

GIUSEPPINA MAGNALDI (ed.), *La Filippiche di Cicerone. Edizione critica*. Minima Philologica 5, Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2008, pp. lxxv + 275, ISBN 9788862740548.

Fewer than thirty years ago D. R. Shackleton Bailey could write that 'Cicero's *Philippics* remain a comparatively neglected area'.¹ Yet with the recent spate of high-caliber scholarly work on the *Philippics*, this claim can no longer be made. In English, we now have multiple commentaries and translations, including J. T. Ramsey *Cicero, Philippics I-II*, Cambridge 2003, G. Manuwald, *Cicero, Philippics 3-9*, Berlin 2007, and Ramsey and Manuwald's collective revision of Shackleton Bailey's own text and translation, now published as the Loeb edition (Cambridge, Mass. 2009). In Italian, there are the recent commentaries on the second (R. Cristofoli, Rome 2004), third (C. Monteleone, Fasano 2003), fourth (C. Monteleone, Bari 2005), and thirteenth (C. Novielli, Bari 2001) speeches of the *orationes Philippicae*. This brief, highly selective list omits other contributions such as the Spanish edition and translation of J. C. Martín (Madrid 2001) as well as numerous scholarly articles on individual points of detail.

As important and impressive as these works are, in many ways Shackleton Bailey set the stage for them, not only providing the Latin text and English translation that stand as the basis of all the Anglophone volumes listed above but also asserting firmly that the speeches had 'no adequate commentary', which surely must have inspired more than one of his readers to contemplate taking up the task.² By contrast, Shackleton Bailey provided only tepid encouragement for future, full-scale critical editions of the *Philippics*. At the same time as he uncharitably asserted that P. Fedeli's Teubner edition was not 'a really critical text' (thus leaving ample room for Shackleton Bailey's own conjectural criticism), he suggested that Fedeli's bibliography and apparatus criticus were 'comprehensive', apparently leaving little opportunity for others to study and re-evaluate the manuscripts.³ Giuseppina Magnaldi's new critical edition of the *Philippics*, the deeply learned work here under review, shows us just how wrong this judgment was. On the one hand, Magnaldi's edition demonstrates how much more can be gleaned from

1 D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero Philippics*, Chapel Hill 1986, vii.

2 *ibid.*

3 *ibid.* It is worth comparing Shackleton Bailey's assessment of Fedeli with that of H. M. Hine, 'A New Text of the Philippics' *CR* 34.1, 1984, 36-9. Hine asserts instead (36) that Fedeli's edition is 'most welcome' and that its 'discussion of relations between the manuscripts... is the one really unsatisfactory aspect of it.

the manuscripts supposedly already comprehensively embodied in Fedeli's apparatus. On the other, her work stands as a powerful testament to the idea that 'a really critical text' is precisely one grounded in a detailed knowledge of the underlying manuscripts and the history of their transmission. If, as E. J. Kenney once remarked, 'textual criticism' is 'the art and science of balancing *historical* probabilities', then fellow scholars—however they feel about some of Magnaldi's individual textual choices—can only be grateful to Magnaldi for making more widely available a greater knowledge not only of manuscript readings themselves but also of the cultural forces that have shaped Cicero's text.⁴

Unlike Shackleton Bailey's edition, whose chief value lies in its ingenious conjectures and identification of undetected textual problems, Magnaldi's work stands more in the tradition of Fedeli's Teubner and, still earlier, A. C. Clark's Oxford Classical Text, volumes that rest upon extensive, first-hand study of the two manuscript families, **V** and **D**, which have been recognized since Clark to underlie any scholarly critical edition of the *orationes Philippicae*.⁵ Like Clark, who demonstrated that **V** and **D** were derived from a single archetype,⁶ Magnaldi has given careful attention to the interrelation of manuscripts, in fact offering a new stemma codicum, which helpfully nuances our understanding of the manuscripts in the **D** family. In particular, she has confirmed the thesis first aired by H. Hine (in a review of Fedeli's first edition) that the **D** family has 'three independent representatives, **b**, **c** and the ancestor of **tvns**'.⁷ She also has introduced several new manuscripts into the stemma, deepening our understanding of the **c** branch of **D** and showing the connection between both manuscript families and the editio princeps. Like Fedeli, she has provided a lavish apparatus criticus, which reports the important manuscript **V** (the codex Basilicae Vaticanae H. 25) more fully than any edition heretofore. She records not only the hand of **V** itself, nor simply corrections of **V**, but she also endeavors to clarify for readers the antiquity of the various hands, employing a variety of detailed symbols—**V**¹ (reading before correction), **V**^{1c} (a correction by the first hand), **V**² (a correction by an ancient hand), **V**³ (a correction by a more recent hand), **V**^c (a correction by an uncertain hand). While Magnaldi does not report the readings of the **D** family as fully, she still on occasion distinguishes corrections and at least two different hands for what is a much larger body of evidence.

⁴ E. J. Kenney *The Classical Text* Berkeley 1974, 146. Emphasis added.

⁵ I borrow these sigla from Fedeli, whom Magnaldi follows. The **V** family is represented by a single manuscript, the authoritative codex Basilicae Vaticanae H. 25, which Magnaldi now dates to the second quarter of the ninth century. The **D** family, which derives its name from the damaged state of its members (i.e. codices decurtati), is represented by six manuscripts known as **b**, **c**, **t**, **v**, **n**, and **s**. Full details on all of these manuscripts may be found in Magnaldi's preface (XIX-XXIII).

⁶ See A. C. Clark *The Descent of Manuscripts* Oxford 1918, 210.

⁷ Hine, *A New Text of the Philippics*, 38. See Magnaldi's preface, XXIV.

This significant effort and careful reporting of detail means that all critics who engage seriously with the text of Cicero's *Philippics* will need to own Magnaldi's edition. Yet from the traditional standpoint of classical textual criticism—that is, the attempt to reconstruct the *ipsissima verba* of Cicero himself, or at least the *verba* of his ancient archetype—one may think that such labor does little more than provide the critic with more variants from which to choose, or even worse, that it simply provides the inexpert reader with more manifestly 'bad' readings upon which to stumble. For those disposed towards such opinions, it may help to clarify the theoretical underpinnings of Magnaldi's edition. She has been influenced significantly by ideas articulated in L. Canfora *Il copista come autore*, Palermo 2002, ideas that—as Canfora's title suggests—place value on attempts to understand the working conditions and psychology of the scribes who have been viewed historically as mere intermediaries. As Magnaldi puts it herself (in a preparatory volume for this edition), her critical practice is based in 'la necessità di ricostruire pazientemente, attraverso lo studio del manoscritto, la fisionomia culturale e psicologica e le consuetudini di mestiere del copista, nel tentativo di distinguere ciò che egli elabora in proprio da ciò che invece eredita dai predecessori'.⁸ In other words, the careful study of manuscripts is not merely a means to uncover the original words of Cicero but also a means to understand the habits and even—in some sense—the minds of those whose hands produced the texts we still have.

Such a practice, while it begins to sound like a project based in medieval intellectual history rather than some versions of Ciceronian textual criticism, can in fact cast significant light onto a reconstruction of Cicero's own words. As Magnaldi has already shown in her earlier works, knowing the working habits and psychology of particular scribes can allow the critic to demonstrate convincingly the origins of various errors in Cicero's text. For example, at *Phil.* 8.7 Fedeli and Shackleton Bailey print:⁹

Ceteris enim bellis maximeque civilibus contentionem rei publicae causa faciebat. **Sulla** cum Sulpicio de iure legum quas per vim [**con. Sulla**] latas esse dicebat...

But Magnaldi has argued that the text should read as follows:

Ceteris enim bellis maimeque civilibus contentionem rei publicae causa faciebat. <**Contendebat**> **Sulla** cum Sulpicio de iure legum, quas per vim [**·I· consulla**] latas esse dicebat...

⁸ G. Magnaldi *Parola d'autore, parola di copista. Usi correttivi ed esercizi di scuola nei codici di Cic. Phil. 1.1-13.10*, Alessandria 2004, 9.

⁹ For fuller discussion of this passage, see *ibid.*, 83-5.

The key point in Magnaldi's analysis here is not that she has proposed a new emendation or a substantially re-written the text. (In fact, Sternkopf, as Magnaldi acknowledges, authored the conjecture here adopted, *contendebat*.) Instead, her careful study of **V** has allowed her to see the previously unreported sign preceding *consulla* here, *·l*; which she interprets as *lege* or *legas* rather than the typical *vel*.¹⁰ This interpretation, in turn, supports the understanding of *consulla* or *con. sulla* as a corrective gloss intruding upon the wrong portion of the sentence. While the unpacking of *con* as *contendebat* may be mildly uncertain—Shackleton Bailey allows both *contendit* and *contendebat* as possibilities in his apparatus—Magnaldi defends the choice of *contendebat* through the idea that its original omission was based in homeoteleuton, which would not hold true for *contendit*.

Even readers who are not entirely convinced by Magnaldi's solution in this example can begin to see both the ingenuity and utility in her work. On the one hand, her careful review and reporting of the manuscripts, especially **V**, has allowed her to observe and take note of glosses that others have either ignored or misinterpreted. On the other, a detailed knowledge of the errors caused by these glosses allows her to make *historically* plausible suggestions to heal errors that conjecture alone has been unable to lay to rest. While Magnaldi's method will not obviate the need for insightful and creative conjecture—or good judgment—it nonetheless demonstrates how great a role detailed historical knowledge can play in shaping both conjecture and judgment.

Yet no matter how well-founded the theory underwriting a new critical edition, readers look to the details. How, more specifically, has Magnaldi changed the text of Cicero's *orationes Philippicae*? As I have already indicated above, the greatest number of changes—impacting literally every page—is found in her apparatus, where she provides numerous readings that have been unavailable to a broad public previously as well as several good older conjectures from *inter alios* G. Garatoni. But there is much else here for students of Cicero to mull over. Magnaldi's careful study of the types of errors found in the **V** and **D** families (and which ones may be traced back to the achetype) has led her to value **V**, always considered the most important single manuscript, more heavily than other recent editors. Whereas the Budé editors A. Boulanger and P. Wuilleumier reached the conclusion that 'l'éclectisme s'impose' with regard to the selection of readings from the two manuscript families (a position endorsed and adopted by Shackleton Bailey), Magnaldi instead prints the reading of **V** wherever possible, abandoning it only in places where this practice is simply untenable because **V** offers an

¹⁰ For the standard symbol for *vel*, see W. M. Lindsay, *Notae Latinae*, Cambridge 1915, 310-1.

unattested, or rare, or late expression.¹¹ Thus, even in places where Shackleton Bailey explicitly asserts that prose rhythm vindicates a reading from the D family, Magnaldi prints the reading of V (e.g. *Phil.* 1.5, 1.15, 1.27, 1.29).¹² In other words, Magnaldi simply does not believe that prose rhythm is a strong enough criterion to outweigh V's superiority with regard to details such as word order. Here she differs even from Fedeli, who certainly valued prose rhythm as a guide in his selection of readings; and on this point at least I am not sure she will convince many in the Anglo-American community of Ciceronian textual scholars, who often treat prose rhythm as something of an established law for guiding critics in doubtful choices between variants.

Her study of scribal habits has induced Magnaldi to suspect the text of corruption in many places where the same term is repeated in quick succession. As she has successfully demonstrated, such repetitions may be markers of corrections or marginal glosses that have intruded upon the text. Some of her choices in this vein seem obviously correct. For example, her transposition of *mihi* to follow *hoc quidem* at *Phil.* 2.2 sounds just the right note for a passage where the idea is precisely that a contest in speaking would be to Cicero's advantage. But in other instances, the results are less certain. At *Phil.* 2.3, for instance, the deletion of *libertini hominis* as a corrective gloss, together with Magnaldi's punctuation, appears to turn Q. *Fadi* into a vocative, which strikes me as unlikely. Q. *Fadi* goes perfectly well with *nepotes* as a genitive, as punctuated in all other recent editions. Occasionally, too, it seems that Magnaldi's incredibly rich, useful apparatus goes a bit far: thus, at *Phil.* 5.5, it is unclear to me why she reports the reading of t, *hoc die es*. There is no chance this reading is correct, and unlike V, for which Magnaldi reports many variants as a means to characterize the types and antiquity of errors made by the different hands, t is not reported consistently enough to make this single error valuable in and of itself.

Different readers will of course find different points upon which to agree or disagree with Magnaldi. The dominant role she gives to V and her rejection of D readings favored by prose rhythm will not inspire assent from all. Yet to focus too strongly on points of disagreement would do this volume a disservice. The brilliance of this work lies less in the fact that it will inspire universal agreement from critics of Cicero's *Philippics* and more in its ability to make critics think harder about their most basic practices. In attempting to develop a critical edition that values scribes and textual variants, Magnaldi brings together two parts of textual criticism that are too often kept apart: *recensio* is too often viewed simply as a means for eliminating worthless manuscripts. Yet as Magnaldi effectively demonstrates,

¹¹ See A. Boulanger - P. Wuilleumier, *Cicéron Discours I-IV*, Paris 1959, 35, Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero Philippics*, xiv, and Magnaldi's preface, XL.

¹² Cf. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero Philippics*, xiv.

recensio, if carried out thoroughly and imaginatively, becomes something much closer to a tool for *emendatio*. Almost all of her own conjectures in this edition are derived from a careful study of the types of errors found in the **V** and **D** families and the related attempt to extrapolate specific scribal practice and psychology from these errors. P. Collomp once remarked that thinking of a conjecture was an ‘affaire de talent’, while justifying it was an ‘affaire de science’.¹³ There remains much truth in these words, but Magnaldi shows how much conjecture, too, can be an ‘affaire de science’.

W. H. SHEARIN
University of Miami
wshearin@miami.edu

¹³ P. Collomp, *La critique des textes*, Paris 1931, 16.