

C. MORESCHINI, *M. Tullius Cicero, Scripta quae manserunt omnia, fasc. 43: De finibus bonorum et malorum* (Bibliotheca Teubneriana), Munich - Leipzig: K. G. Saur, 2005, xviii + 215 pp., ISBN 3-598-71280-4.

Cicero issued his *Academici libri* twice, and the first book of the second edition has survived incomplete as an appendage to some manuscripts of *De finibus*. T. J. Hunt's thesis on its transmission (Exeter 1967) helped R. H. & M. A. Rouse when they set about tracing the medieval circulation of *De finibus*. In an article of 1978 they showed that the text rested essentially on five witnesses: *A* (s. xi), the source of the twins *B* (a. 1467) and *E* (a. 1466, Heidelberg), *R* (s. xii), *P* (s. xii), and *Γ*, the source of such Italian manuscripts as did not descend from *P*. *P* had been used only in J. Martha's Budé edition (1928-30), and *Γ* was known only through two contaminated 15th-century descendants used in Th. Schiche's Teubner edition (1915), *NV*. In the absence of fuller collations and a published stemma, the Rouses said nothing firmer about the tradition as a whole than that it appeared to have two branches, one German (since *ABE* were German) and the other French (since *RP* were French and *Γ* either Italian or a doubtless French import), and that the *Academicus primus* belonged to the French one.

In an article that he published in 1987 after undertaking an edition of *De finibus* for the Centro di Studi Ciceroniani, Moreschini introduced a pure descendant of *Γ*, namely *M* (s. xiv²), and three relatives of *P*, namely *SLY*. He assigned *SLY* to the 13th century and from *PSLY* reconstructed *δ*, with *Y* on one branch and *PSL* on another. In a stemma of the French and Italian manuscripts he put *Rδ* on one branch, *Γ* on another. He offered no stemma for *A*, *BE*, and *RδΓ*.

In the same year, Giuseppina Magnaldi took *R* as her starting point for three articles on the tradition because she considered it

a more honest witness than *P*. In her view, the tradition had three branches, *A*, *BE*, and *RP* (she knew nothing of *Γ*), and the agreement of two would have outweighed the third but that *A* and *BE* sometimes fell into the same error (or perhaps *BE* were contaminated).

In 1992, Leighton Reynolds, who had seen about 120 of over 150 manuscripts known to him, argued that the reconstruction of *Γ* could be improved if *NV* were replaced by *OS* (not Moreschini's *S*); that in all probability Moreschini's *SLY*, of which he assigned *S* to s. xiv², *L* and *Y* to s. xv, descended from *P* with varying degrees of contamination; and that the stemma had two branches, with *A* and *RPF* on one, *BE* on the other. In his *OCT* (1998) he cited the shared errors that had led him to these views (pp. x-xii).

After editing for Teubner Apuleius's *philosophica* (1991) and Boethius's *Consolatio* (2000), Moreschini, an expert on Platonism, has now published an edition of *De finibus* in succession to Schiche's, with a preface dated October 2004. For all the notice that he takes of Magnaldi and Reynolds, however, the preface might as well have appeared in 1987. That Magnaldi's stemma had three branches emerges only from the title of her second article, 'Lo stemma trifido ...', when he cites it in footnotes, and he ignores her third, 'Il codice Rottendorffianus Gronovianus (R) e il testo del *De finibus*', *AAST* 121 II, 1987, 125-55; his account of Reynolds's stemma (p. xiv) is unintelligible without an explanation of what Reynolds meant by α and φ . His own stemma has two branches, with *A* and *BE* on one, *R* and *PΓ* on the other; but there is not a word of argument against either Magnaldi's or Reynolds's, and he does not explain why he now derives each of *PSLY* separately from their common source and makes it a relative of *Γ* rather than of *R*. For reconstructing *Γ* he still uses *MNV*, and Reynolds has not forced him, he says (p. xiv), to drop *SLY*, which he still assigns to the 13th century with no mention of Reynolds's dating; nor is it true either of his article or of what he has already said here that 'nullum eorum descriptum esse iam demonstravimus' (p. xi; in the article he did not even discuss the status of *S* or *L*). He has changed the symbols for hyparchetypes into more confusing ones and fallen victim

himself by writing γ^2 for γ^1 in ‘ex aliquo familiae γ^2 exemplari’ (p. xii) and γ^1 for γ^2 in ‘tertium exemplar familiae γ^1 ’ (p. xiii); together with a careless use of ‘haec’, the first of these mistakes gives the impression that not N but N^2 represents Γ . Much the fullest descriptions of some 40 manuscripts, among them *PYMN*, appear in the book that T. J. Hunt went on to publish, *A textual history of Cicero’s ‘Academici libri’* (Leiden 1998), where P is also illustrated (plate 1); but Hunt and the *Academicus primus* have altogether vanished from the scene, and M. says nothing more precise about the extent of the tradition than that there are ‘non ita multi codices’ before the Renaissance but too many in the 15th century to sort out. All this in Latin that includes *multorum inutiliumque lectionum* (p. vi), *concludisse* (p. viii), *in medio veniat* (p. x), *Parisino altero similes* (p. x), *cognatus esse apparet* (p. xii), misused relative clauses (pp. v, vi, xiii), the baffling clause *Cumque veteres editiones, bonos malosque libros per multa saecula, ex viris doctis ... nullus discrevisset* (p. v), an *Itaque* whose logic defeats me (p. vi), and several almost meaningless uses of *nunc*. ‘Parker’ (p. xi n. 23) should be ‘Parkes’.

After the evasions and solecisms of the preface, I held my breath as I embarked on the text and apparatus. Though not as bad as the preface, it is hard to see what they achieve in the wake of Reynolds’s edition, which may well have taken the wind out of M.’s sails.

Whereas Reynolds in his apparatus reconstructed hyparchetypes whenever he could, M. reports extant manuscripts, to the number of 12: *A*, *BE*, *R*, *PSLY*, *MNV*, and a relative of *R* introduced by the Rouses that presents only excerpts, *Pa* (s. xii). A drawback of this policy is that it gives space to five undeserving manuscripts, *SLYNV*. An advantage is that anyone minded to explore the 15th-century tradition, though M. himself predicts no editorial benefit (p. xi), will find more footholds than Reynolds provides. Without seeing the manuscripts, I will not venture to judge M.’s accuracy, but I noticed that at 1.4.34 (the lines of each book are numbered as in some other recent Teubner editions of prose) *A* is cited for two different readings; at 1.14.144 *P*, at 1.16.162 *L*, and at 5.64.810 *Y*, not cited at all; at 1.50.549 *R*

not included among the manuscripts that interpolate *non potest fieri* despite the explicit statement of Schiche and Martha and the implicit statement of Reynolds; at 1.58.628 ‘discordans A’ (and nothing else) keyed to *discordans* (‘dicordans A’ Martha); and at 2.5.49 *nunc* said to be present only in A (if so, can it be right?) when Schiche, Martha, and Reynolds, implicitly attribute it to ABE. At 1.26.276 and 1.30.324 it was perverse not to identify the superfluous passages in R and P. At 1.51.556 *noctesque diesque* required a note like the one in Reynolds’s upper apparatus. M.’s Latin, of which there is mercifully little, matches the Latin of the preface: 1.8.88 (and often elsewhere) *reponere* for *ponere*, 1.25.254 *A non liquet*, 1.50.549 (and often elsewhere) *corr.* for *coni.*, 2.8.82 *quattuor literarum spatio omissa*. If it is true that at 2.55.647 SLY but not P have *negabat* for *credebat*, neither his old nor his new stemma for PSLY can be right; as the Italian descendants of P in the *Academicus primus* descend from it by way of *Amsterdam Univ. I. C. 47* (s. xii), it might help to know what that manuscript reads here.

In his review of Reynolds’s edition, CR n. s. 51, 2001, 48-9, Shackleton Bailey, a sceptical critic if ever there was, declared the tradition of *De finibus* better than most. Furthermore, the work received from Madvig a classic textual commentary. Not often, therefore, does Cicero’s wording remain seriously controversial. M.’s new material, whether adopted or just mentioned in the apparatus, is limited to eight conjectures of his own (2.10.121 [*voluptatum*], 2.56.670 *cum <bona> causa*, 2.75.867 *vide[s]*), already proposed by Ernesti but impugned by Madvig, 3.15.162 *nova* for *non*, already proposed by Paulus Manutius but irreconcilable with the mood and tense of *videbantur* as Madvig said, 4.70.800 [*dicere*], 4.75.856 *discrepant <a ratione>*, 5.63.800-801 *<cum> ambo [ergo]*, unmethodical when the next words are plainly corrupt, 5.64.812 *innumerabilia <legens> praeterea*, badly placed), fifteen made by Carlo Martino Lucarini (1.17.175 [*nec ultimum*] with no mention of Jonas’s *nec intimum*, 2.25.330 *<dicit> miserum*, already proposed by Lambinus, 2.65.768 lacuna before *saepe* despite Reid’s note, 2.103.1180 *at* for *et* despite Reid’s note, 2.119.1350 *convenire* for *invenire*, 3.2.11 *prob<andum vid>etur*, 3.16.188 *<primum>*

principium, 3.22.257-58 [*sicut nos ... ut conliniet*], 3.52.583 *primo in* for *primorie*, 3.69.766 *emolumenta <et detrimenta, commoda et incommoda>*, 4.31.359 *leniret* for *iniret*, 4.63.732 [*nihilo*], 4.75.856 *discrepant <a rectis>*, 5.57.724 lacuna after *consectentur*, shown by Merguet's *Handlexikon* under *absum*, I 2, or by *ThlL* under *absum*, 213.33-6, to be as needless as M.'s exclamation mark, 5.81.1008 *sed* for *et*), and four taken from Magnaldi's articles (1.32.347 *suscep<er>it*, wrongly assigned to 1.24.246, where *suscepit* in *BER* is even more plainly a mistake for *suscipit*, 4.2.14 <*dicere*> *temere* Giusta, 4.20.241 [*omni*] Giusta, 5.29.352 *qui <si>*). Beyond these conjectures, few are mentioned that Reynolds did not mention, though some receive a different attribution: 1.4.44 *Lucilius*, 1.70.751 *amicos quam*, 2.43.524 <*contra eum*>, 2.108.1244-46 [*animo ... gratulatur*], 3.31.355 lac., 3.49.543 <*non*> *eam*, 4.6.64 *non spinas*, 4.46.525 *selectione* (not the second, as M. says, but the first), 5.42.538 *utuntur* (at least as old as Angelius's edition, Florence 1516), 5.46.589 *ut si quae*, 5.87.1081 *non quaerimus* (incidentally, M. prints *vere falsone*, Reynolds *vero falsone*, both without comment), 5.93.1154 *faceret*, to say nothing of passages where Reynolds knows the *deteriores* better. If an editor produced more than one edition, Reynolds distinguishes them but M. does not; M. even conflates Paulus Manutius with his son Aldus and attributes the ed. Ven. 1583 to the wrong one (p. xvii).

As regards the choice of what to put in the text, I have not been able to persuade myself that M. shows better judgement than Reynolds. At 4.18.213-14, for instance, *appetensque coniunctionum hominum ad societatem* seems much inferior to *appetensque convictum hominum ac societatem*, especially since *coniunctium* in *BE* looks honest and only *R* has *ad*; at 4.56.632 *naturae <ipsi> accommodata* (M. from *N*³) rests on the corruption *ipsa* for *ea* in *PSLY*; and at 5.11.132 *qualem in re publica principem <esse> conveniret* spoils a clausula preserved by *qualem <esse> in re publica principem conveniret*.

Before the text comes an alphabetically arranged *conspectus editionum*. Above the main apparatus is a restrained apparatus of *fontes*, *loci similes*, and *testimonia*. The edition ends with an *Index fontium* and an *Index nominum*, both compiled by G.

Duursma. At 1.4.44 the apparatus is on the wrong page, and at 1.17.177 *omnia* has lost its *o*, but the printer can be happy with the presentation of the volume.

MICHAEL D. REEVE
Pembroke College, Cambridge
mdr1000@cam.ac.uk