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. xii1. MS Harley 4927 alongside Paris, B.N., MS lat. 7794 (P), s. ixmed., on the one hand, and Brussels, Bibl. Royale, MS lat. 5345 (G), s. xi2, together with its sister copy Berlin, Deutsche Staatsbibl., MS lat. fol. 252 (E), s. xii1, on the other offers one of the three main avenues of access to the lost archetype (A), the main source of these orations2. 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 France3), for subsequently it was copied into a number of the recentiores4). In printed editions,


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


4) These are Escorial MSS R, I, 12, s. xiv2, R, I, 15, s. xiv2, T, II, 4, s. xiv2, 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). But the controversy surrounding H began in fairly recent times, in the nineteenth century, when the manuscript first came under critical scrutiny by Baehrens. 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”). 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...” 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). This view held the field until recently when as a result of the fresh collations produced by the Budé editors, Wuilleumier, Tupet and Cousin, the pendulum has once more swung in favor of H, actually to an unprecedented degree. But
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\(^\text{11}\); I have also argued elsewhere about some, to the same effect\(^\text{12}\).

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\(^\text{13}\) 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\(^\text{14}\), does not automatically disqualify it\(^\text{15}\), 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, \textit{Red. Sen.} and \textit{Red. Quir.}, is intended to go deeper into the character of H. First, I shall consider the omissions in H which,\(^\text{11}\) See E. Courtney, "Notes on Ciceronian Manuscripts and Textual Criticism", \textit{Univ. of London, Inst of Class. St.} 10 (1963), 14–15; idem, "De haruspicium response", \textit{CR n.s.} 17 (1967), 299. Cf. also J.H. Simon, "The Budé of Cicero", \textit{CR n.s.} 5 (1955), 71–73.


\(^\text{13}\) 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 \textit{Red. Sen.}, \textit{Red. Quir.}, and \textit{Dom.} (cf. Cicéron, \textit{Discours} 13, ed. and tr. Wuilleumier, 30) but dismissed for the remaining orations [cf. Cicéron, \textit{Discours} 13.2, ed. and tr. Wuilleumier and Tupet, 24; Cicéron, \textit{Discours} 14, ed. and tr. Cousin, 98 (the stemma), and Cicéron, \textit{Discours} 15, ed. and tr. Cousin, 64 (the stemma)]. Nevertheless conjunctive errors shared by GEH exist for these orations too, e.g. \textit{Har. Resp.} 6 \textit{labefactatam} P : \textit{labefactatam} GEH; 48 \textit{in quibus} P : \textit{quibus} GEH; 50 \textit{ne causam} P\(^1\) : \textit{ne causam} P\(^1\) ; \textit{ne causam} P\(^1\) : \textit{ne causam} GEH. \textit{Cael.} 17 \textit{eius} P : \textit{ei} GEH; 30 \textit{versatur} P : \textit{urgetur} (\textit{-gue-} E) GEH; 36 \textit{parasti} P : \textit{praeparasti} GEH; 43 \textit{libet} P : \textit{liquet} P : \textit{neesse est} GEH; 65 \textit{magis} P\(^1\) : \textit{meliori} P\(^1\) : \textit{meliori} P\(^1\) : \textit{meliori} magis H (a striking example). \textit{Prov. Cons.} 4 \textit{omnia} P : \textit{omnia illa} GEH; 36 \textit{se tenere} P : \textit{se scire} GEH. \textit{Balb.} 42 \textit{fit} P\(^2\) : \textit{sit} G\(^1\) E H; 54 \textit{ad civitatem} P : \textit{ac civitatem} GEH; \textit{Vat.} 10 \textit{cum homine} P : \textit{homine} GEH.

\(^\text{14}\) Cf. the stemma in M.T. Ciceronis \textit{De haruspicium responsis}, ed. A. Guaglianone (Florence 1968), 17.

\(^\text{15}\) Provided, of course, that the manuscript has some readings whose authenticity is not doubted. H does have a fair proportion of interesting \textit{lectiones singulares}, e.g. \textit{Dom.} 10 \textit{ob annonae causam} H : \textit{binum nonae causam} P ; in lac. om. G. \textit{Har. Resp.} 31 \textit{pontificum iudicio} H : \textit{pontificum} P : \textit{pontificum} (\textit{ponticum} G) \textit{cum} GE. \textit{Sest.} 84 \textit{e rostris} H : \textit{frostris} P : \textit{rostris} G (\textit{e rostris} seems to indicate that H had access to a majuscule copy). \textit{Cael.} 53 \textit{ausus} HC : \textit{rursus} PGE. \textit{Balb.} 16 \textit{experta atque} H : \textit{atque} P\(^1\) E : \textit{nota atque} G\(^2\).
surprisingly enough, have not received the attention they
deserve. In fact, beyond their listings, whether in the Preface 16)
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 17), 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., Cael. 18), Balb., enough text has been lost to cause con-
cern. 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 dis-
cussion, 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 2, two fifteenth-century wit-
nesses, Erlangen, Universitätsbibl., MS lat. 847 (e), 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, Stras-
bourg 1581, and a new witness, the excerpts from the oration in
Paris, B. N., MS lat. 18104 (X), s. xii–xiii 19). 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)
Quir., Dom., and Har. Resp. will be found in my edition of these orations
(see n. 2).

18) The text of Cael. 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 Clientio in Paris, B. N.,
MS lat. 18104”, Italia Medioevale e Umanistica 22 (1979), 97–122.
In *Red. Quir.*, however, εV 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, TeV, 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.

When confronted with omissions in manuscripts we naturally look for their causes. These, for the most part, are not difficult to ascertain. 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:


---

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.
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 impediebantur lege, non ea quae de me, sed ea quae de ipsis lata erat, [cum mens inimicus promulgavit ut, si revixissent ii qui haec paene delerunt, tum ego redirem; quo facto utrumque confessus est, et se illoram 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 – proscriptionem 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
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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\(^2^3\) non iuris \(<notitia> [studium]\), non dicendi vi\(<s\nnon scien>tia rei militaris, non cognoscendorum hominum \(<studium>\), non
liberalitas rests on:

\[cos.\]
non inconsulta studium non dicendi vitia rei militaris non cognoscen-
dorum hominum non liberalitas P\(^1\) (cos. is a correction of P\(^2\)) :

\[non cos. studium non discendi vitia rei militaris non cognoscendorum
hominum non liberalitas G :\]
non iuris non rei

\[studium non discendi viciari militaris non cognoscendorum hominum
non liberalitas E\(^1\) (the superscript words are corrections of E\(^2\)) :
non iuris studium non dicendi non (sil. F) rei militaris non cognos-
cendorum hominum non liberalitas eVF.\]

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 bonus [tum cum a patria pestem depulissem] crudelis
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-

\(^2^3\) For the restoration see Klotz, “Zur Kritik ii”, 495.
Tadeusz Maslowski

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 insta dicit habereque voluere] arcessivit in patriam, ut eadem centuriae quae me consulem fecerant consilium meum comprobarent.

The words cum vos ... quid denique illo die comprise about twenty-one lines of Teubner. Their elimination was already known to Wolf\(^{24}\), 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 (solum) reducti sumus in patriam [sicut non nulli clarissimi cives]\(^{25}\), 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 \(P^2\) : om. \(P^1\).
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 derelicendum, [servos ... revocatas], equites Romanos prosectionis, [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 prosection, 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 ... Metellorum 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; tribunicis sunt illi roationibus 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.) maius est vestrum in nos promeritum quod non multitudinum proponquorum sed nobismet ipsis nos reddidistis). 7 me enim (at me cett.) nudum a propinqu quis ... deprecatae sunt. 8 frater erat ... renovaret; [qui statuerat] Quirites ... seiunctum. [pro me prae sente ... frater. nam] coningis miserae equalor et luctus atque optimae filiae maeror adsidius filiique parvali singulis pietatem vestram moverunt (filiique parvi desiderium mei lacrimaeque pu riles aut itineribus necessarius aut magnum partem tectis ac tenebris continebantur cett.). [qua re hoc maius est ... reddidistis. 9 sed quem ad modum propinquui ... facta est. 10 tribunicis ... amandatus esset. 11 numquam de ... pertulerunt] Kalendis ... iudicavit. 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
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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 exploratis-simum P. Lentulum proximo anno consulem futurum, qui illis ipsis rei publicae periculosissimis temporibus aedilis curulis me consulem (consule cett.) [omnium meorum consiliorum particeps periculorumque 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 PGTeV’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 editors26) 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 obsceavit. As is evident from the excision of ad axtremum, this omission of nearly seven lines of Teubner is once more deliberate. The words after deinde are still Pompey’s; by striking out ad axtremum 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

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 commissu-
rum 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 ulius 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 P2GETeV) necesse est* and then dropped what later on, at
least since Wolf’s time*27*) has been recognized by most editors
as an intrusion:*

*atque in officio persolvendo dissimilis est ratio et
pecunia debita, propterea quod pecuniam qui retinet non dissolvit, qui
reddidit non habet; gratiam et qui retulit habet, et qui habet dissolvit.*

Thus both orations have been accorded similar treatment
by H, the difference being one of degree rather that 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 recen-
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') GE'.

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'. Klotz' gave some consideration to the reading of GE' 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, to which *Red. Sen.* does not belong, 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'E'.

For the rest, whether *cum mea dixerit* originated as a conjecture or represents H's independence is a moot question.

---


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

33) A somewhat similar case occurs in *Caec.* 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 E²eVF Klotz, Wuilleumier: per vos me H Halm, Peterson (Wuilleumier notes in the app. cr.: “fort. recte”) : per vos PGE¹. The testimony of PGE¹ 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 expect³⁴).

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 areal 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.

habeat. For habeat in this sentence, we are indebted to Lambinus; PGEHTEV have habeat.

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 jüstitis or Verr. 5, 180 quaeret aliquis fortasse: tantumne igitur laborem suscepturus es? Hence the indicative35). In Red. Quir. 4, on the contrary, no such idea is present, the case being identical, for example, with Quint. 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 mibi aliquid illa debebat, quid nunc me facere oportet cum ego illi plurimum debo. Here the manuscripts read: debo P²E²V : debo P¹ : 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 place36). 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 indicatum37).

But to return to Red. Quir. 5, H’s debeamus, whether conjecture or not, hardly admits of improvement. Certainly Klotz’s et (for ut) ... debemus38) 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 PGTEV : 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.
37) Cf. K.-S. 2.2, 205.
tion by all editors, even after Klotz\textsuperscript{39}). 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. \textit{Quir.}\ 18 \textit{mihi} H : \textit{se mihi} PGT\textit{eV} or Dom.\ 30 \textit{rem perficiendam} H : \textit{rem p. perficiendam} PGMV, of which the former, considering that nothing seems to be amiss in the text, is probable\textsuperscript{40}, and the latter, certain\textsuperscript{41}.

In \textit{Red. Quir.}\ 14 it is the combined testimony of H and PGT\textit{eV} that enables us to restore the original text: \textit{cum privati parietum se prae sidio non legum tuerentur}. The reference here is to Pompey, whom the violence of Clodius' gangs debarred from public appearances. Cicero expresses himself similarly in \textit{Red. Sen.}\ 4 \textit{cum ... non legum prae sidio, sed parietum vitam suam tueretur}. Halm's restoration \textit{parietum se} vis à vis \textit{parietum} H : \textit{parietis} PGT\textit{eV} is therefore certain. The archetype (A) must have had \textit{parietu 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 \textit{legum}.

Apart from the example already quoted, \textit{mihi} H : \textit{se mihi} PGT\textit{eV}, \textit{Red. Quir.}\ 18 contains four other variants of H in \textit{En ego (tot) testimoniis, Quirites, hac auctoritate senatus, tanta consensione}

\textsuperscript{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 \textit{Cael.}\ 3, where a -\textit{que} is in fact superfluous. I am in agreement with Cousin on \textit{eam semper ... habitam este sum mam bodique}, but it should be pointed out that he exaggerates H's worth at this point. What he reports in the app. cr., \textit{summam HV : summam que} PGE and \textit{bodique} P\textsuperscript{GE} P\textsuperscript{GE}HV : \textit{bodie P\textsuperscript{P}}, is essentially misleading (see the case of Kasten below). The manuscripts have \textit{summam bodique} P\textsuperscript{HV} : \textit{summamque bodique} GE : \textit{summamque bodie} P\textsuperscript{P}. The reason for Cousin's confusion is his misreading of P, which has \textit{summag bodie}GE. The controversial -\textit{que} in \textit{summamque} is added by P\textsuperscript{P} in erasure. What -\textit{q}; has replaced is not clear but it could only have been \textit{m} since the horizontal stroke over \textit{a} is also from P\textsuperscript{S}'s hand.

This being the case, H. Kasten, \textit{Gymnasium}\ 70 (1963), 254, in attempting to account for the two -\textit{que}'s of Cousin's P\textsuperscript{I} by conjecturing \textit{summamque bodie \textit{quo que}}, is in fact defending GE's version against P\textsuperscript{HV}.

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

\textsuperscript{41} More often the manuscripts commit the reverse of this error, adding \textit{res} before \textit{p.} Cf. \textit{Red. Sen.}\ 25 \textit{p. servilius HE\textsuperscript{eV} : *** p. servilius (rem eras.)} P : \textit{servilius GE}\textsuperscript{I} ; 30 \textit{p. sestio GEHV : ** p. sestio (re eras.)} P ; 38 \textit{p. popilio (pompilio E) P\textsuperscript{GHeV} : re p. popilio P\textsuperscript{I}}.
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 reeditum meum comprobantibus mibi, meis, rei publicae restitutus tautum vobis quantum facere possum, Quirites, pollicebor: primum, qua sanctissimi homines pietate erga deos immortalis esse soleant, eadem erga populum Romanum semper esse.

There is very little one can say with any degree of certainty regarding tot H: om. PGTeV 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 (testimoniis, hac auctoritate senatus, Italiae, tanto studio bonorum omnium). Thus Halm’s his ego restores the link between the elements of the first pair, bis – 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. 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, 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, “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

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; Rose. 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 incundius, longiora*, provide some justification for the retention of the reading of H.

Another contribution of H in this paragraph is the first *Quirites* (written *quiri*, as usual) instead of *qui r. (rem P) p.* of PGTeV. 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* PGTeV 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* PGTeV. The meaningless *cum* was suspected by Klotz to contain *consule*46), by Halm *causam*, and by Walter *coram*47). 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 sé: ante semper H: om. PGTeV*. Klotz pointed out48) 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 context49). 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 correlative *qua – eadem* are strongly contrasted50), *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 chiastic correspondence of the relevant parts,

---

49) See K.-S. 2,1, 700–701.
sanctissimi homines – erga deos immortalis X erga populum Romanum – me 51).

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

cum careret is H’s variant; P²GTeV read si careret, and P¹ 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. P²GTeV’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 videretur 53). 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 compliment stated expressly.

And finally the last passage to be considered, Red. Quir. 23 odium vel precibus mitigari potest (vel) temporibus rei publicae communiqve utilitate depomi vel difficilium et tenevi 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

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 PGTeV’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 54) 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 syntactic
precedents for Ciceronian prose. In the context of the preced­
ing 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 omis­
sions, 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 55).

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 56), in the
first half of the twelfth century. Intellectually the most active
centers of classical study during the twelfth century renaissance

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 Châtrres and Orléans\(^{57}\)). But Tours, a great monastic establishment since the time of Charlemagne, with its long tradition of famous copyists\(^{58}\) had not suffered eclipse. In the twelfth century it was a center of rhetoric and poetry\(^{59}\), 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\(^{60}\) 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.
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