

M. GIUSTA: *Il testo delle 'Tusculane'*. Turin: Le Lettere, 1991. Pp. xix + 371. Paper, L. 65,000.

This review and one other due from me have been casualties of administration. Even more than to the editors, I apologize to G., because the book has far more virtues than faults. Indeed, much of it provides as good an introduction to textual criticism as any manual.

He reveals that he wrote most of it from 1970 to 1973, before deciding not to publish it in full but to draw on it for the introduction and apparatus of the edition that he eventually published in 1984 for Paravia. He changed his mind because S. Lundström, who in *Vermeintliche Glosseme in den Tusculanen* (Uppsala, 1964) and *Ciceroniana* n.s. I (1973), 3–20 had put forward two views quite different from his own about the text and its transmission, greeted the edition with a 138-page monograph of objections, *Zur Textkritik der Tusculanen* (Uppsala, 1986).

The complete ninth-century witnesses, GKR^v, all derive from a lost hyparchetype, X; but since 1890 it has been widely accepted that readings independent of X occur among the contemporary corrections in V, and in 1910 A. C. Clark reported a ninth-century fragment in the Bodleian, F, that also seems independent of X. Claims for a few of the many *recentiores* (over 200?) have as often been denied as made. Lundström puts down to conjecture or corruption everything that was not in X. Like G., who illustrates on his cover one of the passages that best speak for V², I find that view highly implausible (though not because F has an error absent from X, an absurd argument that G. uncharacteristically uses on p. 49).

Several reviewers of *Vermeintliche Glosseme* found equally implausible Lundström's contention that no glosses or interpolations were transmitted in X. Rather than delete even an unwanted *si*, *id*, or *-rus* (G. pp. 32, 50, 86), or the *d* of *quod* (G. p. 171), he proposes supplements, as though omissions were less of a black mark against X. G. rightly calls his conjectures in these and other passages 'per lo più infelicissime' (p. xi).

If the book were nothing but an answer to Lundström, one could simply agree with G. and turn to something else. In fact, however, it is an unblinkered and challenging study of the transmitted text, written accessibly, forcefully, and without a single footnote. The preface gives a foretaste in its excellent remarks on general matters: the place of probability in textual criticism, the difference between the transmitted text and the vulgate, misuse of the appeal to *lectio difficilior*, the practice of *subrepticia emendatio* in translating. The main body of the book has two parts. The first concerns transmission, though always by way of textual problems; after a chapter on V², F, the *recentiores*, and Hadoard's excerpts, come two on matters that he discussed in articles of 1969–70, namely the layout in various ancestors of X and alternative versions in Books 1 and 3. The second part, over twice as long, goes through the passages where he printed a different text from Pohlenz and Drexler, which number some 350.

Least rewarding is the chapter on layout, where he follows Lundström in approach but not in detail. From transpositions and erroneous repetitions acknowledged by all editors he argues that three ancestors of X must have had lines and pages of a certain length, and then he uses the figures in support of further proposals. The proposals themselves are never unreasonable, but many of the arithmetical arguments are weak. Where an omission caused by *saut du même au même* led to a transposition (pp. 55–6, 72–4, 76), length and distance can hardly matter, as Barigazzi pointed out against Lundström in *Athenaeum* 45 (1967), 440; and several corruptions that G. blames on accidents caused by layout look anything but accidental, e.g. one that attached *-rus* ('il residuo di un *rursus* erroneamente ripetuto') to a word that it happened to convert into another word (p. 86), or one that sandwiched *et perturbatione* between *curatione* and *medicorum conturbatio* (p. 91), or one that left a transposed word construable (p. 86 *cuius*, p. 92 *contineri*).

Elsewhere, the only pervasive fault is an uncertain grasp of clausulae. His few remarks on them, if not actually mistaken, are often couched in outdated language (p. 15 on 1.20, p. 23, p. 117). They would have strengthened some of his arguments (p. 30 on 1.53, pp. 40–1 on 1.98, p. 96 on 4.46, p. 123 on 1.14, p. 136 on 1.35, p. 179 on 1.92, p. 197 on 2.14, p. 204 on 2.18, p. 267 on 3.61, p. 285 on 4.8, p. 304 on 4.43), but they weaken others (p. 167 on 1.73, p. 180 on 1.96, p. 198 on 2.16, p. 210 on 2.27, p. 213 on 2.30, p. 225 on 2.43, p. 241 twice on 3.1, p. 269 on 3.66, p. 277 on 3.77, p. 324 on 5.10, p. 341 on 5.68, p. 342 on 5.70, p. 348 on 5.78, p. 352 on 5.87, p. 362 on 5.114). Similarly, he should have been wary of conjecturing *atque* before a consonant (p. 254 on 3.21, despite *T.L.L.* 1090.59–72 on *atqui*; p. 267 on 3.59).

His diagnoses are excellent. Even after reading through most of the book, I still found myself admiring afresh the trenchancy with which he disposes of *quia* at 5.73 (pp. 345–6). He invariably concentrates on the sense, and his main principles are that Cicero's exposition should be coherent and the language in keeping with his habits and grammatically unambiguous without the aid of

punctuation. Many of Cicero's habits he establishes himself by collecting examples from the philosophical works or the whole of the more formal corpus (pp. 7, 14, 61, 73–4, 77–9, 80, 85, 117, 124, 140–1, 143, 185–6, 197, 201–2, 255, 276, 300, 329, 363) or by looking in vain for examples (pp. 59–60, 66, 82, 83, 120, 131, 135, 139, 142, 153, 163, 325). The flames in which he then shoots Lundström and others down make an impressive spectacle.

Sometimes he offers a good defence of the transmitted text (pp. 123–4, 149, 168, 180), but usually he attacks it, often for the first time. He points out that it contains well over 1000 errors 'ammessi da tutti' (p. 339). Though he often disclaims for his own proposals anything more than suitability (unlike Lundström, who constantly declares that Cicero 'ohne Zweifel' wrote or did not write this or that), many of them are persuasive. For a sample see Shackleton Bailey's review of the edition, *Gnomon* 38 (1986), 735–6, or J. G. F. Powell's, *CR* 101 (1987), 29–31. 'Er hat wohl mehr als irgend ein anderer Herausgeber richtige Textänderungen beige-steuert'—words of Lundström's, no less (*Textkritik* p. 8). If I ever manage to edit the *Tusculans* for *O.C.T.*, I shall be better placed, I hope, to adjudicate on his proposals myself. Meanwhile, there are few that I can reject with any confidence. They include 5.107 *ignominiam* <, *damnum*> *nominis* (p. 68), where *nominis* can perfectly well be the word *exilium*; 2.109 *virtutis perfectae perfunctus est munere* (p. 184), where I cannot imagine why Cicero should have written *perfectae* instead of his usual *functus* (*perfectae perfecto functus* X: *perfecto* del. V²); 5.40 *parva* <vi> *metuit* (pp. 331–2), where the association of *vis* with *metuere* badly needed a parallel (for *parva* I should read *pauca* with Baiter, or *raro*); and 5.51 *illam boni*<s> *lancem* (pp. 333–4), which strains the word order.

Some years ago I had the experience of not believing what I read in the Teubner text of Censorinus and finding in the apparatus reasonable conjectures made by G., whose name meant nothing to me. When I investigated, he turned out to have published on philosophical doxography. I am glad to have met him again. If an Italian colleague was right to see in his edition of the *Tusculans* a 'terremoto testuale' (p. xv), then let us have more such earthquakes—even if not, alas, from G. himself, who at nearly 80 is entitled to a quieter life.

Pembroke College, Cambridge

M. D. REEVE

R. ONIGA: *Sallustio e l'etnografia*. (Biblioteca di Materiali e Discussioni per l'Analisi dei Testi Classici, 12.) Pp. lxxxiii + 97. Pisa: Giardini, 1995. Paper. ISBN: 88-427-0258-7.

The author aims to vindicate Sallust's ethnographical writing by setting it in the context of the Greek tradition which went back to Herodotus and was vividly represented in the generation before Sallust by Poseidonios. Of Latin writers, it is Cato in the *Origines* and Varro who, along with Sallust, represent that tradition, not Caesar, who wrote his ethnography with a more practical purpose and eschewed mythology and erudition in general.

After an analysis of the tradition Sallust inherited, the author examines in detail the digression on Africa and its peoples in the *Bellum Iugurthinum* Chapters 17–19. He then uses the characteristics uncovered there to analyse the significance of the considerable number of ethnographical fragments preserved from the *Historiae*. Finally, he turns to a vindication of Maurenbrecher's view that the third of his dubious or false fragments (p. 207 of his edition) does indeed belong after Chapter 19.6 of the *Bellum Iugurthinum* and goes on to make a reasonably strong case for its restoration in our text.

Sallust's claim to have used the *libri Punici* of King Hiempsal, even if 'interpretatum' here means 'translated', does not, according to O. (Chapter 4), mean that Sallust sought inspiration outside the Greek tradition. Hiempsal would probably have written on Punic subjects in Greek, so Hellenized was the Numidian as well as the Carthaginian élite at this time: along with other evidence, O. cites the first century B.C. inscription at Rhodes honouring King Hiempsal (*Ant. Class.* 44 [1975], 89ff.). However, O. eventually agrees with the theory that Sallust used a Greek work which merely claimed to rest on King Hiempsal's work (p. 62).

In accordance with this ethnographic tradition, Sallust's excursuses include mythological, aetiological, and etymological explanations for the location and customs of peoples. They also contain standard contrasts between the civilized and the barbarian, and assume, or even make explicit (as in Fr. III.74 M = 54 McGushin), that environment determines human characteristics. Sallust's readers, familiar with this tradition, will see that the geography of Numidia, with its fertile soil, treeless landscape, and dry climate (*Iug.* 17.5–6), ensures that these opponents of