Terence J. Hunt, *A Textual History of Cicero's* Academici Libri, Mnemosyne Supplementum 181, Leiden/Boston/Köln: E.J. Brill, 1998. xi + 341pp., 4 plates. IBSN 90 04 10970 6.

Many years ago, an earlier, much shorter and less detailed version of what was to become this book was submitted by Terence Hunt as an MA thesis in Classics in the University of Exeter, under my supervision. I hope that this will not detract from my ability to estimate the final product *sine ira et studio*. Since those remote times, H. has been working, on and off, in the little time he could spare from his non-academic employment, on the MSS of some of Cicero's philosophical works. He has established himself as an expert in his own right on the MS tradition of some of Cicero's prose works, and on scribes and MSS in the Italian *quattrocento* in general. Much of the more technical aspects of this book will be better assessed by expert palaeographers and codicologists. Much of what I say of these features of the book should be taken as no more than the judgment of a mere πεπαιδευμένος.

The book has three parts: 1. *From Antiquity to the Renaissance*; 2. *The Manuscripts*; 3. *Since the editio princeps*. It also has one appendix which deals with nine lost MSS; another appendix containing what is most probably a complete *catalogue raisonné* of printed editions down to 1990; an extensive bibliography of books and articles actually employed in preparing this book; and four detailed indices. It has been lavishly produced by Brill, with photographs of the first page of *Academicus Primus* in four MSS.

The book's main contribution to scholarship consists in the detailed study of the MS tradition and of the main printed editions. Here, as H. tells us, he has followed the structure and procedures of P.L. Schmidt's exemplary work, *Die Überlieferung von Ciceros Schrift "De Legibus" in Mittelalter und Renaissance*, Munich 1974. Schmidt later published another work on the composition of *De Legibus* and its history in antiquity. This aspect of the history of the *Academici Libri* (including also attested readers of, and references to, this work in the Middle Ages and early Renaissance) is here included as Part I, pp. 9-40. Since most of my (few) queries concern this part, I may as well begin at the beginning.

The history of the composition is treated briefly on pp. 10-13. It is based on earlier work by Reid, Plasberg, Ruch, and partly on pp. 406-15 of my *Antiochus and the Late Academy* (Göttingen 1978). A fuller discussion of this issue, including the relevant passages from Cicero's correspondence, is now available in Miriam Griffin's 'The Composition of the Academica, Motives and Versions', in Brad Inwood and Jaap Mansfeld (edd.), *Assent and Argument. Studies in Cicero's Academic Books*, Brill 1997, 1-34. Griffin also confirms Plasberg's position, supported with additional arguments by H. (13-16), that Cicero's own name for the second version of this work was indeed *Academici (Libri)*.

Two small points. On p. 11, n. 6, H. writes that 'σύνταγμα is commonly thought to refer to a work in one book, or a single book of a volume (σύνταξις)'. He adds that 'T. Birt argued that σύνταγμα and σύνταξις may be used interchangeably'. To the best of my knowledge, Birt's view is the one which is now commonly accepted. It is, indeed, the only meaning of συντάγματα which would make sense at *Att.*

12.45.1. Indeed, on p. 14, H. refers to *Att.* 13.12.3, where 'Ακαδημικὴ [σύνταξις] may well already refer to all four *Academici Libri*, and where περὶ τελῶν σύνταξις — with the plural τέλη — can only refer to the whole of *De Finibus*. The word for a single book is βιβλίον or the less common διφθέρα (*Att.* 13.24.1).

On the lost *Catulus*, we are told on p. 18 that no citations and quotations can be ascertained, and then on p. 261 that 'the *Catulus* is never cited, and it seems more likely that Cicero was successful in suppressing it, possibly because of its treatment of Philo' (of Larissa, mentioned once in passing on p. 12). A reader unfamiliar with *Antiochus and the Late Academy* 84-8 would make no sense of this statement. No reader would guess that the hypothesis I proposed there in explanation of the total disappearance of *Catulus* was impugned (not very successfully, as I hope to show elsewhere) by Jonathan Barnes, 'Antiochus of Ascalon', in Jonathan Barnes and Miriam Griffin (edd.), *Philosophia Togata*, Oxford 1989 (rep. 1997), 51-96, esp. 76-7.

I shall skip a few other minor details. Any small mistakes and oversights pall before the real achievement of this book, and especially of Parts 2 and 3.

The first — and so far the only — proper critical edition of *Academici Libri* (and *Lucullus*), based on the investigation of a sufficient number of manuscripts and providing (although not quite articulating) something like a stemma, is Otto Plasberg's (*editio maior* 1908; *editio minor* 1922). As far as stemmatics are concerned, H.'s work confirms and corrects some of the main outlines of Plasberg's reconstruction, with far more detail and precision. Plasberg — in what are, after all, *praefationes* with limited space for details 'irrelevant' to the text and apparatus — had to be fairly brief in his delineation of the relations even between the main MSS, and even more sparing in describing the *deteriores* and dividing them into families. H.'s detailed investigation — one by one and in full palaeographical, codicological and historical detail — of all the MSS known to us — including eight which have never before been collated for this work — has at last produced accurate and properly based stemmata. In his analysis of the French tradition (Δ), he demonstrates that the six other MSS in this group (only three of which were used by Plasberg in constituting his text) are apographs of the oldest extant member, Parisinus 633 (P). Thus, six 'witnesses' can now be eliminated, and Δ=P. In studying the much larger Italian tradition (Γ), H. was the first to collate the Cesena MS (C), and this collation helped him in constructing a proper, satisfactory stemma of the primary MSS in this group. The stemma of the main MSS — of both French and Italian tradition — on p. 112, firmly based on the stemmata of sub-groups established in the sections leading to this conclusion, is arranged both by descent and chronology.

In dealing with what Plasberg called *deteriores*, H. demonstrates that all of these MSS — mostly copied in Italy between 1410 and 1490, and many of them connected with Florence (on which later) — are descended, through various channels, from one extant MS written in Florence in 1406, Laur. Conventi Soppressi 131 (Conv.), which Plasberg regarded merely as one of seven members of one of the eight families of *deteriores*. Conv. is a descendant of P, with some contamination from Γ, and the rest of Plasberg's *deteriores* derive from it. But H. also shows that these descendants of Conv. are really *deteriores*, not just *recentiores*. Indeed, a comparison of their

stemma on pp. 220-1 with that of Δ and Γ on p. 112 will show that quite a few of the MSS 'lower down' in Δ and Γ were copied at the same time as many *deteriores* — but they are 'higher up' in the overall stemma.

We now have the first properly based and meticulously argued stemma of this work, and one can only wait to see the results of this study of the transmission in H.'s forthcoming Budé text. The very fact that *Academicus Primus* is incomplete, and stops in mid-sentence (or, as H. argues, with a catchword), should be sufficient to show that, as in the case of most of Cicero's philosophical works, what we have here is a 'closed transmission'. H., following some previous work by other scholars, suggests that the archetype was produced in France some time in the twelfth century, not long before Δ, the source of P, was copied from it (110-12). Already at the earlier stages of the Δ and Γ families, there is a certain amount of contamination between them, and there is more contamination among the *deteriores*. In Pasquali's terms, this is a closed, but partly horizontal, transmission.

A comparison between H.'s work and Plasberg's *praefatio* will indicate the great advancement in the study of MSS and early printed editions between 1922 and the 1980s, when most of H.'s preparatory work was carried out. Plasberg was almost entirely interested in establishing a stemma through the traditional method of comparing *errores*, and his interest in the MSS themselves was wholly subsidiary to the establishment of the text. H.'s study of each MS, and of groups of MSS, is based on new methods in palaeography, codicology, heraldry, the study of water marks, as well as the intellectual history of late mediaeval France and Italy and the Italian Renaissance. His book is thus also a contribution to all of these disciplines, and especially to codicology. It also brings to life quite a few Renaissance scholars, scribes and book collectors. On pp. 30-40 and 215-22, we meet with the familiar figures of Petrarch, Dante, Coluccio Salutati and Guraino of Verona. But the veritable hero of this particular saga is Antonio Corbinelli of Florence (c. 1370-1425), a minor local politician, a pupil of Salutati, a friend of Guarino, Giovanni Aurispa and Niccolo Niccoli, and one of the greatest book collectors of his age. In his historical summary (212-22), H. shows that 'Corbinelli thus becomes the focus of attention for the transmission of over three-quarters of the extant manuscripts of the *Academicus Primus*'. The details on these pages — drawing conclusions from the detailed histories of individual MSS presented in the earlier parts of this book — show that many of the *deteriores*, even where they are worthless for the constitution of the text, are of great importance in the unfolding of yet another episode in the rich intellectual history of Florence, and Italy in general, in the early decades of the Revival of Learning.

The study of the main printed editions in Part 3 is the first proper investigation of editions of this work of Cicero undertaken so far. It confirms what we already know from previous studies of printed editions. For centuries, editors followed earlier printed editions (which they often used as *manuscrits belges*), with little or no help from manuscript sources. Even when new MSS were used, or partly consulted, this was hardly ever done on a methodical basis. It was only in the nineteenth century, when more and more manuscript libraries began — often reluctantly, even then — to open their gates to scholars and to publish catalogues, that more and more editors made more extensive use of manuscript sources, and methods of establishing texts on

the basis of the transmission began to be developed. Plasberg, in 1908, was the first to base his text on a comprehensive list of MSS known to him, and on a study of their relations. Terence Hunt has now completed the work with his meticulous and comprehensive study, where intellectual history emerges from the results of proper, minute and exact scholarship. His book, beside P.L. Schmidt's earlier work on *De Legibus*, should serve as a model and set the standard for future work in this field.

A final note, bringing us back to the sublunary world of our contemporary scholarship. Most of H.'s collations of MSS and printed editions were carried out in the late 1970s and early 1980s. The book was virtually ready about ten years ago. For reasons which have nothing to do with scholarship, some previous attempts to have it published fell through. We should be very grateful to the editors of the excellent series of Supplements to *Mnemosyne* for acting swiftly, and in the spirit of true scholarship. The typescript of this book was presented to them in 1997, and they published it so beautifully in 1998. At a time when so many academic and para-academic presses are producing more and more half-baked dissertations and half-finished monographs by academics anxious for their own promotion and for their department's RAE points, here is a work of real and exact philological and historical scholarship by a private scholar who took his time to let the work mature and has given us results which are there to stay.

In his preface (X), Hunt writes: 'The present work should serve as a starting-point for the scholar who takes it upon himself to study the textual tradition of the *De Finibus*; were I granted another life-time, I would consider it my duty to undertake this work'. No mortal — with the possible exception of Hesiod — has been granted more than one life. But Terence Hunt is not an old man; and some basic work on the transmission of *De Finibus* has already been carried out by him, and by the late Leighton Reynolds before his untimely death. Would it be too much to hope that some research institution, unhampered by the constraints of 'publish or perish', RAE and other monsters of the same water, would grant Hunt a good few years of full-time, undisturbed research, to help him fulfill his next duty?

John Glucker Tel Aviv University

Rudolf Haensch, *Capita provinciarum: Statthaltersitze und Provinzialverwaltung in der römischen Kaiserzeit*, Kölner Forschungen, Band 7, Mainz am Rhein: Philipp von Zabern, 1997. 863 pp. + 2 maps. ISBN 3 8053 1803 0.

This major work addresses the intriguing question whether the Roman Empire had provincial capitals. Since there is no straightforward answer to this problem, it focuses on a more specific problem which can be answered, namely what is known about the governors' residences and administrative centres in the provinces from 27 BC till AD 284. Thus, it is the subtitle more than the title which accurately describes the contents of the book. Having said this, it can only be admitted that the author never loses sight of his theme and has produced the fullest possible treatment of the subject, covering an astonishing amount of material, mostly epigraphical. The