

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](#)



The Textual Criticism of the Pro Milone, the Orations Before Caesar and the Philippics

Albert C. Clark

The Classical Review / Volume 14 / Issue 08 / November 1900, pp 399 - 411

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00083372, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00083372

How to cite this article:

Albert C. Clark (1900). The Textual Criticism of the Pro Milone, the Orations Before Caesar and the Philippics. The Classical Review, 14, pp 399-411 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00083372

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

THE TEXTUAL CRITICISM OF THE PRO MILONE, THE ORATIONS BEFORE CAESAR AND THE PHILIPPICS.

(Continued from p. 257)

A VOLUME for which I am responsible will shortly appear in the Oxford series of texts, containing Cicero's speeches pro Milone, pro Marcello, pro Ligario, pro rege Deiotaro, and Philippics. I have in the February and June numbers of this Review given an account of some MSS. which I have consulted while revising the Philippics, and Orationes Caesarianae. So far as the Miloniana is concerned I have little to add to the discussion of the 'Sources of the Text' (pp. xxxi-xlix of my edition, Oxford 1895), except that I have subsequently collated the Barberinus, used by Garatoni and Nohl, and have also collated the Bernensis 104, which, although well known in connexion with the Philippics, has not been previously used for this speech.¹ The latter MS. is the best member of the *dett.* which I have seen. It has interesting readings, e.g. § 15 *at paret* (*apparet* HT, *at apparet* E, *at patet* *dett.*), § 53 *versabatur* with Gellius (*versabantur* cett.), agreements with the *meliores*, e.g. § 25 *Collinam* (*coloniam* *dett.*), and occasionally throws light upon corruptions in its congeners, e.g. § 36 it has a lacuna to mark the loss of the words *iudiciumne timui*, which in the other *dett.* are replaced by absurd insertions. The Barberinus, which is generally said to belong to the thirteenth century, is in my judgment not earlier than the fourteenth. Its inferiority to the Bernensis may be illustrated by its readings in passages quoted above, viz. § 15 *at patet*, § 25 *coloniam*, § 36 *intenti*. Nothing new is to be gained from either MS., both of which are derived from the same mutilated and corrupt archetype as the rest of the *dett.*

I add the following Adversaria upon some readings adopted or mentioned in this volume.

[A] PRO MILONE.

Mil. 52. hunc prae se tulisse se illo die *Romam* (so MSS., except a few late *dett.* which have *Roma*) *exiturum*, illum eo die se dissimulasse *rediturum*.

¹ This MS. consists of two parts bound up together. That which contains the pro Milone belongs to the fourteenth century, while the Philippics were written in the thirteenth.

The corruption *Romam* is one of those minute flaws common in MSS. derived from the same archetype, but is odd in MSS. like H and T(E) which do not appear to be drawn from the same source.² So minute an error is not likely to have been imported by a corrector from one family to another. It now strikes me that the proper course is, not to emend *Romam* to *Roma*, but to excise the word as a note from the margin meant to refer not to *exiturum*, but to *rediturum*. I would compare Lael. 63 quasi equis temptatis sic *amicitias* aliqua parte periclitatis moribus amicorum, where *amicitias*, the reading of all old MSS., should be struck out as an ungrammatical note from the margin, instead of being emended to *amicitia* with two later MSS. (EV), or *amicitiis*, the only authority for which is '*D ut videtur*' (Halm).³

§ 60. Subito arrepti in quaestionem tamen separantur a ceteris et in arcas coniciuntur, ne quis cum eis colloqui possit: *hi* centum dies penes accusatorem cum fuissent, ab eo ipso accusatore producti sunt. For *hi* I would now read *hic* (=in arcis), or *hinc* (=ab arcis). The *c* of *hic* would naturally drop out before *C* (=centum). I adhere to the explanation of the passage furnished to me by Prof. Purser, viz. that both clauses refer to the slaves of Clodius, and not to the difference between their treatment and that usual with slaves. 'Appius (a) seizes them suddenly, (b) as an additional precaution (*tamen*) keeps them in solitary confinement, (c) has them in his power for 100 days, in which to school them, (d) produces them himself. How can they be expected to tell the truth?'

§ 96. quemcumque cursum *fortuna* *ceperit* (so H: *fortuna dederit* cett.). I now accept a conjecture of Joergensen contained in the Preface to his new edition of Madvig's Select Speeches (Copenhagen, 1900) viz. *fortuna ceperit*, in preference to *fortuna coeperit* which I previously printed. I feel that the defence of the transitive sense of *coepisse*, which I adopted from Mendelssohn, is not free from objection, since in Fam. 1,

² I refer to my analysis of these MSS. contained in pp. xxxviii-xliii of my edition.

³ Anecd. Oxon. vii. p. xviii.

9, 21 *cursum quem coeperis* the correct reading may be *ceperis*.¹

[B] PRO MARCELLO, PRO LIGARIO, PRO REGE DEIOTARO.

In the *Orationes Caesarianae* the text which I adopt is based upon the readings of α (i.e. AHV).² The result is in the *Deiotariana* much the same as that previously arrived at by Nohl. He forms two families only of MSS. in this speech, including in one those which I term α and γ . While I hold γ to be derived from α , the wide difference between them, as shown by the critical notes, prevents me from describing them by one symbol. In the *pro Marcello* and *pro Ligario* a large number of new readings will be found, since in these speeches previous editors have based their text upon the readings of β . I have already advocated a number of these elsewhere,³ and will not now repeat my arguments. Many are small changes, chiefly concerning the collocation of words, which follow naturally if β are deprived of their supremacy. The following cases call for comment.

Marc. 12. haec tua iustitia et lenitas florescet cotidie magis. *Ita* (so α , *ita ut* $\beta\gamma$ edd.) quantum operibus tuis diuturnitas detrahet, tantum adferet (so AHDLM, adfert V, adferat BEah, edd.) laudibus.

It will be noticed that *adferet* is given not only by AH but also by D, the best member of β , and m, the best member of γ . It therefore must have been in the archetype. AH give correctly *Ita...adferet*, V has a slight corruption, DLM read ungrammatically *ita ut...adferet*, while BEah gain a grammatical construction *ita ut...adferat* by conjecture. Cf. for the construction Phil. xiv. 33 numquam...gratissimus sermo conticescet. *Ita* pro mortali condicione vitae immortalitatem estis consecuti.

ib. cum ipsius victoriae condicione iure omnes (so aah, condicione omnes iure m, condicione omnes β , edd.) victi occidissemus, clementiae tuae iudicio conservati sumus.

¹ Minor points, in which I have diverged from my previous edition, are: § 16 *domi* (with HE) for *domui* (T), § 18 *Appiae* (with ET) for *Appiae viae* (H), § 39 *omnia* (with Madvig, *Op. Ac.* i. 180) for *omnia tum* (MSS.), § 66 *suscepta* (with MSS.) for *susceptam* (Guelmius), § 69 *salvis* (with Ant. Augustinus) for *salutaribus* (HE), § 88 *sibi* (with Lambinus) for *quasi* (MSS.) and *devinctum* (P): for *devictum* (cett.). I have also removed the brackets placed round § 45 *fruit*, § 69 *proximorum*, § 79 *ab inferis*, though in the last two cases very doubtfully.

² *Cl. R.* p. 253.

³ *Anecd. Oxon.* vii. pp. xxix-xxxix.

The variants show that either *condicione* or *iure* is an addition. As the latter is naturally contrasted with *iudicio*, and does not occur in the context, it is superior to *condicione*, which would be easily introduced from the immediate context *ipsius victoriae condicio* visque devicta est.

21. tua enim cautio nostra cautio est, ut si in alterutro peccandum sit, malim videri nimis timidus quam parum prudens.

For *ut si* H sol. gives *quod si*, a reading only known previously from Priscian, who twice quotes the passage (Keil's *Grammatici Latini* ii. pp. 181, 226), and the *scholium* of the *Scholiasta Gronovianus*. This appears to be one of several passages in these speeches where H has preserved a superior reading to that of AV. I read *Quod si*, placing a full stop after *est*, this punctuation being found in H.

ib. de tuisne? . . . *anexone* ex (so H; *anexeo* ne V⁴; ex *eone* ex A, an ex eo γ , an ex hoc β) numero, qui una tecum fuerunt.

The readings of $\beta\gamma$ do not account for the corruptions found in α . I propose *anne* ex eo.

25. te . . . nimis crebro dicere satis te tibi (so α : tibi satis te BDL γ : tibi te satis E) vixisse. Credo, sed tum id audirem, si tibi soli viveres.

The variety in the collocation casts suspicion upon *tibi*, and the sense is greatly improved if the word is removed. Caesar says 'I have lived long enough,' and Cicero replies, 'Yes, if you lived for yourself alone.'

A similar passage occurs in the same section, viz.

quid, si istud ne gloriae quidem tuae (so $\alpha\gamma$, tuae quidem β , edd.)? cuius te esse avidissimum...non negabis.

The Schol. Gronovianus omits *tuae*, which in $\alpha\gamma$ has been inserted before *quidem* and in β more plausibly after it. The sense is a general one, viz. *avidus es gloriae*, not *avidus es glorias tuae*.

Lig. 14. id a te in foro oppugnari et in tali miseria multorum perfugium misericordiae tollere (so MSS.).

Editors all accept a reading quoted from a cod. *Lambini*, viz. *id te...oppugnare*, which appears to me an obvious conjecture and not a good one. The simplest correction is for *tollere* (i.e. *toll'e*) to write *tolli*. For the confusion cf. Phil. ii. 52. quid autem agebatur nisi ne deleri (so cln¹, edd. *delere* Vn²t) et everti (so V, *evertere* D) rem p. funditus velles?

⁴ This was erroneously given as *anexeo* without *ne*, *Cl. R.* p. 253.

§ 21. Editors read, *Utrum tandem existimas facilius fuisse, Tubero, Ligarium ex Africa exire an vos in Africam non venire.*

I call attention to the following variants:

Ligario...nobis α

γ vos

Ligarium...vobis D

Ligarium...vos BE.¹

The evidence is in favour of *Ligario...vobis*. It will be noticed that D, the oldest and best MS. of the β group contains an obvious corruption, which has been disguised in BE.

§ 30 ego apud parentem loquor: Erravi, temere feci (so $\alpha\beta$, erravit...fecit γ , edd.) ad clementiam tuam confugio, delicti veniam peto, ut ignoscatur, oro?

In view of the fact that γ are full of interpolations, I am unwilling to adopt readings from so suspect a source, unless there is very good reason for so doing. I cannot see that this is here the case. Why should not the advocate identify himself with his client, and use the first person? Cf. Quintil. vi. 2. nec agamus rem quasi alienam sed assumamus parumper illum dolorem. Ita dicemus quae in nostro simili casu dicturi essemus.

§ 33 Videtisne igitur hunc splendorem omnem (so $\alpha\gamma$: omnium β), hanc Brocchorum domum, hunc L. Marcium...hos omnes equites Romanos, etc.

Madvig adopted *omnem* (omnium edd. recc.) but placed a comma after *splendorem*. I prefer to punctuate after *omnem*, a course which is demanded by the anaphora *hunc...hanc...hunc...hos*, and place *omnem* as frequently in a place of emphasis at the end of a clause.

§ 35. quam (so MSS. quoniam edd.) hoc est animi, tam (so $\alpha\alpha$, quam $\beta\theta\sigma$, quoniam edd.) etiam ingenii tui.

The corruption in α points to *cum* hoc est animi, tum etc. For the thought I would compare Fam. ix. 14, 7, magnitudine cum animi, tum etiam ingenii, and for the construction (i.e. the indicative preceded by *cum*) Phil. x. 1. cum factum tuum gratum omnibus debet esse, tum vero oratio, ib. 5 cui cum rei publicae causa faveo, tum etiam tua, Madvig on Fin. 1, 19.

36. T. Ligarius qui tum nihil egit aliud... nisi ut eum tuis (so H, eum tui AV, tu eum $\beta\gamma$, tui eum edd.) studiosum indicares.

The reading in which modern editors acquiesce is open to serious objection, since *eum* refers to T. Ligarius, and though in some other writers e.g. Caesar, *eum* for *se* is

¹ γ read Ligarium ex Africa non venisse med. omissis.

common enough, such an interchange is very odd in Cicero. I hold that *tuis* in H stands for *tui se*. *Eum* is an addition to supply an accusative, the extraneous origin of which is indicated by the difference in the collocation in α and $\beta\gamma$.

Deiot. 2. *Crudelis Castor* (so V β . *crud. Castor est* AH, *crudelem Castorem* γ , edd.) ne dicam sceleratum et impium.

Madvig in a well-known passage (Adv. ii. 308) pronounces in favour of *Crudelem Castorem* on the ground that the same case is found after *ne dicam* as before it, i.e. that Cicero did not write *Crudelis Castor*, because this must have been followed by *sceleratus et impius*. This seems a hasty dictum on the part of the great critic. Prof. Reid, without committing himself to any view of the rival readings found here in $\alpha\beta$ and γ respectively, points out to me that recent authorities (Schmalz *Antibarbarus* s.v. *dico* and Syntax § 51, Haacke *Stilistik* § 83) hold that in the case of the corrective *dico*, although the other cases are repeated without change, the classical idiom is to change the nominative to the accusative. This subject is one that he will treat in a note on Fin. 2 § 1 in his approaching edition. Instances of *ne dicam* are, as he informs me, rare and indecisive, no example of the phrase preceded by a nominative being quoted either from the speeches or philosophical works. He says that 'there is no trace in Cicero of a repeated nominative in any parenthetic form of correction involving *dico* (i.e. *dico* itself, *cum dico*, *non dico*, *vel dicam*).' It follows that if Cicero chose to use the nominative (cf. § 29 *Felix ista domus*), the accusative must follow after *ne dicam*. Madvig's objection therefore falls to the ground. I read *Crudelis Castor*, omitting *est* as an addition.

10. Ita cum maximis eum rebus liberares, perparvam in amicitia (so α , amicitiae β , inimicitiae γ) culpam relinquebas.

Editors read *amicitiae* with β , which is very odd Latin for *amicitiae violatae*. I excise the word as an addition, which in α is found in its original form, while the readings of γ and β disguise it, the first clumsily, and the second more plausibly.

21. ita non modo improbus sed fatuus et amens es α .

ita non modo improbus et fatuus, sed etiam amens es BE.

ita non modo nequam et improbus sed fatuus et amens es γ .

Kayser and Nohl adopt the reading of γ , to which Halm and Müller add *etiam* after *sed* from β .

D, a MS. which preserves some very rare readings, e.g. in this same section *perduint* with *B sol.* (*perdunt* HVE, *perdent* A: *perdant* γ), and frequently explains the reading of BE (*Cl. R.* p. 254) here has a remarkable variant, viz.

nequam et
etiam

ita non modo *nihil sed* improbus et fatuus
sed etiam a (in *f. l.*) menses. (*corr. m. 2*).

Nihil sed can only stand for *nihili et*. Both *nequam* and *nihili* are used of slaves, and are frequently combined, *nihili* being a stronger term, e.g. Plaut. Pseud. iv. 7, 1, 2.

Nequamst homo qui nihili sui eri imperium facit servos,

Nihilist autem, suum qui officium facere immemor est.

Cf. Casina ii. 3, 29, Cic. ad Q. F. 1, 2, 14, etc.

D appears to preserve a corruption, which was omitted in α and BE as unintelligible, and glossed in γ by *nequam*. If, on the other hand, *nequam* had been the reading in the archetype, it is not easy to see why this familiar word should have been glossed by the obvious corruption in D, and omitted by α. The constant interpolations found in γ must also be remembered (*Cl. R.* p. 255).

29. *Cum* vero exercitu amisso ego, qui pacis semper auctor (so α, auctor fui BDa) post Pharsalicum autem (so αγ, om. autem β) proelium suator fuissem armorum non ponendorum, sed abiciendorum, hunc ad meam auctoritatem non potui adducere, quod et ipse ardebat studio illius belli et patri satis faciendum arbitrabatur.

Madvig pointed out that *cum* is left *pendens*, and produced a construction by omitting *autem* with β, and emending *fuissem* to *fui*. More serious changes have been made by others. I merely alter *cum* to *tum*, otherwise following α.

34. Et quem nos liberi (om. liberi H sol.) in summa populi Romani libertate nati. MSS.

Halm and Kayser excise *populi Romani* on the authority of a few dett., a course which leaves the tautology unrelieved. The omission of *liberi* by H greatly improves the sense, and is probably one of several instances in which it has the true reading as against all other MSS.

[C] PHILIPPICS.

Several editors, Halm in particular, treat with great suspicion words and passages found in D, and sometimes inserted in V by a later hand, but omitted by V¹. In order

to arrive at a fair conclusion it is necessary to examine all the facts. I give first those cases in which such additions are accepted by all editors.

1, 11. M. Antoni...cur in, ii. 49 rem... malebam, 71 quid...Africam, 72 ego...rogavi, 76 nullum turpius vidi, 79 tum est...Dolabellam, 116 quid multa? attulerat, 118 contempsi...non per iii. 15 non contemnitis...Aricinum, v. 4 legionum...legiones, vii. 14 nisi...Quid re, viii. 9 agrestes si homines, ix. 2 non morbus...cum, 13 alter...mimos, xiii. 5 per deos...in eos. I omit some trifling cases. Any fair-minded critic who will inspect this list will admit that omission by V¹ is not in itself damning.

A number of passages have been less fortunate. I give one or two typical cases.

1, 29. te enim intuens Dolabella <qui es mihi carissimus>. So D and V³, om. V¹, Halm and Nohl bracket. Müller retains the addition. To me the genuineness of the words appears beyond doubt. It is by his personal affection that Cicero hopes to move Dolabella. These words come straight from his warm heart.

ib. 30. principibus sceleris poena adfectis <urbe incendio et caedis metu liberata>. This is in a peculiar position, since it is only given by V², and absent alike from V¹ and D. (del. Halm, Müller, Nohl, tu. Kayser, Eberhard). The addition, however, is strikingly supported by Fam. ix. 14, 8 liberasti igitur et urbem periculo et civitatem metu. V² was a very ignorant person who did not usually rise above altering *verba* to *berva*, or vice-versa.¹

ib. 33. vereor ne...gloriosum putes plus te unum posse quam omnes et metui a civibus tuis <quam diligi malis>. So D (not V³), om. V¹, del. edd. rec. In the de Officiis, a work written in the same year, we find ii. 29 dum metui quam cari esse et diligi maluimus. Cicero often repeated himself.

Space prevents me from going into further detail. I would only say that some passages have been particularly hardly used e.g. ii. 119 where Halm italicises *adeptus sum...unum ut* (so Nohl) saying 'vereor ne falsum sit supplementum lacunae antiquissimae.' The Latinity of *res adipisci* can be easily justified, and the fact that V omits two passages in the previous section, in one of which Halm accepts the reading of D without any suspicion, shows that V is not infallible. Halm perhaps went furthest in

¹ *Cl. R.* p. 39.

xi. 10, where he prints in italics the addition found in *D*. quid non haurire cogitatione, <cuius sanguinem non bibere censetis? in> cuius possessiones etc. What is there in the words themselves that can possibly raise suspicion?

On the whole I take up an even more conservative position than Müller in regard to these passages. I see no reason for doubting the genuineness of iii. 25 nullam se habere provinciam, ix. 2 quam in Ser. Sulpicio, x. 7 cui favebitis, xi. 5 atque lanatum, xiii. 2 hominum...potuisset. More doubtful passages are i. 27 quam...habui, 33 num gloriae, ii. 79 induxit ut peteret. Single words found in *D* only are sometimes easier to explain on the hypothesis of omission by *V* than on that of interpolation in *D*, e.g. ii. 25 non solum meis laudibus ornaret, sed etiam <oneraret> alienis. The omission of *oneraret* after *ornaret*, and the *annominatio* is common, e.g. Liv. xxii. 30 pl. scitum quo *oneratus* magis quam *ornatus* sum, Cic. Fr. C. 4 non *honoris* sed *oneris* esse (Cf. Wölflin's Archiv 1886, p. 456). In xiii. 6 tu vero *ita* vitam corpusque <*servato*>, the rhythm of the sentence is better with *servato* than if *tu vero tuere* (Halm) or *tuere* (Madvig) is read for *tu vero*. The writer of *V* knew no Latin, and continually omits words for no reason at all, e.g. ii. 42 *sensim*, viii. 33 *primas* etc. While his *fides* is above suspicion, it is well to recognise his limitations.

I have reserved till the last a peculiar case ii. 20 omni genere monumentorum meorum perfecisse <operis subsecivis>. Halm says 'De Orat. ii. 364 dixit Cicero *subsecivis operis, ut aiunt*, novitatem metaphoræ significans, et similiter de Legg. i. 9 et 13.' In the first of the passages from the de Legibus (*subseciva quaedam tempora*) the qualification of the metaphor is slight, while in the second (*subsecivis, ut ais, temporibus*) *ut ais* merely means, 'to use your phrase.' A metaphor which in the De Oratore, an early work, needed excuse, may have become more threadbare at a later period. (Cf. Quintil. 1, 5, 72 ut Cicero ait, quæ primo dura visa sunt, usu molliuntur). Such an interpolation could only proceed from a learned reader, and is quite unlike all the other interpolations found in *D*, which are puerile in the extreme.

Phil. 1, 14. non modo voce nemo L. Pisoni consulari (So *Vcn*², consularis cett.), sed ne vultu quidem adsensus est.

The reading *consulari*, which I found in *V*, does not appear in Halm's notes except

as that of his worthless *i*. It was previously quoted from *V* by Garatoni. It has superior MSS. authority in its favour, and gives an excellent sense, i.e. 'worthy of a consul.' Cf. Att. ii. 1, 5 non *consulare* dictum, in Sen. 24 *consularem* fidem dextramque, Liv. iv. 8, 4 rem minime *consularem*. As Cicero is speaking of those who 'sententiam consulari loco dicunt,' *nemo* is restricted to the *consulares* by the context.

ib. 29. est enim gloria laus recte factorum magnorumque in rem publicam meritum.

After *rem p.* Isidorus who quotes the passage inserts *fama*, which is also found in *c*, the excellence of which I have previously pointed out (*Cl. R.* pp. 40-42). The addition is strongly supported by other passages, viz. Marc. 26 *gloria* est...*magnorum* vel in suos vel in patriam *fama* meritum, Sest. 139 bonam *famam* bonorum quæ sola vere *gloria* nominari potest, de Invent. ii. 166 *gloria* est frequens de aliquo *fama* cum laude. This reading was here adopted by several old editors from one MS. of Faernus.

35. nec beatus nec clarus nec unctus *V*: om. nec unctus *D*.

For *unctus* many conjectures have been made, e.g. *tutus*, *diuturnus*, *iucundus*, *sanctus* etc., which from a palaeographical point of view seem equally likely. Before attempting to decide between them I would remove a corruption hitherto unsuspected by reading *carus* for *clarus*. The necessity of this will be seen from the context. Cicero's point is that the love of one's fellow-citizens is the only sure defence; cf. Phil. ii. 112 *caritate* te...*sæptum* oportet esse, non armis. This he dwells upon, continually repeating himself, § 33 *carum* esse civem § 35 malis *carus* esse quam metui...Quem qui *beatum* fuisse putant, miseri ipsi sunt. *Beatus* est nemo etc. He then combines in the present passage *carus* and *beatus*. There is just as much reason for repeating one as the other. *Clarus* on the other hand introduces a fresh idea. If *carus* is read, then *iucundus* (Weber) is the correction for *unctus*, which the context demands.—§ 37. *carum* populo Romano vitam A. Hirti fuisse...*iucundum* amicis, in quo vincit omnes, *carum* suis, quibus est *carissimus*. Cf. Sull. 62 *carus* utrisque est et *iucundus*: Fin. 1. 51. diligere et *carum* esse *iucundum* est. The corruption of *carus* and *clarus* is of course common. A peculiarly instructive passage is v. 49 quique se...*senserit* civem *carum* (Faernus *clarum* *V*, desunt *D*) haberi salutaremque rei publicæ...utinam C. Caesari...contigisset adolescenti ut esset senatui atque optimo cuique *carissimus*...eius filii longissime

diversa ratio est qui cum omnibus est, tum optimo cuique carissimus. Faernus there tersely remarks 'comprobat carum potius quam clarum multi inferiores loci in eadem pagina,' a saying equally applicable to the present passage.

ii. 8 The MSS. give as follows:—

Homo diserte ut mus et laetam esse videris *V*.

Homo diserte ut mustelae tam inscio et Tironi Numisio videris *c*.

Homo diserte ut mustelae tamen scio et Tironi Numisio videris *Int*.

The parallel passage xii. 14. *nolite ne Tirones quidem Numisios et mustelas Seios contemnere* ('ubi edd. deleto et quattuor efficiunt ex duobus' Nohl) appears to rule out of court

(a) Halm's reading founded on *V*, viz. ut Tironi et mustelae iam esse videris.

(b) Landgraf's ingenious defence of the reading of *c*, as containing a pun on *inscio*.

The simplest method is to read with *Int*, merely emending *scio* to *Seio*: viz. ut Mustelae tamen Seio et Tironi Numisio videris. *Tamen* = 'in spite of your folly.'

Halm's emendation is somewhat bold. The corruption in *V* must stand for ut Mustelae tam esse videris, i.e. the writer has left out several words.

ii. 55. Omnia perfect quae senatus salva re publica ne fieri possent perfecerat. *codd*. As the repetition of *perficio* is very inelegant, a number of conjectures have been made e.g. *effecerat*, *providerat*, *prospexerat*. While these yield a good sense, it is difficult to see how the corruption could have taken place. The minimum of change is involved by reading *profecerat* (i.e. *p* for *p*). A similar play on *perficio* and *proficio* is found x. 23 temptavit quid patientia perficere posset: nihil cum proficeret (so *ln*, Müller from *ag*: prospiceret *V*: perficeret *bt*), etc. I take *profecerat* to have the same meaning as *consecutus erat*. Cf. Fam. 1, 2, 4, hoc videmur esse consecuti ut ne quid agi cum populo aut salvis auspiciis aut salvis legibus... posset.

56. 'Denticulum Büchel auctore rec. edd.' Müller. The readings are, Denticulam *Vct*, Lenticulam *ln*. Dio Cassius calls this person Δεντικουλος (xlv. 47), a fact which appears to me to turn the scale in favour of Lenticulam. Prof. Reid points out to me that 'Lenticula from *lens*, used as a man's name would be like *Ovicula* (Wilman's no. 1324) and *Cicercula* (Anth. Lat. Bücheler, i. no. 732).'

In connexion with this I would take another name, viz. *Cotyla* or *Cotylo*. Plut.

Ant. 18 gives the latter. 'Ουαπίον...ὃν Κοτύλωνα προσηγόρευον. *Cotylo* (or *Catulo Vn*) is given by all MSS. in Phil. v. 7, in § 5 *V* gives *cotyiam cotyionem*, and *Cotyionem* is in *bt*, in viii. 24, 28, and xiii. 26 the MSS. agree in *Cotyla*. It seems to me rash to expel *Cotylo* from passages where the MSS. evidence is in its favour. The nickname Κοτύλων, as Prof. Purser points out to me, is formed from κοτύλη, as Φύσκων, the nickname of Ptolemy V, was formed from φύσκη.

75. an *tutu* Narbone mensas hospitum convomeret *V*.

an *tu* Narbone mensas hospitum cum vomeres (cum convomeret) *D*.

an cum Narbone mensas hospitum convomeret *Servius* and *Cledonius*.

an cum *tu* Narbone mensas hospitum convomeret *edd*.

The ordinary reading appears to me indefensible. *Cum* rests upon the testimony of *Servius*. If his citation agreed with any MSS., it would strengthen their reading. As it is he is probably quoting loosely. To *cum* editors join *tu*, thus combining two variants. The reading of *V* must stand either for *tu* simply, in which case an *tu...convomeret* should be read, or for *ut tu*. I prefer the latter, which is supported by a correction in *n*, which gives

t
u, and would read

an *ut tu...convomeret*, Dolabella pro te in Hispania dimicaret?

78. The MSS. read

et domi quidem causam amoris habuit, foris etiam turpiorem, ne L. Plancus praedes tuos (so *D*, *tus V*) venderet.

Ferrarius says 'suos aut habuisti.' The latter conjecture is universally adopted, apparently because both in the preceding and in the succeeding clause Antony is addressed in the second person. On the other hand *suus* and *tus* are continually confused, while the corruption from *habuisti* to *habuit* is more difficult. Also, an exact parallel for a transition to the third person occurs § 41 igitur...te faciebat heredem. In multas praeterea pecunias...invasit. Quamquam...admiratus sum mentionem te hereditatum ausum esse facere. I would also compare the sudden change from direct to reported speech in viii. 27 'Galliam...comatam postulo...cum sex legionibus' inquit...tam diuque ut obtineat (obtimeam Cobet) etc.

I would not lay much stress on the fact

that *suos* is the reading of *h* (Harl. 2682), since although this MS. has a few excellent readings e.g. 1, 13 *usquam* (*nusquam Vcln*) it is not free from conjecture. I incline to read *suos*, regarding *tuos* either as a slip, or a correction by a reader, who thought *suos* ambiguous.

91. In this vexed passage the reading of *D* appears to me correct: viz. ut eius omnem propter proximum dictatorem metum tolleretur. The passage is exactly similar to 1, 4 non modo regno...sed etiam regni timore sublato...cum dictatoris nomen...propter perpetuae dictaturae recentem memoriam...sustulisset. In both regni metum (or timorem) tollere is combined with nomen dictatoris tollere. The parallel is destroyed by the various emendations founded on the corruption in *V*, viz. omen nomen, which I look on as one of the geminationes so common in that MS.

101. Quid iam querar de agro Leontino? quoniam quidem hae quondam arationes Campana et Leontina (so *V*: -ani et -ini *D*) in populi Romani patrimonio...ferebantur... Sed ad iter Italiamque redeamus.

I gravely doubt the genuineness of Campana (-i) et Leontina (-i). Cicero first mentions the case of the Campanus ager, then proceeds to that of the ager Leontinus, after which he 'returns to Italy.' Mention of the Campanian land is inappropriate while he is dealing with grants outside Italy.

iii. 7. ut ea quae...gessit et gerit, haec auctoritate nostra comprobentur codd.

Haec after ea is to say the least inelegant, though it may be defended by e.g. vii. 5. It is struck out by Ernesti. A simpler cure is to read hac. Cf. Sull. 80 haec auctoritas nostra.

iii. 26. Qui sunt igitur reliqui, quos sors divina delectet? L. Annius (so *V*: T. Antonius *D*) et M. Antonius.

Copyists frequently substitute familiar names e.g. Antonius, Pompeius, etc. for others slightly resembling them. The corruption Antonius for Annius occurs in *t*, Phil. xiii. 26 and Mil. 1. What, however, is the name concealed by M. Antonius? It must be that of a praetor or ex-praetor. The solution is to be found in Phil. xiii. 26, where among the partisans of Antony are said to be 'duo praetorii, Philadelphus Annius et innocens Gallius.' The praenomen of this Gallius was M. (Att. xi. 20, Suet. Tib. 6). If for M. Gallius were written M. Allius the change to M. Antonius would quickly follow.

38. ut eae provinciae quae (so *V*, Galliaeque Int) exercitus in senati...potestate sint.

For the corrupt *que* editors adopt *atque*, a conjecture of Muretus: *c* read *ique* convincingly.

v. 6. Agitur utrum M. Antonio facultas detur opprimendae rei publicae, caedis faciendae bonorum, urbis eruendorum (so *V*, 'urbis eruendae' in ras. m. 2, ita ut spatium vix ad litteras suppletas suffecerit) Halm: eripiendorum urbis *D*) agrorum suis latronibus condonandi.

That eripiendorum, or the similar word originally written in *V*, is an interpolation is agreed. It was probably due to a misunderstanding of the rare construction agrorum...condonandi. It is usual to insert in its place diripiendae (Faernus) or dividundae (Halm). These are violent emendations. Nothing is necessary except to remove the addition eripiendorum (or eruendorum), which in *V* is placed after urbis, and in *D* before it: and to read urbis, agrorum...condonandi. Urbs and agri are joined as urbs and Italia in xiii. 42 optimi cuiusque caedis, urbis et Italiae partitionis, vastandarum diripiendarumque provinciarum, ib. 47 caedes bonorum, urbis Italiaeque partitio.

11. quid? illi immanes quaestus ferendine quos M. Antoni tota exhausit domus? So MSS.

For tota Ernesti conjectures una, Halm tot una, Pluygers tota ex re p. (hausit). It is simpler to suppose that tota stands for tot which has got into the wrong place, and to read illi tot immanes. Cf. Rosc. Am. 118 illa tot flagitia, Dom. 56 illa tot...milis.

12. si hoc genus pene (so *V*: om. pene *D*) in unum redigatur, non sit pecunia populo Romano defutura.

For genus pene Ursinus emends genus pecuniae, Kayser genus rapinae, Halm more boldly ingens fenus. I had thought of genus praedae (cf. Ven. iii. 171), praedam redigere being a technical term. Of these suggestions that of Ursinus best explains the corruption of *V*, and genus pecuniae is found Verr. ii. 141, iii. 223, Font. 2, Pis. 90. I, therefore, adopt his suggestion, though as the three-fold repetition of pecunia is somewhat inelegant (cf. however, Mil. 104 where patria is repeated three times) it may be better to read genus with *D*. A further difficulty remains in in unum, on which Ernesti remarks 'Erat illa pecunia in unum redacta, i.e. in unam domum Antonii, ut ante dixit.' His conjecture unum is unsatisfactory, since Cicero is dwelling upon the multifarious sources of Antony's gains. Other suggestions are in aerarium (Orelli) and populi in usum (P. R. Müller). For in unum I write universum, i.e. 'if the whole of his pecula-

tions are disgorged.' *Genus universum* occurs in six other passages of the speeches, and Cicero is particularly fond of the assonance *unus...universus* (cf. Mil. 34, 90, Sest. 27, 33, 122, 128, etc.).

39. quid optatius...quam cum bellum civile maximum esset...sapientia etiam (*& iam* V: *desunt* D) id potius exstingui quam armis et ferro rem in discrimen adducere?

The context shows that Cicero is praising the gentleness of Lepidus, cf. § 40 civile bellum...*humanitate et sapientia* sua M. Lepidus ad pacem concordiamque convertit...eius singulari *clementia et mansuetudine* bellum restinctum. Halm for *etiam* conjectures *et mansuetudine*, or *et humanitate*, or *et clementia*, the last of which is printed by Müller. It is not, however, easy to see how either of these can have been changed to *etiam*. I conjecture that *& iam* stands for *et mīa*, i.e. *et misericordia*. For the *misericordia* Lepidi cf. xiii. 8 nemo ab eo civis violatus, multi eius beneficio *et misericordia* liberati, and his own letter, Fam. x. 35, 2, ne *misericordiam* nostram...in civili dissensione sceleris loco ponatis, Appian iii. 84 τοῦ στρατοῦ...τὸν Λέπιδον αἰτοῦντος εἰρήνην καὶ ἔλεον εἰς ἀνυχοῦντας πολίτας.

vi. 10. T. Plancus cum (*tum* V²) *exiluerit* (ex *exulaverit* ?), *adolescens nobilis*. V (*desunt* D).

For cum *exiluerit* Faernus proposed *quam Exilius* from xiii. 28. Recent editors omit the words and mark a lacuna. The reading of V appears to combine two *scholia* viz. *tum exulavit* a note founded upon xiii. 7, in eam urbem redit armis ex qua excesserat legibus, and *adolescens nobilis*, a marginal annotation of a familiar type. Prof. Reid, who agrees in this view, points out to me that 'there was nothing specially noble about the family, and irony is improbable as the two brothers were friendly to Cicero.' In the next sentence probably *Plancum* <*quidem*> *qui* should be read, as *quidem* seems required to balance *nam* in the sentence after it (Nam Trebellium valde iam diligit).

viii. 9. ad aquas usque et Puteolos *provehuntur*.

Halm says 'pro- V, per- D.' This is an error. V *e coll. mea* has *pervehuntur*, which is therefore the reading of all MSS., and should be kept, as the words are used in the same sense.

20. Iterum legatos *qui si* (so Vt, *quod si* b, *quid* ln) ille faceret indutias.

Halm reads *quid? ut ille*, Müller *quid si ille*, while Pluygers brackets *si...indutias*. The corruption in Vt, our best guides, sug-

gests *quasi*. I read Iterum legatos? *Quasi* ille faceret indutias.

25. 'Si cohorti praetoriae *praedam* agrumque dederitis.' Eis etiam praemia postulat, etc.

For *praedam* editors read *praemia* from the context. A simpler correction is *praedia*. Cf. Mon. Ancyr. ch. xvi. pecuniam pro agris...quam pro Italicis *praediis* numeravi.

26. Postulat praeterea ut *cyrographorum sua et onmentariorum* (so V: *chirographorum et commentariorum sua* D) collegaeque sui decreta maneant.

On the whole I acquiesce in the view of Schelle who removes both *chirographorum* and *commentariorum* as glosses, though I have some difficulty in seeing why these words should be in the genitive. A word frequently confused with *suus* is *summus*. Possibly the corruption may stand for ut *chirographorum summa* et *commentariorum*, ut sua etc., i.e. that the 'sum total,' the 'whole block' should be ratified.

30. qui invident alicuius constantiae, qui *labori eius* (so V, *labori eius qui eius* (ag) bl, edd., *laboribus qui eius* n) *perpetuam*...voluntatem...moleste ferant.

The repetition *alicuius...eius...eius* in the ordinary reading is not elegant. It looks as if in the archetype there had been *qui labori, eius qui perpetuam*, etc. *Eius* has expelled *qui* from V, is placed after *qui* in n, and both before and after it in the other MSS.

32. diutius servitutem perpassi quam *captivi servi* (so V, *captivi* D) frugi et diligentes solent.

The status of *captivi* and *servi* is generally distinguished. I look upon the reading of V as a combination of variants, this being the form of error to which it is especially prone, cf. Cl. R. p. 39. The case is very similar to Mil. 30 *feris TE, feris etiam beluis P*, where most editors elect to follow P.

ix. 16. locum...quoquo versus pedes quinque habere, quod is ob rem p. mortem obierit, eamque causam in basi inscribi.

As the passage stands the statement is an odd one, viz. 'his descendants shall have a space of five square feet, because he died for his country.' Manutius struck out *quod...obierit*, while Scaliger proposed *quodque* is...obierit, eam causam. If the clause *quod...obierit* is transposed to follow *inscribi*, it is natural enough.

x. 5. ita enim dixisti et quidem de scripto, *nam* te inopia verbi lapsum putarem (so V¹: putarem, nisi tuam in dicendo facultatem nossem cett.). That *nisi...nossem* was not accidentally omitted by V¹ is shown by

the absence of the words from *t*, the best MS. of the D group. Also, as Halm points out, they pervert the sense, which is *nisi de scripto dixisses*. I emend *nam* to *ne*, otherwise reading with *Vt*, viz. *et quidem de scripto, ne te inopia verbi lapsus putarem*, i.e. 'you read your speech, so I cannot suppose that you made a slip because you could not think of the right word.' Cf. ii. 97 *ne nihil actum putetis*, Verr. iv. 52 *ne quem putetis... domo quod alter eriperet protulisse*.

9. si enim C. Antonius quod animo intenderat perficere potuisset, *aut potuisset* nisi eius sceleri virtus M. Bruti obstitisset *V* (desunt *D*). Editors read *potuisset autem* from *δ*, or *aut potius*, a conjecture of Muretus. The reading of *δ* is of course a fifteenth century conjecture. I propose *at potuisset*, which is nearer to the corruption found in *V*.

ib. *Quod qui* ab illo abducit exercitum et respectum pulcherrimum et praesidium firmissimum adimit rei publicae *V*.

Faenus conjectured *Quare qui*, while Kraffert excises *exercitum*, a proposal accepted by Müller. *Quod qui* appears to me a combination of variants in *V* of the familiar type. I read *Qui* ab illo, etc.

19. *equodnam principium putatis* libertatis capessendae.

That the passage is corrupt is agreed by all editors. The most plausible of the corrections offered appears to me that of Stangl who inserts *fore* before *principium*. I had thought that *aptius* (cf. Liv. xxxv. 19, *apto tempore*) might have dropped out after *putatis*. I now, however, propose a simpler cure, which is for *capessendae* to read *capessendum*. Cf. for the construction Tac. Ann. xv. 49 *principium facinoris capessivere*, and for the corruption Verr. v. 36 *ius imaginis ad memoriam posteritatemque prodendam* (so MSS. *prodendae* edd.).

xi. 5. *secutae collocutiones familiarissimae* cum Trebonio complexusque summae benevolentiae falsi indices exstiterunt in amore simulato.

It is usual to place a comma after *complexusque*, and to write *indices falsi* with Nipperdey. Müller places the stop after *Trebonio* taking *complexusque* with *exstiterunt*, which seems an improvement; retaining *falsi indices*. The clauses, however, seem awkwardly linked by *-que*. I first thought of writing *complexus quoque*, but in view of asyndetic arrangement of the other clauses in the sentence, viz. *secutae collocutiones... dexterarum... sunt violatae, nocturnus introitus... oppressus Trebonius*, now think it better to cut out *-que*.

27. *cum essent tales virtute, auctoritate nobilitate summi viri* (so *D*, *deest V*) quorum alterius iam nobis notus esset exercitus, alterius auditis. Faernus says, 'aut *summi* abundat, quod non credo, aut legendum *summa* aut *tali* pro *tales*.' The second conjecture is that generally adopted. A demonstrative seems to be required by the context. I would insert *ei* or *hi* before *summi*, i.e., 'in view of the fact that these great men are such in point of valour,' etc. For the construction of *virtute* Prof. Reid compares Lael. 12 *vita talis* fuit vel *fortuna* vel *gloria*.

32. *animus* is est quem videtis. Copiae quas audistis, fortes et constantes viri, qui ne vivo quidem Trebonio Dolabellae latrocinium in Syriam penetrare sivissent.

This passage has received very drastic treatment from editors for reasons which I fail to comprehend. They accept readings from Ferrarius *fortis . . . constantis . . . sivisset* not found in any of Halm's MSS., or of mine (*sivisset* is quoted by Deiter Philol. lviii. p. 193 from an Amsterdam MS. which he does not rate highly), and mark a lacuna after Madvig, who supposes that e.g. 'primum legiones egregiae Q. Marci, deinde L. Statii' has fallen out after *audisset*. I read with the MSS.

37. *veteranos tueri debeo, sed eos quibus sanitas est*.

Sed eos quibus, for which Halm quotes no authority (*sed iis quibus* ag, so *l*), is found in *n*. I have some doubt, however, as it hardly explains other variants, viz. *q iis quos quibus t*, and *est quod iis quos quibus b*. Possibly *eos quidem quibus*, regarding *q* in *t* as an error for *q* (quidem), and *quos* as a variant.

38. *quibus cum Bruti salus cara sit, qui possunt Cassii nomen odisse . . . non vereor ne acerbus civis quisquam istorum sit qui otio delectantur* (so *D*, *deest V*).

The meaning, as Madvig points out, must be 'Cassius will not be distasteful to any lovers of peace.' He proposed *acerbus nuntius cuiquam*, a violent alteration which yields a poor sense. Müller with equal boldness conjectures *acerbus Cassii honos cuiquam*. The corruption seems to me due to the constant confusion between *cui*, *cuius* and *civis*, the symbols for which in MSS. where abbreviations are used are very much alike (\bar{c} = *cui*, c^s = *cuius*, c^o = *civis*. cf. *Cl.R.* p. 45). For the confusion in MSS. of the Philippics cf. ii. 23 *civi] cui t*. viii. 23 *cui V*: *cui* is *b*: *civis lt*. xi. 14 *civis Vb*¹: *civi civi t*: *cives civis gln*: *cives cuius a*: *cives b*²: xiii. 8 *civis] cuius l*. *Civis* here appears to stand for *cui*, i.e. in the archetype of *D* was written

cui quisquam, the reading above the line i.e. *cuiquam* being correct. I read *ne acerbus cuiquam* istorum sit.

xii. 9. Gallia . . . exauritur vastatur uritur omnis aequo animo belli patitur iniuriam *codd.*

The conjecture of Ferrarius omnes . . . iniurias is universally adopted, a comma being placed after *uritur*. I see no reason for any change, and would merely place a comma after *omnis*, a punctuation found in *n*. For *belli iniuria* cf. Livy iii. 6, 7 agros . . . sine *belli iniuria* vastatos, xlii. 21, 2 propter cuius *belli iniuriam* (Reid).

20. *ne aquilam quidem ipsum credituram putavit V.*

ne aquilam quidem ipsam credituram putavit Int.

ne Aquilam quidem ipsum crediturum putavit b, edd.

I here find myself in disagreement with recent editors who read with *b* (a highly corrected MS.) on the ground that the jest on *Aquila* and *aquila* contained in the reading of the other members of *D* and indicated by the corruption in *V*, is too frigid a pun for Cicero to make. Halm says disdainfully of this reading 'in qua scriptura nescio qui lepos inesse putetur.' I do not say that the pun is a good one, but it does contain a joke upon the name of an adversary, and Cicero would stoop to anything in order to make this. Cf. Phil. xi. 14 *Germanum Cimber occidit*, xiii. 27 *Muribus . . . rosit* and the numberless examples in the Orations and Letters. In the ordinary reading there is no point at all.

24. itaque in urbe *maneo sisi* licebit *manebo (a) t.*

itaque in urbe *maneo si sic* licebit *manebo (g) In.*

itaque in urbe *maneo si* licebit *manebo b.*

Editors read from *δ*, the Italian vulgate, which omits *maneo* (deest *V*) either by accident or conjecture. *Sisi* in *t* is a ditto-graphy (cf. v. 34 *si*] *sisi V*) while *si sic* is a correction based on this error. I read *maneo, si* licebit, *manebo* with *b*.

ib. Teneant alii castra, gerant res bellicas; oderint hostem; nam hoc caput est; nos... urbem... tuebimur (so *D*, deest *V*).

Cicero is distinguishing between the functions of those at the front, and his own at home. The chief duty of the soldiers is obviously to defeat the enemy. To 'hate' the foe is also incumbent on Cicero. For *oderint* Faernus proposed *fuderint*, and Madvig

superent. Surely the obvious correction is *occiderint*.

27. collocutus est: *quo* (so *bt*: *quod In*) quidem memini *Sex. Pompeium ad colloquium Roma venire* (so *D*, deest *V*).

For *quo quidem* Ernesti, who is followed by Halm and Kayser, conjectured *quo quidem* <tempore>. A simpler addition after *quidem* would be *die*. I am, however, inclined to read *quod...ad colloquium* with *In*.

28. *isse et redisse (D, deest V).*

The usual idiom is *ire, redire* without a connecting particle. The following variants are instructive. Phil. ii. 78 *isti, redisti V*: *isti et redisti D*, 89 *irent, redirent*] *irent ac redirent. c.* For the asyndeton cf. Att. x. 1, 3, *eant, redeant*, Hor. Ep. 1, 7, 55, *it, redit, et narrat*. I read *isse, redisse* here.

ib. *quae cum agam in consilio nullis* (so *bt*, edd., *nonnullis In*) *ut arbitror, repugnantibus, nonne metuendum est ne... multitudo per me pacem distineri putet?*

Nonnullis must be right. Cicero will be considered the obstacle to peace, if some hold an opposite view to his, not if all are agreed. For the corruption cf. ii. 20 *nonnulla V*: *nulla D*. *Nonnullis* was previously only known from *δ*, the fifteenth century Italian vulgate, so it is interesting to find it in *n*, a tenth century MS.

The evidence of *V* fails us after Phil. xiii. 10, and we have to rely solely upon *D*. The best members of *D* are also imperfect: *n* ends at xiii. 29, *l* at xiii. 46, and *t* at xiv. 25. The loss of *n* is not seriously felt, since its readings can be ascertained from the consensus of *αλ*, two MSS. copied from it before it was mutilated (*Cl. R.* p. 251). I have used Harl. 2682 (*h*) after the failure of *l*.

xiii. 11. *sunt alii fortasse, mea* (so *t*: *sed mea In, de mea b*) *memoria dilabuntur*.

Editors generally read *sed de mea* with Naugerius. I find, however, no parallel for the construction *dilabi de*. The simplest course is to read with *In*, since *sed* might easily drop out from *t* after *fortasse*. *Dilabi* is still somewhat odd. The word generally means 'crumble,' 'fall asunder.' (Prof. Reid compares Tusc. iv. 10 *intento opus est animo ne omnia dilabantur, si unum effugerit, for dilabi in connexion with memory*.) *Delabi* which = 'slip down' would be no improvement. The usual word is *elabi*, cf. ad Herenn. iii. 35 *e memoria elabuntur* (so *ΠρCd*, *memoria elabuntur Bl*, *e memoria labuntur H*), where the variants are instructive. I suspect that *sed e mea memoria elabuntur* should here be read.

ib. utrum igitur augurem *I.O.M.*, cuius interpretes internuntique constituti sumus, utrum populus Romanus libentius sanciet. So *D.*

Editors here read *Iovis Optimi Maximi* from *δ*, and adopt an unhappy conjecture of Madvig, who inserts *nos* after *sumus*. Pluygers, who has found no follower, brilliantly points out that nothing is necessary except to write *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus*, which is the natural interpretation of *I.O.M.* The authority of *δ* is *nil*, and *nos* is very awkwardly placed.

19. egressus est non viis sed tramitibus paludatus: *eoque ipso die innumerabilia senatus consulta fecit, quae quidem omnia citius delata (deleta bn) quam scripta sunt.* Ex eo non iter sed cursus et fuga in Galliam.

The words *eoque...sunt* violently disturb the sense. Cicero is describing the instantaneous collapse of Antony, and the point is spoilt if he has time to pass innumerable decrees. Also, there is a ὑστερον πρότερον, since *egressus* implies that he has already left Rome. If *deleta* is read from *bn* there is a sense, since the annulment of his laws would be a feature in his discomfiture. But *deferre* i.e. *in aerarium* is a technical term, e.g. Livy xxxix. 4, 8, Phil. v. 15, and *deleta* looks like a correction. I thought at one time that there might have been a dislocation, but can find no place in the context where the words can be suitably inserted. I now look upon them as a *scholium* intended to harmonise the accounts given by Cicero of Antony's departure. In v. 24 his description tallies with the present passage, if *eoque...sunt* is struck out: viz. non profectus est, sed profugit paludatus. At quo? in provinciam firmissimorum civium, etc. The account of Appian is slightly different viz. διαταραχθεὶς οὖν εἰσῆλθε μὲν ἐς τὸ βουλευτήριον, ὡς δ' ἐφ' ἑτέρα αὐτοῦ συναγαγὼν μικρὰ διελέχθη καὶ εὐθὺς ἐπὶ τὰς πύλας ἐχώρει καὶ ἀπὸ τῶν πύλων ἐπὶ Ἀλβην (iii. 45). In Phil. iii. 24 Cicero's language is ambiguous, since after describing the *fuga* of Antony in similar terms, he adds *praeclara tamen senatus consulta illo ipso die vespertina*, which may show that he elsewhere exaggerates the haste of Antony to depart, or may mean that after he had gone a magistrate acting in his interest convened the senate. The annotator, as I conceive, was puzzled by the mention of *senatus consulta* in iii. 24, and composed this note. Professor Reid remarks upon the Latinity that '*citius delata quam scripta sunt* is clearly nonsensical: *scripta* should at least have been *facta*.' *Innumera-*

abilia sen. consulta seems to be a reminiscence of ii. 97 innumerabilibus chirographis, x. 6, senatus consulto huius generis, sunt enim innumerabilia, and *citius delata quam scripta sunt* of v. 7 ante lata quam scripta est.

19. Caesaris...virtus latronis impetus retardavit, quem *tum* ille demens laedere se putabat in edictis.

For *tum* no variant was previously quoted. I find in *b* the very idiomatical reading *tamen*, i.e. 'in his baffled rage.' For the use of *tamen* cf. ii. 8.

24. Equo te tua virtus provexisset, equo *genus*? In lustris, etc. To the various conjectures for *genus* (*genus vitae* Schelle, *ingenium* Ursinus, *industria* Pluygers), I add doubtfully <*inhlustre*> *genus*. The context appears to require *industria*, but although this would easily drop out before *In lustris* it is difficult to see where *genus* can have come from.

ib. suam amentiam *pueri* (so *t*: *huic* In: *puero huic* b, edd.) praebet ad gloriam.

Puero seems to have been the original reading. It is corrupted in *t*, expelled by *huic* from *ln*, while *b* combines the variants.

25. id agere ut *iure damnatus* sit Dolabella.

Iure damnari in 1, 22 means 'to be justly condemned,' and it is a curious complaint for Antony to make that Octavian is endeavouring to procure this in the case of Dolabella. *Damnatus* appears to be a corruption for *deminutus*. Octavian wishes to make Dolabella an outlaw. Cf. Festus *deminutus capite...cui aqua ignique interdictum est*, Balb. 20 ut de nostro *iure* aliquid *deminueretur*, Caec. 5 pars aliqua *iuris deminuta*.

26. The readings of the MSS. are

Homo diruptus divitique Caelius (*a*)*bn't* (divitique *b ex corr.*)

Homo dirutus divicii^s Caelius *n*².

Homo diruptus dirutusque Caelius *l*.

The reading of *l* passed into *δ* with the addition of *Q.* before Caelius, and has been adopted from *δ* by all editors. As *l* and MSS. allied to it are full of variants (cf. *Cl. R.* p. 43) I had thought that *diruptus* was a variant for *dirutus*. Prof. Reid brilliantly emends to *dirutus aere* (cf. Verr. v. 33 in quibus...cum frequens fuisset, tamen *aere dirutus est*) regarding *divitiis* as the original gloss on *aere*.

27. illud tamen *verum* quod in hoc Planco proverbii loco dici solet, perire eum non posse, nisi ei crura fracta essent. Fracta sunt et vivit.

<*non*> *verum* the correction of Zumpt is much simpler than that of Klotz *mirum*,

which recent editors adopt. There appears, however, to be a further corruption. The sense must be 'the old saw is not true of Plancus,' i.e. *in hoc Planco* must either be placed before *quod*, or struck out as a note.

29. *huic causae orbem terrae patere* (so cod. Ursini, *parere l*, *favere b*, om *t.*). *Parere* is also quoted by Halm from δ , and the interchange of *parere* and *patere* is not uncommon, e.g. Mil. 15. Also *patere* gives an excellent sense. There are, however, some curious variants. In *l* after *Cascae* in the next line there follows *vel in hac causa*, a variant from the margin which has been inserted into the text in the wrong place, while *n* reads *in hac causa* before *orbem*. There must, therefore, have been another reading *in hac causa orbem terrae* <esse>. For *in causa esse* cf. Marc. 2, Lig. 16, 17, 28. The omission of *patere* (*parere*) by *t*, and the obvious conjecture in *b* are suspicious. On the other hand *patere* seems too good to be a conjecture.

31. *vide ne tu veteranos tamen eos qui erant perditum perdidisti*.

For *tamen eos* Madvig conjectures *sed tamen eos* or *eos tamen*. A simpler correction is *etiam*. The words are often confused e.g. ii. 76 *etiam* V. \bar{e} *iam t*: *et tamen l*: \bar{e} *et tamen b*.

33. *Theopompum nudum n̄ expulsum a Trebonio*.

The corruption \bar{n} is found in all MSS. except $\alpha\lambda$ (the apographs of *n*) which omit it. Halm thought that it concealed the name of a place. I propose for \bar{n} to read *vi*. Cf. ix. 14 where \ln^1 give *u* for *vi*. The word is peculiarly liable to corruption.

34. *nihil vidi tam integrum quam ut oppugnare imperatorem incipiant, quem tanto studio consensuque ostenderint* (so *t*: *offenderint cett.*) I emend *ostenderint* (*offenderint*) to *oderint* otherwise following the MSS. If *oderint* were written by error (cf. vii. 3 *providi cives* V: *provindicius* D) the corruptions would quickly follow.

This is simpler than (a) to conjecture *cum tantum studium consensumque ostenderint* with Halm, or (b) to insert *quam oderint* after *ostenderint* with Lehmann. Another possibility which had occurred to me was that *ostenderint* (*offenderint*) might be a 'telescoped' word for *offensionem ostenderint*. This would require *cum* for *quem* with Halm.

35. *quoniam* (so *bot*: *quē l*) *vos adsentationibus et venenatis muneribus venistis depravati* (so *bol*, om. *t*).

Editors adopt from Madvig *quamquam* *eos* for *quoniam*, and *depravatum* for *depra-*

vati. These are violent changes. I prefer for *quoniam* to read *quos iam*, altering one letter only, and for *depravati* to read *depravaturi*. The perfect and future participles of deponents are continually confused, e.g. in the previous section *imitati t. imitaturi cett.* Cf. Mil. 90 *ausurus* H: *ausus cett.*

37. *ut perfugium scelerum esset cum turpissimis rei p. sordibus*.

For *cum*, which is struck out by Garatoni, Halm conjectures *tum* or *iam*, while Müller reads *tutum*. *Cum* appears to me to stand for *quam* (i.e. 'the very vilest'), for the corruption cf. x. 8. *quam cum* V: *cum* D, and Müller on Fam. 1, 2.

40. *pergit in me* (so *t*: *in mea cett.*) *maledicta*.

Halm would add *iacere* or *iactare*. I am surprised that no one has corrected *maledicta* <*dicere*>. Cf. Q. F. ii. 3, 2. *cum omnia maledicta* . . . in Clodium et Clodium *dicentur*, Phil. ii. 42, in te et in tuos *dicta dicere*, Planc. 85 *dictum* . . . in petitionem tuam *dici* potuisse, etc. How easily the omission of *dicere* would take place may be illustrated from Phil. ii. 42, where the MSS. of Suetonius, who quotes the passage (de Rhet. 5), omit *dicta*, while *n* gives *dicere dicta*, which looks as if *dicta* had been at first omitted, and then inserted in the wrong place.

41. *deceptum autem Caesarem a me t*, edd. *deceptum autem patrem a me Caesarem lo*.

deceptum autem patrem Caesarem a me b.

That either *Caesarem*, or *patrem* is a gloss is obvious. *Caesarem* appears to me intolerably obscure, since immediately before *deceptum* comes *Caesari* *plura et maiora debentur*, where *Caesar* = Octavianus. If however, *patrem* is sound, then the sense is perfect. Antony had accused Cicero of deceiving 'Caesar,' using an ambiguous expression. Cicero first clears himself of the charge of deceiving Octavian, and then says, 'Do you mean his father?' There appears to have been in the archetype of D

Caesarem

deceptum autem patrem a me.

Patrem has been expelled from *t* by the gloss, and is variously combined with it in other MSS.

42. *nec deserere partis quas Pompeius odit*.

So edd. and *bl*: *poneius vidi t*: *Pompeius odiū ho*.

The reading of *t* deserves careful attention, since, although the introduction of a common name like *Pompeius* in a corrupt

passage is frequent (cf. iii. 26), it is not so easy to see why it should have been corrupted. Also, it is hard to believe that Cicero, who in the next sentence castigates Antony for *piissimus*, would have passed over *odivit* without comment. Further, the sense is very odd, viz.—‘I will not desert the party which Pompey hated.’ The required sense seems rather ‘I will not desert the party which I myself created.’ Possibly *partis quas sponte adivi*.

44. *quique, nisi ante eius adventum rei p. poenas dederis, ille huius belli feret principatum MSS.*

For *ille*, which was struck out by Ernesti, I read *ipse*. The confusion of *ille* and *ipse* is constant.

47. ‘*legatos venire non credo.*’ Bene me novit: *quod venias* (so *t: bellum quod veniant h: velim quo venias b*), proposito praesertim exemplo Dolabellae. Sanctiore erunt, credo etc.

Editors mark *quod venias* as corrupt, or suppose that there is a lacuna. If we ask what is disguised by *bellum quod (velim quo)*, light is, I think, to be obtained from § 3, where *D* without sense give *belli quorum* for *reliquorum* (*V.*) Here we have only *D*, and a similar corruption is not surprising. I read *Bene me novit. Reliqui veniant, i.e.* ‘He knows my caution. Let the others go if they like, knowing how Dolabella behaved to Trebonius.’ Cf. xii. 26 *si extra castra, ceteri viderint, ego me vix tuto futurum puto*, 27 *si ceteri possunt me posse confido. Reli-* here has been corrupted to *belli*, as in § 3, in *h*, and to *veli* in *b*, cf. xiv. 7 *inustae belli*] *inusta evelli t*.

There is an omission in *oA*, the two apographs of *n*, from *bene...credo*, so I cannot quote their reading.

xiv. 6. *Caesar cum exercitu per se comparato cum primis pestibus rem p. liberasset. MSS.*

For *primis* Pluygers conjectures *primum*, Halm *compressis*, while Müller reads *prius*. *Primis* appears to me to stand for *primum* ^{is} *his*. This became *primum*, then *primis, i.e.* *is (his)* written above the line was interpreted as a correction.

12. *tanta multitudo hostium interfecta dico ita inquam hostium bht.*
tanta multitudo hostium interfecta dico inquam hostium oA.

Editors read <*hostium*> *dico? ita inquam hostium* from ‘2 codd. (?) Ursini.’ From the reading of *oA* it would appear that in the archetype was *ita* ^{dico} *inquam hostium*. I

would read *ita inquam, hostium*, omitting *dico*, with Garatoni.

13. *etiam in eos, qui omnis suas curas in rei p. salute defigunt, impetus crimen* (so *t: impetus crimen invidia cett.*) *quaeretur?*

In this much-disputed passage *impetus* appears to be an interpolation from the context—‘in me *impetus* conductorum hominum quasi in tyrannum parabatur.’ *Invidia* on the other hand has every appearance of being genuine, since *invidiam quaerere* is a favourite expression of Cicero. Professor Reid suggests to me that the interpolation consists of *impetus crimen*, and not of *impetus* alone, and this view seems to me the simplest cure for the passage. The interpolation has expelled the genuine reading *invidia* from *t* and is combined with it in the other MSS. *Impetus* and *crimen* were probably two marginal annotations which have been combined. If *crimen* is retained, I would prefer to read *invidia crimenque* as being nearer to the reading of *t*, viz. *impetus crimen*, than *crimen invidiaeque*, the conjecture of Faernus upon which this suggestion is based.

14. *an ut ego, qui Catilinam haec molientem sustulerim...ipse exstiterim Catilina.*

Ut was struck out by Faernus (so Halm, and Kayser), while all editors accept *exstiterem*, a conjecture of Manutius. I cannot see that any change is necessary except for

ut to read *vero* (*i.e. u* for *û*). For the confusion of these words cf. Marc. 4 where for *est vero* Harl. 4927 gives *et u ut*.

17. *magnus est in re publica campus, ut sapienter dicerē* (so *t, dicere cett.*) *Crassus* solebat.

Crassus appears to need a praenomen, and so Halm conjectured *L. Crassus, i.e.* the orator. The corruption in *t* points to *M. Crassus, i.e.* the triumvir. Cf. ii. 7 *tantum mihi cum M. Crasso contentio esset*. Cicero could speak kindly of a political antagonist after his death.

While I have been engaged upon these speeches I have had the benefit of advice from Professor Reid and Professor Purser, which I gratefully acknowledge. Professor Reid has allowed me to consult him perpetually when I was in doubt, and placed at my disposal his unrivalled knowledge of Ciceronian idiom, as well as several emendations of his own. They are of course in no way responsible for views advocated in this paper.

ALBERT C. CLARK.