The correspondence of M. Tullius Cicero

arranged according to its chronological order

Cicero, Marcus Tullius

Dublin, 1906

Addenda to the commentary

ADDENDA TO THE COMMENTARY.

NOTE I.

ON THE CHRONOLOGY OF ATT. IV. 9, 10, 11.

The chronological arrangement of Att. iv. 9, 10, 11 is much disputed. It may be taken for granted that the date on which Cicero received the letter from Atticus, *a. d. quintum Kal.* (26th April) mentioned in 11, 1 is correct, not only because M has *quintum* written in full, but also because *cum is Romam venerit* would point to a time when the consuls had not yet returned to Rome. Now, Pompey was to meet Crassus at Alba on the 27th, and forthwith proceed to Rome (11, 1): so that they would be in Rome on the 28th and 29th. Accordingly the alteration of the above date to *a. d. ii. Kal.* (Manutius)—a very rare variation of *prid. Kal.*—is to be rejected. Wesenberg and Hirschfelder wish to add *<datas>* or *<scriptas>*. But everything conspires to show that 11 was written on the 26th. It would reach Rome about the 28th, when the arrival of the consuls was imminent, and when the Floralia (April 28 to May 3) were just beginning (cp. 11, 2, *quid primus dies, quid secundus*).

So far Körner (pp. 29–31), admirably. But the arrangement of the letters which he proceeds to sketch necessitates alterations in the data which he acknowledges are hard to explain. He supposes that Cicero called on Pompey at Cumae on the 22nd (10 fin.): that Pompey returned the visit on the same day, and went with Cicero to Naples (9, 1). Cicero went on to Pompeii on the 23rd, returned on the 24th, and had another interview with Pompey at Naples. On the same day, or the next, Pompey set out for Alba. It will thus be seen that he supposes 9 was written from Naples on the 23rd. This will necessitate the change of *v* to *viiii* and *iiii* to *viii* in 9, 2—the former a decidedly violent alteration.

Perhaps a simpler view to take would be that 9, 2 is a separate letter, and that 9, 1 was written on April 24. The order of events then will be—

April 21. Pompey arrives at Cumae.
,, 22. Cicero writes 10, and then calls on Pompey.
,, 23. Pompey returns the visit. Both these visits are mentioned in 9, 1.
,, 24. Cicero writes 9, 1.
,, 24 or 25. Pompey leaves for Alba.

April 26. Cicero writes 11 in the morning. As Atticus had, in the letter Cicero received that morning, spoken of excitement at Rome as to what would happen during the next few days, Cicero told him about Pompey's movements. He did not deem it necessary to speak of them, when he was writing 9, 1 before receiving the letters of Atticus.

In the afternoon of the 26, Cicero left Cumae, and passed the night at the house of Paetus in Naples.

,, 27. Cicero writes 9, 2 in the morning before starting for Pompeii. Probably Cicero remained there for some time; for if it was a mere flying visit of inspection, there would be little point in his telling Atticus about it, unless he added some reason why his visit was of such brief duration.

NOTE II.

(A.)

(FAM. VII. 23, 3, EP. 126.)

TRAPEZOPHORUM.

STARTING from the passage in the Digest, 33, 10, 3, pr. (suppellectili legata haec continentur: mensae, trapezophora, delficae, subsellia, &c.), where the furniture of a house is in a way inventoried, we find mention of three kinds of tables—mensae, trapezophora, and delphicae. Now, *mensae* are big dining-tables, and *delphicae* are round tables on three legs: for one example, among many, to prove this, take Procopius de bellis Vandalorum, i. 21, quoted by Marquardt (iv. 311): *ἐν παλατίῳ γὰρ τῷ ἐπὶ Ῥώμης, ἔνθα συνέβαινε στιβάδας τὰς βασιλέως εἶναι, τρίπους ἐκ παλαιοῦ εἱστήκει, ἐφ' οὗ δὴ τὰς κύλικας οἱ βασιλέως οἰνοχόοι ἐτίθεντο. Δέλφικα δὲ τὸν τρίποδα καλοῦσι Ρωμαῖοι, ἐπεὶ πρῶτον ἐν Δελφοῖς γέγονε.* These might require plenty of discussion, but such would be our conclusion.

Turning to *trapezophora*, its derivation is 'table-bearer'; but that it can be also used for a 'table' is plain from Pollux, x. 69: *ἔξεστι δὲ τὴν τράπεζαν ἐφ' ᾗ τὰ ἐκπώματα κατάκειται, τετράπουν τε τράπεζαν εἰπεῖν καὶ μονόπουν καὶ εἴ τις βούλοιτο φιλοτιμεῖσθαι πρὸς τὴν καινότητα τῆς χρήσεως* ('to go in for the elegance of the new style') *τραπεζοφόρον.* And indeed also from the Digest (*l. c.*); for it is quite impossible that Paulus should have omitted such a common article of furniture as the *abacus*, which he has plainly comprehended here under the term *trapezophora*, for in strictness trapezophoron is the support of the abacus. Now, *abacus* in all its meanings (tablet of a pillar, baker's tray, draught-board, calculating-board, wall-panel, or tile in tesselated pavement) signifies a rectangular flat surface, with, perhaps, a rim round it: cf. coronae mensarum in Dig. 34, 2, 19, 14, where the Greek translation gives *τὸ κύκλον τῆς τραπέζας.* In its sense of 'table' abacus was supported sometimes by four legs, sometimes by one (see Pollux, *l. c.*); the legs were usually of

marble or ivory (Juv. 11, 122), but sometimes of bronze (Marquardt, *l. c.*). The fashioning of these legs was a distinct branch of sculpture: cf. Juvenal, 3, 203:

> Urceoli sex
> Ornamentum abaci: vel non et parvulus infra
> Cantharus et recubans sub eodem marmore Chiron.

The Chiron was the *τραπεζοφόρος*. Examples are also found in museums of sphinxes and griffins. The *δελφινὶς τράπεζα* of Lucian, Lexiph. 7, probably had a dolphin for the *τραπεζοφόρον*. The object of the abacus was to expose plate and ornaments (Cic. Verr. iv. 35, and indeed passim: cf. Mayor on Juv., *l. c.*, but he does not distinguish sufficiently sharply between the abacus and the delphica, which, though used for the same purpose, were quite different in shape), and therefore varied according to the size of the room, just like the cabinets for the same purpose nowadays in drawing-rooms. Sidonius, 17, 7, says of them:

> Non tibi gemmatis ponentur prandia mensis,
> Assyrius murex nec tibi sigma dabit,
> Nec per multiplices abaco splendente *cavernas*
> Argenti nigri pondera defodiam.

What these *cavernae* were is disputed. E. Guillaume, in Daremberg and Saglio's "Dictionnaire des Antiquités," Art. Abacus, gives a picture (fig. 7) of one with *shelves*, which he thinks the *cavernae* to have been. "Des vases sont rangés sur deux tablettes; d'autres sont placés au-dessous. Les cavités formées par l'intervalle des tablettes sont peut-être ce qu'un poète . . . a appellé *cavernae*"; but he goes on—"à moins que l'on ne doive entendre par ce mot des casiers fermés, de veritables armoires comme celles qu'on voit sur le devant du meuble représenté plus haut (fig. 5)." This last is the view of Marquardt, iv. 310, note 6, who refers to a picture of such a one, given by Stackelberg, Gräber der Hellenen (ii. 42), which is, no doubt, a regular cupboard, with opaque doors. The difficulty one feels about such a view is that, while no doubt the word used by Sidonius, *defodiam*, points to 'cabinets,' not mere tables with shelves, like our afternoon tea-tables, yet such cabinets would require glass doors, to let the ornaments be seen; and, as far as we can find, there is no proof at all that any had such. That transparent window-glass did exist is, no doubt, certain (cf. Lactantius, De Officio Dei, 8, 11: Et manifestius est mentem esse quae per oculos ea, quae sunt opposita, transpiciat quasi per fenestras perlucente vitro aut speculari lapide obductas); yet most Roman window-glass admitted light, but was not transparent. Transparent glass was very expensive. On the whole, however, we are inclined to think that the abaci of the wealthy may have been cabinets, but in poorer establishments they were open tables, with shelves.

The use of abaci came into vogue at Rome after the conquest of Asia by Manlius Vulso, in 187 b.c. (Liv. xxxix. 6, 7). But before this the Romans must have seen them among the Etruscans—of whose abaci, of the fourth century b. c., we have some remains (Guillaume, *l. c.*)—and the Sicilian Greeks.

(B.)

(FAM. VII. 23, 3, EP. 126.)

EXHEDRIUM.

Exhedra, -ae.—Such is the usual form of the word; the diminutive, *exhedrium* (or *exedrium*) is found here and in C. I. G. 2554, 123 τὸ ἐξέδριον τὸ κατανοτιαῖον. The earliest place apparently where the word occurs is Eur. Orest. 1449; but the more usual classical Greek term for the building was παστάς: cf. Pollux, vii. 27 παστάδας δ' ὁ Ξενοφῶν ἃς οἱ νῦν (180 a.d.) ἐξέδρας.

As its derivation seems to show, it was a *sitting-place.* We generally find the occupants sitting (Cic. N. D. i, 15); seldom reclining (De Orat. iii. 17, lectulo posito, points to the proceeding being unusual), built *out from* some main building (Varro, R. R. iii. 5, 8, uses the word for an aviary), chiefly from porticoes. They were generally open buildings, *perflatiles,* as a Low-Latin writer would say; cf. Vitruv. 7, 9 Apertis vero peristyliis aut exhedris aut ceteris eiusmodi iocis quo Sol et Luna possit splendores suos immittere. They were often attached to baths, and their semicircular nature may be seen in any ground-plan of Caracalla's baths: see, e.g., Dict. Antiqq. 1[3], p. 281; also to theatres (corresponding to, only perhaps larger than, the splendid foyers in the Parisian and modern London theatres), e.g. that in the theatre of Pompey, where Caesar was murdered, τῆς δὲ βουλῆς εἰς τὴν ἐξέδραν προεισελθούσης, &c., Plutarch, Brut. 17.

Their main use was for conversation, disputation, and the delivery of lectures. They corresponded entirely to our lecture-rooms in Universities and in large cities, *e.g.* Strabo, xvii. 8 τῶν δὲ βασιλείων (sc. of Alexandria) ἐστὶ καὶ τὸ Μουσεῖον ἔχον περίπατον καὶ ἐξέδραν καὶ οἶκον μέγαν ἐν ᾧ τὸ συσσίτιον τῶν μετεχόντων τοῦ Μουσείου φιλολόγων ἀνδρῶν; also Cod. Theod. 15, 1, 53 Exhedras quae septentrionali videntur adhaerere Porticui [sc. Constantinopoli] in quibus tantum amplitudinis et decoris esse monstratur ut publicis commodis possint capacitatis et pulcritudinis suae admiratione sufficere supradictorum [sc. Professorum seu magistrorum] consessibus deputabit [sc. Sublimitas Tua]. Each professor had a separate exhedra, or lecture-room: see Cod. Theod. 14, 9, 3 ita ut unicuique loca specialiter deputata adsignari faciat Tua Sublimitas: ne discipuli sibi invicem possint obstrepere, vel magistri: neve linguarum confusio permixta vel vocum aures quorundam aut mentes a studio litterarum avertat. They were often, too, used for disputations; cf. Vitruv. 5, 2 Constituuntur in tribus porticibus exhedrae spatiosae, habentes sedes in quibus philosophi Rectores [qu. rhetores] reliqui qui studiis delectantur sedentes disputare possint. St. Augustine delivers a lecture in one (Civ. Dei, 22, 8); and he also mentions one adjoining a church (De Gestis cum Emerito Donatistarum Episcopo sub init.), similar to the capitularia in the Monasteries (see Gothofred on Cod. Theod. 15, 1, 53).

Exhedrae, or public lecture-rooms, were a very common form of public building to erect, e.g. Herod (in Josephus, B. J., 1, 16) Βύβλῳ δὲ τεῖχος καὶ ἐξέδρας τε καὶ στοὰς ἀνέθηκε; and often in inscriptions (e. g., Orelli, 3283, where, again, they are joined with porticus), we find their builders notifying the erection.

They appear, then, to have been essentially public; but examples can be found where the word may mean nothing more than our 'sitting-room,' as opposed to

'room' (cubiculum). For example, in a somewhat long title of the Digest (9, 3), where there are copious enactments as regards the liability of people who throw things out of the windows (De his qui effuderint vel deiecerent), Ulpian (law 5) gives us some knowledge of how people lived in lodgings. The passage is interesting, so it may be quoted: Si vero plures diviso inter se cenaculo [i.e. 'flat,' or 'story'; cp. Plaut. Amph. 863, where Jupiter says he is the fellow in superiore qui habito cenaculo, 'who lives in the top story.' Cenaculum later came to mean of itself 'an *upper* story,' and quite early had lost its sense of dining-room] habitent, actio in eum solum datur, qui inhabitabat eam partem, unde effusum est. Si quis gratuitas habitationes dederit libertis et clientibus vel suis vel uxoris, ipsum eorum nomine teneri Trebatius ait; quod verum est. Idem erit dicendum et si quis amicis suis modica hospitiola distribuerit. Nam et si quis cenaculariam exercens ('letting out houses in tenements, or flats') ipse maximam partem cenaculi (here = 'upper stories,' *τοῦ οἴκου*, in the Gk. translation) habeat solus tenebitur: sed si [quis cenaculariam exercens *del. Mommsen*] modicum sibi hospitium retinuerit, residuum locaverit pluribus, omnes tenebuntur quasi in hoc cenaculo habitantes unde deiectum effusumve est. Interdum tamen, quod sine captione actoris fiat ('if not prejudicial to the plaintiff') oportebit praetorem aequitate motum in eum potius dare actionem, ex *cuius cubiculo vel exhedra* deiectum est licet plures in eodem cenaculo habitent, quod si ex mediano [so F.: medio cenaculo *other mss*; *ἀπὸ τοῦ μέσου*, Gk. trans.: maeniano, Anonym. ap. Dirksen: Qu. medio maeniano, the copyist went on at the wrong *i*] coenaculi quid deiectum sit, verius est omnes teneri. Here 'exhedra' may mean 'sitting-room'; but Marquardt is wrong in saying that in Vitruv. 6, 3, 8, and 6, 7, 8, exhedrae must mean 'sitting-rooms.'

Still, in Cicero's time, these exhedrae, in large houses, were special rooms for learned discussion. Only the eminent had them, as only the eminent have at the present time private chapels and private theatres. As is natural to expect, such rooms were adorned with statues (Plut. *l. c.*) and pictures (Cic. Fam. 7, 23, 3). In our passage, then, we may translate the diminutive exhedria 'private lecture-room.'

NOTE III.

(Q. FR. III. 5 and 6, § 7, EP. 155.)

The following learned note on this passage is by Prof. Robinson Ellis in *Hermathena*, xiii (1887), p. 139 f.:—

"*Quattuor tragoedias xvi. diebus absoluisse cum scribas, tu quidquam ab alio mutuaris? et* †ΠΛΕΟC *quaeris, cum Electram et Trodam scripseris?*

"So *M*. I believe this to be a learned mythological allusion to the *varying number of the Pleiades*, which, according as Electra, the least conspicuous member of the group, was visible or not, were reckoned at seven or six alternately. The legend was that Electra, the mother of Dardanus by Jupiter, was so affected by the loss of her son and the destruction of Troy, that she withdrew from the company of her sister Pleiads. Hygin. 192, Schmidt:—*Caeterae sorores* (he has been speaking of the Hyads) *postea luctu consumptae sidera factae sunt, et quia plures erant Pleiades dictae. Nonnulli*

existimant ita nominatas quia inter se coniunctae (quod est πλησίον) adeo autem confertae sunt, ut uix numerentur; nec unquam ullius oculis certum est sex an septem existimentur. Earum nomina haec sunt: Electra, Alcyone, Celaeno, Merope, Sterope, Taygeta, et Maia. Ex quibus Electram negant apparere propter Dardanum amissum Troiamque sibi abreptam.

"Cic. Aratea 27 sqq.

"At propter laeuum genus omni ex parte locatas
Paruas Vergilias tenui cum luce uidebis.
Hae septem uulgo perhibentur more uetusto
Stellae, cernuntur uero sex undique paruae.
At non interiise putari conuenit unam,
Sed frustra temere a uulgo ratione sine ulla
Septem dicier, ut ueteres statuere poetae,
Aeterno cunctas sane qui nomine signant,
Alcyone Meropeque, Celaeno Taygeteque.
Electra Steropeque, simul sanctissima Maia.

"I would therefore write the passage—

"*Et πλείους quaeris cum Electram et Troadam scripseris?* 'And after writing an *Electra* and a *Trojan woman* ask for one Pleiad more?' i.e. are not contented with the number of tragedies you have written, but, after your *Electra* and *Troas* have proved the existence of the last member of the group, still look for the missing Pleiad?

"Quintus Cicero had written an *Electra* and *Troas*, in which he seems to have described two stages of the tragic story of Electra; the latter describing her as a Trojan woman, mourning the downfall of Troy and the extinction of her son Dardanus. 'After thus proving your familiarity with the seventh Pleiad, how can you,' says Cicero, 'talk as if she were out of sight? Yet this is what you do when you complain that the number of your tragedies is still incomplete.'

"I write *Troadam*, as this would be the earlier Latinized form of the Greek accus. *Troada*. Neue Formenl. I., p. 333 (= 497, ed. 3) gives many similar instances: *lampadam, hebdomadam, Palladam, Iliadam, Briseidam, Chryseidam, Amazonam, Syringam, Tritonidam.*"

NOTE IV.

(ATT. IV. 19, § 1, EP. 158.)

Prof. Ellis has also written the following note on this passage with his accustomed learning in *Hermathena* (xiii, 1887, p. 136 ff.):—

"*Sed, nisi fallor, citius te quam scribis uidebo. Credo enim te putasse tuas mulieres in Apulia esse, quod cum secus erit, quid te Apulia moretur? Nam Vestorio dandi sunt dies et ille Latinus* †TTIKICMOC *ex interuallo regustandus. Quin tu huc aduolas, et inuisis illius nostrae reipublicae †germanae.*"

"There are two words in this vexed passage which are corrupt, TTIKICMOC and *germanae*. Both require emendation: but by some unfortunate accident, a very questionable correction of the former has found universal acceptance; while a most admirable restoration of the latter, dating from the time of Poliziano, has been

generally rejected. I shall begin with this first. I have printed above *germanae*, the reading of *M*; but Bosius, in his note on the passage, quotes two variants: 'Tornaesianus, *germa*; Decurtatus, *gerina*.' Now Pius, cited in Orelli's note, states: 'Legebat Ang. Politianus, ex prisco, ut praetendebat, exemplari γεράνδρυον.' Lambinus accepted this, and both sense and palæography strongly confirm it. Sense: for it explains, what is otherwise obscure, *illius*, 'why don't you come and see the rotten remains of our old tree of state?'; palæography: for *gerina* and *gerandria* γεράνδρια (for so I would modify Poliziano's correction) are sufficiently close to each other to make it probable that the former is the truncated remnant of the latter. Hesych. τὰ παλαιὰ δένδρα γεράνδρυα. That the word was used metaphorically is shown in Dindorf's Stephanus, *s. v.* He cites Aristaen. II. 1 δίδου τοῖς σοῖς ὀπωρώναις τὴν ὥραν τρυγᾶν· μετ' ὀλίγον ἔσται γεράνδρυον. Dindorf also observes that the word is often written in mss with an ι, γεράνδριον. This leads me backwards to the other corrupt word: for which the accepted reading since the beginning of cent. XVI. is ἀττικισμὸς. Such is not the conclusion of a student of palæography. By all ordinary rules, ΤΤΙΚΙCΜΟC should represent εὐτυκισμός or εὐτυχισμός. It seems possible that some lurking allusion to the freedman whom Atticus had recently enfranchised under the new name of T. Caecilius Eutychides (Att. IV. 15, 1) is intended; more probably, Cic. means a reference to a character particularly familiar to Roman play-goers (Rosc. Am. XVI. 47 *cum . . . nemo magis uobis notus futurus sit quam est hic Eutychus*) under the name of Eutychus. Eutychus was one of two brothers, whom the comic writer Caecilius introduced as living an exiled and retired life in the country, while his more favoured brother Chaerestratus was allowed to share his father's society in town (Rosc. Am. XVI. 46). The whole passage, then, may be paraphrased: 'You have no cause to stay in Apulia, as your female relations are not there. You must give up some few days to the society of Vestorius (a *faenerator* at Puteoli), and after a period of absence must taste once more the homely life of the rustic Eutychus in Caecilius' Latin version of the Greek comedy'; for such, I suppose, would be the meaning of *ille Latinus*; the *ille* pointing to an allusion which, as Cic. tells us in the passage above quoted from the *pro Rosc. Amerino*, would be familiar and intelligible to most Romans of the time. Then, after thus advising Atticus to submit to a short period of *rustication*, he turns suddenly, *Quin tu huc aduolas*, 'what am I saying? You must hasten to Rome directly, and see how we are getting on in this rotten old country, with our constitution quite on its last legs.'

"I add, as a contribution to the question between ἀττικισμὸς and εὐτυχισμὸς, the following highly illustrative passages of Alciphron. In II. 4, 4, Glycera writes to the comic poet Menander δῆλος ἦν ὁ βασιλεὺς τἀμὰ πεπυσμένος, ὡς ἔοικε, περὶ σοῦ, καὶ ἄτρεμα δι' ὑπονοιῶν Αἰγυπτίοις θέλων ἀττικισμοῖς σε διατωθάζειν, where the *Aegyptian atticisms* form, no doubt, a very close parallel to *Latinus atticismus*. Again, Alc. II. 4, 1 καὶ γὰρ παρὰ σοὶ ἐδείπνησε πολλάκις καὶ ἐπήνεις αὐτῆς τὸν ἐπιχώριον ἀττικισμόν, where the *native atticism* of a woman born in Attic territory is no doubt intended to contrast with the *hybrid* atticism of the Egyptian king. But these instances do not, to my mind, outweigh the palæographical objection as stated above to this reading."

NOTE V.

ON THE TRANSPOSITION OF LEAVES IN *M* IN Q. FR. II. AND ATT. IV.

There are few departments of Roman history on which the genius of Mommsen has not shed light; and in the case of the Epistles of Cicero, which are of such capital importance as authorities for the last stage of the Republic's career, he has performed a most signal service. He has in a most simple way introduced order and cohesion into the confusion which the manuscripts present in the Second Book of the Epistles to Quintus, and in the Fourth Book of the Epistles to Atticus. In two very masterly articles in Hermes (xxxix. (1904), pp. 383–418, and xl. (1905), pp. 1–49), Sternkopf has most carefully examined the Mommsenian arrangement over again, and satisfactorily established its correctness in all essentials; and it would seem as if the order which has thus been fixed will be no longer questioned.

To take the dislocation in the Epistles to Quintus first. The manuscripts present the following order; and each section, as we shall see, consisted probably of two folia of the archetype:—

1. Epistolam (ii. 1, 1) . . . intellegere. Dixit (ii. 1, 1).
2. [cupiant]* omnes vident (ii. 2, 3) . . . superiores ipsius† (ii. 3, 4).
3. [Dixit] Milo.† Coepit (ii. 1, 1) . . . cupiant (ii. 2, 3).
4. [Latiar erat] exiturus (ii. 4, 2 fin.) . . . iacentem (ii. 5, 2).
5. [ipsius] copiis (ii. 3, 4) . . . Latiar erat (ii. 4, 2).

6 ff. [iacentem] A. d. viii. Id. Apr. . . . end of book.

Such being the order as given in the manuscripts, *if we transpose sections* 2 *and* 3, *and sections* 4 *and* 5, an order will issue in which the sequence of ideas and events becomes explicable and clear. This is Mommsen's simple suggestion; and it

* The words which we have given in square brackets [ ] do not occur at the place where they are so enclosed, but have been added in order to show at a glance the way the several folia are connected with one another. The numbers given above in round brackets ( ) represent the letters according to the numeration now generally adopted, and given in our text. The numbers given in square brackets *in our text* indicate the numeration in Orelli's edition.

† Sternkopf (Hermes, 1904, p. 393 f.) has made the ingenious suggestion that *Milo* really belongs to fol. 2 of the archetype, and was originally *Milonis*. The whole passage in Q. Fr. ii. 1, 1 (93) would then run: *Dixit. Coepit dimittere. Tum Marcellinus*, 'Lupus concluded his speech, and was proceeding to dismiss the meeting when Marcellinus said,' &c.; and the passage in Q. Fr. ii. 3–4 (102) would read thus, *in ea multo superiores ipsius Milonis copiis. Sed magna manus ex Piceno et Gallia exspectatur*, 'For the Quirinalia we are far superior (to Clodius) by Milo's own forces; but a large contingent (of Pompey's followers) is expected from Picenum and Gallia.' For Pompey's influence in Picenum, Sternkopf refers to Vell. Pat. ii. 29, 1.

has met with almost universal acceptance. The various sections are of about the same length: 2 is equal to 55 lines of Orelli's text, 3 to 54, 4 to 54, and 5 to 50. The number of lines in 5 is slightly smaller than that in the other portions; and it is possible, as Sternkopf suggests (p. 409), that a few lines may have been lost before Ἀμφιλαφίαν *autem* (ii. 4, 3, (105)), as *autem* comes in somewhat abruptly.

Very similar is the case with regard to the dislocation at the end of the Fourth Book of the Epp. ad Atticum. The manuscripts give the following order:—

1. Occupationum mearum (iv. 16, 1) . . . non mihi ut (iv. 16, 5).
2. [nunc cociace] quod iam intellegebamus (iv. 17, 3) . . . absolutum Gabinium (iv. 19. 1); that is, iv. 17, 3, iv. 18, and iv. 19, 1.
3. [mihi ut] – detur esse valiturum (iv. 16, 5 fin.) . . . nunc cociace (iv. 17, 3).
4. [Gabinium] dictaturam fruere . . . tuis maneas (iv. fin.).

If we transpose 2 and 3, an order results in which the matters treated of become explicable.

Section 2 above contains about 90 lines of Orelli's text; and section 3 contains about 58. The latter is slightly in excess of the number of lines in the sections of the Epistles to Quintus, but not sufficiently so to preclude the conjecture of Sternkopf that those sections and section 3 here each consisted of *two* folia, each folium containing what was equal to 27 to 28 lines of Orelli's text; and that section 2 here consisted of *three* folia of approximately the same length. This will accord with the tradition that the Epistles to Atticus, Quintus, and Brutus were united in the archetype.