The text of this famous letter, written by Cicero from his house at Antium in 56 B.C., is extremely corrupt as it appears in the manuscripts. Scholars from the fifteenth to the twentieth century have laboured to restore sense; the most recent conjecture which (I believe) deserves to be accepted is Constans' *dices eatenus te*¹ *suassis qua*¹ *tacerem* (for *feceram*), which receives support from § 2 of the next letter, *id ipsum mecum in his locis commentor, ut ista* [viz. the policy of the triumvirs] *(ne)* *improbem*. There remain a number of passages in which the true (or the most probable) reading has either not been found or not been recognized as such; I shall discuss these in the order of the text. All references not otherwise specified are to the Epistulae ad Atticum.

§ 1. *Ain tu? an me existimas abullo mallemea legiprobarchique quam (a) te? cur igitur cuiquam misi prius? urgebar ab eo ad quem misi, et non habebam exemplar. quid? etiam (dudum enim circumrodo quod devorandum est) subturpicula mihi videbatur esse παλινυρδία.

¹) So already R. Klotz (1854). The word before *dices* is given by most editors as *resipui*; but the form *resipovi* is supported not only by the manuscript evidence here but also by *resipisset* at Sept. 80, the only other passage in which Cicero uses a perfect form of this verb; cf. Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre 3, p. 247.
Ain tu?, ain tandem?, and ain vero? are regularly (in Cicero, I think, always) followed by a second question 2). Usually this second question either has no interrogative particle or is introduced by -ne (e. g. Brut. 152) or very rarely (not in Cicero but e. g. in Livy 10, 25, 6) by num; the only two instances in which it is introduced by an are our passage and Tusc. 5, 35 ain 3) tu? an aliter id scire non potes? In both of these passages conservative critics retain the manuscript reading (although Sjögren expresses doubts about it), but M. Seyffert 4) was probably justified in emending tu an in both places to tandem. His emendation has been adopted by Dougan-Henry in their edition of Tusc., but not by any editor of the Letters; it is not even mentioned by Sjögren or Constans. The corruption can easily be explained; for the erroneous expansion of tan to tu an a parallel can be found a few lines later on in this letter, where eram, after being corrupted to erain, has been erroneously expanded to erat in 5). As Seyffert pointed out, ain tandem begins a letter at Fam. 9, 21. In my view this emendation deserves to be preferred to the alternative, which is to delete an (it is already omitted in the Φ group of manuscripts) as a careless repetition of the preceding ain.

Quid? etiam cannot stand. If this is an instance of quid? used as a rhetorical formula of transition equivalent to prae­terea 6), it probably ought to be followed by another question 7); even if it can be followed by a statement, that statement (I

2) Examples in T. L. L. 1, 1460, 45 ff.
3) Here ain is a correction for an of the paradosis.
5) Most editors since Baier (1867) have accepted the reading of Cratander’s margin, hoc eran animo ut; Constans, however, returns to the reading of the extant manuscripts, hoc erat in animo, ut. (Tyrrell-Purser have, by inadvertence, conflated the two readings, to produce hoc eran in animo ut.) Cicero’s usage supports eram: he uses est in animo either by itself (Div. 2, 3 ut est in animo) or with an infinitive. Here, as so often, Cratander’s margin has preserved the true reading.
7) This was denied by Mueller (in his note on 10, 4, 10) on the strength of our passage and five others from Cicero; but none of these five (9, 18, 3; 10, 4, 10; 13, 24, 1; Leg. agr. 2, 38; Dom. 47) is an instance of quid (ergo or enim)? used as a particle of transition = pr ae terea; in each case a verb governing quid must (and can easily) be supplied from the preceding context. At Off. 3, 95 (quid? Agamemnon ... immolavit Iphigeniam) and Fam. 9, 22, 4 (quid? ipsa res modo honesta, modo turpis) the manuscripts offer a transitional quid? followed by a statement; but both passages have been emended by Mueller himself.
submit) cannot be introduced by *etiam*, which would be tautological. If it is not an instance of transitional *quid?*, what is it? Most scholars since Manutius have regarded it as a variation of such locutions as 1, 13, 6 *novi tibi quidnam scribam? quid? etiam: Messalla etc.; 2, 19, 5 *quid alius? quid? hoc opinor: certi sumus etc.; Q. F. 3, 1, 24 *quid praeterea? quid? etiam: Gabinius etc.; other examples are given in Mueller’s note on our passage and by Hofmann, Lat. Umgangssprache, p. 68. But our passage differs from these others in two essential points: (a) they all have a word like *novi* or *alius* or *praeterea*, not a bare *quid?*; (b) they all occur at, or towards, the end of a letter (usually a fairly long letter), where Cicero is racking his brains to remember what else he meant to write about; the piece of news which follows is usually not very important, and not connected with anything in the rest of the letter; our passage, on the contrary, comes right at the beginning of the letter, and there is no change of topic. Cicero has just given two reasons for having failed to send Atticus a copy of his ‘palinode’; he now proceeds to advance a third, and the most important, reason. The context requires a phrase meaning ‘moreover’, ‘furthermore’, and the required phrase lurks in the apparatus of Mueller’s and Purser’s editions: *quin etiam* (conjectured by S. H. Rinkes in 1856).

It is no credit to editors that they continue to print *dudum*. It is clear from the material collected by T. L. L. s. v. that Cicero does not use *dudum* with a present tense (‘for a long time’) except in conjunction with *iam* or *quam*; the bare *dudum* occurs only in conjunction with past tenses, in the sense of ‘nuper’ or ‘modo’. The correct emendation was made in 1832 by F. Hand (Tursellinus 2, p. 302): *(iam) dudum*; obviously *iam* has dropped out by haplography after *etiam*.

§ 2. *Sed tamen modici fuimus atque, ut scripserimus, ut uberiiores si et ille libenter accipiet et ii subringentur qui ... domum negant oportuisse me aedificare, vendere aliant oportuissse, sed quid ad hoc sed quibus sententiis dixi quod et ipsi probarent, laetati sunt tamen me contra Pompei voluntatem dixisse.*

There is no doubt that *atque* (*in my deification of Caesar*) is what Cicero wrote. It is the easiest emendation of

---

8) As an alternative one might be tempted to suggest *quin et (iam dudum)*, but *quin et* is not Ciceronian, although it is offered by the paradosis at 15, 3, 1 and by some manuscripts at Lael. 68.
AIIOElQCI, the reading of the few manuscripts which do not omit the Greek word (compare the corruptions of ἄποθέσει at 12, 12, 1); and it makes excellent sense. The vulgate ὑποθέσει, which goes back to Victorius, is not only farther from the manuscripts but fails to give a satisfactory sense; it could only mean ‘in my theme’, not (as editors and translators say) ‘in my treatment of the theme’.

For centuries most scholars have followed Victorius in emending scripserimus to scripsi; erimus; but they have not been unanimous about the meaning of ut scripsi. We can rule out the view of Rice-Holmes 9), who regarded ut as temporal (‘when I did write’). Likewise unsatisfactory is the view which takes ut scripsi as the equivalent of ‘in eis quae scripsi’ (‘in ipso libro’, Manutius; ‘in der Schrift’, Drumann-Groebe 5, p. 681): the sense is rather feeble; the change from the plural fuimus to the singular scripsi and back again to the plural erimus is very suspicious, not to say inexplicable 10); and, most important of all, this use of ut equivalent to a relative pronoun belongs to vulgar (and predominantly late) Latin, and is certainly not Ciceronian 11). If ut scripsi is right, it must mean (as most editors and translators take it) ‘as I have told you in a previous letter‘ 12). We just do not know how Atticus had first heard

9) The Roman Republic 2, pp. 293 and 295. He uses the phrase as one of his arguments against identifying the ‘palinode’ with a speech.

10) One would expect scrisimus, which is a variant (for scripserimus) found in some of the Δ-class manuscripts.

11) See Leumann-Hofmann, pp. 708 and 756; Löfstedt, Vermischte Studien, pp. 7 ff. Some scholars (most recently Shackleton Bailey, Towards a Text of Cicero, ‘Ad Atticam’, pp. 30 and 46) have, quite wrongly, imagined that this use of ut occurs in two other passages of the letters to Atticus. (i) 7,2,3 adulescentem, ut nosti, et adde, si quid vis, probum; here ut has been taken as equivalent to qualem. But adde shows that another adjective, to which probum can be ‘added’, has preceded; therefore doctum (Wesenberg) or the like has fallen out after adulescentem. (ii) 9, 18,3 ’vidisti igitur virum, ut scripserast ingemuisti?’ certe, ‘cedo reliqua.’ quid? continuo etc.; here also ut has been taken as equivalent to qualem. No one would have misunderstood if Cicero had written vidi igitur virum, ut scripseram (the letters of the preceding three weeks contain repeated references to Cicero’s intention to meet Caesar); ingemu (from the disappointment of his expectation that Caesar would prove facilis at the interview); quod ad reliqua attinet, continuo etc.; but Cicero, being unable to unlearn the orator even in his private correspondence, has dressed up his meaning in the rhetorical σχήμα of question-and-answer.

12) In this case the change from the plurals fuimus and erimus (both of Cicero’s literary works) to the singular scripsi (of his private corre-
about Cicero’s ‘palinode’; it is quite possible 13) that Cicero had in fact mentioned it in a previous letter which has not been preserved. But _ut scripsi_ alone, as a reference to a previous letter, would be unique in Cicero’s correspondence; elsewhere (30 times) 14) he always adds either a time-reference or a personal pronoun or both 15). Therefore, before accepting _ut scripsi_; _erimus_ as the correct emendation of _ut scripserimus_, we should consider whether there is any possible alternative 16). I suggest _ut scripsi(sti); erimus_. The curtailment of _scripsisti_ would be due to an obvious cause; the word has been similarly curtailed in some or all manuscripts at 7, 3, 6; 12, 42, 1 17); and 15, 2, 2 18). _ἀποθέωσι_ will then be a quotation from Atticus, like many other words (especially Greek words) in Cicero’s letters to him; for _ut scripsisti_ added to such a quotation compare 12, 29, 2 ‘ἐγγύναιμα’; _quem ad modum scripsisti_; 9, 11, 2 _illum ‘νεκυ-ιαν’, ut tu appellass_; 3, 12, 2 cui ‘vulneri’, _ut scribis, medere._

The object of _vendere_ is obviously ‘the site’, _aream_, which is mentioned five times in the preceding letters (1—3); it is tempting to insert _aream_ after _aedificare_, where it may easily have dropped out by haplography. But it is quite possible that _vendere_ is used absolutely here as elsewhere (it is included in the long list of verbs so used by Cicero which is given by Lebreton, Études, pp. 156 ff.). I do not think that _domum_ is governed by _vendere_ as well as by _aedificare_; it is true that _domus_ can denote both the building (_superficies_) and the site (cf. T. L. L.

---

13) Despite Drumann-Groebe 5, p. 680, who think that Atticus had probably heard about it from those slaves of his (mentioned in § 3) who were at the time with Cicero at Antium, _on loan_ to him for library-work.

14) Including Q.F. 1, 2, 8, where _ut_ has been inserted by conjecture, _probably_ rightly.

15) Most commonly (25 times) he adds both a time-reference (_ante(a), proxime, saepe, etc._) and a personal pronoun (_ad te or tibi_); occasionally (4 times) only a time-reference or (at 11. 4a) the equivalent; once, _only tibi_. It is true that _ut scripsi_ by itself does occur twice (4. 6. 2; Fam. 13. 33), but in both passages it is _equivalent_ to _ut supra scripsi_, the reference being not to a previous letter but to an earlier passage of the same letter.

16) I do not regard Constans’ _at scripsi._ — _erimus_ as such.

17) See also Mueller’s note on this passage.

18) It is quite perverse of Shackleton Bailey (in his recent edition of Books 9—16) to read _nihil enim scripsi_ here (and to suggest a similar reading at 11, 5, 3); ‘there is nothing written’ (cf. 1, 16, 18 _nihil erat absoluti_) is an _unnatural_ (and certainly in Cicero’s letters an _unparalleled_) way of saying ‘there is no mention (of the point) in the letters (I have received)’.
5, 1, 1955, 4 ff.; so in Cicero himself at 4, 1, 7 and Fam. 14, 2, 3), but it is difficult to believe that Cicero used it first in the one sense (with *aedificare*) and then in the other (with *vendere*).

Ever since the first edition of Manutius (1540) it has been usual to emend the corrupt *sed* 19) to *si*, an emendation which is easy enough 20); *si ... laetati sunt* is then a substantival clause in apposition to *hoc*. Such a substantival *si* clause is frequent in Cicero 21), as in other authors; examples are collected by Nutting, *Univ. Calif. Publ. Class. Phil.* 7, 129 ff. (examples with *hoc* on p. 136). The meaning then is: 'what is (all that I have told you) compared with the fact that they exulted?' (How); for this use of *ad*, cf. T. L. L. 1, 548, 71. Nevertheless this is not the best emendation of the passage; a better one is that of Rothstein (reported in Sjögren's apparatus), *sed quid ad hos? scilicet quibus sententiis* etc. For *sed quid ad hos?* ('what business is it of their's?') cf. T. L. L. 1, 547, 42; I should take it here as parenthetic, referring to what precedes. Instead of Rothstein's *scilicet*, however, I should read *et*, which is the more natural word at the beginning of the sentence to introduce a new and more important point. I think that *hos et* was first wrongly divided to produce *ho set* and then erroneously expanded to *hoc set*; compare the erroneous expansions *tu an* and *erat in* in § 1.

Finally, this is one of the very few passages in Cicero where the manuscripts offer *et ipse* in the sense of *ipse quoque*; see T. L. L. 5, 2, 909, 23. The others have been convincingly emended, and it is high time for this one to be brought into line. The correct emendation, however, is not the deletion of *et* (so Boot) but its replacement by *ei*, as at Caec. 58.

§ 3. Viaticum Crassipes praeripit. *tu de via recta in hortos; videtur commodius; ad te postridie scilicet; quid enim tua? sed viderimus.*

The latest, and the most fantastic, view of this passage is that of Shackleton Bailey (Towards a Text, p. 16), who says:

19) Constans' attempt to preserve *sed* is as unconvincing as the rest of his interpretation of this whole passage.

20) Cf. 4, 9, 1, where Sjögren (I think) is right in emending (*at*) *si* to *sed*.

21) Failure to recognize such a clause has been responsible for some misguided emendations and interpretations of 6, 1, 16 *res est gratissima, si ... habent*; for examples with *res*, cf. Nutting, l. c. p. 139.
‘A paterfamilias ought to go straight to his house and family, not to a dinner party in hortis. . . . these were associated with fast living.’ It is surely clear that by hortos Cicero means a villa, probably (so Shackleton Bailey himself) a villa of Crassipes; why in hortos should suggest something less respectable than in villam I cannot imagine. On this misconception Shackleton Bailey bases his view that de via recta in hortos is a question put by Cicero into the mouth of Atticus; Tyrrell-Purser had already taken these words to be a quotation from a letter of Atticus. I know of no passage in Cicero’s letters where words put into the mouth of, or quoted from a letter of, his correspondent are introduced by tu. This pronoun is, in fact, the crux of the passage; Schütz suggested emending it to Tullia, but this does not deserve even such little favour as it has found (from Wesenberg and Boot). Emend it to (cogi)to and the passage for the first time becomes intelligible. After saying that he cannot afford to travel round his other villas because Tullia’s dowry is running away with all his ready cash, Cicero naturally proceeds to tell Atticus about his plans for returning to Rome from Antium. For cogito used in this way, to outline travelling plans towards the end of a letter, compare 2, 8, 2 inde [sc. Antio] cogito in Tusculanum, deinde Arpinum, Romam ad Kal. Iun.; 2, 9, 4 Antium me ex Formiano recipere cogito a. d. v Non. Mai.; 4, 12 Kalendis cogito in hortis Crassipedis quasi in deversorio cenare; . . . inde domum cenatus 24); 7, 4, 3 a. d. iii Non. Ian. ad urbem cogito. So too, in many passages, the epistolary cogitabam.

§ 3. Bibliothecam mihi tui pinxerunt constructione et sillybis; eos velim laudes.

Cicero’s library in his house at Antium had recently been put in order by Tyrannio. From 4, 4a, 1 and 4, 8, 2 we learn

22) The reason for the loss of four letters after praeripit is obvious.
23) The idea that viaticum has anything to do with ‘travelling under pretext of a votiva legatio’ (How) is certainly wrong.
24) Constans dates this letter to June 56 B.C.; if he is right, the plan here outlined is a revision of the plan given in our letter. But his reasons (tome 2, p. 122) are insufficient: it is not certain that 4, 12 was written from Antium, and even if it was there is no reason why Cicero should not have been there in 55 B.C.; and no safe inference can be drawn from the words ut sim mane praesto Miloni (cf. R.-E. 1, 2273, 9). In default of any real evidence for dating, it is safer to refer the letter to the same year as the three which precede and that which follows, viz. 55 B.C.
that, in response to Cicero's request, Atticus had sent two librarioli, Dionysius and Menophilus, to assist Tyrannio; and that these two men (a) made title-labels (sillybi) from parchment provided by Atticus, (b) were concerned with (presumably the erection of) some bookcases (pegmata) likewise provided by Atticus. In our passage we should expect constructione to be a reference to (b), just as sillybis is a reference to (a); so some scholars (e.g. Bosius, 'pegmatum compactio'). But it is difficult to believe that Cicero used constructio by itself in the sense of pegmatum constructione where there is no reference to pegmata in the context. Hence most scholars make constructione refer not to the pegmata but to the libri, and various meanings have been given to the word, e.g. (i) 'arranging the libri' (but it was Tyrannio himself, not the two subordinates, who did this job); (ii) 'building up the libri' in the pegmata; (iii) 'making up the libri' by glueing together sheets of charta; (iv) 'binding the libri' (but Birt doubt whether in Cicero's day a liber had any kind of paenula). Even if these meanings were possible in themselves, they all seem quite impossible without the genitive librorum. Moreover, they do not make sense with pinxerunt, which must be interpreted literally, of 'painting' (the library-room); Cicero's usage of pingere does not support the meaning 'beautify' ('embellir', Constans), since he uses it in this sense only of literary or oratorical style (e.g. 1, 14, 3; Brut. 141 and 293; Orat. 96). The only view which both gives pinxerunt its proper sense and produces a translatable phrase is that of Birt, who emends constructione to cum structione (structure being 'der Aufbau', i.e. the pegmata, and the two ablatives with cum being equivalent to two accusatives governed by pinxerunt); this may tally with what we know, or may conjecture, about ancient libraries, but it is difficult to believe that Cicero used structio, which is a very rare word and elsewhere occurs only in late Latin (apparently first in Tertullian). It would be safer,

26) Die Buchrolle in der Kunst, p. 242. This consideration also rules out the conjecture (first made by Scaliger on Catull. 22, 6) constrictione ('librorum involucris sive pellibus', Boot), which in any case is a late word found mainly in technical writers.
28) 'Daß das Bretterwerk der Gestelle bemalt wurde, war gewiß angemessen; die Bemalung der Sittybi aber steht auch sonst fest', Birt, l. c.
on Birt’s view, to read \((\text{cum}) \ constructione\)\textsuperscript{29}, but I think it much more probable that a mention of *pegmata* has fallen out of the text, and suggest e.g. \(\text{confecta pegmatum con}\)\textsubscript{struc}tione: after finishing the installation of the *pegmata* and the making of *sillybi*, *Dionysius* and *Menophilus* painted Cicero’s library-room.
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**ADVENTUS DEI**

Der Gegenwartsbezug in Vergils Darstellung der Geschichte von Cacus und Hercules (Aen. VIII 184–275)


\textsuperscript{29)}\textsubscript{29) constructio} is used in a concrete sense at Acad. 2, 86; cf. \textsubscript{sub}\textsubscript{structiones} at Mil. 53 and 85.
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