

## TUM AND TUNC

An editor of a text is gripped in a vice; he has to plump for some reading which he will print in his text, and his ability to equivocate extends no farther than adding a *fort. recte* to some other reading in his critical apparatus. When the text is in Latin the editor often has to choose between variants *tum* and *tunc*. Whichever he opts for, the world will go on its way without noticing any momentous impact; but I hope to show that this seemingly insignificant matter actually implies some methodological questions of wide import, and that if the editor thinks seriously about it he will learn lessons which he can apply in more momentous circumstances.

I might take any number of starting points, but I shall choose two quotations from A. Perutelli's commentary on Valerius Flaccus VII (Florence 1997): p. 20 "Courtney... sostiene che di fronte alle parole che iniziano con *c-*, *qu-* e *g-* va sempre restituita la forma *tum*, anche quando è tradito *tunc*. Tuttavia a 7.369 e 570 non muta nell'edizione il testo tradito. Su questo punto mi sono già pronunciato altrove (n.4. Nel mio commento al *Moretum*, Pisa 1983, 126) per la conservazione di *tunc* in casi siffatti".

p. 342 on 369: "Courtney, praef. xlix, ritiene che in tutti i casi in cui la tradizione riporta *tunc* davanti a gutturale sia di correggere in *tum* ('*quae omnia in tum corrigenda censeo*'). Di fatto però corregge nel testo solo a 1.402, dove C, distinguendosi dal resto della tradizione, dà *tum*. La scelta dell'editore non sembra coerente, anche perché la sua edizione è inficiata da una pessima considerazione del valore di C...".

Against this let us set the remarks of Housman (ed. Juvenal, praef. xxi note; Perutelli refers to this in the note which I have abbreviated): "The better the manuscripts we possess of any Latin author, the seldomer do we find *tunc* before a guttural; in Virgil the authority for *tum* is overwhelming. And we know that scribes, when a guttural followed, would change *tum* to *tunc*; for in Lucr. 1.130 we find *tunc cum primis* and in Val. Fl. 1.402 *tunc caelata*, where the authors must have written *tum*, because *tunc* is excluded by the sense".

Contrast this pronouncement with those of Perutelli, and you will observe that a new factor has been introduced, namely that *prima facie* evidence, which Perutelli simply accepts as it stands, has been subjected to testing by rational criteria. Lachmann's note on the passage of Lucretius referred to runs thus: "*Tunc ante consonantem contra poetarum antiquiorum usum uterque codex praeter hunc locum bis, in III 710 tunc periit, in VI 250 tunc per; quadratus solus Tunc porro I 426 et Tunc vigilare IV 455... Sed in hoc versu Antonius Marii maiorem linguae Latinae peritiam exhibuit quam Wakefieldus..., scripsit enim ille ideo TUM, quia praecessit cum...*".

From all this three questions arise:

- 1) Do *poetae antiquiores* (in Lachmann's somewhat evasive phrase) place *tunc* before consonants in general and gutturals in particular?
- 2) Is *cum... tunc* correct Latin for "both... and"?
- 3) Can *tunc* be used to mean "in addition, besides" (*OLD* s.v. 8d, quoting instances from Seneca and Apuleius)?

We should start consideration of the first part of question (1) on the basis of the text of Vergil, for which we have manuscripts dating from the ancient world. Vergil uses *tunc* rarely and only before vowels except at *Aen.* 8.566 *tunc tamen*, so read in the capital manuscripts MPR; since each of these on occasion can be found to corrupt *tum* to *tunc*, it does not seem unreasonable to suppose that here they have united in this corruption, and that we should read *tum* with the respectable Carolingian manuscript b, as Ribbeck does. While there are not lacking cases in which scribes have demonstrably altered *tunc* to *tum* (e.g. P at *Aen.* 8.423, remarked by Housman on Lucan 1.490), the tide runs strongly in the opposite direction. This can be illustrated by two observations.

Salanitro, "Sileno" 16, 1990, 313 remarks that in the Vergilian centos preserved in the codex Salmasianus of the 'Latin Anthology' (nos. 7-18 Riese), in every case *tunc* appears in the initial position of the line where Vergil had had *tum*. He does not list 17.2.16, where the Salmasianus offers *dum* in place of Vergil's (*Aen.* 5.866) *tum*; even if it is right to restore *tum*, this does not weaken but in fact strengthens the point, since this cento, the *Medea* of Hosidius Geta, is much earlier (late second century A.D.) than the other dateable centos. He might also have remarked that in the interior of the line the *tum* of *Aen.* 12.444 is altered to *tunc* at 11.122, but *tum* is maintained at 10.6 and 15.28, and even introduced at 16.58 in adaptation of *Aen.* 6.611. Salanitro reaches the conclusion that *tunc* in initial position should be regarded as a scribal error and that *tum* should be restored throughout. My conclusion would be different, namely that the composers have, consciously or unconsciously, adopted the speech habits of their time, in which *tum* had become or was becoming obsolete, as will be shown below.

The second observation relates to Nonius Marcellus. In the part of Lachmann's note which I have not quoted, Lachmann (besides Caesar *BG* 6.32.5, where *tum* is now known to have better authority) notes Nonius' quotation of Cic. *De off.* 1.123 as a prima facie exception to his dictum about *cum... tunc*. There Nonius has *tunc* as opposed to the vastly predominant authority for *tum* in the manuscripts of Cicero. If we now look at Nonius' quotations from Vergil, we find that in 11 cases (on my count) he substitutes *tunc* against the consensus of the primary manuscripts of Vergil (in two of these instances, *Georg.* 1.388 and *Aen.* 11.775, before c); similar instances

can be found in the lemmata and quotations of Servius (e.g. at *Aen.* 6.573, also in *Anth. Lat.* 16.55 with *tunc*).

In the light of this established tendency to replace *tum* with *tunc* we can now, postponing the second part of question (1), turn to question (2). The passage of Lucretius runs thus:

1.127 *quapropter bene cum superis de rebus habenda  
nobis est ratio.....*

130 *..... tunc cum primis ratione sagaci  
unde anima atque animi constet natura uidendum.*

What is at stake here is the difference between *tumc*- and *tuncc*-. The final quotation in Lachmann's note is of Juv. 9.118-20, where in my opinion Housman was right to restore the text thus:

*uiuendum recte, cum propter plurima, tum est his  
[idcirco ut possis linguam contemnere serui]  
praecipue causis, ut linguas mancipiorum / contemnas.*

For discussion of the complex problems of this passage I must refer to my commentary (London 1980); here I will just remark that R.G.M. Nisbet, *Collected Papers on Latin Literature* (Oxford 1995) 287 = "ICS" 14, 1989, 298 calls *tum est his* a "questionable elision". This it would be if it were an elision, but it is not; it is an aphaeresis, in which what is discounted is not *t(um)* but *(e)st*, and aphaeresis is permitted by Roman poets where elision is not (see e.g. our note in the Teubner text of Ovid's *Fasti* on 4.456). In sum, the basis for believing in *cum... tunc* "both... and" is wholly inadequate.

The passage of Valerius Flaccus referred to by Housman raises both question (3) and the second part of question (1); it runs thus:

*tunc (VSL; tum C) caelata metus alios gerit arma Eribotes,*

where the first word must mean "next, moreover". To deal with question (3) first, there is reasonable, though not abundant, evidence for *tunc* used in enumerations after *primum* etc., and in fact there is an instance of this in the palimpsest of Cicero, *De Rep.* 2.15-16, altered by editors to *tum*. *Tunc* on its own, meaning "in addition, besides", I cannot exemplify from any antique manuscript; I cannot deny the usage, but think that we should reserve judgment on it. I should like to repeat from my note on Juvenal l.c. a warning against the indiscriminate and uncritical collections of J. Svennung, *Untersuchungen zu Palladius* (Uppsala 1935) 413 sqq., a warning made more necessary by the undeserved compliment paid by Clausen on Persius 1.9; I shall point out the fallibility of this work in some cases. He adduces the testimony of grammarians who make the distinction '*tunc*' *temporis adverbium est*, '*tum*' *ordinis*; what they mean becomes clear from Servius on *Aen.* 5.513: *TVM. deinde. et est adverbium ordinis: nam 'tunc' temporis est; i.e. tum is alleged to mean "then" in the sense "next", tunc in the sense "at that time"*.

As for *tunc* before gutturals, Svennung 408-10 provides a list of occurrences which is over-optimistic in detail; for instance, Cassius Hemina fr. 44 comes from Nonius, whose unreliability in this matter has already been documented. Out of his instances only Plaut. *Persa* 730 comes from an antique manuscript, and even without deductions his list is meagre indeed. The avoidance of *tunc* in this position can be confirmed, as I pointed out in my *Musa Lapidaria* (Atlanta 1995) in my note on my 199A.A35, from inscriptions. The concordances now available for *CLE* show that in pre-Christian verse inscriptions there are only two cases of *tunc* in this situation as against six of *tum* (not counting one or two dubious instances); similarly the index to *CIL* VI shows only 10234 (= *ILS* 7213; belonging to A.D. 153).<sup>21</sup> *tunc quaestores* against four cases of *tum*.

It follows that in Valerius Flaccus we have two independent and weighty reasons for suspecting *tunc*, and when, as in Lucretius i.e., what is at stake is the difference between *tumc*- and *tunc*-, and we now know that C, although it is still a thoroughly unreliable source, belonged to the twelfth century (Ehlers in *Ratis omnia vincet*. ed. M. Korn- H.J. Tschiedel, Hildesheim 1991, 29), how can one argue against the adoption of *tum*, which is accepted by G. Libermann in his Budé text?

But now it is time to put the avoidance of *tunc* before gutturals in a wider linguistic context. First, it is well-known that, as languages grow older, unobtrusive words tend to lose their impact and to be replaced by weightier (i.e. longer) or more forceful synonyms, and that this happens particularly in the spoken vernacular; one might instance the replacement of *ut* by *quomodo* and *quemadmodum*, which live on as French “comme” and Italian “come”, whereas *ut* leaves only very faint traces in the Romance languages. On these lines *tum* was driven out by *tunc* (i.e. *tum-ce*, with a demonstrative suffix); Svennung 417 points out that the Vulgate always uses *tunc*, not *tum* (as do the *Peregrinatio Aetherae* and other works; Hofmann-Szantyr, *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik* 520). However, his point that *tum* leaves no Romance descendants is not quite fair since, as he is aware, surviving traces of *tunc* are sparse indeed (see W. Meyer-Lübke, *Romanisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*, ed. 3, Heidelberg 1935 s.v., though oddly he does not mention Rumanian “atonci” = *ad tunc*, for which see Svennung 352; this word is known to me from Hofmann, “PhW” 59, 1939, 1224).

The consequent tendency to replace *tum* by *tunc* can be illustrated from ancient manuscripts in other traditions besides that of Vergil. For example, at Lucan 5.192 the fourth-century Naples fragment reads *tum maestus*, whereas the mass of the medieval manuscripts has *tunc*. At Sen. *Med.* 218 the fifth-century Ambrosian palimpsest and the medieval A-family have *tum meos*, whereas the eleventh-century codex Etruscus has *tunc*; I think it uncritical

here to follow this generally more reliable source, as Zwierlein does (the contrasted *nunc* in 219 makes no more difference than at *Lucr.* 3.710). It is fair to draw attention to *Verg. Georg.* 2.317 *tum claudit P, tunc MR*; from this too we should draw a lesson, that the last thing for which one should look in scribes is consistency.

Secondly, we can document in other forms an aversion to the collision of two gutturals over word-boundary in such words. For the avoidance of *sicque, tuncque, hincque* in Golden Latin see Kühner- Stegmann, *Lateinische Grammatik*, II *Satzlehre* 2.13. In the light of this it is impossible to believe in the transmitted *tuncque* at *Manil.* 3.481 (especially in view of *tumque* at 1.75), though such combinations make their way into Silver Latin. There is also a (less strong) dislike of *ac* before a guttural (*KS* 2.15-16; in *Lucretius*, who avoids this at 2.272 by *similest ut cum* instead of the usual *ac*, only 6.440); years ago my former student Dr Bruce Hedin established for me by electronic means that there are 15 transmitted instances before *c* in *Cicero* (which is no encouragement to introduce another by conjecture at *De fin.* 5.50). This too becomes less pronounced in Silver Latin.

Where does that leave us? As I see it, here:

(a) *cum... tunc* "both... and" is a solecism.

(b) *tunc* before gutturals is not absolutely excluded, particularly in post-Augustan authors, though many instances, which we cannot individually identify, must according to all the odds be corruptions of *tum*. Editors in most cases will have to content themselves with voicing general suspicion of *tunc* but not altering the text; that will explain the 'inconsistency' in my procedure which so perplexes Perutelli. I did feel (see my note on *Val. Fl.* 6.564) that an occurrence of the combination *tum quoque* at 8.26 justified alteration of two occurrences of *tunc quoque*, just as *tum quoque* at *Manil.* 1.346 justifies alteration of *tunc quoque* at 5.611. In earlier writers suspicion must be heavier still. In the Teubner text of *Ovid's Fasti* p. xvi I drew up a summary of the spellings *tum* and *tunc*; of the three examples found unanimously transmitted of *tunc* before *c*, all come after the best manuscript terminates, and one of them is in a couplet deleted (rightly, in our opinion) by Bentley. Given the choice between variants, the prudent editor will prefer *tum*.

(c) *tunc* before other consonants is not in itself objectionable, but each author's usage has to be examined. In *Lucretius* I would agree with Lachmann and Munro against Bailey that two instances cannot be credited against manifold cases of *tum* (when Bailey calls this "arbitrary", what that means is 'I have not felt it necessary to evaluate the facts'). Again I will remark that in *Svennung's* list (408-10) *Accius* 256 comes from two quotations in *Nonius*, one of which in any case offers *dum*. Here too, given a choice, it would seem prudent to prefer *tum*. The best editors generally do this in six such

cases in Horace. At *Epode* 17.17 *tunc mens* is unanimously transmitted, and has no parallel in Horace; I pose the question, without answering it, whether we should read *tum*.

(d) Can *tunc* on its own mean “moreover” in classical writers? Instances quoted are so few that I would certainly follow Housman in altering Manil. 2.213 and (with somewhat less certainty) Pincianus in altering Sen. *Ep.* 115.3, while sparing *tunc* at Apul. *Met.* 6.4.

I began by stating that the point of this article was to be methodological; what lessons have we learned? First, that *prima facie* evidence should not be swallowed without question, but each item needs to be scrutinised carefully and sorted into its proper class. Second, when we have amassed the data which have passed scrutiny, we will not at once rush to our conclusion, but will evaluate the validity of those data against rational criteria both internal and external to them. Finally we will ensure that we are not pushing everything into a straight-jacket, but are making proper allowance for exceptions for which there is motivation; I hope that the results of this particular enquiry, as listed above, show a reasonable degree of leeway. We classical scholars have the paradoxical advantage that our evidence is often lacunose and/or unreliable in some respect. We therefore have the privilege of exercising our brains in weighing up one side of a controversial matter against another and applying judgment in striking a balance of probabilities. Why would we want to abandon this exhilarating intellectual exercise? Let us learn to enjoy living on the edge and to be happy in a sceptical life; after all, would not our politicians pay dearly to have us accept without question everything we are told?

As an appendix to this discussion I shall add another to illustrate a similar methodology on another subject. Perutelli (on 7.186) is at a loss to think why I should adopt the accusative form *Irin* there when the manuscripts have *Irim*; in fact in such cases the Vatican manuscript usually presents *-n*. Undoubtedly the practice of different poets differs in such cases (Housman, *Collected Papers* 823), but metre often gives us the sort of external test which we need. In the case of Valerius, where metre permits a decision about the form of the accusative of Greek proper nouns in *-is* and *-ys*, we find seven instances in which *-in* and *-yn* are required to be scanned short before a following vowel (1.124, 2.739, 3.152, 157, 158 [this one slightly doubtful], 5.15, 6.65). And how often does the metre require *-im* or *-ym*? Never! Now look at Svennung's off-the-point rhetorical question (415): “Dürfen wir also nur solchen sprachlichen Erscheinungen Glauben beimessen, die durch das Metrum gesichert sind?”. Those are the words of a scholar looking a gift-horse in the mouth.

Charlottesville, Virginia (USA)

E. COURTNEY