

CICERO, AD ATTICVM 4,5

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⁾ *suasisse 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 ab ullo malle mea legi probarique 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 *παλινῳδία*.

1) So already R. Klotz (1854). The word before *dices* is given by most editors as *resipui*; but the form *resipivi* is supported not only by the manuscript evidence here but also by *resipisset* at *Sest.* 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 question²). 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. Seyffert⁴) 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 question⁷); 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 paradoxis.

4) Edition of Tusc., Leipzig, 1864.

5) Most editors since Baier (1867) have accepted the reading of Cratander's margin, *hoc eram 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 eram 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.

6) So Wieland (2, p. 210), 'und überdies'.

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 = *praeterea*; 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 aliud? quid? hoc opinor: certissimus* etc.; Q. F. 3, 1, 24 *quid praeterea? quid? etiam: Gabinus* 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 *aliud* 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*⁸).

§ 2. Sed tamen modici fuimus ἀποθεώσει, ut † scripserimus † ubiores si et ille libenter accipiet et ii subringentur qui ... domum negant oportuisse me aedificare, vendere aiunt oportuisse. 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 ἀποθεώσει ('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 paradoxos at 15, 3, 1 and by some manuscripts at Lael. 68.

ΑΠΘΘΩCI, the reading of the few manuscripts which do not omit the Greek word (compare the corruptions of ἀποθέωσιν 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-Holmes⁹), 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 inexplicable¹⁰); 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 Ciceronian¹¹). 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 *scripsimus*, 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 Atticum', 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 scripseras? ingemisti?*' 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); *ingemui* (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 στήμματα 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 possible¹³) 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 both¹⁵). Therefore, before accepting *ut scripsi*; *erimus* as the correct emendation of *ut scripserimus*, we should consider whether there is any possible alternative¹⁶). 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, 1¹⁷); and 15, 2, 2¹⁸). ἀποθεώσει 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 'ἐγγράμμα', *quem ad modum scripsisti*; 9, 11, 2 *illam* 'νέκυν', *ut tu appellas*; 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.

spondence) would be quite credible; see my note on 1, 18, 8 in *Class. Quart. N. S.* 12 (1962), p. 286.

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 scripti* 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 enough²⁰); *si... laetati sunt* is then a substantival clause in apposition to *hoc*. Such a substantival *si* clause is frequent in Cicero²¹), 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*)to²²) and the passage for the first time becomes intelligible. After saying that he cannot afford to travel round his other villas²³) 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 constructio* 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* ²⁵); (iii) 'making up the *libri*' by glueing together sheets of *charta*; (iv) 'binding the *libri*' (but Birt ²⁶) 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' ('embellish', 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 ²⁷), who emends *constructione* to *cum structio* (*structio* 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 ²⁸), 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,

25) So C. Wendel, Nachrichten Göttingen, Phil.-Hist. Kl., 1943, p. 274.

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.

27) Rhein. Mus. 64 (1909), pp. 469 ff.

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 *(cum) constructione* ²⁹⁾, but I think it much more probable that a mention of *pegmata* has fallen out of the text, and suggest e. g. *con(fecta pegmatum con)structione*: after finishing the installation of the *pegmata* and the making of *sillybi*, Dionysius and Menophilus painted Cicero's library-room.

Aberdeen

W. S. Watt

29) *constructio* is used in a concrete sense at Acad. 2, 86; cf. *substructiones* at Mil. 53 and 85.