

## CICERO. AD ATTICUM 4,5

---

In a recent article under this heading (*Rh. Mus.* 106 (1963) pp. 15-22) Professor W. S. Watt refers to the crux in § 3, thus edited by Sjögren:

viaticum Crassipes praeripit. tu de via recta in hortos. vide-  
tur commodius ad te, postridie scilicet; quid enim tua?  
sed viderimus.

This has usually been thought to refer to a visit by Atticus to Cicero at Antium; the time is the summer of 56, probably late June. Constans was, I think, the first to suggest that Cicero is writing about his return to Rome and that the 'gardens' are

those of Crassipes, his prospective son-in-law<sup>1</sup>). The passage should probably be taken in conjunction with a later letter, 4, 12: *Kalendis cogito in hortis Crassipedis quasi in deversorio cenare*. That letter is generally assigned to May or June of the following year, 55, but by Constans to 56. As Mr. Watt says, the reasons he gives are not cogent; on the other hand there seems to be nothing to attest the traditional date<sup>2</sup>), and the references in both letters to dinner in Crassipes' 'gardens' tie up very neatly.

Constans did not succeed any better than his predecessors in making sense of the wording. Mr. Watt claims to be the first to do so with his emendation *cogito* for *tu*. In 1960 I proposed to punctuate (without textual change) as follows<sup>3</sup>): —

viaticum Crassipes praeripit. tu 'de via recta in hortos?'  
videtur commodius. ad te postridie scilicet. quid enim tua?  
sed viderimus.

I took the words *de via recta in hortos?* as a facetious protest put into Atticus' mouth and answered by Cicero with *videtur commodius*. It would not be quite respectable, Atticus is supposed to imply, for Cicero, returning to Rome after some weeks' absence, to make straight for a dinner party *in hortis*, *horti* having a certain association with fast living. This, says Mr. Watt, is the most fantastic view of the passage yet put forward: 'why *in hortos* should suggest anything less respectable than *in villam* I cannot imagine'.

1) The suggestion is tacked on as an afterthought to a different and altogether implausible theory (*Correspondance*, II. p. 120 n. 2).

2) The letters of 56–55 have been so shuffled about in the MSS. that their order counts for virtually nothing. Apart from the reference to Crassipes there is nothing to determine either the year or the place of 4,12. Cicero writes of going 'home' (*domum*) after dinner and asks Atticus and his wife to dinner *apud me*, but it is not a fair deduction that his house on the Palatine was already habitable; these expressions may just as well refer to the temporary residence in Rome which he had no doubt rented (cf. *Q. Fr.* 2, 3, 7). His proposed journey to Larinum gives some indication of the time of year — not winter. As for the place, the words *de re f Hali-meti f vehementer Anti egi* are taken by Constans to indicate Antium, or Antium-Rome. That is clearly unwarranted, but it is equally wrong to infer with Professor L. R. Taylor, who for reasons not clear to me puts Tusculum as the place and some later month before November, 55 as the time (*Class. Phil.* 44 (1949) p. 220), that Antium is ruled out: cf. 2, 6, 1 *libris ... quorum habeo Anti festivam copiam*.

3) *Towards a Text of Cicero*, ad Atticum, pp. 16 f.

As Mr. Watt omits to remind us, *horti* implies not just a villa, but a villa in the suburbs or the immediate neighbourhood of the capital, such as the one across Tiber where Clodia entertained Rome's 'bright young people', to the scandal of proper folk like Cicero<sup>4</sup>). I do not think it takes an unbridled imagination to see why a dinner-party *in hortis* might come to have a rather 'dashing' sound. But I had already produced concrete evidence which Mr. Watt simply ignores, a passage from the speech *pro Caelio* delivered less than three months before the date of this letter. In § 27 Cicero pretends to some diffidence as to whether it is quite proper (*si licet, si fas est*) for a pillar of society like himself to be defending a young man like his client, *eum qui nullum convivium renuerit, qui in hortis fuerit*<sup>5</sup>), *qui unguenta sumpserit, qui Baiae viderit*. Of course the language is ironically mild: obviously a young man might 'have been *in hortis*' (or 'have seen Baiae') without being in the least 'fast'. But I think it establishes my point. One must not be elephantine about this. The social flavour of words depends on who is using them. 'Dinner at the Ritz' is an every day affair for some, but not for all. Even without the implication I have suggested, Atticus' surprise would be intelligible; but I think the implication is there.

Mr. Watt has another objection: '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 line of argument has to be followed with great caution. It is not enough to state that a usage or word is unique in Cicero's letters; we have to judge by analogy and other criteria whether the statement is or is not significant, often a very delicate matter. Now Cicero does indulge in unique or at any rate very rare ellipses in passages such as this. Is the ellipse of *dices* (or *scribis*, if the words following *tu* are a quotation from Atticus' letter) really more objectionable than that of *scribe* in 14, 12, 3 *tu, si quid erit, de ceteris, de Bruto utique quicquid* or of *scrip-*

4) *Cael.* 36 etc.

5) The words *qui in hortis fuerit*, missing from our MSS., are preserved in Donatus' citation (*ad Ter. Hec.* 551). A. C. Clark and R. G. Austin rightly accept them as genuine. The reason for their loss is obvious, and nobody in antiquity but Cicero is likely to have invented them. No doubt, as Austin says, Cicero had Clodia's 'gardens' in mind, but he could not possibly have used the phrase in this context unless *horti* in general had the association I postulate.

*seras in 16, 7, 6 quod tu idem aliis litteris ‘provide . . . armorum’?* But the difficulty, if it be so regarded, can be obviated simply by including *tu* in the question, which is then placed in Atticus' mouth (or quoted from his letter<sup>6)</sup> without introduction as in 8, 9, 2 *quanto autem ferocius ille causae suae confidet cum vos . . . gratulantis viderit! ‘num igitur peccamus?’ minime vos quidem.*

As for *cogito*, it makes good sense (apart from the preceding words: see below), provided that my punctuation<sup>7)</sup> and interpretation of *videtur . . . scilicet* is accepted (whether Mr. Watt does accept this, or how otherwise he deals with these words, we are left to conjecture). But it is not a minimal change. ‘The reason for the loss of four letters after *praeripit* is obvious.’ The reason would be even more obvious if five or six letters had been lost; *praeripit cogito* would be apter to leave *praeripit*, by way of *praeripito*, than *praeripit tu*. The question is, however, whether any textual change at all is needed at this point.

There remains a loose end which I failed to tie up in my note of 1960. The words *viaticum Crassipes praeripit* are generally understood to mean that Cicero cannot travel ‘because Tullia’s dowry is running away with all his ready cash.’ Like Mr. Watt and other commentators I overlooked the manifold improbability involved here. Tullia had only recently been betrothed to Crassipes (on April 4: cf. *O. Fr.* 2, 6, 1) and to judge from Cicero’s later dealings with Dolabella the dowry is not likely to have been payable so soon. Moreover, Tullia had presumably recovered the dowry paid to her first husband who died a year or so previously, so that Cicero should not have been heavily mulcted. The only travel he is known to have been considering at this time is the journey from Antium to Rome<sup>8)</sup>. Mr. Watt rightly dismisses How’s notion that he was still thinking of a *voltiva legatio* (cf. 4, 2, 6). His own view that *viaticum* refers to a projected tour of Cicero’s villas (so Constats: ‘sans doute avait-il projeté une tournée dans ses villas de Campanie?’) is pure supposition. And can any one who knows Cicero’s way of life from his letters believe, once the question is asked, that such a holiday would have been cancelled because

6) So Boot.

7) I say ‘my’ because I believe I was the first to combine a correct punctuation with a correct explanation. The punctuation itself was not new.

8) To leave aside the trip to Larinum, forecast in 4, 12 (no financial problem there).

of a shortage of funds? After all very little extra expense would be involved. The transport and servants were Cicero's own to use when he pleased, the intermediate stops would be almost always at this own *deversoria* or with friends like Papirius Paetus in Naples. I believe that the passage 'for the first time becomes intelligible', wholly so that is, if *viaticam* is written for *viaticum*. *cena viatica* in the sense of a dinner given to a home-coming traveller is attested by Plaut. *Bacch.* 94 *ego sorori meae cenam hodie dare volo viaticam* and the ellipse of the substantive would be fully in accordance with colloquial habit: see Kühner-Stegmann, II. p. 550. *adventicia* (sc. *cena*) actually occurs in Petronius (90. 5) in exactly the same sense: cf. Suet. *Vit.* 13. 2 *famosissima super ceteras fuit cena data ei adventicia a fratre*; Caper, *G. L. K.* VII. 107. 10. For Atticus to ask Cicero to dinner on the night of his return to Rome would be the most normal thing in the world: cf. 4, 4 *quo die venies, utique cum tuis apud me sis*; 4, 19, 2 *quo die venies, tu, si me amas, apud me cum tuis maneas*; 12, 2, 2 *iam te video et quidem, ut spero, de via recta ad me*. Instead Cicero proposes to dine in the suburbs with Crassipes. Who is thus forestalling the 'welcome-home' dinner which Atticus had expected to provide. His protest (real or imaginary) and Cicero's apology become all the more understandable — the present tense of *praeripit* implies that the plans were not definitely decided. A scribe faced with *viaticam* and no feminine substantive in sight would be almost sure to write *viaticum*<sup>9)</sup>.

A passage in § 2 about the 'palinode' bristles with problems: — sed tamen modici fuimus ἀποθέωσει, ut τὰ scripserimus τὰ ubiores si et ille libenter accipiet et hi subringentur qui villam me moleste ferunt habere quae Catuli fuerat, a Vettio me emisse non cogitant; qui domum negant oportuisse me aedicare, vendere aiunt oportuisse.

Mr. Watt is certainly right to reject 'the vulgate ὑποθέσει' for *ἀποθώσῃ* of the MSS. — its survival into some recent editions is one of many scandals; but he might have mentioned that *ἀποθέωσει*, which he considers certain, already stands in Sjö-

---

9) Perhaps I may be allowed to mention that this solution came into my head purely as a response to the exigencies of the context and without any recollection of the literary evidence either for *cena viatica* or for the ellipse of the noun. It is pure chance that such evidence turned out to be available. But for that chance how summarily this conjecture would have been dismissed on lexicographical grounds!

gren's text. I should not be prepared to go quite so far as he does in its favour. Whatever the 'palinode' was (I still think on the whole that it was the *de Provinciis Consularibus*)<sup>10</sup>), ἀποθέωσει strikes me as a somewhat extravagant word. I had thought of ἀποδόσει, i. e. *enarratione*, with reference to the account of Caesar's exploits in Gaul (*Prov. Cons.* 29 ff.). Still ἀποθέωσει is so close to the MSS. that perhaps it should be swallowed. *scripserimus* is generally emended to *scripti erimus* (Victorius). Mr. Watt objects that *ut scripti* alone, as a reference to a previous letter, would be unique (he points out that it does occur twice with reference to a previous passage in the same letter). In other words, Cicero would have written not *ut scripti* but *ut scripseram* (cf. 3, 14, 2 *in Epirum ideo, ut scripseram, non veni quod sqq.; 16, 11, 6 ego me in Pompeianum, ut scripseram, non abdidisti*), which is every bit as probable graphically. Mr. Watt's *ut scripsisti* is also quite possible — like most of the other points in his paper with which I wholly or partly agree I had put it forward myself a few weeks previously in my seminar at Harvard; *ut scripts(eras)* no less<sup>11</sup>).

'The object of *vendere*' says Mr. Watt, 'is obviously the site, *aream*.' So editors generally assume, but *aream* is nowhere

10) See hereon an interesting and novel suggestion by Mr. J. P. V. D. Balsdon in *Journ. Rom. Stud.* 52 (1962) p. 139.

11) À propos of this problem Mr. Watt refers to 15, 2, 2 where in my edition of books IX-XVI I printed *L. Antonium contionatum esse cognovi tuis litteris et aliis sordide, sed id quale fuerit nescio; nihil enim scripti (scripti M; scripti R; scripti vel scripsisti dett.)*. Mr. Watt remarks: 'It is quite perverse of Shackleton Bailey 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)." I do not contest his premise, but it has no bearing on his conclusion. In 15, 2, 2 *nihil enim scripti* will mean 'there is nothing in writing', i. e. no written version of the *contio*. Such speeches were sometimes put into writing and circulated very soon after delivery, as in the case of Dolabella's *contio* in April, 44 (cf. 14, 17 A, 7), but this of L. Antonius was not, or at any rate Cicero had not received a copy. I preferred *scripti* to *scripsisti* because (a) Atticus had clearly written *something* about the speech and (b) logic would require *scripsistis* rather than *scripsisti*. As for 11, 5, 3 *quod tanto intervalllo nihil omnino ad vos f scripit tis f litteris profecto intellegis rem mihi deesse de qua scribam*, I think that Wesenberg's *scripti, his* is most probably right, and therefore print it in my text. But I am by no means sure that *nihil ad vos scripti*, 'not a line to you', would be unnatural or unciceronian and therefore suggest it in my apparatus, bearing in mind that *scriptis* here has the powerful support of Z and the Würzburg fragment.

in the Latin. Mr. Watt feels this difficulty and suggests that *vendere* may be used absolutely. He adds 'I do not think that *domum* is governed by *vendere* as well as *aedificare*; it is true that *domus* can denote both the building (*superficies*) and the site (cf. T. L. L. 5, 1, 1955, 4 ff.; so in Cicero himself at 4, 1, 7 and fam. 14, 2, 3)<sup>12)</sup>, but it is difficult to believe that Cicero used it first in one sense (with *aedificare*) and then in the other (with *vendere*).'<sup>12)</sup> Very true, but on stylistic grounds it is surely no less difficult (I should say impossible) to believe that *domum* is not governed by both verbs. But there is another reason for discomfort here which neither Mr. Watt nor any other commentator has regarded. Cicero is attacking his detractors not only for their ill-nature but for their foolishness and inconsistency; now there would be nothing inconsistent in their saying that he should not have built the new house and should have sold the site, nothing at all comparable to the previous point about the villa (for which cf. an almost contemporary speech, *Balb.* 56). So far from contrast we have something like tautology: if Cicero had not built the house, obviously he would have sold the site. All these problems disappear if we write *vendere aiunt oportere*, making a characteristic verbal point: 'they say I ought not to have built the house, but ought to be selling it' — as though, if he had a right to sell the place he had not had an equal right to build it (the rebuilding was probably now nearing completion after over eight months work: cf. 4, 2, 7; cf. Q. Fr. 2, 4, 2 etc.). The assimilation of *oportere* to *oportuisse* preceding would clearly happen very easily, all the more so with *sed* to follow.

With most of Mr. Watt's other points I am in substantial agreement. Instead of the meaningless *quid? etiam* I proposed in my seminar *quid{quod}etiam...?*, which I slightly prefer to Rinkes' *quin etiam*; and instead of *et ipsi, et{iam} ipsi*. I may remark that the only other *dudum* (without *quam* or *iam*) in the current texts of the letters was removed by me in 1961 (at 11, 24, 1).

Cambridge (England)

D. R. Shackleton Bailey

---

12) This is rather misleading. In 4, 1, 7 *quod de domo nostra nihil adhuc pontifices responderant, domo* means unspecifically the matter of the house, as in the title of Cicero's own speech — no distinction between site and building is in mind. Similarly in *Fam.* 14, 2, 3 *quod de domo scribis, hoc est de area* the last few words virtually correct a loose phrase. The disparity of those passages with 4, 5, 2 is obvious.