The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

On Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* I. 36, 88

T. W. Dougan

The Classical Review / Volume 16 / Issue 01 / February 2002, pp 34 - 35

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00205301, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00205301

How to cite this article:

T. W. Dougan (1902). On Cicero, *Tusc. Disp.* I. 36, 88. The Classical Review, 16, pp 34-35
doi:10.1017/S0009840X00205301

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

protective works, but some editors seem to limit the application of the clauses (a) '*quae pro ariete subjectae et cum omni opere conjunctae vim fluminis exciperent*,' and (b) '*ut, si arborum trunci sive naves deiciendi operis essent a barbaris missae, his defensoribus earum rerum vis minueretur, neu ponti nocerent*,' to the works in connection with the lower and upper piers respectively.

This seems to be a mistake. Caesar might have written, in brief, '*sublicae et ad inferiorem partem oblique agebantur, et aliae item supra pontem*,' but since he had broken the continuity of his sentence, by the clause '*quae . . . exciperent*' expressing the effect which would naturally be produced by the protective works, after his subsequent mention of the upper piles, he adds the clause '*ut, si . . . nocerent*' to express his intention in adding all these protective outworks.

By the way, *item* is always used by Caesar in the sense 'also.'

The V-shaped arrangement of piles figured

by Long, Napoleon III., H. Rheinhard, A. Rheinhard, and others, would naturally be employed in a stream flowing equably in a straight reach, and this form we see everywhere represented by the stone abutments of the piers of bridges.

But, if Caesar's bridge was thrown across at, or just below, a bend of the river or a short distance below where a reef of rock or a sandbank deflected the stream towards one bank, a diagonal line of piles across the front of each pier would have been all that was required to protect them; and this may be what Caesar meant by *oblique*.

Whether V-shaped or in straight lines the *defensores* must have been formed of walls of piles driven close side by side, otherwise they would not have shielded the piers from the force of the stream, though they might, by the obliquity of impact, have lessened the shock caused by floating bodies striking against them.

J. H. TAYLOR.

ON CICERO, *TUSC. DISP.* I. 36, 88.

IN this passage the words *carere in morte* . . . *quod est malum* fail to carry on the argument or to yield any definite sense. The chief emendations, which may be seen in Kühner's crit. n., are unsatisfactory. Bentley confessed that he could not understand the words and O. Heine proposed to cut them out. But how then did they come into the MSS.? I believe that they are merely out of place and that they should follow the words *erroris in uerbo*. An early copyist missed this clause beginning with *carere* and went on to the clause beginning with *carere igitur hoc significat*. When he had written down to *facile patiare* he discovered the omission and inserted the clause beginning with *carere in malo*, out of its proper place. *Carere in malo*, not *carere in morte*, though the latter is the MS. reading. At some time subsequent to the error of transposition *malo* was altered to *morte* by an interpolator or owing to the act of a glossator, who thought the change demanded by the words *sed ne vivus quidem* and *at in mortuo*, following.

I believe that this emendation and transposition remove all difficulties. Cicero in T.D. undertakes to prove that death is to be despised whether the soul is mortal

or immortal. The interlocutor admits (§ 25) that the soul is happy in death if it is immortal, and Cicero in §§ 26-81 sets forth arguments for the immortality of the soul. But in § 82 he commences the second division of his subject and, from that point to the end of the book, maintains that, even though the soul perish as completely as the body, there is no evil in death. After maintaining in § 82 that the act of dying involves no evil, and in §§ 83-6 that the necessity of leaving behind the good things of life involves no evil, and that one is more likely to leave evil behind than good, he maintains in § 87 that, *even assuming that in dying we depart from good things and not from evil, death is nevertheless no evil*. For (by *HYPOTHESIS* assumed throughout §§ 82-117) there is no feeling in death, and where there is no feeling there can be no privation (*carere*). Even to the living there is no privation in being without those things of which they have no need. In § 88 he reiterates (cf. *pre-mendum etiam atque etiam*) the argument stated in § 87 reminding us, as a preliminary, to hold firmly to the principle that there is no feeling whatever in death, a principle which, on our hypothesis that the soul is mortal, cannot be disputed.

Here then Cicero is arguing that, even though in dying we depart from good things and not from evil, death is no evil. His positions are the following :—

(a) A man is not said *carere* in respect of evils (except in a few phrases like *febri carere*).

(b) He is not even said *carere* in respect of good things unless he has need of them, no, *not even when he is alive and can feel*.

(c) Much less then can he be said *carere* in respect of good things when he is dead and cannot feel.

To translate the emended passage in detail :—‘We must sift the meaning of *carere*, lest any source of error be left in the word. We cannot use the word *carere* with reference to evil, for evil (when we have it) would not (in that case) be a thing about which to grieve; we speak of lacking good things, this being an evil. [These Cicero takes to be facts generally recognized with reference to the use of the word.] The meaning then of *carere* is to lack a thing which one desires to have. For wish is implied in the word, except when we use it in another sense, as in the phrase *febri carere*. For the word is used in another sense [of which *febri carere* is a particular instance] when there is something that one has not, and he is aware of the fact though he may also be glad of it. But even when alive a man does not lack a good thing [this second sense of the word applying only to bad things] unless he has need of it. It is true that in the case of a living man it is at least an intelligible mode of expression to speak e.g. of you (i.e. of a man) as lacking a throne, although this cannot with much accuracy be said of you (i.e. individually; Cicero plays on the word *tu*) [since you, Brutus, with your principles and your supposed descent from the *exactor regum*, would be the last man to *desire* a throne]; it could be said of Tarquin after his expulsion [for he wanted to recover the throne, as is proved by the fact that he fought for that purpose]; but in the case of a dead man the expression is not even intelligible, for lacking belongs to one who feels, and there is no feeling in the dead.’

With regard to the MSS. it need not excite surprise that a sentence should have got out of its proper place in all MSS., since

in § 95, a little farther on, the words *iussu tyrannorum* appear after *ponamus* in most MSS., including the best, although they are obviously out of place there and should only follow *triginta* ten lines lower down. The only MSS. that omit these two words after *ponamus* and have them only after *triginta* are late MSS. freely interpolated by Renaissance scholars. Similarly the words *aliunde didicisse uideamur* in iv. 2, 4 are out of their proper place in the best MSS.

The emendation *malo* for *morte* I adopt against the consensus of MSS. Orelli, who adopted *malo*, states that *Bernensis* reads *malo*, but he has been misinformed by the Bern professor who supplied him with the readings of that MS. I can positively assert that *Bernensis* reads *morte* and that it does so clearly, without trace of erasure, and without marginal gloss.

carere in morte non dicitur is read by G R Brux, Bern. Vat. Pal 1 and seven others at Rome, Vind 1, 5 Oxx, 8 Paris, and many other MSS.

carere enim in morte non dicitur, by Vind 2, Mon 1, Ball. and 2 other Oxx.

carereque in morte non dicitur, by ed H.

Two early editions (S.E.); it is true, read *carere in malo*, but I attach little weight to this except as probably showing that some Renaissance scholar saw that *malo* was required.

It is well known that all MSS. of the T.D. have several errors, omissions, etc. in common, cf. Kühner, *Introd.* pp. 11–12; Kühner and Moser on i. § 95; and (for the two best GR) Seyfert, *Introd.*, p. 7.

I maintain that *morte* was substituted for *malo* in the archetype of all existing MSS., either by interpolation or owing to a marginal gloss, the glossator or interpolator thinking the change demanded by the words *sed ne uiuus quidem* and *at in mortuo* following.

T. W. DOUGAN.

BELFAST, 4 Dec., 1901.

[Prof. Dougan's explanation of the passage would seem to involve the interchange of *bono* and *uiuus* ‘sed ne bono quidem uiuus caret si eo non,’ unless we assume loose writing on the part of Cicero.—J.P.P.]