8. 1 Natura autem beniuolentissimus, cum ex instituto Tiberi omnes dehinc Caesares beneficia a superioribus concessa principibus aliter <rata> non haberent quam si eadem isdem et ipsi dedissent, primus praeterita omnia uno confirmavit edicto nec a se peti passus est. in ceteris uero desideriis hominum obstinatissime tenuit ne quem sine spe dimitteret.

concessa principibus concessa {principibus} a se concessa Alexander 1908, 19–20 (ut eandem mendam quam rata resarciret) | rata post aliter
add. Mediol. 1491 (concederent pro haberent ζ)

It is clear that with haberent = 'consider' / 'regard', some objective complement to concessa has been lost. rata habere has the advantage of being an idiom active in S.'s vocabulary (so Gal. 16. 1), and the sequence -ter -ta could account for the loss of the latter (rata, previously attributed to the Aldine edition of 1516, first appears a generation earlier, in the Milanese edition of 1491). Alexander's suggestion was intended to explain the corruption in a still more paleographically satisfying way, but at the cost of a certain awkwardness, on two counts: one awkward element—the simultaneous supposition that principibus is an interpolation—was avoidable (Alexander evidently assumed that saut du même au même required the sequence a superioribus concessa <a se concessa>, but a scribe who finished writing a superioribus concessa principibus could well have found his eye alighting on the second concessa when he turned back to his exemplar, and then moved on from there); the other awkward-ness is inevitable, the threefold repetition of the act of 'granting' / 'giving'—'they would not otherwise consider benefits granted by their predecessors [to have been] granted by themselves than if they themselves also had given the same ones to the same people'—which flirts with tautology in its last two members.

8. 3–4 quaedam sub eo fortuita ac tristia acciderunt, ut conflagratio Vesuuii montis in Campania et incendium Romae per triduum totidemque noctes, item pestilentia quanta non temere alias. in iis tot aduersis ac talibus non modo principis sollicitudinem sed et parentis affectum unicum praestitit, nunc consolando per edicta, nunc opitulando
quatenus suppeteret faculas. 4. ... urbis incendio nihil publice nisi perisse testatus cuncta praetoriorum suorum ornamenta operibus

ac templis destinauit praeposuitque compluris ex equestri ordine quo quaeque maturius peragerentur.

consolando] consu- MR, consulendo Bent. | nihil publice nisi perisse testatus
α: nihil nisi sibi pe- te- (est ζ7 pu-βς7 (sibi om. Dac, add. ss. post nisi Dc),
nicil nisi sibi pu- pe- te-ONς25 †, nihil nisi sibi pe- pu- te- Flor., nihil pu-pe-
te- 'optimo codice' Torr. (Roth, Preud.), nihil pu-nisi sibi pe- te- Alexander
1908, 20-1, nihil nisi publice perisse testatus Martinet 1981, 92

Here as elsewhere the agreement of M and R suggests that their reading, consulando, might well have been that of the archetype, and in any case it obviously prompted Bentley's consulendo. But that is almost certainly incorrect: on the one hand, S. uses consulere only in its primary sense, 'to seek an opinion/advice/information', from a person (e.g., Tib. 59 consulente [sc. Tiberium] praetore), a group (e.g., Aug. 56. 3 consuluit senatum), or a divinity (e.g., Tit. 5. 1 adipote Paphiae Veneris oraculo ... de navigatione consulit); on the other hand, emperors used edicta to express their views on a very wide range of matters (for an extreme case, Cl. 16. 4), and in this instance Titus evidently used them to convey the principis sollicitudinem ... et parentis affectum just mentioned.

As a preliminary to a discussion of the larger issue here, I set out the main alternatives in full, one under the other, the better to grasp the variations synoptically:

nihil publice nisi perisse testatus α
nihil nisi sibi perisse testatus publice βς7
nicil nisi sibi publice perisse testatus ONς25 †
nichil nisi sibi perisse publice testatus Flor.
nihil publice perisse testatus 'optimo codice' Torr. (Roth, Preud.)
nihil publice nisi sibi perisse testatus Alexander 1908, 20-1
nihil nisi publice perisse testatus Martinet 1981, 92

Plainly the main differences between the two branches of the paradosis concern the presence or absence of sibi and the placement and function of publice, differences that are played out variously in the remaining versions. To start with sibi, I take it that any version without it is not just wrong, but wrong on its face. Ihm printed α’s text, indicating that perisse represented Titus’ one and only public
utterance ('he made no public statement save "Lost"'): the fact that this directly 
contradicts the behaviour S. has just said Titus displayed—the sollicitude of a princeps, 
a parent's affection, the offering of consolation—leaves one no choice but to conclude 
that Ihm chose this version just because it is α's. It makes scarcely more sense to say— 
with reference to a fire that raged unchecked for three days and three nights—either 'he 
affirmed that nothing was lost in a public way' (with Torrentius, Roth, and Preud'homme) 
or 'he affirmed that nothing was lost save in a public way' (with Martinet, who elaborates, 
'Er rief aus: "Alles, was zugrunde gegangen ist, ware nur öffentliche Bauten" (und keine 
Wohnviertel und kein Privatbesitz')). sibi must be present because Titus must be involved; 
the question then becomes 'how is he involved?', and the answer is provided by considering 
the placement and function of publice. Here Mooney was right to insist (1930, 494) that it 
must modify testatus, not just because of a parallel like Otho 6. 3 nihil magis pro contione 
testatus est quam id demum se habiturum quod sibi illi reliquisserant (which he cited), and 
not just because the emphasis in §8. 3 leading up to this passage is entirely on the princeps' 
communications with his people, but because linking publice with perisse (so the print 
vulgate derived from ONc25, and so Alexander, Torrentius, and Martinet above) introduces 
a distinction—between public and private loss—that is fundamentally irrelevant to the 
point of the account. Rather, Titus publicly affirmed that the burden of loss was entirely 
his (nihil nisi sibi perisse)—that is why the predicate of the sentence for which testatus 
prepares the way reports his stripping his praetoria of all their valuable ornaments. This is 
the meaning conveyed by the version of both β and the Gallic florilegium, which differ only 
in placing publice before or after testatus: since S. is exceptionally fond of placing adverbial 
information after the word or words it modifies, while the florilegium has the normalizing 
word-order, I print the version of β.

8. 5 inter adversa temporum et delatores amendantoresque erant ex licentia ueteri.

amendantoresque M (aman-G): mandatoresque α: amandoresque Rβ2, om.
ζ

M's text presents an otherwise unattested agent-noun (amendantor) based upon what would 
be a by-form (amendare) of a verb (amandare, cf. G) whose meaning is of no possible 
relevance here, 'to send away' / 'relegate'. The correct reading must be mandatoresque, 
a noun that is used half a dozen time by the jurists in a sense that perfectly complements 
delatores ('qui ad nomen deferendum aliquem subornat': TLL viii. 260. 42–7); cf. Mooney 
1930, 495–6. The error probably arose from a misplaced or misunderstood superscript a 
tended to correct a text with menda.

9. 3 fratrem insidiari sibi non desinentem sed paene ex professo sollicitantem exercitus, 
meditantem fugam, neque occidere neque seponere ac ne in minore quidem honore habere
sustinuit sed, ut a primo imperii die, consortem successoremque testari perseverauit, nonnumquam secreto precibus et lacrimis orans ut tandem mutuo erga se animo uellet esse.

precibus (precipi- M) et lacrimis α: l- et p- β (ante secreto coll. ζ) ‡

Unsurprisingly, prayers and tears often keep each other company in classical Latin texts; rather more surprisingly, the order in which they occur is far more commonly prayers-and-tears than the reverse, by a ratio of more than two to one (twenty vs. eight, according to my count). Some writers display a fine indifference: Cicero, for example, accounts for nearly half the instances of tears-and-prayers (three), while offering prayers-and-tears four times. For others, it is prayers-and-tears all the way (so Livy, seven times, and Tacitus, four times). Thus even if we set aside consideration of the relative reliability of α and β, precibus et lacrimis is what S. is much more likely to have written.

Notes

3 Ihm indicated that he took perisse to be an exact report of Titus' statement, albeit in oratio obliqua, by directing the printer to set the type with extra spacing between the letters (p e r i s s e), the same device used in all such instances.