A NEW STEMMA FOR CICERO’S PRO ARCHIA

1. Introduction
Contrary to what one might expect, a considerable number of major classical texts are still not available in reliable critical editions. A striking example is Cicero’s Pro Archia, not the only one among his speeches where subsequent editors have basically limited their effort to a reappraisal of the collations that were at the basis of Albert Curtis Clark’s 1911 Oxford edition and have contributed little more than a bias toward one or another major witness, in combination with a more or less radical conservatism when it came to accepting or rejecting conjectures and dissent readings. After Clark – whose edition is still the one offered by OCT1 – the Pro Archia was published in the Bibliotheca Teubneriana by Peter Reis (1933, 19492) and Helmut Kasten (19663), and in the meantime Félix Gaffiot edited the text for the Budé series (1938). While Kasten made new collations of one Berlin manuscript (E), Gaffiot’s edition hardly deserves the qualification ‘critical’: Gaffiot seems to rely on Émile Thomas’ 1883 Paris edition, which is an almost diplomatic transcription of G, the oldest preserved witness, making only a few textual alterations taken from the recentiores2. Gaffiot’s allegiance to G’s readings often challenges philological reasonableness, and his apparatus only accounts for the readings of G and E, as all other 270 manuscripts are without much ado pushed aside and quoted sporadically as rec. scr., «recentior scriptura, id est emendatio aliqua recentioribus codicibus prolata quos significare nominatim supervacaneum videtur.» How precisely Gaffiot concluded that the codex optimus had to be the only norm and that «un certain nombre de mss, de date récente, n’ont d’autre intérêt que de presenter ça et là des corrections de quelque érudit inconnu» is unclear3.

Kasten, on the other hand, did produce a stemma, yet apart from his new collation of E, he seems to have entirely relied on the collations that were already available to Clark⁴.

More recently, several scholars in their publication of commentaries and studies of the Pro Archia have printed their own edition of the text, but none of them contains other than a more or less justified personal variation of the abovementioned editions. These à la carte choices are not really helpful and often bespeak questionable philological approaches, taking Gaffiot’s deplorable approach a few steps further. One ‘editor’ candidly confesses that his text «reflects that of no edition»⁵ and the most recent one seems to declare adherence to Kasten, yet then slips into compilation mode too⁶.

Likewise, all critical notes and other publications that have discussed textual issues of the Pro Archia do so by conjecturing and weighing against each other the readings offered by the

---


⁶ A. Coşkun, Cicero und das römische Bürgerrecht. Die Verteidigung des Dichters Archias. Einleitung, Text, Übersetzung und historisch-philologische Kommentierungen, Göttingen 2010. In her review of Coşkun’s book – otherwise a very solid introduction and commentary to the speech – Barbara Saylor Rodgers states that «Coşkun usually observes where his text departs from what others print, but I encountered practical issues with both text and textual commentary: Coşkun’s editorial choices are usually excellent but it is difficult to assess differences between his text and his predecessors’. There is neither apparatus criticus nor a list of deviations from a standard edition. […] Occasionally, too, the reader must consult various other editions and commentaries because Coşkun does not necessarily reiterate others’ previous decisions with which he agrees.» (BMCREv 2011.09.15)
existing editions\textsuperscript{7}. The only contribution containing a fresh look at the transmission is the article by Tadeusz Maslowski and Richard Rouse about twelfth-century extracts from \textit{Pro Archia} and \textit{Pro Cluentio} in Paris, B.N., ms lat. 18104, although the only significant result is a plea in favour of one disputable \textit{lectio facilior}\textsuperscript{8}.

A new comprehensive study of the transmission of the \textit{Pro Archia}, based on autopsy of the main and most other manuscripts, however, now allows for a more solid appraisal of the value of the different branches and of the allegedly major witnesses, and lays the groundwork for future editions, which will therefore be better-founded than the existing ones, which have time and again been based on a rather small sample of codices and especially on their predecessors’ and other scholars’ speculations\textsuperscript{9}.

In this article, we want to assess the relationship between the newly reconstructed text that Petrarch in 1333 discovered in Liège and the other major witnesses on which editors have hitherto been relying\textsuperscript{10}.


\textsuperscript{8} T. Maslowski-R.H. Rouse, o.c. 104-105, defend a reading of the Paris B.N. lat. 18104 they discuss (\textit{in illis libellis} in \textit{Arch.} 26) and therefore consider it an important witness, concluding that other readings peculiar to their ms «merit consideration too. But as can be seen from the Collation, where they have been listed, all of them are \textit{errores proprii.}» The reading their case is leaning on is \textit{in illis libellis} (26.8), for a discussion of which see \textit{infra}.

\textsuperscript{9} See J. De Keyser, \textit{The descendants of Petrarch’s Pro Archia, forthcoming}.

\textsuperscript{10} Throughout this discussion we will compare our assessment of the transmission and of the editorial choices we consider imperative with the abovementioned editions of Clark, Gaffiot and especially Kasten, who edited the
2. The main witnesses

In the most recent real critical edition of Cicero’s *Pro Archia*, Helmut Kasten proposed a double bipartite stemma, with on one hand **E** (Lat. fol. 252 of the Staatsbibliothek in Berlin, ca. 1158) along with its much younger undeniable twin **V** (Palat. lat. 1525, copied in 1467 in Heidelberg), and on the other hand **G** (the eleventh or twelfth century Gemblacensis, now cod. 5348-52 of the Koninklijke Bibliotheek in Brussels)\(^{11}\), the oldest and most sound witness, and its alleged sibling ‘Leod.’, the lost Liège manuscript that was discovered in 1333 by Petrarch, whose transcription (\(\pi\), cf. infra) is at the origin of all other extant manuscripts, the almost 270 recentiores and allegedly deteriores (\(\omega\))\(^{12}\). In this edition, Kasten benefitted from the intermediate Budé edition by Gaffiot, who more than anybody else discussed most critical issues and justified his preferred readings\(^{13}\). Gaffiot, however, «contributes nothing on the manuscripts», to quote Rouse and Reeve, who also challenged Kasten’s stemma: in their opinion, «of the two readings that he regards as Bindefehler of \(G\) and Kasten’s \(\omega\), one, the gloss *Archia* in 1, is not in both branches of \(\omega\), and the other, 16 *profugium* for *perfugium*, is trivial»\(^{14}\).

As already mentioned, Gaffiot went to great lengths to defend quite a few harsh particular readings of \(G\) against the sounder alternatives in the other branches of the tradition, in what appears to be an all-out allegiance to \(G\)’s *codex optimus* status, already advocated by Émile Thomas, who claimed to have examined all Paris manuscripts of the text, but dismissed them as «des copies inférieures du texte que nous avons sous une forme plus pure dans le Gemblacensis, et qui sont à rejeter»\(^{15}\). Granting that \(G\) is by far the best of all witnesses, Kasten warned for an overrating of its value, quoting five particular readings of \(G\), three of which have been, in his eyes unduly, adopted by Gaffiot and one even by Clark\(^{16}\).

\(\text{---}\)

most recent critical edition. All textual references are to Kasten’s (1966\(^3\)) paragraphs and line numbers. As all more recent editions rely on those three editions, their choices or critical argumentation will be mentioned only where considered relevant.

\(^{11}\) A full description of \(G\) is given by É. Thomas, *o.c.* 16-17.

\(^{12}\) Kasten, *o.c.* IX-XI.

\(^{13}\) Gaffiot, *o.c.* 24-32.


\(^{15}\) É. Thomas, *o.c.* 18.

\(^{16}\) «Restat, ut pausa de codice Gemblacensi addam, qui merito longe optimus omnium putatur. Sed cave nimium ei tribuas! Quinquies lectiones proprias exhibet, ex quibus una ab editoribus reicitur (18.22 quotiens ego

-158)
3. The *Itali*

Within the *o* group, Kasten adheres to Clark’s bifurcation between *a* (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 23 sin. 3) on the one hand, and *φ*, allegedly the consensus of all other descendants of Petrarch’s copy, on the other\(^{17}\). This bifurcation, however, has now been rebutted, in the aforementioned new comprehensive study of the numerous descendants of Petrarch’s copy (*π*), which proved that *a* is nothing more than an utterly corrupt member of one of four branches sprouting from *π*, whose particular readings deserve no serious consideration – let alone being reported in the apparatus of a critical edition. The new stemma of the *Itali* now first allows for a clear distinction between transmitted text and innovation – be it corruption, *Schlimbesserung* or felicitous conjecture – in the many *recentiores*. We know for sure now, for example, that in 4.10, where the witnesses are divided between *celebra(ba)(nj)tur*, reading present and past, singular or plural, in all possible combinations, the most primitive manuscripts clearly had a plural and that probably the historic present *celebrantur* is a haplography for the original *celebrabantur*.

In some cases, a misguided view of the importance of *a* has had a lasting impact on the text. In 24.18, where Cicero discusses Achilles’ legacy, we now know the archetype simply read: *Nam nisi illi ars illa extisset, idem tumulus, qui corpus eius contexerat, nomen et iam obruisset*. However, the omission of *illa* in *a* (reading *illi ars*) inspired subsequent alterations, including the inventive conjecture *Ilias*, which Clark and Kasten adopted (*nisi Ilias extsitisset*), ascribing the emendation to Andrea Navagero\(^ {18}\). However, Gaffiot had already suggested keeping *illi ars illa* on account of suspicion of *exces de zèle* on Navagero’s part, the expressivity of the polyptoton *illi...illa*\(^ {19}\) and the aptness of the word *ars*: «ajoutons que ce mot *ars* est bien le mot de la situation; c’est moins la désignation d’une oeuvre poétique...»

---

\(^{17}\) Kasten, *o.c.* IX-XI. See also T. Maslowski-R.H. Rouse, *o.c.* 99-102, for a good synthesis in English of the traditional view of the transmission.

\(^{18}\) Incidentally, the *Ilias* conjecture is also the reading of manuscript Biblioteca Nazionale Marciana lat. XI 34 (4354).

\(^{19}\) See also Vretska, *o.c.* 165.
particulière qui importe que le rappel de la faculté poétique elle-même, qui est nécessaire pour chanter et faire vivre les héroïs»\textsuperscript{20}. This convincing line of reasoning is now confirmed by the reconstruction of the transmission and definitively removes all doubts about this \textit{locus}.

Another illustration of the same phenomenon is 14.15, where we can now be certain that the archetype had \textit{sapientium}. Kasten’s \textit{sapientum} is an unnecessary correction\textsuperscript{21} on the unfounded authority of \textit{a} (the error originated in \textit{a}_1) and some other, later manuscripts. Kasten’s assumption that Petrarch (or Lapo, whom he provided with a copy of the \textit{Pro Archia} that Kasten believed to be \textit{a} or the source of \textit{a}) would never have deliberately changed \textit{sapientium} in \textit{sapientum}, and that therefore \textit{sapientum} was the original reading of the Liège manuscript, can now be dismissed at least in its conclusion. Petrarch, indeed, did not intervene, as \textit{sapientum} is an error that originated only in \textit{a}’s source \textit{a}_1 – but \textit{π} read \textit{sapientium}, as do the other three branches that descend from \textit{π}.

In 14.17, \textit{π} had \textit{accederet} with \textit{G} against \textit{E} and \textit{V}’s lectio facilitor \textit{accenderet}, which also originated independently in several subbranches of \textit{π}, under the influence of the adjacent \textit{lumen}. In 16.8 the abovementioned \textit{profugium} is an independent particular error in \textit{G} and \textit{a}, as \textit{β}, \textit{γ} and \textit{δ} have \textit{perfugium} with \textit{E} and \textit{V} (although the case remains weak, as a trivial abbreviation issue that may have been fluctuating in either direction).

On a different note, we can now pin-point the origin of some later interventions (in 24.18, for example, the archetype had \textit{inveneras}, and \textit{inveneris} now turns out to be a variation that originated in \textit{β}, just like the omission of \textit{minus} in 23.11 that set a lot of tongues wagging\textsuperscript{22}) and we see more clearly how the marginal philological observations and emendations that Petrarch entered in the margins of a duplicate transcribed from the copy he had brought back from Liège – a working copy which is at the base of the \textit{γ} branch – quickly spread by contamination over the different other branches, especially the younger members of \textit{β}. A good example of this is Petrarch’s felicitous emendation \textit{togati} for \textit{locati} transmitted by \textit{G E V} and \textit{π} in 27.16.

The list of alternative readings that we owe to Petrarch’s \textit{ingenium philologicum} can be reconstructed on the base of the marginal notes in Vat. lat. 9305 (\textit{Q}), which has the greatest number of them, along with its twin at the Trent Biblioteca Comunale (\textit{T}), where those

\textsuperscript{20} Gaffiot, \textit{o.c.} 30.


\textsuperscript{22} Coşkun, \textit{o.c.} 130, gives an overview of the doubts generated by some late manuscripts adopting this error of \textit{β}. 
marginalia were incorporated into the main text, and to a lesser extent Pal. lat. 1820 (P).23 The presence of a few such alternative readings in A – indeed the only preserved manuscript containing Petrarchan marginal notes that does not belong to γ – also helps to explain some striking correspondences between the four branches that at face value seem to defy the proposed stemma. In 25.30 Quem nos in contione videmus, cum ei libellum malus poeta de populo subiecisset, quod epigramma in eum fecisset tantum modo alternis versibus longiusculis, statim ex iis rebus, quas tum vendebat, iubere ei praemium tribui sub ea condicione, ne quid postea scriberet D and most a manuscripts read iussit instead of iubere. This was probably caused by an erroneous division of the sentence by a copyist who did not understand the challenging periodicity (or ‘bracketing’ as Gotoff would say) in Quem... videmus...iubere: Quem nos in contione videmus, cum ei libellum malus poeta de populo subiecisset. Quod epigramma in eum fecisset tantum modo alternis versibus longiusculis, statim ex iis rebus, quas tum vendebat, iussit ei praemium tribui sub ea condicione, ne quid postea scriberet.24 Apparently this mistake occurred in a parallel manner quite early in the tradition, since the scholia Bobbiensia read iussit as well.25 The concordance of a and D in this case indeed is not proof of their being members of the same branch: the double reading iubere al’ iussit in A proves this locus to be one of the few where Petrarch’s text had double readings in manuscripts that do not stem from γ. Subsequent copyists would then either maintain the double readings or mostly make their own choices, allowing for some apparent conjunctive or disjunctive variations shared by witnesses that otherwise adhere to clearly distinct branches.

Another example of a double reading in several branches is 21.22, Pontum et regiis quondam opibus et ipsa naturae regione vallatum, where π certainly had naturae regione, just like G and E (while V has natura regione). The natura regionis in γ can be traced back to Petrarch’s intervention. Indeed, while in A naturae is accompanied by al’ natura which would yield a

---

23 See De Keyser, o.c.

24 Alternatively one could read [Is.] Quem nos in contione videmus, cum ei libellum malus poeta de populo subiecisset, quod epigramma in eum fecisset tantum modo alternis versibus longiusculis, statim ex iis rebus, quas tum vendebat, iussit ei praemium tribui sub ea condicione, ne quid postea scriberet. However, in such a case where quem is not a pseudo-relative pronoun, but introduces a subordinate clause, the present tense of videmus seems very harsh. Hence perhaps the alternative al’ vidimus reading in A (and the straightforward vidimus in γ).

rather harsh *asyneton bimembre* in this very classical construction (*Pontum et regiis quondam opibus et ipsa natura, regione vallatum*), **D** reads the nonsensical *naturae regionis*, and **Q** has the original *naturae regione* without any marginal note, the intratextual reading of **T** (a witness beyond any suspicion of contamination), *natura regione vel natura regionis* (within the first alternative either an erroneous *natura* instead of *naturae* or a mirroring of the double reading in **A**) undeniably elucidates the origin of all of the different combinations of ablative and genitive in this passage that we can read in various witnesses.

In one case, Petrarch’s doubts concerning his text generated second grade variations of their own kind. In 12.21 Petrarch’s text read *et enim ex*, in accordance with **G** and **E** (while **V** has *enim ex*). From **Q** and **T** we know that Petrarch considered two possible emendations: both have *et enim ex – vel vox ex, vel vox haec*. Where precisely the *et animus ex* that editors print originates from is unclear, as it is the reading of at least two dozen mostly late manuscripts, and numerous others present the wildest combinations of all four basic alternatives.

Strikingly, the vast majority of Petrarch’s emendations concern readings that were present in the archetype. Only in once case do we see Petrarch restore a true reading that we see confirmed by **G E V**, correcting, that is, an error that was made either in the Leodiensis or by Petrarch himself when he copied **π**. In 15.30 **π** must have read *oratio*, and Petrarch subsequently surmised the *ratio* also read by **G E V**. The fact that in this case **a** follows the three alleged *meliores*, is only due to the fact that the Petrarchan double reading *oratio vel ratio*, as it is in **Q T P** and **A**, gradually disappeared because copyists made their own choices, privileging *ratio*. Some primitive descendants of all branches, like **N O**, **A** and **D** – all of them bereft of double readings – went with *oratio*, but in the end *ratio* prevailed. Just like in the abovementioned case of *sapient(i)um*, here too an all too limited *recensio* has led to an apparatus note unjustly implying that **a** is closer to **G E V** than some or all other descendants of **π**. The recent collation of a fairer part of the witnesses, however, and the resulting new stemma, finally allow for a clear distinction between primitive and other readings, and provide editors with more reliable material when it comes to making their choices between conservatism and interventionism.

Another advantage of the fuller view of the transmission history is that several emendations and felicitous readings that have been ascribed to late manuscripts reflecting the synthesis of Quattrocento philological erudition, or even to more recent scholarship, can now be traced back to old witnesses that reflect the intervention of shrewd Latinists. *Silvani* in 7.4 for example (attributed to Manutius) is already in the relatively old manuscript **C** (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 53.12), which also has *circumscriptum est eisdem* (29.28) for the
archetype’s *circumscriptum iste isdem* and *quantum* (31.17) instead of the archetype’s *quanto*. And *Gratti* in 8.10 (attributed to Franz Bücheler by Kasten), which was probably induced from 12.20, where \( \pi \) had the palaeographically almost identical *Gracci*, can already be read in \( \mathbf{F} \) (Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 76.32).

Particular readings of subbranches of \( \pi \), especially the very prolific \( \gamma \) branch, have often proliferated and may have received more scholarly attention than they actually have deserved. For example, *in domum* (for *domum*) in 5.22 and *fuerit* (for *fuit*) in 5.24, *dubititis* (against *dubitatis*) in 10.32 and *ideo* (for *adeo*) in 13.6, are all innovations from \( \gamma \). It seems unlikely that Petrarch intervened directly in the text, instead of offering marginal alternatives as he apparently used to do. An indication that may be interpreted as pointing in another direction is nevertheless 25.28, where all \( \gamma \) manuscripts have *vidimus* instead of the other branches’ *videmus*. \( \mathbf{A} \) here has *videmus al’ vidimus* – a double reading that might suggest that Petrarch himself really considered this alternative, which makes sense only in combination with the choice of *iussit* instead of *iubere*, which is indeed in \( \mathbf{A} \) as an alternative reading, as discussed supra. All \( \gamma \) members however share quite a few unequivocal errors too,\(^{26}\) which excludes \( \gamma \), as we can reconstruct it, being a flawless copy, ‘authorized’ by Petrarch. Of course it is possible that at a more primitive stage \( \gamma \) contained even more double readings and philological annotations, and that early on in its transmission some were left out, deliberately or not. One wonders, for example, if \( \gamma \)’s felicitous emendation *censam* in 11.12 did not originate as another conjecture by Petrarch, as an alternative for the archetype’s untenable *censeam*.\(^{27}\)

Furthermore, it should be pointed out that whereas Clark, Gaffiot and Kasten in 10.3 print an unqualified *in Graecia* (Clark only mentions Madvig’s conjecture *Graii*), \( \pi \) along with \( \mathbf{G}, \mathbf{E} \) and \( \mathbf{V} \) must have had the abbreviation *in grā*, which actually stands for *in gratia*, not for the *in Graecia* introduced only in \( \gamma \) (and \( \mathbf{F} \)). While *in gratia* (and even the reading *in gratiam* that one could surmise) is not an improvement, it should be noted that *in Graecia* is not the archetype’s reading.\(^{28}\)

---

\(^{26}\) For example: 20.17 item *om. \( \gamma \)*; 22.1 *rebus om. \( \gamma \)*; 23.14 *est om. \( \gamma \).*

\(^{27}\) Another emendation is *censitam*, presented by \( \mathbf{F} \) and a few dozen *recentiores*, while still other manuscripts have *censeo, consitam, censeram, censuram*…

\(^{28}\) The passage remains problematic anyhow, which may have to do with the preceding *gratuito* issue. *Gratuito*, printed by Clark, is the reading of \( \pi \) alone. \( \mathbf{E} \) and \( \mathbf{V} \) have *vel gratuito gravat*. \( \mathbf{G} \) has *gravat in*, adding an interlinear *vel gratuito*. Gaffiot emended this into *gravatim* (*«la faute gravat in ayant été provoquée par civitatem qui suit», o.c. 27*) and Kasten accepted Gaffiot’s emendation. The archetype most probably had double readings
In other cases, transmitted readings considered worthy of mention by many editors can now be proved to be late alterations that have no more authority than any other conjecture, for example 28.21 *huiusce* and 26.8 *in illis libellis*. While the latter alternative for the dative *illis libellis* is also the reading displayed by the primitive witness A, there is no doubt that π along with G E V did not have the preposition and that this *lectio facilior* originated as a *Schlimmbesserung* independently here and there in the transmission instead of being the proof positive for the independent position of the old Paris B.N. anthology X advocated by Maslowski and Rouse, who ascribe *in illis* to two sixteenth-century *editores veteres*, while it is actually the reading of at least two dozen manuscripts belonging to different branches.

Likewise, in 31.16 *Qua re conservate, iudices, hominem pudore eo quem amicorum videtis comprobari cum dignitate, tum etiam vetustate* not only Kasten and Clark, but also the utterly conservative Gaffiot read the relatively recent conjecture *vetustate* for the archetype’s *venustate*. Clark credits Muretus for the *vetustate* reading, while Kasten traces it back to «Lag. 18», which is number 18 of Lagomarsini’s famous collations of Florentine Cicero manuscripts, or the Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana’s Plut. 48.18, a witness commonly dated in the second decade of the fifteenth century, and probably indeed older than the dozen other manuscripts displaying this perhaps unnecessary emendation.\(^{29}\)

4. The stemmatic interrelationship between G, E V and π

Since the readings of π are now clearly defined, a reassessment of both the overall stemma and the relative value of G, E+V and π is due. In the following pages we will discuss a number of critical issues in order to establish a better-founded stemma.

---

or marginal glosses (see also G’s *alveolo vel aleae* in 13.4 and *quae vel quia* in 21.29), of which π kept only one variant, as did the source of E and V, with the one exception of this *vel gratuito gravat*.

\(^{29}\) Vretska, o.c. 186, seems to be the only one offering a line of reasoning for *vetustas*, i.e. referring to Cic., *Rab. perd.*, 2: *nam me cum amicitiae vetustas, cum dignitas hominis, ... tum vero meae vitae perpetua consuetudo ad C. Rabirium defendendum est* and ac., 1,1: *hominem nobiscum et studiis eisdem et vetustate amicitiae coniunctum* as parallels and on grounds of the contents of *vetustas*. Coşkun, o.c. 145, doubts the latter part of the argument, stating: «Daneben referiert Vretska aber die weniger überzeugenden Interpretationen, nach denen auf das Alter der Adelsfamilien oder auf die Gleichaltrigkeit der Freunde mit Archias angespielt wäre; doch ist der erste Aspekt in *dignitas* enthalten und der zweite kein Argument für die Sache des Angeklagten.» However, Coşkun himself does not make a case for keeping the original *venustate*. Nevertheless, we wonder why this reading, attested in all of the important textual witnesses, should be deemed so impossible to be corrected. Indeed, the use of *vetustas* together with *dignitas* in a context of oratorical speech is far from strange. Cicero himself describes the orator’s duty as *ad extremum agere cum dignitate et venustate* (*De orat.*, I.142).
a) The alleged distinct position of G

While Gaffiot offers no stemma and hardly wastes words on the precise relationship between the main witnesses, he implicitly adheres to a bipartite stemma, with G on one side and all other manuscripts on the other. By maintaining time and again G’s particular ‘true’ readings against the consensus of all other witnesses, he apparently retraces these ubiquitous ‘faulty’ readings to a corrupt common ancestor and systematically suppresses plausible variae lectiones.

While Gaffiot deliberately omits many alternative readings, Kasten seems to have fallen victim to his dependency on Clark, as he mentions having performed his own collations on E alone. While one can wonder whether E’s indisputably particular errors really deserved being mentioned in the apparatus criticus – given the existence of its twin V, their consensus may suffice –, Kasten at least broadened our understanding of the fact that the two major witnesses to which Gaffiot limits his reporting are less sound than previous editors claimed. This modus operandi has caused the tradition to be inadequately represented in the main editions, and the main victim of such practice has been a. The way it has been reported suggests that none of the abovementioned editors actually saw it. If they had, they certainly would not have deigned to include a few of its countless particular readings into the apparatus, and also the myth of a’s unique position as the most truthful gateway to the original text as Petrarch had found it in Liège would have been dismissed long ago.

More deplorable, yet, is the fact that not even G’s prime advocate Gaffiot seems even to have seen his ‘codex longe optimus’ – unless he decided for the convenience of his cause that several errors, while already reported by Thomas, deserved no mentioning. Indeed, G reads habitatu for habitu in 15.26, fert instead of fere in 23.9 and not terra marique but mari terraque in 21.19. The latter case is the only one mentioned by Clark, and Kasten omits all three.

In an illustration of his veneration for G, Gaffiot deleted some words on the simple ground that taken at face value they may seem insertions in G: the interlinear addition hic in 1.5

30 Elsy Depret, when reviewing Kasten’s edition in «AC» XXXVII (1968), 295-296, somewhat condescendingly criticized the Teubner editor, asking «Est-ce parce que Kasten a travaillé lui-même sur le manuscrit d’Erfurt qu’il lui donne ses préférences? On ne voit pas d’autre explication.» She endorses Gaffiot’s preference for G, yet her conclusion from another alleged example of G’s being right against all others that «le prestige de G s’affirme mieux encore à la la lumière de cette nouvelle confrontation» has a taste of circular reasoning biased towards Gaffiot’s parti-pris.
the marginal *expectatio hominis* in 4.11. However, in both cases the addition is clearly in the original copyist’s hand, which strongly suggests that the copyist has corrected a simple omission in the first case and an obvious *saut du même au même* from *exspectatio* to *expectionem* in the latter. Gaffiot defends his deletion of *hic* on the base of a *G* error – the interpolation *Archia*, which is not an addition, as the apparatuses of all three editors suggest, but present in the first-handed text – that independently also occurred in *a₁*, while in the second case, his reasoning may be influenced by his need to justify the harsh *admiration enimque* of *G E V* instead of the *admirationique* of the other branch (as will be discussed *infra*).

b) True readings in *π* against *G E V*

Since it appears that *G* may be considered somewhat more tarnished than was assumed before (certainly by Gaffiot), it becomes increasingly more important to reconsider the stemmatic relationship of *π* with the other primitive witnesses. It is clear that *π* cannot derive from *G*, whose particular errors it lacks, and it does not share the common errors of *E* and *V* against *G*’s true readings either. It is not certain whether one should then feel entitled to deduce a straightforward tripartite stemma from this assessment: there are indeed several passages where *G, E* and *V* share errors against *π* readings that may very well be true, and the new reconstruction of *π* finally excludes that these true readings are just later emendations popping up somewhere downstream from Petrarch.

At least in one case *π*’s particular reading is followed by all editors, as in 25.32 they print *π*’s *duxerit* against *G E V*’s untenable *deduxerit*.

There are quite a few more passages, though, where in our opinion *π* alone may have passed down the correct original text. In 14.13 *π*’s *exilii* makes definitely more sense than the harsh *exilia* of *G E V X*³¹. Indeed, when Cicero writes *Nam nisi multitum praeceptis multisque litteris mihi ab adulescentia suasissem nihil esse in vita magno opere expetendum nisi laudem atque honestatem, in ea autem persequenda omnis cruciatus corporis, omnia pericula mortis atque exili parvi esse ducenda*, there is little reason to read *exilia* as Gaffiot wants to do, justifying his decision in the critical *praeliminaria* in a rather contrived way. Surely Cicero’s meaning is that not the actual exile should be disregarded, but the dangers (*pericula*) and fear

³¹ Here and elsewhere (*alveolo 13.4, sapientium 14.15*) *X* follows *G E V* against *π*.  
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of exile, which could prevent one from doing the right thing\textsuperscript{32}. The objection that \textit{pericula} should then also precede \textit{cruciatus} (as if not actual torture, but the danger thereof should be ignored) does not apply. Vretska points out the Stoic background of \textit{cruciatus}, and it was very unlikely that a free-born Roman would ever be subject to torture anyhow\textsuperscript{33}. Furthermore, from a stylistic angle the crescendo parallelism between \textit{omnis cruciatus corporis} and \textit{omnia pericula mortis atque exili}, with the double genitive attribute defining \textit{pericula}, tilts the balance to \textit{exili} rather than \textit{exilia}. Besides, in this configuration the doublet \textit{mortis atque exili} also creates a nice pendant to the preceding \textit{laudem atque honestatem}.

Likewise, \textit{π}'s \textit{admiratioque} in 4.12 produces a more meaningful sentence than \textit{admirationemque}, which was probably introduced in the common ancestor of \textit{G E V} under the influence of the preceding \textit{exspectationem}. In the sentence \textit{Post in ceteris Asiae partibus cunctaque Graecia sic eius adventus celebrabantur ut famam ingeni exspectatio hominis, exspectationem ipsius adventus admiratioque superaret} Gaffiot deleted \textit{G}'s \textit{exspectatio hominis} (which it reads \textit{in margine}, yet cf. supra), arguing that it was introduced by \textit{G}'s copyist to produce wordplay with \textit{exspectationem}, and he kept \textit{admirationemque}.\textsuperscript{34} In this way, he reads a clause with three direct objects and one subject: \textit{ut famam ingeni (O\textsubscript{1}), exspectationem (O\textsubscript{2}), ipsius adventus (S), admirationemque (O\textsubscript{3}) superaret}, as is made clear from his translation: «chaque fois qu’il venait, sa présence attirait de telles foules que tout ce qu’on disait de son génie, l’attente et l’admiration du public, présent lui-même il les surpassait»\textsuperscript{35}. However, this word order seems quite strange, and the copulative \textit{-que} which is usually reserved to intimately connect two words would then bridge two words. Therefore, it makes much more sense to maintain \textit{exspectatio hominis} and read \textit{admiratioque} with \textit{π}, as do Kasten and Clark. This interpretation leads to a much more balanced sentence and does not strain the copulative force of \textit{-que}: \textit{ut famam ingeni exspectatio hominis, exspectationem ipsius adventus admiratioque superaret}, in which we have \((O\textsubscript{1}+G\textsubscript{1})+(S\textsubscript{1}+G\textsubscript{1}), (O\textsubscript{2}+G\textsubscript{2}),\)

\textsuperscript{32} This observation offers additional arguments against the improbable redating of the \textit{Pro Archia} from 62 to \textit{ante} 56 BC in J. Bellemore, \textit{The date of Cicero’s Pro Archia}, «Antichthon» XXXVI (2002), 41-53. See also Coşkun, \textit{o.c.} 117.


\textsuperscript{34} Gaffiot, \textit{o.c.} 25. One might wonder whether ascribing such an astute intervention to the anonymous copyist of \textit{G} is not a blatant overrating of a modest clerk who elsewhere seems to slavishly reproduce his antigraph – plainly transcribing, for example, the pointless \textit{te ne dum} instead of \textit{Tenedum} in 21.28 (the same reading in \textit{E}, while \textit{π} had \textit{Thenedum}) and writing \textit{in genus} instead of \textit{ingeniis} in 31.17.

\textsuperscript{35} Gaffiot, \textit{o.c.} 36.
(S₂+S₃): «so that the expectations about him trumped the fame of his genius, and his arrival and the admiration he received even trumped the expectations about him»³⁶. This interpretation is also rhetorically and stylistically stronger, as it constitutes the figura of climax³⁷ or gradatio (expectatio superaret, expectationem superaret)³⁸. Finally, while Coşkun is right to state that such arguments cannot be decisive, Vretska points out that Gaffiot’s changes would mar the perfect balance between main and subordinate clause (both count exactly 28 syllables)³⁹. Coşkun’s own argument for keeping Gaffiot’s version is first of all based on the latter’s bias in his presentation of the textual tradition, since he proposes to read the «Überlieferung» (which is questionable here) and to strike out «die Ergänzung expectatio hominis» (which is a first-hand reading) and to reject «den Eingriff admiratio[nem]que» (which is not really an intervention, but the reading of one branch of the transmission). Moreover, he opines that the reason for the unusual hyperbaton in admirationemque is that it avoids the dactylic ending of adventus sūpērāret. However, this argument is unconvincing. For one, the clausula heroica (type: esse videtur) is not as rare as one may think (it does occur in 4.9% percent of the endings in Cicero’s orations).⁴⁰ Secondly, such endings are not unusual in the Pro Archia (for example 10.9 rēcīētur, 20.13 facile praecominium pātīātur and 22.6 ēcīēmus), which – in an oration for the epic poet Archias – may very well consciously toy with the foregrounding of hexametric rhythm.⁴¹ Thirdly, the more plausible alternative admiratiōqué sūpērāret has the very regular paean primus (resolution of the cretic) + spondee.⁴² And fourthly, yet most importantly, one should be quite careful with the argument of prosarhythmus to justify critical interventions. Indeed, Zielinski and Clark minded the heroica in the aforementioned facile praecomium patiatur (which in this

³⁶ Alternatively one could also interpret ipsius with adventus admiratioque which would yield the composition (O₁+G₁)+(S₁+G₁), (O₂)+(G₂+S₂+S₃). Nevertheless, interpreting the single noun expectationem as object strikes us as less balanced.

³⁷ Gotoff, o.c. 120.

³⁸ On the gradatio, see Heinrich Lausberg, Handbuch der literarischen Rhetorik. Eine Grundlegung der Literaturwissenschaft, Stuttgart 1990³, 315.

³⁹ Vretska, o.c. 87, and Coşkun, o.c. 84.

⁴⁰ All information on frequencies of clausulae stems from A.W. de Groot, Der antike Prosarhythmus. Zugleich Fortsetzung des Handbook of Antique Prose-Rhythm, Groningen 1921.

⁴¹ See e.g. hexametrical cadence in suscipiendam et ad ingrediendam on which Vretska, o.c. 231, notes: «Reverenz vor dem Epiker auf Anklagebank?». For more information, see T. Deneire, New Perspectives for Latin Stylistics. Deictics and Foregrounding in Cicero’s Pro Archia, forthcoming.

⁴² Cf. Gotoff, o.c. 120: «a favorite Ciceronian cadence». 
instance Coşkun, o.c. 124, appreciates as «Passend zum panegyrisch-epischen Themenkreis»! so much that they wanted to read praeconium facile patiatur, which they found in one late (1459) manuscript. However, such rhythmical considerations should always be subordinate to stemmatic arguments: in this case, we know now that the reading preferred by Zielinski is a metathesis which originated in the γ2 branch alone and which should be disregarded.

Somewhat tougher remains the choice between π’s possemus in 1.11 against the present possumus in G E V. Although Gaffiot is right to point out that with posse and similar verbs the reality of the ability is prevalent in Latin (which thus often uses the indicative mode where we would expect the subjunctive), one can still explain the subjunctive mode as the expression of a consecutive connection between the main and relative clause (id accepimus a quo…possemus). Vretska subscribes to Gaffiot’s lectio difficilior reasoning and prefers possumus also because it creates a rhythmical «schlußschwach im Satzinnern» with a hypodochmius in servāre pōssūmus and a cretic + spondee in fērrē dēbēmus. However, to our mind it seems at least as likely that instead of the rare hypodochmius and a supposed ‘weakness’, Cicero would have aimed at balance and rhythmical rounding of the period with a cretic + spondee at the end of both the main and the subordinate clause in servāre pōssēmus ... fērrē dēbēmus.

In this new appreciation of the stemma, opposing π to the common source of G E V, one might reconsider for instance 18.25, where G E V have Atque, whereas π reads Atqui, which

---

43 Cited in Gotoff, o.c. 181; see also Kasten, o.c. 42.
44 Another example of an even more glaring aberration based on rhythmical grounds is the case made by Rzepkowski, o.c., for sum adhortatus in 28.23. While our new stemma opposes π’s hortavi to the other witnesses’ consensus adhortavi, the suggested sum adhortatus (from E’s adhortatus sum) is not only stemmatical but also paleographical untenable, as was already pointed out by Olszaniec, o.c., whose own coepi adhortari, however, is hardly more convincing. Both Rzepkowski and Olszaniec defend their reading on account of it creating a cretic + spondee in the sentence, apparently without realising that the original adhortavi does so as well. Vretska, o.c. 178, gives Kasten his due defending the paleographically very convincing adoptavi, which also has the sentence end in a cretic + spondee.
45 On this use of the subjunctive see H. Menge, Lehrbuch der lateinischen Syntax und Semantik, völlig neu bearbeitet von Th. Burkard und M. Schauer, Darmstadt, 2000, 880.
46 Vretska, o.c. 76.
47 The hypodochmius (– | – x) is only found in 4,9% of the endings of Cicero’s sentences in his orations, while the cretic + spondee is found 16,2% of the time.
48 Kasten, o.c. X, already succinctly remarked: «possemus enim numero meliore est». 
could now perhaps be defended with some more insistence as a lectio difficilior. Incidentally, Lewis and Short, s.v. ‘atqui’ (II.A.) mentions precisely the present passage as an example of the use of atqui «in adding a thought confirmatory of a preceding one, but not antithetical (v. at init.), but indeed, but certainly, by all means» – the rejection of π’s reading by all modern editors notwithstanding. The same applies for π’s audivisse in 8.12, which now enjoys added stemmatic weight to the argument based on word length that has been made before⁴⁹.

5. Conclusion

In our new bipartite stemma the particular readings of G can hardly be defended. In 8.17 Est ridiculum ad ea quae habemus nihil dicere, quaerere quae habere non possessum Gaffiot tried to defend G’s videmus against habemus in the other branches, on account of its so-called expressivity and the fact that habemus should be «manifestement une correction destinée à faire concordance avec habere qui suit»⁵⁰. Not only does stemmatic evidence indicate that videmus is a particular mistake of G, but habemus is also rhetorically and stylistically much stronger. Videmus would really mar what Gotoff calls the «Gorgianic predictability of construction», a form of stylistic simplicity which Cicero obviously uses «to mock an opponent’s contention»⁵¹. It seems fanciful to suppose that the strong ensuing effect of antithesis and gradatio were not Cicero’s achievement, but that of a later scribe.

Along the same lines, in 22.6 we can now decide more easily between the more or less equivalent eiciamus (G), which Gaffiot and Clark follow, and eiciemus of all the other branches. Another case is eandem (G) versus eodem in 23.11: cupere debemus, quo minus manuum nostrarum tela pervenerint, eodem gloriām famamque penetrare, where Gaffiot opts to keep the difficult eandem without really offering a satisfying explanation⁵². And the last but one word of the speech, finally, should be read certe instead of G’s particular certo.

As can be inferred from the stemma below, a future edition of the Pro Archia will have to weigh up the consensus of G, E and V against the newly reconstructed readings of π.

⁴⁹ O. Schönberger, o. c. 352, defends «qui se non opinari, sed scire, non audivisse, sed vidisse, non interfuisse, sed egisse dicit» preferring not to follow the audisse that the editors adopt from G E V, as «es ist ein Satz, in dem dreimal jeweils zuerst das längere Verbum dem kürzeren entgegengesetzt wird: opinari-scire, audivisse-vidisse, interfuisse-egisse. Bei audivisse-vidisse bleibt zudem eine Art von Annominatio gewahrt.»

⁵⁰ Gaffiot, o.c. 26. Vretska, o.c. 104, follows this line of reasoning.

⁵¹ Gotoff, o.c. 134-135.

⁵² Gaffiot, o.c. 30.
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