

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY

*MUMPSIMUS - SUMPSIMUS*

The *nomen gentilicium* of P. Clodius Pulcher's lieutenant Sex. Cloelius, traditionally known as Sex. Clodius, crops up twenty-four times in Cicero's speeches and letters, six times in Asconius' commentaries, and nowhere else in ancient literature. In a paper published in 1960 (1), I pointed out that the readings of Cicero's manuscripts establish it as Cloelius, not Clodius. 'Clodius' is the *paradosis* in only one passage out of the twenty-four, *Pis.* 23; for at *Pis.* 8 R. G. M. Nisbet's apparatus has revealed that *cloelium* is read by two Ciceronian manuscripts which sometimes present good readings apart from the rest of the tradition.

Mr. Nisbet's edition came out later in the same year, and he was the first editor to put 'Cloelius' in his text. In 1961 I did likewise in the Oxford Text of *Att.* 9-16. In 1963, reviewing J. Cousin's edition of *pro Caelio*, Mr. Nisbet remarked that the news seemed to be slow in getting around. However, the following British, American, and German scholars have by now explicitly approved this innovation in various books and periodicals: J.P.V.D. Balsdon, H. Bloch, A.E. Douglas, M. Gelzer, E.S. Gruen, H. Kasten, J.O. Lenaghan, A.W. Lintott, D. Stockton, S. Treggiari, T.P. Wiseman. I know of none who have rejected it. In France and elsewhere, on the other hand, 'Clodius' survives, especially in the Budé series, in which four editions of Ciceronian speeches published between 1962 and 1966 have maintained him. Two editors at least did so in awareness of the evidence: J. Cousin in his *pro Sestio* (with a footnote "peut-être faut-il admettre 'Cloelius' avec Shackleton Bailey") and P. Grimal, whose *in Pisonem* contains an attempt to defend the traditional nomen (p. 157 f.). Since at least one reviewer (2) found Mr. Grimal's arguments wholly convincing, and since future editors

(1) « Class. Quart. » N.S. 10, 1960, 41 f.

(2) R. Martin, « Rev. Ét. Lat. » 44, 1966, 445 f.

loath to change their old *mumpsimus* are likely to appeal to his authority, it is worth while to examine these arguments in detail.

He begins with a statement to which I can by no means subscribe, that the identity and even the name of the person mentioned in *Pis.* 8 are uncertain. He continues: "on admet généralement qu'il s'agit d'un certain Sextus Clodius, affranchi de Publius ... Qu'il n'ait pas été de naissance libre expliquerait la phrase de Cicéron (*qui numquam antea praetextatus fuisset*), et cela peut constituer un argument en faveur de l'opinion traditionnelle". Now it has never been generally admitted that Sextus was a freedman of P. Clodius Pulcher. He was supposed to have been a client of the Claudii, probably descended from one of their freedmen. If he was himself a freedman, as Cicero in *Pis.* 23 implies, it is improbable that he was a freedman of P. Clodius, since according to the normal (though admittedly not quite invariable) practice of the time he would have taken the praenomen of his *patronus* — Publius, not Sextus. The point is therefore irrelevant to the matter of his *nomen*. Let us nevertheless ask the question: are we to believe Cicero here? I think not for three reasons. (a) If Sextus was a freedman, generally acknowledged to be such, it would be strange that neither Cicero elsewhere nor Asconius should mention the fact. (b) Cicero always names him by *nomen* and/or *praenomen*, without *cognomen*. He never to my knowledge names contemporary freedmen in this fashion; their *cognomina*, i.e. their former slave-names, are regularly used. (c) As we know from Cicero and Asconius, Sextus was an official *scriba*. Persons holding that position were often of equestrian status, and there is no clear example of its being held by a freedman in the republican period (3); even under the empire examples are rare (4). The supposed case of Cicero's *scriba* M. Tullius, which might be cited in contravention of both (b) and (c), is only another traditional error: see my note on *Att.* 5,4,1 (*Cicero's Letters to Atticus*, 3, p. 194; 7, p. 96). Cloelius' origins were doubtless humble and probably obscure. We can readily suppose that his enemies put around a story that he had been born into slavery, and this, or less than this, would be enough to account for Cicero's casual taunt.

Mr. Grimal then comes to grip with the manuscripts. With reference to my paper he comments that the tradition is in fact far

(3) None of those mentioned by S. Treggiari, *Roman Freedmen during the late Republic*, Oxford 1969, p. 154 is clear.

(4) See E. Kornemann, *RE* 2A, 853 ff.

from easy to interpret; true, the best esteemed manuscripts often present the form Cloelius, but they do not do so in a consistent fashion. I find it hard to understand this statement. Taken as a whole, the manuscript evidence is clear and, as Nisbet says, overwhelming. Grimal gives two examples of the alleged inconsistency of the tradition. First, in *dom.* 48 the paradosis is *cloelium*, whereas in §47 A. Klotz's apparatus cites no variant to *clodius*; second, the manuscripts of Asconius show the same uncertainty if we compare *ad Pis.* p. 7 and *ad Mil.* p. 42. On Asconius see my article. If his manuscripts have been fully and accurately reported, they support 'Clodius' in four places out of the six; but that fact, if fact it be, is of no importance in face of the Ciceronian evidence. As for *dom.* 47, Klotz's apparatus records *clodius* as the manuscript reading. If it were so, there would have been no need for a critical note, since Clodius is in his text. Obviously *clodius* in his apparatus is a slip. The manuscripts in § 47, as in § 48, read *cloelius*, and are so reported not only by Orelli but by Grimal's fellow Budé editor, P. Wuilleumier. Even if Cicero's manuscript tradition, instead of virtual unanimity, had shown a fairly even division or, to go further, even if 'Cloelius' had only substantial minority backing, the truth would still be evident. Where proper names are concerned, the principle of *difficilior lectio* seldom misleads; corruptions are generally from the less familiar to the more familiar name. Copyists were under no temptation to make 'Cloelius' out of 'Clodius'. The temptation was all the other way, especially in view of the association of Sextus with P. Clodius Pulcher. In the only place in Cicero's text where the nomen Cloelius occurs with reference to a person other than Sextus, *Sex. Rosc.* 64, inferior manuscripts corrupt it to 'Clodius', while editors, misguidedly following the manuscripts of Valerius Maximus, make it 'Caelius' (*Sex. Cloelius' nomen* is also occasionally so corrupted). On the other hand, the *nomen* Clodius is very frequent with reference to other persons, and so far as I know is never then corrupted to Cloelius. Under what inspiration would Cicero's scribes habitually perpetrate this extraordinary error when, and only when, Sextus is named?

Mr. Grimal concludes: "Dans ces conditions, il paraît prudent de s'en tenir à la tradition des éditeurs". But that tradition was maintained by editors who had not seen the evidence, and had already twice been deserted by editors who had.

I add three collateral arguments not advanced in my paper: (a) The *nomen* Cloelius provides an explanation for Sextus' nickname Athenio in *Att.* 2,12,2; see "Philol." 108, 1964, p. 109 f. and my note *ad loc.* (b) In a review of Nisbet's edition (5) H. Bloch (who pronounced the case 'conclusively proved') pointed out that the change is needed in *Pis.* 23 in order to make sense. (c) When P. Clodius was recruiting for his gangs in 53 he paid particular attention to the tribe Collina (*Mil.* 25 *Collinam novam dilectu perditissimorum civium conscribebat*). It is surely no coincidence that two inscriptions (*CIL* 6, 24627-8) record one Sextus Cloelius, son of Sextus, as a member of that tribe. This observation is due to Mr. R. J. Rowland.

I recently had the opportunity to inspect the famous *codex Mediceus* of Cicero's *Epistulae ad Familiares* in the Laurentian Library. In the few pages I had time to read two items of special interest caught my attention; both are correctly recorded in Mendelssohn's apparatus of 1893, but not in those of later editors.

The first concerns *Fam.* 8, 8, a letter in which M. Caelius Rufus sends Cicero in Cilicia the text of three senatorial resolutions (*auctoritates*), all vetoed by pro-Caesarian tribunes. The name of one them is given in most manuscripts as C. Caelius, and so taken by editors and others without question. It occurs in no other literary source. The *Mediceus*, however, our prime authority, vacillates between *caelius* and *coelius*, presenting the former in § 6 and the latter in § 8, whereas in § 7 an original *caelius* is corrected by the first hand to *coelius*. The apparatuses of Müller, Purser, Sjögren, Constans, and Moricca either ignore these facts or report them incorrectly. On the principle to which I have already referred, *coelius* is likely to have been the true reading; it would naturally get changed to the familiar *caelius*, especially in a book in which that *nomen* appears in every letter-heading. But there is a further piece of evidence to be taken into account. A statue-base found at Demetrias in Thessaly contains a Greek inscription, published in 1929, to one C. Caelius Rufus, son of Gaius, *legatus pro praetore* and tribune-designate. Scholars have unhesitatingly identified him with the tribune of 51, Sir Ronald Syme suggesting that he was the father of C. Caelius, consul-suffect in 4 B.C., and grandfather to C. Caelius Rufus, consul in 17 A.D. (6). But this identification is by no means secure. For the

(5) « Gnomon » 37, 1965, 569 f.

(6) « Class. Philol. » 56, 1953, 133; cfr. Broughton, *Magistrates*, suppl.

same statue-base has another inscription to C. Julius Caesar, Imperator and God, showing that Caelius' statue was removed and replaced by one of Caesar. This almost certainly happened during the latter's lifetime, probably soon after the battle of Pharsalus: see A.E. Raubitschek's article in "Jour. Rom. Stud." 44, 1954, 66 ff. Raubitschek explains that "the statue of Caelius was removed after Caesar's victory at Pharsalus both because Caelius had been as tribune active against Caesar (Cicero, *Fam.* 8, 8) and in order to make space for a statue of Caesar". The second reason can hardly have been paramount — a new base would not have been hard to make. As for the first, our letter proves just the contrary, that the tribune of 51 was active in Caesar's favour. The man whose statue was treated so unceremoniously was surely a Pompeian. We may suppose either that the tribune of 51 changed his side or that C. Caelius Rufus was a different person. The question of the former's *nomen* therefore remains open (7).

The *Mediceus* also confirms the substance but corrects the wording of a conjecture proposed in "Philol." 105, 1961, 72. The penultimate sentence of *Fam.* 1, 1, a letter to Lentulus Spinther in Cilicia, reads in the vulgate as follows: *nostram fidem omnes amorem tui absentis praesentes tui cognoscent*. Apparatuses after Mendelssohn inform us that manuscripts G and R have *pr(a)esentisve* instead of *praesentes tui*, but not that the *Mediceus* has *absens*, corrected to *absentis* by a much later hand. In ignorance of this fact but from observation of Cicero's usage I proposed *amorem tui absens tu, praesentes tui cognoscent*. That is what Cicero meant; what he wrote, as the *Mediceus* shows, was *amorem tu absens, praesentes tui*. *tui* for *tu* in all the manuscripts is the first stage in the corruption which is found fully developed in G and R.

In the same article (p. 79) I put forward a conjecture in A. Caecina's letter to Cicero (*Fam.* 6, 7), which begins *quod tibi non tam celeriter liber est redditus, ignosce timori nostro et miserere temporis*, and inadvertently repeated it in "Philol." 114, 1970, 91. We cannot explain *non tam celeriter* by assuming an ellipse, as equivalent to 'not so quickly as I promised' or 'not so quickly as you expected'. (Tyrrell-Purser's gloss 'sc. *quam factum est*' is to me unintelligible). I therefore proposed to read *non ita* for *non tam*, in the common

(7) In Cic. *Manil.* 58 the *nomen* of Q. Caelius Latiniensis should be emended to Coelius: see R. Syme, « Jour. Rom. St. » 53, 1963, 55.

sens of *non nimis* — ‘not all that quickly’. But Ter. *Heaut.* 874 supplies an example of *non tam* used in the same way: *ego me non tam astutum neque ita* (v. l. *tam*) *perspicacem esse id scio*; so that the meaning I proposed can be understood without textual change.

To conclude with a few novelties:

Writing to Ap. Claudius Pulcher about the end of 52 Cicero uses the phrase *non invita Minerva*, which leads up to a rather odd remark: *quam quidem ego, si forte de tuis sumpsero, non solum Παλλάδα sed etiam Ἀππιάδα nominabo*. Apparently he was expecting to get a statue or statuette of Athene, whether by gift or purchase, from Appius’ famous art-collection; and he says that he will call her not only Pallas but Appias. ‘Appias’ is clearly an imaginary special (or ‘cult’) epithet, invented by Cicero to make a pleasantry. But what of Παλλάδα? We need a genuine epithet to balance Ἀππιάδα and Pallas does this no better than Phoebus Apollo would balance Apollo Lynceus. A passage in a letter to Cornificius in 43 is suggestive (*Fam.* 12, 25, 1): *Quinquatribus frequenti senatu causam tuam egi non invita Minerva; etenim eo ipso die senatus decrevit ut Minerva nostra, custos urbis, quam turbo deiecerat, restitueretur*. Just as in the letter to Appius, the phrase *non invita Minerva* introduces a reference to a statue of the goddess, the statue in this case being that of Minerva *custos urbis* which Cicero dedicated in the Capitoline temple before retiring into exile in 58 (*dom.* 92, etc.). It has been thought that the statue of which he writes to Appius was the very same, dislodged by P. Clodius and now in the possession of his elder brother. Constans argued forcibly to the contrary (*Correspondence*, p. 178). Still, it is in no way unlikely that the statue did represent Minerva *custos urbis*, i.e. Athene Polias; *custos urbis* being the Roman counterpart of Πολιάς or Πολιοῦχος (cf. Altheim, *RE* 15, 1790 f.). That πολιάδα would readily be corrupted to πάλλαδα is obvious. The corruption would be even more facile in Roman letters. I am inclined to agree with Tyrrell (“Hermath.” 15, 1908-9, 440) that ‘a good case might be made for the theory that in the original archetype all the Greek words were in Roman characters’ (8).

In the year 46 Cicero writes to a certain Trebianus, a republican exile, *tu velim existimes et pluris te amicos habere quam qui in isto casu sint ac fuerint, quantum quidem ego intellegere potuerim, et me*

(8) Since this was written I have observed that παλλαδα in the *Mediceus* is a correction. The original may have been πωαδα.

*concedere eorum nemini.* (Fam. 6, 10, 6). Can he really have intended to say that this obscure individual had more friends than any exile ever had before him? Stylistically too *quam qui ... sint* for *quam ceteros qui ... sint* does not commend itself. Perhaps *plerosque* has been lost between *quam* and *qui*. For *plerique* = 'most people' cf. *Tusc.* 3, 73 *quod aiunt plerosque consolationibus nihil levare*.

Fam. 7, 28 is a letter to M'. Curius, who had left Rome to settle at Patrae. Cicero writes in 46 that he used to think that Curius had acted foolishly, but not any more: *nunc contra et vidisse mihi multum videris cum prope desperatis his rebus te in Graeciam contulisti, et hoc tempore non solum sapiens, qui hinc absis, sed etiam beatus.* *tum* is needed in the first half of the sentence to balance *hoc tempore* in the second. It will have fallen out after *multum*. So exactly in § 3 of the same letter: *sed mehercule et tum rem publicam lugebam ... et hoc tempore ... doleo.*

Fam. 9, 9 is a letter of the year 48 from P. Dolabella to his father-in-law, then with Pompey's army beleaguered by Caesar at Dyrrachium. Dolabella points to the republican disasters in Italy and Spain and to Pompey's present ignominious position, and continues: *quam ob rem quid aut ille sperare possit aut tu animum adverte pro tua prudentia* (§ 2). *aut tu* seems to me out of keeping with the scrupulously courteous and respectful tone of the letter, and the *sens* is unsatisfactory. On the one hand, there was no need to say that Cicero, as a follower of Pompey, had nothing to hope for if Pompey had nothing. On the other hand, Cicero could hope for Caesar's pardon, as Dolabella goes on to assure him, so we have to understand 'or you, if you persist in following Pompey'. Again I suspect that the text is incomplete and that Dolabella wrote *quid aut ille sperare possit aut (nos timere), tu animum adverte*; cf. *Phil.* 13, 38 *quam ob rem vos potius animadvertite quid sit elegantius*.