Ich fasse zusammen: E.-J. hat einen Kommentar abgefaßt, der andere Vorarbeiten zur 'Politeia' (darunter Adams Kommentierung) zwar ergänzen, aber nicht ersetzen kann und dessen Benutzung man eher dem Erfahrenen empfehlen möchte als dem Anfänger. Dennoch wird man angesichts der geringen Anzahl echter 'Politeia'-Kommentare E.-J.s Buch dankbar mit heranziehen, wenn man sich mit 'Politeia' 1–2 auseinandersetzt.

Berlin

Norbert Blößner


In October 1990, wandering round Enna, I came across a house that advertised itself as the one where Cicero lodged while preparing his case against Verres. Maps earlier than 1927 do not even name Enna, which for centuries had been Castrogiovanni. In Antiquity, however, the *Verrines* became a classic of championing exploited provincials, and poets too drew on them: Manilius, for instance, on II 5, 118–20 for 5, 619–30, and Silius on II 4, 115–end for 14, 641–88. Modest testimony to their appeal in the colonial era is that at my school, not one overenthusiastic about punishment, we read II 5, *De suppliciis*, and the postcolonial era has recently seen in Robert Harris’s ‘Imperium’ (2006) a brilliant evocation of Cicero’s inquisitorial descent on Sicily. In ‘The hand of Cicero’ (2002) Shane Butler stressed the novelty and relentlessness of the documentation.

Modern commentaries, though, have been slow to come, and this one of Baldo’s on II 4, in a highly regarded series, is the first generally accessible since T. N. Mitchell’s on II 1 (1986). Groundwork for a French one on II 3 has been published by J. Dubouloz & S. Pittia (ed.), *La Sicile de Cicéron: lectures des Verrines* (Besançon 2007), and J. R. W. Prag (ed.), *Sicilia nutrix plebis Romanae: rhetoric, law, and taxation in Cicero’s Verrines* (BICS Supp. 97, 2007). Understandably, historians of republican law, administration, and politics, have been driving most of this effort, because the *Verrines* belong to a period for which other sources are scanty. Furthermore, II 4, *De signis*, rivals the later books of Pliny’s *Natural history* in its value to archeologists and historians of art, and B.’s commentary was soon followed by Alessandra Lazzaretto’s ‘Commento storico e archeologico’ (Pisa 2006). All credit to B., then, for embracing language and rhetoric in a substantial commentary that does not skimp on anything historical.

B.’s introduction (13–73) discusses 1 ‘Verre e la Sicilia’, 2 ‘Lo sfondo politico e il *crimen repetundarum*’, 3 ‘Il processo: dalla cronaca alla fiction’, 4 ‘La numerazione e i *tituli* delle Verrine’, 5 ‘La struttura tematica e retorica delle Verrine’, 6 ‘La *dispositio* nella prima parte dell’orazione *de signis*’, 7 ‘Arte, morale, religione: la seconda parte dell’orazione *de signis*’, 8 ‘Umgangssprache e generae dicendi’, 9 ‘Il testo’. Then come a Latin text with apparatus (75–141), a translation (143–211), a commentary (213–577), a table of divergences from Peterson’s OCT of 1907 that also takes in, though only for such passages, Klotz’s edition of 1923 for Teubner and Bardon’s of 1964 for Mondadori (579–84), a bibliography first of editions and
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commentaries in order of publication, then of ‘letteratura critica’ in alphabetical order, and finally of works cited in the apparatus (585–642), and indexes of names and topics (643–61). The layout is clear and simple, and I noticed few slips or misprints, none seriously misleading except *moment for movent* in n. 115 of the introduction and 2687 for 2682 on 47, 33.

«Le Verrine» says B. in the introduction at the end of section 2 «costituirono … un manifesto politico di cui il principale beneficiario fu il cursus honorum ciceroniano». The longest sections of the introduction, and probably those of greatest interest to readers who do not happen to be professional historians, are 5–8. B. tries hard to find not so much in the individual speeches as in the whole span of II 1–5 and in some episodes the structure prescribed in rhetorical theory for a forensic speech (26–32), but his concession that much of the narrative has an argumentative overlay goes against such schematization. More attractive are his remarks on the episode of Antiochus and his candelabrum (41–42) and on Cicero’s placing of Messina and Syracuse at opposite ends of II 4 (33); he gives qualified support to von Albrecht’s view that the peroration of II 5 was originally designed for II 4, where to compensate for its removal, he suggests, Cicero worked up his treatment of Syracuse (45). He acknowledges the problems created for Cicero by Verres’s main line of defence, that he bought the artefacts in question (13–36), and does not conceal the inadequacy of some rejoinders that Cicero devises or the difficulty of setting boundaries between theft and formally legitimate acquisition at a low price through political or social pressure (see also his note on 10). He does justice to Cicero’s tightrope-walking between admiration and disdain for Greek culture and in particular for Greek works of art and the collecting of them (38–43). If any general point emerges from section 8, I suppose it is that Cicero moves with assurance, even on a small scale, from one stylistic register to another; but the difficulty that I have in summarizing the section perhaps shows that the commentary would have been a better place for the material and that B. should have thought twice before repeating in the same form the article that he contributed to Paideia 57 (2002). In the commentary he often says that a word or usage first appears in the Verrines or previously just in comedy (e. g. on 104, 18), but either in section 8 of the introduction or prominently in the commentary it needed saying how little survives of earlier Latin, especially prose, and in how little of that some of the words under discussion might have been expected to occur.

Besides providing an abundance of historical information, the commentary often makes shrewd points or brings out linguistic features that a reader of Cicero’s Latin might overlook or not be in a position to document.

67, 12–13 on amicus et socius populi Romani «l’impiego costante del nesso formulare nasconde in realtà un’evoluzione dall’originario rapporto paritario alla progressiva egemonia di Roma», 81, 33–35 «va ricordato che dal 94 (consolato di C. Caelius Caldus) sino a Cicero nessun homo novus aveva ricoperto il consolato», 93, 4 against the variant atque strenui et honesti, 113–15 «il crimine religioso è spesso richiamato da Cicero, come in generale nell’oratoria tardo-repubblicana, per la minaccia e l’inventiva, ma non viene mai preso in esame direttamente e formalmente come capo d’accusa principale», 115, 26–27 a subtle note on the interpretation of tanta religione obstricta tota provincia est, 123, 11 a meaty but concise note on likenesses, 132, 4 another on mystagogos; B. draws careful distinctions between words that Cicero tends to pair, for instance 1, 10 gemma – margarita,
Towards some Italian scholars, even eminent ones, underrate clausulae. B. understands them and is mostly reliable on prosody; and he has an enviable command of rhetorical terminology, though some of it, for instance fulmen, needed explaining to less expert readers. Impressive too are the range and quantity of secondary works that he has digested. Occasionally I have reservations. 

7, 33: He should have said not just that Leo and Klotz preferred viderit but why. 8, 15: He says that verbo iam uno nisi adatta meglio alla vivacità ironica dell’affermazione, but parallels would have helped. 10, 17: He defends it quod venale without saying that quod is not an alternative form but turns venale into a noun. Like Bardon, I favour quod. 15, 6–7: He should have admitted with Madvig that the force of ne forte here is unusually hard to grasp. That la costruzione … ricorre spesso in greco will baffle more readers than it enlightens. 37, 7: He mentions Shackleton Bailey’s preference for Ceboelo but not his reason for it, namely that it is in pqr (a fact missing from B.’s apparatus as well as those of Peterson, Klotz, and Bardon, and discovered by Shackleton Bailey himself) and was more likely in alterum abs. 38, 4: That Therica derives from θηρία is hard to believe. What would the suffix be? 39, 19: It is not ‘i recencionis’ that have the infinitive at II 2, 91 or 3, 99. 39, 24: His preference for non (6: om. R) over eis (HH and Servius) is perverse. 42, 29: semme amounts to ‘con ansietà’ only because it goes with expectabat. 53, 29–32: More needed saying about the reading of β than that it is sicuramente una interpolazione. 68, 24: What is ‘proverbiale’ about disciserit? 86, 7–9: The potential subjunctive may be rare in subordinate clauses, as he has already said in his note on 11, 31–33, but this is an inverted cum clause. 107, 26: How can it be that lo iato aequata agri segna il confine tra i colai when the words form part of the phrase aequata agri planities? 110, 16–17: cum loquerer tantis fiebant gemitusque fiebant is not a hexameter, because the i of fiebant is long. 

I hope I can be forgiven for skipping the translation, which non-Italians are unlikely to consult unless translations into their own vernacular fail them. Doubtless, though, the process of translating led B. to focus on things in the text or apparatus that he might otherwise have missed or passed off as trivial. 

I have left till last the most disappointing part of the book: the edition. Madvig showed in 1828 that the medieval tradition is split between a French family, no member of which is complete, and an Italian family, of which the oldest member and most others are complete. The editor who has since done most to explore and analyse each family, Peterson in articles and the OCT, gave priority in II 4–5 to the following mss.: in the French family R (s. ix), S (s. xii), and the excerpts in H (s. xi); in the Italian family p (s. xi), q (s. xv), and r (s. xv). As Bardon did not use the fragment of C (s. ix) discovered in 1931 at Geneva, B. is the first editor to use it, but he contented himself for Peterson’s ms. with a ‘controllo in microfilm’, not the same thing as collation. In his account of the tradition he assumes that
Rouse and I in *Texts and transmission* said the last word on it, when in fact we treated several questions as still open. I now return to some of them.

Peterson vacillated over whether q descends from p and r from q. Klotz in his edition, xiv, listed (with many false references) passages that he took to prove q independent of p, but q (Laur. 48, 29) is now available on line (teca.bmlonline.it), and the list turns out to be a complete sham. He must have inferred readings of q from Peterson’s silence, even though Peterson, xii, said that he had not seen it, «supervacuaneum ratus … quidquid amplius quam cod. q lectiones iam ab aliis enotatas in apparatu meo includere». Where not simply false, Klotz’s statements about q apply not to the original hand but to q’, who at *Caecil.* 2, for instance, added esse at the end of a line and at II 1, 48 added ibi in a gap. Surely, then, q descends from p. Do 30, 8–9 *cum iste … syngraphis* and 133, 4–5 *cum … arbitramini*, omitted by qr for no obvious reason, form a line in p?

No better is Klotz’s case, xv, for the independence of r (B. L. Harl. 2687). The only readings that survive inspection of q, where many cited from r were entered by q’, are II 1, 15 *comprobaverunt* and 60 *[asiam]*, but Peterson rightly cited the former from qr and should have cited the latter from r as well as q’ (r’ adds only et).

In their apparatus Bardon and B. report five omissions of r not caused by *saut du même* au même, and though four of the passages do not occupy a line in q, one does, 39, 26–27 *eius … capitis* (followed in q at the end of the line by *istius* ex-punged). Moreover, G. Lopez in his Mondadori edition of *II Petronii* (teca.bmlonline.it), listed (with many false references) passages that he took to prove q.

I have checked some of B.’s statements and implications by inspecting q on line and r on the spot. At 3, 10 r has *invenire*, corrected by *sic* to something that I could not read; at 22, 29–30 r has the same transposition as q; at 36, 5 q has *proferes* with pr; at 39, 20 q originally left a gap before *commotus*, q’ supplied est, and r has always had est; at 43, 10 q has *petiturum* with pr; at 54, 11 q has just *pallio* with r; at 70, 19–20 q has *aoptuent*; at 91, 11 r has *possit* with q; at 116, 24 r originally had *plurma* with pq; at 119, 21 qr have the same transposition as p; at 124, 3 r originally had *et multa* with pq; at 126, 21 r omits est with pq; at 144, 27 q omits *iact* with pr; at 146, 23 q omits the initial with pr; and at 151, 33 q omits *est* after *adfecta*. Then I saw that B. took over almost all these mistakes and oversights from Bardon’s apparatus. Not surprisingly, therefore, he also ignores errors of qr ignored by Bardon, for instance in a passage that I decided to collate, 60, 7 *Venio nunc* – 68, 24 *discesserit*: 61, 17 *regem* (*regnum* r’), 62, 27 *iam* (*visum* r’), 33 *decessit*, 34 *[et* *istum*, 34 *ornatam* (*tum* r’), 63, 7 *ponent* (*prietor* r’), 8 *illum* (*illud* r’), 10 *[spoliatum]*, 64, 20 *opera*, 28 *syria* (*am* r’), 65, 8 *eorum* *for operum*, 10 *possit*, *sed* *[ad*], 66, 17 *[alter*], 20 *bos homines* (*os bonus* r’), 24 et *<donare>* (*et* r’), 24 *petere*, 24 *[se*], 32 *aut* (*aet* r’), 67, 37 *carinum* (*clarissimo* r’), 9 *lit* (*tera* (*latera* r’), 13 *esse* before 12 et, 68, 21 *et sectum* q’ *et sectum* q’r. Even an editor who regards *q* as independent of *p* needs to justify citing them where *p* and the French family agree against them, and I see no justification for citing them sporadically, let alone inaccurately. I cannot say how accurate the rest of B.’s apparatus is, but it has three faults of presentation: where it is positive, the variants cited are not always coextensive with the lemma (*10 emeris* and *50 adstrictunque dedamus* are superfluous); where it is negative, some are open to misinterpretation (*e. g., 36 *tam etiam* B, 45 *tam* B); and some conjectures are burdened with lists of editors who have favoured them (*e. g., 29 *gratis*, 59 ea per, 144 *recepta*). At 29, 17 the lemma does not fit the text.

B. describes the second-oldest member of the Italian family, k (Paris B. N. Lat. 4588A, s. xiii), as «codice di difficile lettura e limitato valore», but does not reveal
what exactly its value is or why it puts the speeches in the order II 4–5 (from 4, 29), 2–3, with 1, 156–end added by a different hand in the space left between 3, 49 and 50 on f. 85v (the last page of a quire?). This order suggests a French ms. supplemented from the Italian family, but Peterson’s reports show that in II 4–5, as in 2–3, it does belong to the Italian family. «Medium inter p et cod. deteriores locum videtur obtinere» was Peterson’s verdict, but in stemmatic analysis this outmoded expression can only mean that the deteriores go back through it to p, hardly what he had in mind.

What of the other Italian manuscripts? Dazzled by Lagomarsini’s collations of eight in Florence, editors since Zumpt (1831) have treated them as fully representative of what they call the deteriores. In RHT 14–15 (1984–85) 57 and RivFil 112 (1984) 283 I lamented this policy in connexion with other speeches of Cicero’s, and it has done quite as much damage in the Verrines, where Lopez & Piacent have listed over 50 other Italian mss. and I can add a further dozen. Though they give no ms. a date narrower than a century even when a year appears in the subscription, it costs little effort to pick out what seem likely to be the earliest after p and k: Paris B. N. Lat. 7786 (s. xiv according to the catalogue of 1744), Vat. Lat. 1713 (s. xv–xv according to the IRHT), Vat. Lat. 11421 (s. xiv–xv according to J. Ruyschaert in the catalogue, partly s. xiv and partly s. xv according to the IRHT), Reims 1110 (written at Konstanz in 1417), Bologna Univ. 2232 (a. 1419), Vat. Pal. Lat. 1476 (probably from the Veneto and hardly later). Passages of all these need collating so that their relationship to p can be established. Unless some are Florentine, the earliest Florentine mss. appear to be Laur. Strozz. 44, which Sabbadini, ‘Storia e critica’ 40–41, showed to have been written by 1407 (Zumpt wrongly but pardonably identified it with Lag. 42, which is O), and Laur. 48, 27 (Lag. 27), an early specimen of humanistic script and decoration; I suspect that many of the Florentine mss., if not all, will turn out to descend from Strozz. 44, which Bruni expected to be copied. Throughout the Verrines, the Florentine mss. often agree with the French family against p, as I have established by checking Laur. 48, 27 on line where Peterson rejects variants that he cites from p but not dett.; yet no editor has ever asked whether they and the other Italian mss. are contaminated descendants of p or independent relatives of p. If the latter, the task awaits them of exposing errors peculiar to p, not least in II 1, 111–end and 5, 162–71, missing from the surviving members of the French family. Note II 1, 127 ordine, which they share with the palimpsest V but put after nominem, and 5, 167 semper, which they share with Gellius; again, my evidence comes from Laur. 48, 27.

Then the French family. Peterson judged S independent of R, but Klotz, viii–xii, assembled evidence to the contrary, and though he nowhere says how he obtained it, as I imagine he would have done if he had collated R and S himself, it does appear this time to be reliable. B. ignores Peterson’s observation, JPhil 30 (1907) 169, taken up by Klotz, xii, that in II 4 S originally ended where R does, a few lines short of where the Italian family ends. When and how did it recover these lines? No later than s. xii, I thought when I saw it in 1981; but I still have no idea how. The only detailed account of what happens there in R was given by Bursian in an article of Halm’s, Gelehrte Anzeigen 36 (1813) 242 n. 3, and B. should have cited this article, ‘Ueber die Handschriften der Verrinischen Reden des Cicero’, rather
than the monograph that Halm published in 1850, which does not cover the 
Verri
eses; but like Nohl, Hermes 20 (1885) 61 n. 1, I am left wondering if calamitoso die 
is written as a catchword. Halm’s view that R was the archetype of the French 
family in II 4–5 was not ‘presto superata’ but remains valid for the mss. that he 
discussed, which of course did not include the fragment of C at Geneva; nor did 
they include S, but Bardon’s case for the independence of S, which B. approves, is 
so weak that B. cites in his apparatus only two of Bardon’s five readings. After 
Clark had derived from H the extracts from II 3–4 in E (the Erfurtensis, s. xii), 
Petersen, JPhil 30 (1927) 194, cited two readings that stood in the way, 3, 3 precipi-
tur H peremptitur EO, but at 3, 5 H has mihi indices, as Clark mentioned in JPhil 18 (1890) 76 but neglected to mention when he 
published a collation against Jordan’s text, which has indices mihi; the reports of 
E are Wunder’s in his Variae lectiones (Leipzig 1827) 121. For a lost witness to 
the same extracts, Tours 867, see ‘Manuscripts and methods’ (Rome 2011) 227. D matters 
only at the beginning of the collection, where its ancestor S has lost everything 
before II 1, 90, and ignoring it would have been preferable to crediting it as B. does 
with a text of all seven Verrines.

I take the opportunity of bringing Texts and transmission up to date in the rest of the Ver-
ri
enes. Rouse observed that Esc. R 1 2 ought to be independent of D, and I can now add that it 
was written for Clement VI, pope 1342–12; see Manuscripts and methods 397–98. It has many 
corrections from the Italian family. If Peterson’s apparatus can be trusted at II 1, 97, 
indepen
dance of D, which has just produxit, follows not only for Esc. R 1 2 but for the two mss. 
at Wolfenbüttel, which all have protulit produxit with S. Another ms. perhaps independent 
of D is Paris B. N. Lat. 16226, not mentioned by Peterson and not listed by Lopez & 
Picente, which I set apart from the other French manuscripts of Pro Quinctio in my edition, 
 xv–xvii. Fragments of a ninth-century French ms. have come to light at Einsiedeln (II 2, 103– 
4, 107, 134, 136–37) and Bamberg (II 1, 103, 106–7, 109–10, 112–13, with 106 attribue
vet quae omnis … arbitraferetur) and in a private collection (II 3, 133, 157–39, 176, 179–80). On 
the Einsiedeln fragment see B. Munk Olsen, L’étude des auteurs classiques latins aux XI 
fragment, Munk Olsen, II (1985) ix, whereupon Richard Rouse, whom I alerted in 1987, 
obtained a photocopy and kindly sent it to me; the owner of the other fragment kindly 
showed it to me in March 2010. On the place of O in the French family, which it belongs to 
in II 2–3, see my article ‘A lost manuscript of Cicero’s Verrines’, RHT 12–13 (1982–83) 381– 
85; incidentally, it is Laur. Conv. Soppr. 79, not 78 as B. says. G. Lopez in his edition of II 2, 
mentioned above, uses no ms. not used already but gives fuller reports than Peterson or 
Klotz.

Altogether, it is depressing how little progress editors have made since Peterson. 
Had the length of B.’s volume not put me off opening it till August 2012, I might 
have spent much of the five years since I received it on the transmission of the 
Verrines rather than of Pliny’s Natural history. My apologies go to B. and the edi-
tors of Gnomon for the delay and to B. for devoting more of this review to what 
will be recognizable as a hobbyhorse of mine than to the considerable virtues of his 
introduction and commentary.

Cambridge

Michael D. Reeve