

SOME PASSAGES OF SALLUST, NEPOS AND TACITUS

SALLUST

Cat. 59.3 centuriones omnis lectos et evocatos, praeterea ex gregariis militibus optimum quemque armatum in primam aciem subducit.

Servius quotes the first five words in the form *omnes evocatos et centuriones*, and most editors convince themselves that the omission of *lectos* should be followed because the manuscript reading presents virtually a contradiction in terms, and, believe it or not, that the word might easily have been added; but Reynolds for one does not venture to follow Servius in the rest of the wording (though Kurfess and others do), and it seems prudent to conclude that Servius is quoting inexactly from memory. However, K. Vretska in his edition (1976), while he too removes *lectos*, raises the possibility (p. 676, n. 1402) of reading *centuriones lectos et omnis evocatos*, and can say nothing against this, which gives a suitable qualification to each constituent of the army, except that it requires transposition of a word. Is that more drastic than deletion of a word? One might of course vary this solution to *centuriones omnis et lectos evocatos*.

In "RFIC" 133, 2005, 309 I suggested *umquam <quisquam>* at 15.2.

Jug. 1.1-2 falso queritur de natura sua genus humanum, quod inbecilla atque aevi brevis forte potius quam virtute regatur. nam contra reputando... invenias magis (que) naturae industriam hominum quam vim aut tempus deesse.

Should this be *naturae hominum industriam*? This seems to bind the argument together much better, with *naturae hominum* taking up *natura sua*, whereas with the manuscript text *naturae* is left bare.

Jug. 11.8 ea modo cum animo habere quibus Hiempsal per dolum caperetur.

Cum animo habere seems to be an unexampled combination. Should it be *trahere* (cf. 93.1 *trahere cum animo suo*, 84.4 *alia huiusce modi animis traherant*; 97.2 *belli atque pacis rationes trahere* is also relevant, though less close)?

31.22 *illis, quantum inopportunitatis habent, parum est inpune male fecisse...*

Editors convince themselves that this means *qua sunt inopportunitate*, but no parallel is quoted. An easy change would be *tantum*; the resulting form of expression would be like Martial 1.109.14-15 *castae tantus inest pudor catellae, / ignorat venerem*. Likewise in the combination *tantum abest ut... ut*, the second *ut* clause can be replaced by an asyndetic paratactic statement (examples in Kühner - Stegmann 2.167-8). This passage of Sallust would be a paratactic way of expressing what hypotactically would be *tantum habent inopportunitatis ut illis parum sit...* The paratactic form enables Sallust to avoid

writing in Ciceronian periodic style and seems suitable to the rabble-rousing speaker reported here. An alternative would be Professor Woodman's suggestion *qu<i t>antum*.

NEPOS, *Life of Atticus*

13.2 *domum habuit... cuius amoenitas non aedificio sed silva constabat; ipsum enim tectum antiquitus constitutum plus salis quam sumptus habebat.*

"had more of good taste than of expense" is the translation given by C. Damon (Bryn Mawr Latin Commentaries, 1993); this hardly seems consistent with the lack of *amoenitas*, and *sal* in such a sense is applied only to people (*OLD* 6a). Hence a number of conjectures, to which I would add *soliditatis* (*s<olidit>atis* or *sol<iditat>is*).

13.4 (Atticus maintained only house-trained workmen), *quod est signum non solum continentiae sed etiam diligentiae. nam et non intemperanter concupiscere quod a plurimis videas <concupisci>, continentis debet duci, et...*

Loss of the word supplied above was due to 'homoearchon'.

TACITUS

Agr. 2.1 legimus, cum Aruleno Rustico Paetus Thrasea, Herennio Senecioni Priscus Helvidius laudati essent, capitale fuisse.

After deploring the need in the present times to make excuses for writing a laudatory biography Tacitus pens the above sentence, in which the first word has aroused much perplexity and many emendations, the best of these being *flevimus* (Baehrens). In 2.3-3.2 he continues using the first person plural to associate himself with all the others forced to submit without protest to the tyranny of Domitian. But why "we read", whether it be present or perfect? To say with Ogilvie-Richmond that Tacitus (plus his wife?) was out of Rome at the time involves supposing that this "we" is different from every other "we" in the passage, not all of whom would have had to consult the *acta diurna* for information rather than their own eyes. I propose to alter to *lugemus*, comparing 46.1 *virtutum tuarum... quas neque lugeri neque plangi fas est*. The construction of this verb with accusative and infinitive has a parallel in Cic. *Cat. 2.2*, and the present tense will mean that the distress was still acute.

Charlottesville, Virginia

E. COURTNEY

ABSTRACT. Textual notes and conjectures in order to improve some passages of Sallust (*Cat.* 59.3; *Jug.* 1.1-2, 11.8, and 31.22), Nepos (*Life of Atticus* 13.2 and 13.4), Tacitus (*Agr.* 2.1).

KEYWORDS. Sallust, Nepos, Tacitus, Latin texts, improvements.