nel secondo membro. Cf. DS 34. 244. εντύθεν, la lezione dei codd. (ὁπείθεν), confermata dalla versione di Bartolomeo (a posteriori), non giustifica l’emendamento; 36. 260–261 (öις ἀν ἐκ πελάγων προσπάθησων, ... οἰς ἀν διὰ τῆς); 41. 299–300 ἡν δὲ τῷ πόνῳ. νέμεσθαι: anche alla luce delle considerazioni degli Edd. (p. 190) sono d’accordo con Wimmer, Wood e Hort nel considerarlo un locus dependitus; 42. 305–306 κ. κυών...όρυτων ὁμοίως κ. ἀλολυγίων ἰδώσσα...χειμέρων: opterei con Wimmer ed Hort per la variante ὀρύττουσα (M Bart.) perché l’asverbo nella posizione in cui si trova non dà senso. Invero mi sarei atteso un testo diverso: κ. κυών...όρυτων...χειμέρων κ. ἀλολυγίων ἰδώσσα...δομοίς (cf. DS 41. 300–301) oppure la ripetizione di χειμέρων (cf. DS 39. 280–1); 42. 307 ἂν πῶς μὴ θηλή ἄφαγεσθαι: l’emendamento del trádito σχέσαις (M Bart.) risulta palmare, ma la ripetizione quasi immediata (42. 308) di ἄπειρεσθαι μὴ θηλή e la traduzione di Bartolomeo (se ειδεν) desta qualche perplessità; 42. 309 λόγος...παχύ κατόμενος: l’emendamento del trádito θρυγαῖος (M) sembra non necessario (cf. 34. 398 λόγος κατόμενος...παχύκατος); 53. 391 ἂν πεφραγμένη ἢ πεφραγμένη (M avrei preferito per il senso l’emendamento di Schneider (πεφραγμένη); 55. 403–404 οἷς ἀν τούτων κλίνη κάλλιστα: il testo trádito non riesce a giustificare la reggenza del genitivo (vd. «And in whatever way <each> of these incline for the best»). Da qui la congettura di Hort (ἐκφεύνει). Per quanto riguarda l’apparato, redatto con cura ma dove sarebbe stato utile conoscere, almeno nei casi in cui la tradizione risulta divisa, anche le lezioni dei codd. recensioni, si segnala: 133 mancano le lezioni di VBHC; 210 sq. τοῦ δεξιῶν V τῶν δεξιῶν V; 211 σημειον πνευμάτων V: ? (è saltata la lezione di M); 234 παχύ MPB παχύ ἐν Μετρί; 217 non risulta perspicuo se il riferimento sia a ἔτε’ oppure a οὔ τε’; 290 Fortasse > fortasse. Per il testo greco a p. 76. 194 si segnala στροῦθοι > στροῦθοι. Assai sporadici i refusi tipografici: p. IX Harflinger > Harflinger; p. 31 r. 25 astronomers > astronomers; p. 36 r. 6 DS 16. 419 > DS 57. 419; p. 81 r. 3 those those > those; p. 175 r. 17 thorough > throughout; p. 176 r. 32 manca il punto fermo dopo «Phoinikias»; p. 199 r. 33 ancestor > ancestor; p. 200 r. 22 appearece > appearance; 214 r. 11 observations > observations; p. 231 r. 8 acrīe > ascribe; p. 256 (Index of ancient texts cited) Aelianus Historia animalium > Aelianus De natura animalium. Per quanto infine concerne la «Table 1: Signs as arranged in De signis» p. 33 si rilevano alcune mancanze e inesattezze: 13 iridescent halo; 14 intermittently flame; 16 shearwaters (segnalato ma non presente); 22 bright suns; 23 chaffinches; 38 sparrows (segnalato ma non presente); 39 crow, swallow, black birds; 41 cows; 42 black snuff; 50 moont; 52 sea-owl; 54 lamp.

Firenze Francesco Becchi


The witnesses to an ancient text sometimes present it in forms so different that the author may have released or produced it in more than one. Mario De Nonno listed some examples in Anna Ferrari (ed.), Filologia classica e filologia romanza: esperienze eclettiche a confronto (Spoleto 1998), 225–26. He did not include Cicero’s Philippics, because the divergences between V (s. ix) and D (the lost source of the decurtati, which make up the rest of the medieval tradition) have been put down to a mixture of helplessness in V and interference in D.

When V reached Poggio, he used it in 1428 not just for restoring 5.31–6.18, whose loss gave the decurtati their unsuitable name (V, after all, lacks two sections
of 11–12 and everything beyond 13.10), but for correcting a descendant of D throughout, and even editors who knew V and saw its value continued to do the same until Halm in 1856 founded his text on V, admitting variants from D only as a last resort. That the trend has since gone into reverse is probably due in large measure, though Magnaldi does not say so in her introductory survey of the editorial history (pp. 9–22), to Zielinski’s book of 1904 on prose rhythm in the speeches, which showed that many variants in D accord better with Cicero’s preferences. When M. argues, therefore, that the text of the latest editors, Fedeli (Teubner, 1982) and Shackleton Bailey (1986), can often be improved by a return to V, she tends to dismiss considerations of rhythm; but the importance of her work lies not so much in her editorial choices as in her attempt to explain the character of D. She sees it as reflecting close study of Cicero’s language in imperial schools. Such questions as ‘how else might he have put this?’ led, she maintains, to a new and often dangerously plausible text. This monograph, then, is a return to a 19th-century ‘best manuscript’ but with a difference.

In Chapter I (pp. 23–92), which concerns ‘antichi emendamenti’ that survive thinly disguised in V, M. picks up a subject that she explored in La forza dei segni (Amsterdam 2000). In the footsteps of Michelangelo Giusta, she argued there that an ancient method of correction, the repairing of omissions or corruptions by putting the right text in the margin preceded or followed by an extract from the adjacent text for keying it in, often confused medieval scribes: instead of incorporating the intended words in the place indicated by the extract, they incorporated the whole of the marginal entry somewhere in the neighbourhood, with the result that the text sprouted an often bizarre dittography. Instead, then, of just deleting the repeated extract, editors need to consider whether the adjacent words belong where they stand or next to the other occurrence of the repeated extract. Reviewing the book in W. S. 116 (2003) 314, Michaela Zelzer objected that she herself had never met such a correction in an ancient manuscript, and indeed M.’s evidence for the method comes not direct from ancient manuscripts but from what she takes to be medieval traces of it. In the present chapter she has not risen to the challenge of documenting it, and so here too, as in the earlier book, her case depends on the persuasiveness of her examples. In the earlier book they were a mixed bag.

Some were attractive, for instance her conjecture (p. 21), first published in Prometheus 23 (1997) 238–43, that what editors usually print as urgentibus in a much debated passage of Tacitus, Germ. 33.3, originated as in gentibus, a correction of gentibus just before. On the other hand, she often expelled a good clausula or introduced a poor one, for instance at Sen. N. Q. 7.27.1 (p. 28), De erva 2.3.1 (p. 30), Cons. ad Marc. 18.6 (p. 36), Cic. Fin. 2.17 (p. 38), Leg. 2.26–27 (p. 47), Off. 1.151 (p. 50), Sen. Ep. 202.2 (pp. 74–76), 42.7 (p. 78), 94.61 (p. 87), Quint. 6.5.16 (p. 151), or proposed unconvincing Latin, for instance at Apul. Met. 2.23 and 7.12 (p. 19), Sen. Cons. ad Marc. 18.6 again, Cic. Att. 9.5.1 (pp. 67–68), Q. fr. 1.3.3 (pp. 69–70), Sen. Ep. 9.19 (p. 72), 97.7–8 (p. 88), Tranq. 1.10 (pp. 91–92), N. Q. 3.16.6 (pp. 94–95), Liv. 25.34.1 (p. 105).

Among her more plausible examples were five from the Philippiques (pp. 56–62), which she now repeats in a wider treatment of corrections misunderstood by V or an ancestor.

Some corrections she takes to have been corrupted after insertion in the wrong place. Certainly there is no reason why they should have been spared corruption any more than the rest of the text, and perhaps their intrusiveness actually invited manipulation; but the differences
weaken her diagnosis. At 8.7 <contendebat> Sulla, proposed by Sternkopf, may or may not lie behind *i consulla*, which V adds later in the sentence (pp. 83–85), and 5.12 *pene in unum* is not obviously a corruption of *pecunia una in* earlier in the sentence (pp. 65–67).

D too sometimes combines original and correction. Consequently, where V does so but D offers an acceptable text by omitting one or other, she suspects that the archetype responsible for the «innumerovoli errori congiuntivi» shared by V and D (p. 18) had both but the creator of D was intelligent enough to choose (p. 42). The chapter includes ten rather fuzzy plates of V and Poggio’s manuscript, Laur. 48.22; M. should have mentioned that in fig. 1 Poggio can be seen expunging *quidem* from the text because his marginal note had left it superfluous.

Ancient authors quote from the *Philippi*cs some 162 times, and in Chapter II, ‘La tradizione indiretta’ (pp. 93–133), M. concentrates on those quotations that agree with V or D against the other. When they agree with D against a reading of V that she prefers, she concludes that one of two things happened: either the quotation came from a descendant or relative of D, or the author yielded to the tendencies seen in D. As agreements with D already occur in Gellius, the former option would take the archetype back well beyond the grammarians whose concerns provide her with the argument of Chapter III. Gellius and Servius pose a delicate problem, because each shares with D what M. regards as an error (1.10 *videbantur* … *[etiam]* Serv., D: *videntur* … *etiam* V, Gellius, Lact. Plac.; *[tamen]* Gell., D) but elsewhere preserves a true reading against the agreement of VD (2.76 Gallicis Gell.: *cal[l]igis* VD; 3.11 *fudit apothecas* Serv.: om. VD). Worse, Servius quotes 2.76 twice, once with *hospitium* and once with *hospitum* (pp. 98–100).

M. cites variation in the genitive plural of nouns in -*tas*, common but hardly relevant, and does not mention that *hospitium* is a far from rare neuter noun. Not all editors accept *hospitum* at Livy 4.33.4.

Authors who quote Cicero, however, have been equally exposed to corruption in transmission, and Gellius no less than Servius could owe his quotations to different predecessors. Postulating a lost ancestor of D that had both its errors and the true readings, as M. does (p. 104 with n. 35), conflicts with the absence of the true readings from V, which would have to be a coincidence. Better not to force ancient quotations into the stemma of the medieval witnesses when we know so little about the tradition in Antiquity. On the evidence of two quotations in Arusianus M. accepts that Cicero wrote at least 17 *Philippi*cs (pp. 95, 109 n. 43), but the three fullest descendants of D that editors use, bvs, end at what is plainly the end of 14, and a number of scholars, for instance C. Schäublin, Ciceros demosthenische Re-dezyklen: ein Nachtrag, Mus. Helv. 45 (1988) 60–61, have made a strong case for regarding 3–14 as the collection of ‘*Philippi*cs’ that Cicero designed.

In Chapter III, ‘Varianti grammaticali nei *codices decurtati* (D)’ (pp. 133–267), M. discusses the addition of words or phrases, the spelling out of implications, the substitution of words or expressions more or less equivalent, and the recasting of syntax or word order. She links these practices to scholastic exercises by citing analogies from grammatical works and commentaries, especially Arusianus’s *Exempla elocutionum* and Donatus’s commentary on Terence (pp. 108–9, 119 n. 63, 129, 179, 245 n. 293, 254). Sometimes changes went in both directions: parts of *esse* and verbal prefixes, for instance, were added in some places, dropped in others. In such battles with V, then, D cannot win, not even when V omits *esse* from 2.7
quam multa ioca solent esse in epistulis (pp. 119–20). Two of her more interesting suggestions are that some readings of D were designed to remove uncertainty over articulation or whether a sentence was a statement or a question (p. 119 n. 63, p. 155) and that some were imported not just from elsewhere in the Philippics but from distant reaches of the Ciceronian corpus (p. 153 De orat. or Leg., p. 193 Tusc.). Her general view that the text of D reflects close engagement with Cicero’s language pulls the carpet from anyone inclined to urge that D should be followed where Ciceroan parallels give it more support than V: mutato nomine de te fabula narratur (p. 21). Arguments from rhythm are equally vulnerable, because the practice of many authors in late Antiquity shows that Cicero’s preferences were no secret. On the other hand, some of M.’s decisions in favour of V where D has better rhythm strike me as special pleading.

1.27 (pp. 199–91): audio esse factum V: audio factum D. The clausula in V is not just a double but a triple trochee. 10.13 (p. 220): in eadem causa ponatur V: in eadem causa repos- nurat D. If the reading of V is «ottima», why not the reading of D? 5.27 (pp. 238–39): ire iussi erant: D. The scribe of V, she says, is unlikely to have read iussi sunt as iusservent, presumably because he had difficulty even in recognizing words and copied the text letter by letter (pp. 23, 42); but why should he not have inherited the error? 2.63 (pp. 251–52) veniamus ad splendidiora V: veniamus ad splendidia D. «Questo comparativo, infatti, esprime un incremento di splendore non rispetto a una realtà anch’essa splendida, ma rispetto a sordè, che dello splendore è l’esatto opposto. Un ver doctus all’opera entro il ramo D non avrà colto l’ironia di Cicerone, e avrà mutato splendidiora in splendidia.» Really? 5.22, 3.23 (pp. 257, 260): bene sentire de re publica cognoverat V: bene de re publica sentire cognoverat D; tam ferus fuiisset V: tam fuiisset ferus D. If the readings were exchanged, M. would say that D had moved sentire next to bene and ferus next to tam; furthermore, in the second passage V offers another triple trochee, and in the first I do not see why she considers the order in V ambiguous or the order in D less so. 3.5 (p. 239) in re publicae salute conlocavit V: in salute rei publicae conlocavit D. She argues that D moved salute next to in but does not mention that V offers a quintuple trochee.

Though M. acknowledges that not all her examples need have resulted from intentional changes (p. 94 «interventi più o meno intenzionali»), p. 222), some of the variants that she holds against D would be dismissed as insignificant in any other text, especially where omissions could have arisen by sunt duòmê au même, as at 1.33 metus a civibus tuis [quam diligi malis] (p. 142), 11.12 contenti esse poss<e>nt (p. 212). In some passages I have more specific reservations.

2.92 (p. 35 with n. 24): populus suis universis V: populus universis D. Surely universis would not have been abbreviated early enough to be misread after a final s as suis. On the other hand, the variants at 10.7, prætor urbis V prætor urbanus D, could well be different expansions of an abbreviation. 2.56–57 (pp. 77–80): Ego tamen, quoniam conditum esse pro nibilo est, ut ille esset, ignovserem. So D. In place of est ut ille esset V has just ut, before which V mysteriously adds cii. M. interprets cisis as a corruption of hic (supple) but instead of accepting any supplement at this point reads … quoniam conditum esse pro nibilo, ita igno- scere. Where are the parallels for quoniam … ita? and can one ‘facilmente’ supply est, when the only passage among some 30 where Cicero does not express esse or habere/putare/ducere with pro nibilo is Att. 14.9.1 di immortales, quam mihi ista pro nibilo ? On the strength of the repeated in eodem vero that follows in V, M. suggests that hic (apple) was an instruction to restore a passage omitted by sunt duòmê au même; but the first mesmo is conjunctural, and the words that would have been skipped are not what she says. Nor can I believe that the in of neminem (nsv) or nemo inest (t), to which D corrupts hominem, is a relic of in eodem vero, or that vero has a «doppia valenza avversativa e aseverativa» (simultaneously?). 2.84 (pp. 74–75): Her transposition of transitit oratio creates «richiami allitteranti», she says, by putting it
next to forte and leaving Lupercalia nearer to pulcherrimam. Not only are most of the repeated consonants internal and unobtrusive, but the first «richiamo allitterante» seems pointless. The «suggestivi effetti allitteranti» alleged in 3,33 serviamus armis (p. 115) are no more impressive, and elsewhere (pp. 89, 225) she finds assonance where a Perseverationsfehler looks equally possible. 2,110 (pp. 191–96): an supplications … contaminari passus es, pulvisaria contaminari nodasti V: contaminari’ om. D. If the variants were exchanged, M. would call the second contaminari a syntactical gloss; but even if she is right to hold that its omission in D was a linguistic experiment, I do not see how its presence «evidenziare in modo più inci- sivo l’incoerenza di Antonio, pronto a tollerare il primo genere di profanazione e non anche il secondone. 2,91 (p. 209 n. 180): M.’s proposal ut eius nomen nomen proprietur propier [«oppure nomen proprius nostra»] proximum dictatorem metu tolleres is a syntactical maze.

There is much to be learned along the way, not just about Cicero, as on the presence or absence of praenomina (pp. 168–77), not about Latin idiom, as on constare or constare with or without in (pp. 201–3), but also for instance about ancient critical notation, as on corrections framed by points (p. 25) or on k. (pp. 53–54). For more on k. see M. Zelzer in A. Primmer, K. Smolak, D. Weber (ed.), Textsorten und Textkritik (Vienna 2002), 246–48. M. interprets felix navigat, a later addition in V to the colophon of Phil. 8, in the light of fuller colophons that compare the scribe with a ship reaching port (pp. 89–91); V. Gardthausen, Griechische Paläographie (Leipzig 1911–15 II 332–33), mentions similar colophons in Greek and takes them back «in eine Zeit …, in der die verbindenden Fäden zwischen griechischen und lateinischen Schreibern noch nicht zerrissen waren». The book closes with a bibli- ography, a list of manuscripts collated, and an index of passages discussed.

In passing, M. adjudicates on the attribution of many corrections in V and puts editors right on many readings of individual decurtati. More work of both kinds, and a great deal of it, has gone into two things that she has published since this monograph: an article on the stemma of the decurtati, R. H. T. n. s. 3 (2008) 59–87, and a full edition of the Philippics (Alessandria 2008). There is an edition even more recent: two Loeb volumes, a revision of Shackleton Bailey’s edition by J. T. Ramsey & G. Manuwald (2009). M. has also returned to the text that set her on her course in the 1980s: Il De finibus bonorum et malorum di Cicero: due edizioni a confronto, Boll. di studi latini 37 (2007) 623–58. Furthermore, after seeing into print Giusta’s work on the text of Varro R. R. I–II (2006) she followed up the topic that particularly interests her: Antichi marginalia nelle Res rusticae di Varrone, Segno e testo 6 (2008) 35–72. Her style is unpretentious and unpolemical, her judgement consistently independent, her claims no grander than the matter in hand justifies. The textual criticism of Latin prose would be poorer without her distinctive and challenging approach.

Michael D. Reeve


Dieses Buch bezweckt, das Konzept von ‘Weisheit’ zu illustrieren, das Sen.[eca] nach M.[aso] durch eine zweifache und gegenseitig Bewegung auf die Autoreferentialität des Weisen gründet: Sen. betrachtet die Wahrheit, während er sich ihr nähert, und die Wahrheit betrachtet ihre Manifestierung und macht sie unwider-