around the book, under chapters like 'Ovid and Empire' and 'Ovid and Genre'. Newlands's critical approach, essentially the same as that set out in her monograph (*Playing with Time: Ovid and the Fasti* [Ithaca, 1995]) and very different from Fantham's, is to demonstrate how Ovid playfully points up the instability of the established 'truths' in Augustan national identity by means of, for example, ironic juxtaposition and unreliability of narrators.

The handling of the *Fasti* in each volume demonstrates the two major respects in which the Companions differ. Brill structures its chapters chronologically by poem-type; Cambridge prefers to establish critical mindsets in which to situate all of Ovid's production and enable the reader to see the 'bigger picture' across the spectrum of his poetry. Brill aims for detailed assessment of modern scholarship; Cambridge is much keener to privilege certain approaches which are deemed most rewarding.

As the handling of the *Fasti* in each volume suggests, those intent on detailed critical study of Ovid will ultimately find it beneficial to use the two volumes in conjunction. That said, I feel that, on balance, the Brill Companion will prove the more useful for the majority of the Ovidian readership—even though it is considerably more expensive—and will be the first port of call for the student of Ovid for many years to come.

University of Manchester STEVEN J. GREEN

DE CLEMENTIA

E. MALASPINA: *L. Annaei Senecae* De clementia *libri duo*. Pp. 480. Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2001. Paper, L. 80,000. ISBN: 88-7694-500-8.

This hefty edition and commentary—a revised doctoral thesis at the University of Turin—is devoted chiefly to establishing the text of Seneca's *De clementia*. Malaspina promises to provide a more particular treatment of date, sources, structure, and ideological context in the introduction to another edition, with translation, of the same work.

In the present volume, 130 pages of prolegomena review in minute detail the evidence for the relationship among the MSS. M. confirms the prevailing opinion that all existing MSS. derive from a corrected copy of N (Vaticanus Palatinus Lat. 1547), dated to the early ninth century. This includes R (Vaticanus Reginensis Lat. 1529, late ninth or early tenth century), which had been thought to be a witness to an independent tradition by a number of scholars, beginning with Rossbach, who discovered it at the end of the nineteenth century. Most importantly, Hosius (H.) endorsed this view in his two Teubner editions, even after Rossbach himself had abandoned the hypothesis. It is the influence of H.'s text, especially the revised edition of 1914, that has made another examination of the evidence necessary. M.'s catalogues of errors and corrections in N and R present the data accurately, and his analysis is sound. The immediate predecessor of N was likely a manuscript written in new Roman cursive, and behind this, M. speculates, another written in cursive minuscules.

M. has equipped his text with a skeletal critical apparatus that records major variants in the MSS. and those conjectures by modern scholars that he has adopted in his text. For a full conspectus of readings and emendations, one must consult the separate 'lista critica' that follows the text, where M. records virtually every discrepancy among the MSS. and printed editions. Besides the major witnesses, M.

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.367 Published online by Cambridge University Press

has collated nineteen more recent MSS., eleven of them for the first time ever, as well as more than four dozen editions and commentaries, and he has consulted and reported on virtually every relevant scholarly contribution. The split critical apparatus, however, is misleading. Given that all MSS., on M.'s own showing, derive from N, it follows that variant readings in later MSS. have the status of conjectures (or mistakes); thus, there is no good reason for separating such readings from corrections proposed by modern scholars. It is also cumbersome and inconvenient. An example: at 1.1.5 M. notes that there is little to choose between the emendations *clam adimi* and *clam mali* for MSS. *clamati*; M. hesitantly prefers the former, but allows that the latter is paleographically plausible. The commentary sets out the arguments fairly, but *clam mali* does not appear in the apparatus, only in the 'lista critica'. M. would have done better to print a full apparatus at the bottom of the page, in the manner of standard editions.

Apart from H., the only scholar in the twentieth century to produce a new edition from the MSS. was Préchac (P.) in his Budé edition of 1925, which is complicated, however, by an eccentric rearrangement of the text. Unlike H., P. recognized R's dependency on N (p. xxxvii). All subsequent editions, commentaries, and translations basically derive from H. or P., and it is with these, accordingly, that M.'s is best compared.

Surprisingly, perhaps, M.'s text is somewhat closer to H.'s than to P.'s, which suggests that their divergent evaluations of R have not much affected their readings. Where M. differs from both, it is sometimes because he has resuscitated an older emendation, less frequently because he has introduced one of his own. In most of the truly controversial cases, debate over the correct reading will continue, as is inevitable where the constitution of the text depends on a single thread.

I chose the truncated Book 2 as a basis for comparing M.'s text against those of P. and H. (P. transposes Book 2 to the beginning of Book 1). If I have counted rightly, M. differs from H. nine times, in four of which H. agrees with P. (2.2.2 and 2.4.2, both times following Madvig—wrongly in the second instance, in my view; 2.4.3, following Watt in *HSCP* 1994; and 2.6.2, following *recentiores*). Twice, in differing from H., M. agrees with P. (2.2.1 and 2.4.3, where M. notes that P.'s 'emendation' *nam cum* already appears in earlier editions—not the only occasion on which he has uncovered an unrecognized precedent). In the three remaining cases, all three editors differ: two of these involve an emendation or indication of a lacuna by M. (2.2.2, where M. inserts *eius* before *similis*, P. has *illius*; 2.5.3, where M. reads *quidni haec <male audiat> scientia* for H.'s *quidnam haec scientia* and P.'s *quid veri habet haec scientia*; and 2.7.1, where M. posits a lacuna). Four times, M. differs from P. but agrees with H. (2.2.2, 2.3.1, 2.6.1 bis).

M.'s text is balanced and judicious. However, the real value of his edition resides in the commentary, which extends to nearly 200 dense pages and presents all the reader needs to weigh M.'s choices against readings he rejects. M. cites the arguments of other scholars so fully that at times the commentary reads like a variorum edition. He also meticulously collects parallels for grammar and diction in Seneca and other authors, not just for individual words but also for combinations or 'nessi', such as variations in the use of prefixes or prepositions. This kind of evidence is often material to the choice of a reading.

As I have said, M.'s own emendations are few. Here are three. Early in the treatise (1.1.1), M. posits a lacuna in *si hoc iugum fregerit, . . . ita loqui secum*, whereas both P. and H. insert *et*. The latter, M. reports, is already to be found in a Vatican MS. of the fourteenth century. M. argues, rightly in my view, that there is no plausible antecedent

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.367 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to *hoc*, which must therefore look forward to some words that have been lost in the sequel. At 1.3.5, H. has *aut voluntarii terram subsiluimus*, while P. has *aut voluntarii in terram*; M. proposes *aut voluntariam sub<ivimus mortem aut *** sub>siluimus*, which is ingenious. At 1.19.3, M. plausibly proposes *est enim illi mos exercere se in parvis et ingentium rerum documenta in minima re congerere* (H. has *in minima parere*, P. *in minima aggerere*).

In all, M. has produced a most useful volume, above all for the copious prolegomena and commentary. It will be the edition to consult for anyone working closely with the text of Seneca's *De clementia*.

Brown University DAVID KONSTAN

THE NEW LOEB OF SENECA'S TRAGEDIES

J. G. FITCH (ed., trans.): *Seneca VIII: Tragedies I:* Hercules, Trojan Women, Phoenician Women, Medea, Phaedra. (Loeb Classical Library 63.) Pp. viii + 551. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Press, 2002. Cased, £14.50. ISBN: 0-674-99602-X.

The Loeb Classical Library's current policy of replacing some of its early editions is very welcome, and this first volume of Seneca's tragedies is a welcome addition to the new list. F. J. Miller's original text and translation (1917) has served us well, but it has long been showing its years, especially regarding the text. That was based on Leo, but the last forty years have seen some radical rethinking about the manuscript tradition of the tragedies, and two important editions: Giardina's fairly conservative text (1966) and Zwierlein's rather bolder OCT (1986). F. offers his own new text, which, as he says, lies somewhere in between the textual policy of these two editors. He sometimes prints readings which he regards as having been unjustifiably altered or rejected by earlier editors (e.g. *Tro*. 197, *Phoe.* 552, *Med.* 53, 680, *Phae*. 1099), and he has some supplements and conjectures of his own (e.g. *Phoe.* 112, *Tro*. 664, *HF* 634, 1068, *Med.* 343/4). In one place at least (*Med.* 553) he has to choose between two ways of punctuating the line and opts for a quite acceptable one; but from this uncertain punctuation he unwisely derives firm evidence about indications of action on the stage (p. 30). This highlights a recurrent difficulty in dealing with Seneca: one of the main problems in editing either the verse or the prose works is, quite simply, punctuating them. However, that is a minor niggle, and by and large, F. offers us a sensible and very readable text, purged of obeli, and with any cruces dealt with persuasively. F. follows the usual Loeb practice of giving a minimal apparatus, which here records only those places where editors disagree about the original reading and this affects the translation.

The translation is clear and seems to be completely dependable for accuracy. Some readers may find it a little flat in places, and not modulated sufficiently to the changes of speaker and mood; and opinions will differ on whether F. has succeeded in his aim 'to preserve Seneca's characteristic conciseness of phrasing' (p. 29)—notoriously difficult to achieve in an uninflected language. Prose is used throughout, but in the choruses and other non-iambic passages the translation is line-by-line, to preserve the lyric or emotional register of the original. This works quite well, and by the use of varied and regular stresses, F. often achieves an impression of free verse which gives a desirable contrast to the straight prose used for the iambic trimeter. A good test of this

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.2.367 Published online by Cambridge University Press