

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 *Ad Atticum* Superscriptions

Cora M. Porterfield

The Classical Review / Volume 12 / Issue 09 / December 1898, pp 438 - 441

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00033655, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00033655

How to cite this article:

Cora M. Porterfield (1898). The *Ad Atticum* Superscriptions. The Classical Review, 12, pp 438-441 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00033655

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

Athenæum, by parity of reasoning, would be bound to correct the fine passage in Tennyson's *Dream of Fair Women*, where Cleopatra says to Rosamond

‘O, you tamely died !
You should have clung to Fulvia’s waist, and
thrust
The dagger thro’ her side.’

The critic would be bound to say ‘*Fulvia* must be wrong; she was Cleopatra’s rival, not Rosamond’s; for *Fulvia*’s we should read *Eleanor*’s.’ Such an expression as the ‘dumb mouths’ of Milton’s *Lycidas* would have hardly a chance of survival in ancient poetry.

R. Y. TYRRELL.

THE AD ATTICUM SUPERSCRPTIONS.

While it is generally believed that Cicero, following the Roman custom, used superscriptions in his letters to Atticus, nevertheless the superscriptions which precede these letters in our extant MSS. have been pronounced wholly or in part spurious.

Boot, in the preface to his edition of this collection, p. x., says, ‘tamen non est veri simile Ciceronem, qui saepe in epistolis eum alloquitur *mi Pomponi* (vid. III. 4. 9, 2. 22, 3. IV. 18, 2 et cf. II. 8, 1. VII. 7, 7) et in cuius epistolis ante annum DCCIV. *Attici* nomen non invenitur (primum VI. 1, 20), in inscriptionibus semper solo cognomine usum esse. Neque adducor, ut eum semper contentum fuisse credam simplicissima salutandi formula, quae indicatur litera S nomini subiecta, quum in epistolis ad alios datis, quibus non minus familiariter utebatur, saepe S. D. vel S. P. D. adscripserit, quae medium locum inter nomen scribentis et eius, ad quem scribitur, occupare solent.’ And Tyrrell, *The Correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero*, vol. I. p. 48, says, ‘*Cicero Attico Sal.*, as a heading to each letter to Atticus, is probably not genuine, for Cicero never uses the name *Attice* in the body of a letter until we come to the year 704 (B.C. 50) (Att. VI. 1, 20). *Mi Pomponi* is the nearly invariable form of address, even after the year 689 (B.C. 65), before which he must have received his surname Atticus; therefore it is not probable that this surname was used all along by Cicero in the headings of his letters and nowhere else.’ In a note on the same page he says further, ‘In the whole of the sixteen books to Atticus, containing 397 letters, he apostrophises his friend by name only 22 times.’

The arguments here employed in support of the theory that the headings are spurious are three in number, viz.: (1) that the superscriptions are uniform, (2) that Cicero very rarely uses *Attice* by way of address, and (3) that while the name *Atticus* appears through-

out in the superscriptions, it does not occur in the body of the letters before VI. 1. 20 in 704 a. u. c.

If uniformity be urged against these superscriptions, the same objection must be made to the *ad Brutum* collection, in which there is not one change in form, and to the *ad Quintum fratrem* letters, where the uniformity is broken in only I. 1 and 2, where *Salutem* becomes *Sal.* But why should *any* of the superscriptions be accepted and all these rejected as spurious? And yet it is clear that letters had superscriptions, and that some of the genuine forms have been preserved seems certain; for no later hand could have written *Cicero Appio Pulchro, ut spero, Censori S. D., ad Fam.* III. 11, or the jesting superscriptions to Caelius, for example *M. Tullius M. F. M. N. Cicero Imp. S. D. C. Caelio L. F. C. N. Caldo Quaest. of ad Fam.* II. 19, or *Curius Ciceroni suo Sal.*, followed by ‘S. v. b.; sum enim *χρήσει μὲν* tuus, *κρήσει δὲ* Attici nostri,’ in which *tuus* of the letter corresponds to *suo* of the superscription, *ad Fam.* VII. 29, or *M. Cicero S. D. L. Valerio Iuriconsulto; ‘cur enim tibi hoc non gratificer,’ ad Fam.* I. 10, where the superscription is a part of the letter, or finally *ad Att.* III. 20 *Cicero S. D. Q. Caecilio Q. F. Pomponiano Attico, ‘quod quidem ita esse et avunculum tuum,’* on which Boot in a note, p. 150, says, ‘Cicero novum nomen et hereditatem festive nunc amico gratulatur. Nam initium epistolae pendet ex inscriptione ut *Fam.* I. 10, ubi nihil deest, et VII. 29, cuius initium: *Sum enim χρήσει μὲν* tuus referri debet ad id, quod in inscriptione est: *Ciceroni suo.*’ Further there is not unbroken uniformity in the *ad Atticum* collection. In addition to III. 20, given above, VIII. 16; XIV. 18–22 omit *Sal.*; XI. 6 has *Salutem Dicit*; XIV. 5, 6, and 14 have *S. D.*; and XVI. 16 has *Sal. Dic.*, making twelve in all. Again this particular type, *cognomen, cognomen, Sal.*,

is the one most commonly used. It appears in all of the *ad Brutum* collection. The *ad Fam.* collection contains 62 letters written to Cicero, in 22 of which this type is followed, while in the remaining 40 letters there are representatives of 22 varieties of superscriptions. This type is the model for the superscription to 9 of the 26 letters written to Tiro, which present in all 14 varieties of headings. In the rest of the *ad Fam.* collection, while 49 is the number given to the form of superscription next in favor, this one is found 68 times. And still further, an investigation of the correspondence with Lentulus in Bk. I, Caelius Bk. VIII, Varro Bk. IX, Plancus Bk. X, Cassius and Cornificius Bk. XII, Servius Bk. XIII, reveals a tendency to uniformity in the case of a considerable correspondence with one person, and that, too, in favor of the forms, *cognomen*, *cognomen* and *cognomen*, *cognomen*, *Sal.* Lack of variety then can hardly be sufficient ground for rejecting the *ad Atticum* superscriptions.

If Cicero had always used *Tite* or *Pomponi* in the letters, still it would have been quite possible for him to use *Attico* in the superscription, since that is the formal part of these letters, and it would not be out of harmony with *ad Fam.* VI. 12, where *Ampio* of the superscription is followed in the first line of the letter by *mi Balbe*. But he does not always nor almost always use *Tite* or *Pomponi*. In the years indicated, he uses *Pomponi* in (696 a. u. c.) III. 4; III. 9. 2; III. 22. 3; III. 23. 2; III. 15. 7; III. 19. 3; (697) IV. 2. 5; (700) IV. 18. 2; *Attice* in (704) VI. 1. 20; VI. 2. 8; VI. 2. 9; VI. 6. 4; (705) VIII. 11. 3; IX. 6. 7; (708) XII. 3. 1; (709) XII. 19. 4; XII. 23. 1; XIII. 38. 2; (710) XIV. 12. 1; XIV. 16. 3; XIV. 17. 5; XIV. 20. 3; XV. 20. 2; XVI. 2. 2; XVI. 6. 2; XVI. 7. 3; XVI. 15. 5; and *Tite* in (705) IX. 6. 5. Of these 28 cases of address, one is *Tite*, 8 are *Pomponi*, and 19 *Attice*. Six of the eight cases in which *Pomponi* is used are in the third book which belongs to the period of anxiety in exile in the year 696, eight years after the date of the earliest extant letter, and the other two are in book four in passages of deepest feeling. In all these cases it would be perfectly natural for Cicero to call his friend by his nomen as a more intimate form of address. There is no other case of address until VI. 1. 20 in 704, where there is no hint whatever that the use of *Attice* is an innovation. The fact that at this period he begins to send greetings to the little daughter of Atticus and to nick-

name her *Atticula* and *Attica* (first in VI. 5. 4) not only may account for the fact that *Attice* is, with one exception (IX. 6. 5), the only form of address used afterwards, but it also shows that Cicero had recognized this name of his friend. In addition to the references already given *Pomponius* and *Titus*, not in direct address, are found but four times (II. 8. 1 in 695; IV. 15. 1 in 700; VII. 7. 7 in 704; XVI. 3. 1 in 710) and *Atticus*, after VI. 1 in 704, three times in letters to Atticus (VII. 1. 4 in 704; XV. 15. 2 in 710; XVI. 13. 1 in 710) and 18 times in quoted letters (XV. 14; XVI. 16). The preponderance of *Pomponius* does not seem to prove that the superscriptions are spurious.

But before 704 this name *Atticus* occurs not only in *ad Fam.* (703 a. u. c.) XIII. 1. 5 and VIII. 8. 2, but also even in the letters to Atticus, viz.: (1) In 694, before any other mention of a name has been made, Cicero says (I. 19. 10), 'quod homini Attico minus Graecum eruditumque videatur,' which must be a pun on his friend's name. (2) In 695, before any further mention of a name occurs except that made in II. 8. 1, Cicero writes in II. 19. 5, 'in iis epistulis me Laelium, te Furium faciam,' but in the next letter, written the same month, (II. 20. 5) he remarks, 'Quod scripseram et Furio scripturum, nihil necesse est tuum nomen mutare: me faciam Laelium et te Atticum.' Here Cicero himself makes the definite statement, and that too before the occurrence of *Mi Pomponi*, to the effect that he will continue to use the name *Atticus*. (3) Still further in III. 20 (696 a. u. c.) there is the superscription *Cicero S. D. Q. Caecilio Q. F. Pomponiano Attico*, in a special case where it is a part of the letter and must be genuine, as Boot's note given above implies. It appears then that *Atticus* was a name commonly used by Cicero long before VI. 1. 20 of 704. Furthermore, since Atticus first went to Athens in 669, i.e. before Cicero knew him, while the earliest date in the letters is but 687, it is quite possible that all the superscriptions contained *Attico*.

From Cicero's direct statement in II. 20. 5, from the name in the superscription to III. 20, from the inclination to play with this cognomen in I. 19. 10 and in the pet names for the daughter, from the fact that this name occurs much oftener than any other in the body of the letters, together with the tendency to use cognomina in superscriptions, it seems certain that *Attico* should be regarded as a part of these super-

scriptions. Accordingly the presence of this word *Attico* in these superscriptions ceases to be a reason for rejecting them. Further, there seems to be a marked tendency to uniformity of superscription in the case of letters addressed to a person with whom there is a considerable correspondence. For letters which exhibit this tendency to uniformity the particular type of superscription, *cognomen, cognomen, Sal.*, used in

the *ad Atticum* collection, is the favourite. Again this superscription is the most frequent among those regarded as the least formal in Cicero's time. From all these facts it is quite fair to assume that these superscriptions which have clung to the letters are genuine.

CORA M. PORTERFIELD.

Chicago.

ON THE MEANING OF *SICUT*.

THIS word often marks a transition from a general statement to a particular case illustrating it, as has been shown by P. Langen, *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Plautus*, p. 249. This usage has been often neglected, which has resulted in error in both lexicons and editions of particular authors. I propose to illustrate the explanatory meaning of *sicut*, to explain three passages hitherto unsatisfactorily dealt with, viz. Plaut. *Pers.* 135–138, *Cic.* ii. in *Verr.* ii. § 34, and *Iuv.* xv. 98, and incidentally to disprove the assertion that *sicut* is sometimes equivalent to *siquidem*, *quoniam*, as is stated by Forcellini-De Vit and Lewis and Short; both of which authorities thus wrongly explain Plaut. *Epid.* ii. 2, 87, *Mil.* iv. 1, 28.

Sicut in its explanatory sense may be translated 'as for instance,' 'for instance,' 'I mean,' 'namely.' So Plaut. *Epid.* 271 (ii. 2, 86) *nunc occasiost faciundi, priusquam in urbem aduenerit, | sicut cras hic aderit: hodie haud uenerit.* 'Now's your chance for acting, before he arrives in the city, I mean he'll be here to-morrow: he won't come to-day.' *Epid.* 543 (iv. 1, 17) *si is est homo. | sicut anni multi dubiam me dant, animi pendeo.* 'If he is the man. I mean the length of years makes me doubtful; I hesitate in my mind.' *Miles* 974 (iv. 1, 27) *quin tu illam iube abs te abire quo lubet: sicut soror | eius huc gemina aduenit Ephesum et mater arcessuntque eam.* 'Tell her pray to go away from you whither she chooses. For instance her twin sister and mother have arrived here from Ephesus, and wish to take her away.' *Poen.* 1192 (v. 4, 20) *ut uolup est homini, mea soror, si quod agit, cluet uictoria. | sicut nos hodie inter alias praestitimus pulcritudine.* 'How pleasant it is, my sister, for a person if he wins victory in his attempt. For instance, we have to-day

surpassed other girls in beauty.' Other instances are *Menaech.* 588 (iv. 2, 20). *Miles* 518 (ii. 6, 38). *Most.* 381 (ii. 1, 34). *Poen.* 506 (iii. 1, 3). *Pseud.* 374 (i. 3, 140). If Seyffert's restoration, accepted by Sonnenschein, is right, *sicut* is similarly used in *Rudens* 187 (i. 3, 3).

I now come to the consideration of *Persa* 135–138 (i. 3, 55), thus printed by Ritschl-Schoell,

SAT. *tun illam uendas? Tox. immo alium adlegauero, qui uendat: qui esse se peregrinum praedicet:*

sicut istic leno hau dum sex mensis Megaribus huc est quom commigravit.

The lacuna, indicated by Ritschl, makes nonsense of the passage: but if no lacuna is supposed, and *sicut* is understood as explanatory, all is clear. *S.* 'Would you sell her?' *T.* 'No. I'll despatch someone else to sell her, who shall assert that he is a foreigner. I mean it's only six months since this pander settled here' [and so it will be easy to deceive him, as he does not know the people]. The substitution of *siquidem* for *sicut*, proposed by Camerarius, is therefore unnecessary.

The following passages of Cicero illustrate this use: *De Orat.* i. § 238 *quibus quidem in causis omnibus, sicut (as for instance) in ipsa M'Curi . . . et in C. Hostili Mancini controversia... fuit... summa de iure dissensio.* *p. Flacco* § 86, *p. Cluent.* § 67, *p. Rabir. Post.* § 8.

The following passage is thus printed by Müller, ii. in *Verr.* ii. § 34 *selecti ex conuentu aut ex negotiatoribus propositi iudices nulli; haec copia, quam dico, iudicum, cohors non*