

MISZELLEN

NOTES ON SENECA'S PHILOSOPHICAL WORKS

(A) *Epistulae morales*

15.4 *quoslibet ex his* (sc. *saltibus*) *elige* †*usum rude facile*†.

Of the various conjectures reported in the editions none which retains the adjective *rudis* in any form is in the least convincing. By far the best restoration is Haase's *quodlibet ex his elige: usu redde facile* (after Lipsius's *usu facile reddes*). On the same lines I suggest *quoslibet ex his elige: usus reddet faciles*.

15.9 *detraxi tibi non pusillum negotii: una mercedula est. unum* (dictum) *Graecum ad haec beneficia accedet: ecce insigne praeceptum, 'stulta uita ingrata est'* e.q.s.

est (post *mercedula*) Summers (W. C. Summers, Notes and Emendations to Seneca's Letters, CQ 2, 1908, 25): *et codd.*

I have inserted *dictum*, comparing 7.10 *quae occurrunt mihi egregie dicta*; 8.8 *ab Epicuro tam multa bene dicta*; 21.9 *Epicuri egregia dicta*; and especially 24.22 *quaeris quid huic epistulae infulserim, quod dictum alicuius animosum, quod praeceptum utile*. These passages are adduced by Préchac, who would merely understand, not insert, *dictum*.

41.5 *quemadmodum radii solis contingunt quidem terram sed ibi sunt unde mittuntur, sic animus magnus ac sacer et in hoc demissus, ut propius [quidem] diuina nossemus, conuersatur quidem nobiscum sed haeret origini suae; illinc pendet, illuc spectat ac nititur, nostris tamquam melior interest.*

Melior presumably means 'a superior being' to ourselves. No wonder Axelson had doubts about it; in his 'marginalia' (in: N. W. Bruun, Marginalia ad Senecae epistulas, Eranos 87, 1989, 74) he tentatively conjectured *monitor*, which has no attractions. I suggest *memor* (*illius*) (sc. *originis suae*) *interest*, and see a reference to the Platonic doctrine of anamnesis. In support of this I adduce the very similar passage at 92.30 *hic deos aequat, illo tendit originis suae memor*; note also 120.15 *scit enim quo exiturus sit qui unde uenerit meminit*.

95.12 *hoc interest inter decreta philosophiae et praecepta quod inter elementa et membra: haec ex illis dependent, illa et horum causae sunt et omnium.*

What are *elementa* and *membra*? 'Letters' and 'clauses', or 'matter' and 'forms of matter', according to Gummere; 'les éléments' and 'les pièces d'un organisme', according to Noblot. I think that the first of these three views is nearest to the truth, but that *membra* is a corruption of *uerba*; for the interchange of these two words see Ov. Met. 14.148, Manil. 2.758, Juv. 10.198, probably also Val.

Fl. 8.163. Lucretius (1.823ff., 2.688ff., et al.) uses letters and words to illustrate the relationship between atoms and compounds.

104.29 *tota illi* (sc. *M. Catoni*) *aetas aut in armis est exacta ciuilibus aut †intacta† concipiente iam ciuile bellum.*

For *intacta* (which has probably been assimilated to the preceding *exacta*) read *in* (*ciu*)*tate*. This is a conjecture of G. Windhaus, published in a Darmstadt dissertation of 1879 but almost entirely ignored; the only mention of it which I have seen is that of A. J. Kronenberg, *Ad Senecae Epistulas morales*, CQ 1, 1907, 211. (A similar, but less economical, solution is provided by Préchac's ungainly conjecture *aut in togata concipiente iam* (*ciu*)*tate* *ciuile bellum.*)

108.27 *hoc tempus* (sc. *aetatis*) *idoneum est laboribus, idoneum . . . exercendis per opera corporibus: quod superest segnius et languidius est et propius a fine.*

Propius a fine gives the reason why the latter part of one's life is *segnius et languidius*; perhaps therefore *et* before *propius* should be *ut*.

(B) *De beneficiis*

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 another verb, perhaps *sperat*". So Shackleton Bailey, *Emendations of Seneca*, CQ 20, 1970, 361. I think that ⟨g⟩*audet* would be more probable than *sperat*; Seneca goes on to say that such an ungrateful man *sensum beneficiorum amisit*; this includes the pleasure of receiving a benefit. Contrast the duly grateful man (§ 3): *at quem iuuat accepisse, aequali perpetuaque uoluptate fruitur, et animum eius a quo accepit, non rem, intuens gaudet.*

5.3.1 *Lacedaemonii uetant suos pancratio aut caestu discernere, ubi inferiorem ostendit uicti confessio. cursor cretam prior contigit: uelocitate illum, non animo, antecessit. luctator ter abiectus perdidit palmam, non tradidit. cum inuictos esse Lacedaemonii ciues suos magno aestimarent, ab iis certaminibus remouerunt in quibus uictorem facit non iudex nec per se ipse exitus sed uox cedentis et tradere iubentis.*

There are two problems in this passage:

(a) In the second sentence who is *illum*? He must be the defeated runner. One might argue that he is implied in *prior*, but I think it more probable that Seneca contrasted *illum* with a preceding *hic*, to be inserted after *cursor*; there is a similar contrast at 6.2.3 *ne hic dederit, ne ille acceperit*. The two changes of *illum* mentioned by Hosius (Gertz's *ille* and Pincianus's *alium*), and Kronenberg's *aemulum* (loc. cit. 285) are less attractive changes.

(b) At the end of the passage either *tradere* or *iubentis* must be corrupt. *Tradere palmam* is 'voluntarily to surrender the prize', but the Spartan who gives in (*cedentis*) does not order either himself or anybody else to surrender the prize. Madvig proposed to emend *tradere* to *parcere*, a very improbable change; and *tradere* derives support from the preceding *tradidit*. More probably it is *iubentis* which

is wrong; *confessio* at the beginning of the passage might suggest *fatentis*, but more satisfactory, I think, would be *uolentis*; at Stat. Silu. 5.1.83 I have suggested *uolentis* for the corrupt *iubatis*.

6.41.1 *ipsam hanc cupiditatem primo quoque tempore liberandi se meminermus ingrati esse; nemo enim (non) libenter reddit quod inuitus debet, et, quod apud se esse non uult, onus iudicat esse, non munus.*

I have inserted before *libenter* the negative which the sense seems to demand. Seneca here repeats what he has already said at 4.40.5 *qui nimis cupit soluere inuitus debet, qui inuitus debet ingratus est.*

6.42.2 *male agit qui famae, non conscientiae, gratus est.*

The two datives cannot be construed with *gratus*, because the sense is not ‘grateful to’ but ‘grateful (for benefits received) at the prompting of’ or ‘out of consideration for’. A word must be inserted to give the datives some construction. Rather than Gemoll’s *(gratia) gratus* (which seems crude) I suggest *famae (consultens)* (the omission could be explained by the similarity of *con-* to *non*). A perfect parallel will be found at Vell. 2.115.5 *ante conscientiae quam famae consultum.*

(C) *Dialogi*

8.8.2 *ad Carthaginensium ergo rem publicam sapiens accedet, in qua adsidua seditio et optimo cuique infesta libertas est, summa aequi et boni uilitas, aduersus hostes inhumana crudelitas, etiam aduersus suos hostilis?*

The last phrase can be construed only by supplying *crudelitas* with *hostilis*, but this spoils the concinnity of the sentence, because each of the four preceding phrases has its own noun (as well as adjective). I therefore suggest *(animus) hostilis* (ThLL VI 3052,78ff.), which gives a good clausula.*

Aberdeen

William S. Watt

*) I am very grateful to Professor J. Delz for commenting on an earlier version of these notes.