vamento e della generale trasformazione in atto relativa al ruolo e al significato di ‘filosofia’.

In ogni caso, tutti i saggi qui raccolti costituiscono preziose e originali indagini, mirate a dettagli specifici peraltro riconducibili immediatamente ai problemi centrali della riflessione filosofica a Roma: una ‘riflessione’ che non teme il confronto con il mondo greco del quinto/terzo secolo a.C., ma che anzi ne condiziona in modo innovativo l’interpretazione e quindi lo sviluppo. Una ‘riflessione’ che appare, per così dire, più *togata* di quanto comunemente non si ritenga.

Venezia

Stefano Maso


Since 1999, the University of Cassino has been issuing under the direction of Antonio Stramaglia a series of commentaries on the nineteen *Declamationes Maiores* of Pseudo-Quintilian. Commentaries on ten have appeared in print, with this dual offering by Biagio Santorelli (S.) increasing that number to twelve. The presentation accords with previous volumes: after a general introduction, Latin text and translation (in this case into Italian) appear on facing pages, followed by notes covering the full range of scholarly commentary – textual, grammatical, and particularly exegetical. The choice of combining *Declamationes* 11 and 16 seems dictated not by similar subject matter but by the fact that their texts are the two shortest to come down to us. The tortuous logic of each, compounded by the often intractable textual issues of 16 in particular, invites careful commentary and on this S. unquestionably delivers. Since each text presents its own challenges, however, I will follow the example of S. and consider them separately. I will then treat together some of the textual matters.

The situation of declamation 11 does not afford neat summary. While a rich man is leading his state’s army, a rumor compels his enemy, a poor man, to accuse him in a public assembly of treason. In retaliation, the angry crowd stones to death the absent man’s three sons. Upon the rich man’s triumphant return he demands that the poor man’s three sons be executed. The poor man, citing a law that a false accuser should undergo the same penalty that the falsely accused would have suffered, objects that since the legal penalty for treason is death, it is he and not his sons who should rightly be killed. The rich man is the speaker.

The dramatic situation that underlies declamation 11 offers some surprises. While the theme of rich man versus poor man is ubiquitous to the point of being parodied already in antiquity (e.g., Petron. 48), here we have a rare case where it is the poor man, not the rich, who acts unjustly, a situation unique to Latin declamation (23–26). Nor does the issue of discrepancy in financial situation emerge in any detail; n. 43 (2.4) discusses one instance, though even here wealth is equated with moral superiority. S. does not pursue the possible implications for why the virtuous rich man seems peculiar to Roman practice; perhaps one factor involves an unwillingness to test the status quo on the part of the educational program from which these declamations originate.
A second characteristic of the fictive situation is worth emphasizing. The rich man needs to spend little time arguing the status of the case, since the poor man admits to both his calumny and its illegality, and does not attempt to argue that his actions, though illegal, were in some way just. As a result, there is little opportunity for narrative passages such as one sees in other Declamationes Maiores; in the first two speeches of the collection, for example, the nature of the case compels the speaker to narrate scenarios that show the unlikelihood that a blind man could commit a murder in the ways attributed to him. Since 11 offers little scope for narrative, the speaker focuses on what should be the poor man’s punishment, and the declaimer has free rein to show his skill in inventing colores. Indeed, as S. shows, the speaker does so even to the point of self-contradiction; n. 258 (11.4) provides, with bibliography, a particularly egregious instance. The result is that the declamation, despite being the shortest complete speech in the collection, is replete with rhetorical fireworks and reasoning that can be tortuous to the point of incomprehensibility, both in Latin syntax and in sequence of argumentation.

An introduction thoroughly covers the expected ground – the theme of rich versus poor; a survey of Roman legal treatments of calumnia; rhetorical structure; style and date (a rich discussion that supports the general consensus of the last quarter of the second century). In the commentary proper, S. is particularly full in situating the vocabulary and language of the declamation within the context of the larger Latin declamatory corpus, though this inevitably results in repeating much of the material found in earlier commentators in the series (e.g., n. 26 on fidem vestram; n. 32 on facinus est; n. 96 on geminatio of a verb accompanied by a vocative). S. is at his strongest and most helpful when patiently explicating the declaimer’s logic, such as in the notes on section 6 of the speech.

I add here remarks on the commentary portion. Note 8 discusses how stoning could constitute legal capital punishment in antiquity among the Jews and Greeks but not among the Romans; the fact that this act is mentioned only in the theme but not in the declamation proper provides further evidence that the author has adapted an inherited topic to fit the Roman situation. Note 13 (1.1): one wonders if the odd collocation doloris liberi puns on the fact that the speaker has lost his children (liberi; cf. the intentional paradox of the poor man ‘bequeathing the rich man’s childlessness to his own children’ at 1.2). Note 72 (4.1): an apt parallel for plena domus in the sense required here occurs at Tac. ann. 4.1.1. Note 76 (4.1) supplies a detailed argument in support of the difficult suos of the codices, which Håkanson had characterized as a locus suspectus – the defense is mostly convincing, although I cannot find a precise parallel for the sense of promitto required by this interpretation. Several notes show the declaimer aware of legal terminology (e.g., nn. 181, 184, 217); n. 218 (9.3): S. is surely right to argue against other scholars that the ‘unrecognizable’ (quos nemo nosset) children brought forward are not the declaimer’s own dead sons, but those of the poor man, a move that allows the rich man to parody cleverly the practice of the miseratio.

DECLAMATIO MAIOR 16 presents more problems for the commentator than 11, in large part because of the unsatisfactory state of the text. The opening remark in the apparatus of Håkanson’s Teubner is not promising (haec declamatio lacunosa est atque etiam corruptior quam ceterae videtur). The rhetorical situation is, by contrast, relatively straightforward. Two shipwrecked friends are captured by a tyrant. When the mother of one of the friends is stricken with blindness at the news, the tyrant allows her son to return home on the condition that his friend...
be executed if the son does not return to the tyrant on a prearranged date. After the son arrives home, the mother refuses to allow him to leave on the basis of a law that forbids children from abandoning parents in times of need. The declamation represents the son arguing for his return, with a recurrent theme being how to reconcile between the natural compulsions of filial pietas and the cultural constructions of amicitia – «un conflitto interno al sistema valoriale romano», as S. notes, and one that recurs throughout the declamatory corpus (175). The notes consistently and helpfully return to the ways in which the speaker treats this theme (e.g., n. 18, where the speaker argues that pietas is as much an aspect of friendship as it is of filial duty).

As with declamation 11, S.’s introduction to 16, largely reproducing his article in MD 69 (2012) 119–144, highlights the ways in which the speech both follows and deviates from analogous exercises. The speech features the generic tyrant as necessary catalyst to the action, but characterizes him not so much by his power and cruelty as by his apparent interest in using the two young men to test the limits of friendship (177–181). S. also considers other speeches that center on the law that children should support their parents when in need, a motif that Quintilian mentions no less than three times in his Institutio, and historical manifestations of which S. surveys from Solon to Ulpian (191–197). The introduction concludes with a close analysis of the speech’s rhetorical structure, style, and probable date (second quarter of second century CE). In the midst of these expected elements, S. adds a substantial discussion that finds the inspiration and development of the declamation’s dramatic situation in the legendary friendship of Damon and Phintias (181–191). The deviations from this account are minimal but necessary: the added element of the blinded mother provides the needed legal controversy (and, not incidentally, sets up the Roman conflict between amicitia and pietas), while the lack of resolution to the case forces the declaimer to ignore the moral lesson of the Greek original, where the tyrant unsuccessfully asks to become a third friend upon the son’s return. S. attempts to locate suggestions of this ending at 4.1 and 4.5 (n. 103; to which one could add 7.4: expectat totum immo genus hominum etc.). The arguments do not convince. If such allusions were indeed intended, one would surely have expected the declaimer to use this knowledge to undergird his recurrent claims for the superiority of friendship.

In his notes on 16, S. provides a helpful guide to the declaimer’s labyrinthine means of expression; it was rare that my incomprehension was not enlightened by a clear and thorough account of the underlying rhetoric. On a verbal level, S. conscientiously points out expressions particularly favored by the Latin declaimers; of particular interest are his notes on the declamatory flavor of peregre (n. 1), excedit omnem (n. 26), and color (n. 43). Other remarks include the treatment of phrases that tend to suggest a legal register, such as querela (n. 28); repromitto (n. 95); incere manum (n. 106), or that seem to have no clear parallels in earlier texts, such as cuncta facere de (n. 118). Of particular interest are S.’s notes on the prominence of verbs compound with cum (e.g., coire) to complement the declamation’s stress on the shared pursuits of the two friends (n. 13), and on the ways that the declaimer plays on the notion of appearances (videor) in the exordium (n. 31; I would add that the play seems especially pointed given the literal blindness that afflicts the mother).
The Latin text of both speeches follows Håkanson’s 1982 Teubner, offering few deviations for declamation 11, but several for the poorly transmitted and lacunose 16. All important textual issues are fully treated, and the suggestions included per litteras from the prominent scholars of declamation D. A. Russell, A. Stramaglia, and M. Winterbottom increase the value of these notes. I offer here only selected comments.

I begin with declamation 11. n. 17 (1.1): S. argues incisively for Stramaglia’s conjecture of ne negetur poena for sine genere poenae of the codices; n. 143 (6.7): Winterbottom’s suggestion per litteras of possis for possit is convincing; n. 145 (6.7): S. reads Gronov’s obvius for nobis, but Watts’s 1982 suggestion to delete nobis altogether as dittography after omnibus seems preferable and is supported by the absence of nobis from M (according to Håkanson’s apparatus and pace S. – «tradito da tutti i manoscritti»; for the value of M see, e.g., n. 148); n. 160 (7.2) accepts a suggestion of Winterbottom per litteras that gives reasonable sense to a passage where Håkanson accepted no solution.

Issues with declamation 16 are more involved. n. 65 (2.4): the speaker describes a friend as sharing non eiusdem pars animae, a conception that, as S. illustrates, is counter to poetic representations of close friendship; since the declaimer seems not to be making a particular point with this counterintuitive statement, I would suggest emendation by deleting non and replacing the following sed with the et found in the majority of manuscripts; n. 70 (2.5): S. notes that the phrase a primis aetatis is unparalleled in the plural; since, however, every use of a prima aetate that he cites describes the youth of one person, the plural here is surely attributable to the fact that it describes two friends merging from separate origins in eandem vitam (by the declaimer’s logic, this contrasts with brothers, whose relationship would be more natural and hence less remarkable); n. 91 (3.4) offers a convincing defense for tibi primum of the codices, in contrast with the conjectures of Shackleton Bailey (cum primum) and Håkanson (ubi primum); n. 217 (9.1): S. reads ponite sub oculis for Håkanson’s ponite sub oculos, but the parallels he cites have the prepositional phrase governed by a perfect passive participle, where the ablative would be more at home; for the accusative with verbs indicating movement, as we have here, see e.g. Cic. Or. 9 (sub oculos ... cadunt).

I close with a criticism for which S. is not directly responsible. This edition continues the practice of referencing the scholarly commentary to the Latin text not by using the appropriate section number or Latin lemma but by footnotes in the translation. The reasons for the decision are unclear: it detracts from use by a scholar, who must consult the modern translation to see whether a point has received commentary, and provides little of interest to the Latin-less, in particular since the abundant parallels in the notes are cited in Latin only. The arrangement, finally, has the potential to mislead, since the order of notes on the translation does not always match the order of the passages in the Latin text (e.g., at declamation 11, nn. 21–22).

Lawrence, Kansas

Anthony Corbeill
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