

III libro della *Repubblica* (392d ss.), ha alle spalle una metafora spaziale: l'accompagnare, il guidare attraverso un territorio, uno spazio (διηγέομαι).

³ Sulla novità della classificazione aristotelica, e sui suoi possibili precedenti ed esiti, si dispone dell'esauriente ricerca di C. Pepe, *The Genres of Rhetorical Speeches in Greek and Roman Antiquity*, Leiden-Boston 2013. Il problema della tripartizione dei generi del discorso nei rapporti coi *topoi*, che interviene a più riprese nelle pagine dell'A., è tanto più importante quando si pensi che la qualificazione di 'comune' (*koinos*), assegnata ai *topoi* nella discussione aristotelica che porta alla lista di II 23 (I 4 e II 19), è legata proprio al fatto che possono essere usati indipendentemente dal tipo di discorso retorico che l'oratore deve approntare, a differenza dei *topoi* specifici (*idioi*), che riguardano ciascuno dei tipi di discorso. Quella che l'A. definisce a p. 254 come ininfluenza della tripartizione dei generi nell'organizzazione complessiva della lista dei luoghi, al di là di singoli richiami, è, in realtà, una presenza sottotraccia, una sorta di 'pre-giudizio' in ogni caso disponibile. Segnalo qui, a integrazione della bibliografia dell'A. relativa a edizioni e traduzioni della *Retorica* di Aristotele (p. 365), la coeva traduzione italiana commentata, a cura di Silvia Gastaldi, Roma 2014.

⁴ Su tale termine, cruciale nella lunga durata della riflessione greca sulla realtà, dai poemi omerici in poi, è di grande utilità il volume curato da F. Piazza-S. Di Piazza, *Verità verosimili. L'eikos nel pensiero greco*, Milano-Udine 2012, con, fra gli altri, i contributi specifici di F. Roscalla, *L'eikos in azione. L'oratoria giudiziaria attica* (pp. 73-102) e F. Piazza, *L'eikos in teoria. Aristotele e la Rhetorica ad Alexandrum* (pp. 103-137). Recentissimo, infine, il volume di F. Roscalla, *Dalla tribuna al pulpito. La retorica del verosimile*, Pavia 2017.

L. Annaeus Seneca. De Clementia, ed. ERMANNO MALASPINA («Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana»), Leipzig (de Gruyter) 2016, XXXVII-48 pp., € 40,00, ISBN 9783110262476.

Ermanno M(alaspina) tells us (p. XXVII) that, when «iuvenili imprudentia» he started to work on the *De clementia* in 1996, he had no idea that his labours would one day find their culmination in a Teubner text of the book. But here now is that text. *En route* has been an edition with commentary (and much more) published in Alessandria in 2001 (2004²), and an Italian translation (Torino 2009). He ends his preface by asking us to compare the merits of the new text with those of his earlier one. I reviewed his book of 2001 in «BMCR» of that year, commending its «sensible and well punctuated text»¹. So I shall here do little more than comment on the changes M. has made, in the wording of the Latin and especially in the principles governing the *apparatus criticus*.

A number of changes of wording are listed on p. XXIV n. 78. They include the marking of *obeli* in two passages, I 20,2 *et, ut appareat, non* and II 6,1 *ac*. Conjectures are

rightly accepted at I 13,5 *praecluditur* Walter (M. comments on the excellent *clausula* thus produced; but I now feel that rhythm is in general an uncertain guide in this work) and I 22,2 *raritas* Reeve (unpublished, and palmary). At I 19,3 M. tentatively prints his own *minima congerere*, a marked improvement, I think, on his earlier *in minima re congerere* (incidentally he mentions here a conjecture of my own, all I did to merit my appearance in the list of helpful colleagues on p. XXVIII). At II 2,2 M. marks a lacuna before *blandum*, suggesting e.g. the supplement *oblectamentum porrigam*; certainly, with all its other faults, the *Nazarianus* is very subject to *lacunae*.

M. spent sleepless nights pondering the best way to present the evidence of his manuscripts (p. XXV), and not without reason. There are (at least) three inter-related problems facing an editor of this book. *a*) The text of *De clementia*, as of *De beneficiis*, rests on a single extant manuscript, the so-called *Nazarianus* (N, *Vat. Pal.* lat. 1547, saec. IX), full of errors, inconsistently and sometimes eccentrically spelt, and much corrected by different hands; from this, it is generally agreed, descend all the other three hundred or so manuscripts. *b*) Another ninth-century manuscript, R (*Vat. Reg.* lat. 1529) is agreed to be a descendant, or even a direct copy, of N. *c*) All the other manuscripts are agreed to be descended from R (though see below on Q).

How are these witnesses to be reported? M.'s practice is as follows: *a*) to report (with some qualifications) «omnes mendas vel ineptissimas» of N (p. XXVI); *b*) to report the readings of R where it differs from N (though only by implication where the two agree); *c*) to report the «consensus codicum recentiorum (praeter laudatos)» under the siglum 'r'; here the *recentiores*, re-collated in person by M., are defined (I here omit mention of various excerpta) to comprise Q, φ (the agreement of four MSS of the twelfth and fourteenth centuries), π (the agreement of two MSS of the thirteenth and fifteenth centuries) and γ (the agreement of five MSS of the twelfth and fourteenth centuries). In M.'s earlier text, a good deal of this information was, as I think wisely, hived off into a «Lista critica» (pp. 189-230). Such an expedient was not felt to be appropriate to a Teubner text, and much of this material has been transferred to the *apparatus*. The result is something very far from the 'dream apparatus' of Alphonse Dain («“sublime”», *Les manuscrits*, Paris 1964³, 175), far too from the lean and spare *apparatus* of the 2001 edition, especially as rejected conjectures² and editorial comment are now freely welcomed.

Agedum, pauca accipe contra. I entirely understand why M. acted as he did³; but I should myself, bred up man and boy to the conventions of the «Oxford Classical Text» series («recognovit breuque adnotatione critica instruit»), have acted differently⁴. I address the three problems in turn.

1) An editor should, in my view, restrict the amount of information given about the corrections in N. Obviously, any place where there is any possibility that a corrector is drawing from outside the tradition would need to be recorded. It is not clear, however, that there are any such places. A reference in the preface to the commentary (pp. 84-87), together with a short assessment of the position, would be sufficient. M. tells us much, too much⁵: far more than most editors of another text would think it worthwhile to tell us about either of two primary manuscripts.

The question of orthography arises here. As in the earlier edition, M. prefers to follow

the inconsistencies of the *Nazarianus* than to normalise. I do have strong doubts about this. There is nothing sacrosanct about **N**; and why should the spelling found in other primary manuscripts of Seneca's prose works not be equally relevant? It hardly seems worth going to so much trouble to follow **N** wherever it leads at the cost of annoying and distracting readers who already have enough on their hands puzzling out the meaning of a by no means straightforward book. I think in particular of the frequent use of *is* for *iis*.

2) **R** often enough corrects errors in **N**⁶, and where those errors are at all striking **R** will naturally need to be reported, to give some idea what the scribe (or some predecessor) was capable of in the way of correction. In fact, M. remarks of *nobiles* at I 24,2 that it is the «sola fere emendatio ingeniosa» in the book⁷. Here again a reference in the preface to the commentary (pp. 88-90), perhaps with a short assessment, would suffice to make the case against **R**'s independence.

3) This is where the real problem arises. I do not see that where the correct reading appears first in **R** there is any need to give it further support. Where it first appears elsewhere, I feel that some attempt should be made to give an indication of priority. In *De officiis*, faced with a somewhat parallel situation, I used dated manuscripts where possible from the fourteenth century on. For the twelfth century manuscripts, I used formulae like «XII (Par. lat. 18419)», with the implication that I had found the reading in a particular manuscript without in any way claiming that it only appeared there. In *De clementia* some such system could, in a rough and ready way, mark off apparently earlier from apparently later conjectures. But I do not feel that the strings of witnesses⁸ M. so often produces to support good or bad readings (e.g., at random, I 21,1 *accepit*] *accipit* **LGG4S'S2** edd. vett.) are of any value. It cannot be true that these are the only manuscripts that give this reading; and even if the list were complete it would do nothing to strengthen the claims of the variant. At least my formula «*accipit* XII (**L**)» would take less space to make the more modest claim that the variant had not been observed before the twelfth century.

The MS *Lips.* I 4 47 (**Q**, saec. XII) is a special case, for it has been argued by G. Mazzoli to draw directly upon **N** by a different route from all the other manuscripts, bypassing **R** (see Malaspina, p. xxii). Even if this is so, it does not give **Q** any special weight. More important is that **Q** is a rich repository of readings that improve on **N**, from wherever it drew them; and M. hints at its special *status* by giving it pride of place when he lists witnesses. It would save a good deal of space if the presence of **Q** were allowed to displace the mention of any further *recentiores* in such a list.

All this does not throw any doubt on the worth of M.'s new volume. Here we have, clearly presented, the materials from which a better text might be constructed – but only if a new Håkanson were to burst upon the world. Meanwhile, Teubner might consider the desirability of following «Oxford Classical Texts» in encouraging the writing of prefaces in a vernacular, and in giving running heads to help the reader to track down a reference more quickly.

Now let us hope for a new edition of *De beneficiis*, from M., or someone equally energetic and learned.

¹ The paragraphing might be revisited, perhaps with generally shorter segments. I should myself make breaks at the start of I 5,3 (*cum autem*) and I 12,3 (*sed mox*). At I 16,1 I think the break should follow *scriberent*, not *summoveri*. Commas should in my view *e.g.* follow *decipiat* at I 17,2, *suis*, *serpit* and *putat* at I 26,4, *Procrustes* (not *piratae*) at II 4,1. The comma after *est* in II 5,1 might better be a colon. But these are subjective matters; in general I find the text very sympathetically punctuated.

² Even Gertz can be wrong (*e.g.* in the addition of *at* before *principum* at I 5,2); and it would be kind in general to suppress conjectures that have little chance of being right.

³ He explains his principles at pp. XXVff.

⁴ I wrote what follows before reading the comparable remarks of Richard Tarrant, another pupil of Roger Mynors, in *Texts, editors, and readers*, Cambridge 2016, 124-144. Undoubtedly some «OCT» apparatuses are too slim: there is room for a *media via*.

⁵ One example from very many: I 3,4 *desideravit N²: desiteravit N¹*.

⁶ M. over-reports here too (one example from many: II 6,4 *aliquid trahitque R : aliquid trahitquae N*).

⁷ It is perhaps worth saying that N's reading here («no») is presumably not an intended abbreviation (so M.'s commentary) but all that was left of the word when the scribe, moving from one line to the next, went straight on to the following word. S. Monda («RPL» XXVI, 2003, 194) adds a similar case at I 12,3 *armis*: an easier conjecture, but again perhaps prompted by an alert scribe seeing where his predecessor had erred.

⁸ Also sometimes involving lists of editors, as at I 5,1 *incidat*.