

turned out that the occasion was able to celebrate, quite by chance, the 2050th anniversary of the day on which Cicero coined the word *evidentia*.

There is of course much here that goes beyond the bounds of a review that focuses on rhetoric. A great deal comes under the two philosophical headings, 'L'évidence, obstacle ou accès à la connaissance' and 'L'ineffable'. What remains is patchy. Some contributors are in conference mood, ready to turn a piece on quite a different topic into something that fits the theme (I think, for instance, of Aldo Setaioli's piece on Servius, *ad Aen.* 6.703) or Perrine Galand-Hallyn on the *Heroides*). The most interesting contributions for me form a solid centre to the book. Ruth Webb and Sandrine Dubel, in complementary pieces, throw much light, as is only proper, on *enargeia* and *ekphrasis*. In particular, Dubel alertly investigates the implications of the word περιηγηματικός in the progymnasts' definitions of ἐκφρασις. On Longinus 26.2, which comments on the future second persons in Herodotus' description of the Nile, she comments: 'au moment où l'exposé semble perdre de sa validité ... le discours pallie l'absence d'*opsis* par un surplus d'*enargeia*, le narrateur fait voyager à sa place le narrataire' (p. 262). In fact this is true of the passage as abbreviated by Longinus, not of the original, where the second persons start well beyond Elephantine, the last point seen by Herodotus. Colette Nativel interestingly discusses the theory of painting put forward in Franciscus Junius's *De Pictura Veterum* (1637), which exploits literary theory for a new medium, and leads on to celebrated remarks by Poussin. Indeed it might be added that, when Poussin says that 'la nouveauté en peinture ne consiste pas principalement en un sujet jamais vu, mais en une bonne et nouvelle disposition et expression, et ainsi, de commun et vieilli, le sujet devient singulier et nouveau', there lies behind his words not Tasso (p. 282) but Horace: 'notum si callida uerbum / reddiderit iunctura nouum'.

Michael Winterbottom

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

*L. Annaei Senecae Naturalium Quaestionum Libros* recognouit Harry M. Hine (Bibliotheca Scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana), Stuttgart and Leipzig, 1996, li + 331 pp.

Harry M. Hine, *Studies in the text of Seneca's Naturales Quaestiones*, Stuttgart and Leipzig: B.G. Teubner, 1996, 130 pp.

A. Gercke, who did so much for the *Natural Questions* (work that culminated in his Teubner of 1907), knew something of the Geneva manuscript lat. 77 (Z), but not enough to recognise its importance. P. Oltramare (Budé, 1929) knew much more, but did not have the courage of such convictions as he had when it came to drawing a stemma. It was left to Professor Hine, in a fundamental article in *Classical Quarterly* 30 (1980) and his splendid edition of Book ii (New York, 1981), to see it for what it is, the sole complete witness to one branch of a bifid tradition, and to exploit it accordingly. Now his new Teubner, accompanied by a very helpful volume of *Studies*, completes the revisionist task. It benefits too from his re-thinking of the interrelationships of the many manuscripts that form the other branch (Ψ). His work is marked by critical acumen of a high order, and rests on a profound knowledge of the very varied subject matter and of the style of

Seneca. This is in fact a remarkable edition, which puts the text of *NQ* on a quite new footing.

Hine's own conjectures, both those he prints and those he mentions in the apparatus, are always intelligent and often elegant and convincing. He has been fortunate enough to have been able to discuss the text over a long period with R.G.M. Nisbet and W.S. Watt, whose own emendations are often used. The published work of many other scholars has been laid under contribution; there is a convenient index of their 'Commentationes' on pp. xxxvi-li.

I comment on a few passages: iii.3 *uarias habent uenas* seems a strange expression; perhaps the adjective should be *natiuas* or *suas* (cf. iii.14.3), picked up below by *ex suo fonte natiua est*. iii.7.2 (*Studies*, 45) I am not sure that 'pars maior ...' should be emended to make these the words of an interlocutor. Seneca argues that rivers are not fed by underground reservoirs that are in turn fed by rainfall. No rainwater goes deep enough to produce that result (1); it either gets absorbed in dry earth, or runs off down river-beds without going into the earth at all (this, of course, would not make rivers rain-fed in the sense under discussion). iii.15.8 (*Studies*, 48-9) Rossbach's deletion of *et* seems to me more elegant than emendation to *at*. The asyndeton underlines the contrast of *fonti* and *amnes*. iii.20.5 (*Studies*, 58) If *et habens* is not possible ('both sulphurous and receiving ...'), we might perhaps replace the two words with *trahens*. iii.27.5 (*Studies*, 62-3) Whatever is done with the crux here, we should surely rid ourselves in some way of *laeta* (an unwelcome intrusion from Lucretius or Virgil?); perhaps Shackleton Bailey's *laxatum* should replace it rather than be added to it. i. pr.8 (*Studies*, 70) I am not sure why any sort of pairing with a gladiator is relevant in this context. iv.a.1.2 (*Studies*, 71) Perhaps read *adeo* for *ex ea* (though the verb remains doubtful). iv.b.13.5 (*Studies*, 80-1) I cannot see why *quae flueret* should not be intended to distinguish running water from snow. Seneca says, in a characteristic tone of voice, that luxury has gone so far that cold water is not enough for the rich: it has to come in the form of snow before they are satisfied. vi.1.2 (*Studies*, 91) Perhaps read 'prorutae <passim>, passim sine iniuria tremuere'. vi.26.1 The last sentence could be more intelligibly punctuated. vi.32.8 *me* (after *sciam*) seems to spoil the rhetoric. Rather e.g. *ea*.

Seneca's prose rhythm forces itself upon any reader with an ear, and Hine has paid it due attention in establishing his text (note, for instance, the fine re-punctuation of i. pr.14). Though he punctuates much as I would, in the light 'English' manner, one does sometimes hanker after some system that would take more account of the cola. Thus the first sentence of i. pr.7, all nineteen words of it, is punctuated only at its end, though the rhythm calls for pauses at least at *sortis humanae* and (*ma*)*lo petit altum*.<sup>1</sup> Rhythm might seem to favour certain readings where Hine does not mention it: ii.21.2 *nisi ex igne Z*, rhetorically as well as rhythmically superior to *nisi ex eo*;<sup>2</sup> iii. pr.1 *producere* δ, rather than *prodere*; iii.6.2 *Z's parceret* may point to *parcit* rather than Ψ's *caret* (cf. Virg. *G.* ii.339 'hibernis parcebant flatibus Euri'); iii.15.1 *possimus* (some deteriores) rather than

<sup>1</sup> Hine several times makes or accepts emendations where the rhythm suggests contraction of -ii- in nouns (e.g. iii.11.6 *naugit*); one may feel some reservations about *studis*, printed at iv. pr.14 (cf. i.14.2, where he is more tentative about *radis*), in view of the remarks of Housman in *Collected Papers*, 943 (cf. 671), though it should be stressed against Housman that the authoritative manuscript B of Quintilian gives *Spuri* at v.9.13 and *Mari* at v.11.15.

<sup>2</sup> Hine attributes this to 'G, ut con. Madvig'. But Madvig did not suggest these words: he took them without query from E.

*possumus* (cf. *de ben.* i.4.3 *considant*); iii.15.5 *uena percussa est Z*; v.5.1 Reinhardt's *solis* should perhaps follow *impetu*; v.8.1 *partem procedit Ψ* (the rhythm continues over the next short clause). Rhythm might have been noted as in favour of <in> *terrena* (Hine) at iii.28.7 (*Studies*, 66) and against the deletion of *ut* at vii.5.2 (*Studies*, 114). It also weighs against Hine's suggested addition of *septentrionem* after *circae* at i.6.1.

Hine's apparatus, lucid and professional as it is, raises an interesting point of principle: how far does his (or her) stemma commit an editor to citing or ignoring individual manuscripts or groups of manuscripts? For one stretch of the first two books an Escorial manuscript (R), discovered by Hine, is a gemellus of Z. Hence 'codicum RZ consensum nota ζ semper dedi, sed codicis R et Z unicos errores plerumque neglexi' (p. xxviii). All editors do such things, some of them perhaps more conscious of the pitfalls than others. Thus here, if either R or Z is contaminated from the other side of the tradition, the practice can result in the suppression of readings that in fact go back to the hyparchetype, and might be important. Roger Mynors was, I think, referring to this practice when he used to talk of the element of 'whited sepulchre' in his own edition of Pliny's Letters. But the other branch of the *NQ* tradition raises the problem in a more acute form. Hine reconstructs Ψ from three groups of manuscripts, δ, θ and π. But he does not normally cite the unsupported readings of each of the three: 'cum una ex δθπ a duobus aliis cum ζ consentientibus dissentit, lectionem plerumque neglexi' (p. xxviii).<sup>1</sup> That again runs the risk of suppressing information were contamination to be rife. In that sense, Hine tells us too little. In another, he tells us too much, in particular about the errors and conjectures that disfigure δ and π. He is well aware of the sincerity of θ (put very strongly in his commentary on Book ii, p. 3). My guess is that it is so sincere, and the other two so insincere, that the text could be perfectly well constituted from ζθ alone. Certainly a much less cluttered apparatus would result. But as Hine does not tell us the private errors of θ,<sup>2</sup> we cannot know whether their presence in the apparatus would seriously muddy waters cleared by the removal of the other two. To put it another way: it is doubtless true that δ and π are stemmatically independent of θ; but does that justify their presence, except as sources of medieval conjecture, in the apparatus?

I add some further general points. a) The apparatus might perhaps have been relieved of some of the very many conjectures it cites in dubious passages, especially when the lists are repeated in *Studies* (e.g. i.13.2 = *Studies*, 28). In particular there is a case for ruthless exclusion of conjectures going back to pre-Z days (e.g. at iii.3 *aut supino*), and others that have been outclassed by their successors: it is merely embarrassing for the reviewer to be reminded of his *ui* at vi.6.2, where Watt's *nimio* now gives the definitive solution). b) I have elsewhere expressed unhappiness about use of the stigma, here employed for any 'lectio in uno uel pluribus codicibus saeculi quarti decimi et quinti decimi inuenta' (p. xxxiv). Would it be so difficult to be specific, and to attribute conjectures to the earliest manuscript in which the editor has found them? c) I also wonder about the spelling of Greek words with Greek letters, where the manuscripts use Roman. I have

<sup>1</sup> Though he does not spell it out, he follows the same policy when (in parts of Books ii and iii) δ is lacking.

<sup>2</sup> He does in fact do this in his separate edition of Book ii. There are not very many of them in that book. At ii.4.1 neither Z nor θ gives the truth: *tamen* ] *inde* Z, om. θ. But R rides to the rescue. It should be remembered that 'θ' is another case of the whited sepulchre: what divergences of F and H are being ignored, and how sure are we of those manuscripts' individual sincerity?

noticed no case where the MSS show sign of misunderstanding of Greek letters, and I am inclined to think that they should appear in their Latin guise (see my remarks in *Problems in Quintilian*, Institute of Classical Studies Bulletin Supplement 25 [1970], 36). d) As for Teubner conventions, we are now fortunately long past the days when, as in the old Apuleius, every page was disfigured by changing type faces and a multiplicity of brackets. But a ghost from that unhappy past recurs even here at vii.27.3 '<e>mergit[ur]'.

I noticed very few misprints. One faulty word division could mislead: vi.28.2 uo/luit. It is unfortunate that the Sigla on pp. xxxii-xxxiii do not include the vital  $\theta$  and its constituent manuscripts.

Michael Winterbottom

Corpus Christi College, Oxford

T. Maslowski (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 23: Orationes in P. Vatinius testem, Pro M. Caelio*, Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner, 1995, cxxii + 156 pp.

The new Teubner text of *Pro Caelio* and *In Vatinius* represents a clear advance on previously available editions as far as information on the manuscript tradition is concerned. M. has thoroughly studied the Carolingian tradition of *Cael.* and *Vat.* and its relatives and descendants, and the supplementary testimonies for *Cael.* The three ancient witnesses to parts of this speech (a papyrus and two palimpsests, of which one is now destroyed, the other illegible) contribute much less to the constitution of the text than one might have hoped. More important are the readings of the lost Cluniacensis, excerpted or incorporated as variants in later French and Italian manuscripts, and recorded in editions since their discovery by Clark (1905). M.'s major contribution is in elucidating the labyrinthine complexities of this later tradition, building on the work of Silvia Rizzo and Michael Reeve.

The results of these labours are presented in a Latin preface of 106 pages, referred to on p. cv as 'praefatiuncula' (!); the preface also deals with the question of Cicero's own publication of the speeches (pp. v-xii) and with the history of the editing of the text (pp. xcvi-ciii). It takes considerable application on the part of the reader to come to grips with this volume of material, expressed in a Latin style which (I have to say) is not the most concise I have ever encountered; but one certainly cannot complain that anything of significance is missing.

The text of these two speeches has been in reasonably good repair since the beginning of this century at least, and there is relatively little that any new edition could add as regards purely textual matters. M.'s changes to the text are generally minor, and hardly require extended discussion in a short review. Sometimes the Cluniacensis is favoured against the Carolingian tradition; a striking example of this occurs in the first section of *Cael.*, where M. prints *adulescentem nobilem illustri ingenio* with the Cluniacensis. But Caelius was not technically 'noble'; and the passage of Quintilian quoted in the apparatus, ostensibly in support of this reading, refers to Atratinus, not Caelius. Perhaps Cicero wrote *adulescentem nobili ingenio*, which was then glossed by *illustri*. Readings of the Cluniacensis also find favour in *Cael.* 19, *iaciebant* instead of *aiebant* (how can one choose?), 34 *proavum non atavum* (without *abavum*); but sometimes the Carolingian tradition is preferred, as in *Cael.* 1 *consuetudinis[que]*, 3 *et sine mea oratione et tacitus* 6