

LETTER TO THE EDITORS

Three considerations induce me to reply to Professor W. S. Watt's review of my book 'Towards a Text of Cicero, *Ad Atticum*' in the *Journal of Roman Studies*, I (1960), 278 f. First, Professor Watt is a scholar of repute. Secondly, his review is misleading to a degree that deserves exposure. Thirdly, there are circumstances unknown to the general public which in my opinion should have precluded its publication.

On this last point I give only the bare facts. Prior to 1958 I was Professor Watt's collaborator in a new Oxford Text of Cicero, *Ad Atticum*. The collaboration was abruptly and acrimoniously terminated by him. Called upon to deal with the resulting situation, the Clarendon Press decided that we should each edit half the work independently (my part, Books IX–XVI, will probably be published before this letter). Professor Watt having refused any further contact even on matters of format, there has been none.

The review mainly consists of a series of dogmatic, laconic, and mostly derogatory pronouncements. I shall not argue differences of opinion, however remarkable, nor dwell on the contrast between Professor Watt's estimate of the book and that of other reviewers up to the time of writing. I confine myself to points where he has demonstrably failed in a reviewer's first duty; first observing that the review deals with less than two-fifths of the book (notes on Books I–VIII)—a procedure which Professor Watt has not thought it necessary to explain. Limitations of space compel me to be brief and selective.

(1) Professor Watt states that my conjectures at I, 16, 10, IV, 1, 7, and IV, 17, 1 'have, unbeknown to the author, been anticipated, either in whole or in the essentials, by Tunstall, Schütz, and O. E. Schmidt respectively'. No references are given, but in the first case at any rate the anticipation turns out on examination to be very far from complete. The passage as read by Tunstall on p. 31 of his (unindexed) *Epistula ad Middleton* is *Salsum!* (Manutius) *sed tamen quid? hoc simile est, inquam* e.q.s. I doubt if this is Latin. My proposal is *falsum, sed tamen—'quid? hoc simile est', inquam* e.q.s. The aposiopesis and the inclusion of *quid?* in the quotation are essential to my repunctuation, and they are not in Tunstall.

(2) I am alleged to have attempted to vindicate Madvig's 'pointless parenthesis' at v, 12, 2. In fact my note recommends not Madvig's parenthesis (though I agree with him that a parenthesis is required) but a conjecture of my own which another reviewer has called 'nahezu sicher'.

(3) 'Nearly twenty notes attempt to defend the paradosis against emendation, or one manuscript reading against another. Some of these attempts are half-hearted and unsuccessful; e.g. VII, 20, 1 *quorum ego spe* and VIII, 16, 1 *municipis vero deum.*' My note on the first passage refutes the defences put up by recent editors, adding that if the paradosis is to be defended at all, which I doubt (hence the charge of half-heartedness), it must be by a different argument. Most of my note on the second passage argues against Sjögren's widely accepted defence of *ad eum*. The rest gives a preference (on the strength of a Terentian parallel) to the variant *deum* over a

conjecture of my own. Only Professor Watt can be sure that 'in both passages something must have fallen out of the text'.

(4) 'In other cases the choice is indifferent; e.g. between *huiusmodi* and *eiusmodi* at I, 16, 8.' Certainly it is in point of Latinity, and that is precisely what my note essays to prove. *huiusmodi* has become the vulgate, somewhat against the balance of the MS. evidence, because editors are not aware of a use of *eiusmodi* which my note, for the first time if I am not mistaken, fully illustrates.

(5) 'Some notes add little or nothing to the sum of knowledge, like the note on *omnino* at III, 17, 1; on VIII, 11 D, 4 *regionibus* and 7 *ut...videretur* all that is necessary was briefly said by Bardt.' The note (more accurately, part of a note) on *omnino*= $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\nu$ corrects a mistake, and in doing so classifies and states the frequency of a usage which, in the *Letters* at any rate, is usually misunderstood and which, so far as I am aware, has nowhere else received adequate treatment. As for Bardt, perhaps Professor Watt does not expect many readers to refer to his source. I presume it is the *Ausgewählte Briefe* (Teubners Schülerausgaben, 1898), a book for which I sought vainly in the Cambridge University Library and the Bodleian. Bardt's note on the first passage runs: 'Wir kürzer: "abgeschnitten"'; on the second: 'Der Cons.-Satz am besten durch einfachen Hauptsatz: "es war, als böte meine Person Gelegenheit, sich populär zu machen."' I will only add that Professor Watt's earlier criticism of my two notes (see my preface) reads, respectively, 'agreed' and 'a convincing and impressive note'.

The review ends by alleging that 'in bibliographical matters there remains much that is amateurish. There are a few misprints, but far more errors due to the author, such as false or inadequate references, misquotations and other errors (some of them mentioned above).' In fact I find four allegations of error. The first, 25,000 for 15,000 on II, 7, 5, is a slip worth pointing out because it lessens, if only slightly, the probability of my emendation. The second, a 'misreporting' of the vulgate in II, 9, 1, is also a slip, but one of no consequence whatsoever. Thirdly, at II, 24, 4, 1, like everyone else, attribute to Lambinus a conjecture which Professor Watt says was first made by Goveanus. I expect he is right, but my book is not an edition and I make no apology for taking bibliographical items of this sort on trust from Sjögren or from Professor Watt himself (see again my preface). Fourthly, I am accused of quoting MS. evidence on I, 16, 8 without adequate conflation of the sources. I do not know what that may mean, unless it is Professor Watt's way of saying that I have here accidentally followed Constans' notation in writing ΣGH instead of Σ (the information conveyed to the reader remains the same). If so, it seems a very odd way. Professor Watt may well have other errors (or things he chooses so to term) up his sleeve, and I shall be glad to hear of them. In the meantime enough has been said to show that unsubstantiated statements in this review are to be received with caution.

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY.

[Since Dr Bailey's book was published as a Transaction of the Cambridge Philological Society, and since we are informed that it is not the practice of the 'Journal of Roman Studies' to publish replies to reviews, the Editors have thought these Proceedings the most appropriate place for Dr Bailey's letter.]