

final letters of *incidit*, the usage becomes normal. After *id* or other pronoun, *adeo* is often little more than an emphasising particle. *Id* would refer back to *quod ob scelus*.

VIII. 17 § 2: uos inuitos uincere coegero. arrant anum me Catonem.

The last words have been variously emended, always (so far as I have seen) in such a way as to depart considerably from the letters in the MSS. I would add one letter and alter another and propose *narrant anus me Catonem* 'the old ladies babble of me as a very Cato.' The flippancy of the remark suits well the character of the writer, and an assertion that he is regarded as a second Cato suits well the context. I was led to this suggestion by a passage in *Att.* XVI. 1 § 6 where the scapegrace young Quintus Cicero announces himself to his uncle as a reformed character and 'pollicetur se Catonem,' 'undertakes to be a very Cato.' In XV. 29 § 2 the uncle appears to compare the youth to Favonius, 'Cato's ape,' but the words are obscure. Cato figures as a standard of uprightness in XVI. 7 § 4: ergo id erat meum factum quod Catoni probare non possem? flagiti scilicet plenum et dedecoris: utinam a primo ita tibi esset uisum! tu mihi, sicut esse soles, fuisses Cato.

XIII. 69 § 1: haec ad te eo pluribus scripsi ut intellegeres me non uulgare nec ambitiose, sed ut pro homine intimo ac mihi pernecessario scribere.

The corrections of this passage aim at getting rid of *uulgare*, by reading *uolgari more* or the like, but leave *ambitiose scribere* untouched. The phrase is really meaningless. How can *ambitiose scribere* apply to a letter of introduction? I would read, by the slightest of changes, *uolgari nec ambitioso*. These words form a contrast with *intimo ac pernecessario*. The idiom *scribere alicui* with the sense 'to write with reference to some one' is pretty common. To the instances I have quoted in a note on Cic. *Academ.* I. § 8 may be added *Ad Qu. Fratrem* III. 1 § 11; *De Orat.* II. § 341; *Sen. Suas.* II. § 19; *Plin. N.H.* XVIII. § 24; *Avian. Fab.* I. 16; *Ovid. Trist.* II. 245 and 303; *Pont.* III. 351; *Martial* Pref. to I. Similar datives are found

with other verbs which might take a dative of a different kind; so Cic. *Sest.* § 32 ceteris supplicare. The dative *bono* is of the same sort in *Sest.* § 110 cui umquam bene dixit bono? [This is the only passage in Cic. where *bene dicere* occurs]. *Ovid. Trist.* V. 7, 27 nil equidem feci—tu scis hoc ipse—theatris, seems correct though the reading has been disputed; see Mr. Owen's note in his Appendix. For *uolgari* applied to a person cf. *Ad Qu. Fratrem.* II. 11 § 4 Callisthenes uolgare negotium. I do not understand the suggestion of C. F. W. Müller, to read *uolgari*.

XV. 2 § 6: amicos in patris eius atque aui iudicio probatos. The *in* has been generally struck out; but it may be right if Cicero was thinking of some very formal expression of opinion. For parallels to *probari in* see my note on Cic. *Academ.* II. § 75.

XVI. 23 § 1: Antonius de lege quid egerit—liceat modo rusticari. Lehmann in his work on the letters to Atticus, brilliantly proposes 'quod egerit,' an elliptical proverbial phrase 'anything he pleases' (*i.e.* I will put up with) and establishes the idiom by parallels. Mendelssohn commends the conjecture, though he does not print it in his text; it is printed by C. F. W. Müller and by Messrs. Tyrrell and Purser. But the next words, *liceat modo rusticari*, incline me to think that *quid* is an error for *quidlibet*. The sentence seems to have been of the same type as *Phil.* II. § 84 *quidlibet, modo ne nauseet, faciat*; *Acad.* II. § 132 *quem libet, modo aliquem*; *pro Quinct.* § 97; *Tusc.* 4, 45 and 55; *Att.* XVI. 2 § 3; *Ovid. Pont.* I. 1, 44. Cf. also *Mart.* IX. 46 (of a man with a mania for building): *nunc has, nunc illas reficit mutatque fenestras. | Dum tantum aedificet, quidlibet ille facit; oranti nummos ut etc.* So I have no doubt the passage should be punctuated; Friedländer puts a comma at *fenestras*, a full stop at *aedificet*, and a comma again at *facit*. So in *Ad Att.* XV. 20 § 1: *Dolabellae mandata sint quaelibet, mihi aliquid*, the word *mihi* seems to be an error for *modo*, the contractions *m* and *m* having been confused.

J. S. REID.

#### ORATOR = PETITIONER, SUPPLIANT.

THE lexicographers are probably wrong in limiting this meaning of *orator* to Plautus and ecclesiastical Latin (Lewis and Short give it only as Plautine). In *Ter. Hec.* 9,

*Orator ad vos venio ornatu prologi*, modern editors have followed Donatus in taking *orator* = ambassador; but the idea of petition is clearly predominant, as is shown by the

following *Sinite exorator sim.* Cf. *Prolog. Amph.* 34, *Nam iusta ab iustis iustus sum orator datus, and passim*, where again the *Prologus* (Mercury) has a request to make of the audience. In the only other instance of the use of the word by Terence, *Heaut.* 11, *Oratorem esse voluit me, non prologum*, the same signification is probable; cf. 26 *infra*, *qua re omnis vos oratos volo*. The close connection in this passage with *actorem* (12) and *orationem* (15) makes it possible to understand *orator* here in a slightly different sense—not ‘ambassador,’ however, but ‘advocate.’

Festus thus understood *Hec.* 9 and Afranius 92, and explained the use as *pro deprecatoribus*; cf. with this explanation *Cic. Imp. Pomp.* 12, 35, *legatos deprecatoresque misissent*. Even in the use of the word of an embassy, it is to be noted that it is used not so much with reference to the spokesman or the fact that the message is oral, as because the ambassador is a petitioner. This is no less true that his petition is in behalf of another. Accordingly, we find regularly

mention of the thing for which he is to treat. Cf. *Enn. Ann.* 211, *orator sine pace redit*; *Liv.* 1, 15, 5, *Veientes pacem petitum oratores Romam mittunt*; *Verg. Aen.* 11, 100, *Iamque oratores aderant...veniamque rogantes*; *Plaut. Poen.* 357, the command *exora* and the retort *sed vide sis, ne tu oratorem hunc pugnis pectas postea*; *Stich.* 494-5, *Haut aequomst te inter oratores accipi*, of the ambassadors, and the retort *Equidem hercle orator sum, sed procedit parum*, of the parasite begging for a dinner.

An overwhelming number of like passages might be cited to prove that *orator* was commonly used of the ambassador as petitioner or intercessor, even in the face of the testimony of *Servius* (*Verg. Aen.* 11, 100), of *Festus* (p. 198 Müll., *Orare antiquos dixisse pro agere testimonio est, quod oratores dicti et causarum actores et qui reipublicae mandatas causas agebant*), and even of *Varro* (*L.L.* 6, 13, *quia verba facti apud eum ad quem legatur*).

J. C. KIRTLAND, JUNR.

Hobart College, Geneva, N. Y.

#### NOTE ON TER. AD. 223-4.

THE MS. reading *quasi iam usquam tibi sint viginti minae, Dum huic obsequare* has been generally suspected and variously amended. The majority of editors, accepting the explanation of *Donatus* (*Quasi numero in aliquo ducas et in aliqua aestimatione constituas: et non, si velis, penitus contemnas viginti minas, dum modo huic obsequaris*), have seen in the supposed abnormal use of *usquam* the only objection to this understanding of the passage. The only parallel that has been cited for this use is found in *Eun.* 293, *Neque virgost usquam neque ego*, but here the local force with which the word is first introduced is the warrant, as it affords the opportunity for the turn. Negative adverbs of place, however, and equivalent adverbial expressions are not uncommon in this signification, e.g. *nullo loco, οὐδαμοῦ*.

There may well be, then, two ways of thinking with regard to the objection urged on the score of usage against the traditional interpretation of this passage, but as to the strength of the position taken by *Dziatzko* against the logical inconsequence of that interpretation there can be no question. *Sannio* is to be made to feel that he is in great danger of suffering a total loss; there

is no longer any thought of reassuring him, and with *age novi tuom animum* the work of intimidating him begins. *quasi...obsequare* is plainly a threat, and another is conveyed by implication in *praeterea...Cyprum*. It is strange that with this definite notion of the meaning to be conveyed and with but the single word *obsequare* not making for that meaning, *Dziatzko* should have been unable to hit upon a satisfactory emendation.

Is not the passage as it stands capable of interpretation as he would have it interpreted? The effect sought for may be obtained as well by making *dum...obsequare* refer to the future as by substituting a word that will represent the actual present state of affairs. In other words, we have a clause denoting time ‘contemporaneous in limit,’ and not a proviso, as we have supposed it on the authority of *Donatus*; and the subjunctive is anticipatory or due to subordination to *sint*.

*Syrus* has taken upon himself the task of persuading *Sannio* that he will do well to accept what the girl cost him, and he accomplishes his purpose by threatening the procurer with the loss even of this, and by letting him see that his intended departure for