

CICERO, *Ad Familiares* 1, 1, 2

Marcellinum tibi esse iratum scis; is hac regia causa excepta ceteris in rebus se acerrimum tui defensorem fore ostendit.

So the manuscripts. In Rh. Mus. N. F. 105 (1962), pp. 352 ff., Mr. P. T. Eden proposes the following reconstruction: *tibi esse gratum* [so Tyrrell] *scis* [is] *hac regia causa excepta; ceteris* etc. This alters the text at two points, only to produce a sentence which does not yield a satisfactory sense: 'M. is grateful to you, except for this affair of the king.' *Tibi esse gratum*, in this context, can only mean 'is grateful to you' (it cannot mean, as Mr. Eden takes it, 'is favourable to you'); even if it could mean 'is showing his gratitude to you' (= *tibi gratiam referre*), the addition (before *excepta*) of something like *omnibus in rebus* seems essential for the sense. That Cicero expressed himself so badly (particularly in such a carefully composed letter) would be difficult to believe if this were the manuscript reading; as an emendation it is completely unacceptable.

I believe that both *iratum* and *is* are sound, and that the corruption lies elsewhere; for *scis* read *scribis*, and all the difficulties disappear. This emendation was proposed as long ago as 1904 by J. J. Hartman (Mnem. N. S. 32, p. 370); indeed, it may well be several centuries older, since (as Hartman pointed out) it looks as if the scribe of M (Mediceus 49, 9) had tried to alter *scis* to *scribis*, with the result that what now stands in the manuscript is *scrsis* (the relevant page is reproduced by Chatelain, Paléographie des classiques latins, pl. 34). For the confusion between forms of *scribere* and of *scrire* compare Att. 7, 26, 3, *scribenti* and *scribis* corrupted to *scienti* and *scis*; 8, 6, 2, *scribam* corrupted to *sciebam*; 9, 9, 4, *sciebam* corrupted to *scribam*. Sternkopf (Burs. Jahresb. 139 [1908], p. 62), while admitting that Hartman's conjecture is 'an sich nicht übel', objects that nowhere else in this letter is there any suggestion that Cicero is replying to a letter from Lentulus; this is a nugatory objection. With the reading *scribis*, the adversative *is* is entirely appropriate; for a similar use of *is* in adversative asyndeton (equivalent to *sed re vera is*) compare Verr. 5, 162, *civis Romanus . . . se commemoratione civitatis omnia verbera depulsum cruciatumque a corpore deiecturum arbitrabatur: is non modo hoc non perfecit, ut virgarum vim deprecaretur, sed cum imploraret saepius usurparetque nomen civitatis, crux . . . comparabatur*.

I add a note on the unfortunate conjecture *tibicini* (for *tibi*). This is first mentioned by Orelli (1829), who tells us that he found it jotted down by an unknown scholar in the margin of *his copy* of Cratander's edition. By a gross misunderstanding of Orelli's words Tyrrell-Purser ascribed *tibicini* to 'Cratander's margin'; although they corrected this blunder in the list of Corrigenda in vol. 2^a, p. viii, the damage was done, and *tibicini* has continued to be ascribed to Cratander (or to Cratander's margin) by all subsequent editors who mention it. Now Mr. Eden has made confusion worse confounded by ascribing it to 'the margin of Cratander's MS'.