

EMENDATIONS OF SENECA

EPISTULAE¹

10. 2. *lugentem timentemque* custodire solemus, ne solitudine male utatur.

Reynolds does not mention Haupt's conjecture *amentemque*, which is certainly on the right lines. Bereaved persons may need watching because in the violence of their grief they may do themselves an injury (cf. *Ben.* 2. 14. 2 *ut frigidam aegris negamus et lugentibus ac sibi iratis ferrum*), and the same applies to madmen (cf. Macer, *Dig.* 1. 18. 14 *nam custodes furiosis non ad hoc solum adhibentur ne quid perniciosius ipsi in se moliantur, sed* sqq.) or to anyone suspected of suicidal inclinations (cf. *Sen. Contr.* 3. 5 *minantem sibi ipsi* (sc. *filiam*) *custodio*). It does not apply to persons afraid; they may sometimes be glad of company, but do not require surveillance. My only doubt is whether *amentem*, seldom used of actual insanity, is the right word. Perhaps *dementem* or *furentem*, which makes a better match with the participle *lugentem*.

11. 7. *artifices scaenici, qui imitantur adfectus, qui metum et trepidationem exprimunt, qui tristitiam repraesentant, hoc indicio imitantur verecundiam. deiciunt enim vultum, verba summittunt, figunt in terram oculos et deprimunt: ruborem sibi exprimere non possunt; nec prohibetur hic nec adducitur.*

In most editions *hoc indicio* is referred forward and *verecundiam* followed by a colon. This, as B. Axelson pointed out (*Neue Seneca-studien*, 162), is objectionable because of the following *enim*; and why the singular? He himself explains *hoc indicio* as a modal ablative containing the main idea of the sentence, which, as he says, would have been clearer if it had run *hoc indicant imitantes verecundiam*. This interpretation, for which its author admits that he can produce no 'quite exact' parallel, is surely an intolerable straining of the Latin. I suggest that *non* or *sine* has fallen out before *hoc indicio* (= *rubore*, the theme of the letter).

13. 7. 'quomodo' inquis 'intellegam, vana sint an vera quibus angor?' accipe huius rei regulam: aut praesentibus torquemur aut futuris aut utrisque. de praesentibus facile iudicium est: si corpus tuum liberum et sanum est, nec ullus ex iniuria dolor est, videbimus quid futurum sit: hodie nihil negotii *habet*.

sanum et *Madvig*: sanum est *codd.*

Seneca probably wrote *habet*. We need a reference to the whole person rather than merely to his body. The reality of mental pain is denied by implication. To the Stoic it is a 'voluntary' thing, the product of false opinion (*Dial.* 4. 3. 1; *Cic. Acad.* 1. 39).

15. 11. *et quod futuri temporis incerta sors volvit, quare potius a fortuna impetrem ut det, quam a me petam? quare autem petam? oblitus fragilitatis humanae congeram? in quid laborem?*²

¹ Passages are cited from L. D. Reynolds's Oxford Text (1965). Mr. Reynolds has kindly commented on some of the proposals

here advanced, and has saved me from advancing others which were not new.

So Hense in preference to *congeram in quod laborem* (Fickert). But the second question needs an interrogative pronoun to balance *quare/in quid* and *congeram* needs an object (despite Mart. 8. 44. 9 *rape, congere, aufer, posside*). Supply *quantum* before *oblitus*.

18. 14 f. 'inmodica ira gignit insaniam.' hoc quam verum sit necesse est scias, cum habueris et servum et inimicum. *in omnes personas exardescit adfectus*; tam ex amore nascitur quam ex odio, sqq.

Slaves and enemies are the most obvious target of anger, *but* they are not the only ones—anger may be directed against anybody. Gummere rightly felt the need of an adversative particle before *in omnes* and supplied it in his translation ('but indeed this emotion blazes out against all sorts of persons'). Supply *sed* in the Latin.

26. 8. desinere iam volebam et manus spectabat ad clausulam, sed conficienda sunt *aera* et huic epistolae viaticum dandum est. puta me non dicere unde sumpturus sum mutuum: scis enim cuius arca utar.

aera Madvig: sacra codd.

This letter like its forerunners must end with a maxim from Epicurus, *sollemni munusculo* (22. 13), regarded as a debt owed by Seneca to his correspondent. Madvig's rejection of *sacra* (*Adv.* ii. 472) is at first sight cogent, but it is not at all clear that *conficienda sunt aera* could be said 'eodem modo de rationibus conficiendis . . . quo Cicero in Hortensii loco, qui est apud Nonium p. 193'. In the Ciceronian fragment the phrase *aera conficere* does not occur and *aera* means 'sums of money': *quid? tu, inquam, soles, cum rationem a dispensatore accipis, si aera singula probasti, summam quae ex his confecta sit non probare?* The only meaning legitimately attributable to Madvig's reading is 'sums' (not 'a sum') 'of money must be raised' (cf. *Thes.* 4. 201. 35 ff.).

Since there appears to be no other plausible way of emending *sacra* I think it safer to retain it. It is surely conceivable that *sacra conficere*, a stock expression (*Thes.* 4. 195. 51 ff.), was capable of mundane applications in colloquial language, just as one might say 'I must go through the ritual' when passing the port or introducing a friend.

34. 2. ego cum vidissem indolem tuam, inieci manum, exhortatus sum, addidi stimulos nec lente ire passus sum sed subinde incitavi; et nunc idem facio, sed iam currentem hortor et invicem hortantem. 'quid illud?' inquis 'adhuc volo.'

quid illud? *temptavit Axelson (sic iam dist. Buecheler): quid aliud codd.* quid aliud . . . <quam> adhuc volo? (adhuc <quam> *praefert Axelson*) *P. Thomas: quid aliud . . . adhuc <nisi> volo? Madvig.*

I cannot find satisfaction in any of these proposals and would prefer '*quid <enim>? (or quidni?) aliquid inquis 'adhuc volo'.* 'Of course I do' you will say. 'I still want something (beyond what I have achieved)'. Seneca continues *in hoc* (sc. *velle*) *plurimum est*.

37. 5. *neminem mihi dabis qui sciat quomodo quod vult coeperit velle; non consilio adductus illo sed impetu inactus est.*

illo om. p.

The context shows that what Seneca means is not exactly 'nobody' but 'nobody who has not attained wisdom'. The addition of *stultum* before *neminem* (cf. *humilis res est stultitia* above) would make this clear, and would also have the advantage of providing *adductus* . . . *impactus est* with an expressed subject. Incidentally the old reading *ullo* for *illo* might surely be adopted, unless the word be omitted with *p*.

40. 2. 'solet magno cursu verba convellere, quae non effundit †ima† sed premit et arguet; plura enim veniunt quam quibus vox una sufficiat.'

ima awaits plausible emendation, which may not be very far to seek. Read *iam*? For *non iam* . . . *sed* see *Thes.* 7 (1). 94. 40 ff. (for the order cf. Tac. *Ann.* 13. 37 *non furtim iam, sed palam*; Plaut. *Bacch.* 138 *non paedagogum iam me, sed Lydum vocat*).

47. 5. alia interim crudelia, inhumana praetereo, quod ne tamquam hominibus quidem sed tamquam iumentis abutimur. [quod] cum ad cenandum discutimus, alius sputa deterget, alius reliquias temulentorum <toro> subditus colligit. alius pretiosas aves scindit . . . alius vini minister in muliebrem modum ornatus cum aetate luctatur, *sqq.*

quod *secl.* Buecheler: ante quod lacunam statuit Summers.

Summers's note illustrates a general misunderstanding: 'It is clear that several *quod* clauses corresponding to the *quod* . . . *abutimur* clause, and each like that representing one of the *alia crudelia* on which Sen. refuses to dwell, have fallen out together with a phrase such as *illud vero quam contumeliosum est* introducing the *quod cum ad cenandum* clause (the point which Sen. has selected for special treatment).' The various categories of slaves who work in the dining-room (waiters, carriers, cup-bearers, tasters) do *not* form a special case of 'cruel and inhumane treatment'. On the contrary these were pampered favourites among the slave community, and their treatment contrasts with 'other things, cruel and inhumane' (not 'other cruel and inhumane things') inflicted, e.g., in *ergastula*. As for *quod* . . . *abutimur*, that merely gives a general description of the type of cruel and inhumane usage which Seneca says he will pass over for the nonce. Leaving such horrors aside, he says, let us look at the comparatively fortunate slaves, who are not indeed 'treated like pack-animals' but whose employment is none the less degrading to human dignity. Failing to follow the drift neither Buecheler nor Summers could remedy the text. That can be done simply by reading <*quid*> *quod* . . . *colligit*? (for *quid quod* cf., e.g., 78. 14).

48. 7. alium mors *vocat*, alium paupertas urit. alium divitiae vel alienae torquent vel suae.

Reynolds defends *vocat* by 78. 27 *rursus si mors accedit et vocat*, but this merely proves what does not need proving, that death can be said to 'call', not that *vocat* is a possible companion to *urit* and *torquent* here. Obviously it is not, and *avocat* (Castiglioni), which Reynolds cites, is no better. *vexat* (Georges) may well be right. *vellicat* (cf. 63. 1 *illum quoque ista res vellicabit, sed tantum vellicabit*) is a possible alternative. *vellicare* of mental annoyance has been overlooked in dictionaries, but should probably be recognized also in Prop. 2. 5. 7 (cf. my *Propertiana*, 71).

52. 5. puta enim duo aedificia excitata esse, ambo paria, aequae excelsa atque magnifica. alter puram aream accepit, illic protinus opus crevit; alterum

fundamenta lassarunt in mollem et fluvidam humum missa multumque laboris exhaustum est dum pervenitur ad solidum: *intuentibus quicquid fecit* <*alter*> * * * alterius magna pars et difficilior latet.

alter Haupt: alterum *codd.* *intuentibus* Reynolds: inveniebo *codd.*

intuentibus ('dat. commodi') seems an excellent correction. The lacuna may easily be filled thus: *intuentibus quicquid fecit* <*fecit alter*>; *alterius sqq.*

58. 34. paucos longissima senectus ad mortem sine iniuria pertulit, multis iners vita sine usu sui iacuit: *quanto deinde crudelius* iudicas aliquid ex vita perdisse quam ius finiendae?

'frustra temptatum' says Reynolds, relying no doubt on Axelson's defence of the paradoxis (op. cit. 179), according to which *quanto* introduces a real question, to be answered '*nihilo crudelius*' (cf. Noblot: 'après cela estimes-tu que l'abandon d'un peu de notre vie soit tellement plus cruel que l'abandon du droit d'y mettre fin?'). He compares Hor. *Sat.* 2. 2. 125 *quantum hinc imminuet? quanto aut ego parcus aut vos, / o pueri, nituistis, ut huc novus incola venit?* But in Seneca the answer *nihilo crudelius* does not fairly represent the sense, which is not that the alternatives are *equally* cruel, but that the first is *less* cruel than the second. Furthermore, *deinde* is inexplicable. Axelson explains 'unter solchen Umständen', a use (as he says) completely unknown to the *Thesaurus* and for which he can adduce only 'einige, andere, ungenügend gerichtete Beispielen bei HAND, Turs. 2. 247'. This latter difficulty still arises if *crudelius* is changed to *levius* (Madvig) or *utilius* (Gertz). I suggest that a second question begins with *deinde* and that some words have dropped out beforehand, e.g. *quanto* <*mortuis praestant*>? *deinde* . . . *finiendae*? The ironical interrogative *quantus* is of course extremely common.

66. 2. mortalia *minuuntur* cadunt, deteruntur crescunt, exhauriuntur implentur.

Obviously *minuuntur cadunt* does not provide the required opposition (dissolution/creation) to correspond with the ensuing pairs: cf. 74. 16 *bona . . . quae cadere non possunt, ne decrescere quidem ac minui*. Hence the conjectural substitutes *eminet*, *nituntur*, *muniuntur*, *oriuntur*, of which only the last (Ernout's) is acceptable. But transcriptional probability demands *minuuntur* <*augentur, oriuntur*> *cadunt*: cf. § 16 *aut minuere illam aut augere*, 74. 26 *nec infringitur nec augetur*; *Dial.* 2. 3. 4 *nec augeri nec minui potest*.

70. 27. quod animi *perditi quoque noxiosi* habent non habebunt illi quos . . . instruxit . . . ratio?

'Überhaupt is es mir unerfindlich, was am Ausdruck *perditi quoque noxiosi* störend sein sollte. Zum substantivierten 'noxiosi' 'Verbrecher' passt das Attribut *perditi* vorzüglich' (Axelson, op. cit. 94). It is difficult to formulate rules about the combination of epithet and substantival adjective, but I feel sure that this case does not satisfy Nägelsbach's criterion, 'sie eignet sich daher keineswegs überall und kann nur schicklich angewendet werden, wenn sie sich aufdrängt' (*Lateinische Stylistik*⁹, 134). For one thing, *noxiosus*, a very rare word, is never elsewhere used as a substantive. The facile addition of *et* after *quoque* makes all smooth (better than the former vulgate *perditi noxiosique*).

76. 11. id itaque unum bonum est in homine quod unum hominis est; nunc

enim non quaerimus quid sit bonum, sed quid sit hominis bonum. si nullum aliud est hominis quam ratio, haec erit unum eius bonum, *sed* pensandum cum omnibus.

ratio or *virtus* (so above *haec ratio perfecta virtus vocatur eademque honestum est*) is man's only good. It cannot be weighed in the same scale with things like health, wealth, etc. which, though desirable, are of no importance by comparison. This is normal Stoic doctrine (cf. 92. 24); to say, as the vulgate says, that *virtus* is 'to be weighed against' (i.e. is worth) all the rest would be a heretical under-statement; 'the rest' simply does not count. Furthermore an adversative particle is out of place. For both reasons *nec* instead of *sed* seems required.

90. 45. illi quidem non aurum . . . quaerebant parcebantque adhuc etiam mutis animalibus: tantum aberat ut homo hominem non iratus, non timens, tantum *spectaturus* occideret.

That is, gladiatorial shows did not exist in the Golden Age. But if the text is sound there is an anomaly in *spectaturus* concealed in renderings like 'pour le plaisir du spectacle': gladiators did not kill to feast their own eyes, but those of the spectators. It could be argued that *occideret* refers to spectators or givers of shows as really responsible for the slaughter; but it might be better to read *spectaturis*. For the 'dativus commodi' cf. *Ben.* 6. 42. 2 *male agit qui famae, non conscientiae, gratus est*.

92. 24. 'quid ergo?' inquit 'sapiens non est beator qui diutius vixit, quem nullus avocavit dolor, quam ille qui cum mala fortuna semper luctatus est?' . . . non intenditur virtus, ergo ne beata quidem vita, quae ex virtute est. *virtus enim tantum bonum est ut istas accessiones minutas non sentiat, brevitatem aevi et dolorem et corporum varias offensiones*; nam voluptas non est digna ad quam respiciat.

In medical terminology *accessio* = 'fit', 'attack', especially in a case of fever (*ἐπιληψις, ἐπισσημασία*); so Seneca, *Dial.* 3. 3. 4 *morbus et accessio*, *ibid.* 33. 3 *morbi accessionibus* et al. But the rendering 'such insignificant assaults' (Gummere) will not do. Shortness of life is not an 'attack'. Besides, Seneca is rebutting the contention that a sage who enjoys longevity and freedom from pain is happier than one who does not. *accessiones* are obviously these accessory felicities, which are too insignificant to be noticed beside *virtus* (cf. *Ben.* 4. 1. 3 *si quid commodi forte obvenierit, inter accessiones numerabis*; *Dial.* 7. 9. 2 *voluptas non est merces nec causa virtutis sed accessio*). Possibly something like *ut effugiat* (definitive of *istas*) has dropped out after *sentiat*. But it would be convenient to dismiss *brevitatem* . . . *offensiones* as a misguided interpolation (the plural *corporum* seems odd).

93. 11. non tam multis vixit annis quam potuit. et paucorum versuum liber est et quidem laudandus atque utilis: annales Tanusii scis quam ponderosi sint et quid vocentur. *hoc* est vita quorundam longa, et quod Tanusii sequitur annales.

It can hardly be doubted that we have here an allusion to Catullus' *annales Volusi, cacata charta* (36. 1), which Seneca rightly or wrongly took to refer to Tanusius Geminus; or perhaps he misremembered the name. If that is so the puzzling *et quod Tanusii sequitur annales* is simply explained as 'the word that

follows *annales Tanusii* (= *Volusi*) in the poem', i.e. *cacata*. For *hoc* read *sic* or *hoc* <*modo*>.

94. 50. *deinde istud quod dicis iam perfecti viri est ac summam consecuti felicitatis humanae. ad haec autem tarde pervenitur.*

hoc is found in old editions. Perhaps *hanc*.

98. 1. *cetera quorum admiratio est vulgo in diem bona sunt . . . omnia quae fortuna intuetur ita fructifera ac iucunda fiunt si qui habet illa se quoque habet nec in rerum suarum potestate est.*

Neither the paradosis nor the old reading *fortunam intuentur* provides the necessary sense, 'all things that depend on fortune' (so Noblot 'tout ce qui relève de la fortune'). The change of virtually only a single letter (*e* becoming *n*) gives the right word, *nituntur*.

104. 28. *post finita arma triginta tyrannis noxae dedita est civitas, ex quibus plerique inimici erant.*

inimici sc. *Socrati*. We are not elsewhere told that any of the Thirty were Socrates' enemies. Their leader Critias was notoriously his friend, likewise Critias' relative Charmides, who though not one of the Thirty was a leading oligarch. Seneca was capable of gross historical blunders: cf. *Dial.* 5. 23. 1, where he makes Alexander the Great the grandson of Antigonus Gonatas and the confusion between Aristides and Phocion in *Dial.* 12. 13. 7. In *Dial.* 11. 15. 1 it seems certain that the sister of Sex. Pompeius *cuius morte optime cohaerentis Romanae pacis vincula resoluta sunt* is Sextus' stepmother Julia. What persuades me that Seneca wrote *amici* (or *et amici*) here is the rhetorical gain. *inimici* has no rhetorical 'punch'; but for Socrates, Seneca implies, the fact that some of the oppressors were personal friends made matters all the worse.

104. 29. *et hunc [sc. Catonem] licet dicas non minus quam Socraten †in-servisse dixisse† nisi forte Cn. Pompeium et Caesarem et Crassum putas libertatis socios fuisse.*

Cato under the 'Triumvirs', like Socrates under the Thirty, lived as a free man in a community of slaves—unless, Seneca adds ironically, the three despots were to be considered as free men too. None of the three conjectures mentioned by Reynolds properly brings out the sense. Hense's *in servis se* <*libertati ad*> *dixisse* is to the purpose, but Seneca is more likely to have written *se liberum* (or *pro libero*) *duxisse*: cf. Plaut. *Capt.* 435 *cum . . . tuque te pro libero esse ducas*.

104. 30. *denique in illa rei publicae trepidatione, cum illinc Caesar esset decem legionibus pugnacissimis subnixus, totis exterarum gentium praesidiis, hinc, sqq.*

tot dett.

totis is surely impossible. Why not *tantis*? Cf. Cic. *Leg. Agr.* 2. 101 *res publica tantis munita praesidiis*, *Phil.* 14. 34 *tanta . . . praesidia*.

108. 2. *nec passim carpenda sunt nec avide invadenda universa: per partes pervenietur ad totum. aptari onus viribus debet nec plus occupari quam cui sufficere possimus, non quantum vis sed quantum capis hauriendum est. bonum tantum habere animum: capies quantum voles. quo plus recipit animus, hoc se magis laxat.*

bonum habe animum means, not 'be of sound mind' (Gummere), but 'be of good cheer' (cf. *Thes.* 2. 2097. 36 ff.). Fickert saw that *tantum* should be *tamen* (a very frequent confusion, here facilitated by the preceding *quantum*) because *capies quantum voles* is a reversal of what precedes. 'You must not try to fill your mind beyond its capacity. And yet, take courage; its capacity will match your wish.'

114. 5. quid? si quis 'feminae cinno crispas et labris columbatur incipitque suspirans, ut cervice lassa fanantur nemoris tyranni?'

Seneca is denouncing Maecenas' literary preciousities, with examples which, whether textually corrupt or not, are highly obscure. This is no exception. But it would be a step in the right direction to recognize that we have here not one example but two; the words *ut . . . tyranni* have nothing to do with the preceding description of an effeminate. Read therefore *quid? si quis 'feminae . . . suspirans' aut 'cervice . . . tyranni?'* In the second scrap the words *nemoris tyranni* have been suspected. Could they be a periphrasis of *leones*? If so the apparently meaningless *fanantur* might be replaced by *famulantur*.

114. 10. modo antiqua verba atque exoleta revocat ac profert, modo fingit †et ignota ac †deflectit

An unknown word cannot be 'misshaped' (Gummere). Sense calls for something like *modo fingit ignota aut nota deflectit*.

123. 10. fluunt dies et inreparabilis vita decurrit. *dubitamus?* quid iuvat sapere et aetati non semper voluptates recepturae interim, dum potest, dum poscit, ingerere frugalitatem?

Some follow Buecheler: *dubitamus sapere? quid iuvat aetati*, sqq. Better add *vivere* before or after *dubitamus* (cf. Martial's *quisquam vivere cum sciat moratur?*).

123. 12. hae voces non aliter fugiendae sunt quam illae quas Ulixes nisi alligatus praetervehi noluit. idem possunt: abducunt a patria, a parentibus, ab amicis, a virtutibus, et †inter spem vitam misera nisi turpis inludunt†.

inter . . . inludunt *sic B*: in turpem vitam misera nisi turpis illudunt *φ*: in turpem vitam miseramque illidunt (*spat. rel. post miseramque*) *W*: in turpem vitam miseramque illidunt *X*.

The verb for these Siren voices is surely *inliciunt*, palaeographically very similar to *inludunt*. What precedes could with very slight alteration of the paradosis become *in turpem vitam miseramque si turpis*: cf. Cic. *ad Att.* 8. 8. 1 *o rem turpem et ea re miseram! sic enim sentio, id demum aut potius id solum esse miserum quod turpe sit*.

124. 5. quid si quis vellet non oculis sed tactu minuta discernere? subtilior adhoc acies nulla quam oculorum et intentior daret bonum malumque dinoscere.

daret *B^cDφ*: deret *B¹U*: de re *T*: deberet *θ*: debet *det*.

'Locum nondum expeditum esse suspicor' says Reynolds, as well he may. I suggest <cuī> *dare*<*n*>*t*, ('to which they might have given . . .'), the subject being the Epicureans whose theory is under attack (*istos* above).

DIALOGI

1. 2. 7. miraris tu, si deus ille bonorum amantissimus . . . fortunam illis cum qua exerceantur adsignat? ego vero non miror, si aliquando impetum capiunt spectandi magnos viros conluctantis cum aliqua calamitate.

The plural *capiunt* has been defended by *Ep.* 31. 11 *finges autem non auro vel argento: non potest ex hac materia imago deo exprimi similis; cogita illos, cum propitii essent fictiles fuisse*. But here the emphatic *ille* makes the transition uncomfortable. Some editors read *capit* (Gertz). *capiat* would be better palaeographically and also, I think, as putting the somewhat fanciful idea more remotely.

2. 14. 1. tanta quosdam dementia tenet ut sibi contumeliam fieri putent posse a muliere. quid refert quam *habeant*, quot lecticarios *habentem*, quam oneratas aures, quam laxam sellam? aequae imprudens animal est.

habeant is unintelligible and *adeant* (Waltz) not much better. Karsten saw that an epithet such as *divitem*, *nobilem*, *formosam* has disappeared, and since the following items all refer to wealth the first suggestion is the best. But *habeant* is still badly in the way. Perhaps the original was *beata* . . . *habente*—the former becoming *habeant* (*habeāt*) by assimilation to the latter.

3. 9. 3. et quota ista pars scelerum est! non descripsit castra ex *una parte* contraria et parentum liberorumque sacramenta diversa, *sqq.*

ex uno partu (Petschenig) seems an intolerable hyperbole. Perhaps *ex una gente*.

4. 15. 1. 'ut scias' inquit 'iram habere in se generosi aliquid, liberas videbis gentes quae iracundissimae sunt, ut Germanos et Scythas.' quod evenit quia fortia solidaque natura ingenia, antequam disciplina molliantur, prona in iram sunt. *quaedam enim* non nisi melioribus innascuntur ingeniis, sicut valida arbusta [et] laeta quamvis neglecta tellus creat, et alta fecundi soli silva est.

Read *quaedam enim* <*vitia*>. Bourgery (Budé) points to Plut. *Moral.* 552 c (*de sera numinis vindicta*). Cf. especially οὕτως ἄτοπα πολλὰ καὶ φᾶλα προεξ-ανθοῦσιν αἱ μεγάλοι φύσεις.

5. 14. 3. controversiam illi facere de gloria debuit et revocare *iactum*, ut regi liberet in ipso patre certiores manum ostendere.

Seneca has told the tale of King Cambyzes and Praexaspes, who had ventured to advise him to cut down his drinking. Cambyzes rejoined by shooting Praexaspes' son to show his steadiness of hand; which Praexaspes applauded. Seneca is contemptuous of the flattery. Instead of complimenting the monarch on his marksmanship Praexaspes should have challenged him to another shot with himself as the target.

Lipsius proposed *ictum* for *iactum*; 'rectius, ut vid., de sagitta' (Hermes). But how could Praexaspes (or even Cambyzes for that matter) 'recall the shot'? It was a *fait accompli*. Rather read *in actum* (*ī actum*), 'call for an *encore*'. *revocare* in this sense is regular; cf. Lewis and Short, s.v., 2b. For *actus* cf. *Thes.* 1. 450. 61 ff.

6. 10. 6. alios per incerta nudos maria iactabit et luctatos cum fluctibus ne in harenam quidem aut litus *explodet*, sed in alicuius immensae ventrem beluae decondet.

Read *extrudet*? The materials in the *Thesaurus* do not support *explodere in litus*, 'cast up on shore', in a classical writer. Nothing can be built on a corrupt fragment of Afranius, and in Lucr. 4. 710 *noctem explaudentibus alis* (sc. *galli*) the common metaphorical sense 'hiss off the stage, reject' is applied to suggest the clapping of the bird's wings.

6. 19. 6. non sollicitus futuri pendet ex eventu semper *incertiora dependenti*. tandem ibi constitit unde nil eum pellat, ubi nihil terreat.

Marcia's son is now safe from life's uncertainties, disappointments, and alarms.

With Lipsius's *rependenti* the sentence remains Delphic. The corruption surely goes deeper. I should like to read *ex eventu semper incerto, ra<ro a>d spem <respon>denti*; cf. 23. 1 *omne futurum incertum est et ad deteriora certius*, and for the phrase Livy 28. 6. 8 *haudquaquam ad spem eventus respondit*.

6. 24. 1. adulescens statura, *pulchritudine*, cetero corporis robore castris natus militiam recusavit, ne a te discederet.

Feeling that something is wrong editors have fixed their eyes on *cetero* (*certo* is the most popular depravation), which is perfectly innocent. It should be obvious that the fault lies with *pulchritudine*. Born soldiers do not have to be beautiful, but physical strength is an advantage: cf. Veget. 1. 6 *sit ergo adulescens Martio operi deputandus vigilantibus oculis, erecta cervice, lato pectore*, sqq. So read *pect<oris lat>itudine*, a phrase which Seneca uses (I owe the reference to Mr. Reynolds) in *Ep.* 58. 30 *erat quidem* (sc. Plato) *corpus validum ac forte sortitus et illi nomen latitudo pectoris fecerat*, as also Quintilian (*Inst.* 11. 3. 141).

6. 26. 4. quid dicam nulla hic arma mutuis furere concursibus . . . nihil in obscuro, detectas mentes et aperta praecordia et in publico medioque vitam et omnis aevi prospectum venientiumque?

Cremutius Cordus is supposed to be addressing his daughter from heaven.

Emendation is plainly necessary as Hermes admits: 'aut cum Gertz vid. scribendum esse *omnis acti aevi* aut pro *venientiumque* legendum cum Cornelissen *scientiamque* (*eminentiamque* Petschenig).' I fancy that *prospectum <praeteritorum> venientiumque* is preferable to either alternative: cf. 12. 11. 7 *cogitatio eius circa omne caelum it, in omne praeteritum futurumque tempus inmittitur*.

7. 3. 4. intellegis, etiamsi non adiciam, sequi perpetuam tranquillitatem, libertatem depulsis iis quae aut irritant nos aut territant; nam voluptatibus et pro illis quae parva ac fragilia sunt et ipsis *flagitiis* noxia, ingens gaudium subit.

Various substitutes have been proposed for the meaningless *et pro illis*. Perhaps *corporalibus*: cf. *Ep.* 78. 22 *duo genera sunt voluptatum. corporales morbus inhibet*, sqq. There is a similar point in his next chapter, § 4 *quidni ista bene penset cum minutis et frivolis et non perseverantibus corpusculi motibus? subit* (with dative) = 'takes the place of'. In conjecturing *blanditiis* (for *flagitiis*) I was forestalled by Hermes.

7. 8. 4. *erat vera ratio vera sensibus inrita et capiens inde principia* (nec enim habet aliud unde conetur aut unde ad verum impetum capiat) in se revertatur.

Hermes, partly on his own conjecture, prints *externa ratio quaerat sensibus irritata* . . . at (add. Gertz) *in se revertatur*—a poor result for so much rewriting. Consider *erit* (vulg.) *vera ratio sensibus inretita ita ut capiens*, sqq.

7. 16. 1. quid haec tibi virtus suadebit? ne quid aut bonum aut malum existimes quod nec virtute nec malitia continget; deinde ut sis immobilis . . . quid tibi pro hac *expeditione* promittit? ingentia et aequa divinis.

expeditione is translated 'enterprise' or glossed (by Hiltbrunner in the *Thesaurus*)

'explicatio, propositio'. Neither seems a possible usage and neither makes tolerable sense. The latter objection does not apply to *expetitione*. *expetitio* (= *postulatio*), like *expetitor*, is a rare and post-classical noun, but Seneca, alone of classical writers, has *expetibilis* (*Ep.* 117. 5).

7. 17. 4. non perveni ad sanitatem, ne perveniam quidem; delenimenta magis quam remedia podagrae meae compono . . . vestris quidem pedibus comparatus debilis cursor sum.

Hermes, following Gronovius and Bentley, reads *debiles* (vocative). Better, I think, to add *ille* (easily omitted after *-ilis*), 'I, the cripple' (cf., e.g., Sen. *Contr.* 1. 4. 1 *ille onustus modo hostilibus spoliis vir militaris adulteris meis tantum maledixi*).

7. 18. 1. 'aliter' inquis 'loqueris, aliter vivis.' hoc . . . Platoni obiectum est, obiectum Epicuro, obiectum Zenoni; omnes enim isti dicebant non quemadmodum ipsi viverent, sed quemadmodum esset *ipsis* vivendum.

Better delete *ipsis* with Muretus than so print. But Seneca surely wrote *esset* <*et*> *ipsis*. The philosophers laid down their rules for themselves *as well as* for the rest of humanity.

9. 1. 10. . . . utiliorque sim. promptus *sim positus* sequor Zenona, Cleanthen, Chrysippum

promptus, compositus is the vulgate. But *sim positus* should be excluded as a manifest dittography.

9. 5. 3. ut scias et in adflicta re publica esse occasionem sapienti viro ad se proferendum et in florenti ac beata *pecuniam*, invidiam, mille alia inertia vitia regnare.

inertia dett.: inermia A.

petulantiam (Lipsius, printed by Hermes) and *impotentiam* (Pincianus) can be rejected because neither qualifies as *iners vitium*. As for *calumniam* (Madvig) I doubt whether *calumnia* could appear as a *vitium* at all. *homo calumniosus* would not be classical Latin. *socordiam* might be considered. Seneca seems not to use *socordia* elsewhere, but he may here have wished to escape the assonance *desidiam, invidiam*. But palaeographically *pecunia*<*e cupiditatem*> suits best.

10. 10. 1. solebat dicere Fabianus . . . contra adfectus impetu, non subtilitate pugnandum . . . non *probat cavillationes* enim contundi debere, non vellicari.

Hermes's reading *non probam cavillationem esse, nam contundi*, sqq. (Gertz, after Lipsius) is sorry patchwork. Read *non probat* (or *probabat* with Bourgery) *cavillationes*; <*vitia*> enim, sqq.

10. 11. 1. iam vero cum illos aliqua imbecillitas mortalitatis *admonuit*, quemadmodum paventes moriuntur, non tamquam exeant de vita, sed tamquam extrahantur.

meluunt vel sim. must be supplied after *admonuit* to end the sentence. Mr. Reynolds suggests that the missing word may be *adfligit* or *adfliguntur* (cf. *Ep.* 74. 18, 91. 2, al).

10. 12. 4. quid illi qui in componendis, audiendis, discendis canticis operati sunt, dum vocem . . . in flexus modulationis *inertissimae* torquent.

inertissimae, for which such renderings as 'indolent', 'langoureux', 'langsam fließend', are forthcoming, yields no appropriate sense. I suppose *ineptissimae* (Erasmus) is possible, but am tempted by *intortissimae* (cf. *Theo.* 7(2). 33. 42).

11. 3. 5. nihil ergo prodest innocentia ad omnem legem exacta, nihil antiqua frugalitas, nihil *felicitatis summae potentia summa conservata abstinentia*, nihil sincerus et *tutus* litterarum amor.

felicitatis potentia seems a most unnatural expression. Indeed the whole phrase is so obscure as almost to excuse a translation like 'persistent self-restraint when there was unlimited opportunity to gain unlimited wealth'. I think Seneca wrote *nihil felicitatis summae* <*moderatio, nihil*> *potentia*, sqq. (cf. Tac. *Ann.* 14. 53 *ut nihil felicitati meae desit nisi moderatio eius*), or something very like it.

tutus is irrelevant, and, with *sincerus*, absurd; but the remedies proposed (*putus, purus, totus*) are useless. Seneca probably wrote *vetus*: cf. 8. 2. *litterae tuae tam diu ac tam fideliter amatae*.

DE CLEMENTIA

1. 1. 8. *securitas alta, adfluens*, ius supra omnem iniuriam positum.

The unbalance of the sentence is enough to show that something is wrong even if *securitas adfluens* could be right (which I do not for a moment believe). A noun such as *opulentia* has dropped out (possibly *copia*; cf. Cic. *Off.* 1. 153 *omnium rerum adfluentibus copiis*).

1. 20. 2. supervacuum est hoc loco admonere ne facile credat, ut verum excutiat, ut innocentiae faveat *et ut appareat ut non minorem magis* agi rem periclitantis quam iudicis sciat.

et om. FLP ut non O; non NR minore NR.

The Emperor as judge must realize that it is no less important for him than for the accused that an innocent man should not be found guilty. So J. W. Basore (Loeb) translates the vulgate *et ut appareat non minorem agi . . . sciat* 'and to remember that to prove this is as much the business of the judge as of the man under trial' (similarly Préchac). To say nothing of the awkwardness of the expression, *non minorem* gives just the opposite sense—'it is the interest of the man on trial *not less* than of the judge'. My text would run *ut innocentiae faveat et ut appareat* <*laboret*>, *ut non magis agi rem . . . sciat*.

2. 5. 3. quod si est, *quidni haec scientia* quae dediscere humanitatem iubet . . . ?

Of several conjectures—*quidnam h. s.* (Hosius), *quidni haec sit sapientia* (Gertz), *quidni haec* <*damnetur*> *scientia* (Skutsch), *quid veri habet h. s.* (Préchac), *quid mihi h. s.* (Schultess)—the last is the most promising. But usage would, I think, require *quo mihi haec scientia* or *quid mihi hac scientia*. The latter could be what Seneca wrote, but one cannot be sure. *quid iu*<*vat*> *h. s.* would do as well (cf. Ben. 1. 3. 4 *quid ista nos scientia iuvat?*).

2. 6. 1. tristitia inhabilis est ad dispiciendas res, utilia excogitanda, periculosa vitanda *aeque* aestimanda.

The vulgate *aequa aestimanda* seems doubtful Latin. I should rather read *aeque* <*omnia*>.

DE BENEFICIIS

1. 10. 4. haec est enim iniuriae summa: beneficium perdidisti. *salvum est enim tibi ex illo quod est optimum: dedisti.*

Gertz saw that the vulgate offends against logic and proposed *summa: beneficii materiam, non ipsum beneficium*. I think it might be enough to replace *enim* (omitted in some texts) by *autem*.

1. 11. 5. subsequuntur utilia, quorum varia et lata materia est. hic erit pecunia . . . hic erit honor et processus ad altiora tendentium: nec enim utilius quicquam est quam sibi utilem fieri.

The category of useful benefactions is wide, including money and worldly advancement; 'for nothing is more useful than to be made useful to oneself'. Where is the logical nexus? By *sibi utilem fieri* must surely be meant moral progress, i.e. *sapientia* (cf. *hominem sibi ipsi inutilem*, of an ingrate, in 4. 16. 2). Having mentioned various 'useful' benefactions of a mundane sort Seneca reminds us that the most useful gift of all is *sapientia*: cf. 3. 33. 5 *quid? si quis sapientiam consecutus hanc patri tradiderit, etiamnunc disputabimus an maius aliquid dederit quam acceperat, cum vitam beatam patri reddiderit, acceperit tantum vitam?* Perhaps *enim* should become *tamen*; but I do not feel very confident in this answer. It might be better to mark a lacuna after *tendentium*.

2. 5. 2. ubi in taedium adductus animus incipit beneficium odisse dum expectat, potest ob id *gratus ei iam esse?*

gratus ei iam esse P: gratus eua (-tu seua) est NR: ei gravissimum esse M: gratus esse G.

G's reading, which is the vulgate, does not account for the variants, as Hosius tried to do with his conjecture *gratus re vera. gratus etiam* is a simpler answer, almost identical with the text of *P*. Can a man be disgusted with a (prospective) benefaction by reason of hope deferred and also grateful for it (when at last it comes)?

2. 28. 2. parum fecit, sed saepius faciet. illum mihi praetulit, *et me multis.* Perhaps *at (sed Gertz)*.

3. 3. 2. sequitur autem ut, ubi quod acceperis leve novorum cupiditas fecit, auctor quoque *eorum* non sit in pretio.

eorum can only refer to *novorum*; but these new benefactions have no *auctor* since they exist only in the desire of the beneficiary. Either replace by *eius* (i.e. *quod acceperis*) or delete.

3. 17. 2. poena est quod non *audet* [*sc. ingratus*] ab ullo beneficium accipere, quod non audet ulli dare.

If Seneca's experience taught him that ungrateful persons lack the courage to accept benefits, it must have been exceptional. *audet* came from the following *audet*, and has replaced a different verb, perhaps *sperat*.

3. 28. 2. unus omnium parens mundus est, sive per splendidos sive per sordidos gradus ad hunc prima cuiusque origo perducitur. . . . neminem despexeris, etiamsi *circa* illum obsoleta sunt nomina et parum indulgente adiuta fortuna, sive libertini ante vos *habent* sive servi sive exterarum gentium

homines, erigite audacter animos et, quidquid in medio sordidi iacet, transilite; expectat vos in summo magna nobilitas.

habentur *V*.

stemmata quid faciunt? All men have the same ultimate ancestry: *omnes, si ad originem primam revocantur, a dis sunt* (*Ep.* 44. 1). But what are names around a man of low birth? Ancestors (*quidquid in medio sordidi iacet*), not collaterals, are clearly meant. Read *citra*.

habentur is one of those first-to-hand, unmeritorious corrections which once having established themselves in the vulgate stay unmolested for centuries. *sunt* would supply what is needed for sense; palaeography might be satisfied with *latent*.

4. 6. 2. ingens tibi domicilium . . . struxit, in quo vides non tenues crustas et ipsa qua secantur lamna graciliores sed integras lapidis pretiosissimi moles, *sed totas variae distinctaeque materiae*.

Read *sed* <*rupes*> *totas*.

4. 16. 2. fixum illud est . . . honestum ob nullam aliam causam quam quia honestum sit coli. quis ergo controversiam facere audebit an gratum esse honestum sit? *quis non ingratum detestetur, hominem sibi ipsum inutilem?* quid autem cum tibi narratur 'adversus summa beneficia amici sui ingratus est', quomodo adficeris? utrum tamquam rem turpem fecerit, an tamquam rem utilem sibi et profuturam omiserit?

The words *hominem sibi ipsum inutilem*, as they stand in the text, are totally pointless. A supplement is indispensable, as *quis non ingratum detestetur* <*ut malum, non ut*> *hominem*, sqq. or *quis non ingratum detestetur?* <*quis detestetur*> *hominem*, sqq.

4. 27. 3. quomodo homo omnes sensus habet nec ideo tamen omnes homines aciem habent Lynceo similem, sic *qui stultus est tam acria* et concitata habet omnia quam quidam quaedam.

Editors are generally content to add *non* from *V* before *tam acria*, but the text still limps. Gertz with <*non*> *tam acria* . . . *omnia* <*vitia*> *quam quidam quaedam, <omnia tamen habet>* saw roughly what is needed, but the assumption of three lacunae in one sentence is uneconomic. Probably there was only one, as *qui stultus est* <*omnium vitiorum particeps est, non tamen*> *tam acria*, sqq.

5. 12. 1. videor tibi iam illud quod in principio dixeram mentitus. dicis me *abesse* ab eo qui operae pretium facit, immo totam operam bona fide perdere.

Cf. 6. 35. 4 *multum abesse videreris a grato*. Has not *multum* (or another adverb such as *nimum* or *longe*) fallen out?

5. 12. 2. sed quemadmodum quaedam in oblectamentum ac iocum sic inligantur ut eorum solutio imperito difficilis sit, quae illi qui *implicuit* sine ullo negotio *spirat* quia commissuras eorum et moras novit, sqq.

implicuit vulg.: explicuit *O*: ea plicuit Gertz.

paret (*dett.*), usually substituted for *spirat*, is far from convincing, likewise *aspirat* (Roszbach); *se aperit* (Hosius) is somewhat better. I suggest *quae ille qui implicuit sine ullo negotio explicat*. This accounts (by assimilation) for the corrupt *explicuit*.

5. 19. 4. quid ergo? oro te, non dicis 'filium mihi donasti, et si hic perisset victurus non fui'? . . . etiamnunc cum filium tuum servavi ad genua procumbis, dis vota solvis tanquam ipse servatus; illae voces exeunt tibi: '*nihil mea interest an me servaveris*; duos servasti, immo me magis.' quare ista dicis si non accipis beneficium?

The speaker argues that a father whose son's life has been saved receives a benefaction from the saviour. For does not a father in such circumstances regard the saving of his son's life as also the saving of his own? For the father to disclaim any interest in his own life defeats the reasoning. And in any context *nihil . . . magis* would be balderdash. The addition of a single word restores coherence: *nihil mea interest <filium> an me servaveris*. For this construction in Seneca Mr. Reynolds points to *Dial.* 9. 14. 3 *o te ineptum si putas mea interesse supra terram an infra putrescam!*

5. 24. 2. et quidem siti confectus, quia impeditus ire ad fontem proximum non poteram, repere manibus volebam *manibus milito*, homo fortis ac strenuus, aquam mihi in galea sua adtulisset.

manibus milito (praemilicio *P*) *O*: militus *G*: nisi commilito *V*.

V's reading, no doubt conjectural, is the vulgate. But we then have nothing to identify this soldier with the hero of the story. Read *nisi idem commilito*.

6. 7. 1. illo transeamus, an ei debeatur aliquid qui nobis invitus profuit. hoc apertius potui dicere, nisi propositio deberet esse confusior, ut distinctio statim subsecuta ostenderet utrumque quaeri, et an ei deberemus qui nobis dum non vult profuit et an ei qui dum nescit. *nam* si quis coactus aliquid boni fecit quin nos non obliget manifestius est quam ut ulla in hoc verba impendenda sint.

As the text stands *coactus* seems to constitute a third subdivision of *invitus*; but in fact *coactus* = *dum non vult*. A lacuna can be diagnosed, which might be filled somewhat as follows: . . . *dum nescit*. <*sed illud res ipsa decrevit*; > *nam*, *sqq.*

7. 14. 3. quaedam eius condicionis sunt ut effectum praestare debeant; quibusdam pro effectu est omnia temptasse ut *efficeret*. si omnia fecit ut sanaret, peregit partes suas medicus.

efficerent edd. I prefer *efficeres*, since *quibusdam* must be neuter.

University of Michigan

D. R. SHACKLETON BAILEY