

## SOME REMARKS ON LONDON, BRITISH LIBRARY, MS HARLEY 4927 (H)

If one were to single out the most pressing issue concerning the textual transmission of Cicero's post-exile orations (*Red. Sen., Red. Quir., Dom., Har. Resp., Sest., Vat., Cael., Prov. Cons., Balb.*), it would certainly have to be the question of the authenticity of London, British Library, MS Harley 4927 (H), s. xii<sup>1</sup>.<sup>1</sup> MS Harley 4927 alongside Paris, B.N., MS lat. 7794 (P), s. ix<sup>med.</sup>, on the one hand, and Brussels, Bibl. Royale, MS lat. 5345 (G), s. xi<sup>1</sup>, together with its sister copy Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl., MS lat. fol. 252 (E), s. xii<sup>1</sup>, on the other offers one of the three main avenues of access to the lost archetype (A), the main source of these orations<sup>2</sup>. The precise value of H, however, is still open to debate. It is not easy to determine to what extent its testimony reproduces the readings of (A), and this uncertainty has been reflected in the fluctuations of scholarly opinion regarding its worth.

H's influence on Cicero's orations was secured as soon as the manuscript was acquired by Petrarch before the middle of the fourteenth century in France<sup>3</sup>), for subsequently it was copied into a number of the recentiores<sup>4</sup>). In printed editions,

---

1) MS Harley 4927, written in two columns of thirty-three lines, contains: fol. 1-18, *Orationes iv in Catilinam*; fol. 18-20v, *Invectiva in Sallustium*; fol. 20v-21, *Invectiva in Ciceronem*; fol. 21-24v, *Oratio ad Romanos pridie quam iret in exilium*; fol. 24v-29v, *Cum senatui gratias egit*; fol. 29v-31v, *Cum populo gratias egit*; fol. 31v-50, *De domo sua*; fol. 50-55v, *Paradoxa ad Brutum*; fol. 55v-58v, *In Vatinius*; fol. 58v-67, *Pro Caelio*; fol. 67-74v, *Pro Balbo*; fol. 74v-83v, *De haruspicum responsis*; fol. 83v-89v, *De provinciis consularibus*; fol. 89v-99v, *Pro Sestio*; fol. 99v-102v, *Pro Marcello*; fol. 102v-106v, *Pro Ligario*; fol. 106-110v, *Pro rege Deiotaro*; fol. 110v-120v, *De amicitia*. This last item was followed by the *De senectute*, of which only the title *Incipit liber Tullii de Senectute* and the first two words of the text survive at the bottom of fol. 120v. The MS is described in *A Catalogue of the Harleian Manuscripts in the British Museum* 3 (London 1808), 221-22.

2) All questions concerning the manuscript tradition of the post-exile orations are dealt with in M. T. Ciceronis *Scripta quae manserunt omnia*, Fasc. 21, ed. T. Maslowski (Leipzig. 1981), "Praefatio".

3) See E. Pellegrin and G. Billanovich, "Un manuscrit de Cicéron annoté par Pétrarque au British Museum", *Scriptorium* 8 (1954), 115-17.

4) These are Escorial MSS R, I, 12, s. xiv<sup>2</sup>, R, I, 15, s. xiv<sup>2</sup>, T, II, 4, s. xiv<sup>2</sup>, T, III, 22, s. xv, V, III, 23, s. xiv-xv, all naturally of Italian origin.

its readings have been traced back to the *editio Romana* of 1471<sup>5</sup>). But the controversy surrounding H began in fairly recent times, in the nineteenth century, when the manuscript first came under critical scrutiny by Baehrens<sup>6</sup>). Baehrens examined in H only the *Pro Caelio*, and for this oration at any rate, he pronounced it second to none but P, renouncing at the same time GE as derivative. This optimistic assessment was put to severe test by Clark, whose final verdict was: "a Harleian MS., No 4927, collated by Baehrens, is ... valueless"<sup>7</sup>). Something of a replay of the Baehrens-Clark controversy, albeit on a grander scale, took place between Peterson and Klotz. Peterson collated the remaining post-exile orations in H, adopting many of its features into the text of his OCT edition. He apologized in his "Praefatio": "Harleianum 4927 post codd. G et E nomino, non quo inferioris sit notae..."<sup>8</sup>). Klotz, the Teubner editor of the orations, took exception to this. Far from recognizing in H an equal of GE, he denied it any value altogether. Only in the case of the *Pro Caelio* did he concede to H access to a better source, because its readings occasionally receive support from witnesses independent of the main tradition (mainly from the *vetus Cluniacensis*)<sup>9</sup>. This view held the field until recently when as a result of the fresh collations produced by the Budé editors, Wuilleumier, Tupet and Cousin<sup>10</sup>), the pendulum has once more swung in favor of H, actually to an unprecedented degree. But

---

See M. T. Ciceronis *Oratio cum senatui gratias egit*, ed. I. Guillen (Florence 1967), 28. For other recentiores derived from H, see M. T. Ciceronis *Orationes: Cum senatui gratias egit, Cum populo gratias egit*, al., ed. G. Peterson (Oxford 1911), xi-xii.

5) See Cicero, *Orationes*, ed. Peterson, x.

6) See Ae. Baehrens, "Ad Ciceronis Caelianam", *Revue de Philologie* 8 (1884), 33-54.

7) See A. C. Clark, "The *Vetus Cluniacensis* of Poggio", *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, Classical Series pt. 10 (Oxford 1905), xxix.

8) Cicero, *Orationes*, ed. Peterson, x.

9) See M. T. Ciceronis *Scripta quae manserunt omnia* 7: *Orationes Cum sen. gr. egit, Cum pop. gr. egit*, al., ed. A. Klotz (Leipzig 1919), xx-xxi; A. Klotz, "Zur Kritik einiger ciceronischer Reden (*pro Caelio* und *de domo*)", *RhM* 67 (1912), 370-72; idem, "Zur Kritik einiger ciceronischer Reden ii (*cum sen. gr. egit, cum pop. gr. egit, de domo*)", *RhM* 68 (1913), 509-511.

10) See Cicéron, *Discours* 13: *Au sénat, Au peuple Sur sa maison*, ed. and tr. P. Wuilleumier (Paris 1952), 28-29, 30-31, 33-34; Cicéron, *Discours* 13.2: *Sur la réponse des baruspices*, ed. and tr. P. Wuilleumier and A.-M. Tupet (Paris 1966), 24, 26; Cicéron, *Discours* 14: *Pour Sestius, Contre Vatinius*, ed. and tr. J. Cousin (Paris 1965), 97-98; Cicéron, *Discours* 15: *Pour Caelius, Sur les provinces consulaires, Pour Balbus*, ed. and tr. J. Cousin (Paris 1962), 67-69.

an attempt to stem the new avalanche of readings from H is also under way. Scepticism about the wisdom of granting legitimacy to some of them has already been expressed by Courtney<sup>11</sup>); I have also argued elsewhere about some, to the same effect<sup>12</sup>).

Since H, then, is still a going concern, a fresh look at it is not out of place. To date, two features in particular have been associated with it, namely contamination<sup>13</sup>) and conjecture, both of which are damaging to its authority. However, contamination alone, while undeniably rendering the determination of a manuscript's place in the stemma more difficult<sup>14</sup>), does not automatically disqualify it<sup>15</sup>), and conjecture, for all disclaimers to the contrary, can be a relative term particularly when cases of plausible readings are involved.

The present study, while confined to only two orations, *Red. Sen.* and *Red. Quir.*, is intended to go deeper into the character of H. First, I shall consider the omissions in H which,

11) See E. Courtney, "Notes on Ciceronian Manuscripts and Textual Criticism", *Univ. of London, Inst of Class. St.* 10 (1963), 14-15; idem, "De haruspicum responso", *CR* n.s. 17 (1967), 299. Cf. also J.H. Simon, "The Budé of Cicero", *CR* n.s. 5 (1955), 71-73.

12) See T. Maslowski, "Notes on Cicero's Four *post Reditum* Orationes", *AJP* 101 (1980) 404-420.

13) H bears unmistakable signs of horizontal transmission both from P and an ancestor of GE. There is, however, some uncertainty among editors with regard to H's affinity to the GE branch of the stemma. It has been recognized for *Red. Sen.*, *Red. Quir.*, and *Dom.* (cf. Cicéron, *Discours* 13, ed. and tr. Wuilleumier, 30) but dismissed for the remaining orations [cf. Cicéron, *Discours* 13.2, ed. and tr. Wuilleumier and Tupet, 24; Cicéron, *Discours* 14, ed. and tr. Cousin, 98 (the stemma), and Cicéron, *Discours* 15, ed. and tr. Cousin, 64 (the stemma)]. Nevertheless conjunctive errors shared by GEH exist for these orations too, e.g. *Har. Resp.* 6 *labefactam* P : *labefactatam* GEH; 48 *in quibus* P : *quibus* GEH; 50 *ne causam* P<sup>2</sup> : *ne ne causam* P<sup>1</sup> : *ne meam causam* GEH. *Cael.* 17 *eius* P : *ei* GEH; 30 *versatur* P : *urgetur* (-gue- E) GEH; 36 *parasti* P : *praeparasti* GEH; 43 *libet*] *liquet* P : *necesse est* GEH; 65 *magis* P<sup>1</sup> : *meliori* P<sup>2</sup>GE : *meliori magis* H (a striking example). *Prov. Cons.* 4 *omnia* P : *omnia illa* GEH; 36 *se tenere*] *sentire* P : *se scire* GEH. *Balb.* 42 *fit* PG<sup>2</sup> : *sit* G<sup>1</sup>EH; 54 *ad civitatem* P : *ac civitatem* GEH; *Vat.* 10 *cum homine* P : *homine* GEH.

14) Cf. the stemma in M. T. Ciceronis *De haruspicum responsis*, ed. A. Guaglianone (Florence 1968), 17.

15) Provided, of course, that the manuscript has some readings whose authenticity is not doubted. H does have a fair proportion of interesting *lectiones singulares*, e.g. *Dom.* 10 *ob annonae causam* H : *binum nonae causam* P : in lac. om. G. *Har. Resp.* 31 *pontificum iudicio* H : *pontificum* P : *pontificum* (*ponticum* G) *cum* GE. *Sest.* 84 *e rostris* H : *frostris* P : *rostris* G (*e rostris* seems to indicate that H had access to a majuscule copy). *Cael.* 53 *ausus* HC : *rursus* PGE. *Balb.* 16 *experta atque* H : *atque* PG<sup>1</sup>E : *nota atque* G<sup>2</sup>.

surprisingly enough, have not received the attention they deserve. In fact, beyond their listings, whether in the Preface<sup>16)</sup> or in the apparatuses, no meaningful conclusions from H's habit of omitting the text have been drawn at all. The pervasiveness alone of this habit calls for an explanation. Indeed<sup>17)</sup>, some of the post-exile orations in H, *Red. Quir.*, *Sest.*, *Vat.*, are so affected by omission that they survive as fragments, in others, *Red. Sen.*, *Cacl.*<sup>18)</sup>, *Balb.*, enough text has been lost to cause concern. Only *Dom.*, *Har. Resp.* and *Prov. Cons.* are relatively free from this defect. Second, we should be able to gain a fuller appreciation of H's character by subjecting to analysis those of its variants which come into account in constituting the text of these two orations. The variants discussed, I should add, are for the most part known to the editors, but the problems arising from their adoption or the reasons for their adoption have never received a comprehensive treatment.

While these two questions will form the basis of our discussion, I supply the following additional information necessary for its understanding.

In *Red. Sen.* references will be made to the z-family of manuscripts. This group consists of the annotations introduced by the corrector of E, termed E<sup>2</sup>, two fifteenth-century witnesses, Erlangen, Universitätsbibl., MS lat. 847 (ε), a. 1466, and its sister copy written a year later, a. 1467, Vatican, MS Palat. lat. 1525 (V), a manuscript owned by P. Pithou (1539-96), no longer extant, the readings of which (F) appear in the margin of Pithou's copy of Lambinus edition of Cicero's speeches, Strasbourg 1581, and a new witness, the excerpts from the oration in Paris, B.N., MS lat. 18104 (X), s. xii-xiii<sup>19)</sup>. The z-family does not, in my opinion, descend from the archetype (A) which produced PGEH or, as these codices may conveniently be designated (from the predominance of P), the Paris family.

16) This is Wuilleumier's practice; see Cicéron, *Discours* 13, ed. and tr. Wuilleumier, 33, n. 2.

17) At this point the reader will consult the Budé editions (see n. 10) for evidence. An accurate account of omissions in H for *Red. Sen.*, *Red. Quir.*, *Dom.*, and *Har. Resp.* will be found in my edition of these orations (see n. 2).

18) The text of *Cacl.* is continuous until 70 *si commissa vobis*. The remainder, i.e. eleven paragraphs of the speech are lost.

19) For a description of X see T. Maslowski and R. H. Rouse, "Twelfth-Century Extracts from Cicero's *Pro Archia* and *Pro Cluentio* in Paris, B.N., MS lat. 18104", *Italia Medioevale e Umanistica* 22 (1979), 97-122.

In *Red. Quir.*, however,  $\epsilon V$  represent the "regular" Paris family text and are of value because in E, the greater part of this speech (from 6 *movere* to the end) is now missing. Their evidence is supplemented by the testimony of Troyes, Bibl. Municipale 552 (T), s. xiv. These manuscripts, T $\epsilon$ V, are all independent of each other and their ultimate source is an ancestor of GE.

In the first part dealing with the omissions I use the following signs: square brackets denote H's omissions, angle brackets, additions, and the combination of the two, transpositions. Occasionally round brackets will be used to signal the reading of the archetype (A), next to H's innovation. For the rest, the text of H is reproduced only to the extent it brings to bear on the argument of the discussion. Its peculiar errors, minor omissions, spelling etc. are not taken into account. Also, for the sake of economy the omitted text is not always quoted in full<sup>20</sup>).

## I

When confronted with omissions in manuscripts we naturally look for their causes. These, for the most part, are not difficult to ascertain<sup>21</sup>). A scribe will sometimes leave out a word because of some blockage occurring between his perusing mind and his writing hand, in which case we shall speak of a psychological lapse. But when a greater portion of text has disappeared, we suspect and look for some mechanical cause inherent in the text itself. Such a cause commonly consists of any kind of repetition – a homoeoteleuton, homoearchon or the same word occurring twice. The omissions in H, while partly falling under these categories, are on the whole more problematic than that, and for this reason are well worth investigating.

As a preliminary to our discussion I call attention to two cases of H's omission of single words, for which the underlying cause could be psychological but is not:

*Red. Sen.* 28 *dirivitores* edd. : *dirivitores* P<sup>1</sup> : *dirivictores* P<sup>2</sup> : *dirivatores* GE<sup>1</sup> : *direptores* E<sup>2</sup> $\epsilon$ VF : om. H.

---

20. In both orations I make use of my own collations of all manuscripts involved. They occasionally differ from those in the known editions.

21) Cf. e.g. M.L. West, *Textual Criticism and Editorial Technique* (Stuttgart 1973), 24–25.

*Red. Quir.* 11 *sollemni deorum* Halm<sup>22</sup>) : *solempni de*  $\zeta$  : *solem de* P : *sole de* GTe : *sole* V : om. H.

Clearly it is not a slip of the pen that furnishes an explanation for these single-word omissions, but, as the conspectus of failure of the other witnesses shows, H took it upon himself to drop, without leaving any trace of it, what the whole tradition has failed to preserve properly. Such liberty taken by a witness is disturbing to say the least, and it puts us on guard against other points of his testimony. This must be borne in mind as we now proceed to the consideration of the major omissions in H, which we shall review in the order in which they appear in the two orations.

The greater part of *Red. Sen.* survives intact. Such omissions as exist in 1-23 are comparatively insignificant. More important, their causes are not always clear. They are suspected of being voluntary because the resulting text is usually not devoid of grammar and sense. Thus we seem to be dealing with a conscious intervention of the scribe into the text, his intention being either to simplify the sequence of thought, or to eliminate a passage difficult or too corrupt to understand. Of course, this is not to say that some of the omissions are not due to simple oversight.

The first omission which seems merely to simplify the argument of the narrative occurs in *Red. Sen.* 4 *nam consules modesti legumque metuentes impediabantur lege, non ea quae de me, sed ea quae de ipsis lata erat, [cum meus inimicus promulgavit ut, si revixissent ii qui haec paene deleverunt, tum ego redirem; quo facto utrumque confessus est, et se illorum vitam desiderare et magno in periculo rem publicam futuram si, cum hostes atque interfectores rei publicae revixissent, ego non revertissem]. itaque...*

In *Red. Sen.* 11, however, one is inclined to give H the benefit of the doubt and blame *multitudinem* - *proscriptio-nem* for the loss of text: *qui nisi in aram tribunatum confugisset neque vim praetoris nec multitudinem [creditorum nec bonorum proscriptionem] effugere potuisset.*

The next two major omissions, insofar as they eliminate text which was already corrupted in the archetype (A), again furnish

---

22) See M. T. Ciceronis *Opera quae supersunt omnia* 2.2, ed. I. O. Orelli, I. G. Baier, C. Halm (Zurich 1856). Henceforward this edition is not quoted.

evidence of H's willfulness. In both instances the restoration of the text is possible due to the assistance of the z-family.

The first of these omissions occurs in *Red. Sen.* 13, where the recovered text<sup>23</sup> *non iuris* <notitia> [studium], *non dicendi vi* <non scien>tia rei militaris, *non cognoscendorum hominum* <studium>, *non liberalitas* rests on:

cos.

*non inconsulta studium non dicendi vitia rei militaris non cognoscendorum hominum non liberalitas* P<sup>1</sup> (cos. is a correction of P<sup>2</sup>) :

*non cos. studium non discendi vitia rei militaris non cognoscendorum hominum non liberalitas* G :

*non iuris*                      *non rei*

*studium non discendi viciari militaris non cognoscendorum hominum non liberalitas* E<sup>1</sup> (the suprascript words are corrections of E<sup>2</sup>) :

*non iuris studium non dicendi non* (sil. F) *rei militaris non cognoscendorum hominum non liberalitas* εVF.

Unable to cope with the corruption and unwilling to reproduce it, H suppressed the text entirely.

The second omission occurs in *Red. Sen.* 17, where the archetype (A) failed to record *depulissem* which is preserved by the z-family. Here H renders the text as follows: *quo verbo senatum atque omnis bonos* [tum cum a patria pestem depulissem] *crudeliter demonstrabas fuisse.*

So also one may suspect that the list of the tribunes in *Red. Sen.* 21 is consciously curtailed by the excision of *multa de me C. Messius ... promulgavit*, two lines of Teubner, as there is no particular reason why the words should have escaped H's notice.

If the examples quoted so far have already produced in us a certain uneasiness with regard to H's practice in general, we are still in a quandary as to what the scribe really had in mind in particular. And for this to become clear we must now turn to the remaining omissions of H. There we shall be able to find sufficient evidence indicating that the two orations exist in an abbreviated form and that abridgement was precisely what the scribe set out to achieve.

Evidence pointing in this direction can already be gathered from *Red. Sen.* 26–27. Here the intervention of the scribe into the text is indisputable. Its outcome may be presented as fol-

23) For the restoration see Klotz, "Zur Kritik ii", 495.

lows: 26 *quo quidem die [cum vos ... 27 quid denique illo die] quem P. Lentulus mihi fratrique meo liberisque nostris natalem constituit non modo ad nostram verum etiam ad sempiterni memoriam temporis [quo die] nos comitiis centuriatis [quae maxime maiores comitia iusta dici haberique voluerunt] recessivit in patriam, ut eadem centuriae quae me consullem fecerant consulatum meum comprobarent.*

The words *cum vos ... quid denique illo die* comprise about twenty-one lines of Teubner. Their elimination was already known to Wolf<sup>24</sup>), but, interestingly enough, this scholar believed that the omission was visual in origin, due to the repetition of *die*. This, of course, is not unreasonable. On closer examination, however, it becomes evident that the recurrence of the word much rather presented H with a convenient *terminus ad quem* for completing the omission! Had this not been the case one would be hard pressed indeed to explain why H had also eliminated *quo die*, the disappearance of which insures grammatical integrity of the whole.

As for *quae ... voluerunt*, it is the parenthetical character of these words that may have suggested their expunction. We have seen H's penchant for simplifying in small matters before, and this trait of his may be further illustrated by *Red. Sen. 28 itaque P. Lentuli beneficio excellenti atque divino non <solus> reducti sumus in patriam [sicut non nulli clarissimi cives]*<sup>25</sup>), *sed equis insignibus et curru aurato reportati*, where H not only omits but interpolates as well.

The treatment accorded by H *Red. Sen. 26-27*, and in particular his cleverness in making use of recurring word to get rid of a block of intervening words, throws, if nothing else, a sidelight on the omission in *Red. Sen. 29 qui cum ipse propter ... putarit*, corresponding to about eight lines of Teubner. Since the words following *putarit* again read *qui cum ipse*, our inclination is to identify the cause of the omission as mechanical in nature. But in view of what has happened in *Red. Sen. 26-27* can one really trust his instincts? I leave this, as well as a few other similar questions which will arise below, open.

No equivocation of this kind attends the next omission, in *Red. Sen. 33*. This paragraph, in which Cicero continues (from *Red. Sen. 32* to *35*) to state the circumstances which influenced

24) M. T. Ciceronis *Orationes quatuor*, ed. F. A. Wolf (Berlin 1801).

25) This omission, however, may be due to the uncertainty of the tradition with regard to *sicut* GE : *ita ut* EVF : *ut* P<sup>2</sup> : om. P<sup>1</sup>.

his decision to go into exile, received the following form: [*duae ... minuerunt. qua re*] *cum viderem senatum ducibus orbatum, me a magistratibus partim oppugnatum, partim proditum, partim derelictum, [servos ... revocatas], equites Romanos proscriptionis, [municipia] vastitatis, [omnis] caedis metu esse permotos ...* Here only the disappearance of *servos ... revocatas*, about three lines of Teubner, resists satisfactory explanation. But the fact that the omission simplifies the narrative should be taken into account. On the other hand, that the suppression of *duae ... minuerunt. qua re*, six lines of Teubner, is the result of H's deliberate activity is an easy deduction from the elimination of *qua re*, whose retention would be explaining the omitted *duae ... minuerunt*. The strange effect the scribe achieved by omitting *municipia* and *omnis*, whereby the fear (*metu*) of proscription, devastation and slaughter affects the *equites* alone may serve as a further illustration of his insensitivity to the argument of the oration.

In *Red. Sen.* 37 we meet again with the type of omission which may be visual in origin: *pro me non ut pro Publio Popilio, nobilissimo homine, adulescentes filii [non propinquorum ... Metellarum filii] flentes ac sordidati, populo Romano supplicaverunt*. The culprit word is *filii*. Its repetition is to account for the loss of six lines of Teubner.

Finally what we witness in *Red. Sen.* 38 looks forward to H's procedure which received a fuller expression in the *Red. Quir.* than in this oration. The prominent feature in this procedure is H's carefree practice of combining omission with extensive emendation. Thus *Red. Sen.* 38 received the following form: *nihil umquam senatus de P. Popilio decrevit, numquam in hoc ordine [de] Q. Metelli (Q. Metello cett.) mentio facta est; tribuniciis sunt illi rogationibus nulla auctoritate senatus (for nulla etc., interfectis inimicis denique cett.) restituti, [cum alter eorum senatui paruisset, alter vim caedemque fugisset]. [nam] C. [quidem] Marius...*

Needless to say this type of misrepresentations constitutes the gravest cause for concern about H's value, and yet it should be pointed out that it is largely thanks to this process that the grammatical integrity of the orations, abridged as they are, is never seriously disturbed, so that they can indeed be quite comfortably perused without having to think of the losses they suffered.

The text of *Red. Quir.* has been subjected to an even harsher treatment. Here H commences the work of excision with the opening paragraph of the oration, *Red. Quir.* 1 *quod precatus ...*

*laetor*, whose entangled sequence of thought seems to have provided the scribe with sufficient excuse for its elimination.

But to get the full scope of what H was after, we must turn to *Red. Quir.* 6–12, where Cicero recounts the events and measures taken by his friends and sympathizers in Rome, which eventually brought about his recall from exile. By means of omissions, involving for the most part *exempla* of exiles of the past, transpositions and interpolations, H has recast these paragraphs to read as follows: 6 *nam cum ... videamini. [non enim ... potuerunt. 7 nam C. Mari ... revocavit]. <8 hoc autem (qua re hoc cett.) mains est vestrum in nos promeritum quod non multitudini propinquorum sed nobismet ipsis nos reddidistis>. 7 me enim (at me cett.) nudum a propinquis ... deprecatae sunt. 8 frater erat ... renovaret; [qui statuerat] Quirites ... seiunctum. [pro me praesente ... frater. nam] coniugis miserae squalor et luctus atque optimae filiae maeror adsiduus filiique parvuli singultus pietatem vestram moverunt (filiique parvi desiderium mei lacrimaeque pueriles aut itineribus necessariis aut magnam partem tectis ac tenebris continebantur cett.). [qua re hoc mains est ... reddidistis. 9 sed quem ad modum propinqui ... facta est. 10 tribuniciis ... amandatus esset. 11 numquam de ... pertulerunt]. Kalendis ... indicavit. 12 atque eo die confecta res esset, nisi is tribunus plebis quem ... ornaram <noctem[que] sibi ad deliberandum postulasset> cum et cunctus ... iaceret [noctemque sibi ad deliberandum postulasset]; sed deliberatio illa (for sed etc., quae deliberatio cett.) non in ... deferebatur.*

The procedure adopted by H, as presented here, is self-explanatory. Clearly the scribe's interest lies in abridgment. This he achieves by the use of excision, while transposition and interpolation serve as fillers patching up the gaping holes of the dismembered text. Only in *Red. Quir.* 12 the reason for the transposition eludes instantaneous identification. On reflection, however, it becomes evident that its function is to remedy the difficulty caused by *noctemque*. *-que* in this word, attested by the remaining witnesses, indicates that some words had already been omitted by the scribe of the archetype (A). By changing, therefore, *noctemque* to *noctem* and transposing this part of the sentence right after *ornaram* H imparted to the passage some sense and restored its readability. And the scribe's effort to secure the latter is precisely what characterizes his activity throughout. An exception here is H's failure to adjust the text of *Red. Quir.* 8 after the omission of *qui statuerat*, so that the following infinitive lost its governing verb: *qui statuerat ... eandem subire fortunam*.

But this is not an isolated case in the whole speech. Equally

clumsy and hardly successful is H's manipulation of the beginning of *Red. Quir.* 15, where an attempt to restore sense lost in consequence of the suppression of *omnium ... fuisset* is made by the change of *consule* to *consulem*: *an ego, cum mihi esset exploratissimum P. Lentulum proximo anno consulem futurum, qui illis ipsis rei publicae periculosissimis temporibus aedilis curulis me consulem (consule cett.) [omnium meorum consiliorum particeps periculatorumque socius fuisset], dubitarem quin...*

The end of *Red. Quir.* 15 and the beginning of the next paragraph are again truncated, altogether seven lines of Teubner lost. The omission at first sight appears to be mechanical in origin, caused by the similarity of *eo-demque* and *denique*: 15 [*eodemque P. Lentulo ... commendavit. 16 ita me nudum ... deprecata est*], *denique omnes qui ... producti ad vos [ab eodem] ... vos cohortati sunt*. And yet it is most certainly deliberate. First, the transition from the measures taken by Milo and Sestius on Cicero's behalf, which are mentioned before the omission, to what is said after *denique* is so natural that it could only have been contrived. Second and more important, H has also suppressed *ab eodem*, now useless because it picks up the omitted *eodemque P. Lentulo* etc. The fact that *ab eodem* is a correction of PGT&V's *ab eadem* by the recentiores (i.e. that the archetype (A) was in error), may have had something to do with H's rendition of the text. Still, the bracketing of these words by some editors<sup>26</sup>) rests on no firm manuscript authority at all and is contrary to the argument of the narrative besides.

In *Red. Quir.* 16 H has also omitted Cicero's summary of a speech in which Pompey championed his cause: *qui mihi unus uni privato amico eadem omnia dedit quae universae rei publicae, salutem, otium, dignitatem. [cuius oratio fuit ... ab Italia cuncta] deinde ipse [ad extremum] pro mea vos salute non rogavit solum verum etiam obsecravit*. As is evident from the excision of *ad extremum*, this omission of nearly seven lines of Teubner is once more deliberate. The words after *deinde* are still Pompey's; by striking out *ad extremum* H integrated them with what precedes the speech, thus imposing coherence on the mutilated passage.

Since H's irreverence towards the text has by now been sufficiently illustrated and documented, it should probably make

26) See M. T. Ciceronis *Scripta quae manserunt omnia* 2.2, ed. R. Klotz (Leipzig 1866<sup>2</sup>); Cicero, *The Speeches: Pro Archia Poeta, Post Reditum in Senatu, Post Reditum ad Quirites*, etc., ed. and tr. N.H. Watts (Cambridge, Mass.—London 1965<sup>5</sup>).

little difference to us that not all of the remaining omissions in the oration lend themselves to clear analysis.

Thus unless it is an oversight, the deletion of the equivalent of over four lines of Teubner in *Red. Quir.* 17 remains obscure: *eodem tempore audistis eodem ex loco summos viros ... eadem dicere, ut omnium testimonio per me unum rem publicam conservatam esse constaret [itaque ... ceteri. sed audistis eo tempore clarissimi viri non solum auctoritatem], sed etiam testimonium L. Gelli.*

*Red. Quir.* 20 lacks *reciperata vero sua dignitate se non commissurum ut, cum ea quae amiserat sibi restituta essent, virtutem animi non haberet, quam numquam perdidisset.* This omission differs from the preceding one only in that it does not produce near nonsense. The omitted words contain the conclusion of Cicero's report of the humiliations that Marius publicly confessed to have suffered at the time of his exile. Although there is no clear indication of H's activity here, one wonders why the text so conveniently breaks off at a point where Marius' misfortunes have all been enumerated and a new thought is about to commence.

A similar instance of simplification occurs again at the end of *Red. Quir.* 20, where the omission of four lines of Teubner extends to the beginning of the next paragraph: *sed hoc inter me atque illum interest quod ille qua re plurimum potuit ea ipsa re inimicos suos ultus est, armis, ego qua consuevi, <pietate>, utar, [quoniam ... otio. 21 quamquam ... cogitabo].*

Only in *Red. Quir.* 23 we seem once more to be treading on familiar ground. In this paragraph H has first conveniently deleted the corrupt *neque id rei publicae repetere utrumcumque (utrumque P<sup>2</sup>GT&V) necesse est* and then dropped what later on, at least since Wolf's time<sup>27</sup>) has been recognized by most editors as an intrusion<sup>28</sup>): *atque in officio persolvendo dissimilis est ratio et pecunia debita, propterea quod pecuniam qui retinet non dissolvit, qui reddidit non habet; gratiam et qui rettulit habet, et qui habet dissolvit.*

Thus both orations have been accorded similar treatment by H, the difference being one of degree rather than of substance. Both have been considerably reduced in size and appropriate adjustments of the text or innovations have been introduced to create in each case a coherent and legible whole. Clearly the copyist's task, as he understood it, did not consist of faithfully

---

27) The omission of these words was known to Wolf from the recentiores; see Cicero, *Orationes*, ed. Wolf.

28) A similar thought is found in *Planc.* 68 and *Off.* 2,69.

preserving the text of the orations, but rather of offering a certain version of it. In a manner of speaking, then, the spirit pervading H is that of a *florilegium*.

## II

We now pass to the consideration of H's character from its *lectiones singulares* and to the discussion of their merits.

In *Red. Sen.* the influence of H on the text is minimal, and only two of its readings merit consideration.

*Red. Sen.* 29 *cum mea dixerit* H : *dixerit cum mea dixerit* P : *dixerit cum mea* (ea E<sup>1</sup>) GE<sup>1</sup>.

Here the question is one of word order, and, since the testimony of P is ambivalent, the choice must be made between H and GE<sup>1</sup>. Klotz<sup>29</sup>) gave some consideration to the reading of GE<sup>1</sup> insofar as it minimizes the rhyming effect produced by the homoeoteleuton *dixerit, edocuerit, compresserit, excitarit, obsecrarit, petierit, consignarit, putarit, elaborarit*, the distinctive feature of the paragraph. But the employment of this figure was primarily discouraged in judicial and deliberative oratory<sup>30</sup>), to which *Red. Sen.* does not belong<sup>31</sup>), and, more important, the removal of *dixerit* from the end of the first clause does not really minimize anything. The strongest support for H, however, derives from the z-family: *cum me adixerit* F : *cum me addixerit* E<sup>2</sup>εV<sup>32</sup>). For the rest, whether *cum mea dixerit* originated as a conjecture or represents H's independence is a moot question<sup>33</sup>).

29) See Klotz, "Zur Kritik ii", 484-85.

30) See *Rhet. ad Her.* 4,32; cf. K. Polheim, *Die lateinische Reimprosa* (Berlin 1925), 161 ff., 463 ff.

31) Cf. G. Kennedy, *The Art of Rhetoric in the Roman World* (Princeton 1972), 192. Besides, such homoeoteleuta are very common in all speeches of Cicero. Cf. e.g. *Planc.* 26; *Phil.* 7,26; 3,30-31, and L. Laurand, *Études sur le style des discours de Cicéron* (Paris 1907), 122-25.

32) Klotz's *cum mea addixerit* ε in "Zur Kritik ii", 484 and *cum me adixerit* (me add. E<sup>2</sup>, mea add-ε) E<sup>2</sup>εF in his edition are not accurate. Wuilleumier's *cum me adixerit* E<sup>2</sup> in his app. cr. stems from Klotz's report. For the sake of accuracy, it should be noted that E<sup>2</sup> did not erase or cross out the *dixerit* of E<sup>1</sup>.

33) A somewhat similar case occurs in *Cael.* 58. Once more, H seems to have preserved the right word order, *esse dominae* H : *esse domina* || *esse* P : *dominae esse* GC : in lac. om. E, even against the vetus Cluniacensis (C). Its authenticity is guaranteed by the error of P, which originated from the misreading of *e* in *dominae*. Clark (OCT) follows C here, but, all things being

*Red. Sen. 37 qui cum statuisset, nisi me per vos reciperasset, eandem subire fortunam...*

The difficulty in this passage arises from *me per vos* E<sup>2</sup>eVF Klotz, Wuilleumier : *per vos me* H Halm, Peterson (Wuilleumier notes in the app. cr.: "fort. recte") : *per vos* PGE<sup>1</sup>. The testimony of PGE<sup>1</sup> is defective, so that the issue is between the z-family and H. Fortunately the context itself is of considerable assistance in this case. Here Cicero speaks of his brother's devotion to him and his determination to secure his return from exile. Quintus apparently made a pledge that, should Marcus' recall not materialize, he himself would leave Rome and physically share his misery (*eandem subire fortunam*). If we follow the z-family, the emphasis will be placed on *me*, which is required by the context, and if we choose H's reading, the stress will fall on *per vos* (with reference to the senate), which is contrary to what one would expect<sup>34</sup>).

The presence of H in *Red. Quir.* is more pervasive, but the caliber of its readings not dissimilar from those just quoted.

*Red. Quir. 5 vestros denique honores... habemus, ut quantum antea parentibus..., tantum hoc tempore universum cuncto populo Romano debeamus.*

Here *debeamus* is an easy correction by H; the remaining manuscripts, PGETeV, record *debemus*.

H, it is to be noted, is rather sensitive to the proper use of the subjunctive throughout, but unlike in the passage before us, its concerns are usually misplaced. A good example is afforded by *Red. Sen. 8 non dicam: quid egit prius*, where *egit* is attested by PGeV; E omitted the verb entirely and H changed it to *egerit*. Clearly the occasion for the emendation is H's impression that an indirect question should take the subjunctive. This immediately calls to mind *Red. Quir. 4* where H missed a real opportunity, and the error had to be rectified by a later scholar: *ipsa autem patria di immortales! dici vix potest quid caritatis, quid voluptatis*

---

equal, it is P that is the most reliable witness for these orations, and its testimony supports H.

34) This argument holds true on the assumption that in a clause or phrase the determining element comes first. See R. Kühner and C. Stegmann, *Ausführl. Gramm. d. lat. Spr.* 2.2 (Hannover 1966), 591. Henceforward cited as K.-S. Cf. Klotz, "Zur Kritik ii", 490. Of course, pronouncements regarding word-order in Latin may be quite hazardous under any circumstances. Cf. the interesting (and humorous) observation of E. Laughton in *The Participle in Cicero* (Oxford 1964), 46.

*habeat*. For *habeat* in this sentence, we are indebted to Lambinus; PGEHTεV have *habet*.

Indeed, despite the similarity, the two cases are quite different. In *Red. Sen.* 8 the question is felt as a direct quotation, just as, for instance, in *Lig.* 24 *quaero: quid facturi fuistis* or *Verr.* 5, 180 *quaeret aliquis fortasse: tantumne igitur laborem suscepturus es?* Hence the indicative<sup>35</sup>). In *Red. Quir.* 4, on the contrary, no such idea is present, the case being identical, for example, with *Quinct.* 54 *dici vix potest quam multa sint*. Hence Lambinus' conjecture is necessary.

Another interesting example of H's preoccupation with the subjunctive is found in *Red. Sen.* 36 *etenim si eam tum defendebam cum mihi aliquid illa debebat, quid nunc me facere oportet cum ego illi plurimum debeo*. Here the manuscripts read: *debeo* P<sup>2</sup>EεV : *debo* P<sup>1</sup> : *debeam* H. Since the two *cum*-clauses are purely temporal in meaning, the *cum* particles corresponding to *tum* and *nunc* respectively, H's *debeam* is out of place<sup>36</sup>). Nevertheless the innovation is of interest. H seems to have chosen the second *cum*-clause for emendation because occasionally in Latin, subordinate clauses depending on the infinitive (also in the inf. and acc. construction) governed by such impersonals as *oportet*, *decet*, *licet*, *necesse est*, etc. do in fact take the subjunctive. Although the phenomenon is an aberration rather than the rule, examples can be found even in Cicero, e.g. *Tusc.* 3, 15 *necesse est, qui fortis sit, eundem esse magni animi*; *Fin.* 1, 47 *stare oportet in eo quod sit indicatum*<sup>37</sup>).

But to return to *Red. Quir.* 5, H's *debeamus*, whether conjecture or not, hardly admits of improvement. Certainly Klotz's *et* (for *ut*) ... *debemus*<sup>38</sup>) is no better.

*Red. Quir.* 12 *atque eo die confecta res esset, nisi is tribunus plebis quem ... ornaram, cum et cunctus ordo et ... iaceret, \*\*\* noctemque sibi ad deliberandum postulasset*.

The author of the lacuna is Klotz, who proposed *respondere dubitasset* as the missing words; the manuscripts report *noctemque* PGTεV : *noctem* H. As indicated on p. 150 above, practically no authority attaches to H's *noctem*, notwithstanding its recogni-

35) The indicative is quite common in the pre-classical period. See K.-S. 2.2, 489.

36) Cf. K.-S. 2.2, 333 ff.

37) Cf. K.-S. 2.2, 205.

38) See Cicero, *Scripta* 7, ed. Klotz, lix.

tion by all editors, even after Klotz<sup>39</sup>). However, this variant merits further consideration, if only to show that not all corrections of H should be brushed aside unqualifiedly. For it bears some resemblance to such simple adjustments of the text as *Red. Quir.* 18 *mibi* H : *se mibi* PGT $\epsilon$ V or *Dom.* 30 *rem perficiendam* H : *rem p. perficiendam* PGMV, of which the former, considering that nothing seems to be amiss in the text, is probable<sup>40</sup>), and the latter, certain<sup>41</sup>).

In *Red. Quir.* 14 it is the combined testimony of H and PGT $\epsilon$ V that enables us to restore the original text: *cum privati parietum se praesidio non legum tuerentur*. The reference here is to Pompey, whom the violence of Clodius' gangs debarred from public appearances. Cicero expresses himself similarly in *Red. Sen.* 4 *cum ... non legum praesidio, sed parietum vitam suam tueretur*. Halm's restoration *parietum se vis à vis parietum* H : *parietis* PGT $\epsilon$ V is therefore certain. The archetype (A) must have had *parietū se*. Yet it is impossible to tell whether (A) was the ultimate source of H's variant or the scribe got a clue from the adjacent *legum*.

Apart from the example already quoted, *mibi* H : *se mibi* PGT $\epsilon$ V, *Red. Quir.* 18 contains four other variants of H in *En ego <tot> testimoniis, Quirites, hac auctoritate senatus, tanta consensione*

39) *noctem*, however, has been known from the recentiores so far. Even Wuilleumier quotes them as its source.

More interesting, H's reading calls to mind *Cael.* 3, where a *-que* is in fact superfluous. I am in agreement with Cousin on *eam semper ... habitam esse summam bodieque*, but it should be pointed out that he exaggerates H's worth at this point. What he reports in the app. cr., *summam* HV : *summamque* PGE and *bodieque* P<sup>1</sup>GEHV : *bodie* P<sup>2</sup>, is essentially misleading (see the case of Kasten below). The manuscripts have *summam bodieque* P<sup>1</sup>HV : *summamque bodieque* GE : *summamque bodie* P<sup>2</sup>. The reason for Cousin's confusion is his misreading of P, which has *summāq*; *bodieq*†. The controversial *-que* in *summamque* is added by P<sup>2</sup> in erasure. What *-q*; has replaced is not clear but it could only have been *m* since the horizontal stroke over *a* is also from P<sup>2</sup>'s hand.

This being the case, H. Kasten, *Gymnasium* 70 (1963), 254, in attempting to account for the two *-que*'s of Cousin's P<sup>1</sup> by conjecturing *summamque bodie <quo>que*, is in fact defending GE's version against P<sup>1</sup>HV.

40) Despite the existence of *se* in the best manuscripts, no editor to my knowledge suspected the text here. Perhaps its origin should be linked with the preceding *comprobantibus*.

41) More often the manuscripts commit the reverse of this error, adding *res* before *p.* Cf. *Red. Sen.* 25 *p. servilius* HE<sup>2</sup> $\epsilon$ V : \*\*\* *p. servilius (rem eras.)* P : *servilius* GE<sup>1</sup>; 30 *p. sestio* GEH $\epsilon$ V : \*\* *p. sestio (re eras.)* P; 38 *p. popilio (pompilio)* E) P<sup>2</sup>GH $\epsilon$ V : *re p. popillio* P<sup>1</sup>.

*Italiae, tanto studio bonorum omnium, [cum] agente P. Lentulo, consentientibus ceteris magistratibus, deprecante Cn. Pompeio, omnibus hominibus faventibus, dis denique immortalibus frugum ubertate, copia, vilitate redditum meum comprobantibus mihi, meis, rei publicae restitutus tantum vobis quantum facere possum, Quirites, pollicebor: primum, qua sanctissimi homines pietate erga deos immortalis esse soleant, eadem <me> erga populum Romanum semper fore.*

There is very little one can say with any degree of certainty regarding *tot* H : om. PGT $\epsilon$ V save that H's *tot* is superior to Halm's idea, which would substitute *his ego* for *en ego*, thereby questioning the authenticity of *en*, a dubious improvement in view of the unanimous testimony of the manuscripts. Nevertheless this conjecture is in tune with Cicero's style. The sentence before us proceeds according to a definite plan of its corresponding *membra*<sup>42</sup>), 2 + 2 + 2, etc., where the first two pairs are <?> *testimoniis, hac auctoritate senatus* and *tanta consensione Italiae, tanto studio bonorum omnium*. Thus Halm's *his ego* restores the link between the elements of the first pair, *his* – *hac*, just as it exists between those of the second pair, *tanta* – *tanto*.

This approach, combined with a greater regard for the manuscript tradition, has been next taken up and developed by Klotz's *en ego* <*his optimorum virorum*> *testimoniis*<sup>43</sup>). The assumption underlying this emendation is that *testimoniis* needs a genitive in view of *senatus, Italiae* and *bonorum omnium*, and that a line of the archetype (A) consisting of about twenty letters<sup>44</sup>), i. e. *his optimorum virorum*, may have been lost and replaced in H by *tot*.

Now, even though the main thrust of the Halm-Klotz argument appears to be unexceptionable, one naturally hesitates to make such restorations on purely stylistic grounds, and, as Laurand rightly warns<sup>45</sup>), “il n'est pas nécessaire que la correspondance soit mathématiquement exacte”. This, and Cicero's statement of *De Or.* 3, 186 on the length of the succeeding

42) Cf. K.F. Nägelsbach, *Lateinische Stilistik* (Nürnberg 1905<sup>9</sup>), 701–28, esp. 722–24.

43) See Cicero, *Scripta* 7, ed. Klotz, lix. In the text, Klotz reads *tot*.

44) See Cicero, *Scripta* 7, ed. Klotz, xi–xv. This is also the reason for Klotz's *respondere dubitasset* in *Red. Quir.* 12 above.

45) Laurand, *Études*, 119–20. The fact is that there are examples of imperfect symmetry in Cicero's periods, e.g. *Clu.* 18 *hoc enim iudicium, hoc periculum, illa accusatio, <?> omnis testium copia quae futura est*, where Clark (OCT) inserts *illa*; *Rosc. Am.* 10 *aut propter perfidiam abicere aut propter infirmitatem animi deponere*.

membra in a rhetorical period, *qua re aut paria esse debent posteriora superioribus, extrema primis, aut quod etiam est melius et iucundius, longiora*, provide some justification for the retention of the reading of H.

Another contribution of H in this paragraph is the first *Quirites* (written *quir̄*, as usual) instead of *qui r.* (*rem P*) *p.* of PGT $\epsilon$ V. This has not been recorded by the editors so far, nor, if it is a conjecture, was it difficult to formulate. It is comparable to *Red. Quir.* 17 *lentuli H : lentulus* PGT $\epsilon$ V where the genitive is suggested by the context: *huius consilia, P. Lentuli sententiam, senatus auctoritatem vos secuti...*

On the other hand, quite perplexing is *agente H : cum agente* PGT $\epsilon$ V. The meaningless *cum* was suspected by Klotz to contain *consule*<sup>46</sup>), by Halm *causam*, and by Walter *coram*<sup>47</sup>). It is possible, however, that *cum* has been generated by the preceding *omni-um*, and H's suppression of it is the right solution.

The last problem of this passage is *me ante erga*  $\zeta$  : *ante semper H* : *om.* PGT $\epsilon$ V. Klotz pointed out<sup>48</sup>) that the subject accusative here is superfluous, and in strictly grammatical terms he was right. The pronouns *me*, *te*, etc. in the acc. and inf. construction are in fact occasionally omitted in Latin, as e.g. in Cic., *Rosc. Am.* 61 *confitere* (imperat.) *huc ea spe* (sc. *te*) *venisse*. But the condition under which this takes place is that they must be unemphatic and easily deduced from the context<sup>49</sup>). Insofar as *me* in our passage can be extracted from the context, it meets part of this condition; it cannot, however, be said to be unemphatic. The contents of the clauses connected by the correlatives *qua* – *eadem* are strongly contrasted<sup>50</sup>), *sanctissimi homines* corresponding to *me* and *erga deos immortalis* to *erga populum Romanum*, and the *eadem*-clause, in its reversed order, is in a particularly emphatic position. It is doubtful that *me* would have been left out here.

The place of *me* also calls for a brief comment. Editors invariably print the pronoun with the *recentiores*, but the word order attested by H is not inferior. If *me* is placed before *semper*, the result is a chiasmic correspondence of the relevant parts,

46) See Cicero, *Scripta* 7, ed. Klotz, lix.

47) See F. Walter, "Zu Cicero und zu Quintilian mit den Deklamationen", *RhM* 91 (1942), 2.

48) See Klotz, "Zur Kritik ii", 511.

49) See K.-S. 2.1, 700–701.

50) Cf. Nägelsbach, *Lateinische Stilistik*, 649ff.

*sanctissimi homines – erga deos immortalis X erga populum Romanum – me*<sup>51</sup>).

*Red. Quir. 20 quem egomet audivi (non)*<sup>52</sup> *tum se fuisse miserum cum careret patria...*, *cum ... audiret, cum ... videret...*, *cum ... conservaret, cum ... venisset.*

*cum careret* is H's variant; P<sup>2</sup>GT<sub>ε</sub>V read *si careret*, and P<sup>1</sup> *carereret* (not *caret* as Halm and Klotz wrongly report). H's idea is the natural solution, something one readily accepts in view of the following *cum*-clauses. P<sup>2</sup>GT<sub>ε</sub>V's *si careret*, admitted into the text by Klotz, puts too great a stain on the sense of the passage. The construction *tum si* is quite frequent in Cicero, e.g. *Verr. 2, 191 ille vero tum se minime Metellum fore putavit, si te ulla in re imitatus esset; Balb. 38 quae mihi tum si Gaditani contra me dicerent, vere posse dici viderentur*<sup>53</sup>). But while in these and other similar instances the *si*-clause with the correlative *tum* give perfect sense, one wonders what this could mean: "I myself heard him say that not even then he had been unhappy if he was deprived of his country, when...".

*Red. Quir. 21 denique, Quirites, quoniam me quattuor omnino hominum genera violarunt, unum eorum qui ... inimicissimi mihi fuerunt, alterum qui ... nefarie (me) prodiderunt, tertium qui ... inviderunt laudi et dignitati meae, quartum qui ... salutem meam, statum civitatis, dignitatem eius imperi ... vendiderunt.*

Although the direct object of *prodiderunt* can be extracted from the context, both the principle of clarity and symmetry pervading the whole period conspire in favor of H's insertion of *me*. If this be adopted, the main verb of each clause will have its complement stated expressly.

And finally the last passage to be considered, *Red. Quir. 23 odium vel precibus mitigari potest (vel) temporibus rei publicae communique utilitate deponi vel difficultate ulciscendi teneri vel vetustate sedari; bene meritos (ne) colas, nec exorari fas est, neque...*

Here success and failure attend the effort of H alternately. On the positive side, we are indebted to H for *vel*. This is, of course, an obvious correction and, in view of its superscript position in the manuscript, clearly nothing more than the scribe's

51) Cf. Nägelsbach, *Lateinische Stilistik*, 679 ff.

52) The insertion of *non* in this place is due to D. R. Shackleton Bailey, "On Cicero's Speeches", *HSCP* 83 (1979), 263. I am grateful to Professor Shackleton Bailey for allowing me to see this article before its publication.

53) For further examples see H. Merguet, *Lexikon zu den Reden des Cicero* 4 (Jena 1884), 798; cf. K.-S. 2.2, 387.

lucky afterthought. More debatable, on the other hand, is H's *quin* for the printed *ne* before *colas*. *ne* derives from the recentiores and is a welcome contribution in view of PGT<sup>e</sup>V's silence. *quin*, however, has found a supporter too; the conjunction figures in Wuilleumier's text. Nevertheless Courtney seems to be right in pointing out<sup>54</sup>) that H's variant is a conjecture, and a misleading one at that. Although *exoro quin* is found in Plaut., *Men.* 518, this usage is unknown in Cicero. Thus the question arises whether one can rely on the authority of H to establish syntactical precedents for Ciceronian prose. In the context of the preceding remarks, to do so would naturally appear poor judgment.

This concludes the survey of the variants of H that come into account in a critical examination of the text of *Red. Sen.* and *Red. Quir.* The benefits accruing from the application of this manuscript are not impressive. More important, it is impossible to determine whether a reading offered by H is a conjecture or genuine tradition. In some instances H's testimony is simply misleading, and, where it is not, the scribe operates at a level at which obvious deductions from the context are ready at hand. Again, what has been remarked in the discussion of H's omissions, also applies, on the whole, to its *lectiones singulares*. The majority of these appear to be designed to smooth out the rough spots of the transmitted text. Consequently, where the remaining witnesses agree in error, unless the correction is an obvious one, H's innovation must be viewed with the utmost suspicion<sup>55</sup>).

Since it is clear from the foregoing discussion that H's aim consisted in rendition rather than transmission of the text, one wonders what practical use that manuscript was intended to have originally. Unfortunately this final question which the character of H poses cannot be answered without a certain amount of speculation. H was written in France, somewhere on the Loire to judge from its decoration, perhaps at Tours itself<sup>56</sup>), in the first half of the twelfth century. Intellectually the most active centers of classical study during the twelfth century renaissance

---

54) See Courtney, "Notes", 15.

55) This is not to suggest that in such instances H's reading must always be a conjecture. The common error of the remaining witnesses may be independent. See H. Kantorowicz, *Einführung in die Textkritik* (Leipzig 1921), 5.

56) I am grateful for this information to Professor R.H. Rouse. For the Tours script see E. K. Rand, *A Survey of the Manuscripts of Tours, Studies of the Script of Tours* 1 (Cambridge, Mass. 1929).

were Châtres and Orléans<sup>57</sup>). But Tours, a great monastic establishment since the time of Charlemagne, with its long tradition of famous copyists<sup>58</sup>) had not suffered eclipse. In the twelfth century it was a center of rhetoric and poetry<sup>59</sup>), and orators like Cicero must have been in demand. The peculiar character of H, then, ought to be somehow related to the specific needs of that center. Perhaps the manuscript was produced for school use and partook in the twelfth century revival of classics as a school text.

H however, was not the only copy of Cicero's *post reditum* orations of which Tours could boast. B.N. lat. 7794 (P), the main witness in the tradition of these orations, was written, according to Bischoff, in the mid-ninth century in several Tours hands, and at the time of the production of H, this manuscript<sup>60</sup>) and probably its exemplar were in close proximity. This fact offers a reasonable explanation of H's affinity to P and possibly of some of its *lectiones singulares*.

Los Angeles, CA.

Tadeusz Maslowski

---

57) See C.H.Haskins, *The Renaissance of the Twelfth Century* (Cambridge, Mass. 1933), 48, 103; R.H.Rouse and M.A.Rouse, "The *Florilegium Angelicum*: its Origin, Content, and Influence" in *Essays Presented to Richard W. Hunt*, ed. J.J.G.Alexander and M.T.Gibson (Oxford 1975), 66-114.

58) See Rand, *A Survey*, 3-7; cf. J.E.Sandys, *A History of Classical Scholarship from the Sixth Century B.C. to the End of the Middle Ages* (Cambridge 1906<sup>2</sup>), 625.

59) See Haskins, *The Renaissance*, 103; cf. Rand, *A Survey*, 76-78.

60) Cf. Rouse and Rouse, "The *Florilegium Angelicum*", 75.