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Introduction

§ 1. — Circumstances of composition and general character of the work.

It is generally agreed that Cicero wrote the Tusculan Disputations\(^1\) sometime between July and August of 45 B.C.\(^2\), even if the date of composition cannot be determined precisely. Most of our evidence for its dating is internal. There are some hints in his letters that he could have been working on it as early as May\(^3\) but at least we know that Cicero was working on it during June 45 B.C. The De Finibus had been completed by the end of this month and its fourth book is mentioned in the Tusc. as having lately been read.\(^4\) Additionally, at Tusc. 1.8 Cicero recalls Brutus' recent departure from the Tusculan villa, which SCHMIDT (Briefwechsel, p. 53) argued occurred on July 20, 45 B.C.,\(^5\) but there can be no certainty to whether the purported date of the dialogue was true to life. In the later Div. 2.3, Cicero states that the three books of the De Natura Deorum were finished (perfectis) after the publication of the Tusc. Cicero had started collecting material for that work on August 5th, and so we can can assume the composition of the Tusc. was taking place sometime between July 20th and August 5th. However, I do not find that these dates can be accurate since it would mean that Cicero had worked at nearly twice the rate at which he composed the De Finibus by writing each book of the Tusc. in three days. Cicero was usually at work on more than one philosophical text at a time and it is likely that during this period he had finished his Consolatio, was largely finished with the Fin., and was also working on both the N. D. and the Tusc., as well as collecting material for his proposed Sen. Indeed, as I discuss below, we do see that these works show a remarkable internal resemblance. The eventual publication of the Tusc. was not until over a year later, on May 23, 44 B.C.\(^6\)

As for the fictional date of the dialogue, Pohlenz has argued that the five days on which these disputations supposedly took place were June 16–20 45 B.C., shortly after the departure of Brutus (nuper discessum) while Cicero was in the company of several friends.\(^7\) Because of its close connection with Cicero’s Consolatio, I favour the earlier dating, at least for the first book. Schmidt, however, placed the dramatic date later, sometime between July 15–20. More recently, scholars have argued that the dates of the letters which Schmidt used to arrive at his own dating were incorrect; the letters which spoke of Brutus' departure were not in written in July but in August.\(^8\) Because of these discrepancies, there still remain some serious difficulties in matching the dates

---

\(^1\) The title comes from Cicero himself who refers to the work in Div. 2.3 cited below; for the commonly appendend subtitle de contemnenda morte, cf. Att. 15.4.2, and my n. on 1, 1.

\(^2\) MARIONE: Chronological Ciceroniana, p. 215.

\(^3\) ATT. 13.32.2.

\(^4\) TUSC. 4.32, quia legi tuum nuper quartum de Finibus.

\(^5\) Cf. ATT. 13.1.

\(^6\) We read that on May 18, 44 B.C. Cicero expressed his pleasure that Atticus enjoyed the first book ATT. 15.4.2, quod prima disputatio Tusculana te confirmat sane gaudeo. Also ATT. 15.4.2, redeamus ad Tusculanae disputationes.

\(^7\) POHLENZ: Tusculanae disputationes, p. 24.

\(^8\) See TAYLOR (Chronology of Cicero’s Letters, p. 231) and my n. to 4, 8.
mentioned in the Tusc. to those of the calendar. We are left in some doubt when it was written and the actual time of year in which the dialogue was supposed to take place.

It may seem a small point but the dates of Cicero’s fictional dialogues can be significant. For example, Cato had committed suicide in 46 B.C., yet in the dramatic dialogue of Fin. 3.8, Cicero portrays him as alive and well. He is busy reading Stoic philosophy during a holiday while the public games are being held in Rome, and has gone to the country for relaxation (ludis comissis ex urbe). These games were the ludi victoriae Caesaris first held in 45 B.C. and such a coincidence invests the text with deep political significance when we hear Cato begin his discussion of the highest Stoic good. But in the Tusc., we are unable to set down firmly the time of year in which it occurs. This obscurity of time was appealing to Gildenhard. He observed that many of Cicero’s dialogues take place during a public holiday, but the Tusc. by contrast could take place at any time in the summer or autumn. This fact, he claims, implies that Cicero had plenty of free time to hold these conversations now that he had been removed from his duties of public business by Caesar’s reign. So he argued that Pohlenz’s earlier dating to June 45 B.C. is void of any political significance, whereas the departure of Brutus in July 45 B.C. was to meet Caesar returning victorious from Spain.

Gildenhard’s position seems attractive but I do not think that we can really attribute our inability to determine the date of the Tusc. accurately to Cicero’s deliberate design. Scholarly work on the Tusc. has, in my opinion, placed far too much emphasis on the broader ‘political’ context in which it was written. After Caesar’s African victory, and his subsequent victory in Spain, Cicero’s political position remained relatively unchanged though his attitude towards it did not. In 46 B.C., the year previous to the writing of the Tusc., we read in Cicero’s correspondence that he is holding ‘school’ with some of his younger contemporaries, and his description of these seem to be the model which created the dramatic setting for our dialogue. During this time, he was instructing many of this younger contemporaries in the art of speaking, and yet many of these men were firmly in the Caesarian camp, including his son-in-law Dolabella. Though Cicero had ‘lost his own public kingdom’ he found an outlet for his energies and talent for oratory in these schools. Cicero was surrounded by Caesar’s men and yet he was able to speak his mind even then quite freely, and though often warned that this looseness of his speech might land him in trouble with the dictator, he said that he had no need to worry since he was quite safely in the hands of a number of men close to Caesar. I do not doubt that the political situation had been bitter in many ways to Cicero, and all the more so because he had lost many friends in the wars. But at this time he did seem to enjoy his new activities.

His new position and all this activity was driven away in the following year by the death of his daughter Tullia. In April of 45 B.C., only one month before Cicero wrote his Consolatio whose material formed so much of the foundation of the Tusc. we read Servius’ gentle chastisement during Cicero’s deepest period of mourning, noli committere, ut quisquam te putet non tam filiam quam rei publicae tempora et aliorum victoriam lugere. How else can we understand this phrase except that Cicero had placed politics far beneath his own personal grief? The degree to which Cicero had been affected by the loss of this daughter offended the sensibilities of numerous Romans who were beginning to question the reason for his absence from Rome. Cicero even replied to Servius that although he was pained at the loss of his public activities, he had thoroughly started to heal — but then came the loss of his daughter and now all those old wounds were opening up again. He withdrew wholly from politics. He received warnings from Atticus that people were beginning to speak about his noticable and lengthy retirement to his villa. Cicero felt obliged to respond to this. Not a month later we find Cicero asking Atticus for the books of Dicaearchus’ Κορινθιακοὶ and the Λεσβιακοὶ λόγοι, both of which influenced his Consolatio and the Tusc. In response to Tullia’s death, he wrote the Consolatio mostly for himself and this return to philosophy was to help assuage his grief. The activity of writing did much to distract him, but as
Cicero admits, it did not relieve him of his anguish. Curiously, even though the writing was for his personal benefit, we find that one of the main discussions in the Consolatio was a defence of his time spent in writing his self-consolatory material. This defence had political form. Cicero justified his emotional grief at the loss of a child (and a daughter no less) to a Roman audience by arguing that he was unique in Roman history: all others had the Republic to retreat to and by which they could console themselves; he had none. Understood in this light, the tone of the preface is not nearly so politically charged as it would seem if read independently from the main body of text. Although there are many scholars who take his statements about politics in the preface of the Tusc. to explain the main body of the work, it should be quite clearly the other way around. As I understand it, the preface is couched in political terms — the only ones in which Cicero could defend himself and his private grief to a Roman audience for the time he spent away from politics. All other reasons would be unseemly for a consularis.

We may recall as well that Cicero had recourse to a volume of prefaces. These were often pre-composed or could be reworked and then attached to beginning of each dialogue. If we examine them, many of these prefaces resemble each other or treat of the same topics. But this is not to say that they are not important to the work in question. I think Douglas argued correctly that not everything Cicero says in his prefaces can be taken at face-value and in my opinion the preface to the Tusc. has been one of those prefaces often misconstrued. Its opening line, cum defensionum laboribus senatoriisque muneribus aut omnino aut magna ex parte essem aliquando liberatus, has frequently been interpreted as a bitterly ironic statement towards Caesar and as expressing Cicero’s own dissatisfaction with his position. But his personal grief ultimately outweighed his concern for politics. When, at the time of writing the Tusc., he was sorely in need of the Republic and his public dignity as a means of comforting himself for his loss. If Cicero attacked Caesar over the destruction of the Republic, he appears to have done so not over political principle, but for the fact that Caesar had taken from him the only refuge he had after Tullia’s death. But he could not publically avouch, that Servius implied, that he valued his own daughter over the Republic. As a result, he needed to justify somehow his extended grief and his absence from the public eye: this was easiest to do and most readily intelligible to the Roman aristocracy when he explained in the terms of politics.

We can readily see that the preface seems distinctly separate from the main body of the work. It offers only a paltry dramatic setting and does not contain any of the real liveliness we see in the Fin. which preceded or in the N. D. which followed this work. Despite protests by Gildenhard that this preface forms an integral part of the work, we can see that it has a far too general character to warrant this interpretation. It is written in the same vein and upon the same themes as many of Cicero’s prefaces. There is no compelling internal evidence to show that this preface had to be attached to the Tusc. and nowhere in the preface does Cicero even

---

16 Att. 12.14.3.
17White: The Content of the Form, 224, n. 7.
18Cic. Consol. fr. 3 (= Lact. Inst. 3.28.9–10), domo pulsus patria caruerit; tum autem cum amiserit carissimam filiam, uictum se a fortuna turpiter confitetur: “cedo — inquit — en, manum tollo.” Gildenhard (Paideia Romana, p. 69) wrongly believes that the Consolatio was only for Cicero; but the fragments show it was conscious of its wider readership and its political reception.
19Most recently Gildenhard (ibid., p. 64), and see bibliography.
20Schofield (CR, 59), Att. 16.6.4.
21Douglas (Form and Content in the Tusculan Disputations, p. 197).
22Wilcox (Sympathetic Rivals: Consolation in Cicero’s Letters, p. 252); Zehnacker (Officium consolantis. Le devoir de consolation dans le correspondance de Ciceron, de la bataille de Pharsale à la mort de Tullia.).
23The schema of the Tusc. as presented by Seng (Aufbau und Argumentation, p. 342) wholly disconnects the preface completely from the work and I think he is right to do so. Dillon (The Middle Platonists, p. 97) thinks of it as ‘pasted’ onto the front of an essay on Death, as does Bringmann (Untersuchungen zum späten Cicero, pp. 158–159).
24Though all Cicero’s philosophical works are written in dialogue form, the excited and dramatic styles of Plato seem to have died out. Dialogues written in the Hellenistic and Roman period had fewer dramatic scenes and contained less interchange between speakers; they tended to favor a lengthier and continuous exposition. Cicero himself mentions the two forms of dialogue he followed; the first is of Heraclides, who introduced famous men of older generations, and the second is Aristotelio more who always appeared as a speaker in the dialogue and took up the leading role, although the correct interpretation of this phrase is disputed, cf. Att. 13.19.3–4., Q. Fr. 3.5.1; Fam. 1.9.23; also Wilkins (De Oratore, pp. iii–iv); Douglas (Brutus, p. xvii) and Hirzel: Der Dialog, vol. 1, p. 276.
25Gildenhard (Paideia Romana, p. 90).
26Douglas (Tusculans, p. 89).
hint at the topic of Book 1; there is an abrupt break from the preface into the main body which begins with a simple thesis, is death an evil? Despite this lack of connection, many scholars import Cicero’s later political stance into to this work, most frequently misled by Cicero’s grand rhetoric in the preface of the Div. 2 which was composed after Caesar’s death. We find that the preface of our work contains many closer parallels to the preface of Fin. and Ac. and was either modelled on it, or on another earlier version which the two share. All three are remarkably similar, particularly Tusc. 1.1–5 and Fin. 3.3–7.

§ 2. — The Style of the Tusculans and Paideia Romana.

The dire political situation may have been the reason Cicero withdrew from Rome and occupied himself in writing, but it was not the force behind the topics he chose to write about. We see that none of the works Cicero published between 45B.C. and Caesar’s death were political in nature, though in many of them he treated philosophical topics which were readily applicable to his recent personal experiences. When he began to write, philosophical literature in Latin was certainly lacking, and down until Cicero’s age, there was a distinct suspicion of teaching philosophy in Latin. But throughout his lifetime, Cicero remained a constant supporter of the use of Latin to teach Roman youth every form of culture.

The Tusc. differ significantly enough in style and form from Cicero’s other philosophical writings to justify a special type of interpretation. The ideas are expounded with the grace of an orator, rather than the slow and careful progress of a dialectical philosopher in the style we find in his Ac. and Fin. Cicero’s accustomed scepticism appears to fade into the background when he aims at the conviction that death is not to be mourned, but rather welcomed and enjoyed as a reprieve from the injuries and hardships of life. The arguments presented in the Tusc. are not reconciled, but adeptly manoeuvered to reinforce each other, and these at the hands of a trained and expert lawyer who aims not for an acquittal of the claim that death is an evil, but for an absolute conviction that it is a positive good. There is a unique blending of the three main categories of oratory, the praeceptio, the suasio and the consolatio.28

The dimension of consolation is quite obvious in a dialogue de morte. Cicero presents himself numerous times in the dialogue as a grieving father; and in places, the philosophical topic of the soul is replaced by a lamentatio uitaet.29 I believe that Cicero has worked in material from his Consolatio more broadly than is generally thought and I have indicated this in my notes.30 And this consolation goes hand-in-hand with the rhetoric of education. In many cases, the study with which Cicero busied himself to comfort his own grief could be more widely applied to many who had similarly suffered during the civil war. The suicides of Cato and Scipio, brought to widespread public and political discussion through the publication of Cicero’s Cato and Caesar’s pamphlet Anticatones had opened the way to a wider discussion of the philosophy of death; additionally, Brutus had earlier attacked Cato’s suicide as impious or philosophically unsound and the consolatory philosophy and rhetoric in the Tusc. is aimed at countering these attacks.31

The style of the protreptic is most discernible in the preface. The scene, though set informally, is similar to the situation which Cicero sets out his Am.32 As a young man himself, Cicero went to the house of an older statesman to learn the law and be trained in public life, a form of education which Cicero valued highly and one which he felt had been lost or abandoned in his own time.33 The scholae which constitute the Tusc. must have resembled or been modelled on this familiar Roman style of education. Cicero admits that such things are in the habits of the Greeks, Graecorum more; but I cannot agree with Gildenhard that Cicero therefore, in protest at the political climate, turned himself into a Greek scholasticus.34 Scaevola himself, a great Roman figure, set about to discuss philosophical topics at the prompting of young Roman men at such gatherings; these personal connections were important for the initiation into wisdom, and often

27See my nn. on 4. 8.
28See my nn. on 46.
29See my nn. on 36, 86.
30Passages can be found throughout chapters 9, 12, 22, 26–27, 31, 35, and 46.
31See my nn. 30, 74.
32Am. 2, tum meninti domi in hemicyclo sedentem, ut soletat, cum et ego essum una et pauci admodum familiares.
33cf. 4, 7 n.
34GILDENHARD (Paideia Romana, p. 64).
education was led by an apprenticeship to an individual — a practice that was lost in Cicero's youth. The pedagogic 'vision' of the *Tusc.* is an attempt to restore this individual and personal form of education through its substitution by literature. The older Roman orders had been terribly thinned through the civil wars and there were no teachers left in the model of education Cicero had himself been trained in, so he sets about to fill this gap.

In the *Tusc.*, however, it is not clear who the teacher and the student are. Scholars feel that the second speaker, whom they assume to be a young man, is rather clumsy or 'bumbling fool'. In fact, I find that there is no real indication of the ages of the speakers, or of those who participated in the dialogues over these five days at Cicero's villa.\(^3\)\(^5\) Nevertheless, the tone of the dialogue does appear to be aimed at a younger generation apparent in the broad instruction in all aspects of Roman history and life. The call to learning and study is everywhere in the preface of *Tusc.*, and even though the focus is on the rather esoteric thesis of death and the soul, Cicero casts a wide net to encompass aspects of Roman history, religion and its martial valour. The main body of the text is, however, entirely philosophical and in many ways carefully structured. It may begin in the style of a dialogue, but the framework quickly fades to the background and we are only infrequently reminded that there is a second speaker; and only once that there were more than two people present at this gathering.

Throughout, Cicero's forensic training shines through and at many points in the *Tusc.* we have graceful touches of the *suasio*. An examination of the style and arrangement of the *Tusc.* will show that there is a marked difference from Cicero's previous philosophical works which sets it apart. Douglas has, I think rightly, claimed that this book is a 'dialogue with a difference',\(^3\)\(^8\). By this he means that unlike Cicero's other dialogues in which each speaker is given a role to play or a position to represent, the main 'speaker' in *Tusc.* noticeably lacks any defining characteristic. The arguments are only superficially arranged in dialogue form; the bulk of the work takes on a form of exposition and conversation only really occurs at natural breaks and is used as a literary device to change topics. The lengthier passages of exposition often seemed to be closer to Cicero's speeches than his other philosophical works. But Douglas argued that to classify this dialogue as 'forensic' dialogue was unjustified particularly since the presence of forensic vocabulary, which heavily pervades Cicero's other writings, is found among his earlier philosophical works and is in no way unique to the *Tusc*. Further, he suggests that the poetic element of the language and the habit of frequent quotation places the dialogue squarely outside the courtroom. But this only shows that *Tusc.* contain elements which Cicero would not have included in his more formal speeches before the austere Roman judges; it does not necessarily mean that the style of writing does not reflect Cicero's talents as an advocate. Cicero himself calls his first book of the *Tusc.* both a *declamatio* and an *oratio*.\(^3\)\(^7\) This is an accurate description since the majority of the work is shaped as a continuous speech. There are numerous indications in the language that Cicero approached the *Tusc.* as a case to be made for a jury rather than to provide one as a philosophical debate. He writes at *Tusc.* 1.7, *ut enim anteia declamitabam causas, sic haec mihi nunc senilis est declamatio*: a style he is used to (that is, in the style of the court or forum). There is even a stronger evidence for this at *Tusc.* 1.11, *quia disertus esse possem, si contra ista dicerem. quis enim non in eius modi causa?* Here he employs the technical terminology of pleading at the bar. These are more than just passing comments. They are self-referential: Cicero knew that even in his philosophical works there was an advocate making the case. Gildenhard felt that the *declamatio* does not square well with the philosophical material and that the rhetorical exercises were idle time wasted.\(^3\)\(^8\) But is this not exactly what Cicero is aiming for in his own form of education? Is this not exactly what he did in his own youth?\(^2\)\(^9\) This style of philosophical argument would not itself be employed in the courtroom, but Cicero admits that philosophy for him took the place of forensic oratory, public harangues and politics.\(^4\)\(^0\) It should not therefore be surprising if we find

---

\(^3\)\(^5\) There is perhaps a hint at 4.7 Aristotles dicere docere etiam coepit adulescentes; but this passage expressed the fact that Aristotle was joining rhetoric to philosophy rather than that he was teaching young men. At any rate, the term *adulescens* can mean any male up to the age of 40. One of the men whom Cicero had as his students, Hirtius, was at this time was aged 45.

\(^3\)\(^8\) DOUGLAS: Tusculans, p. 16.

\(^3\)\(^7\) Tusc. §§ 5. 7. 16. 60. 73. 108. and 112.

\(^3\)\(^8\) GILDENHARD (Paideia Romana, p. 16), but cf. DOUGLAS (Form and Content in the Tuscan Disputations, p. 198).

\(^4\)\(^0\) See my nn. 4. 7 senilis declamatio.

\(^4\)\(^6\) N. D. 1.6
traces or tinges of these practical duties which captured so much of Cicero’s effort. Nor do I think that the presence of poetic or literary tropes in the *Tusc.* give us sufficient cause to claim that they cannot be in the forensic style. It may be helpful to recall that Cicero’s courtroom speeches, as we have them now, were revised into a more literary style; some, like *Phil.* 2, although written in the forensic style, were never spoken. It would be interesting to find out how much of the defence of poetry found in *Arch.* would have been delivered in the courtroom, how much of it appended afterwards. For just as Cicero’s forensic speeches were imbued with a literary turn, so too may his philosophical arguments be coloured with a forensic style; and just as in a courtroom with a defendant on trial, Cicero wants the outcome of this trial to be judged by the facts. The language in his closing remarks is strikingly similar to the peroration of a barrister, their presence in the *Tusc.* could encourage it to be viewed as a forensic speech.

There was certainly a standing battle between philosophy and rhetoric contending over who had the proper right to argue on general topics. In the *Tusc.*, Cicero claims explicitly that philosophy is the greater and wider science (*arte*), and that oratory stands second. Aristotelian, Cicero says, impelled by the renown of Isocrates, began to join philosophy with eloquence, and to teach his students to speak well. The Isocratean school, and the Greek schools similar to it, would have had sessions to practise the art of declamation, the dominant form being *controversia* of legal matters, a term which could also be applied to prepared discourses by philosophers. The practice of declamation in the style of Isocrates had become very artificial and on this account had often been criticised. Moreover, it was held in very little esteem by Romans, who were generally dismissive of these pedantic and contentious philosophical debates. Nonetheless, in Cicero’s time, the practice of declamation in Rome was still held in high repute, and considered to be a serious pursuit for the improvement of public speaking. If the philosophical dialogues were to be aimed at the public in general, and the elite who rejected technical philosophical style that the presence of poetic or literary tropes in the *Tusc.* give us sufficient cause to claim that they cannot be in the forensic style. It may be helpful to recall that Cicero’s courtroom speeches, as we have them now, were revised into a more literary style; some, like *Phil.* 2, although written in the forensic style, were never spoken. It would be interesting to find out how much of the defence of poetry found in *Arch.* would have been delivered in the courtroom, how much of it appended afterwards. For just as Cicero’s forensic speeches were imbued with a literary turn, so too may his philosophical arguments be coloured with a forensic style; and just as in a courtroom with a defendant on trial, Cicero wants the outcome of this trial to be judged by the facts. The language in his closing remarks is strikingly similar to the peroration of a barrister, their presence in the *Tusc.* could encourage it to be viewed as a forensic speech.

There was certainly a standing battle between philosophy and rhetoric contending over who had the proper right to argue on general topics. In the *Tusc.*, Cicero claims explicitly that philosophy is the greater and wider science (*arte*), and that oratory stands second. Aristotelian, Cicero says, impelled by the renown of Isocrates, began to join philosophy with eloquence, and to teach his students to speak well. The Isocratean school, and the Greek schools similar to it, would have had sessions to practise the art of declamation, the dominant form being *controversia* of legal matters, a term which could also be applied to prepared discourses by philosophers. The practice of declamation in the style of Isocrates had become very artificial and on this account had often been criticised. Moreover, it was held in very little esteem by Romans, who were generally dismissive of these pedantic and contentious philosophical debates. Nonetheless, in Cicero’s time, the practice of declamation in Rome was still held in high repute, and considered to be a serious pursuit for the improvement of public speaking. If the philosophical dialogues were to be aimed at the public in general, and the elite who rejected technical philosophical style eagerly embraced pleading, then it is not surprising that Cicero should couch his philosophy in this style in order to present it in a more palatable form.

Theoretical philosophy is to determine what is, while practical philosophy is to understand what ought to be. The Academic sceptic in Cicero hesitates to assert with firm conviction anything which cannot be proved true, and there are many instances in the *Tusc.* where Cicero admits that the best he can do is to fix a close approximation of the truth (*ueri simile*). He considers many different theoretical positions on the nature of the soul, its composition, and its destination after death. And like a true New Academic, he will not assert that any one of these positions is the final truth. However, his hesitation to affirm any theoretical position does not hinder him from declaring a firm resolution in the foremost practical problem of the *Tusc.*: we need not have any fear of death. In this, Cicero believes that the absolute truth of this position can be proven, and so he approaches the problem rhetorically. A careful mixture of philosophical and forensic style is an elegant approach toward what ultimately amounts to two different problems in the first book of the *Tusc.* Cicero is aiming at certainty on the practical problem as he would approach a legal case: the questions we have regarding the soul cannot be empirically proven. Though the various philosophies contradict and oppose each other, nevertheless Cicero deftly uses them to mutally reinforce the position common to them all: regardless of whether you accept the arguments of Democritus, Epicurus, Plato, Socrates, the Stoics, Aristotes or any other, they all point to the fact that we do not need to have any fear of death. The physical theories that Cicero expounds in this book may be doubted, but the absolute truth of the practical question is firmly held. Cicero handles the question in the same manner as Isocrates. As a lawyer and the defendant of a case, he remains a whole hearted orator and makes the strongest argument he can, very unlike the Academic philosopher who still questions his own arguments.

---

41 See my nn. 48, 116
42 For the Roman perspective, cf. Brut. 48; De Or. 1.52; and Tusc. 2.9, where Cicero separates the practice of rhetoric in the mornings, and philosophy in the afternoons.
43 Cicero first voices this idea in Or. 158
44 Tusc. 1.113, cf. DOUGLAS (Tusculans, pp. 93–94)
45 Sen. Contr. 3.12, Mart. 6.19.
47 Ac. 1.4–6
48 cf. his conclusion at 46, 109 *hanc excutere opinionem radicitus*, ‘fully uprooted the opinion [i.e., the fear of death]’. The *radicitus* is very strong.
§ 3. — Cicero’s Treatment of Philosophy.

Cicero offers a definition of death (quid sit mors) using a method outlined in Fin. 2.3 and Pl. Phdr. 237B, περὶ παντὸς, ὥσπερ, μέλλοντι καὶ δεινοῖς βουλεύσατο εἰδέναι δεὶ περὶ ὃν ἢ ἣ βουλή, ὥσπερ, παντὸς ἀμαρτάνειν ἀνάγεται. The doxography Cicero heavily employs in this work sets out the various opinions of philosophers on the soul in a concise fashion, but not to the same end as in other writers, as Lucr., or Arist. De An., in order to refute them specifically. Cicero rather marshalls such a wide range of arguments to emphasise the agreement between them — that in the end, death cannot be considered an evil: it is either physical dissolution or a blessed immortality. Scholars argue that we need to be cautious when dealing with Cicero’s reports concerning the views of earlier philosophers, for example Fortenbaugh (Cicero as Reporter of Aristotelian Rhetoric, p. 38). At times, it seems Cicero had simply not yet mastered the difficulties of a particular philosophy; or had only a partial account of them to work from, as Donald (Prologue-form in Ancient Historiography, p. 850) suggested; or he has simply erred, perhaps due to the celerity of his compositions. Cicero’s own polemical stance towards a philosophy can misconstrue or blur fine distinctions, but this is not a serious problem in the Tusculan Disputations. The doxography Cicero heavily employs in this work sets out the various opinions of philosophers on the soul in a concise fashion, but not to the same end as in other writers, as Lucr., or Arist. De An., in order to refute them specifically. Cicero rather marshalls such a wide range of arguments to emphasise the agreement between them — that in the end, death cannot be considered an evil: it is either physical dissolution or a blessed immortality. Scholars argue that we need to be cautious when dealing with Cicero’s reports concerning the views of earlier philosophers, for example Fortenbaugh (Cicero as Reporter of Aristotelian Rhetoric, p. 38). At times, it seems Cicero had simply not yet mastered the difficulties of a particular philosophy; or had only a partial account of them to work from, as Donald (Prologue-form in Ancient Historiography, p. 850) suggested; or he has simply erred, perhaps due to the celerity of his compositions. Cicero’s own polemical stance towards a philosophy can misconstrue or blur fine distinctions, but this is not a serious problem in the Tusculan Disputations.

§ 4. — On the Text.

This philosophical work of Cicero’s is one of his most elegant and charming endeavours. It is in this writing that we can see him most wander intellectually and imaginatively. He draws upon his vast storehouse of learning and oratorical experience, and more than in any other work he indulges himself in mythology, history, poetry and tragedy, both Roman and Greek. Cicero introduces medicine, law, physics, ethics and logic; astronomy and astrology, as well as sculpture, and the plastic arts; and he considers religion, politics and literature — all within the compass of the five books united under the title of the Tusculan Disputations.

Despite its attractiveness, this work has received uneven treatment at the hands of scholars, both in terms of philosophical commentary and in textual study. Its first book particularly has largely gone unnoticed over the past century. Perhaps due to the general dismissal of the Tusculan Disputations as a non-technical piece of philosophical writing, the last comprehensive and critical edition in English of all five books of the Tusculan Disputations was given to us by Dougan more than a 105 years ago. Despite all the advances in the fields of Hellenistic philosophy, and particularly in the study of the doxographical tradition, his edition still remains the only scholarly examination of the first book of the Tusculan Disputations in our language. The bulk of Dougan’s notes, however, are aimed at the elucidation of textual difficulties, though he does attempt to go someway towards providing an explanation of the philosophical content of the work. After his edition, King published a translation of the text for the Loeb library but in the main it followed the text as established by Dougan. It was not until nearly sixty years later that Douglas renewed interest in this work by producing a student edition. He followed King’s text quite closely and his notes, while helpful, were cursory; he brought much of his earlier work on Cicero’s Brutus to bear on the Tusculan Disputations, and most capably discussed the oratorical aspects of the Tusculan Disputations. However, his commentary in the main drew upon the thorough but terse remarks of Pohlenz in his Teubner edition, which at the time of Douglas’s

49See Jordan (Ancient Philosophic Prolureptic, pp. 316–318).
writing was nearly 70 years old. It was not until Graver produced a lucid translation and squarely philosophical commentary which was, in part, a response to the growing interest at that time in the philosophical study of emotions and therefore incorporated the growing body of academic literature on Hellenistic philosophy. It was unfortunate that her work only encompassed the central books of the Tusc., 3–4. As a result, the first book of the Tusc. has been for the most part neglected and there has been no scholarly commentary in English on the work for more than a century.

On the other hand, and despite the fact that the text of the Tusc. is widely thought of as being in a good state of repair, it has received a great deal of attention from textual critics over the past fifty years. It will be useful to summarise briefly the results of their detailed work. Dougan consulted and collated over 80 new mss. for his 1905 edition; his primary contribution to the study of the text was the publication of the readings of E found in the British Library. After him and Pohlenz, Folhen produced a critical edition for the Budé series which contained a good deal of useful new material. Folhen, however, followed Pohlenz rather closely and when he did depart from him, his choice of readings were not as judicious as one might wish. A detailed study on the text itself was done by Drexler during the production of his own text; the edition he produced was both readable and cleanly presented. His method was to consult the most authoritative mss. and also many and various editors in order to search out what was best in all of them; but in the end he showed a marked preference for the corrector of V over the archetype X. Lundström responded by producing over a period of twenty years a significant and weighty defence of the better manuscript readings and he warmly supported the archetype. He gave a detailed analysis of it point by point and frequently defended the received readings of the text, accepting only rarely that some were either glosses or errors. Lundström thus was a very conservative critic but his work went a long way to further the understanding of the textual transmission of the Tusc. In contrast to him, Giusta was a considerably more liberal editor, and he found more than one thousand errors in the five books of the Tusc. He frequently disagrees with Lundström and in doing so is liable (at least in my opinion) to the accusation of going to the opposite extreme.

When I began working on what was intended to be a philosophical commentary on the first book of the Tusc., I did not originally foresee that I would need to engage as closely as I have done with the text itself. I began by adopting Giusta’s text; but as I consulted for myself the texts and commentaries of many earlier editors, including Bentley, Davies, Moser, Seyffert, Kühner, Dougan and Pohlenz, I found that I could not accept some of Giusta’s decisions. In several places, I felt the weighty judgement of the older editors in certain readings were not sufficiently appreciated, and in some cases I considered that the ‘science’ of philology had pushed aside good Latinity. I was dissatisfied that Giusta had left cruxes or brackets around faulty text where I thought a good reading was available. He frequently marked up the text with bottom and top tie bars to show where he suspected alternate recensions to have entered the text, but this practice is distracting, and his assumption does not need to be accepted. At times, I think he strayed from good sense and was distracted too frequently by emendation. This happened when his critical eye was focused more on the possible mss. variants than upon the philosophical sense of each argument in the passage. At some places, he has altered the reading of the best mss. which was, in its own right, acceptable and philosophically sound. For instance, his change to igitur quibusdam at 13, 29 would change unjustifiably the drift of Cicero’s reasoning. In other places, I believe he did not adopt a better reading of a previous editor which would have improved the sense; as when he prints possum in place of possom at 25, 60. Nevertheless, in many places, Giusta’s critical judgement led him to offer praiseworthy emendations, for instance at 8, 15 enor; 10, 22 animum

---

56 The mss. are all fairly closely related, and there are many subsequent copies. DOUGLAS (Tusculans, p. 18) noted that the Renaissance editors made an admirable effort in producing a text which contained only few real cruxes.
59 Ibid., p. 65.
62 See Powell (CR, 37, p. 31). Giusta believed that our transmitted text of the first book of the Tus. was a conflation of two different versions produced by Cicero. His only evidence, however, is internal and, as Powell expresses it, no one is likely to believe his claim.
for *uerum*; 13, 30 his defence of the mss. *efficit*; 31, 76 *certe sed*; and 35, 86 *miseris*; in such cases I have accepted his readings.

As a result of a careful study of the philosophical issues raised in the *Tusc.*, I have come to establish my own text. In this endeavour I am heavily indebted to the work of Lundström and Giusta and have learned a good deal from both. My own criticism has been conservative in nature, and I think I have successfully adopted the middle ground between these two scholars. On the whole, I have been inclined to favour the mss. GRKH and Vc (with Giusta), but have on occasions adopted the readings of L (which agrees closely with R) and the older readings of P or M, underestimated by Giusta, which are able (I think) to offer more than just textual conjectures. I have tried to create an *apparatus* that is less cumbersome than Dougan’s and Giusta’s; it is therefore less exhaustive, but I believe complete and takes into account nearly 40 editions and commentaries. I have given explanatory notes on my choice of readings throughout where I have adopted the reading of previous commentators.

Of commentaries in English, Dougan’s was the first. His notes are generally useful and instructive, both for their criticism and explanation; they also contain some valuable notes by Reid. Douglas’s later edition was an excellent student edition, but somewhat too general for my purpose. He has much to say on language and style, but the aim of his work did not allow for a more nuanced treatment of the philosophical aspect of the *Tusc.* I have also consulted several early American editions, among which were Nutting (1909); however, I found that they mostly borrow from their European counterparts. In German, the edition of Tischer-Sorof (1879) had only a minimal commentary and little detail; most of it I found to be only a compendium of Seyffert’s notes. Pohlenz (1918) had much to say on the Stoic aspects of the work, but offered little in the way of historical, religious or legal interest. Previous to these works, numerous commentaries were published in Latin. I found Verbergius (1724) provided some readings by Beroldus which were not in Giusta. Moser (1836) incorporated a great deal of work from Davies and Manutius and preserved a great deal of learning from some of the earliest editors, Bouhier and Camerarius. Kühner’s edition (1874) was perhaps the most thorough commentary of the *Tusc.* to date, and the one to which Dougan owed the most. His notes are exceedingly clear, but too often focused on the finer points of Cicero’s Latinity to the exclusion of all else. My own commentary owes a great deal to these editions since I have been able to draw upon a store accumulated by such a long succession of scholars. I have been forced by the limits of space to be more concise than I would have liked, and I have not always found it easy to strike a proper balance between comments on textual readings, language, philosophical interpretation and content; but such is the nature of a commentary that aims to be comprehensive.

On points of orthography, I agree with the principles as laid out by Reid in his edition of the *Academica*, and approved and followed by Sandy in his edition of the *Orator*. In general, I keep the ordinary superlative termination *-inus*, not *-umus* as Giusta, except in 15, 32 where Ennius’ form would have been *maxima*. I have regularly kept *a* after *u* in *uolgo*, *uolt*; I have also accepted the less confusing and more authentic forms *eis* and *eisdem* instead of the forms in *is*, *isdem* as Giusta and Pohlenz. I have also preferred the consonantal character *u* which is normal script in the mss.
Greek authors and works are referred to by the abbreviations used in Liddell/Scott/Jones (Greek–English Lexicon) or, if not represented in the L.S.J, in Lampe (A Patristic Greek Lexicon); e.g., E. Hipp. 453, Pl. Rep. 544b4–546c2. Latin authors and works are referred to by author and work as abbreviated in Lewis/Short (A Latin Dictionary), or, if not represented in L.&S., in the Thesaurus Linguae Latinae (TLL), e.g., Verg. Aen. 2.21, Var. R. R. 3.17.5; works by Cicero are referred to by name only, e.g., N. D. 1.14. References to secondary literature have the authors’ names in small caps and can be found in the bibliography. My practice has been to refer to the author, e.g. Kirk (Heraclitus, pp. 15–9); or to the publication itself, e.g. (Long: Hellenistic Philosophy). References to ancient works are kept as short as possible, with book, chapter and section numbers separated by dots; if only two numbers are listed, the chapter has been omitted in favor of the smaller sections, e.g., N. D. 2.14, is N. D., second book, (chapter 5), section 14. All references to Tusc. book 1, are designated by the section and chapter separated by a comma, e.g., 27, 67. Chapters are listed in the header of each page, and the sections are carefully listed in bold in the margins. With a few exceptions, standard commentaries are cited by the author’s name only (e.g., Madvig on Fin. 3.4, Reid on Ac. 1.20) unless they are abbreviated (e.g., SVF. 2.128). Abbreviations for other works such as lexica, grammars, or standard reference works are as follows:

- **CIL** Corpus inscriptionum Latinarum, Berlin, 1863–
- **Forcellini** A. FORCELLINI/J. FACCIOLATI/G. FURLANETTO (eds.): Lexicon totius Latinitatis, Bologna: Padua, 1864–1926
- **HAND** F. HAND: Tursellinus seu De Particulis Latinis Commentarii, vol. 1–4, Lipsiae 1845
- **HRR** H. Peter (ed.): Historicum Romanorum Reliquiae, Leipzig 1914
- **ILLRP** A. DEGRASSI (ed.): Inscriptiones latinae liberae rei publicae, Berlin: de Gruyter, 1965
- **ILS** H. Dessau (ed.): Inscriptiones latinae selectae, 1856–1931
- **NEUE–WAGENER** F. NEUE/C. WAGENER: Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache, Berlin: Berlin, 1892
- **Non.** W. M. LINDSAY (ed.): Nonii Marcelli De Compendiosa Doctrina Libri, Oxford 1901
- **L.&S.** C. T. LEWIS/C. SHORT (eds.): A Latin Dictionary, Oxford 1879
- **RE** A. PAULY et al. (eds.): Realencyclopaedie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft, Stuttgart: J. B. Metzler, 1980
- **TLL** Thesaurus Linguae Latinae, Berlin, 2009
Standard collections of fragments are cited by the ancient author’s name only, and have been abbreviated as follows:


**Arist. et Cyren. fr.** E. MANNEBACH (ed.): Aristippi et Cyrenaicorum Fragmenta, Leiden: Brill, 1961


**Cic. Consol. fr.** C. VITELLI (ed.): M. Tulli Ciceronis Consolationis Fragmenta (Opera omnia quae exstant critico apparatu instructa), Milano: Mondadori, 1979

**Cic. fr. poet.** A. TRAGLIA (ed.): M. Tulli Ciceronis Poetica Fragmenta, Milan: Mondadori, 1963

**Dox. Graec** H. DIELS (ed.): Doxographi graeci, Berlin: Reimer, 1897

**Enn. Ann.** J. VAHLEN (ed.): Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae, Lipsiae 1854


**Hortens. fr.** A. GRILLI (ed.): Hortensius, 1962

**Ind. Herc.** S. MЕKLER: Academicorum philosophorum Index Herculanensis, Berlin: Weidmann, 1902

**Menand. fr.** A. KÖRTE (ed.): Menandrea ex papyris et membranis vetustissimis, Leipzig: Teubner, 1910


**Trag. fr. inc.** O. RIBBECK (ed.): Scenicæ Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta, Leipzig: Teubner, 1897

**fr. Wehrli.** F. WEHRLI: Die Schule des Aristotles I, Basel: Schwabe and Co., 1944. The author of each fragment is specified when the reference to WEHRLI is made, e.g., Dicaearchus fr. Wehrli. 8, refers to the collection of Dicaearchus, fragment 8.

**Xenocr. fr.** R. HEINZE (ed.): Xenokrates. Darstellung der Lehre und Sammlung der Fragmente, Hildesheim: Olms, 1892
Editionum Sigla

Vel operum omnium vel editiones Tusculanarum qui in apparatu critico et commentario commemorantur:

Beroaldus, Philippus: Bononiae 1496
Erasmus: Basileae 1523
Cratander: Basileae 1528
Victorius, Petrus: Venetiis 1534–1537, Parisiis 1538–1539
Camerarius, Joachim: Basileae 1540 sqq.
Manutius P. Aldi filius: Venetiis 1540 sqq., Basileae 1543–1555
Bouhier (Boulierius) Ioannes: Lugduni, apud Frellonium, 1560–1562.
Lambinus: Editiones Lambinianae, Lutetiae Parisiorum, 1579; Venetiis 1579.
Fabricius, Franciscus: Coloniis 1568.
Gronowius, Johann Friedrich: Lugduni Bat. 1692 sqq.
Dauisius (Davies), Jo. Accedunt emendationes Bentleii: Cantabrigiae 1709 sqq.
Verburgius, I.: Amstelaedami 1724. Opera quae supersunt omnia, cum scholiaste veteri ac notis Victorii, Camerarii, Ursini; cum notis selectis Manutii, Lambini, Gruteri, Gronoviorum.
Wolff, Fr. Aug.: Lipsiae 1792 sqq.
Heine, O.: Lipsiae quarta editio 1892–1896.
Kühner, Raphael: 5. ed. Hannouerae 1874.
CODICUM SIGLA

codices maiores ex apparatu Dougan, Guista et Drexler afferuntur:


V Vatican, lat. 3246. Contains only the Tusc. Rivals R G in excellence. s. ix.

Vc uetus corrector V, generally of the same period as V, many corrections written carefully in black ink.

R Parisinus Regius, Bibl. Nat. lat. 6332, written στιχηδόν, and with great care. Contains the Tusc. and Sen. s. ix.

K Cameracensis, Cambrai, Bibl. Comm., lat. olim 842, nunc 943; contains Tusc. only. Agrees closely with R V G. s. ix.


F Fragmentum Bodleianum

codices minores præterea afferuntur:

P Palatinus Vaticanus, formerly in Heidelberg. Pal. 1514 (Gruter’s Pal. III), described as antiquissimus. Altered by several hands, often in peius.

M Mediolanensis Ambrosianus T. 56 sup., s. xi.

B Bruxellensis, olim Gemblacensis, Bibl. Roy. lat. 5351. Often corrected in melius. s. xii.

L Leyden, Univ. Lib. Justi Lipsii codex no. 30, membranaceus. Agrees closely with R. s. xii.

E London, British Museum. (Bibl. Reg. 15 C xi); s. xii or xiii.

B² Brussels, Bibl. Roy. lat. 21957. s. xv.

S Berne, Stadt-Bibl. lat. 438. s. xv.

X consensus codicum G V R K (et H)

Ω consensus omnium codicum s editores recentiores
dett. codd. deteriores codices
edd. pr. editores priores

CONSPECTUS EDITORUM

Bou(hier), 1560 Küh(ner), 1874 Poh(lenz) 1918
Dav(ies), 1709 Lamb(inus), 1579 T(ischer)-S(orof), 1887
Doug(an), 1905 Man(utius), 1540 Verb(ergius), 1724
Ern(esti), 1773 Mo(ser), 1836 Vic(torius), 1534
Giu(sta), 1984 Or(elli), 1829 Wo(lf), 1792
The composition of this work was prompted partly by the interest Cicero had in philosophical topics, but more probably the serious thoughts that arose in this work stem from the morose climate in which Cicero was living; many of his friends, both personal and political, had been killed in the civil war, and most recently he was more grievously affected by the death of his daughter Tullia.

Introduction, §§1–9. Cicero’s main aim in the preface is to examine the role of eloquence in philosophy, the topic of which immediately distinguishes it from the other prefaces in the Tusc., whose purpose is generally limited to the praise of philosophy itself, for example, Tusc. 2.5 and 2.13. Cicero, claiming to be finally liberated from the labours of the forum, aims to show that Romans are capable of improving on Greek philosophy. He complains that their native literature show that Roman philosophers have fine sentiments, but that they are unable to adorn them with sufficient eloquence, either to clarify their thoughts or to attract new readers. Cicero intends to address this error which he finds to be one of the most widespread in Roman philosophy, §§1–6. He has held five days of lectures on five subjects at the suggestion of his friends. The first proposition, and the topic of the first book is the discussion whether death is an evil: both to the dead, since they are without life; and to the living, since while they are alive, they forever are doomed to die, and continue afterwards to suffer as the dead already do. But if the dead are not in Tartarus, where are they? They are nowhere at all, they are non-existent; if so, then how can that which does not exist suffer in its wretchedness? The paradox compels admission that the dead are not wretched; but the living remain so, since they must still die, §§7–14.

Doxography, §§, 10–17. In order to answer the question what the soul is, Cicero surveys a wide variety of philosophical schools, from the reputable and well-known, to the less credible and renowned. Strangely however, and quite surprisingly, in this arrangement of philosophers the foremost influences and figureheads of the schools are passed over. Some of those from the major schools are never mentioned by name: of the Academic school Carneades is not mentioned at all in book 1, although Cicero mentions him frequently elsewhere, Tusc. 3.54, 59; 4.53; 5.11, 83, 87, 88, 120; of the Stoic school Posidonius, who had significant influence on the Tusc. is never once mentioned.63 Zeno is mentioned only once (1.19) and appears only as a source for the idea that the Stoics conceived the soul as fire; Chrysippus (1.118) too is mentioned once in passing, and slightingly as a mere story teller. Finally Epicurus (1.82) is mentioned only once, merely in connection to Democritus and atomic physics. However, Socrates, Plato and Aristotle are the most often cited authorities. Cicero himself admits that he has a stronger inclination to the philosophical theories of the older generation of philosophers, such as Plato and Socrates, than he does to the more recent thinkers. Cicero appeals to Socrates more frequently here than in any other work, excepting De Or. 3.; Plato is mentioned by name more often than anywhere else in Cicero’s writing. From this it should not be surprising to find much that is Platonic in character in this book.64

63cf. Long (Hellenistic Philosophy, p. 255)
64Douglas (Tusculans, 110–114, n. 57).
**First Argument: The soul is immortal, §28–81.** (i) There is a naturally implanted belief in immortality. We have evidence for this in the earliest burial and religious practices of men, §28; and there is no society on earth so barbaric as not to bewail their dead so there is a consensus omnium that the soul must survive, §30. And why else would men and woman take any care in their posterity if they knew the soul would not survive? §§31–35. (ii) Philosophy tells us that the very nature of the soul would preclude its death, §§38–71. Plato gave many reasons for it, §38; we know that the fiery material which composes the soul will cause it to rise aloft after death and blend with the warm rarefied air far above the earth, §§40–49. They who deny the existence of the soul apart from the body have difficulty imagining what it would be. However there are numerous arguments for its immortality after it leaves the body. (a) There is the self-moving argument from Plato, §§53–55; (b) the argument from the indivisibility of the soul; (c) the argument from the scale of existence based on the gradual ascent from vegetative growth up to the perfection of the divine soul, §56; (d) the powers of the soul, such as memory and invention, §§57–64; (e) the theory of ἀνάμνησις as discussed by Plato §71. The soul is superior to the body, and while we are alive, we are in a living death; but when the soul leaves behind all its earthly concerns, then it truly comes alive, §75.

**Second Argument: The soul is mortal, §82–116.** However, the doctrine of immortality is rejected by many philosophers. Therefore we must prove that when the soul dies, it perishes as completely as the body and that there is no evil in death. (i) In fact, frequently death has removed people from more misery than good in their life, §86. In every case, because there is no feeling in death, we cannot be said to miss anything of our former life nor can we even be conscious of this loss, §90. (ii) Sleep and Death were called brothers by the poets, and rightly so; for in sleep we see that there is no feeling, so it will be with death. (iii) We also have many examples of virtuous men who go to their deaths readily composed, such as Theramenes and Socrates; even lesser men and whole legions go to their death, §95–101. (iv) Concern for burial is really just superstition; we will not have any sense of death, so what does it matter what happens to our bodies?, §102–109. The man who led a virtuous life will have glory accompany him to his grave; therefore, he will meet it with calmness and understanding.

**Epilogue.** We have many poets who say that the gods granted death to man as the best thing; and dying for one’s country will earn both great glory, but also happiness, §§112–16. We must not fear death; for it is either a departure which is greatly to be desired or our liberation from the misfortunes and miseries of life.
M. Tullii Ciceronis Tusculanarum Disputationum ad M. Brutum Liber Primus: titled so in GV, while the lesser MSS., and a few older editors read quaestionvm. Cicero himself calls them disputationes in Div. 2.2, Fat. 4, Att. 15.2-4, 4.2; BoETHIUS Top. v, and Lact. Inst. 3.13. Most early editions have the words de contemnenda morte, but they are not Cicero’s own, having been introduced from the passage in Diu. Sec Stark (Circulation of Texts in Rome); Oliver (Titulature of Ancient Books); McDonnell (Manuscripts in Ancient Rome).

1. 51-9: The proem of the Tusc. is intricate, and the studied and lengthy period with which it begins aptly sets the oratorical tone that follows throughout the book. Cicero defends Roman talents against those of the Greeks, Roman poetry is praised, and music; however, in this case, Cicero’s main aim is to examine the role of eloquence in philosophy, the topic which immediately distinguishes it from the other prefaces in the Tusc., whose purpose is limited generally to the praise of philosophy itself.

defensionum: Wolf noted ad loc. that Cicero deliberately used term labores defensionum and not labores forense; there is no mention of the accusations, since the majority of Cicero’s extant speeches are for the defence, and he only appears as prosecutor in the court room against Verres, cf. De Or. 29.103, quod igitur in accusacionibus septem libris non reperitur gentis. Doaugan notes that the speech against Vatinius rose out of the defence of Sestius; those against Piso, Catiine and M. Antonius were for the most part delivered before the Senate, the remainder before the people. His role as a defence lawyer became a humilitating task for Cicero after Luca as he was required to defend some of the more disreputable characters who had the support of the Triumvirate. Cicero preferred the more popular role of a defender of the accused, Off. 2.14.49, ludabilius est defensio, and Quint. Inst. 12.7.1.

magna ex parte: he had defended M. Marcellus and Ligarius in 46 B.C., and Deiotarus in 45 B.C. The only speeches to come after Cicero’s later philosophical works were the Philippics.

cum essem: the subj. is used to emphasise the relationship between cause and effect; however, it is written with the aim of justifying his literary occupations, and is not an ironic statement against Caesar.

aliquando: often in Cicero meaning ‘at length’, ‘at last’, sometimes strengthened by tandem. Below, 44, 105, aliquando sapiens Achilles, which shows that the meaning here is that it was long in coming.

libertus: ‘at last liberated,’ a sigh of relief as Cicero is finally freed from the public duties which he has been busy with, often to his chagrin. Cf. Ac. 1.1.11, dum me ambitio dum honores dum causae dum rer publicae non solum cura sed guadam etiam procuratio multos officios implicatum et constriictum tenerat. Nutting: (in his edition of the Tusculans) and Gildenhard (Paideia Romana, pp. 91-2) find that this statement is ‘bitterly ironic’ and directed against Caesar, whose new position in government had deprived all public men of their public offices, and see also MacKendrick (Philosophical Books of Cicero, p. 164); Garlick/Görler (die Philosophie der Antike, pp. 1016-19); Gotter (Griechenland in Rom, p. 7.3). However, this phrase fits only the time in which Cicero wrote it; and he expresses different views of his personal and public freedom after the death of Caesar (Off. 3.1).

The philosophical language of Cicero rarely speaks openly against an individual, though his political pamphlets are another matter; and so we must be careful not to invent political tones for this term under the guise of discovering them. Cicero wrote (in May 44 B.C., after the assassination, Fam. 9.16.3) that it was safer to speak against the dictator during his life than after his death, so why would Cicero need to speak in such guarded tones in the Tusc.? It is more natural to read this term philosophically; cf. below 19, 44, faciemus liberius tutosque nos in contemplandis rebus, where there is no hint of politics.

retilii, retenta, remissa, reuocati: Pohlzen points out that these are followed by interrallum, intermissa, which gives the sentence a highly wrought oratorical style.

Brute: the dedication is to Marcus Junius Brutus, to whom Cicero previously had dedicated his Or., Brut., and Parad. in 46 B.C., and the Fin. in 45 B.C. Unlike Cicero’s previous dedications to Brutus, however, the Tusc. lacks the same friendly treatment and concern for their addressee, cf. Or. 1.1, et igitur unice diligentem me carissimum esse sentirem. The relationship between Brutus and Cicero was far from close; nevertheless, Brutus had dedicated to Cicero his book de Virtute (Fin. 1.1; Tusc. 5.1 and 30; Sen. Cons. Helv. 9.4; Sen. Ep 95.45, entitled προς αι μεταφυσικοιος). The topic of de Virtute was a study of self-sufficiency focused on virtue, similar in matter to Tusc. V. Many scholars are eager to point out the political position Brutus was in at the time of this address. STRASBURGER (Ciceros Spätwerk, p. 30) believes Brutus is addressed either as a confidant of Caesar, or more strangely as the future co-conspirator, or the politician of the coming generation (and see his comments on Fin. 2.66, p. 24 where he finds tyrannicide exhorted.) I am not convinced by these arguments and believe that such imputations are anachronistic. This address is only polite.

me Brute te horante maxime: note the unexpected hómeoteleuton which Cicero sometimes employs in his prose and poetry, (MAROUZEAU: Tradit de Stylistique, pp. 56-65).

Gildenhard (Paideia Romana, p. 95) proposes construing maxime with me retulii; but Cicero never removes this superlative so far from the its verb (Tusc. 3.3, 75, 108); very often it immediately follows or leads the word it modifies. Dougas’ wish to take it with what follows, ad ea studia, is not correct either, since it would suggest more than one study to which Cicero returns from a prolonged separation; but in this case, ad ea studia can only mean philosophy. Pohlzen’s punctuation is correct, construing maxime with te horante; translate, ‘you, Brutus, encouraging most of all.’

dx ea studia: cf. Tusc. 5.103-105. For a good discussion of Cicero’s early activities in philosophy, see BOYANCÉ (Les méthodes d’histoire littéraire: Ciceron et son oeuvre philosophique).

retenta animo: ‘always in mind’; by the age of twenty, Cicero had become familiar with at least three of the most eminent philosophers of that time, each representing a living and important Greek school. In Tusc. 5.2-5, he recalls the time he spent steeped in philosophy as a young man, Rep. 1.7; Off. 2.3-4; Fat. 2. When busied with affairs of the state, Cicero often speaks of his philosophical studies as present in his mind, and often writes to Atticus that he longs for the day when he can return to those studies, Ac. 1.11, haec inclusa i.e., his philosophical studies kept up in his private hours, habeant et te obsolescent renovabant cum licet legendo. The use of obsolescere, as Reid notes ad loc., means ‘to lose brightness’, and this is in elegant contrast to the imagery here of illustration.
remissa temporibus longo interolium intermissa artium, quae ad rectam uiuendi uiama pertinenter, ratio et disciplina studio sapientiae, quae philosophia dictur, contineretur, hoc mihi Latinis litteris inlustrandum putau, non quia philosophia Graecis et litteris et doctoribus percipi non posset, sed meum semper judicium fuit omnia nostros aut inuenisse per se sapientius quam Graecos aut
2. Lact. Inst. 3.14.13

remissa temporibus: abl. of cause, because of circumstances, Zeitumstände; not a dative as suggested by Wolf, Klotz and Moser. Beier ad loc. points out that use of tempus often indicates periods of difficulty, and he offers several examples, Mil. 36.100, bonu, fortunas meas ac liberorum morum in communione tuerum temporum contuli; Planc. 1.1; Sest. 6.14, 58.132, neque ante hoc tempus neque hoc ipso turbulentissimo dix. Here, it refers to the time spent fulfilling the duties of a statesman, and afterwards as an advocate. For the thought, cf. Off. 2.4. Nihil agere aetem cum animis non posset, in his studiis ab initio versatus aetas existimaui hones-tissime molestias possi deponi, si me ad philosophiam retulissim. longo interolium intermissa: his unenjoyable administration of the works of Cicilia in 52B.C., and the civil war. artium: i.e., doctrinarum, as in Nep. Dion. 1.2, ingenium docile, come, aptum ad artes optimas. pertinenter...contineretur: subj. on account of cum causal, which takes its tense from the following putau; contineretur is then attached into the same tense and mood, cf. K. S. 2.181; Fin. 1.5.14, ego arbitrur unum uidisse urum maximissm erroribus animorum hominum liberi ssima et evi dicisse, quae pertinerent ad bene beatique vivendum. The use of a secondary tense of the subj., in connection with a main verb in the past, is used to express ideas corresponding to facts known to be true at the time of speaking, or even universally true (Hale: Sequences of Tenses, p. 53).

ratio et disciplina: 'methodical treatment,' a hendiadys, which betrays the lack of a suitable adjective in Latin. ratio respondet Graeco vocabulo µέθοδος which is methodically learned, or a systematic theoretical which betrays the lack of a suitable adjective in Latin. litteris omnium laudatarum artium procreatricem quandam et quasi nius has explanatory clause indicates that this word had not yet interpretari velis, praeter studium sapientiae see B. the works of Aristotle directly is questionable, on which see B. ratio διαλεκτική tematically.' Frequently, de aliqua re institutio artes traduntur. disciplina est artis uel doctrinae alicuius maximisque erroribus animos hominum liberavisse et omnia tran-tinerent. rationem disciplinaeque artes traduntur. disciplina est artis uel doctrinae alicuius disciplinaeque artes traduntur. disciplina est artis uel doctrinae alicuius disciplinaeque

test et disciplina: 'methodical treatment,' a hendiadys, which betrays the lack of a suitable adjective in Latin. ratio respondet Graeco vocabulo µέθοδος, h.e. via qua artes traduntur. disciplina est artis uel doctrinae alcuicu sşσρμα (Kühner) The best parallel is Off. 3.20, Stoicorum rationis disciplinaeque. It signifies a method and system of science, with reference to the influence of culture in edu-
cationis disciplinaeque artes traduntur. disciplina est artis uel doctrinae alicuius disciplinaeque

ratio et disciplina: 'methodical treatment,' a hendiadys, which betrays the lack of a suitable adjective in Latin. ratio respondet Graeco vocabulo µέθοδος, h.e. via qua artes traduntur. disciplina est artis uel doctrinae alcuicu sşσρμα (Kühner) The best parallel is Off. 3.20, Stoicorum rationis disciplinaeque. It signifies a method and system of science, with reference to the influence of culture in edu-
cationis disciplinaeque artes traduntur. disciplina est artis uel doctrinae alicuius disciplinaeque

ommia...sapientius quam Graecos: certainly an exag-
gerated claim, but not unusual for Cicero to make in his philosophical works, cf. De Or. 1.14, ingenia uero, ut multis rebus possimus iudicare, nostrorum hominum multum ceteris hominibus omnium gentium praestiterunt. This sentiment conveys a typical Roman attitude towards the Greeks and is written solely for the purpose of alluring Roman readers to philosophy written in Latin, on which see Zettzel (Plato with Pillows). Cicero is unlikely sincere in what he wrote; nor can we assume that he wrote amore patriae occassus — Cicero was never so stringently a nationalist as, say, Juvenal. He is only fighting, though not as openly as Scipio had done (De Or. 2.154–155), to give the Roman spirit a chance to declare itself in letters. The Greeks, by their terrible dominance, were preventing Roman literature from ever achieving its rightful stature. See Gutte (Cicero’s Attitude to the Greeks, p. 157).

nosotros: ‘coniuxissua scripta cum laude patriae, et quod potuerunt patriae honores, gloriam et triumphum cohonestas.’ (Manutius). Cicero included among these writers Caesar, Brutus, and particularly the younger Catil, Fam. 15.4, haec iugur, quae uti tecum communis est, societas studiorum atque artium nostrarum, quibus a pueritia dediti ad devinci sol propemodum nos philosophiam ueram illam et antiquam, quae quibusdam otii esse ac desidae uidetur etc. inuenisse: as suggested to me by Professor Fox, this term here used by Cicero does seem to be a curious allu-
sion to the preface of his Iro. where men have improved themselves through ratio et oratio and have gathered them- selves out the fields and into civilian life. It is not so strange to see Cicero choose this word as he proceeds now down a similar argument in the Tusc. as regards philosophy.

sapientius: = φιλοσοφικῶτερον.
accepta ab illis: for the thought, cf. Fin. 2.30 and 68, sint ista Graecorum; quamquam ab eis philosophiam et omnes ingenias disciplinas habebmus.

fecisse meliora: Cicero has in mind the antithesis between the two stages of cultural development, the invention and perfection, cf. below 4.7.

quae quidem...statuissent: ‘those at least which they had deemed’; the subj. is restrictive, limiting to a certain defined class.

elaborarent: subj. of purpose. For the meaning of elaborare, ἐλαμβάνειν, cf. Brut. 7.26, hac est a Graecis elaborata dicendi vis atque copia. The force of elaborata is intensive and looks towards the fruit of the labour.

§ 2. mores: can often indicate not ‘ethical behavior’ but rather ‘political usages’; the idea is repeated in Tusc. 4.1, cf. De Or. 2.26.67.

e...que...ac: ‘which joins the mores et inst. to res domesticas ac familiares. Here ac does not have its usual intensive meaning, but simply connects, being used in place of a second et for the sake of clearness, cf. 40.95.

institutu uiae: ‘conventions of daily life’

resque domesticas ac familiares: ‘the private interests of the household’

melius...lauius: Neider (in Küh.) explains that melius points to the mores et instituta, with an eye on the virtues, while lauius points towards res domesticas ac familiares, with reference to the typical Roman splendidour and opulence, ‘with greater elegance’, cf. Ter. Ad. 5.1.2, lauteque munus administrasti tuum.

certe: certe is always used with an affirmative force, and is a subjectiva affirmatio ad loquentis iudicium relata (Küh.); here Cicero intimates that the current administration of Roman state affairs was inferior.

temperauerunt: ‘have shaped’, and see below 10, 21.

Pohlenz notes that temperatur = ἀρχή, a fashioning, mixing, or forging of the state from democratic, aristocratic and monarchical principles, in Polyb. 6, whom Cicero follows in Rep. 2.65.


quid loquar: the subj. is used as a form of praeteritum, followed by a relative clause (as here, in qua) to indicate the line of thought which the writer intends to take.

de re militari: the usual path to glory for a Roman was either the law or the soldiery, cf. Mur. 9.22, multo plus adferat dignitatis rei militaris quam iuris civilis gloria, and Nep. Com. 2, magnam prudentiam cum iuris civilis tum rei militaris.

uirtute...disciplina: virtus is the culmination and sum of all the virtues required by a Roman bonus vir, such as aequalitas, modestia, prudentia. Cicero here refines the term to include not only moral thinking, but action on behalf of the state. disciplina in this passage refers to the the old method of education, the whole way of life as something taught, Enn. Ann 467, moribus antiquis res stat Romana. Cicero not only argues that the Romans have an innate sense of virtue, but he also stresses the role of education and practical energy in Rome’s greatness. An excellent illustration, not noticed by editors, is Flac. 63, spectata ac nobilitata virtus non solum natura corroborata uerum etiam disciplina putatur, when discussing the system of ἡγεμονία in Sparta (TLL 1.1, 1326, 51); their virtues were not theoretical, but were put into daily practice, cf. Brut. 40.95, Rep. 1.70; De Or. 1.196. Nevertheless, we know that the Romans thought they far exceeded all other nations in virtus, cf. Verr. 2.48.81, virtutem plurimum posse, and Phil. 10.20. virtus, however, is not Cicero’s only but is his chief reply to the question first raised by Polybius on Rome’s success. See Liv. att. (Concept, Action, and Character, pp. 236-242).

iam illa: = δή, ‘moreover’, used to draw attention when adding something fundamental.

natura: for the meaning, Dougan quotes Verg. Geor. 2.49, quippe solo natura subest; the Romans were quite aware of their own natura, an inborn, fundamentally active and productive force; it was often contrasted in literature to the sloth or laziness of foreigners. The theme of native Roman genius is maintained throughout the preface.

litteris: ‘culture’

cum Graecia: an abbreviated comparison, (comparatio comparandia) i.e., = cum eis quae Graecia adseducit est (Wörner: Lectiones Tullianae, p. 135); and Kühner cites many parallel examples for this ad loc. This construction is common in Cicero, whereas Silver idiom prefers a genitive.

neque...conferenda: in Cicero, the gerundive always denotes necessity or fitness, never possibility; it stands in place of confereri possunt, cf. Fin. 1.26 and Reid’s n. 67.

grauitas: the ‘moral weight of character’, a fundamental requirement for an orator as well as a bonus, (Clark: The Roman Mind, p. 165).

constitutia: the resolution to carry through any difficulty to its end, ‘eostat in eis rebus quas semel susceperis ad exitum perducendis’ (Muretus).

constitutia, magnitudo animi: constitutia, άρισταρχία and magnitudo animi, μεγαλοψυχία are paired in meaning and are important for vita activa which the Roman forebears embodied, and these traits are preconditions for men who wish to lead lives in public business. To a lesser extent, though worthy of remark, these virtues are also valuable for men who wish to pursue a vita contemplativa, and must be practised by any man who wishes to avoid verbera fortunae, insidiae iniuriorum, cf. Cell. N. A. 13.28. The quality of constitutia is characteristic of a μεγαλοψυχός since Arist. APo. 97b.15. Cicero later treats of this aspect more fully in Off. 1.61–92, with Dyck’s n., and Dyck (The Plan of Panatellus’ παίδων ταῦτα, p. 410).

probitas, fides: also paired; they all go towards forming a list of all the qualities which were expected in a Roman. De Or 2.16.67 has a fuller catalogue of all the virtues which a good orator should be able to speak about with fluency and eloquence, cf. Sest. 28.60, quid gravitas, quid integritas, quid magnitudo animi, quid denique virtus valeret. It is curious to find that pietas is missing (which Syme (Roman Revolution, p. 464) called the ‘typical Roman virtue’), and religio.
excellens in omni genere uritus in ullis fuit, ut sit cum maioribus nostris comparandarum? doctrina Graecia nos et omni litterarum genere superabat; in quo erat facile unicore non repugnantem. nam cum apud Graecos antiquissimum e doctis genus sit poetaurum, si quidem Homerus fuit et Hesiodus ante Romam conditam, Archilochus regnante Romulo, serius poeticum nos accepimus. annis fere DXLIUUS fabulum dedit, C. Claudio, Caeci filio, M. Tuditano consulibus, anno ante natum Ennium qui fuit maius quam Plautus et Naeuius.

§3. doctrina...omni litterarum genere: cf. the famous Graecia capta, Hor. Ep. 2.1.156, where see BRINK (Horace) ad loc. Here, Cicero continues to assert emphasis on the difference between Roman activity and Greek thinking.

Graecia nos superabat non repugnantem: Cicero shows his experimental elsewhere in defence of the burgeoning practice of Roman philosophy and letters, still overwhelmed by the volume of Greek matter, and held in low esteem from Roman prejudice.

cum...sit: subj. expressing a comparison between the leading proposition and its subordinate, Madv. Gram. 358, not causal.

doctus: is Latin a common epithet of poets, like σοφός in Greek. Dougan is led astray when he claims that it is not causal.

leading proposition and its subordinate, Madv. Gram.

Cicero shows his interest in these questions by Roman writers, perhaps by observations of Paros, about 700 B.C., according to Herod. 1.12, who places him in the reign of the Lydian king Gyges, Ἀργεῖον ὁ Πάριος κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν χρόνον γενόμενον ἐν ἱδρυα τριμέτρῳ ἐπεξεργάζεται, and cf. Arist. Rhet. 3.17.1418d. Gell. N. A. 17.21.8, who relies on Nepos (fr. 7 MARSHALL) makes Archilochus a contemporary of Tullius Hostius, COURTENAY (Fragmentary Latin Poets, p. 86).


serius: relatively speaking, cf. Varro’s comments at Ac. 1.25, quod si Gracci faciunt qui in his rebus tot iam saecula versantur, quando iudicis magis concedendum est, qui haec usque primum tractare consuevit. The Greeks have a few centuries head start on the Romans in oratory and poetry, but not for any special skill; the claim is that the Romans have busied themselves with more practical considerations, and are only now turning their attention to philosophy. For similar phrasing, cf. Hor. Ep. 2.1.161–163.

annis fere DXPO in Tusculana conditam: Varro’s (in Censor. 21) calculation of 753 B.C. is generally accepted, but for a good discussion of the elasticity of the dates, see SANDERS (The Chronology of Early Rome); GRAFTON/ SWERDLOW (Technical Chronology and Astrological History in Varro, Censorinus and Others, pp. 454–56). Cicero himself was not entirely consistent. Sol. De Mir. Mund. 127 (MOMMSEN: De Mirabilibus Mundi) writes, Roman placuit conditioni Olympiadis septima anno secundo, Pomponio Attico et M. Tullio olympiadi sextae anno tertio, i.e., 754–753 B.C., and see MUNZER (Atticus als Geschichtsschreiber, p. 60).

However, in Rep. 2.18, Cicero follows Polybius’ date of 751–750 B.C., and this is why Cicero writes fire rather than being precise.

Liusius: Liusius Andronicus, generally regarded as the first Latin writer, translated the Odyssey into Saturian metre. Modern scholars put his birth around 285 B.C., and the first staging of his adapted Greek plays around 240 B.C. For a critical discussion of the dating of Liusius, see MARTIN (The Date of Livius Andronicus, p. 161); and for the problems facing Romans and their chronology, Brut. 72, and Dougals’

fabulum dedit: sc. populo, but more usually 'fabulum docer': Tusc. 4.29.63; Sen. 14.50: διδασκαίκερ υμία, where cf. Aes. Ra. 1026–1027: οὐ μὴν δραµάτα ἐξεδίδας τὰν άντιπάλους, κοσµήσας ἐργά των άντιπάλων; Att. 6.1.18, ille post id tempus fabulas docerit which is the first expression (though Schackleton Bailey does not remark upon it). This use does, however, occur in the dramatists, Ter. Hec. prol., fabulae haec quom datast nova et c. Claudius, M. Tuditanus: 240 B.C., cf. Brut. 18.72. qui...Naeuius: one of the few real difficulties in the text of the Tusc. Our evidence for the dates of these poets in Cicero is this: Naeuius died 204 B.C., according to Sen. 50 and BEARE (The Date of the Bellum Punicum, p. 48); Plautus in 184 B.C., according to Brut. 60, but Jerome, 200 B.C.; Ennius died 166 B.C., according to Gell. N. A. 17.21.4, who claimed Varro as his authority, however for a critical appraisal see HENDRICKSON (A Pre-Varronian Chapter of Roman Literary History, pp. 289–291). The position of qui would suggest its antecedent is Ennius, but the dates show that qui must point back to Liusius, and so Rath in his editio transposed this phrase to follow immediately after But we do have examples in Cicero of relative pronouns separated widely from their antecedents, Tusc. 1.35.86, Verr. 3.33–34, 3.83; N. D. 1.23.63. (Pohlenz adds Pllaut. Epit. 262) Bou. deleted the phrase entirely though I think quite rightly; most previous editors, Ern., Hel., ML, and Sc. only bracket
the clause: it is a gloss which crept in from Brut. 18.73. An additional cause for suspicion is primus, twice used in the Brut. ad loc. to describe Lliusius, but here omitted when it would seem most needed (Bentley reintroduced it here). The point that Cicero is making is that Lliusius was the first Roman who could properly be called a poet, though a semigraecus one. (Suet. Gram. 1).

II. sero igitur: sero igitur is a collocation not found elsewhere in Cicero, and is inelegant so close to serius. Pohlenz’s also, wise gesagt glosses over the awkwardness. uel…uel: both members may be connected, (partly .. partly), or it is indifferent which of the two is chosen, or it may only be a difference of expression, Madv. Gram. 436. recepti: curiously, nearly all the great names of Latin literature are men who came from outlying areas (Watts: Birthplaces of Latin Writers, pp. 91-92). Ennius came from Calabria, near Lupiae, as Cicero himself well knew, cf. De Or. 3.168, Sl. 12.393; Lliusius from Tarentum in Apulia; Plautius from Sarsina in Umbria; and Naevius from Capua in Campania. The elder Cato, as far as he could be considered a poet, came from Tusculum; and Juvenal calls the highly regarded Lucilius magnus Aauraece alumnus, Juv. 1.20.
quamquam: corrective, ‘and yet.’

Originibus: M. Porcius Cató Censorius, died 148 B.C., wrote this work in seven books, which concerned the history of Roman, Italian cities and nations from Aeneas to the first and second Punic wars. Fest. 216 (Lindsay), 20ff, criticised the title, Originibus librum quod inscripsit, Cató non satis plenum titulam propositi sui valetur amplexus, quando praegnenter suae suae fuisse in senectute et fabritis virum populi Romaníi. Many fragments still survive and have been collected in HR. 54-97; Cicero speaks of this work highly in Brut. 17.66 and 75, De Or. 1.53-227. It is considered to be the first prose historiographical work in Latin, whereas all previous writers employed Greek; its place in Latin literature is discussed by Scarrino (Putting Cato the Censor’s ‘Originibus’ in Its Place). Cicero’s citation of Cató’s Originibus is suggestive of his own role as an author. Gruen (Culture and National Identity, pp. 116-117) shows Cató wrote to promote Roman national character, and of course Cicero has a similar plan with his philosophical works, a recurrent theme in his prefaces, cf. Fin. 1.86, Schmidt (Cicero’s Place in Roman Philosophy, p. 123).
in epulis canere: cf. Tusc. 4.3, with nearly identical phrasing, in Originibus dixit Cató morem apud naiores haec epularum fuisse, ut deinceps, qui accubarent, canerent ad tibiam clarorum varorum laudes atque virtutes. This is one of our strongest pieces of evidence for the history of Roman cantus comœtiales, or banquet songs. Greek influence had been at work in Rome since the days of the monarchy, and there is no difficulty in admitting that the Romans — either directly or via Etruria — received this style of performance from the Greeks. Both Cató and Varro (apud Non.) say that these ‘carmína’ had existed. (Momigliano: Character of Early Roman Tradition, pp. 110-111). We have further attestations of such practices at De Or. 3.51.197, Leg. 2.24.62, Brut. 19.75, as well as in Val. Max. 2.1.10, Quint. Inst. 1.10.20, Hor. Carm. 4.15.29, Tac. Ann. 3.5. I also add Salust’s epistle to Caesar 1.2, quod in carminibus Appius ait, fabrum esse suæ quæcumque fortunae. For a discussion of other sources, and a brief account of Niebuhr’s theory that these songs formed the basis of what was known as the ‘History of Kings’, see Stuart (Narrative Poetry, pp. 31-33).
ad tibicinem: = ad tibicinis cantum’, accompanied by the flute-player’, cf. Leg. 2.34.9. Dougan, I think, is wrong in claiming that ad tibiam is more usual.
de clarorum hominum uirtutibus = the κλάδοι δόμων of the Homer. Zorzettti (Poetry and Ancient City, p. 314) discusses these hymns, and though they were once considered to be preliterary foundations for epic poetry, are now generally criticised as being only an imposition on archaic Roman culture of the symposastic ephébouss of Greek tradition. When Cicero writes that there was a tradition of hymns performed in the convivio and devoted to praise of the virtutes of famous men, he is thinking in terms of traditional Roman customs, i.e., their vetus mos; in this regard, Cicero believed philosophy had left a mark on early Romans in the form of songs, and indeed he knew that Pythagoras and his pupil King Numa sang in verses. For Cicero, μνευματις was a ritual behaviour of high moral character, and even the old Cato wrote a carmen de moribus. (Iadem: The Carmina Convivialia, p. 320).

huic generi: i.e., poetœ, to poets.
declarat oratio Catonis: this omission was supposed to be by Cató against Servius Galba, who was defended by the Fulvii, cf. Brut. 23.80; Malcovati (ORF), 57, discusses the speech In M. Fulvium Nobiliorum, which she dates to about 178 B.C., and assigns this fragment to that speech. At the time Cicero was writing, however, over 150 of Cató’s speeches had survived, cf. Brut. 17.65. We know enough about this speech to know that the citation does not justify Cicero’s inference; it only shows that Cato was opposed to the introduction of lyric Greek culture as championed by Ennius. Cató was certainly well educated in Greek literature, Sen. 1.3, litetris Grcìcìs, qurum constat eum perstiidiumus in epulis canere, in qua obiecit ut probrum M. Nobiliori, quod is in prouinciam.

Fulvius Nobilior: consul in 189 B.C., took Ambra- cia, and conquered the Aetolians. Cicero praises him for the fact that he took Ennius with him at Brut. 20.80, and Arch. 11.27, qui cum Aetolis Ennio comite bellavit. Fulvius, non dubitavit Martin manubius Musis consensere. Cató’s criticism has been overlooked by commentators: we must not assume, like Cicero, that Cató is attacking Ennius the poet, a man he called his familiaris in Sen. 10, and from whom he received great praise (Arch. 22). The target is rather his political enemy Fulvius. Ambracia was never taken by storm, but surrendered while under siege, and its citizens soon afterwards sent a delegation to the Senate complaining of Fulvius’ pillage of their city (Liv. 38.3-10, 43-44). Fulvius tried to improve things by holding lavish games in 186 B.C., but Cató continued to taunt him as ‘Nobilior mobilior’ with the memory of his dubious achievement. Fulvius attempted to elevate the Aetolian campaign with Ennius’ poetry (Ann. Enni. 391-398), and so it is hardly surprising that Cato criticised Fulvius in the Senate for having taken Ennius with him to Ambracia. See Goldberg (Poetry, Politics, and Ennius, pp. 249-250).
poetas duxisset; duxerat autem consul ille in Aetoliam, ut scimus, Ennium. quo minusigitur honoris erat poetis, eo minora studia fuerunt, nec tamen si qui, magnis ingeniis in eo genere exstiterunt, non satis Graecorum gloriae responderunt. an censemus, si Fabio, nobilissimo homini, laudati datum esset, quod pingenter non multos etiam apud nos futuros Polyclitios et Parrhasios

poetas: i.e., Ennius, but the plural is contemptuous and reflects Cato's impatience of Nobiliar's acts. The use of the plural in this way is common, especially in early Latin, Plaut. Men. 321–322, quas mulieres, quass tu parasitos loquare? autem: in S. which is in turn substituted in place of enim (enim). autem therefore has no adversative force, but only serves to add an explanatory fact in the form of a coordinate statement (Hermann), cf. Tusc. 3.6, fieri autem potest.

honoris erat poetis: this phrase is reminiscent of the words of Cato himself; he is quoted in Cell. N. A. 11.2.9, poetae artis honos non erat. si quis in ea re studiet aut sese ad convivia adplicat, grassator vocabatur = Carm. de mor. fr. 2. (Préaux: Caton et l'ars poética). the poet for Cato was not what we would take it to mean, but rather his grassator was a flatterer more like parasites in comedy. Many of these ‘poets’ served to do nothing more than manipulate private laudations for public aggrandisation; hence Cato’s politically motivated slander of Ennius and his support

what we would take it to mean, but rather his poet, but these have their own purpose. The association of problematic to later historical and antiquarian research.

politicis motibus etiam tamen sic fuissent: made more likely by the use of the fut. part. with fuisset than it would have been with a simpler fuisset. Non ‘would have been’, but rather ‘would have been ready to come forward.’

Polyclitos: Polyclitios (or Polyclitos) of Sicyon flourished at Argos, around 430 B.C. Camerarius and Muretus suggested that Polyclitos, who was a sculptor and not a painter, ought to be changed to Polygnotos. They argue that Ciceron had confused the two men, but their point should not be pressed too hard since we have reports that suggest that Polyclitos was in fact an artist (but whether or not they are truly trustworthy is difficult to say), cf. Tz. Chil. 12.320, Πολύκλιτος ὁ Ἀργεῖος ἦν πλάστη τε καὶ γραφήσας, πολλὰ καὶ γραφήσεις τε καὶ ἀναγραφήσεις: Giusta does not adopt the change, but avers that Camerarius is right to suspect an error in the text. All other recent editors follow Neidius in whose opinion Ciceron has simply taken names of famous men from other similar or related arts (and his is indeed his practice): for example, Cicero mentions Polyclitus alongside Zeuxis, the famous Greek painter, in Fin. 2.215.

We know that Ciceron’s knowledge of sculpture was greater than his knowledge of painting, and on the whole he displays greater critical knowledge of sculpture: but this is not much. The sum of our evidence shows that Cicero had only a slight appreciation and working knowledge of art, for which see Snowman (Ciceron’s Appreciation of Greek Art), who collects artistic mentions found in Ciceron’s works. Despite the apparent approbation of a ‘Polyclitos’ here, Ciceron shows the typical Roman attitudes elsewhere, Parad. 5.2.38–38, where he considers a man to be a slave of foolish things quem Actionis tabula stupidum detinet aut signum aliquod Polycliti. Curiously, he eschews mention of Phidias as the obvious name in sculpture; he is simply saying that there were no Roman sculptors of equal ability.

Parrhasios: the plural is generalising, ‘many a Polyclitus and Parrhasios’. Parrhasios was a painter who flourished at Athens, who could not have been born after 460 B.C. and came to prominence in 430 B.C. (Steven: Plato and the Art of His Time, p. 150; Austin: Quintilian on Painting, p. 21). He was an artist well known later to Quintilian and other later Romans. Here, the use is rhetorical or expresses surprise, cf. below 36, 87.

Fabius: Q. Fabius Pictor, grandfather of the famous historian of the same name. Although he was from a noble family, he was employed to paint the temple of Salus in 304 B.C., and whence (in jest) received his name Pictor. The painting was the representation of the battle in which Cn. Junius Brutus Bubulcus gained victory over the Sammites, (Liv. 9.4.25, 10.1.9), the temple was consecrated by Bubulcus while dictator in 320 B.C. The painting lasted until the temple burned down during the reign of Claudius. (Plut. H. N. 35.4.7). That a Fabius should give himself over to a studium sordidum, painting, required some explaining, cf. Val. Max. 8.14.6, id enim demum ornamenti familiae constatibus et sacerdotes et triumphis cerimoniae dererat. For Cicero’s views that the plastic arts were leviora and delights only for children, cf. Verr. 2.4.134, and see Ultramare (Idées romaines sur les arts plastiques, 88ff), and Troadou (Ciceron’s Attitude towards the Greeks, p. 75)

quod pingenter: quod and non quia is used in phrases in the subjunctive which signify praise, blame, or complaint in which is stated both the reason and an assertion by anant laudations for public aggrandisation; hence Cato’s politically motivated slander of Ennius and his support of Fulius. The exaggeration of these ‘poets’ had become problematic to later historical and antiquarian research.

Suet. Rhet. 2.3–4 tells us that a certain Q. Vargunteius helped to bring about widespread public attention to Ennius’ works. It is strange that such a foundational poem in fact needed any help at all to spread. Cicero here conflates the various levels of witness; we have the fact that Ennius was writing these carmina (to whatever degree it is true); and we also have evidence of Cato’s speeches against the poet, but these are rejected in favor of the former. The association of these ideas to form Cicero’s argument that the Romans had largely neglected the art of poetry is somewhat jumbled, and largely unhistorical, on which see Goldberg (Ennius after the Banquet, pp. 428–431).

nec tamen si qui: an elegant expression for ei qui. Verberginius points out that some of the best MSS, including V, have nec tamen sic (“haud spernendum”); this is the reading approved of by Gebhard. It cannot be accepted as it would mean tamen ne sic quidem, and is wholly incongruous with Cicero’s normal usage. Bentley tried to explain the phrase as ‘licet in nullo honore tum essent poetae’; but this is not Cicero’s meaning here: he says that there were no poets, but if there were, they would have rivalled the Greeks; and so most recent editors read nec tamen si qui.


nec tamen...non satis: essentially copula, but in Cicero these particles serve for connecting statements and are always found with words intervening, cf. Parad. 1.8.

nec satis...responderunt: ‘nor did they fail to measure up’: cf. Cat. 2.11.24, urbes coloniarii ac municipiorum responderunt Catillaeenus tumulis silvestros.

§4. an censensum: refers to eo minora studia fuerunt, an can introduce a simple question of a supplementary kind which is subjoined to a preceding inquiry of what must otherwise be the case, or when the speaker himself append an answer, which may itself be under the form of a question (Madv. Gram. 453, and his note on Fin. 1.8.28); it comes close to the meaning of hanc. Here, the use is rhetorical or expresses surprise, cf. below 36, 87.
and self-pity, τόνων Ἡπελεγκτήν ἔγραφε Παρθένος ἃ τὸ γὰρ ὀφθάλμων ἔσφαλι καθὼς ὁποῖον τοιοῦθεν, καὶ ἀ τρέχων ἄτρως ἔστω ἡμῶν (Αἰθ. Παλ. 2, 3485); Prometheus’s sufferings, Sen. Contr. 10.34, which was a powerful influence on the Tusc., particularly in Tusc. ii. and lastly his painting of the ‘Feigned Madness of Odysseus’, Plut., De Audiend. Poet. 3, γράφεται δὲ καὶ πράξεις ἀτόπους ἔνιοι, καθάπερ... καὶ Παρθένος τὴν Ὀδυσσείαν προσφέροντα μαίνει κ.τ.λ. Such perturbations of mind and their artistic representation were censured by Pl. Rep. 3.338a and his arguments were elaborated upon by Cicero Tusc. when he discusses the concept of pain.

honos alit artes: the very famous phrase which has its origin in Pl. Rep. 8.551a, ἀνείπτα δὲ τὸ δὴ τι κυμάτων, ἀμούσιας δὲ τὸ Αυτοκέφαλον αυτοῖς refers both to all aspects of intellectual activity, including the plastic arts. cf. also Sen. Ep. 102.16, antiquus poeta ait, laus alit artis, non laudationem dicit, quae corruptit artes. Cicero uses the phrase superficially elsewhere, Arch. 11, Off. 1.16.8; but consider Val. Max. 2.6.5, virtutes aberrantium alimentum est honos, Prop. 4.10.3, Ov. Pont. 4.2.35.16, and Mart. 8.56.5–6, sīt Maccenales, non dixi Marones; and I think the elder Pliny elucidates the comment. Plin. H. N. 35.36 stressed the Greek artist's prowess in the plastic arts; the names of Zeuxis, Parrhasios and Appelles could be considered stock-in-trade by the third century B.C., and appear frequently in Plautus. Plautus was less critical than Cicero of Roman successors in these arts, and he often condemned them as mere imitators. He argued that Roman art suffered decline because there was no glory attached to private enjoyment. This expression gained great currency among writers and Story, in his note on the passage in Plato op. cit., recalls that it was worked into almost every oration by the rhetorician Themistius later in 320AD.

incendunt: the use of the ablative (gloria) is against reading of accendunt in Aug. C. D. 5.13, cf. 19.44.

gloria: i.e., ‘diuturna gloria’, cf. Rep. 21.23. the idea of an eternal glory for a ‘sapiens’ and writer is prominent in Cicero’s writings after the civil war (Al. Cicero et la gloire en temps de guerre civile, p. 47), and cf. 3.6.

iacentque: = neglegentur, kēsēthai, ‘lie neglected’, cf. 3.5, philosophia iacuit. The ‘que here, as often after negatives, may seem has an adversative force, but really only develops the clause when three or more items are enumerated. Here the length of the interval is considerable so that the anacoluthon is not strongly felt: Cicero intended to use a second cl but on reaching the second clause, felt it was less important than the first; cf. Madvig on Fin. 5.64.

Gildenhard (Paideia Romana, pp. 137–138) comments on the ‘illogical’ order of the words by missing this anacoluthon. Cicero employs here in his argument is the juridical concessio. Themistocles readily admitted his ignorance in music and followed it by self-justification. Cicero uses this anecdote in the same way Plutarch later uses it against false intellectuals who only seem educated in the context of urban entertainment, but cannot apply it to a practicus bloc. Themistocles’ view is perfectly congruous to Cicero’s own view of the devaluation of music and arts (Zadoraβv: Themistocles and the Poets, p. 268). This may however be an anachronistic claim: Themistocles did not have the advantage of the rhetorical training introduced by the sophists, but was a disciple of Mnesiphois, who represented a tradition of practical political guidance in which older politicians took younger ones in hand — very much as in Cicero’s Rome. (Rusell: Ancient Education, p. 215). Quint. Inst. 1.1019 quotes this passage with approbation, and for the thought cf. Philostratus, Life of Apollonius, 5.28, ‘Nero perhaps understood how to tune a lyre, but he disgraced the empire both by letting the strings go too slack and by drawing them too tight.”

Epaminondas praecesses: cf. De Or. 3.139, Epaminondam, hauk scio an summum virum unum omnis Graeciae, but Cicero expresses different opinions elsewhere. Off. 260, Periclem, principem Graecis.

fidibus praecellere cecinisce dicitur: cecinisse is differently used of instrumental and vocal music, cf. Div. 2.59.122, canere vel voce vel fidibus, and for a subtle treatment of the term fidibus, see Madvig’s n. on Fin. 4.27.75.
Epaminondas was known as a man of culture and philosophy (Plu. Ages. 27.4), and it is a shame that his own Life has not survived. Nep. Epam. 2.1, writes that Epaminondas, citharizare et cantare ad chordarum sonum doctus est a Dionysio; and we have information from the philosopher Aristoxenus who claimed that this military man learned to play the aulos from Olympiodorus and Orthogoras, Ath. 4.184D, Ἄριστοξενος δὲ καὶ Ἐπαµινώδαν τὸν Θηβα‹ον ἰδεῖν ὁ µεῖον µεθαλήθαι παρὰ Ὀλυµπιοδόρον καὶ Ὀρθύφωνα. This example of Epaminondas was included in Aristoxenus' treatise on music (SHIRMPTON: Plutarch's Life of Epaminondas, p. 59) which was a source text in all probability used by Cicero later in the Tusc. particularly 10 and 57 below. aliquot ante annos: the adverbial min is may be right, since the accusative annos in Cicero is rare, and not usual with the adverb ante and post, cf. below, 13, 29, multis post annis. In any case, ante here is adverbial, and the accusative (if correct) is due to the imagination going back over a number of years, cf. Sen. 6.16, septem et decem annos post alterum consultatum, aliquot = 'a good number', 'many years earlier', in this case more than a century; Themistocles was at Salamis 480B.C., Epaminondas at Leuctra 371B.C.

recusaret: the imperfect is the reading of the majority and earliest mss., but V⁵ has recussaret, a correction contemporary with the main scribe which has stirred debate among critics. STRÖBEL (Vaticanus 1246) advanced a theory on this evidence of a divergent Y-descent for the transmission of the text; DREXLER (Text der Tusculanen, pp. 57–58, 63) defended the theory by evidence found in patristic sources, i.e., Aug. C. D. 5.3 which has recussaret. This was rigorously opposed by Lundström as inadequate given Augustus' other errors; the reason to reject the theory is found on the two different meanings of the tenses. GIGON (Gespräche in Tusculum) translated it to mean that Themistocles refused the lyre on only one occasion (as Plu. Cint. 9.1), and so understood it as a historical-cum clause; however, it is far better as a causal-cum as Kühner explained, 'imperfectum significat Themistoclem eodem tempore temporis puncto, quo lyram recusabet, indicidendem habitudinem esse'; or alternatively, expressing his customary usage, i.e., Themistocles' always refused the lyre. HARMON (Amonous and Amonous in Antiquity, p. 363) argued that epular above in 1, 3 is a true plural; it would be improbable that Cicero would alter his meaning in this passage. If this is true, then we must rule out the recussaret.

lyram: the lyre was passed from hand to hand and each individual was to offer a song, Quint. Inst. 1.10.19.

ergo: 'hence', by which word Cicero emphasises the high esteem of music in Greece. floruerunt, discenbantque: the tenses are important; floruerunt is aorist, K–S. 2.33, 8. Dougan ad loc. explained that the use of the perfect here is suitable for expressing the fact that an event has occurred, though it might have a lengthy duration; the imperfect which follows is used to describe the circumstances of the event.

id: we are to understand musica from musici, cf. N. D. 1.31.88, non vestro more, sed diadecticonum, quae funditus gens vestra non novit etc. and below, 30, 72 n.

§5. nihil mathematicus in Iustus: nihil (and the interrogative quid) often stand idiomatically in place of nemo and persons, and almost always with the ablative of comparison, cf. Ter. Eun. 5.8.21, nihil est Thaide hae tua dignitas quod amendet; Nep. Alcib. 1; Fam. 4.4. Tusc. 3.10.22, Peripatetici, familiares nostri, quibus nihil est uberos, nihil eruditus, nihil gravius; and Brut. 39.144. Dougan suggested that the mathematici hints at Pythagoras and Plato, but Polehaz is more correct in supposing Archimedes (Tusc. 5.23.64). Cicero speaks generally here, but in other tracts he does cite the mathematicians by name: Eudoxus (mentioned alongside Archimedes at Rep. 1.22, Menarcheus, and Archytas, the last of whom Cicero mentions in the same passage of the Tusc. The stress of the passage is on the intellectual and not practical qualities mentioned in these illustrious men of Greece. The latter three were criticized by Plato as corrupting pure mathematics and geometry (Pl. Symp. 8.2.) by engaging in practical applications of their learning; but this was not the case with Archimedes who was reluctant to turn his learning to mechanical employment.

metiendo... terminauimus modum: translate: 'restricted by the means of (practical) use of measuring and calculating'. For the use of the ablative as means, cf. Off. 3.33.17, qui bona voluptate terminaverit; and for 'measuring', cf. Hor. A. P. 325–332.

III. §6–7: In contrast to the other art forms, Cicero claims that the Romans had a natural inclination and genius towards oratory (aptum) and he further stresses this by claiming that their lack of erudition did not impugn the Roman oratorical abilities, though they did eventually come to hold theoretical models. The focus on the great Romans in this area and their abilities is the defense Cicero proposes for his own work on philosophy. The Tusc. will be as much a monument for Roman ingenuity as it will be for eloquence. There is a great deal of self-posturing and heroic language in this section as Cicero places himself at the head of Roman eloquence by which he wishes to aid his countrymen. The argument here later shifts to the art not of speaking but of writing; and Cicero claims that his work as a philosophical writer is aimed at fulfilling a deficiency of attractive writings in Latin. contra: adverbial.

oratores: = 'eloquentium', Latin prefers the metonymy, and brings the person into prominence; particularly here since the contrast has been hitherto of painters, poets, etc. rather than painting and poetry. Cicero thinks of representatives of the art of eloquence rather than the art itself.

eruditum: Ellendt explains ad loc. as = 'qui arte et litteris institutus est', but eruditus can mean trained in a speciality (regulae) or more generally (peradagme), which for the Romans was the art of eloquence. It has the same sense as doctus below, and usually means educated by Greek teachers in Greek models, as in Gracchus at Brut. 104, doctus et Graecis litteris eruditus; — but not always, as when applied to M. Brutus, cf. Brut. 107, cum litteris Latinis tum etiam Graecis, ut terribilibus illis, eruditus. The term is used contemptuously and ironically against Piso at Prot. Cons. 6.14, homo doctus et a suis Graecis, subtilius eruditus.

ad dicendum: Cicero nearly always uses this phrase to render the Greek προτροπῇ, cf. A. C. 1.33, Cato's definition of a bonus vir (Quint. Inst. 12.1.1) is one who is dicendi peritus.
dicendum, post autem etiam eruditum. nam Galbam, Africanum, Laelium doctusuisse traditum est, studiosem autem eum, qui eis ante aetibat, Catonem, post uero Lepidum, Carbonem, Gracchos, inde ita magnos nostram ad aetatem, ut non multum aut nihil omnino Graecis cederetur. philosophia iacuit usque ad hanc aetatem nec ullum habitu lumen litteraturam Latinum; quae

Galbam: Servius Sulpicius Galba, consul 144 B.C. He is praised for exhibiting traits that distinguished him as an orator, such as his digressions as embellishments, Brut. 21.82, and his forceful delivery ad loc. 89, in Galba; Cicero ranks him above his contemporaries, even Afric anus and Laelius; but there Cicero denied he had any great learning, instead relying on his natural ability to speak, peregrinogenos neque satis doctus. Cicero wrote of his treachery against the Lusitanians when praetor, and we have the story of his prosecution by Cato in De Or. 2.65.263, Val. Max. 8.1.2, quod Lusitaniarum magnam manum interposita fide praetor in Hispania interemisset. When praetor in Hispania, he died 83 B.C. Cicero writes that he had

Africanum, Laelium doctos: in contrast to Galba, these two men are always characterised by Cicero in his dialogues as enlightened philhellenes and learned.


Laelium: Gaius Laelius, surnamed 'Sapiens', consul 140 B.C., and intimate friend of Africanus Minor. For his abilities as a speaker and his often archaising style, cf. Brut. 21.82, C. Laelius et P. Africanus in primis eloquentes.

doctos: 'steeped in letters', different from studiosemi:

eum...Catonem: The pronoun to precede its substantival or explanatory clauses (Küh.), cf. below 13, 29, qui nondum ea quae...physica didissent etc. qui eis: between his and iis the mss. are inaccurate, though the favoured form is his. Kühner has a lengthy note on the difference between the demonstrative his (Pnice. G. L. 17.9.58) and the relative is. It is best to take his to mean quos modo dixi (Mosser): this gives a good sense, and so it could be retained here.

aetate aetibat: Cato was born 243 B.C., consul 195 B.C., censor 184 B.C., died 149 B.C. anteire aliquem is usual, but can also take the dative, cf. Off. 2.10.37, qui anteire ceteris virtute putatur etc.; Fin. 5.31.93.

Lepidum: M. Aemilius Lepidus Porcina, consul 137 B.C., a younger contemporary of Galba (Brut. 25.96), and the greatest orator of the second aetas oratorum (Brut. 333), as Galba was in the first; he introduced smooth periodic structures.

Carbonem: most mss. print catonem, which was first corrected by Berosaldu. Papirius Carbo, was a pupil of Lepidus. When praetor in 130 or 131 B.C., and for years after, he was a supporter of Ti. Gracchus, MRR 1.526; but he later changed his allegiance to the optimates and, when consul in 120 B.C., defended L. Optimus against the partisans of G. Gracchus (Rowe, Caton., p. 374). Cicero writes that he had perpetuum in populari ratione levitatum (Brut. 27.103), which made him unpopular; he later committed suicide to avoid condemnation after being prosecuted by L. Licinius Crassus, cf. De Or. 2.170, Q. Fr. 2.3.3, Fam. 9.21.3, and see Shackleton-Bailey (No-

biles and Novi, p. 296).

Gracchus: Carbo, Ti. Gracchus (Brut. 27.103–104) and his brother G. Gracchus (Brut. 33.125–126) are considered to be in the third aetas oratorum, and for a comparative study of Ti. Gracchus' style, see Albrecht (Roman Prose, pp. 40–44). Cicero's portrayal of the Gracchi is not always one of untempered condemnation; at times he is able to praise their virtues (if not their politics) and always their abilities as speakers, Tiberius at De Or. 1.9.38, and inv. 1.4.5 (if the text is sound), and further Gaius, at Font. 17.39, where he is called ingeniosissimus atque eloquentissimus. For a detailed consideration of Cicero's views of the Gracchi, see Murray (Cicero and the Gracchi).

inde ita magnos nostram ad aetatem: including the fourth aetas oratorum, in which was M. Antonius (consul 96 B.C.); L. Licinius Crassus (consul 98 B.C., censor 93 B.C.) of the fifth, with C. Aurelius Cotta (Brut. 153, 182), and P. Sulpicius Rufus (Brut. 183, 203); of the sixth, Q. Hortensius (consul 68 B.C., see Brut. 230, De Or. 2.228), and there can be no doubt Cicero also includes himself. In his introduction, Wilkins (De Oratore) has a discussion of these orators.

non mutum aut nihil omnino: for aut used only once, see K.–S. 1.137.2.

cederetur: cf. Cicero's language when he speaks about the writing of history, Leg. 1.5, in hoc etiam genere Graeciae nihil edamus. For the tense, see 4, 7 n. It is interesting that Verg. Aen. 8.437–553 has singled out oratory to concede to the Greeks while Cicero has here made it an exception, see Williams (The Sixth Book of the 'Aeneid', p. 61).

iacuit: cf. 2, 4 n.

usque ad hanc aetatem: if the aetas included the previous ten years, he may also be thinking of Lucretius whose work he described, Q. Fr. 2.9.3, multis luminibus ingenii, mulia tamen artis, and see Shillek (Lucretius and Cicero). Cicero says that philosophical texts were only available in Greek until his time, Tusc. 2.5, 4.6; Cat. 40–41; N. D. 1.8; Ac. 1.4.12. But it has not been satisfactorily explained why Cicero does not consider Lucretius a writer of philosophy, despite that the fact that he knew the poet's work well, which (as Munro notes ad loc.) he clearly echoes at Tusc. 1.48, and 4.75. I suggest that Cicero is thinking broadly about Hellenistic philosophy, not just the study or propagation of a single school.

 nec ullum habitu lumen: cf. De Or. 3.6.22, neque esse ulla sententiam inululent sine luce verborum. Cicero is thinking (as he does below) about the Epicurean 'aemulii', who are incapable of expressing their thoughts. Cicero may be feeling as Aristotle did, αἰτέρων σωπάτης, ἑαυτοκράτηρ δ' ἐὰν λέγωι. (D. L. 5.3.), and not Χενοκράτην as Hicks in his edition; see below 4, 7 n. and De Or. 3.141.

lumen litteratum: generally in metaphors, the use of the term lux is stronger than lumen, but lumen is by far the more frequent, cf. Fin. 3.10, honestum, lumen virtutis and 5.58; as well as Seyffert's n. on Am. 8.27, in eo quasi lumen aliquod probitatis et virtutis perspicere valeamus. lumen is 'light' generally; lux is 'brightness'. The use of the metaphor, philosophia nullum lumen habitu, might be compared to the Cimmerians, whose lux was taken away by some god or by nature, and who were then required to subsist only on the meagre lumen of fire (Ac. 2.6.1, which Cicero gets from
inlustranda et excitanda nobis est, ut, si occupati profusimus aliquid ciuibus nostris, progressus etiam, si possumus, otiosi. in quo eo magis nobis est elaborandum, quod multi iam esse libri Latini

Cicero continues to have Prometheus in mind, who brought fire down from the gods for the benefit of man, and was considered one of their greatest friends. We know Cicero had the Aeschylean version, or Pl. Ptd. in mind, and not the Hesiodic. The force of the passage ought to be emphasized. The image of lumen litterarum is further strengthened in inlustranda et excitanda, 'to be lit and kindled', over which Küh. exclaims, 'elegans verborum defectus!' Prometheus underwent great hardships to return the fire to men, and by doing so became their eternal benefactor; he not only brought fire, but wisdom, and arts such as mathematics, music, astronomy, architecture, and philosophy through which mankind would flourish. This is the image that Cicero is aiming at in this subtle passage: philosophy was kept ablaze in Greece while Italy shivered, and he is bringing it to Rome. This fabelia had a significant impact on the Tusc., cf. Tusc. 1.10, and 112–119. In Tusc. 2.23, Cicero translates directly from Aeschylus, euon docus Prometheus, Cleonide dolo potensque, Naci Fatu expendisse supremo. The imagery was used by Cicero before in Arch. 6.14, sed pleni omnes sunt libri, plena sapientium voces, plena exemplorum vetustas: quae iacerent in tenebris

We must not allow others a desirable end for the individual, i.e. in moral, and not political terms. Cicero's time devoted to literary pursuits during his retirement was considered a moral activity with its own intrinsic value, though he does feel it was less than he deserved for his accomplishments for the state, e.g., Off. 3.3. Many of the comments that Boy- 

Amicus iacentem animum excitet

But it must never be forgotten that Cicero did not mean leis-

Amicus iacentem animum excitet

6. elaborandum: 1. 2 n.

Ille Latinii: on Epicurean theories generally, described at Tusc. 4.3 as pauc a admonum Latina monumenta.

dicuntur: contemptuously, as if Cicero would not deign to read them himself.

incognitare: cf. Off. 1.103, ne quid temere ac fortuito, inconsiderate neglegentique omanum; i.e., not done without thinking about the product, but without consideration of its consequences.

Optimus: = ophiys, the expression optimus vir or bo-

nuis vir can carry an ironic or pejorative meaning (Cicero expressed dissatisfaction at being called an optimus con-

venita). He did not have any rhetorical

Ante. And. 3.5.10.

Illi quidem uris: Cicero is referring to the Epicurean writers G. Amafinius (Ac. 1.3.5, Tusc. 4.3.5–7), Rabrius (ibid.,) and the Insularian Catius (Fam. 15.9.15–26, 16.16.1). The dates for Amafinius are uncertain; some scholars think it likely he was teaching late second to early first century B.C., others place him as a contemporary of Lucretius, (DeWitt: Notes on the History of Epicureanism, p. 170; Howe: Amafinius, Lucretius, and Cicero, p. 62). At first, Amafinius taught orally in Latin, but then published many books which had imitators, and students flocked to him from all over Italy. He was known to have invented the word corpuscula (Ac. 1.2.6); he did not have any rhetorical flourish or refinement which would be expected by more literate men (Fam. 15.19.2), and for this Cicero takes issue, Fin. 1.3.8, 3.12.40. C. Catius was a liber sed non insesdundus 

 fictito, in connection with the controversy of tbe anaoen between Theophrastus and Dicaearchus, and the conten- 

tion between the contemplative and active life as espoused by the Epicureans who were champions of the quiet life. Cicero found dignity and true glory by means of writing at leisure, cf. below 15, puetae eorum pro melioris vitae

Seeholtz's note on Epicureans, though Cicero's later dialogues

as well. It is unlikely that Cicero had here in mind the polit-

ical ideas of Epicureans, though Cicero's later dialogues were guarded attacks on their philosophy as destructive to the Republic. It was during the writing of Tusc., 45 B.C., after Tullia's death, that Cicero became more favorable to Epicureanism; it is in this period that he writes letters to the Epicurean Papius Paetus, Att. 1.11.2.

Non satis eruditi: however, compare the portrayal of the Epicurean Torquatus in Fin., described as homo omni 

doctrina eruditus.
potest, ut recte quis sentiat et id quod sentit polite eloqui non possit; sed mandare quemquam litteris cognitiones suae, qui eas nec disponere nec inulizzare possit nec delectatione aliqua allicere lectorem, hominis est intemperanter abutentis et otio et litteris. Itaque suos libros ipsi legunt cum suis, nec quisquam attingit praeter eos, qui eandem licentiam scribendi sibi permissi ulunt. Quare si aliquid oratoriae laudis nosstra attitumus industria, multo studiosius philosophiae fontis aperiemus, et quibus etiam illa manabit.

IV. Sed ut Aristoteles uir summo ingenio, scientia copia, cum motus esset Isocratis rhetoribus gloria, dicere docere etiam coepit adolescentes et prudentiam cum eloquentia iungere, sic nobis

et id: = et tamen: Latin often leaves the antithesis to the reader; Dougan cites De Or. 1.23.86. Add Tac. Hist. 2.20, specieis et irritis nominibus.

ut recit...eloqui non possit: e.g., Philost., Lives of the Sophists, 6. οὖν, ὅτι καὶ ἀκράτεια; οὐδαμῶς δὲ ἀκράτεια; so Eupolis says of Phaeas (Plut. Alc. 15), λαλῶν ἀκρατῶς, οὐδαμῶς ἀκράτως Μέγων. Somewhat ‘catachrestic’ use of eloqui for cum eloquentia dicere. cf. Pline. Nat. 32.113.

quemquam: = ‘any one at all’, the idea of universality; universal negations are more frequent than affirmations, of which this is a rare example, along with Tusc. 1.7.13, and Cat. 1.6.6; the cognates usquam, unquam are similarly used (Verg. Aen. 7.311, Sen. Ep. 7.11.14); see Madv. Gram. 494a. Sometimes usius is so used.

interemperant: cf. Ac. 1.2, interemperant enim arbitror esse scribere quod occulatur velit; ‘without restraint’, or ‘unreservedly’.

cum suis: = ‘cum eis sui similibus’, ‘mit Gleichgesinnten’, quod eum esset Isocratis rhetoribus, ut a ceteris oblectationibus deseror et voluptatum ut a ceteris oblectationibus deseror et voluptatum

attitumus: sc. populo Romano, or ciuis nostris like Phil. 2.20, but the verb adferre can be used absolutely, as Hand has shown by Mil. 28.77, non quod vetera illa populi Romani gaudio quantitate fuerint iidicari: multas tarnen iam summorum imperatorum clarissimas victorias actas nostra vidit, quorum nulla neque tam diuturnam attulit laetitiam nec tantam

Cicero implies that he has contributed to Roman oratorical renown without claiming that it had none before.

philosophiae fontis aperiemus: COlACLIDES (Ennius and Cicero) has pointed out that this phrase shows a similarity to Verg. Geor. 2.175, imperator sanctos aequus recluder fontis (cf. Off. 2.55) which Cicero (and Vergil) have drawn from Enn. Ann. vii.

illa: constructio ad sententiam, i.e., correctly explains quae in dicendi arte attitumus. The plural implies Cicero’s many successes.

IV. 75. ut... sic: an adversative form, ‘conversely’, like in Att. 4.10.1, ut a ceteris oblectationibus deseror et voluptatum propter rem publicam, sic litteris sustentor et recreo.

Aristoteles: the same story is at De Or. 3.35.151, ipse Aristoteles cum floreor isocratis nobilitate discipulorum videtur... mutavit reperire totam formam prope disciplinae suae... Itaque ornavit et inulizzare doctrinam illam omnem rerunque cognitionem cum orationis exercitacione conuinxit.

summo ingenio, scientia, copia: asyndeton with three terms is common in Cicero; Orelli remarks that “tria omnino sunt ingeniis a natura Aristotelis datum, scientia ab ipso comparata, copia siue eloquentia.” summo goes with all three, Mur. 17.386, Verr. 2.4.58.131.

scientia: referring to Aristotles’ broad learning, cf. Or. 1.5, nec ipsa Aristoteles admirabilia quaedam scientia et copia ceterorum studia restinxit. copia: = flumen orationis aurum, Ac. 2.38.119. A common epithet in Cicero’s mouth for Aristotle, and generally for other pupils of Plato, cf. Val. Max. 8.7.2, Platon... ingenii divina instructus abundantia, and De Or. 3.67, Ac. 1.18. Cicero claims in N. D. 1.7.9 that he has surpassed even the Greeks in this mastery of expression. KNAPP (Some Remarks on Cicero as a Student, pp. 52–53) has an excellent collection of Cicero’s opinions on this matter.

cum motus... Isocratis rhetoris gloria: Isocrates, born 436 B.C., and after the battle of Chaeronea in 338 B.C. committed suicide; Aristotle, born 384 B.C., left Athens in 348 B.C., and founded the Peripatetic school in 335 B.C. upon his return. We know of their rivalry from Cicero, Or. 172, De Or. 3.144, Quint. Inst. 3.11.14, and Philodemus, Rhet. 1967; and though their differences would seem plausible, they are by no means certain. The stories may have stemmed from one which existed between Plato and Isocrates, but this itself is doubted by some scholars, e.g., Shorey, while accepted by others, Vries, Howland, Benoit.

Isocrates’ strength lay in his application of language to practical problems, specifically in cases where the absolute truth could not be obtained, as here in the Tusc. It was a strongly held view of Isocrates that an orator should have a wide liberal education in the arts, particularly in philosophy; his focus was pedagogical, and he believed that by direction and guidance he could develop his students. (De Or. 3.35ff, Brut. 204, Quint. 2.8.11). Isocrates would unite philosophy with rhetoric and it was the latter which would prevail among the Romans, cf. above 2, 5. In this preface we already find early hints that we should not expect a purely philosophical treatise as much as an oration. For a similar sentiment, compare Parad. 2, nos ca philosophy plus utinam, quae peperit dicendi copiam, Fat. 3, cum loc genere philosophiae, quod nos sequimur, magnum habet orator statemat, Off. 1.3.

rhetoris: Pohlenz notes that Cicero is careful to use rhetor here, not orator since Isocrates was properly a teacher of rhetoric (his ις τοιού λογοφ ανδρια), and not himself a speaker since all except six of his speeches were meant for reading, on which see HOOK (Spoken versus the Written Word, p. 86); BENZOIT (Isocrates and Aristotle on Rhetoric, p. 252); Too/LIVINGTON (Pedagogy And Power: Rhetorics Of Classical Learning).

prudentiam cum eloquentia iungere: prudentia = philosophia, a rare usage, more usually represented with sapi-
placez nec pristinum dicendi studium deponere et in hac maiore et ubi 
temperatur orationis genus


entia, but cf. Div. 2.4. Aristoteles itemque Theophrastus, excellentes vici cum subtilitate tum copia, cum philosophia dicendi etiam praecox conuixert. Earlier, Cicero had made the same remark as here, in De Or. 3.141, itaque ipsa Aristoteles cum flore isocratem nobilitat discepulorum videret, quod ipsa suas disputationes a causis forensibus et civilibus ad inanem sermonis elegantiam trunclatilis, mutavit repente totam formam prope disciplinae saeae... itaque ornatit et instaruitur doctri

...adem ennom enramque cognitionem cum orationis exercitacione conuixet. Note the stress again on the relationship between the forensic science and philosophy, whose common ground becomes oratory, while Cicero feels himself able to embody all three. At Off. 1.3 he names his own potential rivals among the Greeks in this ability to excel in both the legal, oratorical, and philosophical, as Demetrius Phalerus and Theophrastus.
stoicus... may also be an allusion to the habits of Posidonius, who... ornate et... aequabile et grandeur to them while his philosophical works have a

his own imitation the 'more sublime', probably alluding to the Myth of Er in

with even more vigour and found solace in them as well. Ascalon was also 'perfect' in his own field (De Or. 1.179, Fam. 10.1.4) and Greek, odrk... 11, where we find it commonly in the orators, cf. Isoc. De Pac. 98, odrk... 13, odrk... ung, Madv. Gram. 458c.

... quaestio... could refer to the legal trials or more broadly to... perfectus... adhister; and... Brut... to the great questions, and also its best expression, as this, contains approbation in both a technical and a moral sense. Cicero himself the 'lofter', 'more sublime', probably alluding to the Myth of Er in... thought that the nature of literature was to instruct and that philosophers should make use of poetry to expound doctrinal, which he was famous for employing (and as Cicero does in the Tusc.), cf. Att. 2.1.2, and Gal. De plac. Hipp. et Plut. 4.399, and Ed.--Kidd Ti04.

... a curious pun here; the term... 54.

... orator commodo... it also had a sense of prac-

... and a... perfectissimus... med.(

... as his forensic duties permitted him, Cicero found recre-

ation in his studies, Att. 1.20, nam et Graecis eis libris, quos suspicer, et Latinis, quos scio illam reliquiae, mihi vehementer opus est. ego autem cotidie magis, quod mihi de forensi labore temporis datur, in eius studiis conquiesco. He took them up with even more vigour and found solace in them as well when he was forced to depart from politics.

... compare Cicero's own eval-

uation of his philosophical works, Off. 1.3, non solum orationes meas, sed hos etiam de philosophia libros, qui iam il-

lis fere se aequarat, studiose legas, — vis enim maior in illis... traducit. Commentator... not upon it, most strikingly illustrated at, Isoc. Antid. 183–185, epistulae...

... the words... disseertationes' at Fin. 2.1.1, on which see Rose (The Greek of Cicero, p. 111); but it also had a sense of prac-

... scholas... cf. 47, 113, σηχολβ, a hellenistic phrasing meaning... 'dissertationes' at Fin. 2.1.1, on which see Rose (The Greek of Cicero, p. 111); but it also had a sense of prac-

... and similarly N. D. 1.9, si me non modo ad legendos libros, sed etiam ad totam philosophiam pertractandum desidem. I add Plaut. Cas. profl. operam detis ad nostrum grege...
Graecorum more habere auderemus. ut nuper tuum post discursum in Tusculano cum essent complures mecum familiaris, temptaut, quid in eo genere possem. ut enim ante declamitabam

1 auderemus | audeamus Vc 2 complures | cumplures G1 V1 R1 corr. ipsi, et Or. 2 possem | sic Vc, v., possim X

Graecorum more: no commentator has considered that in 92 B.C., Crassus and Domitius closed down the Roman schools of rhetoric (Gell. Att. 15.1.2) on account of their betrayal of their Greek exemplars, De Or. 3.93–95, yet it is crucial for the understanding of Cicero’s meaning here. As a young man he would have gone to L. Plotinus Gallus but was persuaded against it by the opinion of learned men who thought that Greek was a better means of education, Suet. Rhet. 2. Cicero certainly benefited from it and later praised his Greek education as the foundation for his success as an orator, Brut. 310. Or. 12. We have some evidence (though fragmentary) that Cicero was despairing of the slackness of Greek education around 51 B.C., Rep. 3, principi disciplinam puerum ingenuis, de qua Graeci multum frustra laborant, et in qua una Polybius noster hospes nostrorum institutorum neglegi tam incidit. After their disappearance, Cicero may be attempting to re-establish the Roman schools based on Greek models, and it was for this I think that his detractors often called him ἑρωκλῆς καὶ σχολαστικός, Plu. Cíc. 5.2. In a letter to Paetus, Fam. 9.18, he claims that his ‘teaching school’ was a means of guarding against the times; his students included Hirtius, Cassius, and Pansa (Fam. 7.33–1–2). For the style of the Greek school, see Dougal (Form and Content in the Tuscanian Disputations, pp. 198–200); Harink (Politics of Latin Literature, pp. 64–66); Erskine (Cicero and the Expression of Grief, pp. 39–47).

dedimus...auderemus: ἐπίθετα we should have expected audeamus, hence the correction in V. Moser remarked against the authors, often accommodates the modulation not to the idea, but to the form of the proposition, and so an imperfect follows despite the fact that the force of the sentiment is pertinent to the present. Doug. says that the past sequence is more usual, the primary more rare after a perfect in Cicero, cf. below 42, 100, Rep. 6.3, Sen. 21. Many other examples may be cited.

tuum post discursum: Most editors think that this refers to Brutus’ departure as governor to Casilinae Gaul in 47 B.C., cf. Fam. 6.6; however, Schmidt (Briefwechsel, p. 57) finds a reference here to Brutus’ departure from Cicero’s Tusculanosum, July 20, 49 B.C. to meet Caesar who was returning victorious after Munda, cf. Att. 13.44.1, Brutus apud me fuit; quod sequer velax placebat me aliquid ad Caesarem; Schmidt further maintains that the five scholae contained here in the Tusc. were conducted on five consecutive days, July 20–24 (Att. 13.34.1), but it is unlikely that it is strictly accurate. Taylor (Chronology of Cicero’s Letters, p. 231) has argued that Brutus’ departure was actually August 25.

Tusculano: i.e., praedio, Cicero’s favourite villa, his chosen spot for retirement, and nowhere was he happier (Att. 1.6.2). He writes that it was a place he would forget all his troubles (Att. 1.5.7), and in anguish he was to this place that his feet would almost take him involuntarily (Att. 12.46.1: 15.162a.1). For this reason, there can be no doubt that this location has a significant connection with the title and contents of the Tusc. I find it remarkable that after Tullia’s death, which followed so many others of his friends’, Cicero was in such utter despair that not even this villa could assuage his sorrow, and so he retired to seclusion at Astura, Att.12.4.3, and see Fortner (Cicero’s Town and Country Houses, p. 179). Cicero lived here almost without interruption from 46–45 B.C., sending from it almost 60 letters.

This Tusculan villa was once the property of Sulla (Plin. H. N. 22.12), later of Catulus and Vetius, and bought by Cicero in 68 B.C.; after its devastation by Clodius in 58 B.C., it was restored at great expense. It was distant from the main road (Att. 7.5.3), and contained an upper gymnasion called the Lyceum (Div. 2.8), and a lower gymnasion called the Academy (Tusc. 2.9, 3.7, 4.7) likely below the house. Vitr. De Arch. 5.11.2 describes the and is a description of learned men whose depictions of life and habitus of such Roman villas as constituantur autem in tribus porticibus exedras spatiosae, habentes sedes, in quibus philosophi, rhetores reliquiae, qui studiis delectantur, sedentes disputare possint. When Cicero discusses his villas, very often he uses language reminiscent of scenes by Plato, Xenocrates, and Polemon. (Wycherley: Athenian Philosophical Scene I, p. 152). Moreover, (History of the Romans under the Empire, pp. 366–369) has a beautiful description of the location, but it does not appear that we can come to any conclusion as to its whereabouts. Flavius Blondus of Forli, in his Italia Illustrata, first suggested that the Badia di Grottaferrata was built on its ruins; his supposition attracted a great quantity of scholarship, but is now dismissed. For a detailed examination of the suggested sites, see McCracken (Cicero’s Tusculan Villa); Harper (Site of Cicero’s Tusculanum). Plu. Cíc. 40 reports that it was from his Tusculanum country-seat that Cicero used to write to his friends that he was ‘living a life of Laertes’ (cf. Hom. Od. 1.109, ἐργανθεὶς ἵπποι...ἀπανθέων ἐπὶ ἀγοράν πίστας ναυς; and 24.231ff), which Plutarch presumed was a jest; however, Fam. 13.15 seems to be from Astura and not Tusculanum, and in 49 B.C., rather from this later period of his suffering. posse: passim in the text of the manuscripts, but posse accords to Cicero’s usage, and cf. above n. on auderemus. Cicero feigns modesty, cf. Off. 1.3.

declamitabam causas: the -ito is iterative, (as Phil. 2.16.42 dictiunt), and suggests that the speaking was for the sake of practice. Commentators adduce Brut. 90.310, commentabatur declamitum—sic enim non locutur—saepius cum M. Pisone et cum Q. Pompeio aut cum aliquo cotidie et aliud. Later in imperial times, this practice had become highly artificial. (Mart. 6.19, Petr. Sat. 1.2).

I find that there is another possible interpretation: examine Quint. Inst. 10.5.2, θέσεις...quiibus Cicero iam princeps in republica exerceret solutum. Though often cited, few commentators have looked to Int. (or De Or. 2.133–135) for comparison. In this work, Cicero followed the Stoic Hermagoras who separated the subject matter of oratory into two parts, the ἐπίθεσις, and the θέσις, translated by Cicero causa and quœstio (Int. 1.8) — the former a concrete case with appurtenances of names and places, while the latter was infinitus, and was an abstract problem from the sphere of philosophy; we have an additional passage in Q. Fr. 3.34 which further elucidates Cicero’s meaning, Cicero noster summò studio est Paronii sui rhetoris, hominis valde exercitati et boni; sed nostrum instituendi genus esse paulo eruditius et Passio quem non ignorant, quæque neque ego impediri Ciceronis tier atque iliam disciplinam volo et ipsa magis illo declamatorii genere duci et delectari videtur, in quo quoniam ipsi quoque fuismus etc. What did Cicero mean by θέσις? Gratian understood this accurately, ‘philosophice quaestionibus magis reformat, aptum’; but Orelli, relying on Ernesti thought he rather meant genus subtilius. Now what Cicero surely meant in this letter was that in his youth he practised speaking with a focus on the θέσις, and not on causae which tended to be favoured in the schools, where see De Or. 2.100, and the example given by Quint.
causas, quod nemo me diuittius fecit, sic haec mihi nunc senilis est declaratio. ponere iubebam, de quo quis audire uellet; ad id aut sedens aut ambulans disputabam itaque dierum quinque scholans, ut Graeci appellant, in totidem libros contulii. fiebat autem ita ut, cum is qui audire uellet dixisset, quid sibi uidere turb, tum ego contra dicerem. haec est enim, ut scis, uetus et Socratica ratio contra alterius opinionem disserendi. nam ita facillime, quid ueri simillimum esset, inueniri posse Socrates arbitratur. Sed quo commodius disputationes nostrae explicentur, sic eas exponam, quasi agatur res, non quasi narretur. ergo ita nescetur exordium.

2 audire] audire V5 SME. audiri X 2 ad id) plurimis miss. habent at id: ad id P adf. Verb. 4 quid] quod in quid corr. 

Inst. 7.6.6, Sihler (διευκρινων. 250ff). The implication is that a θέες must have an answer, whether positively or negatively (Arist. Top. 1.11, 201; καὶ θέες προβλήματα ὥς τοι ἐν αὐτῷ προβλήματα, εἰπάν οὖν ἐνα ὑποτροφία βουλείαν). Despite his claim to use the Socratic method, Cicero does in the Tusc. set out to produce a positive answer to the question of mors non mala. Cicero complained in De Or. 2.79 that for most teachers of rhetoric, de altera parte dicendi [i.e., quae insit ne natarum habitum est. He remedies this lack of theory in this Tusc. by presenting us with an example of what he sees as an excellent method for eliciting a Socratic dialogue.

senilis est declaratio: cf. Tusc. 2.11.26, itaque postquam adamsavi hanc quasi senilem declarationem, studiisque equidem utor nostis poetis. Dougan is wrong in thinking this is in contrast to his youth; by senilis, Cicero means that in his old age he is returning to the practice of his youth.

ponere: = tēbeus, the usual word for proposing a topic for discussion, cf. Am. 5.17.

de quo quis: a regular idiom, the attraction of quis into the rel. clause, where see Madvig s.n. on Fin. 3.20.67.

ad id: with dicere, disputare, etc., it means ‘with reference to’ cf. Tusc. 3.9.18, 32.79, 4.21.48 (where it can = adversus); as well as Mar. 13.29, Fin. 4.25.71, ad virtutes et ad vitia nihil interesse. Pohlenz notes that Aristotle uses the phrase πρὸς θέες διαλέγεται. A few of the lesser manuscripts had ac id which is also Ciceronian, Fam. 3.8, idque me arbitrur Synnadia pro tribunali multis verbis disputasse.

socrates aut ambulans: Huxley, (De Dialog. p. 430-431) discusses the Roman custom of setting the scene in the country houses, as opposed to the Greek custom of the city (though Plato does have a number of dialogues, like the Parmenides, which are set in pleasant domestic settings); Hirzel suspects the scene here is the lower gymnasium or Academy, which would be appropriate to the method used in the Tusc. Generally, Cicero uses ‘setting’ to mark the start of the conversation proper, cf. De Or. 3.19, Rep. 1.18, Leg. 2.7, Ac. 1.14, Div. 2.8, among others; but this is not a rigid rule, and we cannot wholly declare that sitting was more associated with more formal teaching than walking, cf. Am. 1, nemini domi in hemiciclo sedentem, ut soletam, cum et ego essem una et pauci admedium familiares, in eum sermonem illum incide qui tum forte multis erat in ore, and see Göhrer (From Athens to Tusculum, p. 216).

disputabam: cf. Crassus’ comments where he opposes the idea of leisure and the strain of the disputatio, cf. De Or. 2.20, utiam autem quod dicis esse, adhibere; verum si fructus est non contento animi, sed relaxatio. §8. fiebat...ita: ‘our means of proceeding was’. contra dicerem...ratio Socratica: cf. Ac. 1.4, 2.7, 1.46; Div. 2.150; N. D. 1.5.11, hae in philosophia ratio contra omnia disserendi nullamque rem aperte indicandi profecta a Socrate, repetita ad Areclia, confirmata a Carneade uque ad nostrum viguit aetatem. In Tusc. 2.9, Cicero attributes the form of arguing both sides of a problem to Aristotle, and describes it as practised by both the Academics and the Peripatetics. Pohlenz says that Cicero has falsely denoted his method as Socratic, but this only highlights the ancient contro-

versy over the precise method that Socrates used, stemming from the desire of different philosophical schools to make Socrates their own special authority, on which see Lonc (Socrates in Hellenistic Philosophy, p. 153). We may state that it is not properly the Socratic method as Cicero defines this in Fin. 2.29, en enim percontando atque interrogando elicere solutum et quae opiniones, quibus escum dissererat, ut ea, quae ii respondissent, si quid visseretur, dicert, but rather the New Academic method of arguing against all opinions, which follows from the doctrine of the indubitability of the things. De Or. 3.84, nos erat patrum Academiarum adversari semper omnis ex disputandis. This practice is called αὐτὸς ἑκάστερος ἐπιφανής by Eusebius, 14.7.15, and ἐπιφανετής in Gal. De plac. Hipp. et Plat. 4.365; Fat. 1; Tusc. 2.9. Cicero, in N. D. 2.10.68, traces the practice back to Aristotle, Plato and Socrates, but this could perhaps be referred further back to the Megarians whom Pl. Phd. 90b called μένυτα ὅ ὁ καὶ πρὸς τῶν ἀντιλογίων λόγους διατριβάμενα οὐδὲ ἐδιώκεται νόμοις νομίσαντα ποίητυσαν γεγονέναι καὶ κατανενοηκέναι μόνοι ὅτι αὐτὰ τῶν πραγμάτων οὐκ εἶναι ὡς ὧν ἐπίθεται οὗτοι ὄντων ὑπάρχειν, ἀλλὰ πάντα τὰ ὡς ἀγαθὸς ὡσις ἐν Θεῷ ἄνω κατὰ στρέφεται καὶ χρόνον ὀδύνει ἐν οὐδενὶ μένει.

haec est enim: cf. 27.66. The expression is compressed.

disserendi: the habit of Socrates, i.e., dialectikos, cf. Ac. 1.5; Cicero sometimes renders the Greek word by intelligendum (De Or. 3.73) or by dialectica, (Ac. 2.91); cf. Fin. 1.22, pars philosophiae quae est quaerendi ac disserendi.

quid ueri simillimum esset: i.e., the search for probabilius, rather than any certain knowledge, representative of the New Academy, but cf. Cicero remarks after describing the underworld in Pl. Phd. 114d, τὸ μὲν ὡς ταῦτα διαφοροποιοῖται ὁδοῖς ἐκεῖ δικαίωται, ὧς πρέπει νῦν ὑπὸ τὸ μέντα ταῦτα ἐκεῖνο τῷ ἑαυτῷ ἀπαίτηται. The thought is also shared by Isoc. Antid. 271.

sed quo ... non quasi narratur: Cicero here avoids the use of inquit or inquitum which he employs in his other dialogues. The same method is used by Pl. Thl. 143b, τὸ μὲν δὲ βαθίων, ὃ Περίδων, τωτε, ἐγράφασεν ὡς δὲ οὖσι τῶν λόγων, ὡς ἐξα διαφορὰς διαφορὰς, ἀλλὰ διαλεγομένων ὡς διαλεγομένων. It is unlikely this conversation ever took place, like the Ac. In a letter to Varro, Cicero felt he needed to explain the practice of writing works in the form of a dialogue, Fam. 9.8, puto fore, ut, cum legeris, mirere nos id locutos esse inter nos, quod quidquam locutii sumus; sed nisti morem dialogorum. The dialogue later gives way to a lengthy oratio, with this ‘dialogue’ acting as an exordium. This structure is unique in Cicero’s dialogues.

agatur, narratur: in English, we would use an imperfect or pluperfect, but Latin has subordinate phrases in hypo-
thetical quasi comparisons follow the tense of the leading proposition, Madv. Gram. 239.

exordium: this is already an early indication in the preface that Cicero intends to use the full force of his eloquence in expounding his philosophical views. Indeed, there are not a few times when the philosophy in the Tusc. gives way to the oratory; the difficulty of combining philosophy with eloquence and the snares of sophistry which it entails have often been taken up in Plato’s writing.
etiam semper miseri. nam si solos eos diceres miseros quibus moriendum esset, neminem tu

esse.

Eisne, qui mortui sunt, an eis, quibus moriendum est?

Vtrisque.

Est miserum igitur, quoniam malum.

V .

Eisne, qui mortui sunt, an eis, quibus moriendum est?

Vtrisque.

Malum mihi uidetur esse mors.

Eisne: the ms. generally have the relative in the form of 

hi or his which most recent editors alter; Pohlenz, whom

Drexler and Giusta follow, alter the orthography of ei or

et to i, NEUE-WAGENER. 2.381. I have not followed this

practice and retain the more authentic ei.

ulo.

est miserum quoniam malum est: Cicero has been

accused by a few editors of a tautology here, but there is a difference between malum and miserum. The former, we can say, is an 'objective' evil (qua natura non bonum), whereas the latter miserum is 'subjective' (id cuius molestia sentiunt potest). The Stoics thought that only moral evil (natura) could make one unhappy; consequently, death was thought to be unable to make unhappy and so classified as an 'indifferent' evil. 

miserum: = 'ein Unglück' (Küh.), the neuter standing as a predicate in opposition to nolum, but not a substantive as bonum and malum were, cf. Pl. Phd. 105fr, ἀθάνατον ἄρα φυς, and Fin. 5.2884.

non miser: sc. est, in short sentences expressing a general opinion, Cicero commonly leaves off the concluding copula esse, cf. 25, 61, absurum id quidem.

tibi constare: = 'to be consistent with yourself', ἔμοι

ολογοεις σεαυτόν, cf. Tusc. 2.2.5, Off. 1.33.119.

moriendum esset. . uiuerent: for the sequence, Madv.

Gram. 517, we may have expected the tense and mood of the subordinate clauses to be present indicative, but often they are attracted into the governing conditional, cf. De Or. 1.210-212. E. Tr. 616, τὸ μὲν γενέθη τῷ μάθαινέ ἰδον λέγω. This is the Epicurean argument that our existence is symmetrical, and our state before birth will be similar to the state after death, Lucr. 3.832-842, and 3.972-5. The distinction which Epicurus and Lucretius make does not consider the fear of dying (metus mortalitatis), only the fear of having become dead. Cicero goes on to treat this point particularly in 7, 14. See WARREN (Lucretius, Symmetry Arguments, and Fearing Death); ROSENBAUM (Symmetry Argument).
quidem eorum qui uiuerent excipieres — moriendum est enim omnibus —, esset tamen miseriae finis in morte. quoniam autem etiam mortui miserunt, in miseriam nascimur sempiternam. necesse est enim miserios esse eos qui centum milibus annorum ante occiderunt, uel potius omnis, quicunque nati sunt.

Ita prorsus existimo.

Dic quaeo: num te illa terrent, triceps apud inferos Cerberus, Cocyti fremitus, trauectio


tu quidem: cf. 3, 6 n.
miseriae finis in morte: cf. Luc. 8.395 sed tua sors leuior, quoniam mors ultima poena est nec metuenda wiris, and Caesar’s famous speech in Sall. Cat. 51.
in miseriam: in expressions result, rather than purpose.
sempternam: cf. 47, 118
qui...occidunt: Cicero assumes a very great antiquity of mankind. The assumption appears to be that the world is neither created or destroyed, and that this cycle of death and birth is eternal: he is likely thinking of the Pythagoreans, on which see above 2, 5 n., and Plin. H. N. 2.1.1. mundum et hoc quocumque nomine alio caelum appellare libuit, cuius circumflexu degunt cuncta, numen esse credi par est, aeternum, immensus, neque genitum neque interitum unquam.

V. §10: Cicero did not concern himself with the survival of the soul until very late in life. He of course knew about the traditional di manes; the myths of Plato; the Eleusinian mysteries (he was an initiate if we trust Leg. 2.36); as well as many of the different philosophies on the soul we read in the doxography which follows below — yet hardly any of these are discussed by Cicero until 43 B.C. (SULLIVAN: Intimations of Immortality, p. 16). With the death of Tullia, Cicero was brought face to face with the great problem of death, and it woke in him a religious instinct which he described to Atticus when he sought his opinion about a fanum for his daughter, Att. 12.18, longunque illud tempus cum non ero magis me movet quam hoc exiguum etc. Though he generally derided the notions of Hades and its terrors, he does imply that he believed in them. His daughter was by his own admission, his only son, and the visual scenario that Cicero wishes to conjure. See WAITE: Cicero on Religion and Superstition, p. 159). It is the discussion here in the Tusc. which becomes the seed for De Natura Doorum.

triceps Cerberus: also called by Hor. Carm. 2.133.34 belua centiceps, Verg. Aen. 6.417, latrata triauiici; Hes. Theo. 312, κατα ταξις τριαυματομοιραω.

Cocyti: Κοώτος, the river of wailing (hence fremitus), mentioned by Cicero only here and in N. D. 3.17.43; it occurs in Plato’s description of the underworld, PL Rep. 389c and again with great detail in Pl. Phd. 1120, MORRISON (The Shape of the Earth in Plato’s “Phaedo”, pp. 115-116). In Vergil, souls of the unburied cannot cross it.

trauectio Acherontis: trauectio is a δρακων, here presumably translating the δρακων in Plato; the image may point rather to Charon than the boat itself, cf. A. Th. 85.6. It represents the fearful elements of Hades, cf. Lucr. 3.37, et metus ille foras praeces Acherontis agendus | funditus humanam qui vita turbat ab ino.
Tantalus tum illud, quod Sisyphus uerat.
Saxum sudans niten nond neque proficit hilum,
fortasse etiam inexcarnales iudices, Minos et Rhadamanthus? apud quos nec te L. Crassus defendet nec M. Antonius nec, quoniam apud Graecos iudices res agetur, poteris adhibere Demosthenem; tibi ipsi pro te erit maxima corona causa dicenda. haec fortasse metuis et idcirco mortem censes esse sempiternum malum.

VI. Adeone me delirare censes, ut ista esse credam?
An tu haec non credis?
Minime uero.
Male hercule narras.
Cur? quaeo.
Quia disertus esse possem, si contra ista dicerem.

3. Nunt. 121, 4: 355, 8

1 tantalus | tantalus X Nonii et Prisciani par codd., corr. K

Tantalus: cf. Hom. Od. 9.582–592, and Tusc. 4.16.35, where he adduces the alternative myth of Tantalus with the rock hanging over him. Most recent editors take Tantalus as not belonging to the verse, in which case aquam is trisyllabic, and makes the verse iambic trimeter, cf. Lucr. 6.552, 868, and 1072 aquai.

Sisyphus: pronounced Sisyphu (dactyl), the final -s is elided in old Latin, often disregarded in inscriptions, as Cicero explains De Or. 48.161. For the description, we can compare Hom. Od. 11.593–600, and Lucr. 3.1000, hoc est adverso nixantem trudere monte saxum. Ixion is often included as a third sinner in Hades, cf. Pl. Grg. 529e.

hilum: hilum is the root of nihil (= ne hilum), and mostly used with negation, cf. Lucr. 3.830, nil igitur mors est, ad nos neque pertinet hilum, and 3.22ff, 785; 5.1408; Enn. apud Varro. L. L. 4.22.

Minos: brother of Rhadamanthus, and king of Crete, who is said to have founded many useful laws; after his death he became one of the judges of the shades in Hades, Hom. Il. 13.450, 14.322, Verg. Aen. 6.432.

Rhadamanthus: among the Greeks, Pl. Od. 2.76–84 and Hom. Od. 4.561ff place Rhadamanthus in the fields of Elysium, rather than the gloomy Hades. With inexcarnables, and as shown by 39, 93, aniles, Cicero is drawing upon the myth of the last judgement in Pl. Grg. 524ff. Aeneus is often considered a third judge.

L. Crassus…M. Antonius: cf. 3. 5 n. Crassus, born 140B.C., Antonius, 143B.C., were the best orators from the preceding generation (Brut. 36–40, 43, 45, 53), and could be considered to be in the underworld. Cicero admired them, though this admiration was not shared by others. Antonius left no written speeches, see Malcovati (ORF, pp. 221–259). It seems strange that Cicero’s conception of the underworld here is filled portrayed mainly through Greek mythology, and both Crassus and Antonius may seem clumsily attached to the image; Cicero furthers his forensic imagery by painting a court in the underworld with sitting judges, presumably to weigh the life of each of the dead and it is an orator who would come to the defense.

quoniam: an ellipse is involved with poteris: ‘I also add this fact, since’, etc.

Graecos iudices: a very comment by Cicero intended to elicit a smile from the reader. If the Greek are so inferior to the Romans, why do they sit as judges of the dead?

adhibere: in a legal sense, ‘retain the services of’; legal language pervades this first half of the Tusc.

Tibi ipsi pro te: this is in contrast with the Greek practice where defendants normally spoke on their own behalf though speeches could be written for them. Romans very rarely spoke as defendants on their own behalf but there were important exceptions, cf. Brut. 127. 304; it seems that their fear would be sincere, Fin. 2.74, si coronam times, and see Alexander (Trials in the Late Roman Republic).

maxima corona: i.e., listeners who encircle the speaker, in this case the shades of the dead. cf. N. D. 2.1.1, Fin. 2.2274, Brut. 84.280, Mil. 1. Here, it is an ablative absolute defining the circumstance.

VI. The argument now turns momentarily to the consideration of the Latin verb esse and the meanings of being. Though the sections are playful, and I think are designed to capture readers' attention through paradox. This sets the groundwork for the later discussion of the exact definition of what mori means.

Ista:iste, the demonstrative pronoun of the second person is often used for that which is referred to the person addressed. It is strongly compared to haec which follows (i.e., demonstrative of the first person) and this helps to create a scene of liveliness, cf. Cat. 1.6.17. The dramatists offer many sportive illustrations of these pronouns.

 Esse: here = ‘really exist’, below 6, 12 n.

Male…narra: = quae dicis non liberent audio, ‘Du sprichst nicht gut. Ei, das ist mir nicht lieb!’ (Wolf), ‘I’m sorry to hear that.’ The language is colloquial, like Parad. 3.223, bene hercule narras, Att. 16.14, male narras de Nepotis filio (he was dead), Ter. And. 5.6.6, narras probe, and Ter. Eun. 5.3.7, bene edepol narras.

Disertus esse posse: = ‘accomplished speaker’, and for the distinction between disertus and eloquens, cf. De Or. 1.21.94, Wilkins compares Quint. Inst. 8. proem. 13, diserto satis dicere quae oporteat; ortane autem dicere proprium est eloquentissimi, and Or. 5.18. Grammatically, Fest. 75. 15 (Lindsay) connected disertus with disserere, but the quantity is against it. Wilkins suggested, however, that it contains the same inseparable preposition and with the neglect of the rohotism, the select element will be -art, as in are: the meaning will then be ‘accomplished in various directions’. I find further evidence for this in Mart. 10.79, where it was used of one who speaks also in a calm, smooth manner instead of sneering with acerbity. But against this view, Leumann (Lat. Disertus, pp. 547–550) derived it from dis-rectus, dis-erces; in this case, the adjective would refer exclusively to speech and only secondarily to the speaker (Weiss: An Oscanism in Catullus 53, p. 358).
Quis enim non in eius modi causa? aut quid negotii est haec poeta rum et pictorum portenta conuincere?

11 Atqui pleni libri sunt contra ista ipsa disserentium philosophorum. Inepte sane. quis enim est tam excors, quem ista moueant?

Ergo apud inferos miseri non sunt, si ne sunt quidem apud inferos ulli. Ita prorsus existimo.

5 Vbi sunt ergo ii, quos miseros dicis, aut quem locum incolunt? si enim sunt, nusquam esse non possunt.

Ego uero nusquam esse illos puto. Igitur ne esse quidem?

Prorsus isto modo, et tamen miseros ob id ipsum quidem, quia nulla sint.

§11. quis enim: enim implies an ellipsis (as yap commonly does in Greek) such as facilis credo. Kühner noted that both it and nam are used when the reader is expected to supply the reasoning.

aut quid...conuincere: = redarguerie, i.e., refute, cf. N. D. 2.1.3, conuitcis Epicuri erroribus.

portenta: often used of almost wondrous falsehoods, cf. N. D. 1.1.8, portenta et miracula non disserentium philosophorum, sed somnialitum, Fin. 4.2570, Ac. 2.123, and PL Hr. Ma. 283, τερας λέγει καὶ θαυμαστόν.

pleni libri: Pohlenz quotes Fin. 11.12.1, tres uno die a te accepte epistulas: unam brevem... duas pleniores, i.e., rather lengthy or substantial, but this not quite what Cicero means here. Reid’s quotation of Fin. 9.16.6 is more apt, cum plena sint monumen ta Graecorum, quenadmodum sapientissimi viri regna tu lerint vel Athenis vel Syracusis. It shows that the existence of these ‘collections’ of sayings or arguments was common enough, cf. Sen. Ep. 33.2, eiusmodi vocibus refer ta sunt carmina, refer tae historiae. Further, and although they were written down, Sen. Ep. 24.6-18 shows that these tables and their counter-arguments were widely current, decentaetis inquis in omnibus scholis fabulae istorum sunt, especially among the Epicureans.

However, I would suggest a different parallel at Aug. Acad. 1.2.10, cum ece tibi libri quidam pleni, where Augustine means that Neoplatonic books were ‘complete’ in the sense that they cover all aspects of Platonic metaphysics and Christian doctrine. If the usage is similar, then Cicero means here that these Epicurean works covered every possible aspect of the underworld and argued against popular superstitions (the underworld looms large in Lucr. 3.37-40; Epicurus would have felt betrayed by the Academics and Peripatetics who continued to defend the popular misconceptions of the Gods and underworld with elaborate theories. This of course leads to his rationalisation of myth, and an attack on religion. (Aristotle accused his adversaries of ιδρυ των αθεόσεων. See Solmsen (Epicurus and Cosmological Heresies, p. 5), Gigandet (Lucrèce et les raisons du mythe, pp. 12-14), and below 39, 93.

philosophorum: Hand suspected this as a gloss on dis serentium, and deleted it; the vulgate reading is contra ista ipsa philosophorum disserentium; Verburgius and Davies instead read philosophorum contra ista ipsa disserentium. All recent editors follow Orelli’s disserentium philosophorum which Kühner found ‘elegantissimum’, as it not only stands in contrast with poetarum and pictorum, but also last in the clause for emphasis. There is of course some ironic gibing here with inepte sane; Cicero is thinking of the Epicureans who are ‘tilting at windmills’.

quis enim est: Or, Mo., and others alter the order of the words to quis est enim, which follows Küh’s rule on their order in his n. on 27, 66. Most recent editors have quis enim est which is the usual position of enim.

excors: 9, 15 n.

ergo...si: The mss. agree in reading si ergo...ne sunt quidem, and many editors have complained about the difficulty and logic of the statement (Pohlenz called it ‘unlogisch ausgedruckt’). Cicero seems to be arguing, ‘If, therefore, those whom you call miserable are not among the infernal shades [whose existence was just denied], then certainly there could not be anyone there at all.’ The assumption is still of course that the inferos exist, and so the speaker quickly shifts his position from denying the existence of Hades to denying any existence after death. Giusta rightly points out the phrase si ergo is unusual in Cicero (only elsewhere in Att. 12.37.2, and 15.15.1), and so the text I think warrants his transposition, which helps clarify the logic. ‘If there is no one among the infernal shades at all, then certainly those who are miserable in death cannot be there.’ This leads more naturally to the questions which follow.

ne...quidem: = odē, and so it does have not its usual force of gradation which would give prominence to the object of negation (i.e., ‘not even’); with uti at the end it means ‘also not,’ or ‘as little as this or something else’. We have other examples at 6, 12, 7, 14, 22, 53, and 25, 83; cf. Brut. 109, and Caes. B. C. 3.33, ne Varus quidem dubitât copias producere. See Mayor on Phil. 2.5.10, and Magvīd’s Excerr. 111 in his Fin.

si enim sunt: The Stoics believed that a man was a complete mixture (καόστας δή διονυσίου, SVF. 2.473) of the universal matter ἄθλης and a φύσα which comes from μεικτα. The soul, when separated from the body, retained its identity after death at least for a time; because it continued to exist after death, it must therefore exist somewhere, SVF. 2.790, and see Sedley (The Stoic Criterion of Identity, pp, 260-261); Long (Soul and Body in Stoicism, pp. 38-41); Hoven (Stoiciens face au problème de l’au-delà).

nusquam esse non possunt: i.e., fieri non potest quin unquam sint = ‘they must be somewhere’; this should not be confused and taken to be a statement by Cicero about ‘nothingness’.

igitur: 2, 4 n.

nulli sint: nullius rather than non is used in colloquial and comic usage, Att. 11.2.4, Ter. And. 578, Ter. Eur. 236, Ter. Herc. 79. As here, Sen. Cons. Marc. 10.5, nec potest miser esse qui nullus est implies a strong negative standing almost adverbially for ‘in no way at all’, cf. Cat. 1.7.16, misericordia, quae tibi nullia debetur, Sen. 15.51.

quia....sint: subj. because he speaks according to his
lam mallem Cerberum metuere quam ista tam inconsiderate diceres. Quid tandem?

Quem esse negas, eundem esse dicis. ubi est acumen tuum? cum enim miserum esse dicis, tum eum qui non sit dicis esse. Non sum ita hebes, ut istud dicam.

Quid dicis igitur?

Miserum esse uerbi causa M. Crassum, qui illas fortunas morte dimiserit, miserum Cr. Pom-

own reasoning. Some editors (Or., Küh.) prefer sunt, but this reading of course would beg the question now under scrutiny.

§12. iam: the phrase has an energetic force and express surprise, as ἐδοκεῖ often does in Greek (Xen. Smp. 5.5). Translate, ‘When you come to say something like that, I could prefer’, etc.

tandum: i.e., quid tam inconsiderate dixit?, which makes good sense; the singular quid is used rather than quae to minimise the censure of the previous ista.

acumen ... hebes: These two words are carefully correlated to bring out their original meaning.

tum eum: this has given editors difficulties, but without reason. Sey. and Sor., following Bake, strike out tum, while Mo. conjectured τά. Dougan also questioned its soundness. Kühner, however, saw the sense as εἰςναλ... und dann which mirrors the antecedent construction. Translate, ‘For you not only call him miserable [i.e., and imply his existence], but also says that he doesn’t exist.’

qui non sit: not a class subjunctive (as Dougan claims) but a continuation of reported reasoning, following quia sint.

esse: can be either copulative in a weak sense, ‘to be’, or else emphatic in meaning, i.e., ‘to exist.’ The sophistic reasoning here revolves on the predication of something which does not in fact exist, a problem of attribution which faced philosophers early on. (CUTHRIE: History of Greek Philosophy, vol. 5, pp. 147–148). The problem is with the Latin esse used to translate the versatile Greek ἐστιν. Arist. Metaph. 1030a dealt with some of the difficulties between predication and existence, καὶ γὰρ τὸ τί ἐστιν ἕνα μὲν τρόπον σημαίνει τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ τόδε τι, ἄλλον δὲ ἕκαστον τὸν κατηγορούµενον, ποσὸν ποιὸν καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα σηµαίνει τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ τόδε τι, ἄλλον δὲ ἕκαστον τὸν κατηγορούµενον, ποσὸν ποιὸν καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα σηµαίνει τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ τόδε τι, ἄλλον δὲ ἕκαστον τὸν κατηγορούµενον, ποσὸν ποιὸν καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα σηµαίνει τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ τόδε τι, ἄλλον δὲ ἕκαστον τὸν κατηγορούµενον, ποσὸν ποιὸν καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα σηµαίνει τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ τόδε τι, ἄλλον δὲ ἕκαστον τὸν κατηγορούµενον, ποσὸν ποιὸν καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα σηµαίνει τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ τόδε τι, ἄλλον δὲ ἕκαστον τὸν κατηγορούµενον, ποσὸν ποιὸν καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα σηµαίνει τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ τόδε τι, ἄλλον δὲ ἕκαστον τὸν κατηγορούµενον, ποσὸν ποιὸν καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα σηµαίνει τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ τόδε τι, ἄλλον δὲ ἕκαστον τὸν κατηγορούµενον, ποσὸν ποιὸν καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα σηµαίνει τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ τόδε τι, ἄλλον δὲ ἕκαστον τὸν κατηγορούµενον, ποσὸν ποιὸν καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα σηµαίνει τὴν οὐσίαν καὶ τὸ τόδε τι, ἄλλον δὲ ἕκαστον τὸν κατηγορούµενον, ποσὸν ποιὸν καὶ ὅσα τοιαύτα σηµαί

to understand existence within a space. The interlocutor tries to remove this implication of existence by removing esse from his assertion. Here we feel the awkwardness of Latin in such concepts before its medieval elaborations.

Interestingly in Greek, the verb ἐστιν does not have an aorist or perfect, instead all three of its tenses are formed from present durative stem, where see MEILET/VENDREYES (Grammaire Comparée), 270. For a Greek, Crassus fitur miser would be untranslatable (seeēstis would = exstitisse). These squabbling sections 12–17 remind us of the controversies of the Eleatics, and the description in Pl. Sph. 216b, τάχ’ ὅν ἄν καὶ τοις ὀστοῖς τῶν κριτικῶν συνέταρ, φαύλους ἐκδόσας ὃς ἐκ τοῖς λόγοις ἐποδόμας τε καὶ ἔλεγχως, θεᾶς ἀν τις ἔλεγχως.

istud: ‘plurimi editi habent ista, non male’ (Kühner); however, I prefer the mss. istud which refers then only to the faulty position uest qui non sit dicis esse. The plural is too general, but the singular meaning helps to narrow and create focus for the arguments which follow.

igitur: the rarer third position, so placed to emphasize the word preceding, and used often this way in the Tusc., 2.19.45, 3.10.23, 4.18.41.

M. Crassus: M. Licinius Crassus, triumvir, fell along with his son Publius at Carrhae 53B.C. and was a Roman exemplum for the ruling passion of avarice (Fin. 3.75). There can be no doubt why Cicero chooses him as the first example of a man who can be called miser because his defeat was preceded by dire omens and positive curses, executiones, apal (Vell. Pat. 2.46.3; App. B. C. 2.18, D. C. 39.39–40).

It was said that Aetius Capito, tribune in 134 B.C., uttered his famous words in mind at Lucan 9.265, οὐκ αὕτη αὐτίκη πατρίων unius incommodo di–mitteret, ius amittit non potest sine nāquo incommodo civicis, and Dougan adds Phil. 2.13.37.

Cicero will later return to this theme in 36, 86 when he analyses more closely the argument that the dead are miserable because they continue to feel the loss of their life. Now, if we have Cato’s words in mind at Lucan 9.265, unum fortuna reliquit iam tribus e dominis...
peium, qui tanta dignitate, tanta gloria sit orbatus, omnis denique miserors, qui hac luce careant.

Revolueris eodem. sint enim oportet, si nisi sunt; tu autem modo negabas eos esse, qui mortui essent. si niger non sunt, nihil possunt esse; ita ne nisi quidem sunt.

Non dico fortasse etiam, quod sentio; nam istuc ipsum, non esse, cum fueris, miserrimum puto.

quid? miserius quam omnino numquam fuisses? ita, qui nondum nati sunt, miseri iam sunt, quia non sunt, et nos, si post mortem miseri futuri sumus, miseri fuimus ante, quam nati. ego autem non commemini, ante quam sum natus, me miserum; tu si meliore memoria es, uelim scire, equidem de te recordere.

VII. Ita iocaris, quasi ego dicam eos miserors, qui nati non sint, et non eos miserors, qui mortui sunt. 

Esse ergo eos dicis.

tanta dignitate: the MSS. V adds, and Victorius retained tanta dignitate, though most old editors were in disagreement whether it should be excluded. Giusta believes it more likely to fall out than be added: and why would tanta dignitate be a gloss upon tanta gloria? We have an example of similar phrasing in the funeral speech, Laud. Turiae, CIL 5, 1527, 625, tantis talibusque praesidibus: Cicero's language resembles that of a laudatio funebreis (Crawford: Laudatio Funeris), as which Cicero himself says should be a brief testimony, simple and unadorned, De Or. 2.84, 341, nestrae laudationes, quibus in foro utimur, aut testimoni brevitate habent nudam atque inornatam. 

Here it is evocative of the fact that Pompey never had a glorious funeral or a funeral speech (Plutarch simply says his ashes were buried by his wife in Alba), which may be why Cicero says that he was bereft of dignitas.

revolueris eodem: the argument is that the verb careant implies existence, and so the argument is reduced to a previous (and admittedly untenable) position. For the phrase, cf. Ac. 2.18, hoc cum infirmat tollitique Philo, judicium tollit incogniti et cogniti; ex quo efficerit nihil posse comprehendat; ita imprudens quo minime vol revoluerit, and De Or. 2.130, Dict.2.13 (with Pease's n.): it indicates that this position will eventually be abandoned, cf. MANSfeld (Philo and Antiochus in the Lost Catulus, p. 56), and below 7, 14 n.

opoeret: i.e., logical necessity, 'ratio postulat ut'; on the other hand, when oportet signifies duty, it is usually found with accusative and infinitive construction, Madv. Gram. 366. This is a deductive mixed hypothetical syllogism; the language (si, autem, igitur) recalls the logical structures which Cicero dealt with extensively in his Inv., particularly 1.62-67, for which he drew heavily upon Aristotle and Theophrastus. He follows similar methodology here. After playing with some paradoxes, Cicero begins with the hypothesis that death is an evil; he will in turn assume the truth of both second premises (the assumptiones) — that either we do exist after death, or that we do not exist after death. He will then go on to prove how either is possible (the approbationes). The only logical conclusion (the complexio) that death can be no evil. For an outline of Cicero's use of logical structures, see Fortenbaugh (Cicero and Hypothetical Syllogistic, pp. 36-37); Ochs (Cicero and Philosophic Invention). In many ways, the philosophic organisation of the Tusc. also reflects or resembles the arrangement of Cicero's juridical speeches, which is not surprising given the nature of the Inv.

non...etiam: etiam = et-iam, 'not yet', cf. Verr. 3.84, 194: Pohleiz en adds Ter. And. 503, non satis me pernosis etiam qualis sin.

cum fueris: = cum quis fuerint, subj. for a second person whose existence is assumed, Madv. Gram. 370. The argument here is later repeated below, 7, 14, cum fuerint.

§13. quid: Giusta wanted to alter this to qui id miserius quam, thinking that the copyists of MSS. GK made the same error as in 48, 116, where quidem was read in place of qui item; here quidem was read in place of qui id, a simple case of haplography (Giusta: Testo, p. 121). Powell approved, but I think LUNDSTRIM (Textkritik, p. 115) is right to think that there is no need to emend. The MSS. are in agreement and the reading is quite Ciceronian. Giusta's alteration to qui id produces questionable Latin and the parallels he cites (Am. 92, Fin. 2.108) do not hold good because there the idiom requires a result clause.

ita: = 'consequently', 'what follows is this'

qui nondum...ante quam nati: continued from 5, 9. The argument again is the Epicurean argument of symmetry, that our life after death is similar to our state before death.

commemini: 'in verbs comminisci, comminississe alius com-significant secum,' (Kühner). The verb commemini is rare in Cicero, used only here, Or. 1.227, De Or. 3.85, and Att. 9.3.1, not noticed by Reid.

antequam sum natus: almost adverbial and loosely attracted to the subject rather than syntactically subordinate. Translate, 'I have, as an unborn, no memories of being miserable.'

me miserum: Lambinus wanted to insert esse, but such an ellipse with an adjective after verbs of saying or thinking is Cicero's usual practice when not involving a perfect or future participle, K.-S. 2.5.

VII. qui nati non sint...qui mortui sunt: the subjunctive is not oblique but rather defines a class (i.e., all those who are not yet born). Baiter reads mortui sint, but the clauses are opposed to each other, and sunt refers to actual persons. The adversary reasserts confidence in his proposition by the use of the indicative.

et non eos: = et non eos potius, 'and — not rather,' as often ac non and neque are used in this corrective sense, cf. Tusc. 3.17, 37, Off. 1.2, 6, si sibi ipse consentiat et non interdum naturae bonitate vincatur, etc.
Immo, quia non sint, cum fuerint, eo miseros esse. Pugnantia te loqui non uides? quid enim tam pugnat, quam non modo miserum, sed omnino quicquam esse, qui non sit? an tu egressus porta Capena cum Calatini, Scipionum, Seruilliorum, Metellorum sepulcura uides, miserus putas illos?

Quoniam me uerbo premis posthac non ita dicam, miseros esse, sed tantum miseros, ob id ipsum, quia non sint.

Non dicis igitur: ‘miser est M. Crassus,’ sed tantum: ‘miser M. Crassus?’

Ita plane.

Quasi non nescesse sit, quidquid isto modo prounitcnes, id aut esse aut non esse! an tu dialectis ne inbutus quidem es? in primis enim hoc traditur: omne pronuntiatum (sic enim mihi)

1 qua non sint | sunt: add. pri. 10 inbutus | inbutus GRK, Küh.: inbutus V

immo: ‘on the contrary’, e contrario, generally a negative adverb used to introduce some stronger expression, and by doing so denies the preceding.

qua non sint: 6, 11 n. qua nulli sint.

eo: ‘for that reason’, in correlation with qua.

pugnansia: ‘self-contradictory’, cf. Phil. 2.8.18, tota in oratione tua tecum ipse pugnaver, non modo non coharentia inter se discere, sed maxime disiuncta atque contraria etc.

non modo...sed: when followed by the adversative sed, it may be rendered ‘I will not say miserable, but (that he should) be anything whatever’, cf. Fin. 2.28.92, Sest. 50.108.

esse: sc. cum

egressus: the laws of the xii tables forbid burial or cremation inside the city, cf. Leg. 2.23, hominem mortuum inquit lex in xii in urbe ne sepelito neve urito. Great tombs were built therefore along the main roads into Rome so that the public could witness the funeral piety of the descendants, cf. Juv. 1.158, quorum Flaminia tegitur cinis atque Latina.

porta Capena: abl. of route. The porta Capena was a celebrated gate of Rome in the Servian wall, out of which issued the Via Appia; it was southwest of the Caelian Hill and carried over it an aqueduct (hence Juv. 5.118). Itstrace and implies the continued existence of his hon-

cilius Metellus Numidicus, consul 109, censor 102 B.C. Vell. Pat. 2.11.3 says after him, Caeciliae notanda claritate est, and the family celebrated more than twelves consulships, censorship and triumphs in as many years. See Gall. N. A. 1.6, and for the family tree see DOUGLAS Brutus, pp. 237–238.

sepulcrum: we have various inscriptions from these sepulchers, four elogia in Saturnian verse, and one in elegiacs. CIL ii 5.89; 6.7; 11; and 15; ILLRP 310, 309, 312, 316, and for their dating, see KATSCHWITZ (Die Datierung der Scipi

onologien). The tomb contained a number of sarcophasi; the one which belonged to Barbatus was conceived in the form of a great altar, and contained triglyphs and roset-
tas in metopes across the façade (SICKLE: The Elogia of the Cornelii Scipiones, p. 41), and in many ways lacked any contemporary parallel in Rome, which marks a turn in the Roman nobility’s cultural interest. (Zevi: Il sarcof

ago di L. Cornelio Scipione Barbato, p. 238). Barbatus was considered a vir sapiens, as was his son known for magna sapiens. The phrase cui vita defecta, non homos appears on his tomb and implies the continued existence of his hon-

ours and virtues, a form of immortality Cicero will pick up later in the Tusc. in 15, 34, and most forcefully in 38, 91, on which see notes ad loc. The visual image that Cicero is appealing to would be powerful for a Roman, who would have seen these tombs frequently. Many of the epigraphical inscriptions would make appeals to their readers and create a feeling that the names were speaking.

me uerbo premis: this is a military metaphor (Focellini), ‘you press me hard with that word’ (i.e. esse).

miseros esse...esse: the quibble continues, and though the interlocutor leaves esse unexpressed, it remains implied. §14. an tu: 2, 4 n. ‘What, have you not learned even the first principles of dialectic?’

inbutus: as opposed to cruditus. inbute can mean giving the first taste to anything. DOUGAN quotes Hor. Ep. 1.2.69, quo senel est inbuta recens seruihit odoer testa diae, and cf. Tac. Dial. 19, elementis studiorum esti non instruisti, at certe inbutus.

in primis: i.e., ‘in elementis, fundamentum dialecticorum’ (Kühner), as among the first subjects that dialectic teaches. Cicero is referring to his work in the Ac.

omne pronuntiatum. . . .: for Aristotle, this was a
in praesentia occurrit ut appellarem ἀξίωμα; ut arat post alio, si inuenero melius) — id ergo est pronuntiatum, quod est uerum aut falsum. cum igitur dicis: ‘miser M. Crassus,’ aut hoc dicis: ‘miser est Crassus,’ ut possit judicare, uerum id falsumne sit, aut nihil dicis omnino.

Age, iam concedo non esse miserus, qui mortui sint, quoniam extorsistit, ut faterer, qui omnino non essent, eos ne miserus quidem esse posse. quid? qui uiiiiuuumus, cum moriendum sit, nonne miseris sumus? quae enim potest in uita esse iucunditas, cum dies et noctes cogitandum sit iam iamque esse moriendum?

VIII. Ecuqid ergo intellegis, quantum mali de humana condicione deiecercis? Quonam modo?

Quia, si mori etiam mortuis miserum esset, infinitum quoddam et sempiternum malum.

15

iam iamque: ‘very soon’, more pressing than iam.

VIII. The lament on which we suffer in life has been a common theme in philosophy across all traditions, and has been scrutinised by many philosophers and philosophies. I think it has been Lucretius who has most touchingly painted such a mournful picture of life: tum porro puer, ut saras uietus ad unidi nauta, nauta, nauta urum iceti infans indigus omni uitali auxilio, cum prumum in luminis oras nixibus ex alio matris natura profudit, | uigitaque locum lugubri complevt, ut aquae | cum tantum in uita restet transire malorum, Luc. 5.223-225, a sentiment possibly copied from Rabirius(?), Ind. Herc. 2.25, omne uagabatur leti genus, omne timoris; Pliny, in his usual manner, also takes a very dim view, cf. Plin. Ep. 2, hominem tantum nudum et nuda humo natali die abicit ad uagitus statim et ploratum, nullumque tot animalium alid at lacrimas et hos protinus uitali auxilio, cum prumum ut malum.

In praesentia: i.e., nunc, as opposed to post which follows.

occurrut ut appellarem: this is the logical perfect, since Cicero had already finished the thought before he should give utterance (Moser). Kühner cites Fln. 16.33, 34 and ili ἀξίωμα dicunt, ut mihi ita occurs ut indifferentes diciem. id ergo est: ‘igiter, rather than ergo is more often employed for this purpose; we should have expected omne pronuntiatum aut uerum est aut falsum, but the anacoluthon, employed rather commonly in the Tusc., changed the construction, on which see Madvig on Fin. 1:21.72, 2.8.23.


miser est Crassus: every proposition must have a logical subject or predicate, otherwise the statement is meaningless.

age iam: cf. Hand: Tursellinus, vol. 1, p. 290. This phrase is used when the speaker at first wishes to concede some point while he is about to bring up some new objection; and so it calls attention less to iam concedo than to the following objection phrased as a question quid? qui...sumus?

ne miserus quidem: ‘not wretched either’, cf. 23, 54.

dies et noctes cogitandum sit: cf. Tusc. 5.70, noctes et dies cogitanti.
haberemus in uita; nunc uideo calcem, ad quam cum sit decursum, nihil sit praeterea extimes-
cendum. sed tu mihi uidieris Epicharmi, acuti nec insolui hominis ut Siculi, sententiam sequi.
Quam? non enim noui.

Dicam, si potero, Latine. scis enim me Graece loqui in Latino sermone non plus solere quam
in Graeco Latine.

Et recte quidem. sed quae tandem est Epicharmi ista sententia?
Émori noló, sed me esse mótuum nihil aéstimo.

Iam adnagno Graecum. sed quoniam cogestī, ut concederem, qui mortui essent, eos miseros
eos non esse, perfec, si potes, ut ne moriendum quidem esse miserum putem. Bene sane facis; sed emit
ut Latine loquar. Cicero’s purpose is different in the letters, and so he introduces Greek freely
in his writings to Atticus and others.

in Graeco Latine: Cicero’s fluency and ease in switching between both languages is attested in Plu. Cic. 4.6, but
compare his statement in Off. 1.111, ut enim sermone ad deumem uitam, qui innatus est nobis, ne, ut quidam, Graeca verba
incantantes uire optimo rideamur. Juv. 6.187 mocks the habit of omnia Graece.

emori…aéstimo: the Latin is trochaic tetrameter cata-
lectic. KABEIL (Comicorum Graecorum Fragmenta), 247 (cf. E. Hercul. 1016 sqq.), S. E. M. 1.273, quote thusly ἄνθρωπον
οὕτως ἐπειδή τεθνήκας οὐ μοι διαφέρει
of which H. Sauppe conjectured a metrical restoration,

This is the Greek parallel, then emori and mori above
should be understood aoristically, i.e., not ‘I do not want to die’, but ‘I do not want to have died’ and looking forward
towards the state of death. This is the force of the prefix ex-
(TULL 5, 1873 31) and EXNOT (Exsto et composés latins
en cxn). The Greek is clearer in meaning.

nihil: The acc. of price (nihil) with aestimo is unusual,
and Mi. and Sch. may be right in modifying to nihilii.

adnagno Graecum: i.e., Gramm versum, ‘ex verbis Latinis iam in mentem venit versum Graecum’, ‘I recall
the Greek verse from those Latin words.’ I doubt Douglas
is right in thinking the reference could be to the author
himselves. cf. Tusc. 2.11.26, unde isti versus? non enim adnagno.

cogistis ut concederem: the construction with cogo is
more usual with an infinitive in Cicero, but 8, 16 below,
and Mil. 26.71.

morierunm: = ‘the act of dying’

§6: ‘Now in view of what has been said from your side’, etc. Note the force of istuc to designate the interlocutor,
and again ista minora below.

ego maiora molior: ‘I am striving after greater things’,
cf. below 38, 91, aeterna moliri, and famously Verg. Ec. 4.1,
Sicilides Musae, paulo maiora canamus. The better MSS.
generally omit these words, though 5 has added it in the margin.

V has ego maiora molior, which Guistra retains.

quia quoniam: quit = ἐστίν, quoniam = ἃ ὁμοιοῦ

cui: sc. [morti] proximum tempus est [tempus] post mortem,
in quo etc. W. The tautology is awkward, intentional,
and almost comic, as in Plaut. Capt. 4.5.83, post mortem
in morte nihil est quad metuam mali. Socrates says of such
lines of reasoning, Pl. Phdr. 262c 4оων δὲ γέγονα, ὡς ἄρα,
est post mortem, in quo mali nihil esse concedis: ita ne moriendum quidem esse malum est; id est enim perueniendum esse ad id, quod non esse malum confitemur.

Vberius ista, quaeo. haec enim spinosiora, prius ut confitear me cogunt quam ut adsentiar. sed quae sunt ea, quae dicis te maiora moliri?

Vt doceam, si possim, non modo malum non esse, sed bonum etiam esse mortem

Non postulo id quidem, aueo tamen audire. ut enim non efficias quod uis, tamen, mors ut malum non sit, efficies. sed nihil te interpellabo; continentem orationem audire malo.

Quid, si te rogauero aliquid, non respondebis?

Superbum id quidem est, sed, nisi quid necesse erit, malo non roges.

---

6 aueo | habeo BK: habeo B alia manu: habeo V: habeo V:

 себе, где он еще не убедил, но не может предложить никаких аргументов. Ciceron говорит, что смерть является «punctum temporis» которое должно быть учтено при любом состоянии, что это уже было принято не только за полное, но даже за первоначальное. Ciceron считает, что смерть является важным аргументом, который следует учесть при любой ситуации, которая может быть представлена как вопрос. Diciare, to defend oneself from injury, to defend, to protect oneself. Cicero, printing his works, shows that, in his philosophical works, Cicero prefers this collocation common throughout the Gram. 404a obs. 4, cf. below 47, 112, and Off. 1.4.13.

ut enim non efficias: ‘haec male luxata sunt, ego non intelligi’, so Verbergius who wanted to delete the non; but ut is concessive, ‘even if you do not bring about’. Madv. Gram. 404a obs. 4, cf. below 11, 23, ut ista non disserantur, and 21, 49, ut enim rationem Platon nullam adferret.

mors ut malum non sit: mors is emphatic before ut, a collocation common throughout the Tusc.; at 17 certa ut sint et fixa, 32 isdemne ut finibus nomen suum quibus vita terminaretur, 76 alla uti ratione mors tibi viserit malum posset, and 99 sed ssum illud, nihil ut adfimet, tenet ad extemum (of Socrates). The brevity of the expression is against strict logic: mors ut malum non sit really should mean mortem ut malum non esse cedam where the thing believed and not the belief itself comes to the foreground, cf. 77, me nemo de immortalitate deplet qui really means de opinionem immortalitatis, and for this use see Madvig on Fin. 1.5.15. Dougan showed that Cicero uses efficio in the sense of probare, such as in 77 in quibus volt efficere animos esse mortals, where Dicaearchus strives to prove his position.

continentem orationem: Cicero has hitherto adopted the ‘Socratic’ mode of arguing against another’s opinion, in a ‘pseudo’-dialogue form, but now turns to a fuller oratorical, and Aristotelian mode to continue, cf. Fin. 1.29, sed uti oratione perpetua malo quam interrogare aut interrogar.

§ 77. nonne respondebis: The better MSS. have nonne. Dougan argued that the reading of non came about through a copyist misunderstanding the abbreviations rather than the interrogative force of non, as Küh, ‘particula non in tritum illud ac pervagatum nonne mutaretur.’ Madvig’s n. Fin. 2.3.10 is misleading on this passage. I find that the most forceful parallel is Ter. Eun. 46. Non eam ne nunc quidem quom accersor ultro?; the doubt expressed is more emotional and expresses incredulity as here (‘cum affectu quodam vel impatientia vel admirations’); there can be no doubt both here, and above, 6, 13, pugnandia te loqui non vides, that non is the reading. See MURPHY (Non and Nonne, p. 226).

superbum id quidem: ‘ὑπερβολῶς, sc. non respondere rogantis, cf. Ac. 2.22.04, and Fam. 1.10, partim te superbum esse dicet, quod nihil respondet, partim centumloquium, quod male respondantes, Att. 4.18.3; also in Liv. 1.54 (of Tarquin), seu ira seu odio seu superbia inest ingenio nullam eum vocem emissae, and (of Hannio), si reticacie, aut superbus aut obnixius uidere. Reid ad loc. I think is right in finding that Roman feeling on this point was rather strong, and the refusal to answer questions was considered rude and haughty. He quotes (among other examples), Suet. Tib. 68, plerique tacitus, nullo aut rarissimo etiam cum proximis sermones coeque tardissimo, whose silence led to accusations of arrogance.

est: Giusta, following Erhardus, wished to alter the mss. reading of est to esse; Kühner thought this was an interpolation, though it is retained by Davies and Lallemand. esset would be based on the idea that the reply involves an ellipse, i.e., si non respondes; but where we prefer the imperfect potential in English, the Romans preferred the present indicative, as in other expressions involving difficilum, longum, magnum, such as below 11, 23, sed est difficile confundere, and 48, 116 quos enumerare magnum est. Madv. Gram. 348e, obs. 1.

malo non roges: Moser, Orelli, and Hand thought non abhorrent to good Latinity as ne and non non is used fol-
lowing verbs of wishing in implied prohibitions, cf. Madv. Gram. 456. Kühner explains that non rogès is opposed to si te rogaret, and n. probabilia sequentia, and non posses.

De Or. 1.62.265, vellem non constituisse. I am not quite convinced of his logic, against which Reid compares Fin. 1.26, vellem...ne deterreant, and Phil. 8.31. Nevertheless, I think the reading of the ms. should be retained. We have many examples of dependent volitional clauses which, in the Ciceronian period, were starting to take on, and many which are not questioned, cf. Inv. 2.16, Manil. 44. Ac. 2.54. Off. 2.54. 84. Att. 4.1.8, again used by Luccaeus in Fam. 5.14.3 and by Varr. R. R. 5.1.1. It was quite natural that non should enter a stage of progression and encroach further on ne. Such cases as, Inv. 2.16, Off. 2.54 and here, have probably no special ground, but merely illustrate the increasing inclination to employ this form of the negative. The fact that in the literary remains of the Republican period non with the volitive is still rare indicates the slowness of the development which culminated in Silver preference of it (Kirk: Ne and Non, pp. 268-272).

IX. geram morem: 'indulge'

quasi Pythius Apollo: ὅθεν ἐκ τρίποδος, said of confident speakers or those with authority. In Dict. 1.38, Cicero speaks of the Pythian oracle as having lost its divine 'adflatus', ut igitur nunc minore gloria est, quia minus oraculorum veritas existat. Cicero's use of the volitive is still rare indicates the slowness of the development which culminated in Silver preference of it (Kirk: Ne and Non, pp. 268-272).

Cicero offers a definition of death (quid sit mori) using a method outlined in Inv. 2.3 and Phil. Phdr. 237b, περὶ παντὸς, ὦ παι, μία ἀρχή τῶν μὲν μολλῶν καὶ καθαρῶν, ἀπεισόδωσα ἐναπεισόδωσα, καταληπτικά τῆς μοιχώς, ἐκείνῃ δει περὶ ὅς ἢ ὃς θείης ἢ πατρος ἢ ἄνθρωπος ἢ ἀνδρός ἢ φύσεως ἢ ἐκείνῃ δει περὶ ὅς ἢ ὃς θείης ἢ πατρος ἢ ἄνθρωπος ἢ ἀνδρός ἢ φύσεως ἢ ἀλλὰ ἀρχαιοτάτης ἀνάγκης. Cicero carefully lays out the beginning of the Tusc. that he will be following the method of the New Academy. In addition, we would do well to recall the oratorical force of Carneades which Cicero will also bring to bear, De Or. 2.38.161. Carneades vero vis incredibilis illa dicendi et varietas per quam esset optando nobis, qui nullam uquantum in illis suis disputationibus rem defendit quam non probarit, nullam oppugnavit quam non exerit.

IX. Geram tibi morem et ea quae uis, ut potero, explicabo, nec tamen quasi Pythius Apollo, certa ut sint et fixa, quae dixeram, sed ut homunculus unus e multis probabilia coniectura sequens. ultra enim quo progresiar, quam ut ueri similia uideam, non habeo; certa dicent ii, qui et percepti ea posse dixunt et se sapientes esse profiterentur.

Tu, ut uidentur; nos ad audiendum parati sumus.
Mors igitur ipsa, quae uidetur notissima res esse, quid sit, primum est uidendum. sunt enim qui discesse animi a corpore putent esse mortem; sunt qui nullum censeant fieri discussum, sed una animum et corpus occidere, animumque in corpore extingui. qui discedere animum censent, alii statim dissipari, alii dieu permanere, alii semper. quid sit porro ipsa animus, aut ubi, aut unde, magna dissensio est. alii cor ipsum animus uidetur, ex quo ‘excorde’, ‘uaecordes’, ‘concordes’ dicuntur, et Nasica ille prudens bis consul ‘Corculeum‘ et,


Historiography, p. 850) suggested; or he has simply erred, perhaps due to the celerity of his compositions. Cicero’s own polemical stance towards a philosophy can misconstrue or blur fine distinctions, but this is not a serious problem in the Tusc. Festugière (Protreptiques de Platon, pp. 9–10) is correct in suggesting that in many ways like Plato’s own Phaedo, this work is a prothetic to philosophy (cf. Tusc. 5.2.5–5.4.11), a genre well established by the Hellenistic period and which generally avoids rigorous philosophical distinctions, relying more on the elegance, volume, breadth and weight of authority to convince its reader. What makes the Tusc. unique in the writings of Cicero is that it blends three distinct rhetorical categories, the praeceptio, the suasio, and the consilto. Just like Philo’s physician (Stob. Ecl. 2.7.2), Cicero offers therapy for the disease and refutes the advice of false counsellors by removing our fear of death, and countering those who would argue that it is an evil. See Jordan (Ancient Philosophic Protreptic, pp. 316–318).

igitur: = tunc, resumptive, in the sense ‘now then’, ‘well then’. Hand: Turselliuns, vol. 2, p. 352; an ellipse needs to be supplied by the reader, quia te ad audirem paratum esse dicis or the like, cf. Am. 10.33.

disc essum animi: Pl. Cris. 524. d thinasco tyachyes oon, oos amel dowie, oon alos o oino mnagamno dalia, ths ths wosy kai to wosyamo, ap’ alllagin, Pl. Phd. 640, kai o thnos to tyachyes, chronos mno th wsam sothws wsam supalygete kai asto to wosy geygenws, chronos de th wsam o sto wosamo apalygete osto kai asto osto einai, but the Stoics use similar language, cf. SVF. 2.790, 2.604, Chrysippus, d thinasco estin chronos wsam ap o wosamo; Tert. Anim. 5 Zeno, consitum spirum, definsi animam hoc modo instruit, iou, iuquit, aegro, animal enimort.


una animum et corpus occidere: cf. 11, 24, si cor aut saquis aut cerebrum est animus, certe, quoniam est corpus, interitter namque corpore. To this school belong Aristoxenus, Dicaearchus and the Atomists.

animumque in corpore exinguire: Ursinus did not find these words in any of his oldest mss, and deleted them as a gloss on the preceding sentiment. Such elaborations, however, are natural in Cicero’s philosophical works, and recent editors are right to retain the words. For the thought, cf. Claudianus, iv Fan. Hon. Aug., 226–223, ille cum corpore lapsam interiit, haec sola manet histoqque superstes evolut.


diu permanere: as most of the Stoics taught, cf. D. L. 7.156. (osher) einai to smfico hmn thn pneuma, de kai th wsam einai, kai met smftos epimenes, phsht einai de, and below 31, 77. Stoici autem . . . diu manusuros aiunt animus, semper negant and the quote there. The Stoics believed that due to the gradual exhaustion of the supply of water (SVF. 2.593) by the aithio, there were periodic configurations of the universe (wtrwos) which restored things to a prriorial condition and in which souls were absorbed into the ‘universal’ soul. SVF. 2.796, and LAPIDGE (Stoic Cosmology, p. 182); Long (Scepticism about Gods in Hellenistic Philosophy, p. 286). Münzer (Stoic Theology, p. 150).

How long the souls last was a matter of some disagreement among the school. Cleanthes (D. L. 7.157) held that all souls survive until the general configuration, while Chrysippus believed only the souls of the wise would survive such a lengthy wuration (the souls of wicked men dissipating much earlier on account of their weakness, SVF. 2.809). Hoven (Stoic. Laws of the un. del, pp. 60–64) shows that even the later Stoics Panaetius and Posidonius (below, 42. 79, n., Diss. i.115, 131) believed that souls survived.

alii semper: a doctrine held by Pl. Phd., passim, but not necessarily in Pl. Men.; it is not quite clear in Pl. Ap. 400, dioun ypar thteinwv estin to thvsnhs: o ypar oen mhv einai mth aisthenei mthma mhmo nthma thvtnhs, h kata th leptomiea metaqehi th wsamn odoa kai metoqehi th wsam tis tis tis tin pno to to ethko eis allos tps, but this is the very thesis Cicero explores in the Tusc. However, in Pl. Rep. 608d, Socrates says with surprise to Glauc. oth phto, oth oth aisthenei oen mhv aisthenei kai aisthenei apalhthei. The theory of the immortality of the soul is also held by Pythagoreans, Porph. VP. 19, oth oth aisthenei oen mhv oth aisthenei kai aisthenei. This work is a protreptic to philo. (Ancient Philosophic Protreptic, p. 243). How long the souls last was a matter of some disagreement among the school. Cleanthes (D. L. 7.157) held that all souls survive until the general configuration, while Chrysippus believed only the souls of the wise would survive such a lengthy wuration (the souls of wicked men dissipating much earlier on account of their weakness, SVF. 2.809). Hoven (Stoics. Laws of the un. del, pp. 60–64) shows that even the later Stoics Panaetius and Posidonius (below, 42. 79, n., Diss. i.115, 131) believed that souls survived.

nasica ille: P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica Corculum, twice consul (162, 155 B.C.), once censor (159 B.C.) Brut. 20.79, was son of the famous P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica who received the statue of Cybele at Ostia when it was brought to Rome from Pessinus in 204 B.C. He was a famous jurist, and is here called prudens for his knowledge of the law and general wisdom, cf. Att. 6.11.17, Aur. Vic. Vir. Ill. 44.5; Münzer (Atticus als Geschichtsschreiber, p. 96); Douglas (Brutus, pp. 153–154).

Empedocles animum esse censet cordi suffusum sanguinem; alii pars quaedam cerebri usa est animi principatum tenere; alii nec cor ipsum placet nec cerebri quandam partem esse animum, speranturque quinque sensibus esse, et novitatem in animae insula. Arist. De An. 2, 515b13 = przynajmniej Empedocles' thought centered on the principles of σοφονου and the agency of Love and Strife, and the familiar doctrine of the 'elements' (earth, water, fire, air), which he held to be fundamental to sensation as well as to the intellect. These elements would enter into the constitution of the soul and by this process we would perceive each external object, Arist. Metaph. 4, 100b5–10; Arist. De An. 2, 1, 404b8; Thphr. Sens. 10, δότι κάθηται μέτα σφυροκόπεσι καὶ σφυροκόπεσι ἐν τοιῇ τυχῇ κινητῇ τῶν κύκλων κακρᾶται τὰ στοιχεῖα. Since the blood's activity is most pronounced at the heart, we may place the soul there. This would make Empedocles a materialist, but I think it quite right that there are some allusions to a possible life which survives dissolution, D.–K. B15, ὄν τὸν ἑαυτόν τοιαύτα σφυροκόπεσι καὶ κακρᾶθαι τὰ στοιχεῖα, since these blood's activity is most pronounced at the heart, we may place the soul there. This would make Empedocles a materialist, but I think it quite right that there are some allusions to a possible life which survives dissolution, D.–K. B15, ὄν τὸν ἑαυτόν τοιαύτα σφυροκόπεσι καὶ κακρᾶθαι τὰ στοιχεῖα, since these blood's activity is most pronounced at the heart, we may place the soul there. This would make Empedocles a materialist, but I think it quite right that there are some allusions to a possible life which survives dissolution, D.–K. B15, ὃν τὸν ἑαυτόν τοιαύτα σφυροκόπεσι καὶ κακρᾶθαι τὰ στοιχεῖα, since these blood's activity is most pronounced at the heart, we may place the soul there. This would make Empedocles a materialist, but I think it quite right that there are some allusions to a possible life which survives dissolution, D.–K. B15, ὃν τὸν ἑαυτόν τοιαύτα σφυροκόπεσι καὶ κακρᾶθαι τὰ στοιχεῖα, since these
sed alii in corde, alii in cerebro dixerunt animi esse sedem et locum; animum autem aliis animam, ut fere nostri — declarat nomen, nam et 'agere animam' et 'efflare dicimur et animosos' et 'be animatos' et 'ex animi sententia'; ipsa autem animus ab anima dictus est —; Zenoni Stoico animus ignis uidetur.

X. Sed haec quidem quae dixi, cor, <sanguinem>, cerebrum, animam, ignem uolgo; reliqua


alii in corde: thought so by Arist. P. A. 3–4, Praxagoras of Cos, and generally the Stoics. D. L. 7.159, ἵρμονων δ᾽ εἶναι τὸ καρδιῶτα τῆς φύσεως, ὥσις αἱ φαντασίαι και ἀι ὀμίλια γέγοναυται και δὲν ὧν ὀρθά ἀναπέμπεται: ὅπερ εἶναι ἐν καρδιᾷ. Chrysippus argued that articulate speech proved that the commanding faculties were located in the heart, Gal. De plac. Hipp. et Plat. 3.11, λέγει δὲ Ἡρακλῆς κατὰ τοῦ πρώτου αὐτὸν περὶ φύσεως λόγον τῶν μερών αὐτοῦ τῆς Ἱμιονωάννου ἀρχής κατα, ἕντος δευνίων περιέργος τῆς ἀρχής τῆς φύσεως ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ μόνη περιέργειαν ετη. A few Stoics did not share this view, cf. Philodemus SVF. 2.910 (HENRICI: Die Kritik der stoischen Theologie in Philon, p. 335). Here it simply meant 'in my soul, and would not let it forth.'

ex animi sententia: Giusta wished to read examinis in place of ex animi sententia, reviving an anonymous conjecture by Halm, but this is both unnecessary and incongruous with the meaning of animosos (from 'animus') and animatos (from 'anime') as regards the will and not the state of life. I think, it better to stay with the ms. reading. The phrase is well known, and similar to Plaut. Bacch. 416, et libidini homini suo animo obsaqii.

animus ab anima dictus est: undoubtedly both are from one origin meaning 'air', and only later came to mean 'soul' — the principle being that the physical precedes the psychical. The same evolution occurs in Greek, where see CUMONT (Lux perpetua, p. 89).

animus ignis: the concept of a 'vital heat' (θερµὸν alone) has taken on many permutations. Among the Presocratics, Parmenides (D.–K. 182a8) correlated death with cold, and life with warmth; Empedocles held that death came about when the heat of the blood became cold (D.–K. 31858); and the Hippocrates assigned a divinity to a θέρµος, and made this heat their cosmic principle. In contradiction to this 'vital warmth', philosophers also posited a 'spiritual fire' which itself had several nuances. By ignis, Cicero does not intend to signify fire proper, i.e., πῦξ, we may assume this since he reports Panaetius' view more accurately by inflammata anima below in 18, 42, where it means warm breath, i.e., a mix of both fire and air, not simply fire alone (SVF. 1.137, 138, 139, and 141), and cf. N. D. 2.15.41, Ac. 1.39, Fin. 4.12. ignis therefore more accurately translates the Greek πνεύμα θεόνων εἶναι τὴν φύσιν, D. L. 7.157 (< SVF. 1.135). This 'fire' was not nutritive in any sense, but understood in the fullest sense as 'spiritual' (spiritus, Verg. Aen. 7.6.747), and from Empedocles, to Plato and Aristotle, this πνεύμα was one of the four elements of which composed all living beings. MANSFIELD (Zeno and Aristotle on Mixture, p. 309); SOLLHEIM (The Vital Heat, the Inborn Pneuma and the Aether). For the relation between πνεύμα and πῦξ, see POHLENZ: Die Stoa, vol. 1, 73ff, and on θεόνων and πνεύμα JAEGER (Das Pneuma im Lykeion, 50, n. 1).

X. <sanguinem>: sanguinem was added by P. Manutius (which he found in aetus liber) and one Oxford ms., but it is not found in any of the better ms. Kühner, believing it a gloss by a copyist who recalled sanguinem above, excised the word; Davies, however, retained it and argued that Cicero frequently listed sanguis with the others, as he does in §§ 244, 41, below.

uoľgo: sc. opinantur, cf. 45, 109 in iis malis quisque uolgo opinantur. Wolf thought by uolgo is meant integer salutae, and that Cicero meant to contrast whole schools to those of opinions of individual philosophers, which Dougan objected to as an unparalleled use of uolgo. Here it simply

...stopt in my soul, and would not let it forth...
differentiate this view from the Platonic one. Manutius’ conjecture of inventio in place of intentio (which is closer to τέχνη) is intriguing, but not what Cicero wrote though it does have curious support from Gell. N. A. 4.13.3: there, Democritus seems to have claimed that plurimus hominum morbidis medicinae fuisse incentiones tibiarum. We should understand Aristoxenus to have meant that the soul is ‘a sound produced if the body were played as an instrument.’ The view here attributed to Aristoxenus has also been attributed to another member of Aristotle’s school, Clearchus (3, fr. Wehrli. 9), but this is in error. At any rate, all philosophers who hold any theory of harmonia agree that it entails the mortality and destruction of the soul, cf. Lucr. 3.100–119. For a full treatment, see Movia (Anima e intelletto), particularly p. 91, and Gottschalk (Soul as Harmonia).

uelt in cantu et fidibus: sc. ciatur quae: by attraction.
uelut...sic...tamquam: Giusta (Testo, p. 128) felt that there was a difficulty with these three adverbs in determining their logical relationship (as did Reiske and Nissen before him) and so wished to insert enim in order to smooth the reading. But this ruins the two parallel comparisons which are in anaphoric arrangement. I find that Cicero uses uelut with an indefinite pronoun in Or. 184, similia sunt quaedam etiam apud nostros, uelut illa in Thyeste; and so we should understand quendam intentionem = similum intentionem. The arrangement is then ‘there is the same sort of attunement in the body itself as is in singing and the lyre; and so an assortment of vibrations arise from the conformation of the body in the same way as sound does in singing.

cantu: 2, 4 n. ccimisse dixit aliquid: ‘nevertheless, he did put forth an important view’
multo ante: i.e., more than fifty years, Plato having died around 347 B.C.
et dictum et explanatum a Platone: Pl. Phd. 85e–86d, 92a–95a, where the exact nature of it (quid ipsum quale esset) is disputed by Socrates.

Xenocrates: of Chalcedon, born 391 B.C., pupil of Plato and later the third president of the Academy after Speusippus, a position he held until his death in 315 B.C.

figuram et quasi corpus: figura translates the οἶος of Arist. Metaph. 6, 1035b29–30 which is the form that is predicative of the matter; corpus is the Stoic σῶμα, the underlying matter.

uerum: LUNDSTRÖM (Glossemu, p. 279), with the support of Giusta (Testo, p. 129) read animum, and so punctuated
dixit esse, cuius uis, ut iam ante Pythagoraeae usum erat, in natura maxima esset. eius doctor Plato triplicem finxit animum, cuius principatam, id est rationem, in capite sicut in arce posuit, et duas partes ei parere uoluit, iram et cupiditatem, quas locis disculit, iram in pectore, cupiditatem in anima.

1. Macr. Somn. Scip. 2.13

iam ante ] iam ante dett. codd. 1 in omni dett. codd. retnuit Dow., Pohl., et Guo, sed non habuit Drex. 3 parere se disculit locis \( \land \) iram X, alias manu disclinat addunt RS. disclusa callisse emend. Gui.

After neglect esse. The ms. reading verum, if verum were an adjective, would have Xenocrates mean a 'true number', an interpretation for which only faint evidence can be found in Nem. De Nat. Hom. (as cited by Davies). However, better testimony shows he called it simply 'number', \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \delta \varepsilon \gamma \mu \omicron \nu \sigma \tau \omicron \) \( \mu \uomicron \alpha \tau \iota \nu \gamma \), so it seems right to understand verum here as a conjunction, on which see K.-S. 2.294 for the treatment of the brachiology \( \epsilon u m \) animum in the second clause. The direction of the thought, here the change from the figure and body of the soul to the lack of body, makes Lundström's correction, I think, unnecessary, see Williams (Gnomon, 37, p. 686).

numerus dixit esse: more accurately, he called it 'self-moving' number, \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \) \( \kappa \iota \). We have evidence for this in Macr. Somn. Scip. 1.14, Theod. Gracc. aeff. cur. 5.72; Arist. De An. 1.5, 416b27, and cf. Plut. de Anim. Prooem. in Tim. (= Plu. Manc. 13.70) Xenocr. fr. \( \tau \gamma \zeta \zeta \psi \gamma \iota \eta \iota \sigma \tau \iota \mu o d \alpha r \iota \xi o \hbar \iota r \iota \gamma \iota \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \). \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \) \( \mu \uomicron \alpha \tau \iota \nu \gamma \), \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \) \( \mu \uomicron \alpha \tau \iota \nu \gamma \). The least that can be said is that Xenocrates upheld the immortality of the soul, as would be expected, Xenocr. fr. 73-75.

Pythagoraeae: Gigon (Der Ursprung der griechischen Philosophie, p. 142) claims that the teaching about number does not, in fact, belong to ancient Pythagoreanism. The earliest evidence we have for such a doctrine is Philolaus (D.-K. 413b-3a), late in the 5th century, who was a proponent of number in an epistemological, not an ontological context. We have no evidence of any claims by the Pythagoreans that 'all number' until Aristotle, who relied on the eclectic Empedocles who, according to Aëtius (D.-K. 512a2), was the first to believe the numerical monads (units) were corporeal. Cicero probably acquired his knowledge of Pythagoreanism through Aristotle whose portrayal is often generalised and at times incorrect. Aristotle cites four quite different Pythagorean views on the soul, and does not offer any explanation. As regards the Pythagoreans' theory of number, Aristotle gives us three contradictory variants. Firstly, they are the basis of the material world, Arist. Metaph. 986a16, \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \) \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \) \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \). Secondly, in contradiction to this, Pythagoreans liken things to numbers, Arist. Metaph. 985b27, 987b11, and thirdly the elements of numbers are the elements of things (so here in Cicero), Arist. Metaph. 985b27, 987b11, and finally the elements of numbers are the elements of things (so here in Cicero), Arist. Metaph. 985b27, 987b11, and then the elements of numbers are the elements of things (so here in Cicero), Arist. Metaph. 985b27, 987b11, and thirdly the elements of numbers are the elements of things (so here in Cicero), Arist. Metaph. 985b27, 987b11, and finally the elements of numbers are the elements of things (so here in Cicero), Arist. Metaph. 985b27, 987b11, and thirdly the elements of numbers are the elements of things (so here in Cicero), Arist. Metaph. 985b27, 987b11. The most likely explanation is that such a rare word as \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \) \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \) \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \), \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \) \( \dot{\alpha} \rho \iota \rho \iota \mu \nu \sigma \) \( \lambda \alpha \mathrm{t} \iota \omega \iota \nu \alpha \iota \nu \).
supet praecordia collocauit. Dicaearchus autem in eo sermone, quem Corinthii habitum tribus libris exponit, doctorum hominum disputantium primo libro multos loquentes facit; duobus Pherecratus quendam Phthiaoram sensum, quem ait a Deucalione ortum, disserentem inducit nihil esse omnino animum, et hoc esse nomen totum inane, frustraque animalia et animantis appellari, neque in homine inesse animum uel animam nec in bestia, unique omnem eam, qua uel agamus quid uel sentientiam, in omnibus corporibus uius aequabiliter esse fuscum nec separabilem a corpore esse, quippe quae nulla sit, nec sit quicquam nisi corpus unum et simplex, ita figuratum ut temperatione naturae uiget et sentiat. Aristoteles, longe omnibus — Platonem semper excipio


praecordia: placed in the diaphragm, Pl. Ti. 70d-e.

collocaut: GUSTA (ibid., p. 15) notes that Cicero always end a cola with collocaut, and not locuit, cf. Rep. 1.17, 2.12, Ac. 2.6, Parad. 25. Phil. 2.44. 3.3.

§ 21. Dicaearchus: Dicaearchus of Messana of Sicily was a Peripatetic philosopher, a disciple of Aristotle, and wrote widely on geography, history, the antiquities, and philosophy. He wrote three books Περί Ψυχῆς which probably are the same as the Kophiakos, three books of the Aετσιχακω (below, 31, 77), one book on death, and his most important work, Βίος τῆς Ἑλλάδος also in three books. Two dosographers ps.-Plutarch 4.2.5 (= fr. Wehrl. 12a), and Stob. Ecl. 1.49.1 (= fr. Wehrl. 12b) attribute to Dicaearchus the view that the soul is a harmony of the four elements (Nem. De Nat. Hom. 2, 17.5–9, ὑψηλὸν τῶν τεσσάρων στοιχείων, Aët. 4.2). Cicero, however, who certainly knew his writings first-hand (Ait. 13.3.2), gives us here a slightly different account of his view. Dicaearchus agreed with Aristoxenus in denying the immortality of the soul, §§ 21, 41, 51, 77, and Ac. 2.124 (= fr. Wehrl. Sc.-e. 9), but he held that the soul was in no way distinct from the body, and that consciousness is a function of the body which arises from the structure of its parts — a theory quite distinct from other major Hellenistic schools, though it shows some resemblance to one attributed to Xenocrates by Lact. Opt. Dei. 16.12 (= Xenocr. fr. 71). The soul for Dicaearchus as harmonia consisted in a certain condition of the body, S. E. M. 1.349 (= fr. Wehrl. 8a), οὐ μὲν μὴδὲν φασιν εἶναι αὐτὴν (sc. τὴν διάνωσιν) παρὰ τὸ πᾶς ἤχον σώμα, καθάπερ δὲ Δωρίδων, curiously, in these fragments the term ἀγωνία does not occur, though Cicero expresses it twice, as does Lactantius.

duobus: sc. reliquis, ‘in the other two’

Deucalion: a son of Prometheus, he survived the ancient flood and became king of Phthia, RE 5.263. He is mentioned by Dicaearchus because he said to have re-created the human race from stones and wood, i.e., lifeless matter.

inducit: the term indicates a work of a dramatic nature, cf. Div. 1.131, Pausanias, qui in Chryse physicu inducitur.

frustra: = sine causa, cf. Fin. 2.12.36, in quo frustra induxit solent, and Madvig’s n. Moser, following Orelli, inserted <ct> before animala found in a few of the lesser mss.; I am inclined to agree but hesitant to depart from recent editors. Nevertheless, I find a good parallel to support Moser at Off. 1.20, vel benefigiati vel liberalitatem appellanti. Here, where we have two words submitted as separate examples demonstrating the vanity of the terminology, we would expect a construction of ’both... and’...

animalia et animantis: cf. Ac. 2.32; N. D. 1.26 and 3.36, where the word animal is generally derived from animus (i.e., spiritual) which Cicero allows to all creatures, i.e., both beasts and man, ζωα, not just an anima or animating vital force, cf. Sen. Ep. 113.2, animum constat animal esse, cum ipse efficiat ut sinus animalia, cum ab illo animalia nostra hoc tracerint. The antithetical term animantes includes plants, encompassing anything with an ‘animating vital force’, ζωψα. Simplicius tells us that Dicaearchus denied the existence of a cause of living creatures, i.e., their soul, Simpl. In Cat. 121.12 (= fr. Wehrl. 98), ὁτι οἱ τῆς ἐφεξεῖσθαι ἐν τῶι ψυχῇ ἐν μοιχείς ἐρήμωσε τε καινὰ ὑπόλοιπα, ἐν δὲ τοῖς καθ’ ἕκαστα καὶ συνθέτοις ἑρήμωσε. καὶ Δαμάρχος ἐκ τῆς αὐτῆς αἰτίας τὸ μὲν ἄραν συνυγόμεναι εἶναι, τὸν δὲ αἰτίαν αὐτού ζωήν ἄνιησαι, cf. lamb. ap. Stob. Flor. 1.43.29, 363.20 and 376.6 (= fr. Wehrl. 8k). For a good overview, see Sharpe, Dicaearchus and the Soul in and Divination, pp. 148–150.

uel animal: Labanmus wanted to delete animam, but here Cicero is bringing out the etymological connection between animus and animam; Pherecrates undertakes to show that there is no life principle, to say nothing of the soul. Davies cites Juv. 15.48, induluit communis conditor illis tantum animas, nobis animum quoque, and see Cæston (Epiphenomenalism, pp. 342–344).

in omnibus corporibus uius aequabiliter esse fuscum: Atticus (the Platonist) argued that Dicaearchus denied the substantiality of the soul, which for him was the logical conclusion to draw from Aristotle’s argument that the soul belonged to the whole man and not a certain part (Arist. De An. 408b5–15), Atticus ap. Euseb. Prep. Evan. 15.9.10 (= fr. Wehrl. 8i), ταχύτατον ταυτορρειχόν ἐπάνων Δαμάρχου, καὶ πᾶλαιστει ἱκανον, ὅν θεωρεῖ, ἀνιέρως τὴν ἡλικία ἤστατον τῆς ζωῆς καὶ Nem. De Nat. Hom. 2 (= fr. Wehrl. 11), Ἀρμάντολες δὲ καὶ διενεργοὶ ἀνθρώπου (τῆς ζωῆς ἑμὸν Δαμάρχου) nec separabilem a corpore: because the soul is thought of as the form of an organic body, Arist. De An. 1.4, and Cheirniss (Aristotle’s Criticism of Pre-Socratic Philosophy, 332ff).

quippe quae nulla sit: Mad. Gram. 366, obs. 2, the use of the relative with the subjective here to assign the reason, strengthened with quippe. Cicero means that such a force cannot exist separately from the body.

uim...temperacione naturae: the power by which we act or are aware comes about through a ‘tempering of the nature of the body,’ τὸ σῶμα κακραμένο, Plut. in Cat. 119a–b, and not the ‘soul,’ as its separate existence is denied — there is often confusion on this point, as in lamb. ap. Stob., quoted above. The term temperatione naturae is a clear allusion to the theory of harmonia; cf. below 28, 68, ad temperationem corporum aptas; Tusc. 4.13.30, corporis temperatio, cum ea congruant inter se et quibus constantes, sanities, sic animi dicitur, cum eis iudicia opinioneque concordant.

uiget: cf. 17, 41 n. ugeta


Platonem semper excipio: as he often does in the Tusc., cf. 21, 49 below.
— praestans et ingenio et diligentia, cum quattuor nota illa genera principiorumesset complexus, e quibus omnia orerentur, quintum quandam naturam censet esse, e qua sit mens; cogitare enim et prouidere et discere et docere et inuenire aliquid et tam multa meminisse, amare odisse, cupere timere, anci laetari, haec et similia eorum in horum quattuor generum inesse nullo putat; quintum genus adhibet uacans nomine et sic ipsum animalium ἐνδελέχειαν appellat noou nomine quasi quandam continuatam motionem et perennem.

5. Arist. De Phil. fr. 27

— quaestor generae principiorum: the doctrine of the four elements, water fire earth and air, as first established by Empedocles, Arist. G. C. 2.1, 328b—329b, and cf. Ac. 1.7.26, ₋ Graceo uertam elementa dicuntur; e quibus aer et ignis movendi quintum genus adhibet uacans nomine et sic ipsum animam ἐνδελέχειαν, e quibus aer at ignis movendi vin habent et efficientes, etc.

principiorum: Lucret. uses the term elementa to represent the Greek σῶμα.

quintam quandam natural: there are a many references to a 'fifth body' (σῶμα πέμπτον) or a 'body moving in a circle' (κυκλοφορητικὸν σῶμα) in later literature, many of which are assigned to Aristotle, though to no particular work. A few say explicitly that he called such a body the 'fifth body' (Ἀετ. 1.7.32, 2.306; Stob. Ecl. 1.502) but such testimony is not entirely reliable. Nevertheless, the term had currency among doxographers and commentators as suitable to the celestial element in Arist. Cael., cf. Xenarchus and Nicolaus ap. Simp. In Cael 13.18, 20.12, 21.33.

If this fifth element is in fact incorporeal, what Cicero claims the fifth element to be is not quite true. D. L. 62, § 91, n. 91 ρανίς ὕδατος ἐνδελεχεῖ ἠδήγησιν, because it suggested the eternal movement of the celestial elements (ἀεὶ ἄτομον) but he himself never used the phrase. He calls it variously τὸ πρῶτον σῶμα, τὸ ἄνω σῶμα, τὸ ἐγκέλαιον σῶμα, or other terms which usually refer to its position or movement. Its application to both 'air' and 'upper fire' made it rather indistinct and this is the reason why Aristotle refrained from using ἄδηγης, and probably why Cicero claimed it did not have a name. Although later called ἀκαταστάτου, Aristotle in his extant works never claims it is without name, cf. Clem. Rom. Recog. 8.15 (= Arist. De Phil. fr. 27), Psell. De Omnifi. Dec. 131, and see Haim (Fifth Element in Aristotle's De Philosophia, pp. 62–66); Chroust (Aristotelian Akonatomaston).

et sic: Giusta (Testo, p. 129) wished to read eis, but cf. N. D. 1.91, seminane deorum decidisse de caelo putamus in terras et sic homines patrum similis extitisse, a parallel which supports the reading of the ms.

animum: = 'mind', not soul, though Democritus conflates the two in Arist. De An. 1.5, 404a, cf. Fin. 5.36, ἐνδελέχειαν: = 'continuity', 'persistence', for which we have the proverb of Chooriels (ed. Naefe), πέτρυν κολαίναν τρέχειν δι' ἰδιαίτερος ἐνδελέχειαν (cf. Lucret. 3, ad fin.) which signifies a continual motion (here, in wearing down the stone). But is this what Cicero wrote? The witness of Mac. Somm. Scip. 2.13 has Aristoteles ἐνδελέχειαν, which goes a way to highlighting how much confusion there was between the two terms ἐνδελέχειαν and ἐντελέχειαν = 'having the end within itself' (Graham: The Eymology of Entelecheia; Blake: Aristotle on Entelecheia). The former term was widespread enough, but the latter was a neologism by Aristotle; therefore, the words nous nomine must surely point to the fact that Cicero wrote ἐντελέχειαν. Nevertheless, most recent editors have preferred to read ἐνδελέχειαν and thus charge Cicero with a blunder — and so Lucianus rightly joked that Cicero 'abolished δι' et sic effere potest contra fas et ius omne'. Arist. De An. 2.1, 412b defined the soul as ἐντελέχειαν ἡ πρῶτος σύμματος φυσικῶν ἄρτικην and denied that it had any movement in 1.3, 406a; but he also writes in Arist. De An. 1.3, 402a—b that it is no small matter to discern whether the soul be a power or an actuality, ὅτι δὲ πέπτων τῶν ἐν δυνάμει ἐντελέχειαν τὰς ἑξισθέντας γὰρ ἀφ' τῶν μορφῶν, and where it would seem most appropriate to do so, Aristotle nowhere tells us what the difference is. Otherwise in 3, 427a17—19, he calls the soul τὸ πρῶτον ἐν ῥιπτηρὶ ἐντελέχειαν καὶ ὄρθιον, an 'appetitive' thing; and this implies movement, though it still is in keeping with Aristotle's denial of the soul as self-moving. As such, it is hardly too dissonant with Cicero's phraseology. If Cicero conceived of Aristotle's fifth element as a physical, but non-substantial, a sort of 'weak-physicalist' position, neither then does he stray far from Arist. Cael. 1.9, 279a15, where Aristotle says that motion is proper to such bodies. In general, the interpretation of Aristotle's theory on the soul is fraught with difficulty, and for a full discussion, see Barnes (Aristotle's Concept of Mind); Sorabji (Body and Soul in Aristotle); Charlton (Aristotle's Definition of Soul).
XI. Nisi quae me forte fugiunt, haec sunt sententiae. Deciccatum enim, magnum illum quidem uirum, sed leibus et rotundis corpusculis efficientem animum concursu quodam fortuito, omittamus; nihil est enim apud istos, quod non atomorum turba conficiat. harum sententiaram quae uera sit, deus aliqui uiderit; quae ueri simillima, magna quaestio est. utrum igitur inter has sententias diiudicare malumus an ad propositum redire?

Cuperem equidem utrumque, si possed, sed est difficile confundere. quare si, ut ista non disserantur, liberari mortis metu possimus, id agamus; sin id non potest nisi hac quaestione animorum explicata, nunc, si uiderit, hoc, illud alius.

Quod malle te intellego, id puto esse commodius; efficiet enim ratio ut, quaecumque uera sit on Ac. 2.10–11; aliquis est substantialis, aliqui adjectivus. In Tusc. 4.16.35, 5.21.61, aliquis terror; but aliquis dolor at Tusc. 1.34.82, 2.20.46, dolor aliquid, and this double use of aliquid as both a substantive and adjective becomes more frequent in later writers.

si posset: as Pohlenz notes, potest here = potest esse, de- noting possibility, not ability. We have common ellipse of fieri, often with solet. Other examples are Catullus 42.16, Att. 12.40.2, ne doleram? qui potest? et, Ac. 2.121, negas sine deo posse quicquam.

dificile confundere: here = ‘to disregard logical rules of definition’. confudere = coniungere, consociare, in combining and mixing things together, a metaphor taken from metalurgy, cf. N. D. 3.8.19, agere confuse, Off. 1.27.95, Fin. 5.23.67 and see Ac. 2.47 with Reid’s n.

ut: here, the ut concessive; but note that the subjunctive has nothing to do with this, itself being one of result, cf. Madv. Gram. 400, obs. 4.

disserantur: the verb dissero is often used often with an accusative, sometimes with pronouns in relative clauses. However, it is used only rarely in the passive with a substantive, both here and Ac. 1.46, nulla disseret.

quaestione animorum: gen. of remitter object = questione de animis, cf. below 12, 27 n. excessu uitae.

hunc hoc, illud alius: hoc is the discussion on the question of the soul, which generally continues until 33, 81, cum satis de aeternitate dicissum, ne si interirent quidem animi, quicquam mali esse in morte. Throughout this discussion, reasons are brought forward why we ought not to fear death. Illud refers to the further historical and philosophiccal plea Cicero marshaless later in 82–119, and done so in order to drive away any remaining fear of death regardless of the state of the soul. In this way, the first book of Tusc. finds its model in the Phaedo, where Plato faces similar difficulties when Simmias and Cebes raise objections; for when Simmias continues to express doubts over the arguments for immortality, Socrates attributes these doubts to fear rather than shortcomings in the argument, Pl. Phd. 107a–b, and thus ends his argument by introducing myths about the soul.

efficiet . . . ut: 8, 16 n.

XI. nisi quae me . . .: ‘Unless I am mistaken, these are nearly all the opinions regarding the soul.’

haec sunt: a rare form of the feminine plural, for which see Hand: Tursellinus, vol. 2, p. 700, Munro on Lucr. 6.456, and Neve—Wagner 2, 417. cf. haec at Tusc. 3.84, 4.36, 5.84; but Cicero variously has xere, below, 17.64

Democritus: Democritus, the atomistic philosopher, born at Abdera, 468 B.C., more fully carried out the system of his master Leucippus. N. D. 1.24.66, Kirke/Raven/Schofield (Presocratics Philosophers, pp. 427–429). Cicero seems to have felt a kindly disposition towards Democritus, Div. 2.50, and seems to love opposing him to Epicurus, cf. Madvig on Fin. 1.20.

leibus et rotundis corpusculis: not leibus, but leibus = λειος, smooth, here opposed to aspera, cf. N. D. 1.24.66, corpuscula quaedam levia, alia aspera, rotunda alia, partim autem angulata et hamata, curtota quaedam et quasi adunca. For the reason why Democritus held that the atoms of the soul were smooth and round, see below, 18, 42, and cf. Lucr. 2.402, e levis atque rotundis esse ea quae sensus iucunde tangere possunt, et 465, quod fluidus est, e levis atque rotundis est. Democritus claimed that the sun and the moon were formed by revolutions of smooth atoms, and in a similar fashion so the mind and the soul, (D. L. 9.44), and also see Arz. De At. 1.3, ἀπέρους γὰρ δῶτον ἐξελέγχων καὶ ἀπέρους τὸ σφακεριδίῳ πῦρ καὶ ψυχὴν λέγει (sc. Ἰερόκριτος), and Stob. Ecl. 1.52.

corpusculum: The term corpusculum is used by Lucretius, inter alia, for ‘atoms’, where see Munro n. on Lucr. 1.55. Cicero is inconsistent with his terminology, immediately using atomus.

concursus quodam fortuito: such ‘chance’ collusions were properly Epicurean, not Democritean, and although Cicero often identified Epicurean and Democritean teachings for polemical reasons, as he does in Ac. 1.6, he very well knew the difference between them. The collusion ‘by chance’, his famous ‘swerve’, was introduced by Epicurus into the atomic theory in order to provide a basis for freewill. Democritus however accepted it was fate (ἀνάγκη, εἰρήματος) that held sway over the continual downward rain of atoms through the void, that in a whirl the heavy atoms would eventually overtake the lighter atoms (atomus gravitato feretur naturali uc necessario) and bring about collisions (σύγκρισις, συμπλοκή = concursus) from which worlds would arise, D.–K. 68B167, and cf. Fat. 23, and 39, where Cicero more accurately distinguishes their theories.

apud istos: = the Atomists, whom Epicurus followed; for the plural, see above 6, 12 n.

 turba: Gustafsson (Coniecturae, p. 169) suggested turbo for the Democritean σωφρ, from Fat. 42, though he admits Cicero is not clear here; cf. Fin. 1.20, turbulent a concursio. The term turba is derogatory.

§23. deus aliqui: so the best mss., but see Reid’s n.
earum sententiarum quas exposui, mors aut malum non sit aut sit bonum potius. nam si cor aut sanguis aut cerebrum est animus, certe, quoniam est corpus, interibit cum reliquo corpore; si anima est, foras dissipabitur; si ignis, extinguetur; et si est Aristoxeni harmonia, dissolueretur. quid de Dicaearcho dicam, qui nihil omnino animum dicat esse? his sententis omnibus nihil post mortem pertinent ad quemquam potest; pariter enim utra sensus amittitur; non sententis autem nihil est ullam in partem quod intersit. reliquorum sententiae spem adferunt, si te hoc forte delectat, posse animos, cum e corporibus excesserint, in caelum quasi in domicilium suum peruenire.

Me uero delectat, idque primum ita esse uelim, deinde, etiamsi non sit, mihi persuaderi tamen

aut malum non sit aut sit bonum: for sit repeated, Klotz compares Sen. 8.26, senectus non modo languida atque iners non sit, verum etiam sit operea et semper agens aliqud et molens. The subjunctive is found in all mss., and can be justified as standing in a relative clause dependent on a subjunctive clause, and so attracted into the subject, cf. 5, 9 n. and Ac. 2.20. A better parallel I think is Flac. 8.19, mirandum vero est homines eos... libenter adripere futilitatem, et terrae et atque et animae a mundo, quas rursus redderent, ignis et rationis expertia insederint ratione depulerit et meminisse, etc.

Tusc. 1.22, 23: corpore ut tempore RGL: τέρπεις K: tempit P, τ’ε’ E. fortasse X: foras nihil recte Giusta 3 si est] si ex dett. coll.: τὸ δ’ ἀναστήσοντος ὀδὸν πρὸς ἁμαρτίαν, a position the Epicureans were eager to maintain, but one which focuses on the state of being dead, and not the process of dying. Plin. H. N. 7.55 maintains the same.

cum uita sensus amittitur: though generally true of the other theories mentioned, curiously we have several pieces of evidence that Democritus argued the soul lingered on for a while in a corpse, and even retained some degree of perception, D–K. 117A160, with TAYLOR (Leucippus and Democritus), and below 47, 112; cf. Plu. De Plac. Phil. 4.4.7; οἱ Δημόκριτος πάντα μετέχει φυσικά ὁ δὲ θάνατος, και τα νεκρά των σώματων; and Alex. Aphrod. in Arist. Top. 21.21, τα νεκρά των σώματων αἰσθάνεται, ὡς ὁ δὸς Δημόκριτος; for Democritus, whose atoms of body and soul are dispersed throughout the body, death may be a more protracted event. But Epicurus opposed this view, cf. Epicur. Ep. Hdt. 64–65, where he argues that as soon as the soul leaves the body (death), all perception is lost, ἀπαλακτικός τῆς φύσεως ὁ δὲ θάνατος, cf. Lucr. 3.380–5. Either the body has the soul and is alive, or the soul departs, and died, and so no longer perceives — there is no intermediate position as in Democritus. See Warren (Democritus, the Epicureans, Death, and Dying, pp. 193–200; Kerferd (Epicurus’ Doctrine of the Soul, pp. 83–84), and below 34, 82.

sensus ...sentientis: It seems we have two meanings of aἰσθήσεως, as applied to the organs of sense themselves, and to the impressions we receive from them. In the Greek sources, the words aἰσθήσεως and φαντασία are often interchanged, cf. Sen. Ep. 124.6, aliquid manifestum sensuque comprehensum, Stob. Flor. 1.41.25 applies the term aἰσθήσεως to φαντασία. See Reid’s n. on Ac. 1.41. quod autem erat sensu comprehensum, id ipsum sensum appellabatur.

ullam in partem quod: the position of the relative after ullam emphasises these words, cf. Tusc. 3.15.32, 36, de rebus quod dici possit subtilius.

nihil intetis: = Epicurus’ ἀδάφος.

in caelum quasi in domicilium suum: the metaphor that in death we have an escape to heaven, as if we were returning to our own home is a common one throughout philosophy, see CUMONT (Lux perpetua, p. 167), 22, 51 and 49, 118 below; Sen. 23.84, ex vita ita discedo tamquam ex hospitio, non tamquam e domo. commorandique enim natura decororum nobis, non habitandi dedit; as well as Cicero’s Hortens. fr. 115, ex hac in aliam hactae paulo meliore domum demigravit; Rep. 6.25, and 29. [Plu]. Consol. ad Apoll. 117f calls life an ἐπιδήµia, and 120b: ps-Pl. Ax. 365b; Epicth. Gnom. 2.23; Sen. Ep. 70.16; 65.21; 66.3; and MOREL/BÜCHNER/BLANSDORF (FPL), Hadrian fr. 3, animula... hospe comesus corporis; Pl. Phil. 117, τῆς μετεκρίσεως τῆς ἐνθένθα ἑξωκά.

The preposition (i) is usually omitted in these apposition clauses with quasii; its repetition here, therefore, is used to heighten the comparison, see Kühner’s n. on Tusc. 3.15.33.

uero: affirmative, as often when attached to pronouns, cf. ergo uero, 76, nihii uero, 25. Many examples occur in Terence, K–S. 133, 22.
uelim. Quid tibi ergo opera nostra opus est? num eloquentia Platonem superare possimus? eulue
diligenter eius eum librum, qui est de animo: amplius quod desideres nihil erit.

Feci mehercule, et quidem saepius; sed nescio quo modo, dum lego, adsentior, cum posui
librum et mecum ipse de immortalitate animorum coepi cogitare, adsensio omnis illa elabitur.

Quid hoc? dasne aut manere animos post mortem aut morte ipsa interire?
Do uero.
Quid, si maneant?
Beatos esse concedo.

Sin intereat? Non esse miserum, quoniam ne sint quidem; iam istuc coacti a te paulo ante
librum et mecum ipse de immortalitate animorum coepi cogitare, adsensio omnis illa elabitur.

Quo modoigitur aut cur mortem malum tibi uideri dicis? quae aut beatos nos efficiat, animis
manentibus, aut non miserum sensu carentis.

XII. Expone igitur, nisi molestum est, primum, si potes, animos reanare post mortem, tum,

carentis] carentem S, V alla manu

euolue: cf. the term volulmen; here, eulue implies that the
work was written on papyrus in the form of a roll as
described by Plin. H. N. 13.74–82, the length of which did
not normally exceed 35 feet, the reader unfolding it with
his right hand, and rolling it up with his left. See KENYON
(Books and Readers in Ancient Greece and Rome), and
the engraving found in the Antichità di Ercolano, viii, Tav. 55.

librum qui est de: a collocation usual for Cicero
(considered formally correct), rather than de simply, cf. Tusc. 4.34.72, and Planc. 56, nomine legis Liciniae, quae est de
dodalia:; but in more informal contexts, Cicero does use
the shorter form, Att. 9.9.2, Demetri librum de concordia: cf.
N. D. 1.41, and K.–S. 1.215. Cicero seems to call the book
by the title of de animo (i.e., perē [ψυχη]), a curious indication
that Plato’s dialogues seem to have gone by their subtitles
in Cicero’s time. See HINZEL: Der Dialog, vol. 1, pp. 293,
329, 544.

eum librum: the Phaedo.

feci: i.e., euoluei, ‘I have done so’, a common use of the
verb facere, like the Greek ποιε‹ν, to avoid a repetition, see
L.&S, s. v. nescio quo modo: the literal force has practically faded
away. Like the Greek οὐκ ὅδε ὅδε, it is often used as a
formula dolentis to express puzzlement or regret. ‘For some
reason, while I read that book, I agree, but as soon as I
lay it aside and begin to reflect myself on the immortality
of the soul, all my assent slips away.’ Beier lists many
examples of this use in his n. on Off. 1.41.146, including
this passage here; 31, 77 below, and Mil. 28.26.

dum lego, adsentior: Socrates claims certainty about
the immortality of the soul at Pl. Phd. 106e, σπανὶς μάλλον ἀμα, ἐφ᾽ οὗ Κέβης, ἐφ᾽ ἄβατοιν καὶ κοινωλευ, καὶ τῷ οὐτὶ ἐστὶν ἧμιν ἀν μόνον οὐκ ἀναλευ ἐν Ἕδου, and compelled the
assent of both Simmias and Cebes. The arguments in this work
elicited much scrutiny on account of Plato’s expressed cer-
tainty. Their earliest critic, Strato of Lampsacus, accused
Plato of begging the question which he claimed to answer;
others have defended the final argument in the work as
formally correct, but still admit that the premises may not
be accepted by everyone. For a critical examination of some
of the arguments in the Phaedo, see BLUCK (Phaedo, 181f);
FREDE (Final Proof in the Phaedo). HASKFORDB (Plato’s
Phaedo, 159, 161ff) argued that Plato was simply unde-
cided over the exact nature of the soul.

§25. quid hoc?: se. est. Pohlenz, however, argued that
hoc does not belong with quid but with the alternative
question that follows and so placed it at the beginning
for the sake of emphasis, citing §§32, 34, 58, 61 below.

Drexler and Giusta follow him printing quid? hoc dansu etc.
However, the parallel at 32 constitutes a different idiom;
and all the other passages cited by Pohlenz refer to a pre-
ceding idea which has been made explicit, whereas here
his punctuation leaves hoc hopelessly vague. If we fol-
low earlier editors, we find there is gentle surprise and
mock chastisement in the Latin, ‘What is this? Do you grant
that’, etc. Note the repetition of the interrogatives quid hoc?…quid?…quonodo where there is a nice parallel in Plaut.
Poen. 1296, sed quid hoc est? quid est? quid hoc est?

dasne: = concedisse. dare is used often in philosophical
language to mean ‘grant’, or ‘concede’, cf. Tusc. 12.2.128,
quare satis mili delisti, cun respondisti mili tibi viser i malum
dedecus quam dolorem, and Fin. 5.28.83.

quoniam ne sint quidem: a few of the lesser mss. read
sunt incorrectly. We have the subjunctive here after quoniam = ἐκέινος since we have reported speech (i.e., a
statement which does not accord to his own position, but one which
is he forced to adopt).

quo modo igitur: ‘In what sense’, cf. Off. 3.27.101, at
stulte, qui non modo non censuerit captivos remittendos, verum
etiam dissuaserit. quo modo stulte?

aut beatos…aut non miseros: to the exclusion of an
unhappy immortality, Cicero will completely dismiss any
tales of torment from the lower world. That there was any
other possibility hardly enters his mind.

XII. §26. expone igitur: : this section begins the cen-
tral portion of the Tusc. and the bulk of its argument to show
that the soul is immortal and that death is a good rather
than an evil; that there is a naturally implanted belief in
immortality as evidenced by ancient customs and practices
(21–33); the argument for the immortal soul, having been
set forth in 18–24, is now resumed and various views of
philosophers are proffered about what the soul is, where
it resides, and the superstition of Hades is exploded (36–52);
Platonic arguments for the immortality of the soul (53–53);
additional arguments for immortality are presented which
are less clearly expressed, such as from the simplicity of
the soul, from the scala naturae, from its faculty of memory
(56–71); a treatment of Socrates and Cato, and arguments
against suicide (72–73); finally, a dismissal of philosophical
arguments against immortality (76–81).
si minus id obtinebis — est enim arduum — docebis carere omni malo mortem.

Ego enim istuc ipsum uereor ne malum sit non dico carere sensu, sed carendum esse.

Auctoribus quidem ad istam sententiam, quam uis obtineri, uti optimis possumus, quod in omnibus causis et debet et solent valeere plurimum, et primum quidem omni antiquitate, quae quo propius aberat ab ortu et diuina progenie, hoc melius ea fortasse quae erat uera cernebat.

Itaque unum illud erat insitum priscis illis, quos ‘cascos’ appellat Ennius, esse in morte sensum.

1 obtinebis | obtinebis PK: obti‘nebis R: obtenebis GV 27
3 auctoribus | auctoritatiuis dett. codd. 3 obtineri

obtinebis: ‘establish’, or show something to be true, as often, cf. Tusc. 5.30.85. Erentini notes that it is a term used both for orators (and Cicero frequently uses it in his pleadings) as well as for philosophers, cf. Fin. 2.33, Iulid autem ipsum qui obtineri potest, quod dicits etc.

docebis: a polite imperative, cf. expone above. The future used in such a way often conveys a forceful desire, as if the author had also written ut ipse et aperit.

carer omni malo: cf. Tusc. 5.36.88, de morte enim ista sentit, ut dissolato animante sensum extinctum putet, autem sensum careat, nihil ad nos id iudicet pertinent.

auctoribus uti optimis: here Cicero expresses an inclination to follow authorities in matters where they have a greater understanding (and greater ability), but faith in such testimony is less trusted later in N. D. 1.5.10, non enim tam auctoritatis in disputando quam rationis momenta quaerenda sunt; cf. Dio. 21.11.27, ego philosophon non esse arbitror, testibus uti... argumentus et rationibus eportet quare quidque ista sit docere; and below 27, 49 n, where Cicero claims great authority for the opinion of Plato; even his own scepticism is placed under the lense of scrutiny.

obtineri: cf. Tusc. 5.41.118, where we have lex obtinetur = lex uael, where Kuhner shows in his n. ad loc. that the usual idiom is passive. Davies preferred the reading obtineri, with early editors, understanding auctoribus ad istam sententiam, quam uis obtineri, obtinendam uti; and this does have a Ciceronian touch. But we must go with obtineri (with the best ms.), and is the more likely reading.

omni antiquitate quae... uera cernebat: not the argument from consensus omnium, as Dougan states, but an appeal to the authority of antiquity. I find a striking parallel to PL EP. 7, 334c, quidem praeterea sit debet quid sit palatium tce et iuros loci, omi deuince non ait aitae homunculus, sed quod homunculus quae visiniu, though there the ancient opinion was also that the souls of wicked men would suffer torment after their judgement. (We know that Cicero had read Plato’s seventh episode from Tusc. 5.100, and Fin. 2.92.) Antiquity held a special authority since the ancients were considered the sons of gods, and held far less corrupt opinions than the moderns — and this was often said with a tinge of old world romanticism, such as Polyb. 6.56.12, οι παλατοι δοκοινοι με αε τα γεις δεμοναι και τας iuros των εν δυσβαθιοι ανεi εκλε και ας οτις εν τα πληθου πισταιηγανηι, πολυ δι μηλοι αε του εκλε και αληνα ει σιβλιαναί ατια, PL Phlb. 16c, και αιμ παλατοι, κρατικες ιμιου και γνημτου δεων εινοιενηι, τατην φημην παρευσαν, where Plato is speaking of Prometheus, and PL Rep. 3.388b. Editors quote S. E. M. 9.23 to show that this argument had an especial appeal to the Stoics, cf. N. D. 2.11.27, quomiam antiquitas proxime accedit ad deos; and we know from Sen. Ep. 90 that Poseidonius glorified primitive man. But it certainly is not limited to them: Arist. De Phil. fr. 44, as quoted by [Plu]. Consol. ad Apoll. 115b-c, speaks of the happiness of men after the departure from life, and he represents it as an ancient doctrine, so an-

cient that no man knows when it began, who the author of it was; only that it had been handed down by tradi-
tion, and cf. PL Ti. 4.4b-d, PL Phlb. 16c, and Boys-Stones (Post-Hellenistic Philosophy).

quo propius aberat: literally, ‘in proportion as it was nearer from’, but no more illogical than the English ‘dif-
frent to’ which arose by an analogy from ‘similar to’. For the Latin idiom, cf. Sen. 21.77, quod ec no cere err mihi melius uideo, quo ab ea propius absurum.

ab ortu: sc. generis humani, ‘from its beginning’.

diuina progenie: progenies is not said of the originators, but of the descendents, cf. 35, 85 below, Primum tanta progenie orbitum; ‘from the sons of gods’, i.e., heroes.

§27. unum illud = illud patissium, ‘that most important’, so Wolf who remarks that unus is often added to words to show a superiority, either, as Orelli teaches, in a good or bad quality, cf. De Or. 1.29.132, and homunculus unus, above 9.17 n.

insitum: ξεϕυτον ἐννοει, Epict. Gnom. 2.11.3.

casces: a very old word, and for its meaning cf. Varr. L. L. 7.28, primum cascem significat vetus; secundo eius origo Sabina, quae usque radices in Oscam linguam est. Casmum vetus esse significat Ennius quid ait: quam Prisci casci populi tenare Latini, and Adams (Oscan Fragment). We also have the testimony of GeL N. A. 1.10, adolescens casces nimis et vetustae loquentes, and Est. 33 (Lindsay) (46–48).

in morte sensum neque...: Cicero claims that the traditional customs of the Romans, like their pontifical and funeral rites, are sure evidence that men believed that the soul lived on after death; and we do have evidence that there was a deep-seated belief among the early Romans, probably adopted from the Etruscans, that the soul sur-
vived after death. Though scepticism about this developed over time with the adoption of the Epicurean and Stoic systems, nevertheless we find that the belief of the souls’ complete destruction was in fact held by some people who were outside the committed adherents of the schools, as is shown by several funerary epitaphs, CIL 9.856 mortales sumus, immortales non sumus; Buechler/ Lommatzsch: CLE, vol. 1, 420. omnia cum uita presunt et inania fiunt; ibid., vol. 2, 1495, in nihil a nihilii quam cito recidimus; and a phrase that was recurrent non fui, fui, non sum, non curo. However, such statements were rare. Many other epitaphs, if they do not affirm a future life, certainly do not deny it. Unfortunately, most of the evidence we possess for the Romans’ conception of the afterlife is for the earlier period. Plautus and Ennius are our chief literary authorities: Ennius here, Plaut. Most. 49, who implies the shades of the dead haunt the living; and Plaut. Capt. 996–999, where he describes paintings of tortures that await in Hades. See Cumont (Recherches sur le symbolisme fun-
érinaire des Romains); Toynbee (Death in the Roman world, pp. 33-43).
neque excessu uitae sic deleri hominem, ut funditus interiret; idque cum multis aliiis rebus, tum e pontificio iure et e caerimoninis sepulcrorum intellegi licet, quas maximis ingenii praediti nec tanta cura coluissent nec violatas tam inexpiabili religione sanxissent, nisi haereter in eorum mentibus

3. Prudent. Cathem. Hymn. 10.53; Phaedr. 1.27, and Theoc. Id. 22.207.


\textit{excessu uitae:} = ‘excessu e uitae’, as Cicero usually writes, cf. Fin. 1.49, animo aquo et vita, cum ea non placat, tamquam e theatro eceamus.

\textit{cum multis:} Giusta (Testo, p. 131) retained Lambinus’ insertion of \(<e>\) before multis, but this has no mss. authority and is against Cicero’s usage. I defend the idiom with Fam. 6.10, neque enim ipsa Caesar, ut multis rebus intelligere potui, est alienus a nobis, a parallel editors have not noticed.

e pontificio iure et e caerimoninis: when two ideas, which are so similar as to be the same are coordinated, often the preposition is not repeated, as Tusc. 4.20.46, \textit{ad opem ferendam et calamitates subleuandas}; but when, as here, the ideas are distinct enough to have individual prominence, the preposition is repeated, on which see Kühner ad loc.

\textit{pontifici iure:} the college of pontiffs, presided over by the pontifex maximus, had jurisdiction over religious ceremonies and superstition over the observance of ancient customs; and while we have evidence of disputes over the ritual procedure used to conduct the ceremonies, and jurisdictional arguments over who could control the procedure, we have no example of any religious figure putting forth a creed which was to be adopted by Romans. This shows that that pontifical law was more focused on ‘orthopraxy’ than ‘orthodoxy’, i.e., the correctness of its rituals than its dogma. (Beard/North/Price: Religious of Rome: A History, vol. 1, pp. 99–108, 211–44). The college of pontiffs regulated the form of private rituals, such as funerals, rites for the defied dead, and the way the manes were to be appeased. cf. Liv. 1.20.5–7, Leg. 2.48–57, and for a general discussion of the role of the pontiffs, see Beard/North (Pagan Priests. Religion and Power in the Ancient World, pp. 17–71, 177–255); Szemler (Religio in the Roman Republic); King (Organization of Roman Religious Beliefs).

\textit{caerimoninis:} for the almost tautological meaning with religione below, see Wagenvoort (Caerimonia).

\textit{sepulcrorum:} a burial and anything left to the dii manes were religiosa, even if the burial belonged to a slave (Bergler: Dictionary of Roman Law, p. 701), sub noce. So far as is known in early Roman law, only civil actions were granted for the violations of sepulchers, and the penalty was pecuniary. But Brown (Violation of Sepulture) discusses an edict of an emperor, sometime between 32B.C. and 4A.D. (thought to be by Augustus) which condemns those who remove corpses nominem sepulchri violati with the penalty being death. (Coleman-Norton/Johnson/Bourne: Ancient Roman Statutes, vol. 2), Doc. 133 (R44). and 244.93, cf. Justin. D. 47.12.3. For the laws concerning the manes, cf. Leg. 2.22, and Phil. 9.14. Cicero later argues against attaching any importance to the body’s disposal.

\textit{maximis ingenii praediti:} cf. Dom. 1.1–4, amplissimi et clarissimi cives ren publicum bene gerendo religiones. Cicero, despite his own religious disbelief, always speaks of religion with the deepest respect and in his political speeches frequently appeals to the religious feelings of his hearers. In N. D. 1.9.22, he expresses doubt about the existence of the gods, but declares that in religious matters, he will always obey the chief pontiff, as religion is subservient to the welfare of the state.

\textit{tanta cura coluissent:} Romans placed a great deal of importance on the continuation of worship. Val. Max. 1.1.8–15 insisted that the gods favoured the Roman because their rituals were never neglected, and their performance was dearer than other obligations, omnia tamque post religionem ponenda semper nostræ civitatem duxit. The Romans continued to maintain that their religious rituals were created at the very beginning of the Republic by Numa (Liv. 1.19–20) or Aeones (Ov. Fast. 2.543–46), and though there was no solid historical basis for this claim, they asserted that the gods had not been neglected since the establishment of the state. And we do have some archeological evidence that the Capitoline Jupiter was worshipped for over a thousand years in nearly the same location (Cornell: Beginnings of Rome, p. 102). There was a decline of faith in the traditional religion among the larger part of the intellectuals in the first century BC, but the rites were still retained and this led to absurdities perpetrated for the sake of political gain, most notably in the case of M. Bibulus in 59B.C., and the event which occasioned Har. Resp. See Fowler (Religious Experience, pp. 306–307); Pease (de Divinatione, pp. x–xi); Burris: Cicero and the Religion of His Day).

\textit{ nec violatas tam inexpiabili religione sanxissent:} ‘nor would they have put their violation under so inexpiable guilt’, cf. Liv. 2.53.160–1, postea res et ab natura profectas et ab consuetudine probatas legum metus et religio sanxit…religio est, quae superiors cuissdam naturae, quam divinam vocant, curam caerimoniarnique afferit. This passage shows that the term religio has a range of meanings from ‘scruples of conscience’ (as a form of guilt), but can also come to mean culpa, as religious error; cf. N. D. 2.4, peccatum suum, quod celati posset, confiteri maluit quam haerere in re publica religione; Am. 4.13, and the fragment of Rep., quote in Non. 174, sic pontificio iure sanctitudo sepulrarum; and we have the bitter sarcasm Cicero uses against P. Clodius at Har. Resp. 9.

\textit{ni haereter:} after coluisset and sanxisset, we would have expected the pluperfect haesisset; but the use of this tense is common in the protasis of past contrary to fact conditional sentences when the fact implied in the apodosis is adduced to prove what is implied in the condition, Madv. Gram. 347b2. As Kühner explains, the imperfect denotes contemporaneous action, referring the idea back to the time in which ancient Romans attached such sanctity to the funeral rites, and their carefulness was taken as proof of their belief in the soul. In such cases where the imperfect is found, its action always involves duration, cf. Mil. 17.56, nisi cogitatum faciam approperaret, numquam relinquisset; Sall. Jug. 49.3, and cf. the Greek \(δὲ οὐκ ἔκρυσαν, \) et \(μὴ ἔνειδον. \)
mortem non interitum esse omnia tollentem atque delentem, sed quandam quasi migrationem commutationemque uitae, quae in claris uiris et feminis dux in caelum soleret esse, in ceteris humi reineretur et permaneret tamen. ex hoc et nostrorum opinione.

Romulus in caelo cum dis agit aeumum,


interitum: eloquently expressed by Plaut. Capt. 686, qui per uritatem perierit non interit.

quasi migrationem commutationemque: quasi, as often, marks a translation, cf. below 20, 46 n.; 24, 57 n. quasi consignatus; 22, 52, quasi uos nut receptacles; and there are many other examples. Here, the vagueness is used in apology for the combination of the terms migratio (which is quite rare, used only twice in the Tusc., and once else in Fam. 16.17) and commutatio. It was Cicero's usual practice to translate one Greek with two Latin words, and the hendiaady probably renders the Greek μετεµψύχωσις. I find a curious story at Verr. 5.45.118, matre osquis miseras per-notabant ad ostium carceris ab extremo conspectu liberum exclamis, quae nihil aliud orabant nisi ut filiorum suorum postremum spiritum receperit. This seems to imply that the Romans held the belief that the soul would escape the body through the mouth (see LaClerc's n. ad loc. in his Lemaria edition), and Sen. Herc. Fars. 1308–1310. The superstition existed that a dying spirit could be taken in with a kiss of the final breath, on which see Duncan (Transfer of the Soul at Death).

quandam quasi: cf. Ac. 1.2.40, quaedam quasi inspiciens. The order quasi quandam would have been more normal when it is often used to modify metaphors (Reid on Ac. 1.5.21). Dougan notes four distinct uses of quidam in his note on this passage, though they involve a degree of vagueness with its effect.

migrationem: cf. 41, 98 n.

migra tionem commutationemque: Reid suspected the reading. However, the Latin mors is used ambiguously and can denote several meanings: (i) ipso tempore, the very moment the person dies, (ii) 'dying', or the time leading up to death, the soul leaving the body, (iii) the state of being dead (mortues) after the separation of soul from body. Hippolytus' dogmography (SvF. 2.806) would suggest that the Stoics also believed in the transmigration of the soul; but the first Stoic to speak of it favorably was Sen. Ep. 75.20, 76.10–11, 78.34, 108.17–22, largely through the influence of his Pythagorean teacher Sotion, Hoven (Stocio facere pro problema de l'au-delà, pp. 91, 158); Mansfield (Resurrection Added, pp. 218–220). uitae quae et permaneret tamen: cf. Milton, Comus, 470–475. "Such are those thick and gloomy shadows damp, Oft seen in charnel-vaults and sepulchres, Lingering and sitting by a new-made grave, As loth to leave the body. Oft seen in charnel-vaults and sepulchres, Lingering and sitting by a new-made grave, As loth to leave the body."

in claris uiris et feminis: for the idiom, cf. Sen. 22, in claris et honoratis uiris, = 'in the case of'; many examples are found Am. 9, with Seyffert's n.

dux in caelum: the metaphor is quite strong and the absence of quasi is noticeable, cf. Ac. 1.32, post argumentum et quasi rerum notis ducibus ubertinent ad profandum.

§28. ex hoc: this section largely deals with men and women who have earned immortality for the sake of their benefits rendered to mankind and who deserve our worship, a topic which Cicero treated earlier in his Consolatio, cf. Cic. Consol. fr. 11 (= Lact. Inst. 1.15.4), quorum ingenios et inventis omnem vitam legibus et instituti excultum consti- tutione habemus. This whole passage greatly resembles N. D. 2.62 as noticed by Jones (Posidonius and Cicero's Tusc. p. 207), in which Cicero takes a Euhemeristic approach to the deification of men, on which cf. 15, 29 below.

et nostrorum opinione: Ernesti wanted to delete et, but Nissen correctly understood it as not connecting hoc with opinione, but balanced by et apud Graecos below.

Romulus in caelo: deified as Quirinus. Servius gives the line more correctly on Verg. Ann. 6.784, Romulus in caelo cum dis genitalibus aequo degit. Skutsch (Emniana, pp. 109–112) argued that Cicero omitted genitalibus in his quotation to avoid any hint at Romulus' half-divine descent from Mars. This passage in Cicero has been taken to suggest that the carmina upon which Ennius drew had reference to Romulus in particular; and I think we can be sure that Ennius did not originate his deification but
rather established it in literature (ANDERSON: Heracles and His Successors, pp. 30–31). Most importantly in such cases, we have outside Greek authority: there is a passage overlooked by all editors, D. H. 1.79, that has been written to be included in Liv. 1.79, Verg. Aen. 8.190, Ov. Fast. 1.543, Prop. 3.9:

**perlaus** ad nos: *i.e.*, the myth concerning Hercules and his combat with Cacus. The origin of his worship at Rome is discussed by Liv. 1.79, Verg. Aen. 8.190, Ov. Fast. 1.543; Prop. 3.9:

**perlaus**: the rare *perlabendi* used by Cicero only here. **Oceanum**: *i.e.*, Atlanticum. Sue. Caes. 7. Gadiske weni-sset, animaduera apud Herculis templum Magni Alexandri imagine ingenuam; Theod. Graec. affect. cur. 7.113, Sil. 3.3, limina Gadis, (on which Lemaire ad loc. quotes ιεράτωτα Νάουρα, and cf. Pl. Crit. 1.148, Verg. Aen. 4.361, 5.620), D. C. 37.52, 43.39–4. Hercules brought the oxen of Geryon from the island of Erythaea, near Gaderia (Gadis, Gadis) on the southern coast of Spain, beyond the the *Herculis* στολαίκαι καὶ βουκόλοις ἐοικότες, ἀλλ᾿ ὅιους ἄν τις ἄξιοσε τοὺς γόνος ἐν τῆς πτησίας ἔµµορο ὑπὸ ῾Ρημῶν ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἄξιοντο; similarly in Plu. Num. 5. It confirms that Ennius had had a body of material on the native legendary history which he could draw upon, and a good portion death with Romulus as hero. These histories existed at least to imperial times (STUART: Narrative Poetry, p. 33).

**indeque perlaus ad nos**: *i.e.*, the myth concerning Hercules and his combat with Cacus. The origin of his worship at Rome is discussed by Liv. 1.79, Verg. Aen. 8.190, Ov. Fast. 1.543; Prop. 3.9:

**perlaus**: the rare *perlabendi* used by Cicero only here. **Oceanum**: *i.e.*, Atlanticum. Sue. Caes. 7. Gadiske weni-sset, animaduera apud Herculis templum Magni Alexandri imagine ingenuam; Theod. Graec. affect. cur. 7.113, Sil. 3.3, limina Gadis, (on which Lemaire ad loc. quotes ιεράτωτα Νάουρα, and cf. Pl. Crit. 1.148, Verg. Aen. 4.361, 5.620), D. C. 37.52, 43.39–4. Hercules brought the oxen of Geryon from the island of Erythaea, near Gaderia (Gadis, Gadis) on the southern coast of Spain, beyond the the *Herculis* στολαίκαι καὶ βουκόλοις ἐοικότες, ἀλλ᾿ ὅιους ἄν τις ἄξιοσε τοὺς γόνος ἐν τῆς πτησίας ἔµµορο ὑπὸ ῾Ρημῶν ἔτι καὶ νῦν ἄξιοντο; similarly in Plu. Num. 5. It confirms that Ennius had had a body of material on the native legendary history which he could draw upon, and a good portion death with Romulus as hero. These histories existed at least to imperial times (STUART: Narrative Poetry, p. 33).
Matutah habitet a nostris? quid? totum prope caeleum, ne pluris persequer, nonne hominum quanum completem est?

XIII. Si auro scrutati uetera et ex eis ea quae scriptores Graeciae prodiderunt eruere coner, ipsi illi maiorum gentium di qui habentur hic a nobis profecti in caelem reperientur. quare, quorum demonstrantur sepulcrum in Graecia; reminiscere, quioniam es initiatu, quae traduntur mysteriis:

Mater Matuta: the only generally known temple to Mater Matuta is the one in the Forum Boarium just inside the porta Carmentalis. It was first ascribed to Servius Tullius, but later restored and dedicated by M. Furius Camillus, cf. Liv. 5.19.6, PLATNER (Topographical Dictionary, p. 330). We now have further evidence from BüCHELER/LOMATZSCH (CLE) 1661 (= DISSAU (ILS) 9346) of a temple to Mater Matuta which existed in the VI regio of Rome (BREUEN: Temple of Mater Matuta).

Matuta, evidently connected with mane, matutinus, signifies the god who precede the manes, from manus, which originally meant 'bright, shining,' then metaphorically 'good, propitious,' on which Munro's n. on Lusc. 12


XIII. §29. si coner...: for the future construction with an implied incomplete condition, cf. Or. 1.14.61, Off. 3.5.23, Fin. 3.21.70, potuerant... nisi exputarunt with Madvig's n., and K.-S. 154.3.

uetera: 'aeus carries with it the notion of time, antiquus generally involves some note of praise' (SEYFFERT on Am. 1.4); here it means παλαιός, which is generally applied to things which have existed for a long time, rather than that which existed long ago (DOEDELEIN: Lat. Syn. et Etym. vol. 4. p. 82); see Mayor on Juv. 15.33 and Wilkins' n. on Cicer. 3.6.

maiorum gentium di: for the term, cf. Ac. 2.41.126, CLEANTHES, qui quasi maiorum est gentium Stoicus. The hundred senators chosen by Romulus to found the original patriciate were classed as the maiorum gentium (Livy. 1.8.7), including those houses which supposedly came in with the Sabines under Tatius (D. H. 2.8); those chosen by Tarquinius Superbus were minorum gentium, (Livy. 1.35.6, Furneaux on Tac. Ann. 11.25, and Rep. 2.20.35). When the lexiceternium was first brought to Rome in 396 B.C., it was comprised of only six gods, Apollo, Latona, Hercules, Diana, Venus, and Neptune. In 217 B.C., after the disaster of Trasimene, the ceremony of the lexiceternium underwent a change, and in imitation of the Greek pantheon expanded to twelve gods who became known as the dui consentes, Liv 22.10. These were the twelve gods who later had their statues in the forum, as they had in the agora at Athens and elsewhere in Greece: whence the distich Enn. Ann. 62ff (= AUG. C. D. 8.5), Iuno, Vesta, Minerua, Ceres, Diana, Venus, Mars, | Mercurius, Iou', Neptunus, Vaticanus, Apollo. Pride of place is given to Juno. Rome's divine ancestors, Venus and Mars, are placed together, cf. (Latte: Romische Religionsgeschichte, p. 253; SKULTCH: Enniana VI), APU. DEO SACR. 2, OM. MEL. 6.72.

a nobis: i.e., a term quare, quorum demonstrantur sepulchra in Graecia: cf. the euhemeristic (LACT. Inst. 1.11.46, Minuc. Felix OCT. 21.1, and above 12, 28 n.), approach seeks to rationalise the deification of men to gods, as rewarded for their virtue. Zeus had a sepulcher on Crete (N. D. 3.21.53); CALLIM.

Hymn 1.9 elaborates by saying Zeus ἄντωρς was buried there by the Kouretes, Κρήνης ἐν ἄνοιξιν καὶ γὰρ τάφος, ὥστε δην, Κρήνης ἐκτριβαντος εὖ ἄλογα, τὰ ἔργα Άσκληπεος — but this Zeus was probably confused with Zagreus, the Cretan Dionysus who is killed by the Titans, for which see CASO (Theories of Mythology, p. 146); and the many passages collected by PRISTER (Der Reliquienkult im Altertum, pp. 385-387); ENNIUS (LACT. Inst. llbd.) placed the tomb in Cnossus; Varro (ap. SOL. DE MIR. MUND. 3.16) and Porphy. VP 17 on Mount Ida. There is also the tomb of Uranus (near Oceania?); of Asclepius in Arcadia, near Lusius (Rep. 3.22.57, OV. Met. 6.260ff, PAUSANIAS 2.26.1) or Epidaurus; of Cronus in Sicily; of Poseidon in Teneus; of Aphrodite in Cyprus; of Ares in Thrace; of Ceres of Eleansia, of Dionysus at Delphi, Cic. Op. Cit., and DOLLINGER: Gentile and the Jew, vol. 1, p. 135; ROHDE (Psyche, pp. 131-143); PRISTER (Der Reliquienkult im Altertum, pp. 387-391). The tomb of Dionysus was said to be under the omphalos or near the tripod (BÖTTCHER: Das Grab des Dionysos; MACHELET: Temple of Apollo, p. 302). We have a fragment of Philochorus that says the golden statue of Apollo was inscribed with ἵδικες καίτως θανόντος Διονύσου ὡς ἐκ Συχίδας. I cannot find any archeological material to corroborate this. Cicero's own source may possibly have been Aristotle, cf. Clem. Al. Probr. 2.28, and AMPELIUS Lib. Mem. 9.6.

demonstrantur... traduntur: Doug. notes that the letter a and u are easily confused in the ms., as are a and e; and so it is not easy to assert that here the subj. should be preferred over the indic. We could have expected the same mood in each of these two parallel clauses (I assume this why Giusta says nothing on it), but there is no reason why it must be so. Moser understood ad sepulcrum deorum quae hodie demonstrantur in Graecia, quae ad 'seek out' or 'find' rather than 'inquire,' in which case the indicative necessarily follows; quae before traduntur is most naturally understood as a relative, but Cicero switched to the subj. (oratio obliqua) due to the intervening quoniam es initiatu.

quoniam es initiatu: this phrase has frequently been used to assert that Atticus, who was an initiate of the mysteries, was in fact an interlocutor: Atticus in Leg. 2.1, says excipis credo illa quibus ipsi initiatu sumus. However, the tone with which Cicero seems to treat 'Atticus' in this work makes it unlikely that it is in fact Atticus who represents the second speaker.

quae traduntur mysteriis: Cicero himself was an initiate and esteemed the Eleusian mysteries and their society highly, if we trust LEG. 2.14.36. They were so prominent that they were often simply spoken of as the mysteries. ISO. PANT. 4.28, and πρὸς τὸν προφάνους ἴμμαν εὐεργέτης ἐκ τῶν ἐφευρέσεων ἃς ἐν οἷς ἀξέρα τὸν μεγανάρχον ἄκοψε intimates that the practice originated in mythical times. Attributed by some writers to Eumolpus, by others to Erechtheus, Isocrates assigned them to Demeter (Ceres) herself, cf. D. S. 5.77. Whatever their origin, they were cel-
tum denique, quam hoc late pateat, intelleges. sed qui nondum ea quae multis post annis tractari coepta sunt physica didicissent, tantum sibi persuaserant, quantum natura admonente cognouerant, rationes et causas rerum non tenebant, usius quibusdam saepe mouebantur, eisque nocturnis, ut siderentur ei, qui utra excesseerant, iuieere. ut porro firmissimum hoc adferri


eluarded with vigorous devotion, which is why they find their place here as an argument for omnis antiquitas. We have only glimpses of the religious doctrine which was to give initiates hope περὶ τῆς τοῦ θεοῦ τελετῆς καὶ τοῦ σύμπαντος αἰώνος ζωῆς, and promised immortality of the soul, cf. Pl. Phø. 63c, and Cicero Hortens. fr. 90.

tum denique: = 'then you will realise'. This signifies a result of action and is more earnest in feeling than tum denum which only means something has happened later than expected, see Sefyffert on Am. 22.84, and below 31. 75.

quam late pateat: 'how wide the application is'

qui ...didicissent: 'as a copyist of'

multis post annis: ablative of measure, cf. 1, 3 n. Here, post is adverbial.

tractari coepta sunt: the best mss. read tractare coepissent, and a few of the lesser mss. tractari coepissent. Keil and Madv. conjectured coepta sunt, and have been followed by most editors. Pohlenz defended the mss. but wrote <Nomines> (cf. Div. 1.5); but the subj. there can be defended on the grounds of doubt, not attraction and so his example is unconvincing. Div. 2.20.117 defends the idiom with the indic. and goes some way (I think) to confirm the suspicion that something has perhaps fallen out after sed and coeiperten (as Ernesti thought). In any case, the subj. is wholly out of place here in the argument. Kühner seems right to explain the ms. reading COEIPSENT as a corruption by a copyist of COEPTAUNT.

physica: i.e., natural philosophy, cf. Fin. 16.19, nihil turpius physico, quam fieri quicquam sine causa dicere, the study of cause and effect. The Stoics believed knowledge of it necessary to live in harmony with nature, and to judge and understand goods and evils, Fin. 3.21.73–22.73: Chrysippus, οἱ γὰρ εἰρηνικζ ἄλλοι εἰρηνικζ εἰρηνικζ ἀλλωτριον τιμητεῖ εἰπὶ τῶν ἀνάγκων καὶ κακῶν λόγων εἰπὶ τῶν ἀκατάς εἰπὶ τῶν ἀκατάς εἰπὶ εὐδαιμονίαν ἀλλ᾽ ἢ αὐτῇ τῆς κοινῆς φύσες.

tantum ...quantum: 'only so much ...as'; with the idea of limitation left unexpressed in the Latin but to be inferred (quite like the Greek τὸν μὲν ἄλλον καθιστάν μὲν τὸν μὲν ἄλλον καθιστάν). But this would wrongly imply that Cicero held that the ancients were affected by certain (false) waking visions because they did not understand the nature of things. But the argument is not that the ancients were therefore without any good reason afraid of these dreams, but that nature hinted at life after death (natura admonentis), though the form the ancients took it to be was incorrect because they did not yet understand the physics of nature. Therefore, we need to take the three clauses cognouerant, tenebant and mouebant as coordinate, and not dependent, cf. Div. 2.128, is [sc. animus] cum langueo corporis nec mem-
uidetur cur deos esse credamus, quod nulla gens tam fera, nemo omnium tam sit inanimis, cuitis
mentem non inbuerit deorum opinio (multi de dis praia sentiunt — id enim utiuso more effici
solet — omnes tamen esse ut et naturam duinam arbitrantur, nec uero id conlocutio hominum
aut consessus efficit, non institutio opinio est confirmata, non legibus; omni autem in re consenso
omnium gentium lex naturae putanda est) — quis est igitur, qui suorum mortem primum non

1 uidetur | videtur RGP\$: vid\& K: videtur V\$; alio atram. suprsenc. 1 omnium | hominum antiquissimus liber habet, et ita
paolo post religionem hominum ut affirmat Vergerius 1 tam sit | tam sit BPS: tam fit G: tam est Madevig 4 consessus |
D.–K 25816, τό διώκειν εαυτὸναποκελεῖν τὸν κάθε άθλητήν.
nulla gens tam fera: cf. N. D. 1.43, quae est enim gens aut
quod genus hominum, quod non habet sine doctrina anticipa-
tionem quandam deorum etc.
tam sit: subj. of reported reason. Reid on Ac. 2.26.81,
quae in paruo notes that Cicero and other authors often
separate tam, quam, tantus, quantus from the words they
modify by inserting another small word, preposition, or sit
and the like.
inbueiri: 7, 13 n. Douglas quotes Tac. Hist. 5.5, nec
quicquam prius inbueurit quoniam contemere doemos, which
suggest first expressions or instruction by first examples. See
L.&S. 1181, sub uoce.
deo rum opinio: = opinio aut persuasio de diis, K.–S. 111.9.
This recalls the Epicurean argument that everyone is
capable of grasping the concept of the gods by the intel-
lect. Compare Velleius in N. D. 1.43, quae est enim gens aut
quod genus hominum, quod non habet sine doctrina anticipa-
tionem quandam deorum, quam appellavit προφύσις Epicurus,
and POHLENZ: Die Stoa, vol. 1, p. 60, "wird dort diese Be-
weisführung als Gemeingut der Philosophen bezeichnet";
see LONG (Hellenistic Philosophy, pp. 14-69); RIST (The
Stoics, pp. 2-10); KEFERER (Sophistic Movement, pp. 80-96).
multi de dis...putanda est: for the various views, see
L.–S. 23. This entire phrase is a paranthetical statement
brought in to meet the possible objection, 'why, if all agree
that there are gods, do they not all agree in the belief?';
but after this remark is made, we would have expected,
if Cicero had bound himself by formal rules of construction,
a clause which corresponds to ut porro as iala immortal-
itatem animorum eadem ratione confirmari potest: nemo enim
cere est qui, etc. The anacoluthon is not harsh, and as Küh-
ner remarks, it represents a deliberate negligence by the
author in imitation of the freedom of conversational lan-
guage, and demonstrates that Latin is capable of ease in
style, cf. Or. 23.78 with Sandys's n. Cicero discusses this
'low-style' of oratory and defines its main feature as its
neglegentia diligentis, or art in the very absence of art, the
Attic style as perfected by Lysias.
id enim: sc. 'neeque id mirandum', 'we need not be
surprised, for' etc.
uitoso more: cf. D. L. 7.89, διαστρέφεσθαι δὲ τὸ λο-
γον ζτεων τοι διὰ τὰς τῶν ξόνων πραγμάτων πιθανότητας,
ποιὲ διὰ τὰ μην τὴν προσφίλουσαν αἰσθήματα, κηδὲ η ὁποίας ἀφοίνικας
ἀξίως ἀδιάφορἀς. The Stoics called this a perversion of
reason, διαστρέφεσθαι, see SVF. 3.328-326, which includes
Leg. 1.11.31, and 17.47.
ec uero: GIUSTA (Testo, p. 134) wished to insert, <sic
permanere animos omnes opinniatur>, uero uero, placing a full
stop after putanda est. He complains "nisi supplexes, non
modo hiat oratio, sed verba instituti... legibus contra veritatem
regnant; et quo spectat igitur [infra] frusta quaerar.
But he has been led astray by following Hei. and Sch.
who read consessus (in place of consensus), comparing 16, 37
'consesses theatri'; they refer it and conlocutio to casual
meetings, which is in contrast to institutis and legibus —
hence Giusta's desire for this reading. However, the paren-
thetical comments which Cicero has here are not repugnant
to the point he is trying to make.
concessus: Boulier and Nissen read consessus. Observe
that the mss. which have consensus wrongly here, also
read below in 17, 37 consensus for consessus. Heine and TS.
contrast the informal casual meetings of conlocutio and
consessus with the more formal institutis and legibus, which
is supported by N. D. 1.61, in sermone et in consessu. Reid
cites, Leg. 2.13, an ea non magis legis nomen attingunt, quam
si latrones aliqua consessu suo sincerint, but the mss. of
that work are also not in agreement; the Teubner edition of Leg.
reads consensus suo, perhaps incorrectly.
efficit: the present is in all the best mss., which Dougan
defended by explaining that the question of such a view
was not one merely formed in the past, but one constantly
brought about. Kühner and Giusta retain the perfect.
on institutis opinio est confirmata, non legibus: οὐ
νόµος ἀλλὰ φύσει; cf. N. D. 1.17.44, cum enim non instituto
alia aut aut leges sit opinio constitutae; D. L. 10.123, θεὰ
μὲν γάρ εἰσα ἑνήργητα μὲν γάρ ἄνωτέρων ἡ γνώσεως.
consensio omnium gentium: = η γνώσης κοινῆς; such a
ting is curiously defined in S. E. M. 8.8 where the friends
of Aenesidemus claim that those propositions which do
not escape common opinion (τὸ µὴ λAPON) are by a change
of the negative prefix called true (ἀληθὲς); of course such
arguments that the definition of true can be founded on
common opinion was a means of ridiculing the Stoic claim.
lex naturae: This is the only occurrence of the phrase lex
naturae I can find in the entire corpus of Cicero; elsewhere
Cicero writes vera lex recta ratio, naturae congruenis, which
implies 'according to nature', found in everything, 'firm',
and 'eternal'. A different expression is 'ius naturae, found
at N. D. 3.45, where Cicero formulates his conception of
a natural law strongly in accordance with the Stoic con-
ception, BÜCHNER (De re publica, pp. 315-316); BRÉGuet
(La République, p. 67). When we further compare Cicero's
Leg., he writes, lex est ratio summna, insita in natura, ...adem
cum, ratio, cum est in hominis mente confirmata et perfecta, lex est,
we find an even fuller definition of how Cicero conceives
natural law — a law of the highest reason, anchored (insita)
in nature, the same reason found in the minds of men; this
definition is wholly Stoic in temperament, POHLENZ: Die
Stoa, vol. 2; cf. below 15, 35, and SVF. 3.4, where Chrysippus
defines κοινὸς νόµος as ἀρχὴς λόγου διὰ πάντων κριτικῶν.
Both the Epicureans and Stoics maintained that the general
law governing nature is knowable, and then tried to erect
their systems upon this, cf. Rep. 3.33 = Lact. Inst. 6.8.6-9.
quis est igitur: resumptive after a digression, cf. 7, 17.
primum: no deinde clause follows, and this is instead
resumed below by maximum uero due to the interrupted
construction, here with the imperative tolle, cf. below
24, 57 n. Often etiam, uero (27, 78), autem, sin (40, 117) take up
primum again after such interruptions.
XIV. Maximum uero argumentum est naturam ipsum de immortalitate animorum tacitam iudicare, quod omnibus curae sunt, et maxime quidem, quae post mortem futura sint, — Serit

'àrbores, quae áltier saéclo prósiēnt, ut ait in Synephebis, quid spectans nisi etiam postera saecula ad se pertinerent? ergo árbores


5 haec X: hoc Davies, Moser
6 Maximum ] maximum K 5 argumentum ] argumentum

æ••(Wolf), and cf. K.–S. phrase practice who prefers the adjective over the adverb in the dett. codd there the mss vel sperant vel metuunt quae futura sunt sibi fore argumentum est of est argumentum λógoς καὶ παιδεία in training, here = 'the stable of reason and learning', like rationis et doctrinae duci oportere of

λογος καὶ παιδεία in training, here = 'the stable of reason and learning', like rationis et doctrinae duci oportere

58. forcellini is to show sadness through consensio in philosophy to contemn misfortune.

6.419. and often in Classical Latin does not have a joining reason of the person mourning.

Am idque sentire vel sperant vel metuunt quae futura sunt sibi fore argumentum est naturam ipsam de inmortalitate animorum tacitam iudicare, quod omnibus curae sunt, et maxime quidem, quae post mortem futura sint, — Serit

átro árbores, quae áltier saéclo prósiēnt, ut ait in Synephebis, quid spectans nisi etiam postera saecula ad se pertinerent? ergo árbores

prosiēnt, though the reading prósiēnt from its P9 ms. of the Sen. is more likely. There is difficulty with the meter. Dougan asserts that these lines are composed of bacchics (based on Ribbeck’s judgement); Grotefend, with Kühner, scans them as an iambic senarius, changing to [alter] prósiēnt saeculo <alterius>; Hermann reads them as cretics; I have followed him, as did Powell (De Senecute, p. 155) who believes that they present the more natural reading; see his discussion of the metrical scheme ad loc. There can be no definitive conclusion, but rhythm the seems to be árbôrēs qu(ae) áltier sâéclo prósiēnt (saeculo here is replaced by a spondee as paralleled in Plaut. Most. 108 and Plaut. Truc. 595.) As Powell notes on the relevant passage in his Sen., the idea of planting trees for posterity is ubiquitous in literature: Verg. Ecl. 9.50, carpert tua poma nepotes; Verg. Geor. 2.58, 2.294; Hor. Carm. 2.14.22; it also exists numerous times in Jewish and Arabic literature (Jacobson: Trees in Caecilius Statius); cf. Addison, Spectator, no. 538 (August 20, 1714), “When a man considers that the putting a few twigs into the ground is doing good to one who will make his appearance in the world about fifty years hence, or that he is perhaps making of his own descendants easy or rich, by so inconsiderable an expense, if he finds himself averse to it, he must conclude that he has a poor and base heart, void of all generous principles and love to mankind.”

áltel: All mss. agree in reading ait, and the better omit the author’s name. (I believe Reid is correct in asserting that no subject is necessary when the quotation is well known that any reader could supply it, where see his n. on Ac. 2.79.) Davies reads ut est in, comparing Tusc. 3.20, ut est in Melanippio, which Kühner and Giustà follow, but the parallel does not hold since here we want the quote itself to be subject of spectans; this could not happen if we alter ait to est.

Synephebis: Caecilius Statius, a close contemporary of Ennius, adapted his Synephebi upon Menander’s Συνεφήβοι; cf. Fin. 1.4; this play is also quoted N. D. 1.13, where see Mayor’s n. ad loc.

quid spectans: the participle following an interrogative Klotz compares to the Greek τί ζητîν quod, ut arbitretur

44.39), quod erat in Synephebi quid ait; this play is also quoted, cf. Addison, Spectator, no. 538 (August 20, 1714). ‘When a man considers that the putting a few twigs into the ground is doing good to one who will make his appearance in the world about fifty years hence, or that he is perhaps making of his own descendants easy or rich, by so inconsiderable an expense, if he finds himself averse to it, he must conclude that he has a poor and base heart, void of all generous principles and love to mankind.’

ait: All mss. agree in reading ait, and the better omit the author’s name. (I believe Reid is correct in asserting that no subject is necessary when the quotation is well known that any reader could supply it, where see his n. on Ac. 2.79.) Davies reads ut est in, comparing Tusc. 3.20, ut est in Melanippio, which Kühner and Giustà follow, but the parallel does not hold since here we want the quote itself to be subject of spectans; this could not happen if we alter ait to est.
seret diligens agricola, quam aspicient bacam ipse numquam, ut magnus leges, instituta, rem publicam non seret? quid procreatio liberorum, quid propagatio nominis, quid adoptiones filiorum, quid testamentorum diligentia, quid ipsa sepulcrorum monumenta, elogia, significat nisi nos futura etiam cogitare? quid? illud num dubitas, quin specimen naturae capi deceat ex optima quaque natura? quae est melior igitur in hominum genere natura quam eorum, qui se natos ad homines iuuandos, tutandos, conservandos, arbitrantur? abit ad deos Hercules: numquam abisset, nisi, cum inter homines esset, eam sibi uiam muniuisset.


clauses are coordinate rather than dependent for effect. KNAPP (Classical Weekly, 10, p. 11) places a colon after ergo. The form of argumentation, known as argumentum a minore ad maius, is discussed by Cicero in Top. 55, where see the edition of REINHARDT, p. 145, n. ad loc., and HANo: Tursellinus, vol. 2, p. 460, 2. bacam: cf. 28, 69 n.

ipse numquam: note the emphasis in the arrangement. leges seret: for the image, cf. Leg. 1.6.20, serendi etiam mores nec scriptis omnia sanctora. Most editors have suggested that this metaphor is a happy one; Kühner shows that it does have some philosophical significance. PL. Phdr. 276c, dunt tacis τῆς δικτυκτῆς τῆς χρήματος, λαβον ψυχή προσφοροφησαι, φυλαθείν τε καὶ στηρίζεται επίστασις λόγουs. The comparison between agriculture and politics was one strong in the ancient world (Xenophon tells us Cyrus, for instance, was reported to have a keen interest in his gardens), and it had particular resonance with the Romans.

adoptiones: the best MSS. have adoptiones, the earlier form than adoptio, which is frequently obliterated, cf. Balb. 25, 57. But Reid notes that the insertion of a common syllable occurs often in the MSS. and the passage in the Balb. is not above suspicion (which Klotz restored). The same phenomenon occurs with sector, sector, Fam. 15.19.3. Adoption was an important matter for the family in order to keep the name alive (Gell. 35, to keep the name alive (Gell. 35).
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terminaretur? nemo umquam sine magna spe imprimitur. habeo mortem. licuit esse otiioso Thesmophoroi, licuit Epaminondas, licuit, ne et utera et externa quaebar, mihi, sed nescio quo modo inspiciet in mentibus quasi saeculum quodam auguriwm futurum, idque in maximis ingenii altissimis animis et existit maxime et apparat facillime. quo quidem dempto, quis tam esset amens, qui semper in laboribus et periculis uiueret? loquor de principibus; aspicite, o ciues, sēnis Ethni imagnis fórmam, hic uéstrum pánxit máxima fácta páttrum.

mercedem gloriam flagitât ab eis quorum patres ad Crescent gloria, idemque:
nemó me lácrumis —
cur? ulító uíuos per ora uiurum
Sed quid poétas? opifices post mortem nobilítari volúnt. quid enim Phidias, sui similé speciém

discendum est. cuius ignoratio finxit inferos easque formidines, quas tu contemnere non sine uirtute animus excellit, eos arbitrabimur, quia natura optima sint, cernere naturae uim maxime, ueri simile est, cum optimus quisque maxime posteritati seruatur, esse aliquid, cuius post mortem sensum sit habiturus.

XVI. Sed ut deos esse natura opinamur, qualesque sint, ratione cognoscimus, sic permanere animos arbitramur consensu nationum omnium, qua in sede maneant qualesque sint, ratione discendum est. cuius ignoratio finxit inferos easque formidines, quas tu contemnere non sine causa uidebare. in terram enim cadentibus corporibus eisque humo tectis (e quo dictum est (quo dictum est) 'humani'), sub terra ceasebant reliquam uiam agi mortuorum; quam eorum opinionem magni


11 uidebare] uideere det. cond. 54 cesserint | 4 cesserint | excesserint Urisinus. 5 arbitrabimur | arbitrabimur 6: arbitrabimur X 8 qualesque] sic X: 'ubi' qualesque Giu., cf. N. D. 1.65 |

...
37 errors consecuti sunt, quos auxerunt poetae. frequens enim consessus theatri, in quo sunt mulierculae et pueri, mouetur audienti tam grande carmen, àdsum atque aduenio Ácherunte uix uia alta atque árdua pér speluncas sáxis structas ásperis pendéntibus, máxumis, ubi rigida constat crásse caligo inferum, tantumque ualuit error, qui mihi quidem iam sublatus uidetur, ut, corpora cremata cum sciênt, tamen ea fieri apud inferos fingerent, quae sine corporebus nec fieri possent nec intellegi. animos enim per se ipsoiuuentis non poterunt mente complicet, formam aliquam figureramque quaerabant.

3-5. Trag. fr. inc. 73
1 errores [ terrores in marg. ad Crat. ]
2 consessus [ consensus RGEL: consensus in conse[[i Ɪ mut. P: consensus Ɪ V manu antiqua ]

37 errores: a few editors, on the strength of formidines, and below, mouetur, have thought the reading should be terrores; cf. Pl. Ti. 40c, ἀσκος κατακλυ̃στατος καὶ πάλλο ἀπαθαινών κόλπος, where fears follow dire portents; but this is over-subtle reasoning, and error is more naturally connected with a false opinio than fear; in any case, the mss. are unanimous. Cicero is trying to emphasise that those without philosophy (rationis expertes) are led astray by the vivid imaginations of artisans and poets.

consecuti sunt: the prefix con- in consequi suggests a cause and effect relationship, i.e., magni errores cum hac opinione comincuit securi sunt (Küh.) and see Dougan’s n. ad loc. on the cognate force of this verb, where he cites 39, 91 below, uurtutis quam necessario gloria... consequatur.

Cicero’s argument is a non causa pro causa fallacy by suggesting that the Romans’ superstition of Hades found its origin in their practice of burial. But we know that both cremation and burial were common in the Republic according to the xii tablets. Though burial was considered the older practice (as suggested here, and at Leg. 2.56, et quod nunc communitur in omnibus sepulturites venit uti ut humati dican- tur, id erat proprium tum in iis quos humus inexacta contenterat) — and though there is also evidence of embalming, it is quite clear that cremation was their normal practice, Lucr. 3.888, ILS 6687, 73. Tovnkea (Death in the Roman world, p. 39). However, Pythagoreanism, a philosophy which forbade cremation, was exercising a growing influence at this time and reached its peak in the period Cicero was writing. Even Varro himself was buried according to the Pythagorean fashion of an earthen coffin, with olive and myrtle leaves, Plin. H. N. 35.160, qui et defunctos seu multi fictilibus solís condi maluere, sicut M. Varro, Pythagorio modo in myrti et oleae fæsis, ut huc nesciat θεῖος ἁγιὸν. άριστος χοᾶς ἰχθοῖς γιόνοις. Jocelyn (Tragedies of Ennius), 133, 421-422 thinks on the other hand that it is from Accius’ Hecuba, after Euripides own in which Polydorus’ spirit says, ἡς νεκρῶν σκευῆμα καὶ σκεύους πόλεις ἥκω νεκρῖν κευθὴνα τε καὶ πύλας ἀφεῖς σκότου ὡς. The terms, though strictly a river, is used of the underworld in general.

adsum atque aduenio Ácherunte: for the attribution of both mood and tense, cf. below — 4 and 7. The term is only resisting a growing Greek/Eastern influence.

άκτας ἀπαίωνας τε καὶ µελαµβαθε‹ς ἀήχοια γόους. The grammar certainly does not suggest a counter example? The grammar certainly does not warrant the preposition, Madv. Gram. 275, obs. 4. Diction-aries continue to give it only as short, despite the abundant examples of acheruns with a long o, Plaut. Bacc. 106, Plaut. Mil. 627, Plaut. Capt. 695, 955, Plaut. Trin. 444. The term, though strictly a river, is used of the underworld in general. uix: not statim, modo as Wolf and Doughan. Pohlenz understood it correctly in his n. ad loc. ‘mit Mühe’, μόνης.

constat: = σινιστάτα, with thick consistency, cf. Farm. De Nat. 4.1, τὸ ἐὼν τοῦ λόγου ἔχοσθαι ὁ πάντως κατὰ κόσμῳ ὁλοκληρωμένων, Pohlenz compared Liv 33.38, ueluti stipita phalax constat.

error qui iam sublatus: i.e., uetius error, the misunder-standing which was held in older times, but now generally exploded (sublatus) as it seemed to Cicero, at least among the more learned.

quae sine corporibus nec fieri possent: for the attraction of both mood and tense, cf. below 5, 9 p.

uiuentis: Giusta reads vigitens on the parallel of Div. 1.70, pars animi rationis atque intelligentiae sit particeps, eam tum maxime vigere, but this does not seem sufficient to abandon the consensus of the mss. when the words are too commonly paired.
inde Homeri tota νεκώδα, inde ea, quae meus amicus Appius νεκομαντεῖα faciebat, inde in uicinia nostra Auerni lacus, 

οστίου αλτας Acherūntis, salso sānguine 

unde animae excitāntur obscura ūmbra opertae, imagines 

mōrtuorum,

has tamen imagines loqui ulont, quod fieri nec sine lingua nec sine palato nec sine faucium, 


1 νεκώδα | necyomantea GV; NECYia RK 1 νεκομαντεῖα | NEPCYO manria RPKE: nypressomantia G; psychomantia V, at psycho in litura: νεκομαντεῖα dett. codd. 6 fieri nec sine lingua | fieri nec sine X: fieri dett. codd.

Homeri tota νεκώδα: title of Hom. Od. 11 in which Odysseus approached the shades of the underworld and spoke with them, cf. N. D. 16.36.41. Homerus apud inferos conveniri facit ubi Ulisse sicut ceteros, qui excesserant vta.

meus amicus Appius: Appius Claudius Pulcher, augur in 63 B.C., consul in 54 B.C., elder brother of Cicero's hated enemy Clodius. He was a nuisance and lost no opportunity for slighting Cicero when he was succeeded by him as governor of Sicilia, though befriended Cicero when he became enmeshed with difficulties of his unlawful acts. We should not find the remark meus amicus surprising; Cicero had a penchant for flattering. Appius had also composed a book on augury which he dedicated to Cicero (Fam. 3.4–5, Varr. L. L. 3.2.2, Brut. 77, Div. 1.29, 105). We also have a book of letters between the two men (Fam. 3) in which Cicero frequently addresses him in friendly terms.

Appius was intensively superstitious with such divining rites, and Luc. 5.69 portrays him as pestering the oracle at Delphi, Appius eventus, finemque expressere terram solumitatem superos, cf. Val. Max. 1.8.10.

Appius νεκομαντεῖα faciebat: Guı́sta here prefers to take the reading Ἰοδομαντεῖα from V which was accepted by many of the older editors. Kühner (with TS) printed νεκομαντεῖα; Dougan and Drexler however prefer Ἰοδομαντεῖα with the majority of the mss, and with Plu. Çim. 6 and Hdt. 5.92. There is a strong parallel at Div. 1.58.132, νε ψυχομαιντα quidem, quius Appius, amicus tuus, uti solebat and 1.15 below but of all editors, Giusta is the only one to adopt the change to ψυχομαιντα. (A similar difficulty is found in Plin. H. N. 35.40.132 with the reading ἱεροκολύχρωμα, Athenis νεκομαντεῖα Homeri).

νεκομαντεῖα was a process of divination by which one can learn of future events through the evocation of ghosts assumed to have knowledge of things to come; these ‘rites of separation’ were associated with the places they were conducted, the νεκομαντεῖα, where see Ηλλάδα (Greek Divination, pp. 236–239). Clem. Al. Protr. 1.11 tells us that the art was popular and frequently practised by the Etruscans. Schmerel (Mittleren Stoa, p. 250) observed that Posidonius asserted that the soul passes to higher regions explicitly to deny the possibility of evoking ghosts from the underworld.

in uicinia nostra: the Auernus was in Campania, southern Italy, in the fields of Phlegraean, near Puteoli and Cumae, where Cicero had a villa.

Auerni lacus: i.e., the lake at Auernus; the genotype is locative. According to Verg. Aen. 6.118, the cave used by Aeneas and the Sibyl was concealed by the darkness of the lake in the shady Auernian copse; the lake was sacred to Proserpina, its waters were putrid and birds, as it was alleged, fell dead if they flew over it, Luc. 6.738–837 and see Munro’s n. on the various spots called Auernus. There was thought to be a νεκομαντεῖα there, as described by Maxim. Tyr. Diss. 14.2, υἱὸν τῆς Ἰταλίας...περὶ λήμνον Ἀφρος...οὕτως κολομένων ματῶν ἀντίροις καὶ βραχιόνεις τοῦ ἀντίροι ἀνθρῶποι φοιχαγούσι, οὕτως ἀνανείλουσα ἐκ τοῦ ἔργων; and Strabo. 5.5.244. Ἐρεβών δ’ α’ πρὸ ἱμάν ἐν τῷ Ἀφρός τα πέρῃ τῆς νεκώδας ἤμερην καὶ δὴ καὶ νεκομαντεῖαν ἐντύχα ἤμεραν καὶ Οὔους ἐν τῷ πόσῳ ἄμβουσαν.

but editors have not noticed that Serv. 6.237 makes the sharp distinction between the catabatic cave at Avernus, and the oracular cave on the Cumae acropolis described at Verg. Aen. 6.10–11, and 42f, on which see Clark (Location of the Vergilian Underworld, pp. 262–263), fig. 1. The lake is painted in the background of Turner’s Bay of Baiae, with Apollo and the Sibyl, currently in the Tate Gallery, London.

οστίου...imagines mortuorum: These lines have been variously arranged and emended by editors, the better of which Giusta (Tusculanae, p. 29) lists in edition, though he misquotes Bentley’s reading. Many suggestions do not need repeating. A number of older editors, with Gustafsson (Coniecturae) and Ribbeck, have assigned imagines mortuorum to Cicero himself, though Reid has noted that it has a strong appearance of a marginal gloss, but this has not generally been accepted. Heine and Schliche gave them to the poet, as do all recent editors including Giusta who arranged them as trochaic tetrameter catatetic in two incomplete lines. The imagines mortuorum reflect Hom. Od. 10.476, φροτών εὐδοκα καλωτόν. The source of the lines remains doubtful, but we have similar language in Lucr. 1102–123, etsi praetera tamen esse Acherusia templo | Ennius aeternis exponit versibus edens | Quo neque permanent animae neque corpora nostra | sed quaedam simulacra modis pallentia miris; the probable model is Ennius, and Levêle, in his edition of the fragments, assigns them to his Hecuba.

salsō sanguine: for the imagery, Trag. fr. inc. 127 (quoted by Macrobr. 6.2), neque miserae laurei lacrimae salsum sanguinem, and Non. 192, salsum cruorem. Dougan shows it is best taken with excitantur, ‘raised forth by salty blood’, cf. Hom. Od. 11.35–38, μὲ α’ αἷμα κολομένη: α’ α’ δέκροντο φοιχα ὑπ’ Ἐρεβῶν νεκών καταστέγων. We also have Acc. trag. 578, salis cruorem guttis lacrimarum lauit; and E. Supp. 44, ἄιον ἄιον (Skutsch: Notes on Ennius Tragedy, p. 141). TS. and other editors read falsō sanguine, ‘blood that is not blood’. Levêle, in his edition of the fragments, finds that this phrase is excellent in describing a body to be opaque or pallid as these vain images would be. Alternately, ‘magicians’ who could excite these images would use a mix of honey, wine, milk and blood in their ritual. Their libation which raises the ghosts would then appear thick and red, but not be true blood.

obscura ūmbra: modal abl. which describes the opertae, ‘souls buried within gross shadows’.

sine faucium, laterum, pulmonum: the better mss. leave this series as asyndeton whereas many of the lesser offer various combinations of -ne, -ne or aut. The tone of the passage is given a heightened solemnity which Rath had first noticed ad loc. to be somewhat alien to the argument; further to this, Cicero had wrote in 17, 41 in corde, cerebræ aut in sanguine. However, there is no need here to abandon the best attested reading.
laterum, pulmonum ui et figura potest. nihil enim animo uidere poterant, ad oculos omnia referabant. magni autem est ingenii seucocare mentem a sensibus et cogitationem ab consuetudine abducere. itaque crede equidem etiam alios tot saeculis, sed quod litteris exsetet, Pherecydes Syrius primus dixit animos esse hominum sempiternos, antiquus sane; fuit enim meo regnante gentilii. hanc opinionem discipulis eius Pythagoras maxime confirmavit, qui cum Superbo regnante in

1 laterum pulmonum | laterumque pulmonumque dett. codd. Epist. 3 repouit Div. 2 syrius | syrius X. sirius dett. codd.

nihil enim animo uidere poterant: i.e., they had no sense of abstract reasoning for the form of the soul, and so they gave it human shape.

ad oculos omnia referabant: the phrase referre ad means to subject something to a frame of judgement or measurement, cf. Am. 9.32, ad sulpitatem omnia referunt, where Cicero means that the Epicureans measure all their philosophical judgements by the ruler or standard of pleasure, on which see Dougan's n. ad loc.

seucocare mentem a sensibus: the mss. seucocare cannot be right, as it means to recall from an action already begun, (Tusc. 3.46, revocari igitur aportare a master ad cogitationem); but here we want to mean 'abstract from', or 'separate from'. Orelli restored seucocare from a conjecture first by Davies which was later found so quoted in an epistle of Augustine. Moser compares 30, 72; N. D. 3.2.1, non quid diffici sit mentem ab oculis seucocare. The pervasive image of sleep as an early indication of death was also widely used by philosophy in attempting to describe the state of the soul after its departure from the body. Dreams were used as evidence by the ancients of a mind which could function separately from its senses, and this was at times discussed in medical tracts, ps.-Hippocr. De Insomn. 1 (ed. Kühn), ή γαρ ψυχή ευρυγραφή, μεν τι τῷ σώματι υπερηφάνεια, επὶ πολλὰ μεριζομενη, οὐ γίγνεται αὐτῇ εὐσωτηρία κλτ. (although modern medicine tells us this is quite untrue); also Arist. De Phil. fr. 10 tells us that the mind/soul is most in possession of itself when no longer subservient to the body during sleep, δεν γάρ, ψυχή, εν τῷ τι τοῦ σώματος καθάπερ για τῷ ψυχή, τὸν τῆν θολον ωπελύνων ψυχον προμανται στα και προσωπον τά μελλόντα; Aristotle expands further by arguing that we can see where the mind grasps upon its truest nature, because this nature includes an ability to prophesise; and cf. Div. 1.63, cum est seucocatus animus a contagione corporis; et 113–115, particularly 114, simulant atque excurrent with Pease’s n.

equidem: cf. Madvig: Opuscula, vol. 1, p. 497, Hand: Tursellinus, vol. 2, pp. 341–342, 422 shows that this is not a compound of e-+quidem, but rather the syllable e- is in many ways like the Greek ἐ-, which has a demonstrative force that intensifies the composition, as enim from nam; eum, etc. The particle equidem = e-+quidem is, as a general rule, joined to first person verbs to add affirmative force to the opinions of the speaker (Cicerio must have thought it connected with ego as he never uses it except with the first person singular). Rassac/Halse (Vorlesungen), 157, n. 302. It is only rarely used with other persons, Sall. Cat. 52.16, and see K–S. 2.606.42. alios: sc. dixisse, from the following dixit. Such elliptes maintain the feel of a dialogue.

quod litteris exsetet: = ita ut id exsetit, 'that which survives', the subjunctive being one of limitation, Madvig. Gramm. 3.64, obs. 2, K–S. 146, 13; cf. Brut. 15.57, quum vero exset et de quo sit memoriae probitatem eloquentiem fuisset et ita esse habitum, primus est M. Cornelius Celsus.

Pherecydes Syrius: Pherecydes of Syria, a philosopher who flourished around 540 B.C., was known as one of the first writers of Greek prose, after Cadmus, D.–K. 666a, and 714a (D. L. 1.116), τοτεν γαρ Θεόπομπος πρῶτον περι φύσεως καθαίρεσας, et Strabo. 1.18–20. He was known for speaking allegorically, μωθών πάντα λέγειν (Aryst. Metaph. 1091b5) and he was praised for his virtue and his modesty (Ipn. fr. 30 West, D. L. 1.120). Many authors speak of him as a student of Thales, and the master of Pythagoras (though the latter is likely fictional) but known also to have had relations with other sages and theologoi of the time. For a detailed account of the controversy of his identification or misidentification with Pherecydes the 'Athenian' (who, according to the Suda was older, 16, according to Strabo 10.487 younger), see Kirk/Raven/Schofield (Presocratics Philosophers, pp. 50–56), Jacoby (The First Athenian Prosse Writer); Toye (Pherecydes of Syros); Fowler (Authors Named Pherecydes).

syrius: the adjectival form is corrected from Φερεκδεως τού Συρίους Syros, the island: Σώρος νήσοι επι Σοριαν, το Σύριου πόλις in Strabo. 12, cf. Or. Met. 7.483, though the form given in the mss. is Syrus.

animos esse hominum sempiternos: we have his view of the soul expressed here, Lact. Inst. 7.8, Aug. Acad. 3.37; in Tattanus, Or. ad Gr. 41 (‘Ἀριστοτέλης τῆς ψυχῆς διαπεράστη τὴν ἁθανασίαν τῶν Φερεκδεώς, but I cannot find any reference to such a thing said in Aristotle); Ath. 11.977; and the fragment of ion quoted by D. L. above (= D.–K. 384), φθίμενος ψυχή τερπνὸν ἔχει βίοτον. Some would attribute this view to Thales his master.

antiquus sane: the emphatic position recalls the authority which is given to more ancient opinions on the survival of the soul, cf. 12.26.

meo regnante gentilii: a jest of which kind Cicero was peculiarly fond, ‘when my namesake was ruling’, sc. Servius Tullius, cf. Brut. 16.62, si ego me a M. Tullio esse dicerem (the consol of 500 B.C.) We have the elegy of Cicero in Sil. 8.404, Tullius aetatis raptabat in aeminen tarnus, Regina progenies, et Tullo saeptus ab alto.

Pythagoras: 9, 18 n. ali. sempier.

Superbo regnante: cf. Rep. 2.15.28, nam quartum iam annum regnante Lucio Tarquinio Superbo Sybarin et Crotonem et in eas Italiae partis Pythagoras venisse repertur; according to Cicero’s (Polibian) chronology, Superbo began to reign 532 B.C., and Pythagoras arrived in Italy in 520 B.C.

in Italiam unissent: Aristoxenus, fr. Wehrli. 16 (Porph. VP. 9), who reports that Pythagoras migrated to Italy when he was aged 40, fleeing the tyranny of Polycrates, is also likely the source for Porph. VP. 21 and Iambl. VP. 33–34 and their accounts of Pythagoras’ marvelous arrival. They characterise him as a liberator who brought a sense of concord to the cities of Croton, Sybaris, Regium, among others through his philosophical pursuit of simplicity. He later helped shape the laws of Catana. But this report of Aristoxenus, who was a Pythagorean partisan, is rather favourable towards his master. Other historical reports show, on the other hand, that there was a steep decline in the cities of Magna Graeca. It began with the sack of Sybaris by the Crotoniates; later, in consequence of all their internal fueding and lack of peace, these cities were un-
Italian uenisset, tenuit Magnam illam Graeciam cum disciplina, tum etiam auctoritatem, multaque saecula postea sic uigiut Pythagoreorum nomen, ut nulli aliis docti uiderentur.

XVII. Sed redo ad antiquos. rationem illi sententiae suae non fere reddabant, nisi quid erat numeris aut descriptionibus explicandum. Platonem ferunt, ut Pythagoreos cognosceret, in Italiam uenisse et didiscisse Pythagorea omnia primumque de animorum aeternitate, non solum sensisse able to resist the onset of the Sabellian peoples. For an account of Pythagoras’ widespread travels (Dicaearchus fr. Werth. 33 called him πολύπλοκος), see MURRISON (Pythagoras of Samos).

Magnam illam Graeciam: so Polyb. 2.154, κατὰ τὴν μεγάλην Ἑλλάδα τῶν προσηγοριῶν, ἐκτρέφθη τὰ συν-

Magnum Graeciam, quae magna dicta est

Graeciam, quae quondam magna uocitata est

Illam Graeciam, quae multaque

Graeciam, quae magna dicta est

Graeciam, quae multaque auctore, sed etiam siner ratione salutis auctoris.

Ille autem, qui est auctore

Ille autem, qui est auctore

Ille autem, qui est auctore

Ille autem, qui est auctore

Ille autem, qui est auctore

Hieron etiam auctoritate: cf. Arist. Metaf. 1.6.1, 987a. Ἡ Πλάτωνος ἐπεγένετο πραγµατεία, τὰ μὲν πολλὰ τούτων [i.e., Pythagoreans] ἀκολούθησα, τὰ δὲ καὶ ίδα para τῶν Ἡρα-

Many facets of Pythagoras’ ideas were tangled up with

and Plato’s thought. Most conspicuously were the numerical aspects, such as the concept of proportion (BURREET: Ancient Pythagoreanism, 86ff); but Plato also took other interests in the Pythagorean idea of the Limited-Unlimited, which, as scholars generally agree, supplied source material for Pl. Phyl. 498d. Plato was said to have learned so much that
idem quod Pythagoram, sed rationem etiam attulisse. quam, nisi quid dicis, praeterrimitamus et hanc totam spem inmortalitatis relinquamus.

An tu cum me in summam expectationem adduxeris, deseris? errare meherecul multi malum cum Platone, quem tu quanti facias scio et quam ex tuo ore admiror, quam cum ists uera sentire.

Macte uirtute! ego enim ipse cum eodem ipso non inuitus errauerim. num igitur dubitamus? — an sicut pleraque? quamquam hoc quidem minime; persuasum enim mathematici terram in

5. Non. 341. 37

rationem... quam ] ratione/ / / m. ad loc

quod Pythagoram: Kühner understood this as an ellipse, sc. *erant sensissime*, K.–S. 1.719 (and see other examples there quoted); but Dougan pointed out that the ellipse is clumsy; for what we really expected was *quod Pythagoras sensisset*: what he thought himself rather than what he was reported to have thought. The attraction then is one from brevity in expression, cf. Fin. 2.27.58, *ne dolor quidem* where we have another example of an accomodation to the substantive, where see Madvig’s n. ad loc.

nisi quid dicis: *‘unless you object’. an tu: cf. 2.4 n. for an used rhetorically.

cum... adduxeris, deseris: *‘whereas’, ‘although’, cum with the subjunctive expressing contrast between the leading and subordinate propositions, cf. Madv. Gram. 358, obs. 3, Ac. 2.19.62, *an tu cum res occultissimas aperueris* etc. Kühner (after Moser) supposed that *adduxeris* was fut. perfect, and so emended the text to read *deseris*; but as Dougan notes *ad loc.*, the speaker has already been led into the expectation, so there is no need to alter the ms. reading. *deseris*: for a similar thought, cf. Div. 2.46, *cum ex te causas unius ciusque dispossessione excusieris, multa verba fecisti: te, cum res videre, rationem causamque non quaerere multa*.


quem tu quanti: the arrangement emphasises scio, cf. Arch. 1, *quod quam sit ciquam senti, where see Reid ad loc., and Stürenburg; in vulg. Eng. ‘whom I know how much you rate him’

quem ex tuo ore admiror: *‘je le trouve admirable dans la bouche’*

cum istis: i.e., those who argue for the soul’s mortality and hold opinions contrary to Plato, such as the Epicureans.

54. macte uirtute: Orelli thought the expression derived from the archaic sacrificial *lup.* O. M. *macte hae hostia esto*, which is generally agreed among scholars. (Madvig thought it an adverb with but this is unlikely). Conington, on Verg. Aen. 9.641, *macte noua uirtute puer*, explains it grammatically as a vocative participle, as did Serv. (schol. Dan.) who glosses *uertes ‘macte esto’ dicebat, mactus ap. uet. etiam mactatus dicebat*, cf. Neue-Wacener. 2, 178–81; *Reiss–Hasse 537, n. 515a; Antibarb. s. v. WORDSWORTH (Early Latin) translates *macte esto* as ‘be honoured with’, a participle which was retained through religious conservativism from the obsolete frequentative verb (*mago* *macto*). This theory is supported by Non. 81.18, and Fest. 112 (Lindsay) who both connect it with *magis auctus*. This sense here in the Tusc. can be derived from an early fragment

we have from Pauclius, Trag. fr. inc. 146, *macte uirtute esto operaque omni alprob’, ‘be now strengthened by your virile might’, the first example of such a use with *uirtus* in its original meaning. Cicero may be punning on *uirtus* in the philosophical sense. For a discussion, see PAlmer (Macte, Mactae, Macula, p. 61); JOnkers (Macte uirtute esto). It seems that any religious connotations of the phrase were largely ignored in Republican times; elsewhere, Cicero uses the phrase simply to mean ‘bravo’, Att. 12.6.3, 15.29–3.

eodem ipso: even though the ms. strongly favours *ipso*, there has been considerable discussion whether such a collocation does actually occur in Cicero. *Antibarb.* 444 denies this, though *Reiss–Hasse* 122, n. 387 points out that it in fact does occur in six places in the ms. of Cicero: *Verr. 1.71, haec ipse idem; Red. in Sen. 53, ipse ille animus idem; Or. 255, ipse idem conditioni; Manil. 46, idem ipse Mithridates; Tusc. 5.26, nisi idem hoc ipsum; and here. *Editors* have variously emended the passages; as regards our passage here, Matthiae proposed *eodem illo* (which is not so good), *Wesenberg eodem isto* (and adopted by Dougan), but as Kühner remarks *ad loc.*, it is not easy to see how a copyist would change *isto* to *ipso* with *ipse* preceding by two words. Pohlenz retained *ipso*, and defended it only by reference to *Aug. C. D. 29.21, in eidem ipsis libris*, but that does not show that Cicero used the idiom. All editors have somehow overlooked *Meader* (Latin Philology, pp. 42–43, 85–87), who has shown by the passage in Div. 2.45, *quod uno et eodem tempore puncto nati dissimili et naturas et vitas et casus habent, parumne declarat nihil ad agendum vitam nascenti tempus pertinere? Nisi forte putamus neminem eodem tempore ipso et conceptum et natum, quo Africanam* that the idiom is defensible. The degree of completeness or emotion would hardly have been as well expressed in that passage had Cicero instead used *eodem illo* or *illo ipso*. As such, here *ipse cum eodem ipso* is surely lively, and conveys excitement, *For I myself would gladly go astray with that very same man*! Giusta’s emendation is indelicate.

non inuitus errauerim: the potential perfect is rarely used by Cicero, cf. Madv. Gram. 350b and Hor. Sat. 1.5.44, *nil ego contulerim inaudito sanus amico*. For the thought, below 21, 49 ipso auctoritate me frangeret [*Plato*].

an sicut pleraque: Giusta’s emendation *an sit ut pleraque* is attractive, but there does seem to be any real need to abandon the consensus of the stts. Kühner notes that *num = *mamo*, i.e., *plhabv*, and though as has been struck out by Bentley and several, it does follow *num* in Or. 1.129, and Rosc. Com. 9.25, *num tabulas habet? an non?*. Cicero asks rhetorically whether they should consider this sceptically as he does in all other matters, referring to the practice of the New Academy.

minime: *sc. dubiebus_; an anachronoluth which arose from the interruption by persuasum: strictly, we ought to have expected *num igitur dubitamus quin terra... obtineat*. A similar construction below, 36. 88.

terram in medio mundo sitam: the views of the an-
medio mundo sitam ad uniuersi caeli complexum quasi puncti instar obtinere, quod κέντρον illi uocant; eam porro naturam esse quattuor omnia gignentium corporum, ut, quasi partita habeat inter se diversa momenta, terrena et umida suopte nutu et suo pondere ad paris angulos in terram et in mare ferantur, reliquae duae partes, una ignea, altera animals, ut illae superiores in medium locum mundi grauitate ferantur et pondere, sic hac rursum rectis lineis in caelestem locum subuent, siue ipsa natura superiora adpetente siue quod a grauioribus leiuiora natura repellantur. quaee cum constant, perspicuum debet esse animos, cum e corpore excesserit, siue illi sint animals, id est spirabiles, siue ignei, sublime ferri. si uero aut numeros quidam sit...
animus, quod subtiliter magis quam dilucide dicitur, aut quinta illa non nominata magis quam non intellecta natura, multò etiam integriora ac puriora sunt, ut a terra longissime se eferant. horum igitur aliquid est animus — ne tam vegeta mens aut in corde cerebro aut in Empedocle sanguine demersa iacæat.

XVIII. Dicaearchum uero cum Aristoxeno aequali et condiscipulo suo, doctos sane homines, omittamus; quorum alter ne condoluisse quidem umquam uidetur, qui animum se habere non sentiat, aliter ita deletururus suas cantibus, ut eos etiam ad haec transferre conetur. harmoniam


which Kühner did not approve. He retained the subjunctive argument that Cicero is not adding his own arguments but he instead represents those of another. All other editors have adopted Madvig’s emendation. Any defence of retaining sit has been exploded by Dougan in his n. ad loc. quod subtiliter magis quam dilucide dicitur: cf. Ac. 2.1324, numerus nullus corpore quod intelligit quale sit vix potest.

subtiliter: Dougan renders it as ‘slight’, or ‘over-refined’; Dormus’ translation of ‘subtle’ hardly helps the understanding. There does not need to be a negative meaning attached to the word, cf. Ac. 2.425, haec ego subtilitatem philosophia quaedam depressissimam judicio, where it means ‘accurate treatment’. Wilkins, in his note on De Or. 1.57, has traced the various meanings of this word in Cicero; from ‘delicate and graceful’, ‘precise’, to ‘plain, unadorned’; the original meaning was as an epithet of filum, taken from weaving = ‘finely woven’ (where see Sandys’ n. on Or. 5.20). Here it means a well-argued statement, or consideration of a problem from many sides, perhaps to the point of obscurity, hence quam dilucide. However, obscurity does not necessarily imply superficial treatment.

quinta natura: Cicero seems to imply here (with concedat below) that Aristotle derived mind (animus) from the fifth element (also at infra harmonias et harmoniam VG) misreads, as King did in the Loeb. The question is to decide if Cicero wrote here animus sit nec (ne is the favoured form in RGV, B, and B2). The sentence would most naturally read est animus ne and Dougan is probably right to suspect that τε (= est) fell out before a-nimus.

ne...iacet: ‘significare uult Cicero, nisi horum aliquid animum esse statuamus, verendum esse ne tam vegeta mens iacet,’ so Kühner after Madvig on Fin. 2.24.77, ne id non pudet sentire, quod pudet dicere; add Sen. 16.55, ne ab omitted eam uitiis uidar uidicari. For the brachylogy cf. Madv. Gram. 440b. ugeta: cf. Div. 1.16, tertia pars mentis præbeat se vegetam et Pl. Rep. 9.572a, τὸ τρῆτον ὅν καὶ κυριᾶν ἐν ὣς ὁ φῶνεος ἐγ-case, and Adam’s n. there.

mens: = animus from what precedes.

in corde cerebro: cf. 9, 18–19.

iacet: ‘lie sunken in the Empedoclean blood’, the use of iacere is strong, ‘to lie prostrate and fallen’.

XVIII: Dicaearchus: 10, 21 n. Aristoxenus: 10, 20 n. eaequali: i.e., ἥλιος, of the same age.

condoluisse: cf. Tusc. 2.22.52, si pes condoluit; De Or. 3.2.6, latus ei dicenti condoluisse. When prefixed to simpler words con- (cum) often acts as an intensifier, e.g., conticere, concatefacere (Moser), collaudare, committ (Kühner).

qui animum se habere non sentiat: a passage often mistranslated, as King did in the Loeb. qui here is causal with the subjunctive, and more elegant and compressed than could be achieved with a conjunction, cf. above 6, 12 n., Tusc. 3.27, Tarquinio uero quid imprudentius qui bellum gereret, Madv. Gram. 366. The remarks contains a slight against Dicaearchus, which stems from his conflation of body/soul in 10, 21. We must understand condoluisse to be emotional pain. ‘Dicaearchus never appears to grieve since he does not feel he has a soul’, and compare the English, ‘That man has no heart’.

no better is Wesenberg’s animus sit nec (ne is the favoured form in RGV, B, and B2). The sentence would most naturally read est animus ne and Dougan is probably right to suspect that τε (= est) fell out before a-nimus.

condoluisse quidem...non habere animum: for the idea, cf. Ter. Ad. 610, discruici animi; Hor. A. 7.432, delen- 

tibus ex animo.

haec: philosophical speculations, cf. below haec concedat Aristotelēi.

harmoniam: Giusta’s harmoniam is unacceptable, and though it is the reading of RG cannot be left as such. The question is to decide if Cicero wrote here ἀρmoniav (which Pohlenz adopted) or the naturalised harmoniam used at Rep. 1.16 and adopted by all other editors: in 10, 21 above, armonia is the consensus; not much later 11, 24 harmonia is read in GRK, but ἡρmonia, a correction which I think done wantonly by the copyist. It therefore seems certain to accept the naturalised form. Here, VE have armonian; RG harmonian, but infra, the readings harmonias, harmonian are unanimous in the mss., and it is hardly Cicero’s practice to use such terms in a confused fashion except when discussing the terminology itself.
autem ex interuallis sonorum nosse possimus, quorum uaria compositio etiam harmonias efficit pluris; membrorum uero situs et figura corporis uacans animo quam possit harmonian efficiere, non uideo. sed hic quidem, quamuis eruditus sit, sicut est, haec magistro concedat Aristotelli, canere ipse doceat. bene enim illo Graecorum prouerbio praecepitur.

Quam quisque norit artem, in hac se exerceat.

illam uero funditus eiciamus individuorum corporum leiueum et rutundorum concussionem fortuitam, quam tamen Democritus concalezaetam et spirabilem, id est animalem, esse uolt. is autem animus, qui, si est horum quattuor generum, ex quibus omnia constare dicuntur, ex

harmonian autem...efficit pluris: 'we can come to re-cognise a melody out of a sequence of notes which differ in pitch, and the varied arrangement of these tones can create further melodies.'

ex interuallis sonorum: by harmony, the ancients did not mean, as we do when we use the term, the simultaneous use of chords; instead they meant 'melody'. In Arist. Pr. 29, 39, we have boys and men singing in unison, their differing by an octave ('as the highest tone differs from the lowest tone'), η και το μεν αντιθωμος συμμωνος έσται δα πασην εν πάσης γαρ νόμοι και διαν δινεται το αντιθωμον, α δεικται τοις τοις, ως γην προ τιν την εντατην. Further into the passage Aristotele indicates that any instrumental accompaniment would separate itself from the chorus, and from. Plu. De Mus. 19.28. Curiously, Aristotle claims that the Greeks knew the effects of such consonances, which to our ears are quite enjoyable but such harmonies displeased them, έται μετατητη της ζωης και καθημερης δια την συγχωση τας φωνας της εντατης. Η αυτη η συμφωνη αυτη της τοις τεταρτων δια της αρμονιας και τα αυτοι των συμμωνων φαινεται αυτην. According to the scholion on Epicur. Ep. 1, 144, Epicurus regarded these atoms as the smallest and finest atoms most capable of moving themselves (Lucr. 6.225–227, and 4.344, moibleri, minuitior; Arist. Cal. 368b–370a), and so capable of moving the body (Arist. De An. 404a). Cicero slightly misrepresents Democritus' position by applying the term spirabilem. For Democritus believed that the soul atoms were spherical and fiery, but that respiration was required for maintaining a balance against our environment which would threaten to press out the lighter soul atoms from our body, Arist. De An. 404a16. According to the scholion on Epicur. Ep. Hdt. 66.5 (cf. Lucr. 2,456–465), Epicurus regarded these fiery atoms different from Democritus' round soul atoms (Winterbottom: Fiery Particles, p. 318).

spirabilem, id est animalem: but in 17, 40 animales, id est spirables. Dougan aptly remarks ad loc. that Cicero is following his own principle described in Fin. 3, 4.13, etsi enim notius quale sit pluribus notatum vocubulis idem declarabantis when he uses various Latin synonyms to impress upon his listeners what he means by the word virtus.

autem: not adverbarive, but like the resumptive si, Hand: Tursellinus, vol. 1, pp. 562–564.

si est: Guista wants to write si et duobus est horum, etc., explaining: 'nam quid futurum esset, si quattor ex generibus unum esset animus, dixit Cicero 17, 40; nunc videlet non quid futurum sit si et quattuor simul generibus constet, nec quid si ad quattuor genera pertineat (sic fere interpretes, quasi non 17, 40 had eandem πρότασιν aliu sequatur διος, animum aut spirabilem aut igneum esse), sed quid futurum sit quatuor, si et spirabilis et igneus simul sit.' But this is then not just a modern day gloss? feliciter lege et the meaning is clear enough with inflammata anima and haec duob below. There is no reason here to change the text.
inflammata anima constat, ut potissimum uidetur Panaetio, superiiora capessat necesse est. nihil enim habent haec duo genera proni et supera semper petunt. ita, siue dissipantur, procu a terris id euenit, siue permanet et conservant habitum suum, hoc etiam magis necesse est ferantur ad caelum et ab est perrumpatur et diuidatur crassus hic et concretus aer, qui est terrae proximus. 

Calidior est enim uel potius ardentior animus quam est hic aer, quem modo dixi crassum atque concretum; quod ex eo sciri potest, quia corpora nostra terreno principiorum genere confecta ardore animi concascent.

XIX. Accedit ut eo facilius animus euadat ex hoc aere, quem saepe iam appello, eumque perrumpat, quod nihil est animo uelocius, nulla est celeritas quae possit cum animi celeritate.

Cicero describes his attitude towards Stoic doctrines at Rhodes, flourished around 130 B.C.; he migrated to Rome and became friends with Laelius and Scipio Africanus. Cicero describes his attitude towards Stoic doctrines at Fin. 4.28.79.

Panaetius: the celebrated Stoic philosopher from Rhodes, flourished around 130 B.C.; he migrated to Rome and became friends with Laelius and Scipio Africanus. Cicero describes his attitude towards Stoic doctrines at Fin. 4.28.79.

superiora capessat: cf. N. D. 2.45.115, medium locum capentes.

nihil habent proni: ‘these two elements never sink downwards’, cf. Hor. Carm. 3.27.18, pronus Orion. The word is somewhat hardworked.

haec duo genera: = ignea et aerea

siue dissipantur: this represents the Stoic view, and indeed the idea is also found ascribed to Posidonius and Panætius, D. L. 7.157. From the Democritean viewpoint, the earth’s atomospheric crassus hic et concretus aër: further elaborated in 19, 43; and 25, 60; cf. N. D. 2.17, terram autem esse inflammam, quam cressissimum circumfundat aer, and Chrysippus, SVF. 2.429, who calls it τὸν ἀέρα ζοφέρον.


qui est terrae proximus: Posidonius thought that turbulent atmosphere extended about 40 stades (about 7.5 km) from the earth, beyond which was a pure, clear and bright airsphere, Plin. H. N. 2.21 (= Ed.–Kidd. 120).

quia: quia and not quod here to avoid the repetition.


XIX. § 43. accedit ut... euadat: = praetera fit ut, so Madv. Gram. 373, obs. 3: 398; K.–S. 144.1 and Kühner ad loc. There is a difference between accedit ut and accedit quod; the former with the subjunctive is used to state a fact, but one which requires further deliberation or is open to doubt; the latter with the indicative may be used simply to relate a fact as a fact, cf. Tusc. 5.21.62, where ne integrum quidem erat ut = ne fieri quidem poterat ut.

aëre, quem saepe iam appello: cf. N. D. 2.34.61, cui nomen est aer, Craccum illud quidem, sed preceptum iam tamen usu a nostris; A. 1.7.26, itaque aer utimur enim pro Latin.

nihil est animo uelocius: cf. Hom. Od. 7.36, τῶν νῦν ὕπνων ὠάκων, ὡσεὶ πτερὸν ἠὲ νόηµα, and Thales also affirmed that nothing was swifter than thought, τὰ φυσικά νῦν, D.–K. 135. DUXEREBI, Lat. Syn. et Elym. vol. 2, pp. 129–135 explained the difference between celeritas animi (which is more usual in classical prose) as ‘via leaps and bounds’, (the /cel/ = to push); whereas uelocietas contains the idea of a ‘smooth, even speed’. I suspect that this may be an over-subsct treatment, cf. Moser n. ad loc.

nulla est celeritas: the tautology was displeasing to Sext. for whom wish to read nulla est /cel/ (= γαϊδαρόν) celeritas; Kühner thought Cicero would have obliterated it upon revision (indeed, Keil and Wolf even thought it a gloss!) But this is harsh condemnation, for this little rhetorical flourishes give colour to the dialogue and emotional colour. The language swells as the soul is described arising to heaven. Cicero enjoys such oratorical epexegethes.

si permanet incorruptus suique similis: ‘if it will remain there, uncorrupted and unchanged’, sui similis here takes the place of immutatus, integer, cf. A. 2.7, incorruptum et integrum, Brut. 35, incorrupta integritate. The phrase hints that the souls of the corrupt may not possess sufficient lightness to ascend to such heights.

omne caelum hoc: i.e., the atmosphere where the clouds are in its most literal sense, (ἀτρομοδαία = sphere of vapour), cf. 25, 60 below nebuloso et caliginoso caelo.

coguntur: = congregantur, ‘massed together’.

caliginosum est propter exhalationes terrae. quam regionem cum superaurit animus naturamque sui similem contigit et adgnouit, iunctis ex anima tenui et ex ardone solis temperato ignibus, insistit et finem altius se eferendi facit. cum enim sui similium et leuitatem et calorem est adeptus, tamquam paribus examinatus ponderibus nullam in partem mouetur, eaque ei demum naturalis est sedes, cum ad sui simile penetrat; in quo nulla re egens aletur et sustentabitur iisdem rebus, quibus astra sustentantur et aluntur. cunque corporis facibus inflammari soleamus ad omnis fere


quam regionem cum superaurit animus: after rising above the sphere of vapor, the soul finally comes to a rest, but still (seemingly) below the sun, n. below. This is a slightly altered version from Rep. 6.16, where the soul ascends higher than these sublunar/subsolus regions and can make the milky way. This ‘milky way’, at least according to the eschatological view of Empedocles, in the dialogue written by Heraclides of Ponticus, is placed (as here) above the moon and beneath the sun in the order of the spheres, on which see fr. Wehrli. 66–97, Schützumph/ Stöhr/Van Opheusen (Heraclides of Pontus, pp. 93–101); Gottschalk (Heraclides of Pontus, pp. 100, 149–154). Cicero seems to place the souls both near to and at the same time beyond the sun and nearer the regions of the stars. For other possible influences, see Jones (Posidonius and the Flight, p. 100).

naturam: = odioav, its substance or being, cf. 25, 62 n.

iunctis...insistit et finem altius se ecferendi facit. cum enim sui similem et leuitatem et calorem est adeptus, caliginosum est propter exhalationes terrae. quam regionem cum superauit animus naturam: = ‘the substance as light and warm as itself’

tamquam paribus examinatus ponderibus: i.e., ‘libratus aequa lance’ (Berolaldus). The literal meaning of ex- animo ‘to weigh’ in its passive form is rare, used by Cicero only here. The imagery is evocative, ‘as if placed in a scale with commensurate weights, perfectly balanced, and its beam centered’.

sui similis: = Giusta (ibid., p. 147) wished to insert caelum here which would be parallel to p. 75 l. 3. He complains that the following in quo could not refer to sui similis. Of course, the ambiguity is something Cicero aimed for, and the insertion is not necessary.

se eferendi: the gerundive sui eferendi would be more usual, but Cicero uses the gerund at Phil. 9.3–6, rifiendisi se et curandi potestas, De Or. 2.4.6, cupidas tu in disputatune audiendi.

cum enim...est adeptus: the better mss. lack est, and so Bentley proposed to emend sum enim, but he is alone. Kühner thinks that in the original reading adeptum tamquam, the -t fell out before tamquam (so he prints adeptus est); however, Giusta (Testo, p. 147) agrees with Doegans’s suspicion that the more likely error was calore adeptus, where est (6) fell out after the ligature -em of calorem and before a. Both read ad est adeptus.

sui similis et leuitatem et calorem: ‘a substance as light and warm as itself’

aestet et sustentatib:...sustentat et aluntur: note the chiasis and highly rhetorical structure of the structure.

iisdem rebus, quibus astra sustentatib et aluntur: that celestial objects were nurtured by fire fed by the vapoury exhalations of the earth is argued in N. D. 2.46.118, sunt autem stellae natura flammone; quoccia terrae maris aquarum vaporous aluntur ets, qui a sole ex agris tepfactus et ex aquis excitantur, quibus alta renovatque stellae atque omnis aether refundant, and Pease’s n. ad loc. The Stoics also held such a view, cf. D. L. 7.139, and 145, τρέψοντα δὲ τὰ ἐκπαρά ταῦτα καὶ τὰ ἁλὰ ἀντέχει ἀλήθεια Srv. 1.612, pasci aquis marinis sidera; so Cleanthes Lét. 2.20.4 (= SVF. 1.501), ἄνθρωπος γονον τὸ ἐκ θαλάττης τὸν ἑλλος; and Posidonius, Macr. Sat. 1.23.2 (= Ed.–Kidd. F18).

astra: according to the Stoics, stars were divine and intelligent beings, N. D. 2.45–49.

§44. facibus: = incitantemis corporis, ‘the natural lusts and promptings of our body’, Tiss. 2.61. 5–7, and cf. De Or. 3.1.4, verborum faces.
cupiditates eoque magis incendi, quod isi aemulmur, qui ea habeant quae nos habere cupiamus, profecto beati erimus, cum corporibus relictis et cupiditatum et aemulationum erimus; quodque nunc facimus, cum laxati curis sumus, ut spectare aliquid uelimus et uisere, id multo tum faciamus liberius totoque nos in contemplandis rebus perspicendiisque ponemus, propertia quod et natura inest in mentibus nostris insatiabilis quaedam cupiditas ueri iidendi et orae ipsae locorum illorum, quo peruerimus, quo faciliorem nobis cognitionem rerum caelestium, eo maiore cognoscendi cupiditatem dabunt. Haec enim pulchritudo etiam in terris 'patrimate' illam et 'auitam', ut ait Theophrastus, philosophiam cognitionis cupidityte incensatem excitauit. Praecipue uero furentu ea, qui tum etiam, cum has terras incolentes circumfusi erant caligine, tamen acie mentis dispicere cupiebant.

XX. Etenim si nunc aliqvid adsequi se putant, qui ostium Ponti uiderunt et eas angustias, per quas penetraet ea quae est nominata

Argò, quia Argiium in ea delecti uiri

Vestì petebant pellem inauratam árietis,

...
aut ii qui Oceani freta illa uiderunt,

Europam Libyamque rapax ubi diuidit unda,
quod tandem spectaculum fore putamus, cum totam terram contueri licebit eiusmod cum sitym, 
formam, circumscriptionem, tum et habitabiles regiones omni cultu propter uim frigoris aut 
caloris uacantis? et rursum nos enim ne nunc quidem oculis cernimus ea quae uidemus; neque

est enim illius sensus in corpore, sed, ut non physici solum docent uerum etiam medici, qui ista
aperta et patefaca uiderunt, uiae quasi quaedam sunt ad ocoulos, ad auras, ad naris a sede animi

2. Enn. Ann. 302

Europam Libyamque: ‘where the swelling sea divides Europe from Libya’, i.e. the straits of Gibraltar, as Skutsch thinks comparing Liv. 28.30.6, urbs a in ora Oceani sita est, ubi primus e fauciis angustius panditur mare, and cf. 18, 28 n. Cicero quotes this line again at N. D. 3.10.24. Though Cicero claims that in relative terms those who 

traverse such great distances see nothing when compared to the grandeur the soul will observe sub specie aeternitatis, nevertheless some philosophers did in fact set out on such 

travels in order to study natural phenomena, most notably Posidonius who went to Gibraltar to study the tides, Strabo. 3.5.7–8 (= Ed.–Kidd. 217, 183 Jac.).

The term rapax is a common epithet of the sea particularly surrounding Sicily (Scylla) likely used here to suggest the 


formam, circumscriptionem: ‘shape and circumfer-

ce’ (geometrically), but perhaps ‘form and outline’ from 

the plastic arts. The visual element of this passage is 

heightened by the use of vocabulary often used in the 

description of painting, cf. Quint. Inst. 12.10.5, Zeuxis plus 

membris corporis dedit, id amplius aut augustius ratus atque, 

ut exsimiant, Homerum secutus, cui validissima quaeque forma etiam in feminis placet; ille 

cum oculis cernere, Pompeianum non cerno

habitatrices regiones... aut cultu uacantis: cf. below 28, 69 and N. D. 1.10. In Rep. 6.19.20–21, the earth is divided 
in five ‘zones’, of which two are temperate, habitabiles; 

these are separated by an impassable zone scorched with 

heat (vini caloris), and the two zones at the poles, uninhab-
table from their frigidity. The theory of such separation 
goes back to Parmenides (Strabo. 2.2.2, and found in Ar-

ist. Mete. 2.5, τὸν αὐτὸν δὲ τρόπον πρὸς τὸν κάτω πόλον ἕτεροι τρίων κάνου τῆς γῆς ἄστασιν [i.e., regiones] ποιοῦν. ταύτα δὲ αἰσθήσεις μόνα διακοτα καθιστάντας, Cicero is more precise in Rep. 

when he uses the term circinus, ‘bells’ to translate the 

Greek ὀίνους (‘girdle’).

This evidence speaks against several scholars, includ-
ing Pohlenz, who believe that Posidonius was the source 

for many of Cicero’s remarks in the Tusc., particularly in 

18–71. For we know that Posidonius argued that the inte-

merge zones were in fact inhabited, Cleomedes, De Mot. 

Caec. 1.6.21–3 (= Ed.–Kidd. 210). Instead, Cicero’s source 

was likely Alexander of Ephesus, a contemporary of his 

(Strabo. 14.1.25). Cicero had collected his works and was 

copying them out in order to prepare material to be used 
in his own proposed Geography (Att. 2.4.20, 2.20, 2.22).

ruusum: 17, 40 n.

στερνίσμα... uidentem: ‘distinguish and identify the 

things we see’, i.e., to perceive the differences between 

the objects we see (diuidicare), cf. Ac. 2.25.80, Cumana regionem uide, Pomponium non cerno, where see Reid’s n. The root of cernere in “circum originates in κηρεω, ‘to be 
able to pick out’, often in the sense of consideration with 

the understanding, cf. Or. 18, cernebat animo.

neque est enim: for the order of the words, cf. 

De Or. 2.28.124.

physici... etiam medici docent: a strange quirk in 
termology. The physici (‘physicists’) were the ‘natural philo-
osphers’ who argued mostly by analogy, whereas the term 

medici (‘physicians’, as later = medicis ILLRP. 790) in an-
tiquity could encompass ‘experimental philosophers’. 

Diogenes of Apollonia, who considered himself a doc-


[Gal]. De Humor. 29.495 (= D.–K. 64290) — placed the seat 
of understanding in the brain with the senses connected to 
it via ‘ducts’ (Thphr. Sens. 30), τὸν γὰρ γεγονός αὐτῶν 

μακρύν καὶ τὰ δείχνα. He probably derived his doctrines 

from the earlier anatomist Alcmæon of Croton. Parmen-
ides too dissected small animals to locate the seat of sense 
in the brain via nerves, and later Epicureans, whose own 

language suggested his title as a doctor, Emped. fr. 12, Göt-

tschall (Heraclides of Pontus, p. 13), believed in pathways 

to the brain, Arist. C. G. 1.7, 342b26, πάθηνεν διὰ διά

των τῶν πόρων οἰνικίου τοῦ ποιοῦντος εἴσαγαγός καὶ κατακλήσαντος, καὶ τῶν τῶν τρίσσων ἢν καὶ ἠνεκὲν ἡμᾶς ὡς, καὶ τὰς ἄλλας αἰσθήσεις αἰσθάνεται πάσας (= D.–K. 31847); Thphr. 

Sens. 7 (= D.–K. 31166); and Pl. Men. 76. For an overview 
of the earlier medical philosophers, see Lonczácz (Philo-

sophy and Medicine). Davies on this passage cites Theod. 

Grac. auct. citr. 1.15, who has Epicarmhas (not Menander 
as Ursinus thought, cf. Tz. Chil. 5.52, 12.440) sing a doc-
trime that the mind, rather than the sense-organis, is the 

agent which perceives, νοσ ὁρ καὐδος λαθὰ λαθὰ κοσμί 

καὶ τεσσάρι (Epich. fr. 249). This thought is found as well 
in Pl. Thit. 18b–d, σει συνει οὐσίας ἢν δὲ διὰ καλέν, σινά 

τούτα συντινής, δὲ διὰ τῶν ἡγομένων ἔργων ἀνθεθεμένη διὰ αἰσθήτα. 

Arist. De Anim. 415b15–21 felt the body existed for the sake 
of the soul, but that sight was still was a physiological pro-

cess (Socrates: Body and Soul in Aristotle, p. 88), cf. Arist. 

M. A. 6, 700b2–24; so the Stoics (Chrysipp. ap. Gal. De plac. 

 Hipp. et Plat. 7.5.622), and Plin. H. N. 11.145, in ovulos animus habitat. The Epicureans opposed the position, Lucr. 3.359– 

361, διερχερο ποιο uoleum nullam rem cernere posse | sed per eos 

animum ut foribus spectar reclusis i difliecte etc.

aperta et patefaca uiderunt: dissecctors of bodies and 

the anatomists, on which see Reid on Ac. 2.29.122 where 

Cicero uses similar language to describe the doctors who 

open us up to see how our parts work, medici ipsi, quoram intererat ea nosse, aperuerunt, ut viderentur. Orelli compares 

Cels. praf. 45, where such men are labelled ‘medical mur-

derers’, latoentnantis medici. Vivisection was generally dis-

approved by Celsus, though he thought it perfectly fine 

to train in medicine by examining the organs of maimed 

gladiators or those murdered on the highway.

quasi quaedam: cf. 12, 24 n., ‘quandam quasi mi-

grationem’. Here, quasi (quaedam uiae perforatae) hints at a 

translation.
perforatae. itaque saepè aut cogitatione aut aliqua ui morbi impediti apertis atque integris et oculis et auribus nec uidentem, nec audimus, ut facile intellegi possit animum et uideere et audire, non eas partis quae quasi faci. Quod erat demonstrandum. Postea quidem, ut eadem mente res dissimilissimas comprehendimus, ut color, saporem, calorem, odor, quoniam quae nunquam quinque nuntius animus cognosceret, nis ad eum omnìa referrentur et ut omnium iudex solus esset. atque ea profecto tum multo puriora et dilucidiora cernentur, cum, quoniam natura fert, liber animus peruerit. nam nunc quidem, quantum foramina illa, quae patent ad animum a corpore, callidissimo artificio natura fabricata est, tamen terrenis concretisque corporibus sunt intersaepa quodam modo: cum autem nihil aliud praetereat animalium, nulla res obtecta impediat, quoniam non perspicat, quae quidque sit.

XX. Quamuis copiose haec diceremus, si res postularet, quam multa, quam uaria, quanta


uiae perforatae: 'there are pathways, as if bored out from the seat of the soul through to the eyes, ears, and nose,' and below fenestrae; for the language, cf. N. D. 3.4.9, duam lumina ab animo ad oculos perfora. The position in general that there were pathways to the brain was assigned to Aenesidemus 'the doctor', and earlier to Strato, S. E. M. 7.350, o[ì] δὲ αὐτήν (τῆς διάνους) εἰναι τὰ αἰσθήσεις, καθάπερ δὲ τῶν ὁπίων τῶν ἁπάντων προσκοπῶν, δὴ ετέλεσε ἄρχῃ. The position in general that there were pathways to the brain were assigned to Aenesidemus 'the doctor', cf. Lact. 36.2.11, ad uoluptatem omnia referentur. et omnia iudex solus: cf. A. 1.32, mentem volvabant rerum esse iudicum, solam censebant idoneum cui crederetur. Cicero is somewhat blurred the distinction between the the best views were later filtered through Plato, Pl. Ti. 82a–82d, εἰπάθη γενότοι πλάσμα. These views were later filtered through Plato, Pl. Ti. 82a–82d, εἰπάθη γενότοι πλάσμα. These views were later filtered through Plato, Pl. Ti. 82a–82d, εἰπάθη γενότοι πλάσμα: thus with the passage from the best views were later filtered through Plato, Pl. Ti. 82a–82d, εἰπάθη γενότοι πλάσμα. These views were later filtered through Plato, Pl. Ti. 82a–82d, εἰπάθη γενότοι πλάσμα. These views were later filtered through Plato, Pl. Ti. 82a–82d, εἰπάθη γενότοι πλάσμα. These views were later filtered through Plato, Pl. Ti. 82a–82d, εἰπάθη γενότοι πλάσμα. These views were later filtered through Plato, Pl. Ti. 82a–82d, εἰπάθη γενότοι πλάσμα.
spectacula animus in locis caelstibus esset habiturus. quae quidem cogitans soleo saepe mirari non nullorum insolentiam philosophorum, qui naturae cognitionem admirandur eiusque inuentori et principi gratias exulantates agunt eumque uenerantur ut deum; liberatos enim se per eum dicunt grauisimis dominis, terrore sempiterno, et diurno ac nocturno metu. quo terrore? quo metu? quae est anus tam delira quae timeat ista, quae uos uidelicet, si physica non didicissetis,

which is on account of the understood inanimate nature of

Ep. Pyth

ἡ τοà σύµπαντος φύσις, ἀλλ᾿ ὑποπτευόµενόν τι τîν κατὰ τοὺς

are a unified idea, wished to read

error

Fam

Gods and death.

frees us from suspicions and allays our fears about the

which Cicero speaks about here in guarded terms are the Epicureans. After a detailed discussion of how and why the soul rises to fiery aether to remain forever in blissful contemplation, he turns to attack these philosophers who, though professing to be students of nature, offer doctrines that dispel the myth that fears of Hades held only by fools. That Cicero should be involved on such a digression on his least favorite philosophers should cause no amazement. It gave him no pleasure to see rising Epicureanism spread throughout Italy, on which see 3, 6 above and Long (Hellenistic Philosophy, p. 17). Fine examples of Cicero’s hateful invective against the sect can be seen in Piso, Delacy (Cicero’s Invective against Piso, 96f).

insolentiam : possibly with the meaning ‘offensiveness’, but can also come to mean ‘unusual attitude’ or ‘peculiarity’. Cf. Sall. Cat. 23.3 where Fulvia discovered the plans of Curius on account of his strange behaviour coepit ferocius eritam agitare quam solius erat; Fulviae, insolentia Curi causa cognita etc.

inuentori et principi : i.e., Epicurus, cf. Ac. 2.43, Zeno inuentor Stoicorum; the term has connotations of praise, Quint. Inst. 3.7.18, L.&S. s.c.

cuirante inuentor ut deum : cf. Lucr. 5.8, deus ille fuit, . . . qui princeps uata rationem inuenit eum, quae nunc appellatur sapiens; N. D. 1.16.43, uenerari Epicurum et in eorum iporum numerum, (i.e., deorum) et comes Majoris n. ad loc; also Fin. 1.14.32; Piso. 59. Metrodorus in Plu. Adv. Colot. 17 praised τὰ Εὐμορφά ὡς ἀλλήλων διάβατα δέρμα, and Colotes knelt to worship Epicurus. Epicurus’ birthday was celebrated by the school, and on the 20th of every month a festival was held in his honour (D. L. 10.18), and Epicurus does not seem to have wished to prevent such things. In a fragment of a letter to Idomeanus (fr. 27 Bailey, fr. 130 Usener) he himself wrote στρεφάν ὄνη ἀπαιρῆ ἦναν εἰς τὴν τῶν ἱερῶν σύμπανθρωπίαν. Voluntary contributions were frequently made for the support of their master, and though the religious language is perhaps used playfully, Bailey remarks that early Epicureans did indeed give such veneration.

liberatos per eum dominis : Epicur. Ep. Hdt. 83, Epicur. Ep. Pytho. 104, κάλλος μὲν μόθος ἀπλῶς, Epicur. Sent. 12, οὐκ ὡς τὸ βούλομαι λείαν ὑπὸ τῶν καυχηθῶν μὴ κατέλει τῇ ἡ τῶν σύμπαντος φύσεως, ἀλλ’ ὑποπτευόμενον τὸ κατ’ τὰ κατὰ τῶν μάθησις Epicurus thought that there was no need to study nature or natural phenomenon except to the end that it frees us from suspicions and allays our fears about the Gods and death.

grauisimis dominis : note the lack of ὁμιλία in the phrase, which is on account of the understood inanimate nature of the things, cf. Fam. 12.1.1, non regno, sed regi liberati videmur.

terrore : Bentley, on the grounds that terror and metus are a unified idea, wished to read error against the ms, but Kühner rejected the idea both by quoting Fin. 1.5.14, maximis erroribus animos liberavit. There are also arguments against Bentley’s reading on the grounds that it is more comprehensible that dread can have mastery over the mind than can error. Munro: T. Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura, vol. 2, pp. 18–19 (and in his n. on Lucr. 2.1050–1052, natura libera continuo, dominis priuata superbis), remarks that, though Cicero only rarely quotes from the works of his contemporaries, he was still familiar with the language of Lucretius’ poem, which was published a few years earlier. Here in the Tusculan, we can see its influence.

quo terrore? : = ποῖος ἔθελε, in a rhetorical strain, below 44, 105, quem Hectorem? Pohlenz quotes Plaut. Carc. 546, quos Summonos somnias?

quo est anus tam delira . . . : similar language in Dov. 2.141, an tu censes ullam amum tam deliram; Dom. 48, Har. Resp. 19, Phil. 5.5; and N. D. 2.5, quaeque anum tam excors where see Pease’s n. ad loc. Of course the popular superstition of Hades was widespread in antiquity: Tantalus, Titus and Syphyes are already in Hom. Od. 11.576–600; Ixion in pse.-Pl. Ax. 371e; and artistic representations of such myths by Polygnotos could be found at Delphi (Paus. 10.28.1) as well as by other painters who were well enough known to be referenced by Dem. Adv. Aris. 1.53, μὲν οὖν ὦ θεώραξ τὸν ἄνδρα ἐν Άδη καθιερωσόμενος. See above 12, 27 n. and the quote from Plautus. In addition to artistic or literary allusions, we also start to see early philosophical discussion of the underworld. We have ascribed to Democritus a books entitled παρά τῶν ἐν Άδησιν (D.-K. 53b1); later, to Antisthenes (D. L. 6.17), and to Heracles Ponticus (D. L. 5.87); and Cicero himself makes references elsewhere, Cat. 4.8, Phil. 14.32, etc. Polyb. 6.56 argue that such myths were introduced to keep people pious and law-abiding, and that they were foolish who advanced arguments against such invisible terrors which keep the people restrained. Intellectuals, however, were less credulous about such eternal punishments.

uidelicet : ‘doubtless’, often used in clauses of derision, as do other like particles (scilicet, etc).

Acherusia templum : from Enn. trag. 70–71, his Andromacha Aechmochalitis, which Ribbeck Trag. fr. inc. restored as Aristophanic anaphes, Vahlen as trochaic septenarius. Cicero had seen this tragedy acted in 54 B.C. (Att. 4.20). The line is also cited in Varr. L. L. 7.6 where he finishes the line Acherosia t. o. salute infera, which shows again that Cicero often abandons or otherwise modifies poetry to fit his purpose.

templum : cf. Munro on Lucr. 1.221, Archeirusia templum. Not a building, but the term templum originally meant an area marked out in the sky by the augurs, Serv. 1.446; it then eventually came to mean simply ‘regions’, cf. Tac. Ann. 1.54 where Ennius calls heaven caerula caeli templum; and Plaut. Mdal. 414, in locis Neptunis templisque turbolentia. It was only afterwards that it came to signify the building itself. In these verses, note the vowels which give the lines a deep, sonorous forboding.

Orci: there is an ambiguity in the term Orcus, Walde/
— pallida leto, nubila tenebris loca?

non pudet philosophum in eo gloriari, quod haec non timeat et quod falsa esse cognoverit? e quo intellegi potest, quam acuti natura sint, quoniam haec sine doctrina credidiri fuerunt. praecrularum autem nescio quid adepti sunt, quod didicerunt se, cum tempus mortis uenisset, toto esse perituros. quod ut ita sit — nihil enim pugno — quid habet ista res aut laetabile aut gloriosum? Nec tamen mihi sani quicquam occurrit, cur non Pythagorae sit et Platonis uera sententia. ut enim rationem Plato nullum adferret — uide, quid homini tribuum — ipsa auctoritate me frangeret: tot autem rationes attulit, ut uelle ceteris, sibi certe persuasisse uideatur.

XXII. Sed plurimi contra nituntur animosque quasi capite damnatos morte multant, neque

leto nubila] letio nubila GPE: lecio nubila L: leti ob nubila P: letionubila K alio atram. superscr. 3 e quo] e quo


Hoffman (Lateinisches Etymologisches), s. v., states that Orcus can be used in the sense of ‘underworld’ (Unterwelt); but according to Meillet/Verdrayes (Grammaire Comparee) ‘it is the name of God of the infernal regions, synonymous with death itself. The same distinction is made in RE. 1.980 where Orcus is first the kingdom of the dead and equivalent to Hades-Pluto. Only later did its Roman conception arise which was afterwards replaced by the better known Dis Pater. It therefore seems to me that the original meaning was the person and not the place. We have Plaut. Bacc. 368, aperte propere ianuam hanc Orci; Plaut. Most. 490, me Accheruntem recipere Orcus noluit; and Plaut. Poen. 344, quo die Orcus Accherunte mortuos amiserit, which has a proverbial ring to it (Knapp: Literature in Plautus). A curious parallel not mentioned by scholars is Verr. 2.4.111, Verres alter Orcus seneisse which, however, lends itself to an interpretation as = Pluto. Orcus though likely was of Etruscan origin (cf. Plaut. Capt. 98a pica Accherunti are reminiscent of Etruscan tomb paintings) and later found favour among the Latins. That it eventually came to signify the ‘underworld’ was probably due to development which paralleled the Greek concept. Its use recalls of Homer’s ‘Αχ! προΐαψεν, inimicum Orco inmittere, which, however, is parallel to Cicero’s usual practice to write ex before ei. This seems to suggest that Cicero was in doubt as to whether Plato himself was convinced by his own arguments.

in eo gloriari: i.e., in eo collocatum labere gloria, ‘to put all his pride in this’ (Moser). For the construction with in cf. N. D. 3.36.89, in urrite gloriarum; add Off. 2.59 and Lig. 25; the idiom is similar to laetiari in and laetari in, which Madvig’s n. on Fin. 1.39.

quod timeat... cognoverit: subj. from reported thought, refers to the philosophum.

e quo: the mss. favour the reading e quo, though it is Cicero’s usual practice to write ex before ei. We have the same at Fin. 2.5.15 where the better class read e quo, see Beier on Amph. 78 and Hasting: Tursellinus, vol. 2, p. 614.

sine doctrina: ‘since they would have come to believe such had they been without their teachings’, where sine doctrina almost comes to = nisi didicerunt.

§49. autem: the autem resumes the thought on why they should treat Epicurus like god; the words liberatos enim enim se... credidit fuerunt are parenthetical. Zumpt (in Holden) shows the same with sed in Off. 1.4 where sed cum statussem scribere which recalls the digression of the preceding chapter again to the proper introduction of the work.

quod didicerunt: the vulgar reading qui would leave ‘they have obtained something wonderful who learned that...’ — but we do not need any further exposition of who ‘they’ are and further quod (the reading of the better mss) gives the phrase a sardonic irony (with praecrularum) which is very Ciceronian, ‘they have obtained something wonderful, the fact that they have learned...’ which seems both to place emphasis on the shallowness of their teachings (or at least places them on the same level as the falsa) as well as giving a new turn to the quam acuti sint. It hints that these Epicureans have perhaps been hoodwinked.

uenisset, toto esse perituros: the pluperfect represents the future perfect had it been in oder piobiqua and indicates that one action was completed before the other, i.e., cum venerit tempus, toti peribimus, cf. Madv. Gram. 379. quod ut ita sit: ‘but though it should as they say’, i.e., that we all perish and dissolve in death. ut is concessive, cf. § 16 n.

nihil enim pugno: I am inclined (with Moser and Sorof) to read this ironically, rather than simply as a statement of a New Academic deliberating his choices, i.e., ‘But if it is true that Epicureans are wholly destroyed in death, I don’t object.’

nec mihi occurrerit: we have adopted this Latin idiom into English, ‘nothing occurs to me’ in the sense ‘I cannot think why’.

Pythagorae: 9, 18 n. ut enim: ‘for if’.

quid homini tribuum: a sense of gravity is conveyed by the added homini in place of the simpler ei. The same can be seen in Fam. 1.2.3, ut mihi widerer animum hominis.

ipsa auctoritate me frangeret: ‘Est-il homme, en nostre siecle, si impudent qui pense leur estre comparable, soit en vertu et piet, soit en scavoir, jugement et suffisance?’ Montaigne, Essais, 1.27, who quotes this passage. The New Academic places even his own scepticism under scrutiny. If we cannot be sure of our own powers of reasoning and mental abilities, then we should turn to those who have authority in the subject. But how can we judge them if we cannot understand them? I find it interesting that Cicero is astounded by the number (quot) of reasons and not their weight. This seems to suggest that Cicero was in doubt as to whether Plato himself was convinced by his own arguments.

ipsa auctoritate: = sola auctoritate (Moser). Cicero is very much a φιλοπλατων and the foremost position of Plato is thematic in the Tusc., at 17, 39 n., here, and below 32, 70; and cf. what Cicero says of Plato elsewhere, Div. 1.62, ut rationem non rederet, auctoritate tamen philosophos sinceret; N. D. 2.32, Platonem quasi deum philosophorum; Leg. 3.4, diuinum uirum Platonem; DeKraig (Plato in Cicero).

uelle: sc. persuadere. The following persuasisse would seem to need soluisse, but Moser explains that uelle can be viewed as aoristic, and that the reader can conceive of the author as being present. This is the same reason for uidetur which expresses the continuing result, though we could have expected uidetur, Madv. Gram. 383, obs. 3.

XXII. §50. capite damnatos: capitis damnare is more usual, the gen. being one of penalty, but cf. below 49, 98.
where we have capite damnaru. Reid explains that the ablative might be through assimilation to morte multari, which is a common enough expression. I find this more likely than understanding capite as abl. of price, a construction which is generally only used of definite fines. Justin. Dig. 45.11 explains the capitis deminutio maxima as the loss of one’s liberty, citizenship and family. Gai. Inst. 1.16.4 tells us that servus manumissus…nullum caput habet, a law which expresses the absolute privation of all legal rights since a slave was not considered to have his own persona or status. I find the phrase capite puniri is common in the legal digests, for which see Berger (Dictionary of Roman Law, p. 380), s. v.


quasi uero: this expression is particularly used in ironic jesting, though sometimes in simple correction in order to state something is not, in fact, the case, cf. Madv. Gram. 444, obs. 1. In this case uero does not have an adversative but an assertive force as it does in answers to questions in combination with si or sibi. The verb intelligo is in the present subj. even though the proposition is inadmissible because the preceding sequens is also in the present, cf. Kühner’s n. here and Holdon on Off. 3.39. Translate, ‘indeed!, as if they should understand that…!’, cf. Mil. 31.84, quasi nostram mentam qualis aut ubi sit sentire possimus.


ut si iam posset: the emendation by Pearce at in place of the mss. ut adopted by Dougan and recently Giusta is not to be accepted. Pohlenz tried to defend the interpretation as = δορκε, which is not nearly so harsh a construction as Dougan was led to believe. However, the parallels which he adduces, among which is Div. 2.69, do not successfully support the Latin idiom. Nevertheless, I find that De Or. 3.165, ut si olim diceret…sin…, which has a secure mss. testimony, can confirm our reading here. The conjecture aut of Lambinus and Seyffert is possible, but leaves an anacolouthon after the quasi uero exclamation.

si iam: a formation often used with the pres. subj., but not always as here. It ‘grants for the moment’; or supposes something for the sake of argument only for a short time, cf. Madvig n. on Fin. 3.366, ut iam. Many examples of this type of logical reasoning can be found in Lucretius, 1.396, si iam posset, sine inani posset; 2.967, si iam est sensus; 3.540, si iam liberat; 5.195, quod si iam primordia quae sint; etc.

in homine uioso: Klots felt that omnia and the mss. reading in homine uno were well placed in opposition, and that Cicero was asking us whether we could catch sight of the soul if we were once capable of seeing uncovered all the material which resides in a man while he is still unified. However, that arrangement would beg the question of whether the soul is corporeal; but this is, in fact, now under scrutiny: assuming the soul is material, as did the Epicureans, then if we open up a man, will we see his soul? Or is it made of such a fine material that it escapes our ability to see it? — Now this reasoning assumes the man is still alive, for upon death his soul escapes: it caused Bentley to emend in homine uioso, ‘quippe in homine mortuo iam excessit animus ex corpore neque ibi quaerendus est’. All editors after Bentley, Moser excepted, have adopted this emendation, cf. below 36, 88 where the mss. have sed in uioso.

casurusne…: anacolouthon. Cicero had been about to write ita qualem et casusar in conspectu videatur animus,’if we peek inside the body, would not the soul come to light in this way?’, but he changed the construction instead to a direct disjunctive question: ‘if we looked inside — would we see the soul or would it escape us?’

uideatur: somewhat weakened form of sit but perhaps Cicero is playing upon the visual element.

fugat aciem: the simpler form of the verb is used poetically. This has not been much discussed by the Latin grammarians, but its use is often enough employed and in the same fashion as in Greek, e.g., where ἐκφεύγειν is placed for ἐκφεύγω. Klotz compares nihil pungo, above 21, 49 where we understand repugno and see Wilson (Use of the Simple for the Compound Verb).

haec reputent. . . uidebunt: videbunt looks toward the result of their action implied by the imperative force of the subjunctive reputent. The future is often used in this way, cf. above 13, 30 n., ‘tolle… sustuleris’.

animus sine corpore: i.e., animus qui corpus effugisset; Dougan remarks that the attributive use of this preposition is rare in Latin of the classical period; where any such cases occur, the noun modified has a coordinate adjective, Tusc. 2.7, lectionem sine detectione; Tusc. 5.48, uir temperatus sine metu; Att. 1.18.5, ignaus ac sine animo miles.

quem in ipso corpore: really means quam in ipso…, as it does often. In a similar fashion demonstratives can sometimes take the place of tails. Plaut. Men. 402 plays humorously on this idiom when he asked quan tu mihi nunc naueris narras? which is answered by ligneam.

mullo difficillior occurrat cogitatio: ‘indeed, when I look into the nature of the soul, I find it rather difficult to imagine…’.

quais animus in corpore sit: Plin. H. N. 7.55.118 has this to say, omnibus a suprema die eadem quae ante primum, nec magis a morte sensus ulius aut corpori aut animae quam ante natali. eadem enim canitas in futurum etiam se propagat et in mortis quoque tempora ipsi sibi ultam mentitur, alias immortalitatem animae, alias transmigrationem, etc. Here, Cicero’s scoffings seem somewhat ill-mannered. There is a difficulty; that by looking for the philosophical background and inspiration we may come to doubt Cicero’s sincerity here without real ground for it.

domui: the old form of the locative is given here by the mss., though some editors have preferred domi. For the orthography, see K–S. 1.89, and Neue–Wagener. 1. 117.
uidius, id quale sit intellegere non possumus, certe deum ipsum et diuinum animum corpore liberatum cogitacione completi possumus. Dicæarchus quidem et Aristoxenus, quia difficilis erat
animi quid aut qualvis esset intelligentia, nullum omnino animum esse dixerunt. est illud quidem
uel maximum animo ipso animum uidere, et nimium hanc habet uim praeceptum Apollinis,
and even contemplate god himself, unless it so happens that we cannot come to understand what a thing is which we have never seen. But Epicurus held that all knowledge of the soul and of the gods comes through the soul's faculty of σωφροσύνη and not through the senses themselves (D. L. 10.123). If Cicero is hinting at the position of Epi-
curus in this passage, then there is a need to emend nisi to si as with Seyerfert and Pohlenz. Since, though, this passage stresses the 'native' soul as a substance whose powers of understanding are enlarged when freed of the body, i.e.,
its physical senses which only act to cloud its thoughts, we can construe uidius as 'sensory input'. If we affirm
that the soul cannot contemplate anything unless we have such input, then we will be unable to form any idea of god
once released from this body. This is the mes. reading, and gives us a comprehensible meaning and I think should therefore be retained, cf. N. D. 1.88, nihil esse potest nisi quod attingimus aut uidiumus, and Pl. Th. 155a, εἰναὶ δὲ αὐτὸν [i.e., οὐδέν ἄλλο οἴομεν εἰναὶ ἢ οὐ δὲ δύνασθαι ἀπὸ τῶν χερῶν λαβέσθαι, πράξεις δὲ καὶ γενέσεις καὶ πᾶν τὸ ἀδύνατον οἷον ἄποδοχέμενον ὡς ἐν σοφίᾳ μόροι.

diunum animum: cf. 18, 24 n. dissipantur. The Stoics claimed that the soul was divine insofar as it found its root in
and was composed of like material as the universal soul, or 'World' soul. All individual souls then are considered as
one single soul which is divine, cf. Sen. Ep. 4.1, in uno, quis deus incertum est, habitat deus. Similar in fashion is the
use of deus here, a stronger assertion which precedes the somewhat weaker diuinum. It can be claimed that irascibilis
as the soul takes part of the eternal/universal soul, it itself can also be named as a 'god' or 'divine'.

Dcæarchus quidem: cf. 10, 20 n; for the emphasis of
uidem, used to mean ueluti, or exempli causa, cf. 48, 116.

Aristoxenus: cf. 11, 24 above.

aniim: proleptic for emphasis.

quid aut qualvis: quid looks toward what it is made of
and constitutes its existence, whereas qualvis, like παρεξ.,
looks toward its appearance or species, cf. Ac. 1.7.26.

intelligentsia: = difficile erat intelligere

nimirum esse: emphatic for non esse, which tends to be
used more in colloquial writing, cf. Alt. 11.244.4; it gives a
conversational turn to the work.

§52. animo ipso animum uidere: We now have a
discussion on the meaning of the apophthegm 'know thyself'.
Its true meaning is to contemplate the soul and not the body in
which it resides, i.e., your mental, moral, and virtuous
qualities, not your physical ones. Whether the body constituted
a part of the 'real' person was long debated by
favoured the Platonic position and identified the person
with the soul and not the body, Pl. Phd. 115c–3, ἐγὼ εἰμί
οὗτος Ζωκράτης, δὲ νέω διαλέγομεν καὶ διαπτέτων Ἰκαστον
tῶν λυγίμων, ἀλλά ἂν τελεῖ με ἕκαστον ἐκείνο ἐν ἔνδοτη λύγιν
ὑπότευκτον λεγόν, Pl. Lg. 12.950-b. Cicero is here almost
certainly drawing on the declared position of
Alc. I. 128e–133e (Boyanče: Cicéron et le Premier Alcibiade), perhaps also ps.-Pl. Ax. 356e,
370b-c (Jones: Posenidius and Cicero's Tusc, p. 270), and
Pl. Ti. 89–90, where there is an equation between ἰδέαν and

abhínavat. But where Boyancé is inclined to see Posenidius
as the source for Cicero's material, I am at least hesitant to
accept such views. There is nothing in these passages, 52–
57, which is particular to Posenidius though he may have
accepted or exhorited their position. Certainly the claim of
the soul's divinity was commonplace. It was frequent in
Plato (as I have shown), as well as in Arist. De Phil. fr. 11,
Cratippus in Div. 1.70 expounded the views, and it was
a doctrine held by the Stoics. For a discussion of Cicero's
sources, see Boyancé (Etudes, pp. 121–4).

est illud uel maximum: uel intensifies the superlative,
'indeed, the most important is the principle that the soul
sees by the soul itself'.

nimirum: i.e., its literal meaning of 'mirum ni', cf. Reisig-
Hasse. 271 and Ter. Aud. 3.4.19. It contains a thought in itself
and is commonly used in ironical statements. 'It would be
strange if Apollo's aphorism did not have this meaning!

There may be a pun being played here by Cicero on
the choice of nimirum. The Apolline phrase had many
different interpretations by philosophers: from 'Know
your own measure' (found earliest in Heraclitus, Stob. Flor. 5.119, fr. 106 Bywater, omm. Kirk, ἀνθρώπων παῖς
μέτατρις γνώσεως κατωτέρου καὶ σωφρονίσου, and cf. A. Pr. 330);
'Know what you can do' (Xen. Mem. 2.26, Pl. Chrm. 164–c,
Arist. Rh. 2.21.13); 'Know your place' (σωφρονίσου); 'Know
the limits of your wisdom' (i.e., the opposite of Plato's ἀμα-
θία); 'Know your faults' (as one of the key maxims of the
Pythagorean school, Stob. Flor. 108.81, lambli. VP. 18.83);
'Know you are mortal' (Archilochus, fr. 62, φύγεσαν δὲ ἀθάνατον
μὲν ἄθανατον καὶ αἰνεῖς ἐμοὶ); and 'Know your soul' (as here); but
we must also recall that paired with this phrase was its
counter-measure found on the exit of the temple, 'Not too
much', οὐὶ άθανατοί; there seems a nice pairing here when
Cicero says that Apollo's saying (with regard to the soul)
has 'too much' force.

praeceptum Apollinis: Plu. E apud Delph. 2 (= Plu. Mor. 384C) says that the precept 'know thyself' was a seed
that gave rise to countless philosophical discussions in all
eras; but of this purported volume of writings, we have
now very little, cf. Stob. Flor. 21. [Plu. Consol. ad Apoll. 28
made great use of it in this work, where he there takes
it to mean 'know that you are mortal'. There should be
no doubt that Cicero also maintained this position and
probably had worked it into his own Consolatio. But here
in Tusc. as in the Pl. Alc. I, it means 'Know your soul'.

The somewhat cursory treatment here of the statement
misrepresents the energy with which the Platonic school
trained the aphorism. For them, self-knowledge was one
of the bases for their psychological holism, cf. Pl. Alc. I. 344a,
Gill. (The Structured Self, 29fl). Proclus, in his comment-
ary on Pl. Alc. I. called it the ἰδιωτικαί ἄρχη, and claimed
that Iamblichus placed that dialogue first among Plato's
works and considered it to contain his whole philosophy.
Its identification of body and soul, ἰδιωτικά ἄρχη, was
considered by ancient commentators as the founda-
tion for the Stoic philosophy (as did Cicero, cf. Fin. 5.16.44,
Leg. 1.22.58, and Tusc. 5.25.70).
5-6 non esset...cognoscere: non esse hoc praeceptum tributum deo. sit hoc acrioris cuiusdam animi praeceptum tributum adeosit hoc se ipsum posse cognoscere.

5-6 non esset: for the idiom with the ablative, cf. Sen. 73, elegit quantum quo se negat; though it can be found more rarely with indirect speech dependent on a substantive, cf. Flac. 65, hoc proierium Phrygum plagiis fieri solere meliorum (Dougan).

se quisque noscat: γνῶθι σεαυτόν, and cf. Iuc. 11.27, and Mayor’s n. and the thorough dissertation by Wilkins (Know Thyself in Greek and Latin Literature) which covers the varied uses of the pronoun.

non enim, credo: as above, nimirum; this particle connotes a degree of irony, just as opinor, puto, spero, obliv. neque nos corpora sumus: cf. Rep. 6.2.4, mens cuissisque est esse quique, non es figura quae digito demonstrari potest.

quasi uas est aut aliquid animi receptaculum: the idea that the body is a vessel (ἀγγεῖον) is not unplatonic, and many expressions are found in later philosophers, cf. M. Ant. 10.38, τὸ περικείµενον ἀγγεῖον καὶ τὰ ὀργάνα ταῦτα τὸ περικείµενον; and cf. 3.53 where he calls the whole body a vessel. Mayor quotes Synesius Calvitiae, 6, who termed the head a νοῦς λογικὸς. For the use of quasi to combine two words in translation, cf. above 12, 27 n.

ab animo tuo quidquid agitur, id agitur a te.: Bouhier complained that his mss. were somewhat jumbled in this passage, and it does seem like the thought runs backwards.

I would have expected the more logical ab te quidquid agitur, id agitur ab animo tuo. Notice ab and a are used to emphasize that the soul is fully equated to the person and gives to each an identical agency, further balanced by the chiasmus.

hunc igitur nosse. . .: ‘therefore, if the capacity or faculty for knowing oneself was not itself divine, then this precept discovered by some penetrating soul would not be attributed to a god.’

non esset...cognoscere: a somewhat confused passage and the mss. offer a variety of readings. Lundström tried to emend the passage, but in an unconvincing fashion. Wessenburg deleted sit...cognoscere as a gloss and has been followed by most editors including Kühner and Dougan. Though I am inclined myself toward this interpretation, I have retained the archetypal reading which was restored by Giusta (Tusculanae, p. Ix) and have decided it best to obelise. Drexler however preferred the reading found in V and prints non esset hoc praeceptum tributum deo. [Sit hoc acrioris cuiusdam animi se ipsum posse cognoscere], bracketing the final clause as a gloss. But this order does not seem to be right. Cicero is arguing that from its divine source we must understand the phrase to mean ‘to know one’s [divine] soul’: that is to say, from the simple fact that the aphorism was put in the god’s mouth shows there was either divine inspiration (in which case, it really did belong to the god), or else the soul has shown such profound intelligence as to be practically equal to god. Drexler’s order appears to undermine the stress Cicero is placing on this connection by bringing its inventor too much into the foreground, whereas what is needed is to leave deo last in the clause.

cuiusdam animi: variously assigned to the seven sages of Greece, the canon of which was generally established by Pl. Prt. Paus. 10.24.1 and Demetrius Phalereus (Stob. Flor. 3.79) follow it closely with a few substitutions of names. D. L. 1.9.35 assigns the saying to Thales; the scholiast on Pl. Cf. 5.59 specifically to Chilon, as does D. S. 10.10 though Aristotle claims it was there before his time.

praeceptum tributum deo: for the attribution of this saying to Apollo, cf. Dyck n. on Leg. 1.22.58, docuit, ut nosmet ipsos nosceremus, cuius praecepti tanta uis et tanta sententia est, ut ea non homini quoipiam, sed Delphico deo tribueretur; and also expressed in Fin. 5.16.44, alter enim nosmet ipsos nosse non possumus, quod praeceptum quia maus erat, quam ut ab homine videretur, idcirco assignatum est deo. Itab igitur nos Pythius Apollo noscere nosmet ipsos, which clarifies our mss. reading here.

deo: Wessenburg, and most editors I think are correct in reading deo in place of deos. Drexler explains that the preposition a found in some of the best mss. arose from an insertion by an early copyist who misunderstood the passage and took god to be the giver and not the recipient of the precept. I have placed a full stop after deo. Translate as, ‘The precept of that penetrating spirit, to know the soul, would not have been assigned to the mouth of God unless the soul was something divine. Let this then be what it means to be able to know oneself.’ It has been pointed out that the diuuum esset does not necessarily refer to the hunc, but could be consider a neuter adjective, in which case the actual faculty of ‘knowing thyself’ would be considered divine; the result of which would be that the soul is defined precisely by its capacity for consciousness of self. If this interpretation is true, then the following statement sit hoc...cognoscere would likely be a gloss on this rather confused statement.

nesciet...sciet: cf. 15. 35 n. ‘will the soul prove not to know that...’

illa ratio: ratioinatio, argumentatio, ‘line of reasoning’ as often; cf. Div. 171; N. D. 2.22; Fin. 1.22; Fat. 31.

in Phaedro explicata: Pl. Phdr. 245c–e.
in sexto libro de re publica: Rep. 6.25; arguments found also in Sen. 21, and N. D. 2.12.32.
XXIII.

'Quod semper mouetur, aeternum est; quod autem motum adefert aliqui quoque ipsum agitatur alicunde, quando finem habet motus, uiuendi finem habeat necesse est. solum igitur, quod se ipsum mouet, quia numquam deseritur a se, numquam ne mouerit quidem desinit; quin etiam ceteris quae mouentur hic fons, hoc principium est mouendi. principii autem nulla est origo; nam e principio oriuntur omnia, ipsum autem nulla ex re alia nascerit: nec enim esset id principium, quod gigneretur alicunde. quod si numquam oritur, ne occidit quidem unquam; nam principium extinctum nec ipsum ab alio renascetur, nec ex se alium creabit, siqeidem necesse est a principio oriri omnia. ita fit, ut motus principium ex eo sit, quod ipsum a se mouet; id autem nec nascer potest nec mori, uel consiciat omne caelem omnisque natura et consistat necesse


XXIII. §54: On the whole, Cicero renders a very close translation. Pl. Phdr. 245c–246c γιὰ τὶν ἁμαρτήμασιν ἐξ ἑνὸς ἀλλὰ καὶ ἀπόλλυσθαι εἰς ἑνὸς ἀλλὰ καὶ πᾶναν ἐξενεργητικὸς τὸ κινεῖν; ποίησις γὰρ ἀεικίνητον ἀθανάτου δὲ πεφασμένον τὸ ὑπ᾿ ἑαυτὸ κινοῦντα μορφῶν, ὑπὸ τὸ γὰρ ἀεικίνητον ἀθάνατον· τὸ δ᾿ ἀρχὴ κινήσεως ἐξ ἑνὸς ἀπὸ τοῖς ἐκεῖνης τὸ μυστήριον συμπεσον στάναι καὶ µήποτε αâθις ἔχειν ὅθεν κινηθέντα γεγείραται. ἀδιάφορον δὲ πεσάμενον τὸν ὑπ᾿ ἑαυτὸ κινοῦντα, ψυχῆς ὡσεὶς ταῖς καὶ λέγω τοῖς αὐτοῖς τις λέγων ὁικεύεται. πῶς γὰρ σόμεν, ὃς ὅσιος τὸ κινήσεως, ἄνευ, ἢ ὅτι ἐκθέτηκεν αὐτῷ εἰς αὐτόν, ἄνευ, ὃς ταῦτα ὅπως πάντας ψυχῆς, εἰ δὲ ἐκεῖνο τοῦτο ἀριθμὸν, µὴ ἀλλὰ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα ἅμα τὸ ἀριθμὸν κινοῦντα ἢ ψυχῆς, εἰς ἄνευς ἀρχής ταῖς καὶ διάθεται ψυχῆς καὶ ἀεικίνητος εἰς ἑαυτόν εἰς τὸ εἰρήνη. semper mouet : mouetur is middle and with semper is used to help translate αἰκόνισεν; but this is a form that is one of the oldest errors in the mss. of Plato for aικόνισκον, (Williams: Νόημα, 37, p. 684). LUNDSTROM: Glossema, pp. 121–130.

alicunde : = εἰς ἑνὸς in Plato. Some of the best mss. read the rarer form alicundum. In Rep. 2.27, we have agitatur alidade, which is printed by Ziegler and Zetzel, but (as Kühner remarks) they also fluctuate in those mss. and are indeed generally confused. He argued that the opposed sources of movement were (outside), and internal to the hypothesis already established. For the subjunctive, cf. 36, 87 n. ne occidi quidem : ‘neither’, ‘not either’. Madvig, in his Fin. Excurs. in, showed that nec never = ne...quidem in Cicero and that the idiom is generally avoided by the older writers. Copyists throughout the Tusc., however, have a propensity to replace nec...quidem with the simpler nec. Iordanus, on Cacc. 68, unsuccessfully tried to defend the reading nec hoc debent dicere with the majority of mss., but the Teubner has the better non hoc debent dicere. ex: the mss. omit ex, but it is read in Rep. 6.25, and in Plato where we have ξεικόνις. This is probably a case of haplography due to the similarities of ex and ex.

motus principium : ‘the origin of motion comes from that which itself is moved by itself’, i.e., initium motus. Earlier on in the passage Cicero uses the term principium to mean causa motus in the abstract sense. consiciat omne caelem omnisque natura et consistat: Plato writes ἢ πάντα ταῦτα πάντα ταῦτα τέκνας ἢ εἰς συµπεσον στάναι καὶ µήποτε αâθις ἔχειν ὅθεν κινηθέντα γεγείραται. In this version, all heaven and creation collapse first, and then come to a standstill: here, the mss. reading, without et before consistat, is more liberal in its translation but does not substantially differ. Cicero has the universe collapse, and then nature comes to a ruinous halt. Schicke inserts et and he has good mss. authority in Rep. 6.27, which reads consiciat et consistat, as does the passage quoted in Macrobius. Lambinus at least felt a change necessary by suggesting concedunt, as did Gebhard (in Vergberius) who read et consistat. The plural however is not wanted since Plato writes that it collapses into a unity. Therefore, I think Schicke was correct in restoring the reading from Rep. and have followed him against recent editors. Dougan rejects Macrobius’ witness here, though he accepts him below for qua est primo.

natura: this reading shows that the correction by Bekker in Pl. Phdr. 245e, γένεσις with the better mss. in place of γένεσις is certain (against Burnet’s reading). Some editors have wrongly read this backwards, and have altered Cicero’s natura to read terra against the mss.
est nec uim ullam nanciscatur, qua a primo impulsa mouetur. cum pateat igitur aeternum id esse, quod se ipsum moueat, quis est qui hanc naturam animis esse tributam neget? inanimum est enim omne, quod pulsu agitaturn externo; quod autem est animal, id motu cietur interiore et suo; nam haec est propri a natura animique atque uis. quae si est una ex omnibus quae se ipsa moueat, neque nata certe est et aeterna est'. licet concurrant omnes plebei phi losophi — sic enim ii, qui a Platone et Socrate et ab ea familia dissident, appellandi uidentur — non modo nihil umquam tam eleganter explicabant, sed ne hoc quidem ipsum quam subtiliter conclusum sit intellegent. sentit igitur animus se moueri; quod cum sentit, illud una sentit, se ui sua, non aliena moueri, nec accidere posse ut ipse umquam a se deserat ur. ex quo efficitur aeternitas, nisi quid habes ad haec.

Ego uero facile sim passus ne in mentem quidem mihi aliquid contra uenire; ita isti faueo...

XXIV. Quid? illa tandem num leuiora censes, quae declarante inesse in animis hominum diui na...
quae si cererem quae si cernerem quem ad modum nasci possent, etiam quem ad modum interirent uiderem. nam sanguinem, bilem, pituitam, ossa, neronus, uenas, omnem denique membrorum et totius corporis figuram uidere posse dicere unde concreta et quo modo facta sint: animum ipsum — si nihil esset in eo nisi id, ut per eum uiueremus, tam natura putarem hominis uitam sustentari quam uitis, quam arboris; haec enim dicimus uiuere. item si nihil haberet animus hominis nisi ut appeteret aut fugeret, id quoque esset eie commune cum bestiis. habet primum memoriam, et aem infinitiam erum innumerabilium. quam quidem Plato recordemin esse uol.

quae si cernerem: quae = quaedam divina. Since our soul shares similar ‘animative’ forces with plants and animals, we need to distinguish those faculties and abilities which share properties with the divine in order to prove it will be immortal.

nam sanguinem...facta sint: though the nouns are properly the subject of the indirect question, through prolepsis they have been attracted to the accusative as if they were the objects of verbs of thought or declaration, Madv. Gram. 439, obs. 1. Such attraction occurred in everyday speech where discourse can often turn away from the thought as contemplated at first. It is frequent in the comic writers, Ter. Hec. 575, ueror Pamphilum ne otros tra sequeat didius celare (where we expect ueror ne Pamphilus etc.). Ter. Ad. vii.20, illum ut uiiat optant; Ter. Eun. 610, metuo fratrem ne iitus sit; and there are many examples also in Plautus. Though rarely found in good prose authors, it is used sparingly by Cicero in his letters, cf. Fam. 8.103 and has a natural place here in a dialogue where it lends a certain beauty to this passage above what would be achieved by more formal construction.

bilem, pituitam: χολέρα, θησαυρισμὸς οὐσα φαντασιîν, ἀναιρε‹τα δὲ πᾶσα τέχνη· οἱ φύσεις χαλκουχῶς ἄνθρωπος. Translate, ‘the extension of its whole body’, i.e., the components when aggregated which then constitutes its external shape.

concreta: 18, 42 n. That which is composite and has formed a whole of parts is subject to dissolution, cf. Pl. Phd. 58c, ἄρι οὐν τῷ μῶν συντριβτέι τα καὶ συνάφτων ἂν ωδικα ψεύδημα πάλα, διαφόροντας τις βιβλισσά τις συναφὸς τάς τε τις τουχάνας τάς διαφόρας, τοὐχε τὸν μήν προσεία μή πάντως ταύτα, ἀπεικτρ τὸν ἀλὸς; and cf. Sen. 76, cum simplicex animi esset natura, neque habetur in se quiquam admissum dispar sit atque dissimile, non posse eum divid. The argument is later recalled by Lact. Inst. 7.22.9, and by Ambrose de Excessu fratris, 2.126.

animum ipsum: the lesser ms. read per animum ipsum, which led Lambinus to conjecture the animo ipso; but the si clause which follows points rather to an anacolouthon, where we understand si nihil in animo ipso esse. The accusative is retained to mirror the previous construction sanguinem unde concreta sint etc.

tam natura...quam uitis, quam arboris: cf. Am. 95, secerni autem blandus amicus a vero et internocni tam potest adhibita diligentia quom a noua fucata et simulata a sinceris atque veris. The tam...quam structure places smaller limits on the term natura by comparing the vital force of a plant with that of a man (here the vital force = φύσις, not φοίης), but with the leading nihil nisi, i think it is more natural to understand the passage as restrictive (as Heine). Translate, ‘If the soul is nothing more than that force by which we live’, then I should think that a man is kept alive by no greater force than sustains the life of a vine or tree.

natura: ablative.

uiriam: “addidi in, nam non uita sed animi uis quae uiram adferunt unde sit quieritur. aliquid excidisse ἀνακλωδο‐θη indicat” (Giusta: Testo, pp. 150-152), whose arguments for emendation I have not accepted: (i) in this passage, Cicero is no longer speaking of the uis animi as the φοίη, but states that if the soul is nothing but that through which we live, it is then too much of a plant’s (i.e., not φοίης, animum, but φύσις, animum nisi ut appeteret aut fugeret, id quoque esset ei commune cum bestiis. habet primum memoriam, et aem infinitiam erum innumerabilium. quam quidem Plato recordemin esse uol.


§57. habet primum: this looks back to the quaedam divina in 25, 61.

primum: though Cicero starts with primum, no deinde clause follows, probably owing to the length of the passage which follows, cf. 13, 30 n.

memoriam: the argument stems from Plato, but the division of mental faculties into gifts of nature and habits which have been formed becomes popular after the time of Aristotle, who separates the δοξοκόμοι ᾠτεια from the ἀναγινώσκει ᾠτεια (Arist. E. N. 1.13.20); Arist. M. M. 1.5. Compare Cicero’s De Or. 2.343; Fin. 5.36. Here, memoriam stands for ἀναγίνωσκεις or recollection of things once known before the soul enters the body. Later, in 59 he changes the meaning to μνήμη, where cf. Ac. 2.22, memoriae quidem cetae qua non modus philosophico sed omni vita usus omnique artis una maxime continet; and cf. S. E. M. 7.373, ἀναγίνωσκεις μη μνήμη, ἀναγίνωσκεις ἄνθρωπος ἂν, ἀναγίνωσκεις δὲ πάση τέχνης σύντομον γινὴ ἢ καὶ ἄδρειμα καταλήψεως.

innumerabilium: cf. Fin. 2.113, animi solum partibus, in quibus item memoria erum innumerabilium; Ac. 2.32; Epic. Gram. 1.148, μνήμης ἀπὸ μνήμων πρωτόκολλων. Plato...uitae superiores: the proof that the process of learning is recollection from pre-natal existence is set out in Pl. Men. 82, and hinted at in Sen. 21.

uolit: 18, 42 n.
uitae superioris. nam in illo libro, qui inscribitur Menon, puseccion quendam Socrates interrogat quaedam geometram de dimensione quadrati. ad ea sic ille respondet ut puer, et tamen ita faciles interrogationes sunt, ut gradatim respondens eodem perueniat, quo si geometrica didicisset.

ex quo effici voluit Socrates, ut discere nihil alium sit nisi recordari. quem locum multum etiam accuratus explicat in eo sermone, quem habuit eo ipso die, quo excessit e utia; docet enim quiemus, qui omnium rerum rudis esse videatur, bene interroganti respondentem declarare se non tum illa discere, sed reminiscendo recognoscere, nec uero fieri ullo modo posse, ut a pueris tot rerum atque tantarum insitas et quasi consignatas in animis, notiones, quas ennoias uocant, habemus, nisi animus, ante quam in corpus intruisset, in rerum cognitione uigisset. cumque

1–4. Plat. Men. 81e sqq. libere reddit Boeth. in Civ. Top. 76
7–o. cf. Boeth. in Civ. Top. 76
9–2. Pl. Ti. 27d–28a

1–4 menon | GRBPS: me non V: meh E: Meno Lamb.
2 respondet | respondit X: respondet B
3 quo si | quo si X: quasi V, Boeth. 6 respondentem | respondem RG: respondem K alio atram. n inculcato et t superficier: responden B

inscribitur: the use of the present tense indicates the wider publication of the work, i.e., whenever a copy is made, the title Meno is inscribed, cf. Ac. 2.12, librum qui Scripsit subscripsit, and Reid's n. and see Kühner on Tusc. 2.49.

Meno: the best mss. read Menon, and though copyists frequently reduce Greek names to the Latin alphabet (cf. Λευκοθέα above), Cicero only very rarely does so while retaining the Greek termination. We should therefore have expected Meno not Menon. Interestingly, we have the testimony of Prisc. G. L. 2.241, 4 de nomine, that in his fragmentary speech pro Fundacio Cicero wrote 'esse situm, quod Meno noniasset', quo si X: quasi V, Boeth. 6 respondentem | respondem RG: respondem K alio atram. n inculcato et t superficier: responden B

puseccion: in Plauto, he was a πάς τῶν ἀκολούθων, but Cicero chose to use this rare term in place puer presumably to give it an air of archaisms, or endearment which does not quite exist in the Greek. Though puseo was rare, it was used by later by Juvenal, Martial and Apuleius often in a pejorative sense.

ita faciles interrogationes: Cicero wants to say that such simple questions were designed to 'aid' the boy's memory and help him recollect; that thereby he arrives at the answer as if he had learned geometry. But by a looseness of expression, Cicero implies that the boy arrives at the answer because of the easiness of the questions, and not by recollection.

geometrica didicisset: cf. Fin. 1.20, geometrica discernere, but homina erudito in geometriaeque perfecto.

effici ut: 8, 16 n.

nisi recordari: Pl. Mep. 81, μεμαθησαται της ψυχης διανοης, αυτε καλωδια εν μινω αναμνησθηναι (δε μαθησαν καλωδιαν αναμνησθον) αλλα πραγμα αυτου αναμνησων. Pl. Phae. 249, Sent. 78.

locum: 'topic', L&S. 2a, cf. Fin. 1.26, 5.59, with Madvig's n., and see SELLARS (Stoicism, 76f); JACKSON-McCARE (Stoic Theory of Imprinted Preconceptions, pp. 725–730).

I am not convinced by FERRY (Laeliaus dans De re publica, p. 758) or DILLON (The Middle Platonists, p. 99) that Antiochus is necessarily the source upon whom Cicero was drawing (Madvig thought similarly on Fin. 5.21.59). Cicero carefully draws a distinction between the ennoias and idia (SCHMELKE: Mittleren Stoa, p. 124) and this would suggest that he is not relying on Antiochus' efforts to unify the two schools. I at first thought that we must assume that Plato himself was the source, and not that Cicero had simply stated his theories wrongly, but I found SANDBACH (Ennoia and Prolepsis in the Stoic Theory of Knowledge, p. 49) quite astutely remarked that, though Cicero is perhaps reproducing more properly Stoic ideas, he can not shake off the deeply influential Platonic metaphors in their exposition.

quasi consignatas in animis: 'as if these notions were fixed with a seal upon the soul', the term consignatas = ἐναμφισβητορικα (cf. D. L. 7.45, where Zeno famously describes the reception of images in the mind as impressions upon wax.

§§8. cumque nihil esset: Pohlenz felt that there was something missing here, but the words he supplies, though correct, amount only to a gloss upon nihil enim putat esse quod… which follow. (Previous editors wished to insert nihil corpus, which is not correct.) Wolf and Kühner have sufficiently defended the text as it stands, and there is no need to suspect a lacuna. The phrase turns on the meaning of esset, not in the vulgar sense but the Platonic
nihil esset, ut omnibus locis a Platone disseritur — nihil enim illae putat esse, quod oriatur et intereat, idque solum esse, quod semper tale sit quale est; idēav appellat ille, nos speciem — non potuit animus haec in corpore inclusus adgnoscere, cognitā attulit; ex quo tam multarum rerum cognitio nervator illi putat. VSE: putat (Academic scepticism over doctrine, in sharp contrast to the former which exists (idēa), the latter only happens (γνῶσισθα)). This is clarified by the clause that follows: esset: the imperfect is explained by the rule of sequence of tenses after potuit, i.e., ‘the soul was not able...since nothing was truly real’. Cicero could have written cuncte nihil sit...non potest animus (why the soul simply does not recall everything when it enters its crude material body, cf. Pl. T. 444-b, and δ' δη ταῦτα πάντα τὰ πάθημα νῦν κατ' ἀρχή τε ἄνω μονοφθη γνῆται τὸ πρῶτον, οἷον ἵνα ἰσού ἴσοθη θετη; also 86c-d where there is the argument that the existence of pain and pleasure in the body, as well as its natural petition of the former and avoidance of the latter, bewilders the soul and distorts its views, and even vitiate its ability to bear and see correctly, cf. Pl. Ph. 81c, 83c).

eadgnoscit: in the more usual sense of this verb, ‘to recognise’, ‘to recall’. §9. ego autem maiore etiam: the argument now departs from Plato’s concept of memory as recollection of things already known previously to the soul entering the body to the more conventional sense of simple ‘remembering’, or the capacity for memory, μνήμη, to store and recall learned information.

miae quodam modo: Reid doubted whether this phrase could stand independently for maiorem in modum; early correctors felt similarly and one Oxford ms. altered to maiorem quodam modo memoriam. But this is not what Cicero is saying. Rather, Cicero claims that he admires the faculty of memory in another, more remarkable way — certainly not that the power memory is in some fashion greater to Plato’s conception of it and so there is no need to suspect the reading, cf. De Or. 2.237, maiore quidam ui.

naturam: some editors have thought that the reading should be natam in place of naturam with a few of the lesser MSS. The sense, however, at 25, 60, quae sit illa us, et unde sit shows that there is nothing here to prevent the better supported reading of naturam which itself is commonly found to correspond with the term us.

Simoniaes: the ars memoriae was said to be founded by Simones of Ceos, the famous lyric poet who lived at Athens in the time of Hipparchus, cf. the epigram μνημονευτικα ἡ ἀσφαλε φυσ ἡ Σωματική ἐμεμπαρη μνημονευτικα, ποιη Εὐαστήριος (fr. 14 West), Callim. fr. 64, and see Blüm (Die antike mnemotechnik, pp. 41–46). The artform was supposedly completed later by Metrodorus of Scophsis, De Or. 2.360, cf. Ac. 1.2 (where it is Themistocles who has prowess of memory); Fin. 5.21; Flin. N. 7.86; Quint. Inst. 11.12; Xen. Simp. 4.62, and see Sen. 23 with Powell’s n.

Theodectes: of Phaselis of Asia Minor. He was born around 375 B.C., later became a pupil of Isocrates and Aristotles, and was known both for his tragedies and his oratory. Quint. Inst. 11.2.51 said he could repeat any number of verses which were once read to him.
legatus ad senatum est missus, Cineas, quanta nuper Charmadas, quanta, qui modo futi, Scepsius Metrodorus, quanta noster Hortensius: de communi hominum memoria loquor, et eorum maxime qui in aliquo maiore studio et arte uersantur, quorum quaanta mens sit, difficulte est existimare; ita multa meminerunt.

XXV. Quorsus igitur haec spectat oratio? quae sit illa uis et unde sit, intellegendum puto. non est certe nec cordis, nec sanguinis, nec cerebri, nec atomorum; animae sit ignis nescio, nec me pudet ut istos lateri nescire quod nesciam: illud, si ulla alia de re obscura adfirmare possem, siue anima siue ignis sit animus, eum iurarem esse diuinum. quid enim, obsecro te, e qui in aliquo maiore studio et arte uersantur, quorum quanta mens sit, difficile est existimare; ita

**Cineas**: a distinguished orator; Sen. **Contr.** 1, proem, tells us he was sent by Pyrrhus as legate to the senate of Rome and whose prodigious memory allowed him after one day to salute the entire senate and most of the people by name, Plin. **H. N.** 7.24, **De Or.** 2.360

**Charmadas**: an Academic philosopher and pupil of Carneades for several years in Athens around 140 B.C. He left to Asia where he prospered, but later returned to Athens and set up his own school. **De Or.** 1.45 says he was in the Academy with Clitomachus around 110 B.C.

**Met rodor us**: of Scepsis in Troas, another pupil of Carneades. He is often mentioned as a mnemotechnic philosopher, **De Or.** 2.360, *diuina prope memoria*, and flourished later than Charmadas, hence the use of modo. He is called Scepsius to distinguish him from the Epicurean philosopher from Lampascus of the same name who is mentioned in *Tusc.* 2.3.8.

**Hortensius**: *Brut.* 301, *memoria tanta, quantam in nullo cognoesse me arbitrator, ut quae secum commentatus esset, ea scripto verbo eisdem eisdem redderet, quibus cogituissest;* for other testimony to his remarkable powers of memory, Sen. **Contr.** 1. pr. 19, **Quint. Inst.** 10.6.4; 11.2.24; **De Or.** 3.230.

**XXV. § 60. quorsus**: Ciceroc preferre quorsus, but at times writes quorum. He wavers similarly between rursus and rursum; cf. *Leg.* 1.24, *sed quosua haec pertinent.*

**haec**: i.e., Cicero asks rhetorically what the conclusion is which all this seems to be aimed at, cf. *Fin.* 1.6.19, *nec id cuius causa haec ficerat assecius est.*

**sit. . . sit**: for the repetition of sit, cf. *Fin.* 4.29, *sint illa necne sint, N. D. 3.17.* Bouhier suggested we read aut unde sit, sic intellegendum puto, and it does feel that we need some form of adverb with intellegendum.

**quae sit illa uis**: by this phrase, Cicero means to encompass the whole force and power of the soul, not just its memory.

**intellegendum puto**: i.e., at least only from what has been said so far.

**non est certe nec. . . nec**: for the structure of these negatives, see Madv. **Gram.** 460, obs. 2.

**ignisne**: Kühner defended the mss. reading of ignisne, asserting that here, as below with siue anima, there is no need to understand it interrogatively, but this hardly seems good Latin. LUNDSTRÖM (**Textkritik**, p. 32) approved of the mss., and wished therefore to read *num animae* with Schiche. Giusta (*Testo*, p. 153), however, rightly points out that this is a formulation never found in Cicero. Seyffert, whom Dogan follows, reads *ignisne* which has only one tenuous parallel at *Fam.* 2.5.2, *quem illum nescio gratulernne tibi at timeam* but is nevertheless intelligible.

**nec me pudet. . . fateri nescire**: with *nescire*, supply *me*. Though seldom in Cicero, pronouns as subject acc. are sometimes omitted before an infinitive when it has already been used with the principal verb which is of speaking or thinking, cf. Madv. **Gram.** 401, K.–S. 1.128, 4; *N. D.* 1.109, *pudet me dicere non intelligere, si nos ipsi intelligeretis.* Reid lists many others in his n. on *Fin.* 2.49. It regularly happens in the dramatists where both subject and object are to be left to the mind of the reader or hearer.

**ut istos**: *de dogmatistis, cf. Ac. 2.8, eos qui se scire arbitrantur, where scire means to express absolute knowledge (similar to *adfirmare* below). Cicero goes on to explain that in the very spirit of the New Academy, nec ut omini, qua praescripta a quibusdam et quasi imperata sint, defendamus necessitas ulle cognim, Tusc. 2.2.*

**quod nesciam**: a class-subjective, *I happily admit ignorance of anything about which I am ignorant*, Madv. **Gram.** 364, and Reid’s n. *Ac.* 2.25.81.

**illud, si ulla alia de re**: illud creates an acclamoutchon and is pleonastic. It points with some added emphasis forward to *iurarem*, rather than back to *adfirmare*. Translate, *‘And I would do it; if I could affirm it, I would swear the soul divine.’*  

**adfirmare**: i.e., to speak with certainty, 9, 17 above.

**possem**: Most editors retain the mss. reading of *possem*. Most recently Giusta has decided to follow Seyffert and so altered to *possum* but I do not think with good reason. Cicero would not say here that he is indeed able to assert positively that the soul is divine; on the contrary, as a New Academic, he would swear it something divine if his philosophical tenents allowed him to do so (but they do not). The parallels often cited in their defence cf. *Ac.* 2.3.8, *nos probabilia multa habemus quae adfirmare vix possamus*, and *Tusc.* 2.2.5, *nos qui sequimur probabilia nec ultra quam id quod veri similc occurreroprogvy possamus* are categorial assertions and therefore parallel to our passage here. The subj. mss. *posse* is therefore correct.

**siue anima siue ignis sit**: subj. as depending on the oratio obliqua. As such we could have expected the imperfect esset through the rules of attraction, but these rules have many exceptions, cf. *Fin.* 1.25, *si concederetur, etiam si ad corpus nihil referatur*, and K.–S. 2.193 where there are listed many examples of a primary sequence depending on a condition contrary to fact. These irregularities are excusable in conversational style.

**eum iurarem esse diuinum**: *‘quae sit us memoriae hoc loco quaeritur,’* and so Giusta wished to alter to *eum*. But he is led astray: firstly, the gender is naturally attracted to *animum*, and secondly that the *uis animi* is naturally part of *animum* makes his emendation moot.

**quid enim, obsecro te**: *quid enim* often introduces a question with ironic force, as *quid ergo* and *quid ergo.*

**e terrane**: though no mss. have the preposition, I think that the more likely reading is *e terrane*, if we compare 25, 62 ex hucine terrane. It is very probable that *he has fallen out after obsecro te* and I have restored it following an early edition.
ines placitum, pp. 72 of Mind, pp. 156–157. Regarding this was more sophisticated, and was more accurately in such a brief manner. Translate, ‘if you do not see it is’. The repetition of uides creates a tone of incredulity. capacitatem: this term signifies the physical size of its space to hold things and is not to be confused with the metaphorical use of it to express ability. absursum id quidem: cf. 8, 17 n. superbum id quidem est; N. D. 2.133, at id quidem absursum est. talis animi figura: i.e., the physical composition and shape of the soul. See above, 23, 65 figuram noscamus and n. inprimi quasi ceram animum: this instead of the expected in animo uestigia impressa. In this case, inprimi with the accusative is similar to the double construction of verbs adspere, inscribi, though it is more regular with the dative. For the expression, Moser cites Fam. 5.20, quae cum viderem tot vestigis impressa etc.

In such a description, the Stoics Cleanthes and Zeno took a more literal view and thought that such impressions can exist in the soul (not how many), then asks on the other hand, if they could exist, what could be so big as to hold as many impressions as there are things and words?

magnitudo: = spatium et amplitudo, referring to its size or capacity. effingere: Davies originally suspected this verb because he felt that the capacity itself did not have the ability to form or fashion the memories, but Wolf showed that effingere really means efficere continere, cf. Div. 2.94, formas et mores effigere a parentibus liberos; Hand: Tursellinus, vol. 1, p. 30, and add perhaps Tim. 34, impressa ab illis quae initilabatur effingent. This presents a more vivid and active role for the mind in holding the impressions it receives in relief rather than only passively being impressed. 62. quid? illa uis?: 24, 57 n. et primum. Having finished with memory, Cicero now turns to the other powers of the animus.

quae uestigia: Giusta wished to insert <tot> here and the best parallel for it (which Giusta does not himself notice) is the passage from Fam. cited above. However, I think porro is against this. Cicero first questions whether any such impressions can exist in the soul (not how many), then asks on the other hand, if they could exist, what could be so big as to hold as many impressions as there are things and words?

aut qui primus...aut qui: the particle aut, very much like the Greek ἢ is often placed to recall what has preceded. In each case of aut qui which follows, we are to remember animus ex hac tibi terrena natura concreta usitetur. quod summae sapientiae Pythagorae uisum est: according to Iamb. VP. 56, and 83, it was not the greatest wisdom but the second greatest wisdom, τὸ σοφῶτατον ἄρθρον: δεύτερον δὲ, τὸ τόσον πρέμπα τὰ οὐσίατα τῆς τριβῆς; and Pythagoras argued that names of things came about by θέαν, that is arbitrary choice. However, Gell. N. A. 10.4 quotes the learned Pythagorean P. Nigidius Figulus, a contemporary of Cicero’s, who maintained the contrary view, nomina verbaque non positu fortuito, sed quaedam vi et ratione naturae facta esse; quae enim enim solutum apud philosophos, φῶς τὰ οὐσίατα sint e ἴδεν.
Pythagoreans uisum est, omnibus rebus imposuit nomina? aut qui dissipatos homines congregauit et ad societatem uitae conuocauit, aut qui sonos uocis, qui infiniti uidebantur, paucis litterarum notis terminauit, aut qui errantium stellarum cursus, praepressiones, institiones notauit? omnes magni, etiam superiores, qui fruges, qui uestitum, qui tecta, qui cultum uitae, qui praesidia contra feras inuenerunt, a quibus mansuefacti et exculti a necessariss artificis ad elegantiora defluximus.

nam et auribus oblectatio magna parte est inuenta et temperata uarietate et natura sonorum, et astra suspensus cum ea quae sunt infixa certis locis, tum illa non re sed uocabulo erantia, quorum conversiones omnisque motus qui animo uidit, is docuit similem animum suum eius.

Varr. L. L. 6, solitium quod so die sistere videbatur, the 'standing still of the sun'. Cicero here means that certain stars also 'come to a standstill', or at least appear to do so from our perspective.

superiores: 'men who existed in even earlier times'.

defluximus: 'flowed downward from the necessary to the more elegant and refined arts in life'. The prefix de- often conveys movement from the better to the worse, cf. Am. 100, and Lucretius who finds that we became worse off as we progress. Cicero, however, presents a positive view of the advance of society and the term he uses describes very nicely the passing of knowledge down to descendents. He uses the same form to express the power of the mental faculties as 'flowing down from the stars above' in N. D. 2.79, cf. Rep. 6.15.

inuentae et temperata uarietate et naturae: arranged chastically, inuentae natura, temperata uarietate, cf. 3, 5, and 14.

51. non re sed uocabulo erantia: the stars (πλανήται) of course did strictly wander off their regular course, but were only poetically said to do so, cf. N. D. 2.51, fals o uocantur errantes, Div. 2.96, seder quae uocant errantia; Rep. 1.22, stellarum quae errantes et quasi uagae nominantur, Pl. Lg. 7.281b–282a, άστρα μετά τῶν, επουνάμωται πλανήται αὐτά...οὐ γάρ ᾧτο τοῖς...; Pl. Ti. 36c, άστρα ἐπικλητ' ἔχουσα πλανήτη; Maxt. Somp. Scip. 1.14.25, υμηττιαίum stellarum error legittimas.

qui animo: the mos reading animus, as every editor observes, cannot be right with animum so closely following. A few have entirely ejected the word as introduced by a glossator, or perhaps a simple mistake of animo for anima', a usual ligature for animus. The phrase animo uaderis is common enough for 'comprehend' (Ac. 2.125, Div. 2.91).

Elsewhere one could (like Moser) object to its rather otiose use, but the parallel use of the word here accentuates the identity of the soul and the cosmic soul. Since the divine world soul was the force which ordered the astronomical motions, then the human soul which could understand them could be said to be involved in the work of the deity.
esse, qui ea fabricatus esset in caelo. nam cum Archimedes lunae, solis, quinque errantium motus in sphæram inligauit, effect idem quod ille, qui in Timaeo mundum aedificauit, Platonis deus, ut tarditate et cerelitate dissimillimos motus una regeret conversio. quod si in hoc mundo fieri sine deo non potest, ne in sphæra quidem eosdem motus Archimedes sine diuino ingenio potuisset imitari.

XXVI. Mihi uero ne haec quidem notiora et inlustriora carere ui diuina uidentur, ut ego aut poetae graum plenumque carmen sine caelesti aliquo mentis instictu putem fundere, aut eloquentiam sine maior quidem ut fluere abundantem sonantibus uerbis uberibusque sententiis. quid est enim memoria rerum? quid porro inuentio? profecto id, quod ne in deo quidem quicquam maius intellegi huic est, quam ne tam u egeta mens.

philosophia uero, omnium mater artium, quid est aliud nisi, ut Plato, donum, ut ego, inuentum

In the sphere of the heavens, as in our hands, as is shown in the Timaeo, the master of the gods created the world, as Platonis Deus, ut

aurum plenus loquitur, ut deum in sphaera eosdem quidem motus Archimedes non poenitentia potuisset.

inhortatur: 'whence' cum-clauses with the indicative virtually unite the two actions, 'by the act of doing this, this is done', cf. Cat. 1.8, cum quiescent, probant. The use of this grammar again reinforces by its simultaneity the identity of the soul, which is capable of reproducing with its reason the movements of the heaven, with the creator of those heavens.

quae de mihi diuina mihi uidentur, ut ego aut poetae graum plenumque carmen sine caelesti aliquo mentis instictu putem fundere, aut eloquentiam sine maior quidem ut fluere abundantem sonantibus uerbis uberibusque sententiis.

haec: oratory, poetry.

inlustriora: not 'more famous' (Dougan), but 'fresh', 'brighter', 'current, and in our hands', cf. De Or. 3.150, where the term is opposed to obsoleta.

poetae fundere: the theme that a poet is the mouth-piece of divine inspiration is developed at length by Pl. Ion. 553e–534e (after the famous simile of the ring magnets), ἡ Μοῖσαι άνθρώπων μὲν ποιεῖ αυτή, διὰ δὲ τῶν άνθρώπων τῶν ἄλλων ἐνθουσιασμῶν ὄρμαθα ἐξαρτᾶται, πάντες γὰρ τὰ τῶν άνθρώπων ποιμαίναι τὰ ἀγάθα ὧν ἐκ τῆς σφαερᾶς ἀνδρῶν τῶν κατακεχαμένα πάσα τάθα τὰ κάλλα μέγαρα ποίματα κλῆσι, cf. Pl. Ap. 226c–d, where Socrates says that poets forge their poems by nature and enthusiasm, not by any wisdom; Pl. Phdr. 245a, where he speaks of the 'madden and raving soul of the poet'; Pl. Lg. 682a, and Pl. Mem. 99e–c. Aristotle seems to admit the theory in part at Arist. Po. 17. 1453a22, διὸ εὐφορία έπειτ' έπειτ' έπειτ' έπειτ' Lucknow: ':et de iuvantibus et de mutatis iuvantiis, ut Arist. 18, excidit et quasi divino quodam spiritu inflari (where Reid quotes Ov. Fast. 6.5, deus in nobis, agitante calecimiu illo).


instinctu: cf. Div. 1.12, instictu divinique additu; Div. 1.66, οὗ corpore animus abstratus diuino instictu concluder: it is of course not surprising to see a fair amount of correlation between these passages and those where Cicero considers divination.

fundere: commonly used of verbs, below 44, 106 bonus septenario fundat ad librum.

maior quadam ui: cf. above 17, 27 n.

ut Plato: ait is often omitted.

domum...deorum: cf. Pl. Ti. 472c–b, τὸ θεόν γένει διαφανές ἐν θείοις, and Lact. Inst. 3.14.7. Cicero had previously translated this philosophiam adepto sumus, quod bonus nullum oblivitus nullum praestansius necque datum est mortalium generi deorum concessus atque munere noque dabitur; see also Leg. 1.18; Am. 57; Sen. 40. Off. 2.5; Fam. 15.4.16.

ius hominum: moral law that arises from nature (so Pl. Rep. 4.441c) and opposed to the laws of society, ius civile.

eademque: 'que here = denique, and in short', cf. below 34, 82, 43, 104, 49, 118.

ab animo tamquam ab oculis: i.e., 'the mind's eye'.

supera, infera, prima, ultima, media: asyneton is common in comparisons of classes of objects, Madv. Gram. 434.

ne in deo quidem: cf. 23, 54 n. ne. The insertion of quidem found in V, though absent from most mss., is necessary here, and likely to fall out before quicquam.
diuina mallem ad nos: all editors quote Longin. 19 who

Maenades: ut Hēry, daughter of Zeus and Hera, who was

Ciceronis: XXVII
XXVII. ‘Animorum nulla in terris origo inueniri potest; nihil enim est in animis mixtum atque concretum aut quod ex terra natum atque factum esse uideatur, nihil nee aut umidum quidem aut flabile aut igneum. his enim in naturis nihil inest, quod uium memoriae, mentis, cogitationis habeat, quod et praeterita teneat et futura prouideat et complecti possit praesentia. quae sola diuina sunt nec inueniatur umquam unde ad hominem uenire possint nisi a deo. singularis est igitur quaedam natura atque vis animi seiuncta ab his usitatis notisque naturis. ita, quidquid diuina sunt nec inuenietur umquam unde ad hominem uenire possint nisi a deo. singularis est


ing perhaps arose from locum → loc to → hoc. He compares Lec. 1, 27, hanc locum satis in eis libr is quos legistis expressit Scipio, and Off. 2, 74 (I add Off. 1, 160). The difficulty with Giusta’s emendation is that here locus = sedes rei (‘the essential point’), which feels redundant after hac sententiam secut. I find a very close parallel at Rep. 1, 65, tum fit illud quod apud Platonem est luculentum dictum, si modo id expresserine Latine potuerro, which defends both idiom and the singular hoc. Pohlenz and Lundström (Glottom, pp. 109–113) defended the reading of the mss, and Nisbet (CR, 16, p. 98) points out the it gives a superior clausula.

XXVII. § 66 animorum nulla in terris... Cic. Consol. fr. 21 (= 10 Muller).

nihil enim est: for the position of enim, see K–S. 2, 132 ff, and also Watt (Enim Tullianum, p. 120) for the usual word order. In Sen. 28 we have quid enim est, cf. Anti- barbar. 520, Hand. Tursellinus, vol. I, p. 579, and Madvig on Fin. 1, 13–43, and below 6, 11; 36; 37; 39, 94 with the best mss.

flabile: = spirabile, cf. 18, 42 n.

naturis: cf. 19, 43. Here natura is equivalent to elementa. memoriae, mentis, cogitationis: ‘memory, mental acuity, imagination’, cf. 22, 50.

qua sola diuina sunt: to me the clause has the appearance of a marginal comment. If it is genuine, it shows want of careful expression and so if we retain it, we should probably understand it best by quae sola together, ‘which things, and no others, are divine’ (so Reid). Nissen does not seem right to take sola diuina, i.e., quae nonnisi deorum diuina sunt, cf. Tusc. 5,45; ex bonis quo sola honesta sunt. singularis quaedam: for quaedam adding a sense of vagueness, cf. 12, 27 n.

natura atque uis: cf. 23, 54 propria natura atque vis. Here, natura = oœa, almost equivalent to στοιχεῖα or ὁρίον, as in N. D. 2, 84, naturis hic ex quaibus omnia constant, where cf. N. D. 1, 20; 2, 144; 3, 34; Ac. 1, 39.

usitatis notisque naturis: the four elements which were generally known.

quod sentit, sapit, uiuit, uiget: ‘who feels, has wisdom, lives and grows’. The two verbs uiueres and uigere are often joined together as an alliterative pair, the former with the meaning of ‘having life’, the second of ‘growing out’, ‘thriving’ commonly with plants, cf. N. D. 2, 83, a terra stirpis continentur arte naturae uiuent et uigent; Div. 1, 33, uiget autem et uiuit animus; Sen. Q. N. 6, 16, 1, illo spiritu, dico, uiuili et ugeto et alente omnia et see Döderlein: Lat. Syn. et Etym. p. 527.

qui intellegitur a nobis: i.e., comprehended intellectually. The passage is quite Platonic.

§ 67. ubi uiget... a few editors had given this question to the interlocutor, but the question is rhetorical and Cicero is anticipating possible objections.

potens: = num potes, cf. Sen. 56, poteratne tantus animus non efficere uicandum senectatem?

uilem: the imperfect uilem (instead of the present ule- lim) in such conditional statements implies that he cannot, in fact, have all that he would wish, cf. above 11, 23 cuperem uideuim, si posset.

se ipsum ipse: this is the reading of the best mss. Giusta wished to move ipsum forward to se uideuim, but I think that the unusual expression se ipsum ipse emphasises the proposition that, though the soul has such broad powers, nevertheless for all its strengths, it is impossible that it should ever see itself.

quamquam fortasse id: sc. uidet. The direction of the argument seems inconclusive and so Cicero drops the line of reasoning with relinquamus. For the form, cf. Off. 3, 39, negant id fieri poss. quamquam potest id quodem; sed quaero...

motum: expresses general ‘movement’, while celeri- atem expresses its velocity, cf. Lucr. 3, 184, octis ergo animus quam res se perciet uilla.

diuina: cf. 17, 41.

qua facie quidem sit... cf. N. D. 1, 32, Socratem dis- patuam formam dei quaerer non oportere, and with the thought, cf. Philomen, fr. 166 (Kock), οἱ των ὁθονίων ὁθονίων ὁθονίων ὁθονίων.

quidem: for the peculiar adversative force of this particle, cf. 41, 119 dii immortalis scint; hominem quidem scire arbitr at neminem.
XXVIII. | Vt cum uidemus speciem primum canidremque caeli, dein conversionis celeritatem tantam quantam cogitate non possumus, tum uicissituidines dierum ac noctium commutatio
|isque temporum quadrupertitas ad maturitatem frugum et ad temperationem corporum aptas eorumque omnium moderatorem et ducem solem, lunamque adcertione et deminutione luminis quasi fastorum notantem et significantem dies, tum in eodem orbe in duodecim partes distribuo, quinque stellas ferri eosdem cursus constantissime seruantis dispersibus inter se motibus, nocturnamque caeli formam undique sideribus ornatum, tum globum terrae eminentem et mari, fixum in medio mundi uniueris loco, duabus oris distantibus habitabilem et cultum, quaram altera, quam nos incolumis,
Sub axe posita ad stellas septem, unde hortifer, Aquilonis stridor gellido molitir niues, altera australis, ignota nobis, quam uocant Graeci attubationes)/ceteras partis incultas, quod aut frigore rigeant aut urantur calore; hic autem, ubi habitamus, non interrimitit suo tempore,

10-11. | Non. 346, 20-21


XXVIII. §88: | In order to persuade us of the divinity of the soul, Cicero estols the splendour of the universe and raises the tone of his language to match the lofty topic. The argument is ‘just as we behold the beauty of the universe
|huc igitur. The command of language is indeed impressive.

candremque caeli: ] cf. N. D. 2.4, aspice hoc sublime can-
dens quem invocant omnes Iouem (Cicero quoting Ennius

quasi fastorum notantem et significantem dies, tum in eodem orbe in duodecim partes distribuo, quinque stellas ferri eosdem cursus constantissime seruantis dispersibus inter se motibus, nocturnamque caeli formam undique sideribus ornatum, tum globum terrae eminentem e mari, fixum in medio mundi uniueris loco, duabus oris distantibus habitabilem et cultum, quaram altera, quam nos incolumis,

Sub axe posita ad stellas septem, unde hortifer, Aquilonis stridor gellido molitir niues, altera australis, ignota nobis, quam uocant Graeci attubationes)/ceteras partis incultas, quod aut frigore rigeant aut urantur calore; hic autem, ubi habitamus, non interrimitit suo tempore,
Caelum nitescere, árbores frondescere, Vítés laetificae páminis pubescere, Rámi bacarum ubértate incurrúscere, Segétés largiri frúges, florecr ómnia, Fontés scatere, herbis prátta conuestriér, tum multitúdinem pecudum partim ad uescendum, partim ad cultus agrorum, partim ad uhen- dum, partim ad corpora uестienda, hominemque ipsi quasi contemplatorem caeli ac deorum cultorem atque hominis utilitati agros omnis et maria parentia — haec igitur et alia innumerabila cum cernimus, possumusne dubitare quin iis præsit alicuius uel effector, si hac nata sunt, ut 1-5. cf. De Or. 1.3.14 3. Non. 122.18 9. Pl. Ti. 28b

3 incurrúscere] incurrúscere K: incurrúscere Nonius. eorum Bouhier: terrarum Bentley: argorumque Klotz: caelum nitescere...: iambic trimeter, but the author is unknown. Hermann conjectured that they were possibly from Ennius' Euenenides, but they do not closely resemble A. Æs. 94ff, and Jocelyn (Tragedies of Ennius, p. 285) is doubtful of their attribution. Beier thinks they may come from Accius' Philoctetes. For the language, cf. Lucr. 1.11, placatamque nitet diffuso lumine caelum, nitescere, frondescere, ...: older Latin authors had a peculiar fondness for such alliteration which was often used for poetic effect, cf. 35, 85 ui uiam évitari et 44, 105 saepe spargere labo, sancte et sanctumgine. Even Cicero did not despise its use in prose.

uites laetificae: = uites laetae, cf. Lucr. 2.1157, uneta laeta. The adjective fucis gives it archaic sound and was later dropped in favour of the simpler forms; cf. Div. 1.13, tristíficus; Tusc. 2.22, rastíficus; De Or. 3.1577, largíficus. pubescere: 'to put forth young shoots', cf. Orv. Tr. 3.127, prætac uabes uanturar florum colore. bacarum: the term bacuæ is used often of any sort of fruit produced by trees.

scatere: in Classical latin scatere is in the second conjugation, but here it is short so that the second foot of the line is an anapnest, scatér' hér—, cf. Lucr. 5.597. Many of these kinds of verbs were in the third conjugation among the old writers.

contuestirer: for the form, see 44, 105 n. on raptarir. pecudum ad uescendum...: cf. N. D. 2.37, aliorum causa omnia genera, cf. Xen. Mem. 3.4.10, Arist. Pol. 1.8, 1255b, 15-17, οὐγάνα τά τε τεύχα τάς ζώνς οὐκεκάνει ἥνα και τάλλα κύρια τῶν δεσμών κάρφων, Fin. 2.40, ad arandum brom, adnál- agandum canem (of Aristotle's position); but more prominently, this theory was held by the Stoics who viewed natura as a thing in which all parts were adapted with an end in mind, cf. N. D. 2.82-83, and Porph. De Abst. 3.20, τα εὐρότπτων πεπιθανή ἢ, ὡς ἰδία ἀναίων και αὐλλῶν ὀ τείχα κάρφων ἐποιήσανε, ἡμῶν δὲ τάς ζώνς, συμπληρομένη μὲν ἄντονως καὶ συνθετικῶς ἄνευς. If, therefore, all things in nature are so designed, then there must be government in the world for the Stoics' strongest arguments for the existence of god. Generally, plants existed to support animals, and animals existed to support man, SVF. 2.1152-1167, Nem. DeNat. Hist. 2.12–28, N. D. 2.37, Off. 1.22, placent Stoics, quae in terris gigantur, ad usum hominum omnium creanti; and further that the world was created for the benefit of man, Fin. 3.67, N. D. 2.133. contemplatorem caeli: cf. N. D. 2.140, deorum cog- nitionem capere, and 2.153 where one of the convincing arguments for the existence of beings superior to man was the regularity of the heavenly bodies; also Fin. 4.11, Rep. 3.3, and 6.15, Sen. 77, cælestium ordinem contemplantes; Leg. 1.26. The idea that the contemplation of heaven is the whole end of mankind recurs frequently, and is perhaps found earliest in Anaxagoras, Arist. E. E. 1216a (cf. D. L. 1.3.10), ἀποκαίρισαν πρὸς τινα...δεικνυόμενα τίνος έννοι' ας το το ἱεροτροπία μιταν η τε μιή καλυθείνη, 'τοι', φύκαν, 'θεωρήσαν τα υφάσμα και τα πικ τα τον θεον κόσμον τάξιν', similarly Posidonius, Clem. Al. Strom. 2.21.129 (= Ed.–Kidd. 186) who defended the θέλο aix ης θεωρήσαν τη των θεων άλθεως και τάξιν, on which see Nox (Posidonius, p. 73); also Arist. De Phil. fr. 10, Sen. Ep. 65.16; Sen. Cons. Marc. 18. If man had reason and could therefore contemplate the heavens, he was therefore the only religious an- imal, Leg. 1.24, nullum est animal præter hominem quod habeat notitiam aliquam dei; Lact. Inst. 2.3.14, 2.9.26; and Dyck's n. on Off. 1.59.

Seyffert recalled that numerous philosophers, including Posidonius (D. L. 7.140, Dox. Grec. 466, 18) thought that both the stars were and indeed heaven itself was a god; but this does not seem to be what Cicero is implying here. Rather, he is tracing out the origin of religious sentiment from the contemplation of nature to the worship of the gods. The line of argument backwards from effects to causes is similar to Cicero's earlier arguments about the origin of funerary practices.

decorum cultorem: GIUSTA (Testo, pp. 161-162) tried to defend his correction to duarum orarum cultorem but I am not convinced. He misunderstands the passage at N. D. 2.99, homines quasi cultores terrae constituti. Here, terrae is not genitive but dative and means 'men were placed upon the earth as if they were its caretakers', for certainly the passage does not mean that men were set upon the earth to worship it, cf. Agr. 2.7.17, legibus agrarìs curatores constituti et Sen. 77, qui terras contubernium, where it means 'to watch over', 'guard'. Additionally (as shown in the note above) the world was for man's benefit, as this is again stressed here with hominis utilitati parentia. Giusta's change reverses the argument of the passage and implies that man existed for the sake of plants. Surely not: he is placed on the earth to remove cruelty and wildness (i.e., to bring justice) and any cultivation of argiculture is for his own sake or that of his fellow man, not for the sake of the plants he tends. Further, the aci firma joins both contemplator caeli with cultor; if Cicero wrote duarum orarum, he would have written instead c. caeli et d. cultorem atque etc. As Cicero has already argued for the divinity of the soul, then it seems perfectly reasonable that the purpose of man on the earth is to contemplate the gods. Therefore, I retain decorum cultorem.

§70. haec igitur: this phrase ties the thread of the argu- ment together.

possusmusne dubitare: instead of non possusmus dubitare, we have this construction on account of the anacolouthon which follows such a lengthy exposition of the heavens. ut Platonii uideretur: cf. Ac. 2.118, Plato ex materia in se omnia recipienda mundum factum esse consei a deo sempiternum, Pl. Ti. 31-33 and see Brodée/Kenny (The Creation of the World).
Platonii uidetur, uel, si semper fuerunt, ut Aristoteli placet, moderator tanti operis et munerus? sic mentem hominis, quamuis eam non uideas, ut deum non uideas, tamen, ut deum adgnoscis ex operibus eius, sic ex memoria rerum et inuentione et celeritate motus omniique pulchritudine uirtutis usit ut diuinam mentis agnoscis.

XXIX. In quo igitur loco est? — credo equidem in capite, et cur cremad adferre posseu. sed alias, ubi sit animus; certe quidem in te est. quae est eius natura? proppria, puto, et sua. sed fac igneam, fac spirabilem: nihil ad id de quo agimus. illud modo uideto, ut deum noris, etis eius igneres et locum et faciem, sic animum tibi tuum notum esse oportere, etiamsi igniores et locum et formam. in animi autem cognitione dubitare non possumus, nisi plane in physicis plumbei sumus, quin nihil sit animis admixtum, nihil copulatum, nihil coagmentatum, nihil duplex: quod cum ita sit, certe nec secerni, nec diuidi, nec disceri, nec distrahi potest, ne interire quidem igitur. est enim interitus quasi discessus et secretio ac diremptus earum partium, quae ante interitum uctione aliqua tenebantur. his et talibus rationibus adductus

ut Aristoteli: cf. Arist. Pol. 1.10, δῆλον γάρ ὅτι καὶ εἷς ἄλλων τῶν στοιχείων συσσώρων οὐδὲ τούτων τάξις γέγενται καὶ σύστασις, ἀλλ’ ἡ αὐτή, ἄλλως τε καὶ κατὰ τὸν τότον τὸν λόγον ἐφημοσύνης, et Arist. Cael. 2.1. muneris: ‘the governor of such a great work and building’, cf. N. D. 2.90, moderatorem tanti operis tantique muneris, as often said of a public structure, cf. Vell. Pat. 2.48, and 2.130 where Pompeii munus means his theatre. munus was originally a spectacle, usually gladiatorial, put on by the aediles during festival days and later came to be associated with the buildings. In this metaphor god is made to be the aedile our universal spectacle. In N. D. 1.22, the stars of heaven are equated to the lights which the aediles hung on public buildings and temples during the celebrations, and cf. Pl. Ti. 370c, τῶν ἄθαντές θεών γεγονός ἄγαλμα.

eam: the idiom with eam is Ciceronian and there is no need, with Giusta, to alter to ita.

XXIX. in capite: cf. 10, 20 n. for the Stoic views of this position, and D. L. 7.159. adferre: the verb is used absolutely, sc. rationem adferre, or multa adferre, cf. Fin. 5.27. The best parallel is cited by Dougan, Lucr. 3.354, quid sit enim corpus sentire quis adferet

sed alias, ubi sit animus: sc. dicam, exponam, etc. natura: ‘substrance’, cf. 19, 43 n. and 25, 61 n.

propria, sua: propria means that the soul’s nature is unique to it and has nothing in common with other objects, whereas by sua Cicero means that its nature is appropriate to the function or role of the soul as an entity.

spirabilem: cf. 17, 40 n.

nihil ad id de quo agimus: cf. D. L. 2.21, τῆς φανερῆς θεωρίαν χειρὶν εἶναι πρὸς ζῆσιν, where the theoretical does not seem to impair the ethical reasonings at hand, and cf. 2.45, similarly of Arist Chius. Grammatically, the ellipse of a verb like scire, sc. atnum, sc. quidquid, is common enough, cf. A. 1.15, nihil tamen ad bene vivendum.

§51. plumbii sumus: ‘unless we are quite dull’. The metaphor of the lead dagger to mean a blunt dull implement is used by Cicero when he was fooled by the acquittal of Clodius, Att. 1.16.2, cum illum plumbum gladio iugulatum in iatum decert, i.e., Clodius was in such a weak position that he could have had his neck slit with a butterknife. It is also used to describe a weak argument, plumbum pugionem. For the metaphorical use of it to mean ‘dullard’, cf. Ter. Heaut. 877, quae sunt dicta in stulto, caudex stipes anina’ plumbeus. It seems to be a pun, meaning both ‘unless we are foolish in the natural sciences’, and ‘unless we are made up of heavy material’. nihil admixtum...concretum: ‘that which has nothing added or united with it’. nihil copulatum: ‘nothing connected’. Both these phrases look toward the duplex. Each of the words corresponds to one of secerini, diuidi, disceri, distrahi which follow; cf. Sen. 72, adem que coagentavit, natura dissolvit.

animis: Ernesti wished to insert in=c, based on the similar passage at Sen. 78, neque haberet [i.e., animus] in se quidam admixtum dispersu atque dissolutum, but the idiom here does not require it.


ne interire quidem igitur: for the reading and final position of igitur, cf. 26, 65 n. and N. D. 3.44, ne Orcus quidem igitur, which confirms Madvig’s conjecture.

diremptum: as can join synonyms, often with the effect of emphasis or elaboration, ‘and even’. The hendiadys means ‘its destruction is a separation, and a tearing asunder’. uctione: Wilkin’s on De Or. 3.191, uctioni verborum asserts that the word is very rare, occurring there and here in the Tusc. Laminibus and Madvig would read coniuncte.

nec patronum: i.e., Lyssias. According to the popular account, Lyssias wrote a defence speech for Socrates but he refused to use it as unmanly, D. L. 2.40, De Or. 1.231, Quint. Inst. 2.15.80, Val. Max. 6.4.2, Stob. Flor. 7.56. There is nothing inherently improbable about this story since we know that Cephæus and his son Lyssias were close friends with Socrates; but we have some evidence that there was an epideictic speech written by the sophist Polyocrates against Socrates after his death, and that Lyssias wrote his defence of the philosopher in response to this speech, Schol. ad Aristid. 113.16, ὥθε τῷ Σωκράτῃ πρὸς τοὺς νέους ἐκ τῶν θεωροῦται διδασκάλων...ὡς Πολυκράτης εἰς τὸν κατά λόγον φοινικὸν καὶ λέγει τῇ πρὸς Πολυκράτην ὑπὲρ αὐτοῦ. It is possible that this latter story gave rise to the former.

adhuiquitque: ‘but he displayed’, as the particle -que often has an adversative force after a negative, Madv. Gram. 433, obs. 2 and above cf. 2.4 n. incenique.
liberam contumaciam: ‘a noble disdain’; contumax, though often a negative quality in an individual, it can at times (though rarely) be considered positive, cf. Tac. Hist. 1, 3. contumax aduersus tormenta securorum fides, DOEDERLEIN: Lat. Syn. et Etym., vol. 4, p. 180. Wolf compared Xen. Ap. 1, ἀλλ’ ὅτι ἔθη κατωτά ἡγεῖται αἵρεσις ἤπειρον ἐστιν τοῦ ἐπιστήμων, τοῦτο οὐ δικαιοίναιν, ὅτε ἄφοβον ἅστιν ἡμεῖς φαίνεται ἅ ἄνακτον. The orthography is not certain. At Leg. 2, 8, we read in caelum ascensus with unanimous MSS. authority; also at Am. 58, in caelum ascensidit. Parad. 1, 2, 2, 11, ascendi in caelum is dubious, and the Teubner reads ascendit in caelum. It would appear that ascendere is the more usual idiom. Past editors variously read ascendere and ascendere, though there is likely little difference in the meaning. Both are equally used for mounting the rostra before addressing a crowd.

XXX. § 52. ita enim censebat...: the following sections are thoroughly Platonc in nature, and I list below the various passages which reflect Pl. Phd. in the notes. Much of what is here discussed was treated earlier in Cicero’s Rep. Those souls which have indulged too much in the delights of the body and have acted as its ministers have contravened the laws of both man and god; they are trapped on the earth, and only escape after many years, cf. 12, 27 n. on permanere, and Pl. Rep. 10, 614ff, the myth of Er. censebat... dissierit: Moser thought that the imperfect here signified that this was Socrates’ typical view, and the perfect reflected that he spoke it once (in the dialogue of the Phaedo). But see 2, 4 n. on fluvorunt, discerunt; and cf. 35, 86 fuerunt, gratulabantur. animorum e corpore: note again the frequent change from the single above to the plural, cf. 17, 40 n. humanis utilis: this = ἄθρωμον κακός, Pl. Phd. 84b, and Hortens. fr. 88. humanis: GIUSTA (Tusculaneae, p. xxi) believed the real reading was huius, and that the MSS. reading came about by a scribe misunderstanding an abbreviation and inserting intervocalic letters (i.e., here in place of huius, reading hāius = humanis). He compared Rep. 6, 29, eorum animi qui se corporis ululativus dedisserunt cum uiolatae se quasi minis- tres praebuerunt; Pl. Phd. 81b, οὐ μή τινι θάνατι καί νόμῳ καί τοῖς θεραπευόμενοι καὶ ἐράσα καί γοητευοµένη ἐν πάσιν ἐπὶ τοῖς ἐπιθυμών καί ἤρων. But there is no doubt that in hu- manis utilis Cicero is referring those vices of the body and particularly attacking Epicurean hedonism. The authority of the MSS. reading is overwhelming, and the change to huius is weak. The Latin vocabulary on this point is par- ticularly effective since humanus originally stemmed from humi (earth); also cf. Aug. C. D. 2, 7, mirum nimium, si illus ibi erat pudor mortalium, quia humana flagitia non libere homines committere quae apud eos etiam religiosae discerrent; Aug. Ep. 19, 29. If we are able to conduct ourself in a heavenly fashion while trapped in our earthen containers and to refuse indulgence to that which is mortal, then we will keep our immortal parts clean.

dedidissent: the vulgar gate reading dedidissent would have been more forceful, ‘they had given themselves wholly up’, with the idea of abandoning other pursuits, cf. Off. 1, 71, Q. Fr. 5, 5, 4, TLL 5, 1, 267–68; 5, 1, 1698. The MSS. reading simply means to ‘betake oneself to an activity’ and though the testimony are in strong agreement, in matters like this, the MSS. cannot be trusted too far, cf. Rep. 6, 26, se ululativus dedidissent and Sen. 43, se ululativus dedissent where Powell mused about accepting dedidissent. I have thought it better to take the vulgar reading with Orelli against the MSS. domestics utilis atque flagitiis se inquinauisset: a good example in Cicero of a final word which by itself would constitute a rhythmic unit is directly preceded by what looks like a rhythmic close (the emphatic ce makes little difference), see HUTCHESON (Rhythm, Style, and Meaning in Cicero’s Prose, p. 490).

domesticis utilibus: ‘domestic sins and crimes’, i.e., those vices which we adopt which affect only our private lives and not the public good. The repetition of utilis would be facile on its own, but it is reinforced somewhat by the opposition of domesticis to republica.

re publica uiolanda: ‘by their injury to the public good’, i.e., eo quod uiolant rem publicam: the gerundive serving to fill in for want of a present passive participle in Latin. fraudes inexpiables concepiissent: ‘had taken upon themselves such unpardonable guilt’, cf. Sall. 16, flagitiun concept, Leg. 3, 32, uitia concipiunt. The term fraus came to signify not the commission of crime, but its resulting ‘guilt’, cf. Leg. 1, 40, fraudique cruciatus, Div. 1, 7, uita obiit. concilio deorum: the society of the gods, instead of consilium deorum, which would be the council or assembly of the gods. Cicero is thinking of his earlier Rep. 6, 16, in
which the souls of the departed were said to fly to their fi nal habitation in the Milky Way, cf. Heraclides, fr. Werker, 97; Gottschalk (Heraclides of Pontus, 58f); Sen. 84, titanum animorum concilium; Sen. Cons. Marc. 25, exspectit ilium coetus sacer, Pl. Phd. 81a, metò ðèiv diágonou.

castosque: ‘clean’, pudicus, in the same sense as the Greek καθαρός, cf. Doederlein (Lat. Syn. et Etym, p. 35).

seseque ab ııs: loosely expressed for quique sese ab ııs…


seuacuissent: 16, 38 n.

in corporibus humanis…deorum: cf. 6, 11 n. differentium philosophorum where the order of the words are so arranged to bring focus upon the one last in the clause.

ııs ad ıillos: cf. Am. 15, animus hominum esse divinos, ıısque, cum ex corpore excessissent, reditum in caelum patere, optimoque contemplandi diligentiam amittimus. Itaque dubitans, circumspectans, haesitans, multa adversa quı se integros castosque servauissent, quibusque fuisset minima cum corporibus contagio

Vaucher, Mül., Drex.

Servius

H. N

Vaucher, Mül., Drex., Kurfess (Adnotationes criticae).

9 diligentiam: diligentiam X : licentiam G. Licentia = ability; licentia scientiae = ability of the soul to acquire all details.

diligentiam :

for its formation see Kühner n. ad loc. and K.–S. 2.345, n. 3. uenit is perfect (with the subj. intuerentur), and is best translated by the use of the word which means ‘happen to’. Orelli has an exhaustive note on its use ad loc.

qui cum acriter…intuerentur ut…: the subj. intuerentur follows the cum temporal clause because the order in time is also the same as the order of cause and effect, cf. Madv. Gram. 358, Reid, in Dougan’s n. suggested the true reading may have been quiscumque…ut and I am inclined to think he is right. Our passage here is taken almost word for word from Pl. Phd. 99d, μὴ πάθοιµι ὅπερ οἱ τὸν ἥλιον ἠλευστὸν θωρακὸν καὶ σκοποῦμαν πάρχων διαβαφρονοῖ τὸν ὄλον κατασκοπῶν την ἐδών αὐτῶν.

quod ııs…omnino amitterent: this anacolouthon gave rise to suspicions of a lacuna and spurious conjectures by editors, many of whom demonstrate that they understand the passage without any need to insert words or alter the passage. Translate, ‘a thing which happens to those as such when they look at the setting sun with their eyes, that they wholly lose their vision.’ If emendation is needed, Davies’ qui tan is the simplest and best.

acriter: this means ‘with sharp focus’, Planc. 66, auris hebetores, oculos autem esse acris atque acutos, i.e., with glaring or squinting, cf. Lucr. 3.290, ex oculos mici acribus arder, Verg. Aen. 12.102, omnis oculus acerbus ignus.

aspectum: for the phrase, cf. Tusc. 5.114, impedi animi aciem aspectu acuorum.

sic mentis acies: marks another anacolouthon, frequent in this part of the text. With the sic, Cicero resumes the analogy as if it were a comparative that clause which it corresponded to. Though not grammatically true, nevertheless, the idea does carry with it a sense of comparison.

se ipsa intuenus: this topic was touched upon at 23, 54 n. For the confusion between these phrases with ipsa and ipsam, cf. 11, 24 n. Generally, the nominative form is the more emphatic of the two, Sull. 39, de se ipse confessus esset, Fam. 1.1.1, 1. ceteris satisfacit omnibus, miti ipsa vnumquam satisfacit; K.–S. 2.122 and Madvig’s n. on Fin. 5.28.

diligentiam: ‘sed diligentia cogitantes non diligentiam, sed facultatem contemplandi amittimus’, so Giusta who wished to read licentiam, but this is hardly good grounds for changing the ms. Reading. He assumed that omnino is to be understood with omnissimium, but since we have non vnumquam hebescit, we can assume that diligentia here = attentio animi, an ability of the soul to acquire all details. Its opposite tarditas, was a dullness or stupidity but not a complete failure of the faculties. An excellent explanation is De Or. 2.35.149-151.
reuerens tamquam ratis in mari inmenso nostra uehitur oratio. sed haec et uetera et a Graecis.


tamquam ratis nostra uiehitur oratio: cf. Pl. Phd. 86d, τὸν γανὸ βλήτων τῶν ἀνθρωπῶν λόγων λαβότα καὶ δεσθεχτήτατον, ἐπὶ τούτων ἡμῶν ὁμέρυν ἐπὶ σχέδεις κατανοώντος διπλανύν τὸν θάνατον. Although the imagery is borrowed from Plato, there have been some editors who thought that there might have been a line from an old Roman poet lying hidden somewhere here on account of the colourful exuberance of the passage. Guietius in an early edition arranged the participles dublantes, circumspectans, haesientes, multa aduersa reuerentia as an appositive.

oratio: Giusta wished to restore the old ratio (= Plato's λόγος) in place of oratio, a view that had numerous previous exponents. Indeed, these two words are often confused even in the best mss. G and R, twice at 47, 112 and again 48, 116. The previous contemplantium would seem toavour understanding ratio here. Cicero would then imply that the difficulty of the subject matter of the Tusculum has led him to consider many and various lines of reasoning in a wandering fashion; but this could be equally said of an oratio. The participles do not help clarify either as they can all be construed intelligently with either oratio or ratio. The metaphor of the raft is found at Pl. Rep. 3. 394d, ἐπὶ ὧν ὁ λόγος ἄνευ πενήνθα πέτρας, πάντως ἵναιν and Pl. Lg. 10, 89b. Dougan noted that it was not the ‘utterance’ which is born upon the sea but ourselves who have embarked upon the λόγος as if a raft. It would be a difficult matter to decide which to read, but we read Pl. Phl. 4. 33, tamquam ex scrupulosis cthibas exagirtat oratio where the mss. there are on more solid ground. So not only do we have a strong parallel in the same work, but, additionally, the rhythm also favours oratio. Therefore, there seems to be no substantial reason for abandoning the majority of the mss.

754. a Graecis: sc. dacta, and for the preposition cf. De Or. 2. 285, ὅπερ hoc uero Crasso nihil facietis, and HAND: Tursellinus, vol. 1, p. 16. Cicero turns to Roman and away from Greek exempla. Cato was a fierce example and a man whom not many had the strength to follow. Nevertheless, Cicero picks the most vivid example to inspire his readers as well as strike at their conceptions of fearing death. The philosophical and historical account of Cato was not yet solidified in Roman literature. Cicero here is as much structuring and creating the myth of Cato as he is simply recalling it, see Fox (Phil. Hist. Pp. 157–176).

Cato: M. Porcius Cato of Utica was known for his staunch Stoic ways which earned him gentle mockery from Cicero in his Mir. Cato committed suicide in 46 B.C. after the battle of Thapsus, having supposedly read Plato’s Phaedo the night before. It is a curious fact that the characterisation of Cato changed drastically. Though Cicero knew of Cato’s suicide while he wrote Fin. 3, he still vividly and gently portrayed Cato as a glutton of Stoic books, and eager to discuss the nuances of the summum bonum. But in the Tusculum that living character is now dead, a martyr, and we have here the first presentation in extant Latin literature of him as a Roman ‘Socrates’ and the one Plutarch had in mind when he wrote his life (Zadarovnyt: Cato’s Suicide in Plutarch). I think this characterisation can be explained by Cicero’s now lost Cato which had been published early (March, 45 Att. 12.21.3), and Caesar’s response to it which I think had probably come to be circulated enough by the time Cicero came to write the Tusculum. Plutarch tells us that Brutus, who was an adherent of the Old Academy and not a Stoic, had criticised the death of Cato as impious (Plu. Brut. 40.4, μὴ δοκεῖν, cf. Pl. Phd. 62a), but later changed his mind after the assassination of Caesar. If Brutus did in fact invite Cicero to write his Cato (as Cicero claimed at Or. 35), then as the Tusculum are dedicated to Brutus, they may represent here a reply to some of the arguments Brutus had used to reprove Cato’s self-murder, on which see Mollis (Some ‘Last Words’ of M. Junius Brutus, 757ff). Griffin (Cato and Roman Suicide: II, p. 195); or perhaps also a reply to Caesar himself.

sic abiti et uita: this passage is often taken to be representative of ‘Cicero’s’ real position on suicide, though we should really ask whether this was Cato’s position, for which Rist (The Stoics, pp. 231–41); Droge/Tabor (Noble Death, pp. 32–4; 1). According to Olyb. In Phl. 1. 8 (= SVF, 2.768, D. L. 7.130) the Stoics held that suicide was advisable should tyrants force us into shameful position or acts (ἀληθευομένων οὐκ οὖν). As Cato was in no way about to acknowledge the legitimacy of Caesar’s rule, he felt justified in taking his own life. cf. Off. 1.112, moriendum potius quam tyranni virtus ascipienda fuit. utet enim...: in the Pl. Phd. 61c and following, Socrates says a man must not kill himself unless the gods send some great necessity (ἁγιάσθω) to him. One of the authorities quoted is Philolaus the Pythagorean. Cicero speaks of the Pythagorean prohibition of the act elsewhere at Rep. 4. 285 and Sen. 73. We also have Euthydemus (quoted by Clearchus of Soli), Ath. 4.157c (= fr. Wehrli, 38, D.–K. 464.14), and see Burnet’s n. on Pl. Phd. ad loc.

Though in this work suicide is explicitly forbidden except in situations where the god can be seen to call you from life, Plauto in his later works, Pl. Lg. 9.875–d, was more prepared to consider painful misfortune or intolerable shame as justifying suicide. Aristotle also allowed a man to lay his life down for his country, but he considered it cowardly to use suicide as a means of escape from things as poverty, desire or pain (Arist. E. N. 3.116.14; 113); and generally considered suicide to be an injustice against the political state (Arist. E. N. 5.138.4ff). The Epicureans allowed the practice for those whose pain outweighed their pleasure in life, Fin. 1.49, 2.95 but such a solution was despised, Epicur. Sent. Vet. fr. g (Griffin: Cato, and Roman Suicide: I, p. 72). The Stoic theory of suicide was more elaborate, on which see Bezz (Das Todesproblem in der steinischen Philosophie, 48f; Rist (Stoic Philosophy, 23f). They required a rational justification for departing from life. D. L. 7.28 says that Zenos, its founder, gave the best example. For having fallen down and broken one of his fingers, took this as a divine hint and so committed suicide by holding his breath.


causam iustam: the ἔλεγχος ἐξαγωγή of the Stoics.

dederit...excesserit: the future perfect is used to express a completed action in the future and often is used to imply the speed with which it will be finished. When the two are joined in following sentences, the clauses are often to be construed as almost contemporaneous action.
saepe multis: cf. the Greek τολάλα πόλλακας. Strictly this phrase means ‘to many others at different times’, but the Romans did not distribute in this fashion.

ne: the affirmative ne is almost always in the better writers followed by a pronoun, as here.

ille uir sapiens: ‘the ideal good man’, or ‘the typical good man’, as ille often conveys this sense, cf. Tusc. 5.36, hic est ille moderatus; Ac. 2.23. The praise that Cicero puts on Cato resembles that of which he used for Regulus who was for the Romans the example of a man who could perhaps undergo suffering for an ideal, cf. Fin. 2.65; Parad. 17.

me dius fidius: the shortened form of ilia me dius fidius adiuuet, a popular exclamation, Réigq-Hasse. 132.

sapiens: Giusta thinks there is a lacuna here after sapiens, and wishes to fill it with «erit habendus qui Socratis praecepta sequens». He argued that, without an intervening mention of Socrates, Cicero would be implying that Cato was not wise, but this is hardly a naturally reading of the text and the following ill idem can obviously point to no other than Socrates in the Phaedo whom Cicero is here paraphrasing. There is no reason to suspect the text.

uincla carceris: Bentley wanted to alter the reading to uincla corporis which is found in Div. 1.110, Am. 14. However, cf. Rep. 6.15, qui ex corporum uinclis tamquam e carcere eiptantur. The ‘prison’ imagery is from Pl. Phd 38, ilucum est secum esse quam diutissime; and 9.13; 104.7; D. L. 6.6 (on Antitheneses), ὑπερθαλάσσει τί αὐτήν περιγέγονεν ἐκ φιλοσοφίας, ἔφη τὸ δύνασθαι ἐνέδουν εἰς ἐπίρρυτον σῶμα καὶ ἀπορρυτον ἐνδεθίθαι. Cicero's ordering of the words here prompted Kühner to remark that the reverse should have been expected, a corporte, id est, a voluptate, id est a corpore: the affirmative ne: the words are from Pl. Phd. 67d, τὸ μελέτμα αὐτῷ τοῦτο ἐκ τῆς φιλοσοφίας, λύσι καὶ χωρεμές ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σῶμας: Theod. Orat. affect. cit. iv. 8.18, ἡδίκως τῷ τοῦ φιλοσόφου θυμάτω μελέτην ἔκπονεν: Sen. Ep. 2.9.10, meditare mortem. qui enim hoc dicit, meditari libertatem iubet; Sen. Const. 11.9.2.

totem enim:...the words are from Pl. Phd. 67d, τὸ μελέτμα αὐτῷ τοῦτο ἐκ τῆς φιλοσοφίας, λύσι καὶ χωρεμές ψυχῆς ἀπὸ σῶμας: Theod. Orat. affect. cit. iv. 8.18, ἡδίκως τῷ τοῦ φιλοσόφου θυμάτω μελέτην ἔκπονεν: Sen. Ep. 2.9.10, meditare mortem. qui enim hoc dicit, meditari libertatem iubet; Sen. Const. 11.9.2.

XXXI. Nam quiid aliud agimus, cum a voluptate, id est a corpore, cum a re familiar, quae est ministra et famula corporis, cum a re publica, cum a negotio omni seiuocamus animum, quid, inquam, tum agimus nisi inanimam ad se ipsum aduocamus, secum esse cogitum maximeque a corpore abducimus? sequernere autem a corpore animum, nec quicquam aliud, est mori discere. Quare hoc commentemur, mihi crede, disinguamsgusque nos a corporibus, id est consuescamos mori. hoc, et dum erimus in terris, erit illi caelesti uietae simile, et cum illuc uitius emissi exierit tota enim philosophorum uita, ut idem, commentatio mortis est.


quid aliud Vc 6 omni seiuocamus Vc omni seiuocamus KVR: omnis euocamus GVc 7 inquam Vc inquantum G 7 aduocamus Vc acuocamus GVK: ducocamus d: aduocamus codd., 5 8 nec quicquam aliud] nec quicquam aliud emori G: è i mori R: necquicquamaliudémori K: nec quiequam aliud nisi Vc, in marg. add. manu recentior: nec quiequam aliud emori P: quam emori (ante) codd. 9 crede V creditis iungamus G...
in compedibus corporis: though called compedes these 'shackles' were not just for the feet, cf. Varro in Non. 113, 28, manus compedes conor reuellere. For the thought of the stiffness of our soul upon its release from the cramped con-
fines of the body, cf. Plu. De Educ. Puer. 9.17, ο重要指示ᾳ ἐν σάλῳ χρῶνον ἔδειξε, κἂν λυθήν χρῶνος, ὡς τὰς πολυχρονίας τῶν δειμων συνθάναι αὐτὸν δυνάμεις ἐνθάδε, ὑπόπτευξαται. Pohlenz suggested that this may be reminiscent of the simile of the cave in Pl. Rep. 515c, but it seems more probable that Cicero is thinking of Pl. Phdr. For the imagery of escaping from chains, cf. Pl. Crat. 408c–c. Pl. Ti. 79a; Pl. Phdr. 697d, ὑπὸπρὸ ἐν δειμων ἐν τῷ σάμιμος ἔτι Burnett's n.; Pl. Phdr. 250c, ἀπετόντες ἐν αὐγí καθαρ´, καθαροὶ ὄντες καὶ ἀνέμαυτο ἄνωθεν δὲ κάπως αὐτῷ πάρεφροντες ὁμολάμις, ὀστρέφι τρόπων δεησεμοίου; Div. 1.111, unialis corporis in-
pediti, where Pease finds a play upon σάμια σέμα. But such passages can in turn be attributable to the Pythagoreans (Burkert: Ancient Pythagoreanism, 78 n. 157, 248).

haec quidem uiter moris est: cf. Stob. Flor. 120.661, ὁ βάσανος δόμδομον μὲν εἶπο σώζε τῇ ἁλυσίᾳ ψυχῆς, τοῦτο ἐν ἐντὸς ἀποτάσσεινα λεγόμενοι.

quam lamentari posse: i.e., uitam quam lamentari possem. § 76. in Consolatione: 26, 65 n. Cic. Consol. fr. 48–15 constitute what can be called a lamentatio uitae, where Cicero deplored life itself, and nearly half of these frag-
ments come from the first book of the Tus. In fr. 7 (= Lact. Inst. 3.8.18), Cicero supposedly railed against a man who thought life was not punishment; and in several fragments he reiterated the fact that the best thing for man to do was citius mori, cf. 48, 114 n.

es lamentatus: there is perhaps a gentle joke here, or a slight self-effacement of his own Consolato.

has res: a 'deictic' use, i.e., 'all these things here around me'. After such a lengthy discussion, we almost forget that we are supposedly listening to a dialogue. This phrase is a fine way for Cicero to restore the visual setting of these disputations. We see these men sitting or walking about in Cicero's villa.

retractabit: with a sense of unwillingness, i.e., (literally) a 'kicking back' to avoid going forward like a stubborn ox, cf. numquam stimulò lacesat iuvenam, quod retractantem calcitrosumque eum reddit. properabis: oppositely, used of desire and eagerness, Prov. Cons. 35, si ad deos penates redeer probertac; Tuc. Ann. 2.31, nisi voluntarium mortem properauisset; Verg. Aen. 10.401, pulchrum properet per uidera mortem. duum: 'a while back', at 5, 9.

certe sed: there is no reason to emend here and Giusta is right to restore the mss. reading of certe sed in place of most other editors who adopt the suggestion of Jeep to read certius. The difficulty lies in judging how far Cicero wishes to push his claim. Would he really say that no other thing was more certain not to be an evil? But he is only striving to dispose of the proposition, cf. § 8, 16 non modo malum non esse; sed bonum etiam esse; and 11, 23 aut malum non sit, aut sit bonus potius. I retain the mss. reading, and translate, 'it is so far from being true that death is an evil — which seemed true enough to you a while back — that I am afraid no other thing is so certainly not an evil; but it is rather a good thing, if indeed we shall either be gods, or be with the gods.

di ipsi: 26, 65 n.

quid refert: there is a dispute over the question to whom to assign these lines. Many editors, including Wolf, Orelli, Kühner, Dougan, Pohlenz, and Drexler assign these two words to the second interlocutor 'A'. But this has resulted in suspicions of a lacuna, and I think for no reason. The somewhat abrupt change in direction of the dialogue caused Pohlenz to wish to insert after futuri sumus <sed iam quid reliqui philosophi sentiant, circumspiciamus>. Indeed, this conveys the right sense but is inelegant. Giusta believed there to be a somewhat larger omission and would supply, 'quid refert <igitur a te id nunc disputari, ne si intereat quidem animi, quidquid malis esse in morte? — certe refert;> adsunt enim', etc. Against these views, Kühner had argued that the text itself is sound and that the enim after the interrogation is affirmative (like ὡδε), cf. Hand: Tursellinus, vol. 2, p. 384. This, however, would make a connection to the previous sentence which is very strained and unconvincing. It seems to me that the older editors Lambinus, Bentley, and Davies are correct to assign everything from uirem temps down to uidera malum possit to the first speaker 'M'. Tischer objected to this: if the words were assigned to 'M' we would need quamquam or another adversative before quid refert. But while such an idiom is usual (Att. 9.19.2, ultimum in Volcaci sententiam! sed quid refert? est enim una sententia omnium; and Fam. 11.14) it is by no means necessary. (Phil. 7.4.14, quamquam illa legatio non est, desunt at est parum illi exitum, nisi paruerit huic ordinii; quid refert? tamen opinio est gravior).

adsunt: cf. 4, 7 cum essent complures muncum familiares,
sermone dimittam, ulla ut ratione mors tibi uidere malum possit.

Qui potest, cum ista cognouerim?

Qui possit, rogas? catuerae uenient contra dicitium, nec solum Epicureorum, quos equidem non despicio, sed nescio quo modo doctissimus quisque conterminit. acerrum autem deliciae meae Dicaearchus contra hanc immortalitatem disseruit. est enim tris libros scripsit, qui 'Lesbiaci' uocantur quod Mytelines sermo habetur, in quibus uoluit efficiere animos esse mortalis. Stoici autem usum nobis largiuntur tamquam cornicibus: diu manusuros aiunt animos, semper negant.

XXII. Num non uis uigurare audire, cur, etiamisita si, mors tamen non sit in malis?

Vt uidentur, sed me nemo de immortalitate depellet.

Laudo id quidem, etsi nihil nimis oportet confidere: mouemur enim saepe aliquo acute

though we are not told who exactly is present at this conversation. Curiously, after the oration begins, this is the only signal given in the whole book that would suggest that there are individuals present other than the two interlocutors.

ulla ut ratione: Manutius rejected the second ut which Bentley explained as 'ambigua dictio uti...libraris fraudi fuit', and most editors follow. However, the orthography of uti is rare in Cicero's philosophical works, occurring in the Tusc. only here, and that dubiously. Elsewhere, at Fin. 3.15.49, the lesser manuscripts read ut in ea contineant which Baiter and Madvig emended to uiti ea continet, though Ernesti read ut ea continet. Giusta emended here ulla ut ratione ut — attractive, but not keeping with Cicero's style. I think the change in V in most telling, though Drexler doubted the first erased. I read ulla ut ratione mors etc., and cf. above 8, 16 mors ut malum non sit.

§77. qui potest: 11, 21 n., feri. The qui here is the old ablative.

nec solum: for nec solum without a following sed etiam, cf. Fin. 2.113, and Phil. 12.14.

quos equidem non despicio: the remark is of course ironic, cf. Tusc. 2.7. quos non contemno equidem, quippe quos numquam legerim.

nescio quo modo: 11, 24 n.

conterminit: several editors wish to eject conterminit, which was absent from one of the ss., used by Manutius. Kühner thinks there is an anacoluthon but he does not explain why this is so: if there was one, it would be rather harsh. DOugan believed it to be an interpolation by a glossator thinks there is an anacolouthon but he does not explain.

Deliciae meae: Cicero tends to use extravagant language in his descriptions of Dicaearchus. In 60 B.C., he wrote to Atticus that had 'piles of Dicaearchus at his feet' (Att. 2.2) and it seems that he was one of Cicero's favorite writers. There was much in him that would appeal to a Roman admirer, particularly to anyone who was practical and had no use for a philosopher who would refuse to take part in politics (Dicaearchus, fr. Wehrli 359), and it seems that he was one of Cicero's favorite writers.

Dicaearaus: 10, 21 n., and cf. 11, 24, 18 init.; 22, 51.

Mytelines: the main city of the island of Lesbos.

efficere: 8, 16 n. for effici = procure.

Stoici autem aiunt: cf. above 9, 18 n., SVF. 2.822, and Theod. Graec. affect. cur. 5.72, ἀδ Ἡσιόκτιστος τῆς χορφομενής τῶν σωμάτων ἑαυτῆς διαρκείας μὲν κἂν ἐκτὸς τῆς ἐκποίησιος ἀλλὰ τῆς μὲν ἀκτικωδικῆς ἑλέγχου, τῷ δὲ ἀρχαῖο πάντως τῆς κατά πάντως ἐκποίησιος; as well as op. cit. 73-74.

usuram: the best explanation of this term is Fam. 7.29.1, when Curius wrote to Cicero saying, sum enim χρόνῳ μὲν τις, κρίνει δὲ Ἀττίκην ο γ το ρ κ τυ τος, eructus est tuus, mancipium ilius. To this Cicero replied cuiris (Atticus) quoniam propriam te esse scribis mancipio et nexo, ne cumus ust su et fructu, contentus isto sum. id enim cunisque proprium, quia quosque fructar atque utitur. Curiously missing from what Cicero says here in the Tusc. is the term fructus, the free enjoyment of what has been given to us (viv. life), though it is something which we can never claim as our own through length of use (usucapio), cf. E. Supp. 5.55, οὔτε γὰρ κυκλήθη ἢ κεκλήθη ἢ κεκλήθη τοι ζῷον τοίον ἡμέτερον αὐτὸ πλὴν ἐνοικᾶσαι βίον; as Lucill. 27.6, nil esse in uita proprium mortali datumiam, qui tempestas nito, chresin ad me recipio (= Non. 407.28.)

largiuntur: 'they are overly generous with their giving'.

tamquam cornicibus: crows were thought to live up to nine generations of men, cf. Ov. Met. 7.274, οίνῳ caputque novum coricis sacula passae; Hor. Carm. 17.13, annona cornis, Hes. fr. 304 ed. West (= Plu. De Def. Or. 415), οἶνῳ τοῦ ὄνου γενέω καλατρόει καρυόν ἀνθρωπίνως; Arist. Phan. 1022; Plin. N. 7.48.153 (who paraphrases Hesiod); Lucr. 5.1084; and see Tusc. 3.69 where Cicero is citing Theophrastus.

XXIII. §32. num non uis: the vulgate reading num uis cannot be right. Bentley, Davies adopted the reading found in V nomine which, though, is very rare in Cicero and found elsewhere only in N. D. 1.88 and Am. 36. This is more emphatic than but differs little in meaning from num non uis (i.e., from nolo), the better attested reading, cf. K.-S. 2.513-514.

de immortalitate: cf. 8, 16 n. The phrase is more compressed for de opinione immortalitis.

nihil nimis oportet confidere: cf. Tusc. 5.93, non nimis fortesse subtiliter. I find the use of this phrase here remarkable. The preceding section had been rather dogmatic in nature and great stress had been placed on the certainty of the soul's survival which grew out of the Apolline dictum 'know thyself'. In the interlude before Cicero again takes up a sceptical view by considering conflicting theories, he concludes with nihil nimis, the translation of the other famous Greek Apolline dictum found on the temple of Delphi, μηδὲν δαίμον «not too much», quoted by Pl. Charm. 165, Paus. 10.24, Plu. Pyth. Or. 29.
conclusio labamus mutamusque sententiam clarioribus etiam in rebus; in his est enim aliqua obscuritas. id igitur si acciderit, simus armati.

Sane quidem, sed ne accidat, proutdeo.

Num quid igitur est causae, quin amicos nostros Stoicos dimittamus? eos dico, qui aiunt manare animos, cum e corpore exscesserint, sed non semper.

Istos uero qui, quod tota in hac causa difficilimum est, suscipiant, posse animum manare corpore vacantam, illud autem, quod non modo facile ad credendum est, sed eo concesso, quod ulunt, consequens, id uero non dant, ut, cum die permanserit, ne intereat.

Bene reprehendis, et te isto modo res habet. credamus igitur Panaetio a Platone suo dissen-

the grounds of liveliness. Cicero began with an indirect report, but as he progressed he passed into direct speech.

id uero non: the mss. consensus of idcirco here presents an unparalleled use of the term. Kühner retained idcirco and simply remarked that the passage wanted polish. However, there have been various conjectures. The best has been of Klotz, who suggested id uero which repeats the earlier idcirco for greater clearness of the thought; in addition, dare used in this way with a consecutive clause always has a demonstrative pronoun, or is otherwise followed with an accusative and infinitive formulation. Pohlizen cites the Greek idiom at Pl. Phd. 80, ἣ δὲ ὑπάρχῃ ἐκ…πετυ δὲ δὴ… and Giusta explained the reading idcirco as having arisen from a misunderstanding of the compendium into 'id uero' for idcoco, ‘id circo’.

ut ne interest: cf. Tusc. 5.34, demus hoc, Brute, ut sit beatus semper sapiens; Leg. 2.50, dant hoc Scaeuola ut sacris ne alligenter; Ac. 1.24, Madv. Gram. 372a. The construction here of ut ne is difficult where we would have expected ut non since the clause must be consecutive. Reid (in Dougan) explains that ne in these cases seem to retain their original force of a pure negative. This seems better than Kühner who understands ut as explicative, viz., ‘namely’.

Panaetio a Platone suo: cf. 18, 42 n. Cicero reports that Panaetius strove at times to tone down the rigidity of Stoic doctrine, cf. Fin. 4.79, fatighe in altero genere (among the Stoics) mitior, in altero illustror semperque habitus in ore Platonem, and did not accept the view that the soul survived after death, at least for a period of time, (Schmelke: Mittleren Stoa, pp. 105-109). It is difficult to gain a clear assessment of Panaetius’ philosophical position as a whole since there is so little evidence and the majority of it comes from Cicero, on which see Long: (Hellenistic Philosophy, pp. 211-215); Rst (Stoic Philosophy, p. 173). This passage is important. Panaetius has been commonly thought to have differed from some orthodox Stoic tenets, and had in places revised some of Zeno’s doctrines under the influence of Plato and Aristotle. We have further evidence for this in Panaet. fr. 57 (= Ind. Herc. col. 61 ed. Dorandi), ἦ γάρ ἵκωσις φιλολόγων καὶ φιλοσοφοστήλης, ἀλλὰ [ἐν] παρατήκησιν [ὑπὸ τὴν Ζηνωνίκου] καὶ τὸν Περίπτερον. However, the view that Panaetius was not an orthodox Stoic has recently been challenged by Tittelmann (Panaetius’ Place in the History of Stoicism). Here in the Tusc., we find evidence that, although Panaetius was an admirer of Plato, he did not prevent him from accepting that the soul was not immortal contrary to a significant tenet in Plato’s philosophy.
Huius hanc: for the collocation, cf. Sull. 6.9, quis his horum audiat?

uolt: 'maintains', as dare can sometimes signify.

declaret: the force of the subj. indicates that this is Panaetius' own opinion which is given.

aegrum esse: here, aegrum esse is one idea, aegrotare. The former expression, however, I think more forcibly.

im similitudo magis apparat: of course there is a similarity between parents and children and the animal world, and Aristotle had treated of this earlier in physical terms, Arist. G. A. 4.3.767a–769b. It cannot be denied that the 'mixing of bodies' which leads to procreation has a great influence on the form of both the body and mind in the children, but it does not necessarily follow that the soul is therefore 'born' and itself 'procreates'. The argument is also found in Plin. H. N. 7.12.52, cogitatio etiam utrislibet animum subito transvolans effusior

similitudinem aut miscere excitatatur, idque pluris in homine quam in ceteris omnibus animalibus differentiae.

We have evidence that other Stoics had things to say about the character and shape of the body and the fact that children resembled their parents. Cleanthes said that children reflected their parents both in the frame of their body (corporis lineamentibus), but also in marks of their soul (animae notis), Tert. Anim. 5 (= SVF. 1.518). And Cleanthes said that children were like their parents both physically and psychologically, in their emotions (a–in), character (Ba) and in their disposition (hudone), Nem. De Nat. Hom. 2.20.14–17. However, we have no evidence for how the Stoics explained the psychological resemblances. Presumably they explained that, since the soul takes its shape from the body, if the children resemble their parents physically (which was not difficult to account for), then they should also acquire psychological similarities as well. Some Stoics spoke of the child's soul as being a fragment (a–in) of the father's (SVF. 1.128), though this does not constitute a soul as an 'embryo'. Chrissipus argued from the fact that children resemble their parents that the soul came into existence at birth, for which see Plu. De Stoic. Repug. 1033c (SVF. 2.806, L.–S. 53c). This seems to point to the conclusion that the soul takes its shape from the body. For a discussion of the general Stoic position on this, see Boys-Stones (Physiognomy and the Ancient Psychological Theory, pp. 80–82). It was Panaetius' innovation to ascribe to the psych and not to the physis its procreative and nutritive functions, at least it seems so from the evidence found in Nem. De Nat. Hom. 2.26.6–9 (SVF. 2.711, L.–S. 53i), and cf. Straaten (Panaetius fragm. 86, p. 233[180–181]Rist11/06,48[Long1982]. Cicero takes up Panaetius' argument and assimilates the minor position of his syllogon these.

tiens? quem enim omnibus locis diuinum, quem sapientissimum, quem sanctissimum, quem Homerum philosophorum appellat, huius hanc unam sententiam de immortalitate animorum non probat. uolt enim, quod nemo negat, quidquid natum sit interire; nasci autem animos, quod declarat eorum similitudo qui proceuntur, quae etiam in ingenii, non solum in corporibus appareat. alteram autem adfert rationem, nihil esse quod dolet, quin id aegrum esse quoque possit; quod autem in morbus cadat, id etiam interitum; dolere autem animos, ergo etiam interire.

XXXIII. Haec reelli possunt: sunt enim ignorantis, cum de aeternitate animorum dicatur, de mente dici, quae omni turbido motu semper uacet, non de partibus eis, in quibus aegritudines, irae, libidinesque uersentur, quas is, contra quem haec dicuntur, semotas a mente et disclusas putat.

agtaret

appareat. alteram autem adfert rationem, nihil esse quod doleat, quin id aegrum esse quoque

M. TVLLI CICERONIS XXXIII

Adv. Colot

According to Plu. De An.

The former expression, however, I think more forcibly

N. D.

soul) would survive since it would not be subject to the

tenets and argues from the position which considers the

ings apart from reason but Panaetius follows the Stoic

only have the -que joining the latter two words.

is contra...: cf. 10, 20 n. Plato separated these two feel-

ings apart from reason but Panaetius follows the Stoic

De Or. 1.72, apparat aitque existat (Moser).
multa enim e corpore existent, quae acuant mentem, multa, quae obstant. Aristoteles quidem ait omnis ingeniosos melancholicos esse, ut ego me tardiorem esse non moleste feram. enumerat multos, idque quasi constat, rationem cur ita fiat adfert. quod si tanta uis est ad habitum mentis in eis quae ignuntur in corpore, ea sunt autem, quae non similiter faciant nihil necessitatis adfert, cur nascantur animi, similimudo. ommittit dissimilitudines. uwel adesse posset Panaetius — uixit cum Africano — quaererem ex eo, cuius suorum similis fuisset Africani

facie uel patris: Q. Fabius Maximus, son of Q. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus (consul 121 B.C.), and grandson of Q. Fabius Maximus Aemilius (consul 145 B.C.), who was the brother of Scipio Aemilius Afric anus Minor, the son of Paulius who was victor at Pydna in 168 B.C. This grandson was so profligate in his activities that the people wept to see the wealth and grandeur of the Fabii wasted to such a gross extent. The praetor Q. Pompeius confiscated the little that was left, cf. Val. Max. 3.5.2.

facie uel patris: sc. ita similis. Hermann conjectured facie uel patris which Kühner and Dougan thought quite likely because the nepos seemed to desire a reciprocal connection. But this to my mind is not needed since the force of uel is only intensive and seeks to challenge the argument of Panaetius by offering a firmly self-contradictory example in which one aspect (the physical) seems obviously inherited whereas the other aspect (the moral character) could in no way be considered as inherited, so dissimilar is it to its origins. Cicero asks rhetorically, 'whose son could the father of the Triumvir. Crassi nepos: the grandson was also named P. Licinius Crassus Dives, consul in 97 B.C. He was distinguished as a statesman, jurist, orator, and was the father of the Triumvir. Cicero asks rhetorically, 'whose son could be the worst of them.'

P. Licinius Crassus Dives, consul in 97 B.C. He was distinguished as a statesman, jurist, orator, and was the father of the Triumvir. Crassi nepos: the grandson was also named P. Licinius Crassus Dives. He squandered his wealth and earned himself the nickname Decoctor, but when later in poverty was hailed by his former title in derision, Val. Max. 6.9.12, cf. RE. 67 (Licinius).

sed quid agimus?...: this begins the second part of the consideration begun at 12, 26.

aeterinate: 23, 55 n.

facile patiebar: has the signification of 'readily', 'willingly', similarly with audire, De Or. 2.229, facile homines audiur.

XXXIV. §82. alte spectare: άνω βλέπειν, 'I see you have your eyes on the sky', metaphorical for having high ambitions and a pun, cf. Pop. 6.23, alte spectare si uoles atque hanc sedem et autem donum centuri.

ulle in caelum migrare: as Beroaldus, 'cupere ueram esse animi immortalitatem ut possis a morte remigrare ad caelestia domicilia unde ortus est et origo animarum,' and cf. 11, 24.
sed fac, ut isti unolunt, animos non remanere post mortem: uideo nos, si ita sit, priuari spe beatioris utiae; mali uero quid adhert ista sententia? fac enim sic animum interire ut corpus: num igitur aliquis dolor aut omnino post mortem sensus in corpore est? nemo id quidem dicit, etsi Decremitum insimulat Epicurus, Decremitae negant. ne in anoimo quidem iigur sensus remanet; ipse enim nusquam est. ubi iigitur malum est, quoniam nihil tertium est? an quod ipse animi
discressus a corpore non fit sine dolore? ut credam ita esse, quam est id exiguum! sed falsum esse arbitrator, et fit plerumque sine sensu, non numquam etiam cum ulolute, totumque hoc
leue est, quaelcumque est; fit enim ad punctum temporis. ‘at illud angit uel potius exercuiat, discressus ab omnibus eius quae sunt bona in uita’. uide ne ‘a malis’ dici uerius possit. quid ego nunc lugeam uitam hominem? uere et iuere possum; sed quid necesse est, cum id agam ne post mortem miseros nos putemus fore, etiam uitam efficere deplorando miseriorem? fecimus hoc in eo libro, in quo nosmet ipsos, quantum potuimus, consolati sumus. a malis uigitur mors abducit, non a bonis, uerum si quae unus.

et quidem hoc a Cyrenaco Hegesia sic copiose disputatur, ut 2.4. D.-K. a160, Epicurus fr. 17 
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et quidem hoc a Cyrenaco Hegesia sic copiose disputatur, ut 2.4. D.-K. a160, Epicurus fr. 17 

sed fac, ut isti unolunt, animos non remanere post mortem: uideo nos, si ita sit, priuari spe beatioris utiae; mali uero quid adhert ista sententia? fac enim sic animum interire ut corpus: num iigitur aliquis dolor aut omnino post mortem sensus in corpore est? nemo id quidem dicit, etsi Decremitum insimulat Epicurus, Decremitae negant. ne in anoimo quidem iigur sensus remanet; ipse enim nusquam est. ubi iigitur malum est, quoniam nihil tertium est? an quod ipse animi
discressus a corpore non fit sine dolore? ut credam ita esse, quam est id exiguum! sed falsum esse arbitrator, et fit plerumque sine sensu, non numquam etiam cum ulOLUTE, totumque hoc
leUE est, quaelcumque est; fit enim ad punctum temporis. ‘at illud angit uel potius exercuiat, discressus ab omnibus eius quae sunt bona in uita’. uide ne ‘a malis’ dici uerius possit. quid ego nunc lugeam uitam hominem? uere et iuere possum; sed quid necesse est, cum id agam ne post mortem miseros nos putemus fore, etiam uitam efficere deplorando miseriorem? fecimus hoc in eo libro, in quo nosmet ipsos, quantum potuimus, consolati sumus. a malis uigitur mors abducit, non a bonis, uerum si quae unus.
is a rege Ptolomaeo prohibitus esse dicatur illa in scholis dicere, quod multi is auditis mortem sibi ipsi consciscerent. Callimachi quidem epigramma in Ambrociatam Cleombrotum est, quem cum ei nihil accidisset aduersi, e muro se in mare abieciescit, lecto Platonis libro. eius autem, quam dixi, Hegesiae liber est Ατοκαρτερων, quo a uita quidem per inediae decedens reuocatur ab amicis; quibus respondens uitae humanae enumerat incommoda. possem idem facere, etsi minus quam ille, qui omnino uiuere expedire nemini putat. mitto alios: etiamne nobis expediat? qui et domestici et forensibus solacii ornamentalsque priuati certe si ante occidissetus, mors nos a malis, non a bonis abstraxisset.

XXXV. Sit igitur alius, qui nihil mali habeat, nullum a fortuna uolonus acceperit: Metellus


Cleombrotus: Cleombrotus and his fate are fairly accurately documented and in most philosophical contexts had become proverbial. Cicero recounts his story in Scour. 3,4. and here. Aug. C. D. 12.2 considers his suicide as a plausible paradigm and says that it was done from lofty motives (probably Augustine had this passage in mind since he also recounts the suicide of Cato immediately afterwards); Lact. Inst. 3.18510 associates him with eminent philosophers but attacks his belief in the pagan philosophy, as do many later Christian apologists (Williams: Cleombrotus of Ambracia: Interpretations of a Suicide, p. 161).

But his example here in the Tusc. clearly serves as one of philosophical acceptance of and even desire for death—though Cleombrotus suffered no misfortune. He draws a curious comparison to the consistently miserable Hegesias whose account his own interrupts, on which see White (Callimachus on Plato and Cleombrotus).

It is quite possible that Cicero had read the epigram himself since Callimachus had been popular in Rome at least since Cicero’s youth. We have translations of the Alexanderian poet by Catulus (Gell. N. A. 19.14.1; Cinna (dead in 44 B.C.) had rendered Callim. Ep. 27 (Morel/Buchner/Blansdorf: FPL), Cinna fr. 11; and see Cameron (The Greek Anthology from Melaeus to Planudes, pp. 51–56).

The tale of Cleombrotus was later borrowed from Callimachus by Ov. Isis 493–495. In which Ovid described the Phaedo not as a book de animo, but one de necce.

Platonis libro: i.e., the Phaedo.


possem idem facere: i.e., ‘but I do not want to’, si wellem being the usual idiom, cf. 27, 69 quae habere uellem.

solarcis priuati: Cicero’s solacii domesticus was his daughter Tullia, having died either late January or early February 45 B.C. The foresiosis ornamentis were the performance of public duties, no longer open to him once Caesar gained autocratic power. In numerous letters to his friends, Cicero recounted the impassivity of other bereaved fathers, such as Q. Maximus, L. Paulus and the elder M. Cato who all lost sons. The use of such exemplars was to show, and not just emotionally, that his own scenario was unparalleled (Hutchinson: Cicero’s Correspondence: A Literary Study, p. 76). In each of the cases, these men were able to console themselves for the loss of their son through their high public standing. In Fam. 4.6.1, Cicero claims his own prolonged and rather indecorous mourning for his daughter can be excused on the ground that he has been robbed of his dignitas which those earlier men could enjoy, and which he had earned from his service to the republic, non enim, ut tum me a re publica maestum domus expiabet, quae levaret, sic nunc domo macerens ad rem publicam con fugere possum, ut in eius bonis acquiescam. itaque et domo absens et fort, quod nec mecum doremen, quem ad re publica capio, domus iam consolari potest nec domesticum res publica; also Fam. 5.15, and Wilcox (Paternal Grief and the Public Eye, p. 280).

XXXV. §85, sit igitur alius…acceperit: the subjunctives are of class, ‘think of any man, then, who has never suffered at fortune’s hand’. The argument by example is not as obscure as TS. or Dougan think, and is one of the most frequent in consolationary literature (Kassel: Römischen Konsolationsliteratur, pp. 98–103). We know from Cic. Consol. fr. 198 that Cicero had in fact treated Metellus’ case earlier in that previous work, and no doubt he works it into the Tusc. again. Cicero considered fully many Romans of distinction in his preparation for the work (Att. 12.20.2; 12.22; 12.23; 12.24). Hier. Ep. 60.5 tells us Cicero had considered the Maximus, Cato, Gallus, Piso, the Bruti, and Scaeuola, Scaurus, Martius, Crassi, Marcellus, and Aufidius in addition to many others. In each case he weighed whether fortune could be said to take them from the good in life any more than from the evils of life. When he asks us to consider any man at all, he asks already having considered a good many. Cicero explains his methodology in Tusc. 3.35. We are able to console ourselves in two ways, first by inquiring into the nature of death itself, and second by bringing examples to bear upon the matter, cuius onus disputando leuamen docent, quam parva et quam pauca sint quae natura desideret, aut a disputando subtilitate orationem ad exempla traducimur.

Metellus: Q. Caecilius Metellus Macedonicus, who conquered Andricus 145 B.C., held the consulship in 143 B.C., and was also an augur. He had sons, three of whom he saw become consuls, one as censor who also triumphed; he had a fourth son who was standing for praetor when he died; but before his death he also saw his three daughters marry good men (Fin. 5.82). Metel-
ille ornatus quattuor filiis, at quinquaginta Priamus, e quibus septemdecim iustae uxore natis. in utroque eandem habuit fortuna potestatem, sed usa in altores est: Metellum enim multa filii, filiae, nepotes, nepotes in rogum inposuerunt, Priamum tanta progenie orbatum, cum in aram confugisset, hostilis manus interemit. hic si uiuis filiis incolumi regno occidisset,

...astánte ope bárbarica,

Tectis caelatis lásqueatis,

5–6. Enn. trag. 83-84, cf. Tusc. 3.44.


lus was an example commonly quoted by ancient authors of a man with unsurpassable human happiness (cf. Plin. H. N. 7.44.139ff, Val. Max. 8.5.1, Vell. Pat. 1.11.6). He was covered with honours himself, and was carried to his funeral pyre by his honoured sons. He is placed in sharp contrast to Priam who was at one time similarly considered a man most blessed by fortune (though perhaps this comparison is less apt than Metellus' comparison to Regulus in the passage from Fin.). The argument is that death did not take Metellus away from his happiness, but rather secured it, for he could no longer suffer any future woe that could assail him. Curiously, here, where we would expect Cicero to mention Solon’s famous dictum to Croesus (recounted earlier in Fin. 2.87), it is passed over. A different story of Solon is told below, 49, 117.

ille: The ms. reading of ille honoratus is suspected, rightly I think. Giusta had conjectured ill<es> e<est> ornatus, but this is only partially defensible. He remembered the ms. reading in Tusc. 2.18 where Halm conjectured si forte est in place of si forte, i.e., sifor[?] of the ms., and, believing a similar error here, printed ill<es> e<est>. But this is hardly Ciceronian (and I find Shackleton-Bailey agrees). Nor can it be defended by PhiIl. 13.27 which I find is not parallel. The ms. ille ought to be retained and we do not need to suspect the ellipse here of est, an idiom too frequent in these types of short laconics statements commonly used in colloquial writing. We have examples of such usage at ad Brut. 2.5.4, liaque ille ille silens et; Att. 13.28.4, ille de ingenio nihil nimis, modestum et frugi, and there are many others. The collocation is rare, since it is Cicero’s normal usage to place ille before proper names (of which there are many examples), but this practice is not without exception, Att. 2.5.1, Cato ille noster qui mui unus est pro centum milibus (but cf. Att. 4.16.3, ille noster Platoh). I retain the unanimous reading of the ms.

ornatus: Drexlner (Text der Tusculanen, p. 72) defended the ms. reading honoratus by comparing Gaius, Instit. 3.50, 53, duobus liberis honoratis ingenue matronae which does demonstrate the Latinity of the expression but fails to withstand the criticisms of Moser since it is never found in Cicero. If we read honoratus, we would understand that Metellus’ distinction depended on his sons — but it did not. And in what way can Priam be said to have gained ‘honour’ (in this sense) from his fifty sons? Bentley instead conjectured reading honoratis (which is also found in V) understanding the expression honoratus = honoratus functus, cf. Val. Max. 7.1.1 quattor filios sustulit... omnes superstites et honoratissimos. This is the reading which Lündström calls ‘indispensable’, and which most editors retain — but if I may say, non modo non Priamus honoratissi filii dici poterat sed ne honoratus quidem filii! And so I think something is to be said for Giusta’s conjecture of ornatus. He finds a good parallel at ad Brut. 1.18.2, imperator... libribs ornatus, though I disagree with him that est is required here, cf. Brut. 81 cited by LUNDSTRÖM (Textkritik, p. 17). Giusta says nothing about the fact that his conjecture does make an elegant constrast between ornatus filiii and orbatus progenie.

at: Pohlenz retained the reading of the K aut and defended it with Pat. 5, magnum aut naufragum illum sine nomine in rivo esse lapsum but the parallel is not exact. With the focus on numbers, it seems that Cicero is forging a link between how happy Metellus was with his large family and how much happier and prosperous Priam would be expected to be with his even larger family. As such, we would expect aut to give extra force to the quantity of children Priam had, — and so lost.

quinquaginta: sc. filii, for the number cf. Hom. Il. 6.2.44, Verg. Aen. 2.503.

septemdecim iusta uxore natis: from his proper wife Hecuba, the others were from concubines. Hom. Il. 24.496 gives their number at nineteen, but Theoc. Id. 15.139 makes them twenty.

in utroque...: translate, ‘Over both did Fortune hold the same power, but in each case she used it differently.’

in rogum imposuerunt: for a Roman, it was the final touch of good fortune to depart with a prosperous and unbroken family, cf. Agr. 24.4. filii atque uxor superstitibus, salvis adfinitis et amicitias futura effugisse.

Priamum orbatum: Priam’s tale was also one common among philosophers, cf. Arist. E. N. 1.10.14, παραγόντων πάχας παρεπηρήσας.


hostilis manus: his murderer was Pyrrhus, the son of Achilles and for a description of his death, cf. Verg. Aen. 2.505ff, Juv. 10.258ff.

adstante...: these lines are also quoted more in their context in Tusc. 3.19.44, here the missing words are uidi ego te. They are from Ennius’ Andromacha Aechmalotis which employed anapsis dimeter (90 ed. Jocelyn) Compare also Sen. Trad. 44ff (with Keulen’s n. ad loc), E. Andr. 350ff, and SchöNBERGER (Zum Klagedied der Andromache, p. 255).

ope barbarica: ‘his foreign strength (i.e., allies) standing firm.’ Forcellini quotes Verg. Aen. 2.22, Priamus dum regna manebant has having the same meaning. For barbaricus, cf. Verg. Aen. 2.504, barbarico postes uero auro spoliisque superbi, i.e., Phrygian whom even Hecuba calls βαρβάρος (E. Hec. 1200) and which Serv. ad loc. explains as πᾶς μὴ "Ελλῆν βαρβάρος. Therefore, it is not unnatural that Andromache, who speaks these lines, refers to her own Trojans as barbarici.

tectis caelatis laqueatis: the roof of the palace was both carved with images (caelatus) as well as spaced out and so fretted as panels to form a coffered ceiling. We have such examples as the marble ceiling of the Hephaisteion, the Parthenon, and the Temple of Apollo at Bassai. Slabs (πλάκαι) were carefully cut into square lacunaria (δεῖτα), smoothed on the visible lower surface and an astragal (or torus) was carved into it in order to frame each of these coffers and so as to mask each joint. For literary descriptions of the practice, cf. Leg. 2.2, magnificas villas et pavimenta marmore et laqueata tecta, and Vite. De Arch. 8.2. Such pan-
utrum tandem a bonis an a malis discississet? tum profecto uideretur a bonis. at certe ei melius euenisset nec tam flebiliter illa canentur, Haec omnìa uidi inflammarì, Priamò ui uitam euitari, Iouis âram sanguine turpari.

110.7–111.5. cf. Sen. Cons. Marc. 20.4

eled ceilings were signs of great wealth and luxury, and was a target of the Epicurean Diongenes of Oinoanda found in a recent fragment, περιέχοντα οἵ&alpha;

86. Pompeio nostro: Pompey is conspicuously joined with Priam to give illustrations of such suffering, one Roman and one Greek, one recent and the other legendary. Cf. Div. 2.22 where there are also joined.

cum grauiet agrotaret: for the imperfect, cf. 2, 4 on cum recusat.

melius est factum: i.e., he recovered, cf. Piat. Cist. 73, erit isti morbo melius.

fuerunt... gratulabantur: for the sequence of tenses, cf. 2, 4 n. on fuerunt, discant.

nimium etiam Puteolani: for the ironic meaning of nimium, cf. 22, 52 n. ‘It was not a wonder, then, that the people of Puteoli came as well’, so Cicero mocks their imitation of the residents of Neapolis.

uolgo: adverbial, i.e., ex magna parte meaning from nearly all the other towns in the outlying areas, cf. 46, 111 n.

publice: i.e., chosen to represent the cities from which they came.

gratulabantur: cf. Plu. Pomp. 57, έκ των δάκων & Πούμπιος εν Νεάπολι νοσήσας ἑπόσφαλος ἅγιος... Πραξιγόρος δε σκέταντες τέλος Νεάπολιτας ἔθοι ἢ ἢ αὐτοῦ σωτῆρα κλήτ. Other historical accounts, App. B. C. 2.28, D. C. 41.6, 8.16.1, 9.5.4. Vell. Pat. 2.48 suggest that the rejoicing which followed Pompey’s recovery from his illness in 50 BC. was thought to have done more than anything to bring about a war as it made Pompey over-confident of his own power and contemptuous of Caesar’s. Pompey was in the city attempting to recruit for the Republican cause.

ineptum sane negotium et Graeculum: ‘silly and thoroughly Greek’. ineptum is used for want of due regard to time and place, cf. De Or. 1.221; or of want of taste, cf. De Or. 2.18. Along with their garrulity (Sen. Ep. 40.40, in Graecis hanc licitiam), Cicero also at times accuses the Greeks of their inclination to such foolish and obsesquious behaviour, cf. Q. Fr. 1.5.16, Graeci diuturna serenitate ad nimium assentationem eruditi. However, he did not seem to mind the behaviour too much when he was greeted with cheers on his return from exile, cf. Pis. 51, neque enim regio fuit uita ex qua non publice ad me uenerint gratulatum.
malis discessisset? certe a miseris. non enim cum socero bellum gessisset, non inparatus arma
sumpisset, non domum reliquisset, non ex Italia fugisset, non exercitu amisso nudus in seruorum
ferrum et manus incidisset, [non liberi defleti], non fortunae omnes a victoribus possiderentur.
qui, si mortem tum obisset, in amplissimis fortunis occidisset, is propagatione uitae quot, quantas,
quam incredibilis hausti calamitates!

XXXVI. Haec morte effugiuntur, etiamsi non euenerunt, tamen, quia possunt eueneri; sed
homines ea sibi accidere posse non cogitant: Metelli sperat sibi quisque fortunam, proinde quasi
aut plures fortunati sint quam infelices aut certi quicquam sit in rebus humanis aut sperare sit
prudentius quam timere. sed hoc ipsum concedatur, bonis rebus homines morte priuari: ergo
qui, si mortem tum obisset, in amplissimis fortunis occidisset, is propagatione uitae quot, quantas,

1 a miseris] a miseris RKV: a miseris edd. pr. 3 non liberi... fortunis occidisset] haec usque non habet in proprio loco P
sed subscripta ad calcem paginae 3 uctoribus] auctoribus RG: a uctoribus VKE: a uctoribus S 7 proinde] proinde X:
perinde dett. codd. 8 aut] ut X: ut S in marg.: "ut V": 8 certi] certe RG: certe KPV: 14 sic] si X: del. si V:
aut si mut. in eis dett. codd.: aut sic Seyffert

dissessisset: for the thought, cf. Prop. 3.11.37, 37. isent Phle-
graeo melius tibi funera campo, and Juv. 10.283-286, provida
Pompeio dederat Campania felres optandas etc.

a miseris: Davies and Giusta rightly objected to the weakness of miseris and remark that it is extremely rare
(I can find only two instances, at Att. 1.1.4.1, and Prov. Cons. 3.5, neither which are neuter). The reading miseris
is found in only one minor Oxford ms, but the correction to miseris is easy. Such errors in spelling are also found at
Tusc. 2.20, trachinis, and 3.45, regis (not regis).

socio: he married Julia, Caesar’s daughter, in 59 B.C.
non inparatus: the tone is bitter, and despite the many
years separating Pompey’s defeat and the writing of this
work, Cicero cannot refrain from recalling Pompey’s ar-
rogance with fresh acrimony; the first series of pluper-
fect subjunctives, gessisset, sumpsisset, fugisset, inciduntiss
is plaintive and sorrowful, and heightened by the furthered
continuation of more in the conditional.

nudus: ‘unarmed’.

defleti: Pohlenz thought a lacuna existed after non
and supplied non "cessent ab omnibus bonis" liberi. Lundström
(Glosseme, pp. 184-188), however, tried to defend non liberi
defleti by comparing Plaut. Capt. 139, but this is unconvinc-
ing. The omission of essent is quite against Cicero’s style.
Further, Magnus’ son Sextus Pompey was certainly alive
in 45 B.C., and though defleti does not necessarily imply the
sons were dead, it is doubtful Cicero would use a rhetor-
ical plural to describe such metaphorical mourning. What
follows, non fortunae possiderentur, however, forms a
good clause and does make sense in the context: had Pompey
died in 58 B.C., there would have been testamentary disposi-
tion of his property, unlike what happened afterwards to
his belongings in 45 B.C. I think there is good reason, with
Halm-Baier, simply to delete non liberi defleti as a marginal
gloss. Both Nutting (Classical Philology, 19, p. 351) and
Williams (Gnomon, 37, p. 680) believe that the gloss crept
in from a commentator who was drawing a comparison
between Pompey’s sons and those of Priam which Cicero
had previously mentioned. It would easily have entered
the text from the anaphora.

si mortem tum obisset: cf. Div. 2.22, Caes. Pompeium censes

laetaturum fuisset, si ictum sit in solitudine Aegyptiorum tru-
cidatum iri amissu exercitu.

hausti calamitates: ‘he drank his calamities down to the
dregs’; the metaphor is a common one. Editors compare
Dom. 30, si utile rei publicae fuit haurire me unum pro omnibus
illam indignissimam calamitatem etc.; Sest. 63, lactum nos
hausimus maiorem; and below 49, 118 exanclauisset omnes
labores. Serv. 3.693 says ueteres diciatant “cladem hausi”, id est,
putril; cf. Tac. Hist. 3.8.4, 4.32; and E. Cyc. 110, "παπαί τον
ἀδῶν βαίων ἀγαθὰ παπαίκοι παπαίKOι.

Metelli: the emphatic position reveals the proverbial
nature of the name, on which see n. 75, 91.

XXXVI. proinde quasi sint: the force of proinque is properly idcirco, the sense wanted when we consider that
hope has so often deceived us. A few of the lesser mss
have perinde (i.e., haud aliiter ac si) but the two forms are
frequently confused. For the use here of quasi, cf. 22, 50 n.
§§9. carere vitae commodis: ‘to lose the advantages
of life’. The expression vitae commoda is common. In our
passage it means adiuncta vitae or eōs ἵππων ekhipon, external
advantages makes one use of while living, such as friends,
wealth, etc, cf. Ac. 1.23; N. D. 1.23; Lucr. 3.2

certe ita dicit necesse est: Frederking (Zu Cicero, p. 636) would delete these words as a gloss, but Lund-
ström (Glosseme, p. 23) I think has defended them suc-
cessfully. Even if we do retain them, there is no reason to
suspect an with Nisbet (CR, 16, p. 58), see 2.4 n. above.

nomen ipsum carendi: nomen here has the meaning of
ōrēa, the gerund is a gen. of definition, 4, 8 n.; 15, 34 n.;
and 23, 53 n. principium mouendi.

ulalet hoc in uiuis: ‘but this is only valid for the living’.

non modo...sed ne quidem: i.e., non modo non. When
the two clauses share a common verb which stands in the
second, the negative implied in the second clause is
implied in both, Madv. Gram. 416b and cf. Tusc. 5.93, neque
necessitatem modo, sed ne naturam quidem.

qui nulli sunt: cf. 6, 11; 38, 91.

sic: ‘in the same way as the dead are said to go without
life’. V erased the word entirely (a possibility), but I think
Seyffert’s correction of sic for the mss. si is more likely, the
consonant falling out easily before cornibus.
cornibus caremus aut pinnis? ecquis id dixerit? certe nemo. quid ita? quia, cum id non habeas quod tibi nec usu nec natura sit aptum, non careas, etiamsi sentias te non habeare. hoc premendum etiam atque etiam est et urguendum argumentum confirmato illo, de quo, si mortales animi sunt, dubitare non possiblemus, quin tantus interitus in morte sit, ut ne minima quidem suspicio sensus reliquatur — hoc igitur probe stabilito et fixo illud excutiendum est, ut sciatur, quid sit carere, ne relinquatur aliquid erroris in uerbo. [carere igitur hoc significat: egere eo quod habere uelis; inest enim uelle in carendo, nisi cum sic tamquam in febri dicatur alia quodam notione uerbi. dicetur enim alio modo etiam carere, cum aliquid non habeas et non habere te sentias, etiamsi id facile patiere.] [ carere in morte non dicitur; nec enim esset dolendum; dicitur illud: ‘bono


cornibus: I think Reid is right to see an allusion here to the καρνίδια λύχνου of Eubulides, D. L. 2.11.8 and 7.187. Cicero must have been familiar with the paradoxes as he criticises them in his Ac. 2.49, utissimum sane et captissimus genus. The paradox causes a problem in trying to account for intuitions about presuppositions in two-valued logic. Given the argument, ‘You still have what you have not lost; you have not lost your horns, therefore you have horns’, Eubulides denied that ‘your horns’ was a meaningful statement by accepting Parmenides’ dictum that τὸ γὰρ αὐτό νοεῖν ἐστὶν τε καὶ εἰσιν, Dox. Grsec. 63 (PHILLIPS: Parmenides on Thought and Being). His conclusion then was that we cannot represent in any logical fashion what it means to lack something, cf. Arist. Part. Or 112

care... in morte: [we must fully explain the words carere in morte]... in morte X: carere enim in morte (aut) in malo dett. codd.: carere in morte Madvig: ita carere in morte Sappe: carere... in morte: if we would have expected to read below, Madv. Gram. 370. inest enim uelle in carendo: ‘for a sense of desire is in the word “lacking”’.

tamquam in febri: cf. Fam. 16.15, mihi nuntiavit te plane febri careare; Fin. 1.11, careare dolore, Gell. N. A. 19.8, morbo quidem, inquit, cares, sed uero uito non cares, and DOEDERLEIN: Lat. Syn. et Etym., vol. 3, p. 114. One scholar in S failed to see the meaning and commented quae careare iucundum est.

careare in morte: Bentley confessed that he did not understand the words carere in morte... quid est malum, Heine similarly who deleted them. The passage is indeed obscure. Kühner explained in morte as si quis mortuus est and this is how I understood it. Many emendations have been proposed, but the one commonly accepted, careare in malo non dicetur... in the msS. S and E and adopted by Dougan, is to my mind more baffling. On the other hand, we can extract at least some sense from in morte. The argument turns upon the logical problem of assigning to the dead something that is not apart of its nature. I find that Kernius (in Wolf ad loc.) translated with Vermissen, and English translators, who mar this passage by needlessly clinging to the definition ‘to lack’, should take note. Our own versatile ‘to miss’ is quite fit for purpose in this regard and is commonly punned upon by humourists: ‘You missed work!’, ‘Yes, but I would not say I missed it!’, where the first denotes absence, the second desire. The former meaning is found in careare when Cicero earlier stated morte careare omnis sensa, that ‘death lacks any sense’ both above 12, 56 and in Tusc. 5.88, in which he applies the term to an inanimate object in the sense of ‘free from’, ‘absent’. So we should find no trouble with the phrase careare in morte, ‘a dead man is missing life’, though it is not one generally used except perhaps comically. But Cicero now explicitly states that ‘to lack’ implies a feeling of something
care', quod est malum. sed ne uiusus quidem bono caret, si eo non indiget; sed in uiusu intelligi tamen potest regno carere — dici autem hoc in te satis subtiliter non potest; posset in Tarquinio, cum regno esset expulsus — at in mortuo ne intelligi quidem. carere enim sentientis est, nec sensum in mortuo: ne carere quidem igitur in mortuo est.

XXXVII. Quamquam quid opus est in hoc philosophari, cum rem non magnopere philosophia egere uideamus? quotiens non modo ductores nostri, sed uniuersi etiam exercitus ad non dubiam mortem concurrerunt quae quidem si timeretur, non L. Brutus arcens eum redivit tyrannum, quem ipse expulerat, in proelio concidisset; non cum Latinis decertans pater Decius, cum Etruscis filius, cum Pyrrho nepos se hostium telis obiecisset; non uno bello pro patria cadentis Scipiones Hispania uidisset, Paulum et Geminiun Cannae, Venusia Marcellum, Litana Albinum, Lucani

missing this and is not attributable to the dead because they cannot feel any anguish (13, 30. doli). And so we can translate the whole passage thus (changing the fever idiom accordingly): 'And so to "miss" signifies this: to be without something you wish to have — for there is a sense of desire in "missing", unless it is used in a different sense, as "to miss being caught". For there is also another way in which "to miss" is used, when you do not have something and you are aware you do not have it, even though you can easily bear that. But not even a living person can be said "to miss" something for which he has no desire etc.' This, I think, gives sense but the brevity of Cicero's passage make it obscure.

sed ne uiusus...sed in uiuso: for the recurrence of sed, cf. Fin. 5.89 and Off. 1.60.

regno carere: Dougan claims that te is abundantly supported by the mss. and would translate 'you, i.e., any living person', but this deviates from the Latin. Lundström also tried to defend it but I do not think successfully. The examples are poignant.

Tarquinio: Tarquin Superbus, seventh king of Rome was driven out from his kingdom in 509B.C. by the possibly mythical L. Brutus.

cum regno esset expulsus: the subj. is likely causal, and not simply so by attraction, i.e., 'we could say' Tarquin "misses" his kingdom because he was driven out from it", i.e., he once had it, and now lacks it.

The historical event is mentioned at Tusc. 4.2, perhaps with a hint to Brutus his addressee, L. Brutus patriam liberavit, praecules acer noctilibat tuae; however, at Brut. 331, tibi optamus eam rem publicam in qua duorum generum amplissimorum renovare memoriam atque aegre possis, there is an even less guarded exhortation. It is difficult to say with certainty why Cicero chose Tarquin and the example of a kingdom in place of a more common example when making his point about 'lacking'. I only remark that Tarquin does come chronologically first in the list of examples Cicero recalls where Romans die nobly for their republic (as L. Brutus does below). The examples are poignant.

XXXVII. 88g. cum uideamus: the subj. is causal.

quotiens...: there are numerous passages where such a series of heroes occur, below 46, 100; Sen. 75; Rep. 1.1; Off. 1.61; Parad. 1.12; N. D. 3.80, cf. Sen. Ep. 82.22. satis...: for the tense, cf. 12, 27. nisi haeret.

L. Brutus: traditionally said to have fallen in battle against Arruns Tarquinius Decius: Decius was the father who at Verseris 340B.C. in the great Latin war; his son P. Decius similarly 'devoted' himself to the Di Mances and Tellus at Sentinum in 295 B.C. in his fourth consulate. Both of the stories are described by Liv. 8.9, Fin. 2.61, Tusc. 2.29, Parad. 1.12, Off. 3.16, Liv. 10:28.13, Sen. Ep. 67.9, Sen. Bel. 4.27.2, 6.36.2, D. S. 21.6.2, and see RE 5.229ff. For a study on this type of devoitio ducis, see Versnet (Two Types of Roman devotion); Janssen (Devotio Deciana, pp. 378–379).

The grandson P. Decius supposedly perished at Asculum in 273B.C. in a similar fashion, as Cicero states Fin. 2.61, consul cecidisset in proelio seque e continenti genere tertiam victimam rei publicae praebuit, though Zon. Ann. 8.5 indicates that this Decius did not in fact dedicate himself and lost the battle to Pyrrhus, cf. MRR 1.202, n. 2. The grandson is excluded from the passages cited earlier, where the only the father and son feature. Cicero probably came to know about the grandson through Enn. Ann. 6.191–194, cf. Smutsch/Cornell (Book VI of Ennius’ Annals, pp. 514–515).

It is a curious feature that all three men who 'devoted' themselves bore the cognomen Mus, which was a name never used again.

Scipiones: P. Cornelius Scipio, the father, and Cn. Cornelius Scipio Calvus, uncle to the elder Africanus, both defeated and slain in Spain 212B.C., Gnaeus a few days after Publius, cf. the passages mentioned above and Balb. 34, cum duo fulminis nostri imperi subito in Hispania, Cn. et P. Scipiones, extincti occiderant. For the campaign and deaths, cf. Polyb. 8.14; 10.36.3; Liv. 28.28.13; Val. Max. 1.6.2; 2.7.15; 9.11, extl. 4 oppressos in Hispania Scipiones. Cn. Servilius Geminius: consul 217B.C., fell at Cannae. L. Aemilius Pauletus: consul second time in 216B.C., whose foolhardy colleague C. Terentius Varro led him into battle at Cannae, App. B. C. 7.19. On his death, cf. Dig. 2.71, num minus credidit in Cannessi pugna cum exerciti, Sen. 75, Val. Max. 3.4.4. We know much about him from Plutarch’s life. M. Claudius Marcellus: five times consul who fell at Venusia in 208B.C. against the Carthaginians. Hannibal (according to tradition) sent his ashes back to Rome, cf. N. D. 2.185, 3.80; Div. 2.77, Liv. 27.26, Plut. Marc. 30, Verg. Aen. 8.896.

Litana: Litana was a forest in the Apennines in Cisapline Gaul, where L. Postumius Albinus was destroyed by the Boii 216B.C. along with his entire army, cf. Liv. 23.24, Silua erat usata (Litamum Galli uocabat)…iī Postumiis omni ui ne caperet dimicans occubuit. Livy tells us that he was
Gracchum. num quis horum miser hodie? ne tum quidem post spiritum extremum; nec enim potest esse miser quisquam, sensu perempto. ‘at id ipsum odiosum est, sine sensu esse.’

§90. odiosum, si id esset carere cum uero perspicium sit nihil posse in eo esse, qui ipse non sit, quid potest esse in eo odiuos, qui nec careat nec sentiat? quanquam hoc quidem nimis saepe, sed eo, quod in hoc inest omnis animi contractio ex metu mortis. qui enim satis uiderit, id quid est luce clarius, animo et corpore consumpto totoque animante deleto et facto interitu uniuerius illud animal, quod fuerit, factum esse nihil, is plane perspiciet inter Hippocentaurum, qui numquam fuerit, et regem Agamemnonem nihil interesse, nec plures nunc facere M. Camillum hoc ciuile bellum, quam ego illo uiero feceram Romam captum. cur uigerit et Camillus doleret, si haec post trecentos et quinquaginta fere annos euentura putaret, et ego doleam, si ad decem milia annum gentem aliquam urbem nostram potituram putem? quia tanta caritas partiae est, ut eam non sensu nostro, sed salute ipsius metiamur.

XXXVIII. Itaque non deterret sapientem mors, quae propter incertos casus cotidie minime, propter breuitatem utae numquam potest longe abesse, quo minus in omne tempus rei publicae

4 sed eo] sedeo GVR
7 esse] esse GVR: est K  illo uiero] illo uiero RG
urbem nostram GVR: urbe nostra s: urbe nomin BP:
VGL: non R: K fort. ead. manu superesc.: non modo ante non in marg. add. V: 12 imminet: iel
impent V: decapitated, and his skull was covered over with beaten gold and turned into a drinking cup used for libations, cf. Vell. Pat. 14.2.8.

Gracchum: Ti. Sempronius Gracchus, distinguished general of the second Punic war was slain 212 B.C. in Lucania having been ambushed by Maglo, Liv. Per. 25.

§90. odiosum, si id esset carere: i.e., odiosum esset, the ellipse of the verb being common, cf. Fin. 2.93, and K.–S. 2.162 1a.

quanquam hoc quidem: sc. mortus nihil sentire.
nimis saepe: sc. a me dictor. For the ellipse, cf. 17, 40 ignatur dubitamus? an sic, ut pleraque? quamquam hoc quidem minime.

sed eo: another ellipse, sc. hoc facimus. The particles quanquam... sed are often joined in this way.
in hoc: i.e., the belief that the soul, even after death, continues to perceive the world as we do now.

animi contractio: for the term, cf. TLL 4, 752, 55 and Tusc. 4.66, effusio animi in laelitia quia in dolore contractum, anguis or dejection.

fuerit... fuerit... fuerim: the use of the perf. subj. is for reported thought, dependent upon uiderit and perspiciet.

Hippocentaurum: though Cicero uses both term, centaurus is sometimes used without any specifications to mean a creature formed of man and horse, while the term hippocentaurus is used in distinction from the other types such as oncentaurus, ichthyocentaurs, and the strange nepheleo-centaurus. Philosophers used the animal as a typical example of a non-existent being, Div. 2.5, quis enim hippocentaurum fuisse aut Chimaeram putat, Div. 2.49, N. D. 1.105 and frequently argued and rationalised over the origins, particularly as stemming from the confusion of ideas between men and horses, D. L. 7.53, Pl. Rep. 9.586c, S. E. M. 2.60, and the Suidas s. v. stede. We have many instances of philosophical scepticism, Xenophanes (Dox. Grac. 11b1, 22) κατακρίνων, τιμήτων τῶν προτέρων: ps.-Pl. Ax. 596c; Arist. Apol. 2.1, 893bd ὥσπερ οἱ ἐκ τῶν ἤμη κατάντας τῆς ἥμης (and Aristotle said was to have written books ὅπερ τῶν συνέτων ἔσχων and ὅπερ τῶν μεθολογομένων ἔσχων, D. L. 5.25); also see Lucr. 4.739–740; Sen. Ep. 58.15, S. E. P. 1.162, ἀκολουθεῖα παράλληλα τοῦ ἱστορικου ἱστορίας ἡμῶν. Agamemnonem: sc. qui olim urae fuerit. Editors here assume that Cicero believes in the historical authenticity of the Trojan account, however cf. Off. 3.94, omittamus et fabulas et externa; ad rem factam nostranquam veniamus where he dismisses the Homeric heroes Odysseus, Agamemnon and Theseus as stories. For the purpose, it does not really matter as he is simply conceived as being long dead, and so there is no difference between him or something which never existed. Cicero follows his usual practice and follows a Greek by a Roman example.

soc pluri nunc facere: i.e., nec magis Camillo carae esse etc. The negative is one of price as floci facere.

M. Camillum: recalled from exile by the Romans to take command after the Gauls seized upon their city in 390 B.C.

hoc ciuile bellum: though we know from Att. 15.2.4, quod prima disputatio Tusculana te confirmat sanctoque Aticus was reading this around 44 B.C., the civil war here referred to was likely the battle of Munda, fought on March 17, 45 B.C. Cicero was writing the Tusculana probably in mid-July of this year, and no doubt expected another triumph to be held upon Caesar’s return as had occurred in 46 B.C. upon his return from Africa. Cicero perhaps did not perceive the civil war as over while Sextus Pompey remained alive and active, as he was at this time.

Camillus doleret... et ego doleam: cf. 12, 27 n. on hcecret. It seems best to take the imperfect subjunctives as denoting continuous states of mind, and the present doleam and putem as hypothesis, cf. K.–S. 2.469, 3b and Madv. Gram. 390a. Translate, ‘Why would Camillus mourn if he thought that all this would happen 350 years after him, and why shall I mourn now if in another ten thousand some city comes to control Rome?’

ad decem milia: cf. HAND: Tursellinus, vol. 1, p. 88, though not a common construction, nevertheless the usage is the same as ad diem or ad extremum, cf. De Or. 3.92, faciendum est ad annum, ‘done in a year’s time’; Att. 5.2.1 and Att. 12.46.

urbem nostram: it is not clear why Giusta in his latest edition abandoned the mss. nostram urbem. The accusative is found with the verb poterit in Plautus and Terence, and the authors of the B. Hisp. and B. Afr. use it for the storming of towns and forts. Kübler complained that too many editors think the idiom foreign to Cicero and so needlessly correct many instances of it in his works. We have urbem est potitus at Off. 2.81 (with good MSS. authority) though altered to urbe by Winterbottom. In our passage, there does not seem to be reason to abandon the rarer reading.

quia tanta caritas...: Cicero seems to have raised a possible objection in the mind of his reader who was not quite convinced of the soul’s annihilation at death — why would we care then what happens to our posterity? Cicero’s reply undermines his earlier argument that such care is evidence of an immortal soul, 14, 31.
suisque consulat, ut postteritatem ipsum, cuius sensum habiturus non sit, ad ut se putet pertinere. quare licet etiam mortale esse animum iudicantem aeterna molli, non gloriae cupiditate, quam sensurus non sit, sed uirtutis, quam necessario gloria, etiamsi tu id nonagas, sequatur. natura uero <si> se sic habet, ut, quo modo initium nubis rerum omnium ortus noster adferat, sic exitum mors, ut nihil pertinuit ad nos ante ortum, sic nihil post mortem pertinbet. in quo quid potest esse mali, cum mors nec ad eiusu pertinete nec ad mortuos? alteri nulli sunt, alteros non attinget. quam qui leiuorem faciunt, somni simillimam ulunt esse: quasi uero quisquam ita nonaginta annos uelit uiuere, ut, cum saxaginta confecerit, reliquos dormiat; ne sues quidem id uelint, non

3–6. [Plu.] Consol. ad Apoll. 109e.


XXXVIII. §91. ut...se putet: if the construction is sound, ut...se putet is compressed for ut inde adprecat cum posteritatem...ad se pertinere (so Kühner understood it), but Reid points out that in all such cases, the statement preceding the subj. clause is never general, implying something like ut putem or ut credam esse. Drexler, following Seyffert, altered to cum citing Tac. Ann. 13.26 but such a passage is thought corrupt by most editors and we would want something there like cum is. Müller’s conjecture of aut is both possible but rather weak, and the emendations of Marione and Giusta are improbable since Cicero prefers quippe cum or quippe qui utuotpe. It is best simply to retain the ms. reading in these cases.

licit animum iudicantem: the construction of licet is common enough in Cicero with the accusative participle when the subject, as here, is definite, cf. Tusc. 5.44, abund- antem licet esse miserrimum; Fat. 15.35, superioura retrepentem regredi infinita licet; Off. 1.92, praescripsenturam licet mag-nifice uiuere, K.–S. 2.129, 12.

animum: mss. have anima but throughout this discussion Cicero only uses animus to mean the soul, cf. 9, 19.

gloriae: cf. Fin. 3.57, de bono autem fama — quam enim appellant eobifins, aptius est bonam famam hoc loco appellare quam gloriain — Chrysippus quidem et Diogenes detracta utilitae ne digimium quidem eius causar prorrigendum esse dicebant, i.e., ‘good reputation’.

sensurus non sit: the subject is to be supplied from iudicantem (Wolf). The indefinite pronoun, quam enim appellant eobifins, aptius est bonam famam hoc loco appellare quam gloriain — Chrysippus quidem et Diogenes detracta utilitae ne digimium quidem eius causar prorrigendum esse dicebant, i.e., ‘good reputation’.

sensurus non sit: the subject is to be supplied from iudicantem (Wolf). The indefinite pronoun, quam enim appellant eobifins, aptius est bonam famam hoc loco appellare quam gloriain — Chrysippus quidem et Diogenes detracta utilitae ne digimium quidem eius causar prorrigendum esse dicebant, i.e., ‘good reputation’.

gloria consequatur: the concept of a virtuous ‘glory’ was stressed by Cicero after the ravages of the civil war and under Caesar who thought he acquired glory through his victories. He once wrote to Cato (Fam. 15.4.13) that he never himself pursued glory for its own sake, but only conduct which brought glory as a true reward. In both the Fin. and the Tusc. Cicero stressed a connection between uirtus et gloria, whereas the cupiditas gloriae was a disease, a dangerous and vain passion like greed or desire for tyranny, cf. Tusc. 3.2–4, Tusc. 4.79, Fin. 1.59 and Jat. (Ciceron et la gloire en temps de guerre civile, p. 40). For the former was true glory, όλοικα; whatever happened to the soul, Cicero held fast to this nobler immortality, one that was difficult to conceive but nonetheless for good men was very real (Sullivan: Cicero and Gloria, p. 398; Bruewaene: La Théologie de Cicéron, p. 79; Allen: Cicero’s Conscit, p. 120). The latter was an empty ghost, only a popular glory. However, for the oratorical hypocrisy of Cicero regarding distinction between the two, cf. Marcell. 26–27.

id agas: cf. 20, 46 n.

consequatur: cf. 16, 36 n.
adferat: cf. 4, 8 uellet. The subj. is due to attraction because adferat is to be understood with sic exitum mors.

§92. alteros non attinget: Dougan is right to explain the tense as noting not only what in fact is true, but also what will prove to be so in the future, cf. ps.–Pl. Ax. 369b (where this sentiment is perhaps falsely assigned to Prodicus), θάνατον δὲ εὖ, πότε δὲν θάνατον; n. 109. cf. Quint. 4.26, that if even pigs would refuse such a passage of the Tusc. refers not to the moment of dissolution, but the resulting state of death.

qui leiuorem: = minus altum, cf. Lucr. 5.864.

somni simillimam: cf. the old poets who called Sleep and Death brothers, and cf. Sen. St., and Hom. I. 11.242, κοιµήσατο χάλκεον ὕπνον, 12.790, πότε δὲν θάνατον; n. 125, who uses the same line of reasoning, όσος μὲν ἕζεται ὑπὲρ ὁ θάνατος οὐ πάρει οὐδ’ ὁ θάνατος οὐ παρεῖ. Lucr. 3.850, mors in this passage of the Tusc. refers not to the moment of dissolution, but the resulting state of death.

suisque consulat, ut posteritatem ipsum, cuius sensum habiturus non sit, ad ut se putet pertinere. quare licet etiam mortale esse animum iudicantem aeterna molli, non gloriae cupiditate, quam sensurus non sit, sed uirtutis, quam necessario gloria, etiamsi tu id nonagas, sequatur. natura uero <si> se sic habet, ut, quo modo initium nubis rerum omnium ortus noster adferat, sic exitum mors, ut nihil pertinuit ad nos ante ortum, sic nihil post mortem pertinbet. in quo quid potest esse mali, cum mors nec ad eiusu pertinete nec ad mortuos? alteri nulli sunt, alteros non attinget. quam qui leiuorem faciunt, somni simillimam ulunt esse: quasi uero quisquam ita nonaginta annos uelit uiuere, ut, cum saxaginta confecerit, reliquos dormiat; ne sues quidem id uelint, non
modo ipse. Endymion uero, si fabulas audire uolumus, ut nescio quando in Latmō obdormiuit, qui est mons Cariae, nondum, opinor, est expe[rr]ectus. num igitur eum curare censes, cum Luna laboret, a qua consopitis putatur, ut eum dormientem oscularetur? quid cuid autem, qui ne sentit quidem? habes somnum imaginem mortis eamque cotidie induis: et dubitas quin sensus in morte nullius sit, cum in eius simulacrum videas esse nullum sensum?

XXXIX. Pellantur ergo istae ineptiae paene aniles, ante tempus mori miserum esse. quod tandem tempus? naturae? at ea quidem dedid usuram tamquam pecuniae nulla praestituta die. quid igitur quod querare, si repetit cum uolt? ea enim conditione acceperas. idem, si puer paruus occidit, aequo animo ferendum putant, si uero in cunis, ne querendum quidem. atqui ab hoc acerbius quid est igitur quod querare, si repetit cum uolt? ea enim conditione acceperas. idem, si puer paruus...
muito saeptius lacrimasse Priumquam quam Troilium. eorum autem, qui exacta aetate moriuntur, fortuna laudatur. cur? nam, reor, nullis, si uita longior daretur, posset esse iucundior; nihil enim est profecto homini prudentia dulcis, quam, ut cetera auferat, adfert certe senectus. quae uero aetas longa est, ut quid omnino homini longum? nonne

Mòdo pueros, modo aedulescentes in cursu a tergo insequens

Nec opinantis ãdsecta est. senectus? sed quia ultra nihil habemus, hoc longum dicimus. omnia ista, perinde ut cuique data sunt pro rata parte, ita aut longa aut breuia dicuntur. apud Hypanim fluuium, qui ab Europae parte in Pontum influit, Aristoteles ait bestiolas quam necuti, quae unum diem uivant. ex his

τό τε πολὺ δήπου ἢ µικρὸν οὐδὲν διαφέρειν δοκε‹

τό γÁρας τὸν Κιµµέριον ὑπὸ τροπὰς θερινὰς καταφέρονται ὑπὸ

εἴωθεν χρόνο

εἶς

720

Sicero argues ironically (cur?. . . :

omnia mortua est, prouecta aetate mortua est; quae vero occidente sole, decrepita,

Verg. Oct. 9.31, omnia fert actas, animam quaque.

omnia ista: 'all the spans of life (childhood, youth, adulthood, and old age) are measured in each their own terms, or so are called either short or long', viz. in terms relative to the normal duration of the life of the species: the flies live a long life at three days, but that measurement in a man's life is very short. therefore

perinde: 36, 86 n.

Hypanim fluuium: the Southern Buh (or Bug) in Ukraine, which flows southwesterly into the Black sea.

bestiolas quasdam nasci, quae unum diem uian: cf. [Arist]. H. A. 5.19, 553a, sê pri de ton ὤμoν ὄχειν τὸ περὶ κλάσματα τῶν ζωτικῶν τὸς στόμαςòν κατασκευάζεται ὑπὸ τοῦ πτωσοῦ ὠνθάκα µακρὸς ραγών, ἤ ὡς ρηχοχυμίων ἐξερχεται ἔξω αὐτῶν τετράποσαν· ζī δὲ καὶ πέτεται µέχρι

τί δ᾿ ἐστὶ µακρὸν ἢ τί

τὸ γέροντος, κατασκευάζεται ὑπὸ τοῦ θύελλα µακροσειοῦ ὁ καὶ καλείται ἐφίμωρον, which Plin. H. N. 11.36 translates quite literally but calls them not ἕφημουs but ἡµερόβιον, while Ael. H. A. 5.43 uses the term µονόµερον.

prooeita aetate: here, prooeita agreeing with quae, and not prooeita with aetate, i.e., 'the little fly died well advanced in his age', as opposed to 'the little fly died, his age having well-advanced', the latter I think erroneously listed in L. & S. s. v. TLL 10.2, 2308, 5; Sen. 10, aetate prooeita and n. below.

decrepita: found only here in Cicero. Again, decrepita seems applied only to people and so we should understand here decrepita with quae.

solstitiali die: i.e., the longest day of the year, summer solstice (thought to be from Aristotle's 

Protrepticus, fr. 10a 11), and so are called either short or long', viz. in terms relative to the normal duration of the life of the species: the flies live a long life at three days, but that measurement in a man's life is very short. therefore

perinde: 36, 86 n.
propemodum breuitate, qua illae bestiolae, reperiemur.

XL. Contemnamus igitur omnis ineptias — quod enim leuius huic leuiatati nomen inponam? — totamque uim bene uienidi in animi roborac magnitudo et in omnium rerum humanarum contemptione ac despicientia et in omni uirtute ponamus. nam nunc quidem cogitationibus molestissimis effeminamur, ut, si ante mors aduentem quam Chaldaeorum promissa consecuti sumus, spoliati magnis quibusdam bonis, insulis destitutiqueuideamur. quosdi exspectando et desiderando pendemus animis, cruciamur, angimur, pro di immortales, quam illud iter iucundum esse debet, quo confecto nulla reliqua cura, nulla sollicitudo futura sit! quam me delectat Thera- menes! quam elato animo est! etis enim flemus cum legitimus tamen non miserabiliter uir clarus...
emoritur. qui cum coniectus in carcerem triginta iussu tyrannorum uenenum ut sitiens obduxisset, reliquum sic e poculo eiecit, ut id resoneraret, quo sonitu reddito adridens 'propino' inquit, 'hoc pulchro Cruciae,' qui in eum fuerat taeterrimus. Graeci enim in conuiuis solent nominare, cui polum tradituri sint. lusit uir egregius extremo spiritu, cum iam praecordiis conceptam mortem contineret, uereque ei, cui uenenum praebiberat, mortem eam est auguratus, quae breui consecuta est. quis hanc maximis animi aequitatem in ipsa morte laudaret, si mortem malum iudicaret?

uidat in eundem carcerem atque in eundem paucis post annis scyphum Socrates, eodem scelere iudicum quo tyrannorum Theramenes. quae est igitur eius oratio, qua facit eum Plato usum apud iudices iam morte multatum?

XLI. 'Magna me,' inquit, 'spes tenet, iudices, bene mihi euenire, quod mittar ad mortem. necesse est enim sit alterum de duobus, ut aut sensus omnino omnes mors auferat aut in alium quendam locum eum locis migretur. quam ob rem, siue sensus extinguitur morsque ei somno


ut sitiens: 'he drank it down, as if he were thirsty', obduco, like obsorbo, only means to 'drink' ('not gulp down') where it is the participle which brings forward a sense of eagerness (Küh).

sic e poculo eiecit, ut id resoneraret: cf. ἐπιμοιασάμεθα the passage from Xen. Hel. loc. cit. above. The κάτταβος was a drinking game among the Greeks where wine lees were flung at a statuette (παλάτσιον) atop a candelabrum stand (μάνης κοτταβίζειν). The goal was to knock the statuette off in such a way as it would strike a disc (μάνης) half way down the stand and make it ring. For the details of its configuration and the evidence, see HaIvLy (The κάτταβος κατακτός). Rosen (Euboules' Ankylion and the Game of Kottabos, p. 355), and RE. 11.2, 1528–41. The game apparently required a great amount of skill and those who were adept at the game were held in high honour.

propino hoc: 'I drink this to fair Critias,' for the idiom cf. Mart. 2.15.1, nulli calceum tuum propinam.

pulchro Cruciae: we have an inscription on a drinking vessel (Louvre, G 114, Copenhagen Painter, 480 B.C.) which shows that these 'toasts' were usually directed towards someone other than the person about whom the kottabos player is speaking, and so Theramenes probably spoke these words to his gaoler. (Kottabos Toast, p. 377) argued that the phrase inscribed on this drinking vessel was was τῷ τάνδε λατάσσω: a question was posed, 'for whom shall I toss the wine?' and then the answer was shouted out with humourous anticipation, often with complimentary terms. The anticipation was due to the oracular nature of a successful throw. It was thought that you shouted out a name of a lover and if you hit the mark and it made a sound, you were assured that your love was required, cf. scholast to Ar. Pax. 343, κοτταβίζειν εἰ γένετο μείζον φόβος, ἐδόκουσιν ὑπὸ τῶν ἐραστῶν ἔρασθαι κλ. And so, if, therefore, Theramenes threw the wine and was not expecting to hit the mark on account of the difficulty of the attempt, he would have been surprised and so laughed at his discovery that fortune had given him a sign; he told the man nearby (likely the one who gave him the poison) that he would requite Critias for the love he bore him (rather than simply toast to his health ironically, as most editors). At least as I understand the passage, the ut is a result clause and not purpose.

teterrimus: Critias took the lead in the prosecution of Theramenes.

Graeci poculum tradituri: cf. Hom. Il. 9.223, στηληθάμες δ᾽ αἷων δέθας διδέκτη 'Αχιλέα: πλησοῦτες γὰρ πρὸς τὸν ἄμφος μετὰ προσγιασμένος

extremo spiritu: cf. 5, 10 maxima corona. In this passage it is an abl. abs. of accompanying circumstances, not of means and so not 'with his last breath', but 'at the end of his life'.

praeberiet: = propinuart, to toast and found in Cicero only here and nowhere else in Classic Latin. Davies quotes Apu. Met. 10.334 and Bentley found this entry in Stephonius' Glossarium Graeco-Latinum: προπίνω, propino, prohibeo, after which he writes 'corrigi praebibō'. See Dougan ad loc.

consecuta est: 16, 36 n. Critias was dead not shortly after, falling at the battle of Munychia in March, 403 B.C.

§§7. quis hanc... iudicaret: Camerarius objected to the logic; the fortitude that Theramenes showed was not necessarily due to the fact that he judged death no evil, but perhaps was a result of his virtue which manifested itself, as it often does, during calamity and misfortune.

uadit: 'udare volentis est, non eius qui iudicum scelere in carcarem ac supplicium mittetur; praeterea illud uadimus haud dubiam in mortem and Dougan's n. Critias was dead not shortly after, falling at the battle of Munychia in March, 403 B.C. 361, The change is owing to the length of the construction also happens in 3.56, with bold resolution and does not necessarily imply any force of willingness as Giusta would believe. Joined with it is an abl. abs. of accompanying circumstances, not of means and so not 'with his last breath', but 'at the end of his life'.

praebierat: = praeberiet, to toast and found in Cicero only here and nowhere else in Classic Latin. Davies quotes Apu. Met. 10.334 and Bentley found this entry in Stephanius' Glossarium Graeco-Latinum: προπίνω, propino, prohibeo, after which he writes 'corrigi praebibō'. See Dougan ad loc.

paucus post annis: post is adverbial, annis is abl. of measurement.


XLI. magna me spes tenet: i.e., cum magna spe credo (Kühner), and so the infinitive follows.

militar: subj. from reported thought as these are Socrates' statements.

§§8. siue sensus... sin uera sunt: the change of construction also happens in Ac. 1.7, siue enim... si uero, where we would have expected, as in our passage, either siue... siue or si... siue. The change is owing to the length of the clause which intervenes.
emori: this is the reading of most mss., though two Oxford mss. read mori, adopted by Ernesti. There is no reason to depart from the best authority here, and it is likely that Cicero avoided the iambic mori at the end of his clause. The difference in meaning between the two is often slight, such as De Or. 1.243, nasci et emori and Off. 3.111, uiuere et emori; but cf. my n. 8, 15 and Doederlein: Lat. Syn. et Etym. vol. 3, p. 183.

migrationem: i.e. migrationem, Pl. Ap. 490. Cicero does not use any quasi or quidam to soften the term, as he did previously in 12, 27; this is likely because it is a free-flowing translation rather than the a simply borrowing of a term.

qui e uita excesserunt incolunt: the verbs are in the indicative similar to the Greek, though Ernesti and Bouvier wished to alter to excesserunt; but it is the factual statement of whether souls do ‘inhabit those remote shores’ after death which is under evaluation. Below, however, the subj. appellentur is correct and supported by the following uixerint; not, as Dougan says, because of their hypothetical character (though this is expressed through sin uera), but because they are referred to in the judgement of Socrates, i.e., ‘those who would be rightly called judges’, and ‘they who would have lived justly and with honour’, contrary to his immediate and corrupt judges. Cicero’s translation of this passage from Plato is somewhat looser.

id multo iam: iam placed elegantly for tum certe or sine Cato and signifies that the statement is immediately evident on its own accord. ‘And so it is actually all the more blessed.’

tene uenire, conuenireque: rather than placing a full-stop after beatius, the older editors before Davies placed a comma and construed it with the infinitives which follow; however, later editors like Davies, Kübler, TS., place a full stop after beatius and understand the indirect speech to be taken with uideri potest, i.e., ‘This peregrination, that you should meet such men, does it seem to you only a mediocre thing?’ But the Latinity would require us to read te (not tene), an emendation adopted by Moser. I think it best (with Dougan) to understand tene as nonne mirum est so that the accusative with the infinitive expresses exclamation, as we must also understand at Tusc. 2.21, virginelam me ore plorate edere (with nomine est indignum).

iudicum numero haberi uolunt: for the se accusative in such forceful constructions, cf. Tusc. 2.7, qui se philosophos appellari uolunt. The emphasis is placed more upon their own consideration than on their desire. For the subtle difference, cf. K.-S. 1.229, 4 and Off. 1.65, quisque animi magnitudine maxime excellet, fit maxime vult princeps omnium vel potius solus esse..principemque se esse nullum quam videri.

Minos, Rhadamanthus: Minos and Rhadamanthus were said to have judged justly upon earth and so to have become judges in the underworld after their death. They are frequently mentioned in Greek and Roman literature. Aemac, Triptolemus: note the pairing of all the names, including those below Orpheo, Musaeo, and Homero, Hesiodo. Along with Minos and Rhadamanthus (cf. 5, 10), Aeacus, the mythical king of Aegina and famed for his justice was the third judge of the underworld according to Plato, though nowhere else so referred to. Both he and Triptolemus, called ἱεροφόροι for wisdom in the laws and revered for his invention of agricultural practices, were considered just judges while they lived.

conuenireque: conuenirique, the use of -que after è is avoided by Cicero in his speeches, but used twice in the Tusc. 1.28 indique above and Tusc. 5.119, omnique. For the force of -que, cf. abvoe 40, 95 totanique.

peregrinatio: the term in Cicero is more frequent in his letters than in his formal speeches. Dougan thinks that it is often used of travelling for pleasure, but I do not find this to be the case. It simply means journey, cf. Phil. 2.101 (ironically of Antony) quam nobilitis est tua illa peregrinatio! and TLL 10.1, 1301, 55. ut uero: the particle uero often has an affirmative force. The force of ut seems to be final.

Orpheo: son of the Muse Calliope, generally taken to be representative of primaeval poetry. It is disputed whether he or Amphion first discovered the use of the lyre.

Musaeo: son of either Orpheus, Linus or Eumopolus and Selene (some accounts make him only the follower of Orpheus). Verg. Aen. 6.667 addresses him in Hades as tuque optime cates with a crowd of disciples. Both he and Orpheus were classed among the theologoi poetae by Aug. C. D. 18. Marius Plotinus Sacerdos Art. Gramm. 6.502 (ed. Keil) said that the hexameter was called the metrum theologicum from its use by these men.

quant tandem aestimates: cf. the phrasing used by Pl. Ap. 414, είτι πίστις ἢ τις δέξατ’ ἢ μετοχοί ετέ. Palamedes: son of Nauplius, king of Euboea, went with the Greeks on their expedition against Troy. Envious of his fame, Odysseus contrived against him and brought false accusations that led Palamedes to be stoned to death, cf. Ov. Met. 13.56-60. According to Philostratus 33.38, his final words were to have been ‘Pity you, Truth, for you have died even before me.

Aiacement: the Telamonic Ajax contended with Odysseus for the armour of Achilles but lost; and so driven to madness, he put an end to his life. Socrates considered him, like himself, to be surrounded by unfair judges because Ajax was thought to have lost his suit from an unjust decision by the judges who were themselves deceived by Odysseus.
etiam summi regis, qui maximas copias duxit ad Troiam, et Vixii Sisyphique prudentiam, nec ob eam rem, cum haec exquiererim sicut hic faciebam, capite damnarer — ne usus quidem, iudices i qui me absolutistis, mortem timueritis. nec enim cuiquam bono malii quicquam euenire potest nec uiiuo nec mortuo, nec quamquam eius res a dis inmortalibus neglegentur, nec mihi ipsi hoc accidit fortuito. nec uero ego is, a quibus accusatus aut a quibus condemnatus sum, habeo quod susceaseam, nisi quod mihi nescere se credererunt.' et haec quidem hoc modo; nihil autem melius extremo: 'Sed tempus est,' inquit, 'iam hinc abire, me, ut moriar, uos, ut uiatam agatis. utrum autem sit melius, di inmortales sciunt, hominem quidem scire arbitrator neminem.'

XLI. Ne ego hau paulo hunc animum malim quam eorum omnium fortunas, qui de hoc iudicauere rut. eti, quod praeter deos negat scire quemam, id scit ipse utrum sit melius — nam

accidit fortuito. nec uero ego is, a quibus accusatus aut a quibus condemnatus sum, habeo quod susceaseam esse malum, quod sit a natura datum omnibus, intellagamemus, si mors malum sit, esse sempiternelnum malum. nam uitae miserae mors finis esse uidetur; mors si est misera, finis esse nullus potest. sed quid ego Socratem aut Theramenem, praestantis uiros uirtutis et sapientiae gloria, commemor, cum Lacedemonius quidam, cuius ne nomen quidem proditum est, mortem tantopere contemserit, ut, cum ad eam ducere damnatus ab ephoris et esset uoltu hilari atque laeto dixissetque ei quidam inimicus: 'contemnisne leges Lycurgi?' responderit:

ne ego haud paulo hunc animum malim quam eorum omnium fortunas, qui de hoc iudicauere rut.
101 'ego uero illi maximam gratiam habeo, qui me ea poena multauerit, quam sine mutuatione et sine uersura posse dissoluer.' o uirum Sparta dignum! ut mihi quidem, qui tam magno animo fuerit, innocens damnatus esse uideatur. talis innumerabilis nostra ciuitas tulit. sed quid duces et principes nominem, cum legiones scribat Cato saepe alacris in eum locum profectas, unde redituras se non arbitarentur? pari animo Lacedaemoni in Thermopylæ occiderunt, in quos Simonides:

Díc, hospes, Spartae nos te hic uidisse iacentis,
Dum sanctis patriae legibus obsequimur.
quid ille dux? ‘<prandere> pergite animo forti, Lacedaemonii, hodie apud inferos fortasse
positive sense, cf. H
e e quibus e quibus unus :

§101. principes : cf. 15. 34 n.
Cato : in the Orignes, cf. 2. 3 n. The anecdote is also found in Sen. 75, legiones in eum locum saepe profectas alacris animo et erete, unde se redituras nonnum arbitarentur, and cf. Sen. Ep. 82.22, who quotes a Roman general ire illo necesse est, unde redire non est esse. Cicero speaks about the courage of the Roman armies also at Off. 1.61.
in Thermopylas : cf. Fin. 2.97; but the construction is apud Thermopæas at Sen. 32.
Simonides : his words are given in Hdt. 7.228, 'Εγὼ έλπίζω πάντα πολέμισαι ἐμὲ τις, ἔφη, γενόμενος; ἀνὴρ ἀγαθός, δεῖ γε τέκνον, φησί·
or rei publicae disciplina. quid? Cyrenaeum : three Latin adjectives are formed from

9 dux ] dux semidam dicit X: leonidas dett. codd. et s
mortem non ] morte non X: mortemon V
rei p. X: [rei] publica Bent!

qui multauerit: subj. with relative clause indicating reason, cf. 6, 12 n.

102 multauerit...possem : for the sequence, cf. 4. 7 n.
sine mutuatione et sine uersura : a mutatio is the borrowing of money gratuito, whereas the technical phrase uersura dissoluerent meant to borrow money in order to pay off another debt (i.e., transfer the debt, but this was usually at higher interest), see L.&S. s. v.

§102. leges uigebant : cf. Isb. 799. 122, 124. and Stob. Flor. 106. 576 γυνὴ Λακωνική, ἀπαγγέλαν-
a somewhat rare word when speaking of women in place of parere, but is exampled in Cicero at N. D. 2.129, pisces, ut aiunt, ova quum genuerunt, relinquunt, and L.&S. oppetere, ait, o fortes
morte cumbere : the phrase has been doubted and is certainly unexampled in Cicero. The only other example is Liv. 1.7.7 where mortem occumbere is read in a conjecture by Westenben. The phrase is also questionable in Lact. Inst. 5.19.25. The mss. strongly support morte but there seems to be no consensus which of the forms is correct, cf. TLL. 9.2, 386, 45. Anth. Inst. 1.9, 90 and L.&S. occumbe, 2b. Reid denied the use of occumere by Cicero and thought that the true reading here was apperere which is the usual verb. It is unlikely a copyist would insert the rarer word.

XLIIL esto : ‘granted that those Spartans were strong, and used to hardship’. esto, like the Greek ἐστι, concedes some point. The same difficulty arises in taking the example of the Spartans just as the Spartans, they are too iron hearted to be convincing. And so Cicero grants this, and turns to examples of similar resolution but which are more within our own grasp.

Spartiatae : Kühner noted that Cicero never uses the form Spartani, but always either Spartiatae or Lacedaemonii, the former referring only to the Ἐλευσίνα, or the ruling-class of Laconia, whereas the latter encompasses everyone, including the Helots and Perioichoii.
rei publicae disciplina : the term can be translated as ‘national training’ (Dougan), or ‘Staatswissenschaft’ (Krafft).
aeum Theodorum, philosophum non ignobilem, nonne miramur? cui cum Lysimachus rex crucem minaretur, ‘istis, quaeso,’ inquit, ‘ista horribilia minitare purpuratis tuis: Theodori quidem nihil interest, humum an sublime putescat.’ cuius hoc dicto admoreno, ut aliquid etiam de humatione et sepulitura dicendum existimem, rem non difficilem, eis praesertim cognitis, quae de nihil sentiendo Paulo ante dicta sunt. de quae Socrates quidem quid senserit, apparet in eo libro in quo moritur, de quo iam tam multa diximus. cum enim de immortalitate animorum disputauisset etiam mortiandi tempus urgetur, rogatus a Cronte, quem ad modum sepeliiri uellet, ‘multam uero,’ inquit, ‘operam, amici, frustra consumpsi; Critoni enim nostro non persuasi me hinc auolaturum neque mei quicquam relicturum. uerum tamen, Crito, si me adsequi potueris aut sicubi nancisci eris, ut tibi uidebitur, sepelito. sed, mihi crede, nemo me uestrum, cum hinc excessero, conse- quetur.’ praecclare is quidem, qui et amico permiserit et se ostenderit de hoc toto genere nihil neque mei Bent., et coll. dett.; neque mei me Moser

7–11. Pl. Phd. 115c–116a

9 sepe at

9 nancetus : nactus R: nactus KSL. Heine, Pohlenz qui notatui Societam esse oppositum Diogeni.

Cyrere: Cynæanum, Cynæacum, and Cynenensis, the first two being borrowed from the Greek. The thesis termination in an adjective or as a substantive is frequently used for the member of the philosophical school of Cyrene, De Or. 3.62; Off. 3.116; Ac. 2.20; and below 34. 83. The adjective in our passage, like Tusc. 4.5, only suggests the fact that Theodorus was born in Cyrene.

Theodorum: Theodorus of Cyrene (as distinguished from Theodorus of Cyrene the geometer, RE. 5a, 1811–1825) was a notorius atheist; N. D. 1.63, 1.117; Philo Qwq omn. Prob. lib. 1.27: τοι ἐπωλθεθεν αἴθων; Plu. Phic. 38.2: τῷ ἄνευ, Ath. 13.661b; Clem. Al. Protr. 2.24.2; S. E. P. 3.218; and Dux. Grec. 591, θεόδωρος ὁ ἀθεός ἐπωλθεθεν ἀεὶ λόγων, δει τῷ πάντω θεῷ λόγων, δει τῷ μῷ ἀθεός δει τοῖς ἀνθρώποις πάντως κλεπτόν, καὶ μὐ ἀπομηνὴν πατρίδος κλτ. Fritz, in the RE, article places him around 340 B.C. Theodorus was a pupil of Aristippus and Anniceris (D. L. 2.98) who, forced from Cyrene for political reasons, came to Athens where he was again forced to leave on account of the extremity of his moral and religious views (O’SULLIVAN: Athenian Impiety Trials, pp. 141–145). D. L. 2.99 says he stole, committed adultery and robbed from temples always declaring that μὴ ἄθετον ὄραμα αἰρετόν εἶναι. He was also famous for his outspoken and bold expressions. He later stayed at the court of Pythlemy who sent him as an ambassador to Lysimachus. The story is recounted again at Tusc. 5.177, where Theodorus boasts, magnum uero effectissi si cantharidis uim conseqvatus es, cf. Val. Max. 36, ext. 2.

cui : attracted into the rel. clause, cf. 34, 84 quí... si ante.

Lysimachus rex: at this time, King of Thrace and Macedonia around 268 B.C. He was one of the generals of Alexander, who later fell against Seleucus.

minaretur: subj. refers to the nonne miramur and our state of surprise that Lysimachus should threaten him.

ista horribilia: perhaps ‘such frightening things’. But it is not usual for Cicero to use such adjectives as substantives; it may be better to construe ista as such here, in which case, ‘such things as are frightening to those men’.

purpuratis tuis: cf. Cat. 4.6.12, regnantem Lentulum, purpuratum esse huic Gallinium, ‘purpled folk’, i.e. courtiers.

Theodori nihil interest: for the thought, cf. Plu. Mor. 496d, καὶ ο θεοδώρα μᾶλλα πάντων ἦπε γῆ ἤ ἦπε γῆ σφέραν. The paranomasia of humine and subtine is curious.

sublime: an adverb, cf. 17, 40 n.

putescat: here, the better MSS. have putescat though others have putrescat; the former means ‘to rot or grow putrid’, the latter means more precisely ‘to mould’.

cuius hoc dicto: a good example of how Latin prefers to bring the person to the forefront, where we would have expected quo huic dicto. Whereas earlier in the Tusc., Cicero had argued that the historic and religious rituals surrounding burial constituted evidence for the existence of the soul; after arguing that the soul has no feeling after death, he now turns to give numerous examples of how such funerary practices can be erroneous or superstitious. The contrast between the arguments would seem odd if Cicero was truly arguing for either side — but we must always remember that he is only seeking to show that there is no reason to fear death.

humatione et sepultura: cf. Leg. 2.57, inepta glæba tum et ille humatus est et sepulturam vocatur, ac tum denique multa religiosa iura conplectitur. There does not seem to be much difference between the two terms, the former probably only the particular, the latter the general term.

rem non difficilem: an accusative in apposition, see Madvig n. on Fin. 2.75 for a list of these in Cicero. The accusative is governed by some idea of facere supplied, i.e., ‘it would not be a difficult thing to do’.

de nihil sentiendo: Boulier was offended by the Latinity of the phrase and denied that it was worthy of the Golden period, and Ernesti too was baffled by the phrase. However, Wolf showed that although only occurring six times in Cicero it is acceptable, cf. Fin. 1.2, de bene beatique uiuendo; Fam. 8.6 de inter calando; Att. 9.1.1, de transcursso in Epirum, and see his n. ad loc. The intervening accusative should be construed as a single idea, K.–S. 1.131, 11b where the Greek ποιεῖ τὸ μῆκος αἰσχὴν λαβέωθαι demonstrates the idea.

in eo libro: Pl. Phd. 115c–e.

in quo moritur: cf. 39, 93 n. on quod tempus, but in this case the preposition cannot be omitted since it means in quo moriens inductur (Pohlenz).

§103. multum uero: cf. 11, 24.

adsequi, nancetus, consequetur: the three verbs differ in their sense of intention. nancisci is to overtake by chance, adsequi with a notion of desire (norto desideri), while consequi generally means ‘a hot pursuit’, from zeal.


praeclare is: sc. dicti. I adopt Heine’s suggestion that is preferred over the mss. id because darius Diogenes which follows suggests that the individuals and their manner of speaking are compared, not the ideas.

hoc toto genere: sc. rerum, that is, death. The defining genitive with genus is frequent, cf. Ac. 1.3; 2.20–21; also in Att. 1.8.2; 16.5.2; Balb. 54; Tusc. 1.3 above, and 2.5; 3.57; 4.48.
laborare. durior Diogenes, et eadem is quidem sentiens, sed ut Cynicus asperius, proici se iussit inhumatum. tum amici: 'uolcribusne et feris?' ‘minime uero,’ inquit, ‘sed bacillum propter me, quo abigan, ponitore.’ ‘qui poteris?’ illi, ‘non enim senties.’ ‘quid igitur em ad inferos tandum uiae est.’ totaque de ratione humationis unum tenendum est, ad corpus illam pertinere, sive occiderit animus sive uigeat. in corpore autem perspicuum est uel extincto animo uel elapso nullum residere sensum.

XLI. Sed plena errorum sunt omnia. trahit Hectorum ad currum religatum Achilles: lacerari eum et sentire, credo, putat. ergo hic ulciscitur, ut quidem sibi uidetur; at illa sicut acerbissimam rem maeret:

Vidif, uidere quod me passa aegerrume, Hectorum curro quardiitugo raptatire.

quem Hectorum, aut quam diu ille erit Hector? melius Accius et aliquando sapiens Achilles:

§ 104. Diogenes: of Sinope, founder of the Cynic school of philosophy.

is quidem eadem sentiens: the ms. is quidem sentiens leaves the participle without an object and so Wolf conjectured to read is quidem idem sentiens, thinking it was a case of haplography: I find it could be supported with Flac. 53 cum quidem idem hic mihi Maenandrus subiens. However, is eadem is quidem is the reading by the second corrector of V, and Giusta argued that it was left unerased accidently. For the phrase, cf. Pis. 32-78, non eadem de re publica sensisse. I have adopted Pohlenz’s reading which was supported by Giusta. Translate, ‘Diogenes rather roughly, and indeed thinking the same thing, but as a Cynic quite brusquely, ordered himself to be left unburied.’

ut Cicynus: 8, 15 n. ut Siciuli.

asperius: sc. exprimens

proici se iussit inhumatum: cf. D. L. 6:79, ἔνα μὲς φαν τελετώτα αὐτῶν (Diog) and εἴναιανα ἅταρον βάθησα, ὡς τὰν θηκὴν αὐτὸν μετάχθη χόρον ἐγείρα τὸν ἐπιπλέον συνόσια καὶ ἱππόκειν ἱππόπειν: τὸ δέ ἐς τὸν Παύλου ἱμπαλάνοι, ἵνα τοῖς ἀνδρῶνος χρήσιμον γένητα.

bacillum propter me: Davies quotes an apocryphal letter from Diogenes to Hippio found in the old Aldine Diuersorum Philosophorum Epistulæ (pub. 1499), in which Dio- genes writes, κλίνος γενικὸς ἐπισκόπος μοι παρεισθηναι τὸ βακτρον, ἵνα τὰ δοκοσιὰ λυματίζῃ ἧδον ἀπελάανοι.

nihil sentienti: for the thought, cf. the funeral inscription KASAE (Epigrammata Graeca ex lapidibus conlecta), 686, ἓκελ ἐς πάντες τοῖς κατο καθάρισε, ἀστέια, τῷρα γεγώναμεν, ἄλλο δὲ ὡδί εἰν καὶ ILS 8156.

Anaxagoras: the first philosopher to settle at Athens. Clem. Al. Strom. 1.63 (Dox. Graec. 599) says that he transplanted philosophy from Ionia to Athens, ἀκοτος μεταγαγεν ἀπὸ τῆς Ἡσίας Ἐθνίσας τῆς δαστρέβη. For a chronology of his life at Athens, see MANSFIELD (Chronology of Anaxagoras’ Athenian Period, 53ff); Woodbury (Anaxagoras and Athens, p. 301). He befriended Pericles, and owing to that man’s enemies, was later prosecuted for Medism and for impiety (his charge was that he believed the heavens to be made of stone, D.–K. 59a20). After his acquittal, he lived at Lampscacus where he set up a school and flourished for a few years until his death.

moret: the imperfect suggests he was just about to die, cf. Div. 2.135, cum Ptolemeus summo cum dolore moret.

Clazomenes in patrim: for the idiom with the preposi-
Ímmo enim uero corpo Priamo réddidi, Hectora abstuli.
non igitur Hectora traxisti, sed corpus quod fuerat Hectoris. ecce alius exoritur e terra, qui matrem
dormire non sinat:
Matè, te appello, tū, quae curam sōmno suspensām leuas,
Neque té mei miseret, surūgē et sepelī nātum —
hac cum pressis et flebilībus modis, qui totis theatris maestītiam inferent, concurrunt, diffīcile
est non eos qui inhumati sint miseros iudicare.
Prius quām ferae uolucrēsque —
metuit, ne lacerātis membris minus bene utatur; ne combustis, non extimescit.
Neu reliquias semésas sireis dēnudatis ossibus
Per térram sanie délibutas fōdē diexūrēr —
non intellego, quid metuat, cum tam bonos septenarios fundat ad tibiam. tenendum est igitur


1 Hectora] hectorem GRV: hectora 4 suspensam] suspenso X: suspens Porphyry. ad Hor. Serm. 6 pressis et]

sanity when he realised that it was not Hector, but only the body of Hector that he hoped to destroy since all sense had long left the corpus.

emīn uero: the verses are trochaic tetrameter catalectic. The quantity is ēmin uēro in old Latin before two con-

Hectora: Varr. L. L. 10.70 tells us that Accius frequently archaized and reintroduced Greek forms into his tragedies, Accius Hectorem nolet facere, Hectora nolet. Given this, and the fact that Cicero writes Hectora immediately below in an obvious sarcastic reference to Accius’ own words, most editors have adopted this spelling in place of the mss. Hectorem, likely due to the frequency of this version in the lines above.

§506. ecce alius: thought to be Deipylus (or Deipylus) in the tragedy of Pacuvius, though Écrouct (Recueil de textes latins archaïques, p. 200) thinks that the speaker was Polydorus. The story of Deipylus is preserved in Hygin. Fab. 109. According to that mythographer, when Polydorus was born to Hecuba and Priam, he was given to Iliona their daughter and wife Polymestor, king of Thrace. Iliona raised her brother as if he were her own son, and her own son, Polydorus, she instead raised as if it were her brother. After the fall of Troy, the Greeks wished to destroy the line of Priam by killing all male offspring. They sent messengers to Polymestor, offering him gold and Electra in marriage. Polymestor accepted the offer but, mistaking Deipylus for Polymestor, killed his own son. The real Polydorus had gone to the oracle of Apollo seeking information about his real parents. We have further support that the ghost was Deipylus in Ac. 2.88 (= Warminstone: Remains of Old Latin, vol. 2, p. 240, fr. 221) where we find the question, quid Iliona somno tulo ‘mater te appello’ nonne ita credit filium locatum ut expeerta etiam crederet?; and cf. Att. 14.14.1, Tus. 2.44, and Sest. 126, cum sub tabulas suberasarat ut, ‘mater te appello’, dicturus uideretur. A comment preserved in Schol. Bob. states de fabula Pacuviana, quae sub titulo Ilione fertur; similar remarks are made by the scholiasts on Hor. Sat. 2.3.60–63, cum Ilionum edorint, Catienis mille ducentis
‘mater te appello’ clamanuitus; ps.-Acron on this passage of Horace gives the line as ‘Mater te appello, exurge et sepelī me’, giving a more compressed version of the quotation than in our passage here. For an analysis of myth and the Greek versions, see Wallach (Deipylus or Polydorus?).

mater te appello...: from Pacuvius’ Iliona, tamīc octon-
arīs (trochaic tetrameter acatalectic), though Cicero calls them below 44, 107 septenarii. The second line breaks off in a parenthetical comment before being resumed by prius quām ferae; The second line breaks off in a parenthetical comment before being resumed by prius quām ferae, but the line is still short by a foot. Bentley suggested nātum tuūm to complete the septinarius; but if the line is an octonarius, we will need to read me tuum (in ps.-Acron).
suspendam: suspenso is read by most mss., and was likely altered by copyists to agreed with somno. The scholiasts on Hor. Sat. 2.3 (cited above) quote the line with suspendam, pressis et flebilībus modis: ‘slow and woeful measures’, modes used to mean a musical accompaniment, cf. De Or. 3.302, qui fecerunt modos, i.e., μοδοντεύσαν. The term pressus, ‘clear and deliberate’ is opposed to citus by Quint. Inst. 11.111, cf. N. D. 2.159, sonos uios distinctos et pressos efficit; De Or. 3.45, presse et acquiūbliter et leniter, and Ac. 1.19, with Reid’s n.

qui inferent: i.e., tales qui... inferent, the subj. being one of quality.
totis theatris: i.e., the spectators by transference common in Latin, cf. De Or. 3.195, tota theatra reclamant.
concinnatur: ‘are recited to the sound of’, lit. ‘sung along to the tune of’.
combustis: sc. utitur. Note the chiasmus.
neu reliquias:... trochaic tetrameter catalectic, but see n. above on the meter.
sireis: = siri = sieris (optative in sense). The corrupt mss. reading of semiasis regis which could not be scanned was restored to semisēas sireis through Bentley’s ingenious emendation. Kühner enjoined his students to study the elegance of the example again and again to acquire the proper taste for restoring corrupt passages.

§107. fundat: cf. 24, 64 carmen fundere.
ad tibiam: cf. 2, 5 ad tibicinem.
nihil curandum esse post mortem, cum multi inimicos etiam mortuos poeniuntur. exsecratur lucentis sane uersibus apud Enniium Thystes, primum ut naufragio pereat Atreus: durum hoc sane; tali enim interitus non est sine graui sensu. illa inania: 
Ipse summis sāxis fixus āspēris, euisercatus,
Lātere pendens, sāxa spargens tābo, sanie et sāguine atro —
non ipsa saxa magis sensu omni uaccabunt quam ille ‘látere pendens’, cui se hic cruciatum censet optare. quam essent dura, si sentirent, nulla sine sensu!
illud uero perquam inane:
Nēque sepulcrum, quō recipiat, hábeat, portum cóporis,
Ubi remissa humána uita córpus requiescát malis.
uiides quanto haec in errore uersentur: portum esse cóporis et requiescere in sepulcro putat mortuum; magna culpa Pelopis, qui non erudierit filium nec docuerit, quatenus esset quidque curandum.

XLV. Sed quid animaduerunt singulorum opiniones animaduertam, nationum varios errores perspicere cum liceat? conduint Aegyptii mortuos et eos servant domi; Persae etiam cera circumlitos condunt, ut quam maxime permanente diuturna corpora. Magorum mos est non homare


poeniuntur: both poenir and puniri occur as deponents in Cicero, Mil. 33, Phil. 8.2, K.–S. 1.62; and for the form of poeniuntur here, cf. Leg. 3.4. We could have expected the subj. here to mean ‘whereas’, or ‘although’ (cf. 17, 39 n.) but the indication was explained by Orelli as: ‘When you see men take revenge upon the empty bodies of their fallen enemies, do not fear or take notice of it; for you should be persuaded now that there is nothing to worry about after death.’
exsecratur: Thystes curses his brother Atreus upon discovering that he had murdered his children and fed them to him, cf. A. A. 1600ff, Enn. Ann. 309, Pis. 43, and of course Sen. Thyest.
sensus: cf. 34, 82; Am. 12, mortiendi autem sensum celeritas abstulit; Sen. 74; Sen. Ep. 30; Arist. sen. et iuu. 23.
ipse summis...: trochaic tetramer acatalectic.
quam essent dura, si sentirent, nulla sine sensu!: ‘how painful would they be, if Atreus could feel such things, <but> how vain they are without sense!’ quam appeared as a rather bland exclamation to several editors. They emended to quae, in which case sunt must be inserted either before sine (TS), or after sensu (Orelli). The mss. G R read sentirent, and so Bentley proposed quae ut essent dura si sentirent, nulla sine sensu sunt. The force of the exclamation does feel cloistered; Giusta’s insertion of autem is not strong enough for the contrast and I would insert sed after Seyffert.

neque sepulcrum...: trochaic tetramer catalectic.
recipiat: a few mss. read recipitur, but this would be against the meter. Here, recipiat = se recipere, common enough in the older idiom, cf. Plaut. Rud. 800, ad nos abharet potius, dum recipis; Plaud. Bacch. 294, rursum in portum recipimus. Similar idioms occur in classical Latin in uertere in place of uerti, and mutare for mutari; Kühner says the general rule is that active verbs containing a sense of motion are often used intransitively or reflexively, K.–S. 1.105, 2.
haec in errore uersentur: for the plural here, cf. 39, 93 ista ineptiae. Manutius noted that we should have expected to read hic to represent the speaker, but the change from the person to the thing said is common in Latin, cf. N. D. 3.25, ‘si alquid est’, inquit... haec omnia in errore versantur.
Pelopis: father of Thystes and Atreus. qui... erudierit, docuerit: subj. giving reason, cf. Fam. 1.9, nostrum consilium qui noluerim.
corpora suorum, nisi a feris sint ante lanitiae; in Hircania plebe publicos alit canes, optimates domesticos: nobile autem genus canum illusionem esse, sed pro sua quisque facultate parat a quibus lanietur, cæcumque optumam illi esse censent sepulturam. permulta alia colligit Chrysippus, ut est in omni historia curiosus, sed ita taetra sunt quaedam, ut ea fugiat et reformidet oratio. totus igitur hic locus est comtempendus in nobis, non neglegendus in nostris, ita tamen, ut mortuorum corpora nihil sentirentiasmus; quantum autem consuetudini famaeque dandum sit, id curent uiui, sed ita, ut intelligenti nihil id ad mortuos pertinere. sed profecto mor tum sequimur animo appetitur, cum suis se laudibus uita occidens consolari potest. nemo parum diu uixit, qui vitæ munere: pro sua quisque facultate: i.e. quantum civiissim faculatates aut opes patinatür.

colligit: 18, 42 n. uult.

Chrisippus: of SOLI in Cilicia, Stoic philosopher who succeeded Cleante at the head of the school and was regarded as its second founder, cf. D. L. 7.183, εἷς μὴ γὰρ ἦ Χρυσίμπος, ὥσ ἴν γε Ἰωάννου

historia: not the discipline of recording history, but here literally, istorias as investigation, i.e., an indagatio rerum, cf. Att. 2.8.1, si quid in ea epistula fait historia dignum, scribe quam primum tu ignornemus (Kühner).

curious: cf. Fin. 1.3, curiosi quoque offendit noster minime nobis inincucundus labor; Suet. Aug. 27, curiosus et spectulator, like the Greek οἰκοποργίον.

ita taetra... reformidet oratio: i.e. Off. 1.159, Pseudoios collegit multa sed ita taetra etc. Chrysippus was apparently well-known for his frank language, cf. D. L. 7.187-188.

locus: ‘subject’, cf. 24, 57 n.

in nobis, non neglegendus in nostris: in here means ‘in the case of’.

ita tamen, ut mortuorum corpora nihil sentirentiasmus: these words are essentially repeated by the following sentence which led Reiske to conjecture that Cicero had revised the phrase, but then forgot to delete it from the text; GIUSTA (Tusculanea, p. lxi) believed it was evidence for a parallel recension of the text, but this is unlikely (POWELL: CR, 37, p. 31).

We do know that the Cicero made corrections and changes to his texts even after they were published (Att. 16.3.1, Att. 13.21.4). Still, Seyffert noted that Cicero is frequently prolix in points he wishes to emphasize and there is no reason per se for suspecting the text.

§69, ut intelligenter: here, we see the stipulative force of the subjunctive ‘on the understanding that’ easily developing under the influence of the context into the meaning ‘with the restriction that,’ ‘with the reservation that’, where see BENNETT (The Stipulative Subjunctive in Latin, p. 229).

ded profecto... : cf. [Plut.] Consol. ad Apoll. 1118, οὐδὲ ἡ μακρότατος βίος ἄμαρτος ὅλα ἢ ἀποκόλλοντος; Sen. 70, breue tempus aetatis satia longum est ab bene honeste vivendum; Sen. Ep. 101.15, quam bene uius referre, non quam diu; Sen. Ep. 49.10; 13.13; 92.24; Sen. Ben. 5.17.6. There was a background debate between the Stoics and Peripatetics about how long life should be to give it happiness; the former argued that happiness was not increased by possessing a longer life (SVE, 3.200), cf. the Stoic ratio perfecta uirtus uocatur, SVE, 3.200.

§69b: GIUSTA (Tusculanea, p. lvi) wished to transpose this passage beneath in 46, 111.

multa tempestiua: i.e., multae opportunitates moriendi.

For the thought, Beroaldus compared Phil. 1.38, mihi fere satis est quod tuis uel ad mortem uel ad gloriam; and Davies, Sen. Cons. Marc. 20, M. Cicero si illo tempore quo Catilinae sic deuatait, quibus pariter cum patria petitus est, concisitiet, liberata re publica servatur eius, si denique filiae sue funus secatus eset, etiam in uixi mori potuit.

cumulta erant officia uitate: ‘when the duties of life have been finally crowned’; cf. Att. 6.3.3, cumulate publicans satisfacent, the metaphor often having to do with the final coping stone on a building, cf. Liv. 30.32, aut cumularent ius die aut eueruit (Dougan).

cum fortuna bella: ‘conflictandum adhuc erat cum fortuña’ (Neidius).
restabant. quare si ipsa ratio minus perficiet, ut mortem neglegere possimus, at uita acta perficiat, ut satis superque uixisse uideamur. quamquam enim sensus abierit, tamen suis et propriis bonis laudis et gloriae, quamuis non sentiant, mortui non carent. etsi enim nihil habet in se gloria cur expetatur, tamen uirtutem tamquam umbra sequitur.


XLVI. uera: editors differ on how to understand uera: Wolf (and after him, Kühner) believed it was a conjunction (i.e., and), and so understood iudicium as emphatic alone, i.e., "right judgement", a meaning which occurs in Tac. Hist. 1.12, and is not without example in Cicero, Div. 2.13.30. However, on his view, the following est seems weak (and the same objection may be brought most recently against Giusta); Pohlens tried to improve this and read de bonis "bonum si quando est", conjecturing bonum to have fallen out after bonis, but to this I object that such a collocation does not occur anywhere in Cicero. Dougan thought that rectum or sanum was left out after quando by a copyist who himself thought uerum was an adjective. If we take the mss. reading, we must understand: multi. iudicium de bonis (i.e., uiris) si quando est uerum, which leaves an asyndeton many scholars find objectionable.

quoquo modo hoc accipietur: and not the vulgar ac- ciptatur: some early editors; the indicative is used in these kinds of expressions of introducing new aspects of argument, K.–S. 165, 2. hoc: refers too all of what follows regarding Lycurgus and Solon. Cicero rhetorically plays on the double meaning of carere here. He earlier defined it as either egere eo quod habere velis, or cum aliquid non habas et non habere te sentias, etiam sem faciile patare. How could but we say that these two great lawgivers and leaders of men went without glory and honour? For they did not seek it while alive as wise men, but yet, as we have just learned, virtutem gloria tamquam umbra sequitur.

Lycurgum, Solonelem: the asyndeton suggests that Cicero had more names which he could have added, cf. 4, 7 n. Lycurgum: Cicero refers to this famous νομοθετησ in Div. 1.96, Lycurgus quidem qui rem publicam temperauit; Rep. 2.18, Lycurgus leges scribere instituit; Leg. 1.57, Brut. 40 disciplina Laecaeaeoniorum astricta legibus (with Douglas' n.). cf. also Hdt. 1.65; Pl. Rep. 10.599d; Xen. Mem. 4.14.15.

publicae disciplinae: 'political system' (in the sense of education or training of a people which would bring about a political system); Moser compared N. D. 3.85, res publica ratione qualam et disciplina dignitata, like a well run house. Salamina: for the spelling, see Neve–Wagener. 1.366, and my n. 26, 65 Ganyoden. Kühner held that "-em was the more usual ending, K.–S. 1.490. At N. D. 1.119, codex B read Eleusinam, which Pease rejected ad loc. in favour of the rare Eleusinam found in a few mss. The majority of mss. in our passage read Salaminam which Kühner retained. The -em ending does occur in Cicero, cf. Fam. 16.12.2, Anconam (which is unanimous in the mss.) though this Latinised form is generally considered peculiar to those later. However, all the other parallels Kühner cites in his n. ad loc. are from writers of later ages. Dougan and Giusta prefer Salaminam, the -a acc. ending for such nouns sometimes used by writers in the best period. The L and P mss. have the lecto difficilior.

tropaei: a poetical metonymy for victoriae, the effect in place of the cause, cf. Ar. Eq. 1331, τὸ εἰς Μαραθών τροπαῖον. memoriam: the force of obrept carries forward, but the logical subject of the verb becomes something like tempus of oblivio.

e Boeotia: most mss. lack the preposition, in which case Boeotia would be an adj. and so explanatory (like qui est mons Cariae). However, Reid notes (in Dougan ad loc.) that when Cicero speaks of the utter removal of locations, he usually indicates from where, or to where, cf. Verr. 2.2.4, Giusta noted that e was likely to fall out after priusque and that the second corretor of V has inserted it. The reading e Boeotia would mean, 'sooner would Leuctra be wiped from Boeotia than the glory of its battle'.

multo autem tardius fama desert: ... for these men, see 37, 84.
Laelium, innumeralis alios; quorum similitudinem aliquam qui arriperuit, non eam fama populari, sed uera bonorum laude metiens, fidenti animo, si ita res feret, gradietur ad mortem; in qua aut summum bonum aut nullo malum esse cognoimius. secundis uero suis rebus uietiam mori; non enim tum cumulus bonorum uicendius esse potest quam molesta decessio. hanc sententiam significare uidetur Laconis illa uox, qui, cum Rhodius Diagoras, Olympionices nobilis, uno diu suo dis filios uictores Olympiae uidsset, accessit ad semen et gratulatus: ‘morere Diagora’ inquit; ‘non enim in caelum ascensurus es.’ magna haec, et nimium fortasse, Graeci putant uel tum potius putabant, isque, qui hoc Diagore dixit, permutam eximiam tris Olympionicas una e domo prodire cunctari illum diutius in uita fortunae obiectum inutilu putabat ipsi. ego autem tibi quidem quod satis esset, paucis uerbis, ut mihi uidebar, responderam — concesseras enim nullo in malo mortuos esse — sed ob eam causam contendi ut plura dicerem, quod in desiderio et luctu haec est consolatio maxima. nostrum enim et nostra causa susceputum

2–3. Lact. Inst. 7.10.9

arriperit: like the Greek ἐπιθύμω, suggests a willing and readiness to seize upon something desirable.
non fama populari... for the qualification of glory by reference to the optimates, cf. 38, 91 n.
si ita res feret: the ms. si refer likely arose from the compendium scriptum. The impersonal phrase makes little sense here. The idiom ita res ferit is common and has many variations, cf. Phil. 4.14, si ita res tulisset; Verr. 3.23.57, voluntas fert; Q. Fr. 1.4, ratio fert; Rep. 6.1.1, fortuna fert.
aut summum bonum aut nullo malum: the whole aim of the Tusc. The perf. tense of cognosceus lends force to attaining conviction, ‘as we have come to know in our conversation’.
secundis uero suis rebus uietiam mori: for the thought, cf. Pub. Syr. mori est felicis, antequam mortem inuocaret; Sen. Cons. Marc. 20, moris... de nullis melius merita quam de eis ad quos venit antequam invocaretur; H. Eoc. 497–499. ηπειρομενησεν τινας εικανας εις ανθρωποις, ἐφεισεν αποθανειν ἰσόθεον νοµίζεσθαι. esse potest: the ms. pregnans on this order of the words but Kühner thought that it was very rare in Cicero who preferred esse potest to avoid the pentameter. I find this not to be true, and count numerous examples in Cicero of esse potest, in both his philosophical works as well as his speeches.
decessio: i.e., deminuatio, cf. Div. 2.36, Off. 3.12, Tim. 18.
Diagoras: son of Damagetus, famous for his size, fairness and modesty, was an Olympic victor in 464B.C. in boxing, and his victory was celebrated by Pl. Od. 7. He also won prizes at the Isthmian and Nemean games, and saw his one son Damagetos win the second of his two prizes in the pankration, and his other son Akousilaos win the prize in boxing in 448B.C., cf. Plu. Pelo. 34, 6 Dicov. των Ολυμπιονικων Διαγορας ἐπιδύναται μὲν δυος στρατηγου−μενος Ολυμπιακων, ἐπιδύνατα δ’ ὑστερον και θυγατριδον, ἀν−παισμενον, ελτ. Paus. 6.7, Gell. N. A. 3.15. Olympiae: gen. locative.
more Diagora...: cf. Plu. Pelo. 34, καθένας, επτε, Διαγορας ου εις των Ολυμπων αναγεννησε. The meaning is that he reached the highest eminence and happiness, and that he could hope for no more or better, since all else was reserved to the gods alone, cf. Pl. Pyth. 10.22. The Lacedaemonian Chilon was said to have died for a similar reason, D. L. 1.72–73; and Lucian, De Gymnast. 274 says that the among the Greeks, to hold Olympic victory was ὡς τον νικήσαντα αὐτῆς ἱδώνος νόμιζεσθαι, PL. Rep. 5.366, Athen. 2.145, and Tusc. 2.16
itile: cf. Off. 2.49, seditionum et inutilium ciuem show that this word by litotes can be used of something very harmful (Moser). However, here it is only the contrary of uile.
ipsi: Giusta (Tusculanae, p. 1v) brackets ipsi and thinks that it may be evidence of a serious transposition. He thinks a copyist skipped a page when reading the archetype, and afterwards noticed his error. He then wrote out the portion which he omitted, passing over again the lines he already transcribed and resuming again from the place where he first noticed his omission. Giusta thinks that the text I have brackets as §109b above ought to be placed here, which he argues is more pertinent to Cicero’s train of thought than here above: but I am not entirely convinced of this. Though the Greeks themselves thought athletic success in the Olympics the height of glory (cf. n. above), I do not believe a Roman consolarius would compare his acme of political attainment to such contests, as they were generally held in scorn by the Romans. (Tusc. 4.70, Tac. Ann. 14.20.5–6, Flinn. H. N. 15.19, etc.) Further, it seems more natural that Cicero progresses from a discussion of sons to considerations of the demise of his own daughter, as follows in §111, and not those of his political career. Giusta’s suggestion to alter the text is ingenious, but not so defensible to warrant the redistribution.
tibi quidem: construe with satis esset, as indicated by the quisim and the concessasera beneath.
concesseras: 7.14
contendi ut: a self-reflective comment by Cicero, almost to himself, for this reason I sought to speak my mind on the subject, because this is the greatest consolation in times of mourning and longing; contendi = operam dati (Moser), ‘I put effort into’, the subj. is one of result.
haec: i.e., the idea that nullo in malo mortuos esse. We should have expected hoc but it was attracted into the gender of consolatio, cf. K.–S. 2.12.7
consolatio: consolatio is the third type of the genus demonstrativum, cf. N. D. 2.59.ı46 where Cicero claims that force of eloquence was divine and was made first to teach, to persuade, and to console the afflicted; De Or. 2.12.50; Leg. 1.62, Grant (Cicero on the Moral Character of the Orator, p. 474).

109b

nostrum enim et nostra causa: cf. Servius’ letter to Cicero, Fam. 4.5.2, as well as [Plu]. Consol. ad Apoll. 25.
dolorem modice ferre debemus, ne nosset ipsos amare uideamur; illa suspicio intolerabili dolore cruciat, si opinamur eos quibus orbati sumus esse cum aliquo sensu in eis malis quibus uolgo opinantur. hanc excutere opinionem mihimet uolui radicitus, eoque fui fortasse longior.

XLVII. Tu longior? non mihi quidem. prior enim pars orationis tuae faciebat, ut mori curperem, posterior, ut modo non nollem, modo non laborarem; omni autem oratione illud certe perfectum est, ut mortem non ducerem in malis.

Num igitur etiam rhetorum epilogum desideramus? an hanc iam artem plane relinquimus?

Tu uero istam ne reliqueris, quam semper ornasti, et quidem iure; illa enim te, uerum si loqui uolumus, ornauerat. sed quinam est iste epilogus? auoe enim audire, quidquid est.

Deorum inmortalium iudicia solent in scholis proferre de morte, nec uero ea fingere ipsi, sed.


modice ferre: the thought is a commonplace enough, cf. Am. 10, Brut. 5, Att. 2.24.2, De Or. 3.8, Tac. Agr. 44–45.

ne nosset ipsos amare: sc. magis quam eos quos amimus, cf. Am. 10, suis commodis grauiter angii non aniciam, sed sc. ipsum anamis est, i.e., too egotistical; and Brut. 4, id e as ad amicitiam sed ad domesticam utilitatem referre uideamur, cf. Plu. Mor. 650, parakaleōme na τὸ φάλαινον εκκόπτειν ἑαυτάς; [Plu]. Consol. ad Apoll. 1110, κρίνων εἰ αὐτῶν (ἐννέα πενθοῦς ἑαυτῶν) φάλαινον τῇ λήτῃ πρόβασις.

in eis malis quibus: 39, 94 n. for the preposition assumed.

mihimet uolui radicitus: opposed to tibi above. The force behind the work (and his Consolatio) was the death of his daughter.

longior: sc. justo, cf. Hor. Sat. 1.1.57.


faciebat: the imperfect is most suitable here to mean ‘while you were speaking’.

oratione: on the face of it, ratio may seem likely, but here it cannot stand and this was seen by the correct of V. For the interlocutor is not saying that he is convinced by each argument or every kind of series of arguments, but his is looking to the whole speech and its ability to persuade him that in death there is no evil, cf. Merr. 2.4, 115, totam huius generis orationem concludam.

perfectum est...ducerem: cf. 4, 7 n. dedimus, auderamus.

In English we would say ‘I will not’, but the imperfect here suggests that he had not only carefully learned the arguments but continues to hold the opinion.

rhetorium epilogum: ‘the kind of epilogue rhetoricians make’.

relinquimus: there is no reason to depart from the ms. relinquimus as Giusta; the present tense is more desirable with the preceding desideramus, and the perfect is almost never used in such questions after an.

ne reliqueris: there are in classical prose, from the beginning of the Ciceronian period up to near the end of the Augustan period, only seven instances of ne with the perfect in prohibition, and these are all in Cicero. Each of these occurs in dialogue where the tone descends to ordinary conversation, and in which some one is delivering himself of an earnest command, where it is natural to be more unceremonious in addressing a familiar friend than

in addressing a mere acquaintance. Here, Cicero falls more readily into energetic forms of expression, and assumes an offhand, imperious tone as a bit of pleasantry. This would be especially natural when he was urging his friend not to do what he feared that friend might do. (Elmeer: The Latin Prohibitive I, p. 149). We can hardly fail to notice this tone at a talkative gathering of intimate friends such as supposedly here in the Tusc.

ornasti: sc. laudibus.

solent: sc. rhetores.

in scholis: cf. 4, 8 n.

Argiae sacerdotis: the woman’s name was Cydippe, Plu. Mor. 109, Stob. Flor. 18.32. She was priestess of the temple of Hera.

Argiae: the ms. read Argiae here, Argii above in §45. Lambinus wished to correct this instance to Argiae, Wesenberg approved, and the change was adopted by Kuener, Seyffert, and Dougan. Dreder and Giusta retain the vulgar reading as defended by Klotz, I think rightly, and cf. Muller on N. D. 1.82. (Kreiss/Schmale: Anlibarbarus, vol. 1, p. 199).

Consol. ad Apoll. 1101, τὸν κόσμον γὰρ τῶν καθένας, καὶ τὴν κάθησιν τῶν ἄνθρωπων τῷ πολιτείᾳ τῆς καθήσεως τῶν τιμῆς, τῷ πολιτείᾳ τῆς σοφίας, τῷ πολιτείᾳ τῆς ἁγίωτας, τῷ πολιτείᾳ τῆς σωτηρίας, τῷ πολιτείᾳ τῆς ἱστορίας, ἕνα νῦν ἄρα ἑναντίον τὸν ἀνθρώπον, ἅπαντα τὰ παραγόμενα ἑναντίον τῷ πολιτείᾳ τῆς ρῆμα τῆς καθήσεως. Also cf. Serv. ad Virg. Gae. 3.532 and Th. Chil. 1.31, καὶ Κλάπιδα καὶ Βιτων τῶν πατέρων τῇ ἱστορίᾳ τῆς Κόσμου, [Plu]. Consol. ad Apoll. 109, Val. Max. 5.4, ext. 4: S. E. P. 3.24, Hygin. Fab. 254.


Biton: for the story. cf. Hdt. 1.31, Stob. Flor. 109, Κλάπιδα καὶ Βιτων, Κόσμου τῆς τοις πατέρων ἐναντίον εἰς θηρίαν τῶν τιμῶν, ὅποιον ἄλλην παρουσίαν ἄνθρωπον ὅτι τῆς τοις πατέρων τῆς σοφίας τῆς σωτηρίας τῆς συνεργίας τῆς Κόσμου 

Pohonlz (to whom Giusta reverts) thinks that binoto = binot (but possibly from a corruption from nota below?), in which case the termination of -o suggests that Cicero used the form Bito, as he sometimes does when rendering Greek names ending in -os, -osos, and -osos, i.e., Plato (but cf. Att. 9.13, Deartos, Platon in the ms.) However, we have far more examples of Cicero using the termination -on, cf. Endymion, 38 92; Menon 24 57, and below Aristigiton, 47 116. Most editors, except Pohonlz and Giusta, read Bito.
nota fabula est, cum enim illam ad sollemne et statum sacrificium currur uel opus esset satis longe ab oppido ad fanum morarenturque iumenta, tum iuuuenes ii, quos modo nominai, ueste posita corpora oleo perunxerunt, ad iugum accesserunt. ita sacerdos aduecta in fanum, cum currus esset ductus a filiis, precata a dea dicitur, ut id illis praemi daret pro pietate, quod maximum homini dari posset a deo; post epulatos cum matre adulescentis somno se dedisse, mane inuentos esse mortuos.

simili precatione Trophonius et Agamedes usi dicuntur; qui cum Apollini Delphis templum exaedificauissent, unaerantes deum peteruern mercedem non paruam quidem operis et laboris sui: nihil certi, sed quod esset optimum homini. quibus Apollo se id daturum ostendit post eius diei diem tertium; qui ut inluxit, mortui sunt reperti. iudicauisse deum dicunt, et eum quidem dari posset a deo; post epulatos cum matre adulescentis somno se dedisse, mane inuentos esse mortuos.
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simili precatione Trophonius et Agamedes usi dicuntur; qui cum Apollini Delphis templum exaedificauissent, unaerantes deum peteruern mercedem non paruam quidem operis et laboris sui: nihil certi, sed quod esset optimum homini. quibus Apollo se id daturum ostendit post eius diei diem tertium; qui ut inluxit, mortui sunt reperti. iudicauisse deum dicunt, et eum quidem dari posset a deo; post epulatos cum matre adulescentis somno se dedisse, mane inuentos esse mortuos.
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simili precatione Trophonius et Agamedes usi dicuntur; qui cum Apollini Delphis templum exaedificauissent, unaerantes deum peteruern mercedem non paruam quidem operis et laboris sui: nihil certi, sed quod esset optimum homini. quibus Apollo se id daturum ostendit post eius diei diem tertium; qui ut inluxit, mortui sunt reperti. iudicauisse deum dicunt, et eum quidem dari posset a deo; post epulatos cum matre adulescentis somno se dedisse, mane inuentos esse mortuos.
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proximum autem quam primum mori
qua est sententia in Cresponte usus Euripides:
Nam nos decebat coetus celebrantis domum
Lugère, ubi esset aliquis in lucem editus,
Humanae utiae uaria reputantis mala;
At, qui labores morte finissent grauis,
Hunc omni amicos laude et laetitia essequi.

simile quiddam est in Consolatione Cantoris: ait enim Terinaeum quendam Elysium, cum grauiter filii mortem maereret, unenise in psychomantium quarentem, quae fuisse tanta calamitatis causa; huic in tabellis tris huius modo uersiculos datos:
Ignaris homines in uita mentibus errant;
Euthynous potitur fatorum numine leto.
Sic fuit utilis finiri ipsiisque tibique.

his et talibus auctoris usi confirmant causam rebus a diis inmortalibus iudicatam. Alcidamas


 declares that of the -rebus in auctoris. But the term is too frequently employed in legal language to mean, ‘by the facts’, ‘by action’, so there is no need to delete it. Giusta, on the other hand, wished to add ac uerbis, claiming that of the four judgments listed by Cicero, two are giving through actions, and two by words, cf. Phil. 3.14, and Tusc. 3.46. (Schische suggested re et uerbis similarly.) But a constrast is struck between authors and deeds; Dougan compares Ov. Fast. 2.734, non opus est uerbis, credit rebus. These two words are opposed and so, in our passage, the rebus or the actions of the gods in killing the men are emphasised as confirming their words.

Alcidamas: of Elaea, pupil of Gorgias and the last of the Sophists, flourished around 400 B.C.
quidem, rhetor antiquus in primis nobilis, scripsit etiam laudationem mortis, quae constat ex enumeratione humanorum malorum; cui rationes eae quae exquisitius a philosophis colliguntur defuerunt, ubertas orationis non defuit. clarae uero mortes pro patria optabilis non solum gloriosae rhetoribus, sed etiam beatae uideri solent. repetunt ab Eracheo, cuius etiam filiae cupide mortem expetuerunt pro uita ciuium. <commemorant> Codrum, qui se in medios inmisit n. mutavisse, et quamquam fugerint eum hostes uexare, ne posset aduerso, si esset ornatu regio, quod oraculum erat datum, si rex interfactus esset, uictrices Athenas non superare. Menoeceus non praetermititur, qui item oraculo edito largitus est patriae suum sanguinem. Iphigenia Aulide duci se immolandam iubet, ut hostium eliciat suo. ueniunt inde ad propria.

XLIX. Harmodius in ore est et Aristogiton; Lacedaemonius Leonidas, Thebanus Epaminondas uigi. nostros non norunt, quos enumerare magnum est: ita sunt multi, quibus uideo us obligabilis mortes uisse cum gloriam. quae cum ita sint, magna tamen eloquentia est utendum atque ita eliciat suo. ueniunt inde ad propria. Menoeceus: son of Creon. In the war of Seven against Thebes, Tiresias declared that the city would be preserved if the last of the descendents of Cadmus should devote himself to Ares. Menoeceus understood the oracle to refer to himself and immediately killed himself in front of one of the city gates, Apollod. 3.6.7, E. Ph. 911. duci se: E. I. A. 1475, ἀρχηγὸς μὲ τὰν 'Θέου καὶ Φαρέων ἡλέπτολιν', and Enn. trag. 204, cf. Jocelyn (Tragedies of Ennius, pp. 107, 324). eliciat: Giusta would restore the original line thus: duci me immolandam iubeo, ut hostium eliciam meo. in ore: sc. rhetoribus. uiget: 'is celebrated', cf. De Or. 3.110, Philonem, quem in Academia in uigere audu'o; Pohlenz cites Fam. 8.1.4, Iuven. in politici libri omnibus uiget (VAHLEN: Opuscula academica, vol. 1, p. 158). norunt: sc. rhetores. magnum est: i.e., difficile, as in magnus opus etc., cf. De Or. 1.19, Ac. 2.6, Phil. 8.29, Verg. Geor. 3.289 and Kühner's n. ad loc. optabilis: the original meaning of optare was to 'to choose', eventually coming to mean 'to wish for'. cum gloria: this can be construed either with mortes, in which case it is attributive, i.e., gloriosae mortes, 'glorious deaths are choiceworthy'; or else it can be taken with optabilis (with Dougan) which would then mean glory is a condition on which death is choiceworthy, i.e., si gloria accederet. §117. tamen: cf. 17, 39 n. above; with quae cum ita sint 'although', there is no need (with Giusta) to read iam in place of tamen, the adversative needed to constrast deaths gained with glory, and those without, which still not need to be feared. superiorem e loco: legal language. This phrase refers to a weighed opinion of a judge (as down from the bench, pro tribunal) instead of off-hand one given anywhere in a simple case (de plano or ex aequo); cf. Verr. 2.2.102, Fam. 3.8.2.
sed commutationem adfert loci, quid optabilius? sin autem perimit ac deet omnino, quid melius quam in mediis uitate laboribus obdormiscere et ita conuentum somno consopiri sempiterno? quod si fiat, melior Enni quam Solonis oratio. hic enim noster:

‘Nemo me lacrimis decorat’ inquit ‘nec funera fleu

Factum!’

at uero ille sapiens:

Mors mea ne careat lacrimis: lingamamus amicis

Maerorem, ut celebrent funera cum genitu.

nos uero, si quid tale acciderit, ut a deo denuntiatum uideatur ut exeamus e uita, laeti et agentes

perimit | perimit K: peremit GV

xii

wrote what he thought was Solon’s motive, Epl. credo,

plural; Ennius means ‘weep not for me at my parting’.

poets’ consideration of what happens after their death

µηδέ µοι ἄκλαυτος θάνατος µόλις, ἀλλὰ φίλοισι

praefica

take

implies a continued existence, Ennius’ was preferred as

above) suggests only he only wanted his family and friends
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; this does not mean, therefore, that in
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necesse est. quod autem omnibus necesse est, idne miserum esse uni potest? habes epilogum, ne quid pretermissum aut relictum putes.

Ego uero, et quidem fecit etiam iste me epilogus firmiorem.

Optime, inquam. sed nunc quidem ualetudini tribuamus aliquid, cras autem et quot dies erimus in Tusculano, agamus haec et ea potissimum, quae leuationem habeant aegritudinum formidinum cupiditatum, qui omnis e philosophia est fructus uberrimus.

---

4 et quot dies] et quos dies VBK. et quot dies dett. codd. e philosophia Doug., Poh.: <in> philosophia Reid.

5 e philosophia] e philosophia GK: philosophiae V: <e>

ego uero: cf. 11, 24 n. me uero.

optime: the expression is of polite thanks, often found in comedy and colloquial. With the word optime, the verb facere is often omitted, as here. It has been translated by Dougan, 'Capital, I say', and Douglas 'Splendid.' cf. Hor. Sat. 1.4.17, di bene fecerunt, 'Thank heaven!'; and Div. 1.47; Brut. 52. 'A' is complimenting 'M' on his successful persuasion.

et quot dies: i.e., quotdei quoad erimus in Tusculano (Klotz); the mss. often confuse quos and quot; Cicero had written above quinqui scholas in totidem libros contuli and so it is better with most editors to read quot found in the lesser mss.

agamus haec: cf. 20, 46 n. id agere.

leuationem habeant: an elegant use of habere to mean secum ferre, cf. Div. 2.96, dissimilitudo locorum nonne dissimiles hominum procreationes habet?. This refers to the topics of the following books of the Tusc.

e philosophia: Pohlenz preferred the reading e philosophia, and compared ad Brut. 1.3.2, si est aliquid fructus ex solida ueraque gloria. But it is difficult to decide between this and the reading of V which has omnis philosophiae.
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| music | 23 |
| eloquium | 37 |
| Eleatics; controversies | 35n |
| elegia | 41 |
| emori | 43 |
| Empedocles | 48 |
| on the soul | 48 |
| Ennius | 20, 24n |
| trip to Aetolica | 23 |
| Epaminondas | 23 |
| Epicharmus | 43, 43 |
| his witticism | 43 |
| Pythagorean | 42 |
| Epicureans; accused of atheism | 38 |
| authors; see Amafinius | |
| Rabrius | 27n |
| Catusius | 27 |
| Paetus | 28, 28 |
| Papirius | 28, 28 |
| education | 45 |
| on the soul | 46 |
| their books | 27 |
| Epicurus; symmetry argument | 35n, 40n |
| esse; 40, 41 |
| Eudosius | 27n |
| Euripides; Troades | 35 |
| exordes | 46 |
| exordium | 31 |
| Fabius, Q. Pictor | 23 |
| fides | 19 |
| Fulvia, M. Nobilius | 23 |
| Galba, S. Sulpicius | 27 |
| glory | 26 |
| Gracchus, Ti. | 28n |
| Gracchus, G. | 21, 27 |
| Gracchus, Ti. | 27 |
| Hesiodus | 19 |
| hilum | 36 |
| Homer | 19, 22 |
| Lycurgus, 22; date of | 19 |
| Hortensius, Q. | 27n |
| indusstrandum | 19 |
| Isocrates; practice | 30 |
| rhetor | 30 |
| Junilus Africanus | 35n |
| καταληπτικαὶ | |
| Lælius, Sapiens | 23 |
| Lapidus, Porcina | 27 |
| Liberatus | 19 |
| life; as a race course | 42 |
| human condition | 42 |
| misera | 42 |
| Livius, see Andronicus | |
| logic structure | 40 |
| lyra | 23 |
| mathematicus | 23 |
| see Archimedes; Archytas; Menaechmus; Eu- | |
| doxus | |
| memory; when unborn | 37 |
| Menaechmus | 27n |
| Metelli | 40 |
| Minos | 36 |
| misera | 34 |
| from nothingness | 37 |
| mores | 19 |
| music; at dinner | 23 |
| esteemed in Greece | 23 |
| lyre | 23 |
| Nero, 28n | |
| Themistocles not trained in | 23 |
| music | 23 |
| Naerius | 20 |
| dates | 20 |
| Nasica, P. Cornelius Scipio | 47 |
| New Academy | 30 |
| see Carneades | |
| verisimilitude | 47 |
| non; with volitional states in place of ne | 46n |
| nothingness (non-existence) | 37 |
| orator; logical necessity | 37 |
| Pausanias | 28n |
| painters; see Polycritos; Parrhasios; Polygnutus | |
| Panaitius | 28n |
| Parrhasios | 23 |
| Pericles | 26n |
| persuasion; not compulsion | 45, 45n |
Phidias, 25
Philoctetes, 25n
philosophai, 19
philosophia perfecta, 30n
philosophy; joining with oratory, 31; learned from Greeks, 19;
sapiences, 46
Plato; immortal soul, 46
Plautus, 20; dates, 20
poets; birthplaces, 24n; honour, 23; inventions of underworld,
37; late arrival in Rome, 24; songs, 23
Polyclitos, 23
Polygnotus, 25
Pompey; death, 39n; dignitas, 37n
Pompey Magnus, 37
Posidonius, 48n; Cicero’s consulship, 31n
probabilia, 46
Prometheus, 29n
pronuntiatum; translation of ἀξίωµα, 40
Rabirius, 29n
ratio, 19
Rhodamantus, 36
rhetoric, 27
Romulus, 19
Rufus, P. Sulpicius, 27n
σχολή, 29, 30; see disputatio; lack of names, 35n
schools; Roman closing of Greek schools, 30
Scipio, Africanus Minor; as orator, 27
Scipios, 40; tomb, 41n
sculptors, see Phidias
sepulcrum, 40; of the Metelli, 40; of the Scipios, 40; of the Servili, 40
Servili, 40
Sextus Aelius, 48
Sicilians; their wit, 42
Sisyphus, 36
Socrates, 30
Socratic method, 30
soul; as blood, 48; as Stoic fire, 48; doxography; in the brain, 48;
Stoic πνεύµα, 37
spinatus; used of Stoic arguments, 45n
Stoics, 46; ἐκπύρωσις, 46; τὸ ἡγεµονικόν, 48; on the soul, 46
Tantalus, 36
Themistocles, 23
Theophrastus, 49n
Tullia, 33
Tuditanus, M., 19
Tullia; her death, 35n
Tusculanum, 30; location, 32
Tzetzes, 25n
uaecordes, 46
underworld, 34, 38n; judges, see Minos, Rhadamanthus; location,
37; rivers, see Cocytus, Acheron
Varro; chronologies, 22n; date of foundation, 23
villa, see Tusculanum; description of Roman villa, 32n
virtus, 19; Roman virtues, 19