells Trajan that he had earlier planned to construct a temple in his home town, Comum, and to place in it several *statuas principum* which he possessed, that Nerva had approved the project and consented to have his own statue added to the collection, but that a definite start on the undertaking had been delayed, first by Pliny's own illness, then by the illness of Nerva, and still again by press of work in the office of the *praefecti aerari Saturni*. He says however that his month (in which he would carry the chief responsibility in the office) would be up September 1st, and the work in the office would be lighter in September because of the large number of holidays in that month, and that this would be a good time for him to get away for a while and go up to Comum to complete arrangements for the building of the temple. He therefore asks leave of absence from his office and for permission to add a statue of Trajan to the collection of statues of the Principes.

The Emperor begins his reply as follows: "Et multas et omnes publicas causas petendi commeatus reddidisti; mihi autem vel sola voluntas tua suffecisset." This may be translated as follows: "The reasons you have given for asking for a leave of absence are many and all based upon the public interests; for me however the simple statement that you desired a leave would have been enough."

multas and *omnes* refer to the same reasons. Catanaeus (1518) interpreted them as referring to two sets of reasons, only one of which was connected with the public interests. He therefore supplied, by pure conjecture, the word *privatas* after *multas*, assuming that this word had been lost through scribal error. This conjecture has not been accepted by most modern editors, but Hardy (1889), Durry (1947), and Schuster (1952) have reintroduced *privatas* into the text.

Pliny gave no *privatas causas petendi commeatus*. The only *causas* stated before his "Rogo ergo . . . indulgeas commeatum" were *publicas causas*. After stating his request however he tells the Emperor that he does not wish to conceal from him the fact that the leave would also serve his private interests somewhat, but he does not make this a part of the basis upon which he asks for the leave.

In his reply the Emperor officially recognizes that the reasons upon which Pliny based his request were *omnes publicae*. To make *multas* refer to *privatas causas* in contrast to *publicas* gives an impossible meaning to the words *omnes publicas causas reddidisti*. Set over against *multas privatas causas* these words could only mean "You have stated all the possible reasons that can be based upon the public interest."

* * *

10.22 Et mihi scripsit Gavius Bassus non sufficere sibi eum militum numerum qui ut daretur illi mandatis meis complexus sum. Quid quaeris scripsisse me? Ut notum haberes his litteris subici iussi. Multum interest te poscat an homines in se ut latius velint (velint a). Nobis autem utilitas demum spectanda est et, quantum fieri potest, curandum ne milites a signis absint. **Ia** Multum interest res poscat an homines imperare latius velint *Cat.*²

In the previous letter Pliny tells Trajan that when he informed Gavius Bassus, *praefectus orae Ponticae*, what assignment of soldiers the Emperor had allotted to him for the following year, Bassus had said that he would need more than were being allotted to him and that he would write to the Emperor to ask that the assignment be revised. The letter given above is Trajan's reply to Pliny. The Emperor had a copy of his reply to Bassus appended to this letter. The friend of Pliny who published the correspondence after the death of Pliny apparently did not regard Trajan's letter to Bassus as belonging in an edition of the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan.

The text of this letter is evidently corrupt in the second and

third sentences. The original of the second sentence seems to have been: "Quae rescripsissem ut notum haberes his litteris subici iussi." From *quaerescripsissem* the copyist first caught and wrote *quaeris scripsisse* and made a hasty correction of *m* to *me* to get a subject for *scripsisse*, a typical scribal emendation. A later reader thought that *quaeris* called for an interrogative clause and supplied *Quid*, and perhaps a question mark.

"Quid quaeris scripsisse me?" is found in both **I** and **a**, and therefore stood in **P**, our only remote source for the text here. The reader who made the hasty conjecture thought this to be a rhetorical question, and rhetorical questions were a favored feature of style with rhetoricians. But Trajan would not have used such a rhetorical question in writing a business letter to his governor.

Modern editors print the text of Keil: *cui quae rescripsissem*. But there is no trace of *cui* in **P**, and it need not be supplied. *Quae rescripsissem* should be accepted because it was in the manuscript source, gives an appropriate meaning and syntax, and the development of the erroneous text from it is easily explained on palaeographical grounds.

The manuscript text of the next sentence has no meaning, hence does not give Trajan's words. Keil, Müller, and Merrill print it but mark it as corrupt. Giacondo did the same when he made the copy **I** for Budé. Kukula, Schuster, and Durry print "Multum interest, res poscat an homines iure uti latius velint." This gives a possible meaning but should not be seriously thought of as Trajan's words. Such a scissors-and-paste method of emendation probably never succeeded anywhere in getting back to an author's words from corrupted manuscript readings and free conjectures.

* * *

10.23 Prusenses, Domine, balineum habent et (est **Ia**) sordidum et vetus. Itaque tamen aestimamus (aestimans **i**) novum fieri, quod videris mihi desiderio eorum indulgere posse **Ii**

Scribal error has obscured the meaning of the second sentence as it appears in **I** and in the emendations of Budé and Aldus. As so often elsewhere, Aldus removes the difficulty for his readers by simply substituting a sentence which can be understood: "Id itaque indulgentia tua restituere desyderant, ego tamen aestimans novum fieri debere, videris mihi desyderio eorum indulgere posse."

In *Hermes* 61 (1926) 206-7 Cuntz proposes to substitute *tamiae* for *tamen*, change *aestimamus* (aestimans **ai**) to *aestimant*, and add

debere or *oportere* after *feri*. This gives an intelligible text, which is one objective of a critic: "Itaque tamiae aestimant novum fieri debere." In a brief search I fail to find the Latinized form of this Greek word elsewhere in Latin. While this would not prove that Pliny did not use it, it should not be received into the text except upon rather firm proof that he did use it. The assumption that a word needed by a critic, such as *debere* or *oportere*, has dropped out without leaving any trace in a manuscript is never a safe one; it usually represents mere wishful thinking, and should not be made or accepted except as a last resort, and even then with mental reservations. Schuster (1933, 1952) and Durry (1947) accept the first and second conjectures of Cuntz, but do not supply *debere* or *oportere* with *aestimant fieri*. Their Latin ought to mean that the *tamiae* think that a new *balineum* is under construction, not that one ought to be made, which the context requires. The feeling of Aldus and Cuntz that *debere* or *oportere* must be supplied is supported by the fact that no parallel to the meaning which Schuster and Durry give to *aestimant* is given in *ThLL* s.v. "aestimo."

The following seems to me to be a possible solution of the difficulty. *itaquedre* (itaque debere) of a manuscript was read as *itaquetn* (itaque tamen). *t* and *d* are often misread, the one for the other, especially after *e* or *o*, and *r*, or the digraph for *re* or *ri*, in a script in which the second stroke of *r* dips toward the base line, is often read as *n*. It is difficult at times to distinguish between *r* and *n* in the script of monks trained in Irish monasteries. Examples from Pliny manuscripts are (1) *condemnit M* for *contemnit* 4.25.4, *retundet M* for *redundet* 5.6.36, *silentii* (silēti) **aI** for *silēdi* 8.14.6, *date h* for *etate* 4.18.2 and (2) *disteritum D* for *distentum* 3.5.7, *errores V* for *errones* 2.10.3, *remissioribus F* for *remissionibus* 4.3.1, *genere* (gnē) **r** for *gratiae* (grē) 5.6.22, *proclamo D* for *Pro Claro* 9.28.5, *non* (nō) **t** for *ratio* (rō) 1.5.16.

Accepting with Cuntz and others *aestimant* as the original for *aestimamus* or *aestimans*, this would explain the errors satisfactorily and give an excellent text: "Itaque debere aestimant (Prusenses) novum fieri." This also gives emphasis to *debere*, which is appropriate in the context.

* * *

10.58.5 Flavius Archippus philosophus impetravit a me ut agrum ei adderem circa Prusiadam (Prusiam *Cat.*) patriam suam tam uberem **A Ber. Cat.** ut agrum ei ad C (DC **a Cat.**²) circa Prusiadam patriam suam emi iuberem **ia Cat.**²

The agreement of **a** and **i** on *emi iuberem* can only mean a common source for them, which was evidently **P**, probably in each case through *I*. *addc* or *adc* stood also in Leander's manuscript or in an ancestor of it, and furnished the starting point for *addere*, the editorial effort of Avantius or some earlier editor in the ancestry of the Leander manuscript to recover an intelligible reading after scribal error had led to *tam uberem* for *emi iuberem*. On this assumption, *ad DC* is to be preferred to *ad C*.

* * *

10.61.2 Potest enim lacus fossa usque ad flumen adduci nec tamen in flumen emitti, sed relicto quasi margine contineri pariter et dirimi. Sic consequemur ut nec *vacuo* videatur flumini mixtus et sit perinde ac si misceatur. **A** *Ber.* **a**

Editors have found it difficult to believe that *vacuo* can have been Pliny's word. It stood in both Leander's manuscript and **P**. These two manuscripts went back to a common source. Catanaeus (1506) simply substituted *vicino* for *vacuo*. Several other attempted emendations are found in modern editions, but Merrill (1922) and Schuster (1933, 1952) give up and simply mark the text as corrupt.

Pliny's word here was, I think, *lacus*. The initial error was made when a copyist read *l* as tall *i*, giving *iacus*. This sounded enough like Latin that the hurrying scribe was not disturbed. *iacus* was later turned into *vacuo* by a reader or editor to give a word and connect it with nearby *flumini*. He did not ponder long on the meaning in the larger context, where modern editors have found their trouble.

* * *

10.61.3 per id spatium per quod fossa *fienda* est **A** *facienda* *Ber. Cat.*
a *fodienda* **i**

In the Leander manuscript *fienda* was an ignorant scribe's attempted correction of *fcienda* in his exemplar. The contraction *fc* for *fac* in writing conjugational form of *facio* was not uncommon in late minuscule manuscripts, such as the mother of Leander's manuscript may well have been. *fienda* was never a recognized form of *fieri*. Budé suggested *fodienda* for *fienda* in the margin of his copy of Avantius. This seems to imply that *fienda* was also the form found in **P**, and then in *I*, so that Budé had no other reading before him when he made his proposed emendation. *fodienda* has no manuscript support, but Merrill and Durry receive it into the text. Beroaldus did better in correcting *fienda* of Avantius to

facienda; Catanaeus at once accepted *facienda* from him and Aldus took it from Catanaeus.

* * *

10.63.1 Legatio quidem . . . nulla adhuc venit, sed venit (veniet **A**) tabellarius Sauromata, cuius (quem **a**) ego usus opportunitate quam mihi casus obtulerat, cum tabellario qui Lycormam (Lycorinam **A**) ex itinere praecessit mittendum putavi, ut possis. . . . **Aa**

Hardy, in his notes on this letter, rightly points out that the reference is to Sauromates, King of Bosphorus at the time this letter was written. Pliny could not have introduced King Sauromates into this letter without the accompanying title *rex*. See *Rex Sauromates* 10.64 and *legato Sauromatae regis* 10.67. No restoration of the text which omits *regis* can be accepted. The following is a possible history of the error.

The word *regis*, perhaps through some damage to the parent manuscript, became illegible. A recognizable trace of *eg* led to the word *ego*, which Pliny would hardly have used here. In an endeavor to recover the text, *cuius* was added editorially before the new *ego*. If an accusative as subject of *mittendum* (esse) must necessarily be expressed, it could have been *eum*, which may easily have been lost before *cum* by haplography. The original text may thus have been "Sed venit tabellarius Sauromatae regis. Usus opportunitate quam mihi casus obtulerat, eum cum tabellario. . . ."

* * *

10.78.2 Plures enim et quanto infirmiores erunt idem (idem petent *Ber. Cat.*) fiduciam diligentiae (d. tuae *Cat.*) habeo **A** *Ber. Cat.* Plures enim tanto magis eadem requirent quanto infirmiores erunt. Tibi eam fiduciam diligentiae habeo **a** *Cat.*²

Aldus, as he so often does, rewrote the sentence in a form that makes it unnecessary for a reader to exercise his intelligence in "reading between the lines," but no manuscript authority can be assumed for his text. It is clear that Budé had no such reading as that of **a** in his manuscript **P** or **I**, by which he corrected his copy of Avantius. Hardy (1889) restored the correct text here, but Schuster and Durry have returned to the elucidating expansion of the text by Aldus.

* * *

10.81.4 Ubi *consedissem* cogniturus **A** *Ber. Cat.* i

Aldus emended this to *cum sedissem*, which is accepted in *Cat.*², and by Merrill, Schuster, and Durry. *consido* is the usual word

used of a judge taking his seat to hear a case. See *consederat auditurus* 6.31.9 and other examples cited in *ThLL* s.v. "consido" A.2.b: "de iis penes quos arbitrium est." It is therefore better with Orelli and Keil to assume haplography here and print *ubi cum consedissem cogniturus*.

* * *

In the manuscript source of our text 10.85, 86A, and 86B are given as a single letter. It contains *testimonia* concerning two subordinate officials who had been serving in the province with Pliny and presumably were now returning to Rome for a new assignment.

The first of these officials (10.85) was Maximus, a freedman of the Emperor who had been serving as procurator. The portion of the manuscript text of the letter devoted to him closes with a formula which was commonly used in such letters of recommendation: "Libenter apud te testimonio prosequor ea fide quam tibi debeo."

After these words about Maximus, the manuscript, without a break in the text or the lineage, continued as follows:

Galbium Bassum, Domine, praefectum orae Ponticae, integrum probum industrium atque inter ista reverentissimum mei expertus, voto pariter et suffragio prosequor *ea fide quam tibi debeo* quam ea quae speret instructum commilitio tuo, cuius disciplinae debet quod indulgentia tua dignus est. Apud me et milites et pagani, a quibus iustitia eius et humanitas penitus inspecta est, certatim ei qua privatim qua publice testimonium pertribuerunt, quod in notitiam tuam perfero *ea fide quam tibi debeo*.

It is probable that the words *ea fide quam tibi debeo* after *suffragio prosequor* are an editorial echo of the same words which are found after *testimonio prosequor* three lines above at the end of 10.85. The rigid mechanical repetition of the formula is not like the composition of Pliny: it is more on the level of what an officious editor might insert into the text to make it conform to the pattern for such letters. Pliny himself was not limited to such a pattern: at the close of this letter he varies the formula by using *in notitiam tuam perfero*.

That the words are an editorial addition is strongly suggested by the fact that with them the rest of the letter can only be made to give meaning by supplying words that will turn what follows into a third letter about a different person. The testimony however of the soldiers and citizens ties the last portion inseparably to Gavius Bassus because, as subordinate to Pliny, he had been in charge of

ora Pontica. See 10.22, discussed above (239). Such a report about him to his superior officer, Pliny, was regular procedure at the close of his administration.

Catanaeus saw the difficulty created by these words and borrowed the name of one of Pliny's correspondents from 4.24 and rewrote the next words as follows: "Fabium Valentem instructum commilitio tuo valde probo; cuius disciplinae. . .".⁴ He was unfortunate in the choice of Fabius Valens, who already ten years before the time of this letter was an intimate friend of Pliny (cf. "familiaris est omnes cogitationes meas tecum communicare" 4.24.7) and would have been recommended by Pliny in far different terms than those found here.

Aldus had this letter in Manuscript P, and refused to accept the conjecture of Catanaeus, and Catanaeus himself gave up his proposed reading when he published his revised edition in 1518, in which he printed 86A and 86B as one letter.

When Hardy published this correspondence, he did not have access to the second edition of Catanaeus and was thus misled, though "with much hesitation," to adopt the reading of the first edition of Catanaeus. Kukula (1908) adopted Hardy's reading except that, having noticed *domine* in both 85 and 86A, he improved the text of 86B by adding *domine* in it also, after *commilitio*. Schuster (1933, 1952), followed by Durry (1947), improved Kukula's Latin composition by shifting the contributed *domine* to a position after the also contributed *Valentem*. It is difficult for scholars who rewrite Pliny to agree on their Latin composition. Hardy's hesitation does not appear in these recent editors. Goldfinger, when writing his article on Fabius Valens for *RE*, misled by these editors, accepted the invention of Catanaeus about him. The other modern editors follow Keil (1870) in placing dots before *quam*, the first word of their 86B, to indicate that the name of the person recommended has been lost, leaving the reader to struggle with the syntax of the opening words of the letter.

Budé, after receiving a copy of the Aldine edition, inserted between the lines of his Avantius edition before *ea quae speret* the word

⁴ Neither Schuster nor Durry can have looked at the sources whose readings they cite for the text of 86B in their apparatuses. Schuster reports that four of the seven sources cited contained the words Fabium Valentem, while Durry reports these words as being found in all seven. They are found in only two, and any critic who attempts to determine the correct reading here without knowing the history of the text can easily be misled by finding the words even in these two.

abunde, with which Aldus had enriched the text of Pliny. After securing a copy of the edition of Catanaeus, Budé cancelled his word *abunde* and inserted in the margin from Catanaeus *Fabium Valentem valde probo*. Although Catanaeus published in 1506 and Aldus in 1508, there are many evidences in the notes of Budé, as here, that he used a copy of the Aldine edition before he obtained the edition of Catanaeus.

The history of the text outlined above shows that 86A and 86B should be printed as one letter. The text after *expertus* should be "voto pariter et suffragio prosequor ea quae speret instructus. . . ."

* * *

10.87.3 meum gaudium, domine, meamque (meam **a**) gratulationem filii honore continerent (-erem *Ber.*, -ebis *Cat.*) **A** *Ber. Cat.*

From the original *honorcontineret*, a scribe first caught and wrote *honore*, reading *c* as *e*, a frequent error. He then changed *contineret* to *contererent* to make it agree with *filii*, which he took as subject. A scribe's repairs on the text were hastily made, and with a very limited amount of text under scrutiny. Many emendations of this reading have been made, all of which, if I may borrow a comment of Brakman, "nimis longe a tradita lectione recesserunt."

* * *

10.96.10 certe satis constat prope iam desolata templa coepisse celebrari et sacra sollemnia diu intermissa repeti, *passumque* (pastumque *Ber. Cat. i*) *venire victimarum, cuius adhuc rarissimus emptor inveniebatur* **A** *Ber. Cat. i* *passimque venire victimas, quarum adhuc a Cat.*² (From Aldus Budé emended *passum* of **A** to *passim*, but later wrote *pastum* in the margin from Catanaeus and deleted the *passim* of his earlier emendation.)

pastum, the *st* being written as a digraph, might easily have been misread as *passum* by a copyist. This strongly supports the emendation of Beroaldus. All modern editors accepted his emendation until Koerte in *Hermes* 63 (1928) 481–84, following a lead given by Eduard Meyer, *Ursprünge und Anfänge des Christentums* 3.560–61, objected to it on the ground that *pastus* meant "pasture," not animal food in general, for which the word was *pabulum*. Pointing out that the sale of the flesh of sacrificed animals was a principal source of income for the priests of a temple, Koerte proposed to insert the word *carnem* after *victimarum* as the subject of *venire* and accept *passim* from Aldus for *passum* of the manuscript source.

The loss of a word such as *carnem* does occur occasionally, but

rarely. It should not be lightly assumed by a critic of the text. This should be a last resort, used only when no acceptable emendation based upon an analysis of the manuscript evidence can be found. There is really no valid objection to the use of *pastus* as a general term for the food of animals. Chapters 47–50 of the second book of Cicero's *De natura deorum* contain observations on nature's provision of food for living beings (*animantia*) and on her equipment of various animals for securing and making use of the food best suited to them. For the general term *food* Cicero uses *pastus* and *cibus* in this discussion. Many references to *pastus* used as a general term for the food of animals are given in Merguet, *Lexikon zu den philosophischen Schriften Ciceros* 3.25, s.v. "pastus." The original meaning of *pastus* was not "pasture," nor was it ever restricted to that meaning. Schuster (1933, 1952) and Durry (1947) have accepted the text proposed by Koerte. The simple solution of the textual problem by Beroaldus gives a satisfactory text and is based upon a palaeographical analysis of the manuscript evidence, where all good criticism must begin.

* * *

In 10.112 Pliny brings to the attention of the Emperor the fact that under the *Lex Pompeia* of 63 B.C., which was still the basic law for the provinces of Bithynia and Pontus, men who were made members of the local senate by the censors in a city of the province were not required to pay an honorarium upon taking up the office, but he adds: "Sed ii quos indulgentia tua quibusdam civitatibus super legitimum numerum adicere permisit et singula milia denariorum et bina intulerunt."

The new members added to the senate by special permission of the emperor were elected by the Boulê, which fixed the honorarium to be paid by the new members. At this early date the honorarium was moderate; later in various parts of the empire this draft into the local senate became merely a method of robbing the well-to-do by the imposition of huge honoraria which they were not allowed to evade.

The part of the Emperor's reply concerned with these supernumerary members of the local senates has been made unintelligible by the error of a scribe. Many attempts have been made to reconstruct the text, all of which depart so far from the manuscript tradition that they can not be accepted as restoring Trajan's words. The manuscript text, as shown by the reading of the Avantius edition is:

"Sed adversus eos qui inviti fiunt decuriones id existimo acturos ut praefatio ceteris praeferantur." A simple emendation gives what seems to me to be possibly Trajan's original words. In copying manuscripts the letters *c* and *o* were often misread, the one for the other. A scribe, coming upon *praefaticeteris* may have thought he saw *praefatio* and copied it. On going back for the next word, *ceteris* stood out, and he did not realize that he was using one letter twice. Such a mistake is frequent, especially in copying from *scriptura continua*. A later reader, finding a singular subject, made the verb singular.

praefati ceteris praeferantur seems to me to give meaning. For the use of *praefari* to mean "to make a solemn promise to pay" Hardy, in his note on 10.113, cites *praefatio donationis* from Cicero, *Verr.* 2.3.80. *invitus*, at this early stage of the custom, before abuse had crept into it, need not mean more than that the proposed additional *decurio* was not a candidate. The word often means merely "without my wishing it" rather than a positive "in opposition to my wishes, against my will." The Emperor is merely suggesting that the proposed new member should be approached before action was taken, and that when the election took place preference should be given to those who had agreed beforehand that they would pay the honorarium.

If a pause is indicated after *fiunt*, *decuriones* becomes the subject of *acturos* (esse). In this context no predicate noun is necessary with *fiunt*. Cf. "interim beneficio tabellarum habebimus magistratus qui maxime fieri debebunt" 3.20.9. Editors who have construed *decuriones* with *fiunt* have sometimes felt that a subject for *acturos* (esse) should be supplied. This again is unnecessary in this context.⁵ Pliny would have understood Trajan's meaning at a glance. In a letter, as in conversation, that is satisfactory syntax. Catanaeus (1506) supplied *Bithynnos et Ponticos*, but only in his

⁵ The accusative subjects of the following infinitives are omitted by Pliny: (me) audisse 2.14.9, facturum esse 5.8.1; (nos) nosse 7.4.6; (te) facturum (esse) 1.19.3, venisse 4.13.1; (se) habiturum (esse) 2.20.13, servisse 10.74.1; (eum, id, eos, eas, ea) induisse 1.12.10, esse 1.16.6, coartasse 1.20.8, fore 2.11.9, scriptum (esse) 4.7.7, passurum fuisse 4.22.6, relatos (esse) 6.28.2, gesturum (esse) — reversurum (esse) — moriturum (esse) 7.27.2, inchoatos (esse) 9.1.2, esse emendatum 9.21.1, posse 9.37.2, dimittendos esse 10.96.5. The only requirement is that the omitted noun or the pronoun representing it should be evident to the reader from the context. In 4.13.1, "Salvum in urbem venisse gaudeo" are the first words of the letter. If Tacitus, the recipient, fell into a state of troubled suspense as to the subject of *venisse*, he found quick relief in the first word of the next sentence, *venisti*.

Commentary: he saw that this accusative need not be expressed in the text. Others have inserted *censores* into the text, which Durry varies to *duumviros*. Neither *censores* nor *duumviros* can be accepted because the selection of these supernumerary decurions was not made by the local censors, the *duumvirs*.

* * *

10.116.2 ipse enim sicut arbitror praesertim ex sollemnibus causis concedendum⁶ *iussi immutationes* ita vereor ne ii qui mille homines . . . vocant modum excedere . . . videantur **A** *iussi invitationes* *Ber. a* (Aldus also contributes *non imprudenter* before *praesertim*) *iussisti invitationes i*

The misreading of *invitationes* as *immutationes* was easily corrected by Beroaldus from the first sentence of Trajan's reply. *invitationes* stood in **P**, as the here independent readings of **a** and **i** show. The recovery of the original reading, *ius invitationis*, by Scheffer (*Lectiones academicae*, Hamburg 1675) was championed by Longolius (1734) in his notes, but out of deference to long tradition he printed *iussi invitationes* in his text. Keil, Merrill, and Sicard (1931) have *ius invitationis*; Hardy, misled by his reverence for the Bodleian Volume, his discovery, printed *iussi invitationes*, and Kukula, as often, followed him. Postgate, in *CQ* 16 (1922) 176, thinking of *iussisti* as a manuscript reading instead of as a conjecture by Budé, proposed to emend it to *ius istud*, which Schuster, followed by Durry, mistakenly received into the text.

Many other disputed readings from Book X could be cited to emphasize the point, but I hope that these are enough to make it clear that a critic who works at the text of Pliny must keep vividly in mind its history, upon which so much new light has been thrown in the last half century.⁷

⁶ *concedendum* is the reading found in the copy of **A** in the library of Indiana University and in the copy which Budé had bound into the Bodleian Volume. Through a typesetter's error it is reported in the apparatus of Merrill as *concedum*. When Schuster copied this reading from Merrill's apparatus he added "(sic)" to assure his readers that he had copied his source with care. Durry evidently copied his report of this reading from Schuster's apparatus and carefully preserved this "(sic)." The apparatus of neither of these editions has independent value in the report of readings from the sources, which neither editor seems to have felt that he owed it to his readers to examine.

⁷ The author wishes to thank the editor of *TAPA* and one of his associates for suggestions which saved him from some errors and caused him to make some clarifying additions in the text and notes.