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A NOTE ON ABBREVIATIONS

A number of editions, books, and articles are frequently cited in the course of the text; the following abbreviations have been adopted for these to avoid a longer citation in each case:

Bourgery\textsuperscript{1} Bourgery, A. Sénèque Dialogues, De Ira. Paris, 1961 [1922].


Gertz\textsuperscript{1} Gertz, M.C. Studia Critica in L. Annaei Senecae Dialogos XII. Copenhagen, 1874.

Gertz\textsuperscript{2} Gertz, M.C. L. Annaei Senecae Dialogorum Libri XII. Copenhagen, 1886.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Author</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Details</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
CONSPECTUS SIGLORUM

MSS in Textu Viansino:

B     Ambrosianus B 2 sup., saec. xiv in.
C     Ambrosianus C 293 inf., saec. xiv.
E     Estensensis K.c. 5.3. (Lat. 924), saec. xv ex.
F1    Florentinus pl. 76,35, saec. xv.
F2    Florentinus pl. 76,38, saec. xiii.
F3    Florentinus pl. 76,41, saec. xv.
G     Guelferbytanus (Gud. 10), saec. xiv.
M     Malatestianus S. XX. I, saec. xiv.
Par   Parisinus M.L. 15086, saec. xiii.
P2    Palatinus 1539, saec. xv.
P3    Palatinus 1542 [1540], saec. xv.
Scor  Scorialensis Q I 8, saec. xiv.
Ven   Marcianus Latinus 268 (cl. XII 141), nunc 1548, saec. xiv.
S     Bononiensis 1137, saec. xiv.

Viansino follows Gruter for these Palatini manuscripts, but while Gruter II is Palatinus 1539, Gruter III is Palatinus 1540; Palatinus 1542 contains the Letters, but no Dialogi.
MSS de Scriptis Hijmans et Forder (H-F):

B Berolinensis (M.Lat.Fol.47), saec. xiv.
C Mediolanensis C 85 inf., saec. xiv.
F = F3 supra
J = F1 supra
K Vaticanus Lat. 2215, saec. xiv.
M Vaticanus Lat. 2212, saec. xiv.
N Vaticanus Lat. 2204, saec. xiv.
W Palatinus Lat. 1541, saec. xv.
X Vaticanus Lat. 2214, saec. xiv.

δ Parisinus (Bibl.Nat.) 6390, saec. xiv.
η Parisinus (Bibl.Nat.) 7698, saec. xiv.

Sigla de scriptis Reynolds:

β classis codicum, derivatorum de A.
γ classis codicum, non deriv. de A.

MSS Nova:

F4 Florentinus, Laurentianus pl. 89, sup.70, saec. xiii.
Vat1 Vaticanus Latinus 5941, saec. xiv in.
Vat2 Vaticanus Basilicanus C 121, saec. xiv.
Vat3 Vaticanus Chisianus H. VII 259 (2023), saec. xv.
Vat4 Vaticanus Chisianus H. V 153 (1917), saec. xiii.
Vat5  Vaticanus Reginensis Lat. 1454, saec. xiv.

Vat6  Vaticanus Rossianus 559, saec. xv.

MS in textu omnium:

A    Ambrosianus C 90 inf., saec. xi ex.

A₁⁻⁶  manus correctorum in ms.A, saec. xii-xv
      (in textu Hermes, nec non m₁⁻⁶).
CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION AND SCOPE OF STUDY

This dissertation is the result of the study of manuscripts of Seneca in Italy. The study produced first of all a catalogue of the manuscripts, compiled from printed and handwritten inventories, including genuine and spurious works of Seneca the Rhetorician and Seneca the Philosopher.¹ The printed sources were covered

¹The distinction between the elder and younger Seneca seems not to have been made in the medieval period. Inasmuch as many of the inventory entries were made uncritically from the manuscripts themselves, it became necessary to note all occurrences of the work of both. In fact if any distinction was made, it was between a Seneca tragedian and the other Senecas. The work of Sicco Polenton gives a good idea of the state of the discussion in the first half of the 15th century. The following extracts are from B.L. Ullman, Sicconis Polentoni Scriptorum Illustrium Latinae Linguæ in Libri xviii, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 1928, reference by page and line:

His parentibus nati fratres sibi duo sunt, Iunius Annaeus Gallio et L. Annaeus Mella, Lucani pater. De Lucano quidem et tragico Seneca, nostri moralis Senecae filio, actum satis existimo superioribus libris cum dicendum de poetis fuit. p. 466, 26-29 (The passage on Seneca tragicus is p. 116, 15ff.)

Again in listing Seneca's works he writes:

Ad filios vero Novatum, Mella, et Senecam (tragediarum hic auctor fuit) scripsit Civilium Causarum
through the catalogue collections of the Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana and the Biblioteca Nazionale Vittorio Emanuele II in Rome. The handwritten inventories of the

seu Declamationum libros viii. p.495, 8ff.

He answers the objection that Seneca the moralist also wrote the tragedies:

Tragoedias etiam hoc isto morali a Seneca scriptas opinio pervulgata dicit. Sed ista de re puto explicatam ita libris superioribus esse, cum de poetae sermo habendus fuit, quod esse nihil existimem amplius unde quisquam illis assentiat qui nominis aequivocatione decepti auctorem earum nostrum hunc Senecam esse putant. p. 496, 3-8.

The confusion between the Senecas even at this late date is important to show what continued into the inventories. A good summary of the history of the confusion, which derives from Sidonius Apollinaris, Carmen IX, 230-240, can be found in Giorgio Brugnoli, La tradizione manoscritta di Seneca tragico alla luce delle testimonianze medioevali, Atte della Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, Rome, 1957, 213-214 and especially note 38, p.214. The first to distinguish the father and the son was Raffael of Volterra (Comm. urb., ed. 1559, p. 446). See also P. Faider, Études sur Sénèque, Gand, 1921, p. 280, especially chapter 19 in the Vita Senecae by Paulus Pompilius, "Quae scripserit Seneca?" Faider surveys Sicco's life of Seneca, pp. 132-133. Brugnoli cites scholars of the 13th and 14th century who have the confusion, among them Sicco Polenton and Coluccio Salutati who in a letter of 1371 (Ep., I, 150-155 Novati) maintained a distinction between philosopher and tragedian, distinguishing two Senecas, Lucius and Marcus. Laurentianus, pl. 37,13, the Etruscus, gives the author of the Tragedies the name Marcus Lucius Anneus Seneca. A letter of Coluccio Salutati prefaces a manuscript of the Tragedies in the Laurentian, pl.37,5; he states there:

...admiratus sum illas vulgares opiniones Senecam ethicum Neronis preceptorem colluctatorem Pauli tragediarum auctorem fuisse nec temere assentiendum vulgo arbitreor.

Brugnoli feels the confusion in Sidonius Apollinaris
libraries of Rome and Florence as well as the major libraries of Naples and Venice were consulted. The preliminary catalogue of manuscripts has weaknesses inherited from such printed sources as Mazzatinti. Its strength lies principally in the independent consultation of a number of manuscripts in the Vatican, Rome, Florence, Naples, and Venice; but difficulties occur even here which must limit the usefulness of any preliminary list without more extensive personal examination of manuscripts indicated enigmatically in the inventories. An example in point is found in the Vatican collection of the Archive of St. Peter.

---

derives from Martial Ep. 1,16,7-8 and 4,40,2. Sicco Polenton according to the inventory of Pal. Lat. 888 wrote a Life of Cicero and a Death of Seneca, f.51-85: "Iste liber tractat de morte Senece data sibi per Neronem crudelissimum imperatorem per Sicionem Polentonum." I have not consulted that manuscript, but the death of Seneca is a popular medieval exemplum and occurs frequently in the inventories. Some accounts seem to have been derived from Tacitus.


3 G. Mazzatinti, Inventari dei Manoscritti delle Biblioteche d'Italia, later with A. Sorbelli, complete through 87 volumes in 1968. Kristeller gives a survey of the libraries covered through volume 82. It should be noted that for many of the smaller libraries Mazzatinti is the only source.
Prior to 1967 there existed only a well worn handwritten inventory of this collection, Ms. H 101, a typed copy of which was made available for the catalogue room in 1967. In 1968 there appeared a three volume inventory of the collection which attempted to give a description of the contents of each manuscript. One of the 14th century, C 121, was listed in the handwritten inventory by incipits and explicits to a large number of works which referred to a table of contents. The number of folia was given as 335. The 1968 inventory was more detailed and showed that this was a very extensive collection of the works of Seneca. Not all inventories have had this revision. Such a diligent searcher as Russo overlooked this manuscript for the first edition of his *Apocolocyntosis* which

---

4 The inventory contains two notices for the De Beneficiis, f.210v a compendium in 7 books and f.283-313. (Other manuscripts have double entries for one work, e.g. Vat.Lat. 2211, 2212, 3087, 5062.) The manuscript also contains the Ad Polybius although it is not mentioned in the inventory. This is a common occurrence, however, since the beginning of this work has been lost in A (Ambrosianus, C 90 inf.) and is often run together with the De Brevitate Vitae in later manuscripts. One suspects the same situation for the De Vita Beata and De Otio which are joined in the manuscripts, although here the damage is in the archetype (See Hermes' note at the end of the De Vita Beata in the Teubner text, p. 230-231.).

5 The 4th edition of Russo contained reference to this and other manuscripts gained through the offices of the Institut de recherche et d'histoire des textes in Paris, see C.F. Russo, L. Annaei Seneca Divi Claudii *ΑΠΟΚΟΛΟΚΥΝΤΟΛΩΣ*, Florence, 5th edition, 1965. This
brought many previously unknown and unused manuscripts to light. The possibility of new discoveries is not limited to the minor collections of the Vatican. The Vatican Latini and Palatini are relatively little covered by published catalogues and the lesser known collections such as the Chigi, Romani, and Barberini are covered almost exclusively by handwritten sources. I have made note of over 100 manuscripts of Seneca in the Vatican not current edition is a reprint of the 4th edition. Russo published a preliminary list of the manuscripts and a discussion of their relationship in *La Parola del Passato*, 1 (1946), 241-259; this is similar to the preface of his text. Many of the manuscripts he lists were in printed sources but had not been discussed by editors; Rossbach, for example, in an article in *Philologus* 51, N.F.5(1892), 512-518 had noted the Basilicanus C 121 reference. Russo's 4th edition also notes other manuscripts that have come to light since the first edition of his work. There is yet a Florence manuscript of some importance that has not been published, but I hope to do so in the near future.

See Kristeller's remarks in *Iter Italicum* on the Vatican collections, vol.II, London, 1967,p.xviii. The researcher must still travel to Europe for these manuscripts. The microfilm collection of the Vatican at St. Louis University is only about 60% complete and, of course, no such services exist for other Italian libraries in this country. One trip to St. Louis specifically to study Vat. Lat. 2214 and 2215 turned up the fact that these were not available, although they kindly offered to order them. The St. Louis collection has advantages in that one can consult more material in a longer daily period of time, and they do have complete records of the handwritten inventories and the valuable card index covering individual works, incipits, explicits, owners, scribes, and other material otherwise difficult to track down.

The call numbers of manuscripts in Italy containing any of the Dialogi are listed in Appendix B.
listed in either printed catalogues or in the Vatican card index, which covers some material not yet published. Many contain little more than spurious works and many are known to editors from previous searchers. C.E. Stuart

8C.W. Barlow, *Epistulae Senecae ad Paulum et Pauli ad Senecam [quae vocantur]*, Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome, 10(1938), p. 69 and p. 80 estimates the number of manuscripts for this work at about 300. One early manuscript not in his list of pre-12th century codices is Rome, Biblioteca Vallicelliana D 3. For the De Formula Honestae Vitae, an epitome of Seneca's lost De Officiis, see the introduction to the work in C.W. Barlow, *Martini Episcopi Braccensis, Opera Omnia*, New Haven, 1950, and C.W. Barlow, "A manuscript of Seneca in the Library of Indiana University," Speculum 9(1934), 322-324. In the opera omnia the number of manuscripts is given at 635 including French and Italian translations, the earlier article had the figure at 425. The De Formula Honestae Vitae went under Seneca's name as De Quattuor Virtutibus and later De Copia Verborum. For a different view of the development of this text Barlow directs the reader to B. Haureau, * Notices et Extraits de Quelques MSS latins de la Bibliothèque Nationale*, Paris, 1890, II, 195ff.

Another problem that is destined to plague the searcher is that inventory notices are sometimes made only by the first work or author occurring, or by some general phrase as miscellanea moralia or Seneca et alia. None of these give much clue to contents, but the searcher should note particularly the number of folia for the total manuscript, or if works are listed, the number of folia for each work. One soon becomes accustomed to how many folia are proportionally needed in a manuscript for each work. My own discovery of an unknown Apocolocyntosis manuscript came about in this way in that a common sequence of works was listed by an irregular number of folia. The preliminary catalogue at least gives a starting point and shows the scope of the material available. For a survey of the works of Seneca, see Faider, pp. 109-122.

9C.E. Stuart, *Tragedies of Seneca*, Dissertation, Cambridge, 1907; articles in *Classical Quarterly*, 5(1911), 22-41 and 6(1912), 1-20. His notebooks exist in Trinity College library, Cambridge; the catalogue has been continued by Alexander MacGregor who has sent me preliminary


11Otto Foerster, Handschriftliche Untersuchungen zu Senekas Epistulae Morales und Naturales Quaestiones (Diss. Würzburg), Stuttgart, 1936.

12L.D. Reynolds, The Medieval Tradition of Seneca's Letters, Oxford, 1965, and his text in the Oxford Classical Series, 2 vols., 1965. For his work on the Dialogi, see "The Medieval Tradition of Seneca's Dialogues," Classical Quarterly, 62(1968),355-372. This work came out after my initial gathering of manuscripts and selection of material for study, but has been most stimulating on aspects of the indirect tradition. We only coincidentally both treat one important manuscript, Chisianus H V 153. I am indebted to Reynolds and Wilson, Scribes and Scholars, Oxford, 1968 for first notice of omissions of lines in the later manuscripts as a clue to family groupings. This guided my selection of some manuscripts as a late test group.
while for the Dialogi Fickert, Gertz, and Reynolds did much.

The present study, going beyond the rather uncritical listing of the manuscripts, surveys a number of new manuscripts in an attempt to determine their textual value. The area selected is in the prose works, De Providentia of the Dialogi. The Dialogi were singled out since the present standard text relies so heavily on one manuscript, Ambrosianus C 90 inf., as the best manuscript, while later manuscripts are for the most part dismissed as recentiores and deteriores. These come into use only where manuscript A is physically lacking or where later manuscripts are at hand for an editor. The Ambrosian manuscript is itself

\[13\] C.R. Frckert, Senecae Opera, Leipzig, 1842. This work was unavailable to me, but was treated with ample reference in later discussions and editions, see especially, Otto Rossbach, De Senecae Philosophi Librorum Recensione et Emendatione, Breslauer Philologische Abhandlungen,II,3, Breslau, 1888; reprinted Hildesheim, 1969. Fickert treated the material more extensively in, Prolegomena in novam oper- um L. Ann. Senecae philosophi editionem, Naumburg, 1939. This was also unavailable to me. For Reynolds, see note 12, for Gertz, note 17 below.

\[14\] Especially De Ira and Ad Polybium, see above note 4. None of the manuscripts studied repairs the gap between De Vita Beata-De Otio, nor the lacuna in Book I De Ira. Reynolds dates Chisiánus H V 153 as the oldest of the recentiores, but it had received no attention before his work and this study. Par. Lat. 15086 had been considered the oldest, while Berolinensis M. Lat. Fol. 47 had been considered the best of the later manuscripts. Reynolds feels this latter manuscript is a copy of the Chigi codex. Antonio Fontán, "Algunos Codices de Seneca en Bibliotecas Espanolas y su Lugar en La Tradicion de Los Dialogos," Emerita, 17(1949), 9-41 and Emerita, 22(1954), 35-65, lists (p. 9-11) other notable manuscripts used by editors.
relatively late\textsuperscript{15} although it is the earliest of any known manuscripts and in the calligraphic but difficult Beneventan hand.\textsuperscript{16} It has suffered correction by as many as five hands\textsuperscript{17} as late as the 15th century. These corrections, if not from some independent source, survive in the text with some patina of A's respectability.\textsuperscript{18} This study first compares the new manuscripts at those points in the text where

\textsuperscript{15}The Dialogi were little known before the period of this manuscript, the latter half of the 11th century. See especially Reynolds\textsuperscript{1} who traces the earlier history of the text; see also Klaus-Dieter Nothdurft, Studien zum Einfluss Senecas auf die Philosophie und Theologie des zwölften Jahrhunderts, Leiden, 1963, who in his early chapters traces the history of each of Seneca's works with particular reference to the medieval catalogues. See also Appendix C. The text tradition of the Dialogi is only germinating toward the beginning of the 12th century and is still somewhat sparse in the 13th.

\textsuperscript{16}The Teubner edition by E. Hermes did not benefit from the later study of this hand by E.A. Loew, The Beneventan Script, Oxford, 1914, and few editors seem to have made much use of the work which is essential on many points.

\textsuperscript{17}E. Hermes, L. Annaei Senecae Opera Quae Supersunt, vol. 1, fasc.1 [Dialogi], Leipzig, Teubner, 1905, vii-x disc the hands mostly from the work of Gertz; see especially L.A. Senecae Dialogorum Libri XII ad Codicem praecipue Ambrosianum, Copenhagen, 1886. I acquired a copy of this work only very late; it does not materially change any of my conclusions although I have added notes where Gertz is most helpful. See also Appendix D. Gertz's views on the later manuscripts and troublesome points in the text tradition are presented in his review of Rossbach in Berliner Philologische Wochenschrift, 9 (1889), 372-376, 402-408. Gertz's Studia Critica, Copenhagen, 1874 is also helpful. See Hermes, p.xiii-xiv for the recentiores.

\textsuperscript{18}For additional caveats on these see Reynolds\textsuperscript{1}, p. 369. My theoretical approach treated in Chapter II makes a
A has suffered correction by A¹, A², or A³ since these are earlier than the known recentiores and may have derived from manuscript sources. Secondly, an attempt is made at classification of the new manuscripts with those already known, while a commentary is provided to support the classification and to add evidence for the value of an apparently independent manuscript. The conclusions drawn from the study of a single text are applied to a consideration of the corpus of the Dialogi and the archetype. Particular attention is given to the physical condition and lacunae of manuscript A and how this affects the later manuscripts and the construction of the archetype.

The De Providentia was selected because its recentiores have received the most extensive treatment thus far. But there were other reasons for studying an clear distinction between the later correctors and A² and A³ which antedate any of the recentiores and represent, I feel, a different type of correction.

The comparison was facilitated by Viansino's recent publication of the text of the De Providentia that made great use of citation of the recentiores in the apparatus as did his earlier Paravia series texts. See Giovanni Viansino, L. Annaei Senecae De Providentia De Constantia Sapientis (Dialogi I-II), Rome, Athenaeum, 1968. Viansino does not clearly explain how he selected the recentiores. His list is not the same as in his previous editions of the Dialogi.

individual dialogue, the primary one being the occurrence of an important manuscript containing only the De Providen-
tia and my own procedural conviction that each work must be looked at individually rather than as a group of Dialogues.\footnote{This seems to be a procedural point of Hijmans and Forder as well by implication from p.40,n.1, "vix pro certo novimus eadem traditionis fumine omnes ad nos pervenimus dialogos. neque in omnibus extantibus totus numerus praeserv-
vatis: alii ex aliis codicibus absunt dialogi." They might have added order of occurrence within the collection. It seems that if A were not extant, the approach to these manu-
scripts would be different and all the labor would be worth the price. But even with A the fact that part of its text is damaged and that it contains a great deal of correction would be sufficient to merit the research. The presence of A has exerted too much of a "best manuscript" approach over the text. This seems to be Reynolds' defect although one must certainly agree that the establishment of a stem-
ma is a difficult matter; Hijman's stemma (p.55), even con-
sidering the number of manuscripts involved, is so compli-
cated as to give doubt that the procedure will eventually have value.

Hijman's article, "Two manuscripts and a commentary" Mnemosyne 21,1968,240-253, counts his earlier effort as due to "youthful optimism" and substitutes instead a logical concept of interlocking circles to show degrees of rela-
tionship. I hope my own belief is not so much optimistic as realistic, namely, that until there is a complete descrip-
tion and study of the manuscripts, any elimination of them would be premature and any text published under these circumstances should be a working text which would show the broad groupings of the recentiores. A complete listing of the readings (except for the most obvious spelling problems) would tend to show the more solid groupings and the more interpolated manuscripts. For a scholar with such a text, the relatively few manuscripts that have still escaped detection would need no massive effort for classification. Such a text would also provide something useful beyond the author's text, which is the primary goal of the editor. It would provide the history
archetype existed that contained all the Dialogi. To work from this premise allows the more easy elimination of manuscripts as a group, but does not provide for the of the text for comparison with that of those who have found Seneca a rich mine or who have only once or twice used the text in their own writings. The use of the Dialogi is admittedly sparse, but the example of Bacon cited by Reynolds gives pause to consider the question. (Bacon and Seneca appear together in one Vatican manuscript Latinus 4086 although only the De Clementia of Seneca is represented). This is an area that seems more endless than the present question about the recentiores, but one for which classical scholarship could provide some tools.

Hijman's second article anticipated my arguments above but was available to me only after the previous had been written. In turning to the larger group of manuscripts to which those under study belonged he stated, "we must face some rather intricate problems, the first of which is the question, raised by Bourgery, whether the Dialogues as a group of writings share one ms. tradition. The very fact that our mss. do not contain all the Dialogues of Hermes' edition and that there is little regularity to the order in which they are exhibited would make it methodically wrong (italics mine), to expect at the outset that the answer will prove to be positive. We shall have to determine the groups of interrelated manuscripts separately for each dialogue and thus obtain the material needed to answer the question in how far the traditions are connected." Hijman's note at this point gives some important statistics, but only roughly, "Among over 100 mss. I know only six or seven that offer the Dialogues in the same sequence as A (Ambrosian C 90 inf.). Another seven, among them W, show the order as in H...Since my list is still far from complete there is little sense in giving full statistics. Many mss. have only one or two of the Dialogues...."(p.243). My own catalogue, as far as it goes, supports this. Hjman's apparently feels more mss will come to light, an opinion unchanged from his earlier article, "Plures apparituros diligentem bibliothecas insipienti satis constat."

(p.44) My own search has not been complete enough to suggest that all have come to light for Italy.
possibility that individual dialogi had an independent tradition obfuscated by inclusion within the collected Dialogues. The procedural difference is that instead of working from the fact of a manuscript of the 11th century (possibly the Ambrosian),\textsuperscript{22} one would work from the premise that each of the works had an independent tradition or that there was more than one collected group. There has been little speculation, for example, about when, where, and in what manner the works of Seneca were gathered into a corpus or corpora.\textsuperscript{23} Later opera omnia show no homogenous

\textsuperscript{22}Reynolds p. 356 quoting Loew, p.50,n.5, would at first allow no more than this tentative identification. Loew cites there the books definitely known as done under Desiderius with their present locations and adds, "There are several other MSS which may be successfully identified with books named in ancient Cassinese catalogues. But this subject deserves separate study." Since the Seneca was not mentioned in the first group, it possibly falls into this last category. Further discussion by Reynolds shows he feels that the Ambrosian is indeed the Seneca mentioned in the Desiderian chronicle. Loew, p.71, has the book as coming from Monte Cassino, "The book may have been presented by Monte Cassino to a monastery of its congregation. The script is unmistakably Cassinese in type." Fol. 2\textsuperscript{V} has a 15th century ex libris: "iste liber est...Congregationis Casinensis signatus sub numero..."

\textsuperscript{23}A. Bourgery in his edition of De Ira gives some attention to the problem. After showing that the term dialogi can be extended at least to the De Clementia and De Beneficiis and to some of the lost works of Seneca he turns to the collection commonly called the Dialogues. The order is arbitrary, certainly not chronological. Supposing a Christian as the editor of the collection, one can understand the De Providentia as the lead work. Given these conditions, he does not feel the necessity of maintaining
character in their texts, but instead reflect the variety in the textual tradition of the various works. The apparently independent transmission of the various groups of Seneca's works points to the possibility of independent transmission within the corpus of the Dialogues. The confusion of the De Vita Beata and De Otio in A, not corrected by any other manuscript, would simply put those two works together as an ancient group while the question of the beginning of the De Ira would not be so neatly resolved as

the dialogues in the traditional order of A. His own grouping is presented which does not, for example, put the De Vita Beata and the De Otio together, although my remarks about this group would find that a minimum need. One principle of selection is common dedication, which plays some part in the combination of the De Providentia and the Letters in the Florence manuscript studied in this present paper. See for further comments A. Bourgery, Sénèque Dialogues, De Ira, Paris. 1961[1922], Budé edition, xii-xiii. On the term dialogi see also O. Rossbach, "De Senecae dialogis," Hermes, 17(1882), 365-376.

24 Alexander MacGregor communicated to me that of nine mss. represented as opera omnia none has a text of the tragedies in common with any other and in fact two mss., Vat. Lat. 2212, 2213, possibly by the same scribe, do not share the same text. A comparable situation is found in two English manuscripts of the complete text of the letters. They have a "Common Archetype for letters 1-88, but the Harley manuscript has succeeded in adding letters 89-124 from another source." This happens although they occur in a rare period for the complete text and geographically close together. (Reynolds2, p. 123).
Reynolds has done it. The difficulties from a practical point of view are many, but the procedural difference adds a proper note of caution, a good corrective to the general dismissal of the later manuscripts; even Reynolds who eventually comes up with a family possibly independent of A (his γ group) starts his discussion with a conclusion: "It is clear that the later manuscripts have at the most a modest contribution to make to the text and there is a limit to the amount of time and energy which should be expended on them."26

Undoubtedly because of the maze presented by the recentiores, little work has been done on a stemma of the Dialogues. Reynolds more or less rejects the possibility of establishing anything more than general groupings because of the obvious later horizontal corruption.27 His basic procedure is to find manuscripts dating from the

26Reynolds, p.363.
27Reynolds' article (p.363-372) is a discussion of the point; he specifically rejects (p.363,n.3) the stemma and conclusions of Hijmans and Forder, which Hijmans himself later revised (see n.21 above with the discussion of Hijman's idea.) The process is weakened by the fact that the two correctors A² and A³ are also dated to the 12th century. The relationship of correcting hands to the manuscript tradition is discussed below.
period when the text is still rare and to start with these as being most likely free of interpolation, the period is the 13th century. The present paper does not intend to make any definitive classification, since the material under study is limited and borrows in method from the two approaches. Limiting the material from the manuscripts to the De Providentia (Hijmans' one dialogue procedure) a collation is made of the readings with some attempt at classification into groups as being close to A or not. For those that are not close, the question arises as to the source of their readings: scribal conjecture, interpolation, independent tradition? Closely connected with this is the question of the source of the readings of the later hands in A. Even within the group of manuscripts related to A readings occur that antedate the correctors' hands in A.

Apart from the question of the dating and identification of each of the correctors' hands in A, there seems to be a likely possibility that would further confuse the picture of the recentiores and this is that A may well have served as an exemplar throughout the medieval period and not just

28 This begs the question but does correspond to Reynolds' point that what really matters is whether any of the recentiores are independent of A. Unfortunately none of the manuscripts I selected from my preliminary study in Italy fall into Reynolds' possibly independent γ group, but we both agreed in the selection of Chigi H.V. 153 as an important manuscript previously neglected by scholars.
at the beginning of the proposed stemma in the 11th century. It would seem likely that a manuscript that was so often corrected (kept up to date?) may have been serving not just a comparative role but actually served as a continuing exemplar copy. As the original manuscript became encrusted with readings of whatever source, the new copies would have taken on the appearance of interpolated texts.  

A comparison with manuscripts that had had their beginning with the Ambrosian manuscript at some different point in the chain would not necessarily give any distinctive results due to the possibility of independent reinterpolation and corruption. The important point in the end is not to establish a criterion for accepting manuscript readings on the basis of manuscript age (for a reading may be older than the manuscript and from one now lost) before a

---

**Reynolds conjectures much the same thing as a possibility in discussing the problem of the correctors in A:** "Other changes which appear to have been made by the same hand are obvious interpolations and various views are possible about their origin. They could be conjectures on the part of A² and A³; or they could have been taken from the archetype, if we assume that it had suffered correction since A was copied from it in the eleventh century, a likely enough occurrence; thirdly, they could have been taken from an independent but interpolated copy of the archetype."(p.369) But, of course, one has simply carried over the same problems to one or more hypothetical archetypes of the posited manuscript readings that have found their way into the corrected A text. It assumes as well extended collaboration between A and the archetype of A. Hijman's idea of showing relative corruption of traditions
presumed corrupted period, but rather to treat all readings
in the critical text with comparatively equal respect and
depend upon critical judgment for the reading included in
the text, a critical judgment formed from passages where
no doubt of corruption occurs. This seems to be about the
best that one can expect with a text that exhibits obvious
corruption.

Reynolds¹ (pp. 368-369) shows the likely existence of
at least one other manuscript at Monte Cassino itself in
discussing the question of the readings of the completing
hand in the beginning of the De Ira, designated by the lower
case letter a, and this likely independent of the Ambrosian
manuscript. The possibility of at least one source of
readings can be assumed as a working premise. A note of
cautions about the recentiores can also be added from other
texts in the Seneca corpus, specifically the Letters where

seems better than forcing a stemmatic method on manuscripts
that do not fit, even by a careful selection of dated
material.

The assumption of collaboration between A and its
archetype over a long period of time is complicated by the
fact that the Ambrosian manuscript has no clear history
through the medieval period but in 1583 was in the posses-
sion of a certain Caracciolo and then in 1603 in the pos-
session of Fredericus Borromaeus who put it into the Am-
brosian library where it has remained until this day.
the discovery of the Q manuscript\textsuperscript{30} has given validity to a number of readings that had long puzzled editors as being intrusions in the text; at the same time it gave new status to readings previously considered as corrections or interpolations. In the end the fact that readings may be interpolations in no way invalidates them so much as they do the stemmatic method for the text in question. Instead of a clear recension-emendation transition one is forced to keep both processes in his mind as he prepares the text. This necessitates as well the notation in the apparatus of any variants that have any claim to significance.\textsuperscript{31}

\textsuperscript{30}Interestingly enough this manuscript, Brescia, Quirianus B. II. 6, was first reported as 14th century, A. Beltrami, "Index codicum classicorum Latinorum qui in Bibliotheca Quiriana Brixieni adservantur," Studi Italiani 14, 1906, 17-96. It was not until 1913 and 1914 in two articles in Rivista di filologia that Beltrami showed the significance of this manuscript in preparation for his 1916 edition. This points up the difficulties in dating manuscripts in a rapid survey by anything more than general impression. Other manuscripts have suffered bouts of favor or disfavor as they have been dated upward or downward even in leisure. C. Cipolla, "Il Codice Queriniano delle Epistoloe Morali di Seneca," Rivista di filologia 42(1914), 93-95 confirmed a 9/10th century dating for the manuscript.

\textsuperscript{31}Significant is a very difficult concept in this context. It must include at least a test of the principles upon which the text is being established and would likely produce different results for different editors, Bourgery, de ira, p.xvi, gives his criterion in discussing what was to be done with the erratic spellings found in A, "Inutile
The present study differs from Reynolds' conclusions in that the procedure suggested here demands a more careful method for the elimination of manuscripts by individual Dialogi. It produces, I think, more optimism that productive results can be gained from the study of recentiores. It shares the original hope of Hijmans and his later modification that the mass of later manuscripts can be worked into a rough stemmatic grouping that will produce a sounder text, but also one that leaves the eventual solution of the

...d'ajouter que nous ne mentionnons qu'exceptionnellement dans notre apparat critique ces divergences d'écriture. Notre but a été, en un mot, de publier un texte correct, aisément lisible, scientifiquement établi, mais sans vaine curiosité d'érudition." But one finds sometimes common abbreviations running through the recentiores that seem to be the most likely source of corruption in other recentiores.

The scribe of A adds probability to this theory, Hermes, p.vii: "Ac primus quidem librarius (A aut A¹), latinae linguae non admodum peritus, ea quae in codice archetypo invenerat summa cum fide, sed non aequali cum cura descripsit." Such a description does not fully correspond to Loew's high opinion of the scribes and their rules (p. 309), but that manuscript A is not signed is probably because the scribe was not the best (p.320), nor even a master. Leo, who flourished under Desiderius (p.329), could not have been the scribe, nor did he have the patience and care of the later Ascarius who spent 20 years in copying the Pauline Epistles (Naples VI B.3), noting the day and hour he began(p.322).

For the readings in general, Bourgery¹, p.xv, states, "Il n'est malheureusement pas toujours facile de discerner si ces variantes sont des vestiges du texte authentique ou des corrections arbitraires, dues à l'ingéniosité de certains copistes lettrés." See also J. Marouzeau, "Ce que valent les manuscrits des Dialogi de Sénèque,"Revue de Philologie, 37(1913),51 who decried the state of the text for language study; Bourgery³(p.189) felt the criticism exaggerated, but did point to a need for principles as a basis for the selection of readings.
problems open for later scholars and recentiores yet to be found. One would not in the future be faced with scattered arguments on the value of the manuscript readings and even then only briefly cited.\textsuperscript{32} The study goes further, too, in speculating on the nature of the hyparchetype of A, which, I think, weakens that manuscripts' position as the supposed source of most of the recentiores; but real clarity may only come at some later time when the problems have a sharper focus and even more fragments of the indirect tradition can be brought to illuminate the question of the predecessors of all the manuscripts. "....a toto particulam revelli placet et unam contradictionem manente lite integra solvere."\textsuperscript{33}

\textsuperscript{32}A text such as the Teubner, whose editorial principle is rejected, offers very little help in understanding the tradition of the readings the author found interesting in the later manuscripts. Some passages in have served as focus points for all editors, but they have not resulted in any better understanding of the relationship of the later manuscripts. The key may be elsewhere. Viansino's test is an improvement for the study of recentiores, but a text is needed that selects the recentiores on some principles.

\textsuperscript{33}Seneca, \textit{De Providentia} 1.1.
CHAPTER II


The introduction briefly covered some of the major issues in the study of the relationship between the existing manuscripts. The question, briefly put, is whether any of the later manuscripts is independent of the Ambrosian C 90 inf. This question is related to the reconstruction of an archetype or the hyparchetypes of the manuscripts. The crucial passages as outlined by Bourgery (pp. 191-2) are: a few chapters in the De Ira, the end of the De Vita Beata and the beginning of the De Otio, and very probably the beginning of the Ad Polybium De Consolatione. For the archetype of all the manuscripts it would seem a minimum necessity to posit a run-together De Vita Beata and De Otio, since these two works have not been separated in any of the manuscripts, nor the lacuna between them filled in any known manuscript. More serious problems are found in the other areas and especially the De Ira. The value of the later manuscripts particularly hinges from the questions raised in the De Ira and there has been little unanimity on the answers. The following
discussion will treat the areas listed above and their relationship to the formation of the corpus archetype while maintaining the theoretical approach of studying the individual dialogues separately.

The Ambrosian manuscript was apparently copied from an exemplar which lacked the De Ira from 1.1.1-1.1.3 damnatos... since the scribe in copying left five sides blank (Reynolds¹, p. 368) between the end of the De Constantia Sapientis and the beginning of the De Ira in A at 1.1.4 tamquam. A hand, dated variously from the 12th-15th century, filled in the portion of the text from 1.1.1-1.1.3 on f. 14r. This still left a lacuna that exists in all manuscripts. The intervening blank folia were then cut out. What I have not seen discussed is whether the exemplar of A also had a space which would indicate to the scribe that a portion of the text was missing and could possibly be filled in from another source. There is no indication that scribes were aware of the problem between the De Vita Beata and the De Otio. What is more, no one suggests that the hand that eventually filled in the missing portion of the De Ira was contemporary with the writing of manuscript A. The earliest date, by Reynolds¹ (p. 68), is the 12th century, by which he feels that previous arguments to show that there must be texts independent of manuscript A have been put to rest. The argument
is that manuscript A could account for the text from 1.1.1-1.1.3 in all later manuscripts, since the texts of all manuscripts exactly coincide in material and the writing in manuscript A antedates all known recentiores. The De Constantia Sapientis, which immediately precedes in the A text, ends with accipere sapientem. explicit Incipit Ad Novatum De Ira liber primus fe li ci ter and would have provided a clue to the scribe that something was amiss with what he was about to copy. There are no incipits or explicits between the De Vita Beata and the De Otio to indicate to a scribe that the texts should be separate; the works, written together in the manuscripts, end with no explicit. ¹ A space of two lines was left, however, in which a later hand wrote an incipit for the De Tranquillitate Animi, which is the work that follows in A. A likely explanation would be this: The scribe had been cautious and had left a space at the beginning of the De Ira because the same was presented to him in his exemplar. This would fit the picture we already have of the

¹There are similar problems in the Ad Polybium De Consolatione where the work is run together in the later manuscripts while A has problems of its own (see Hermes, pp. 309-10), but these will be discussed in a later chapter. Gertz, p. vii of his text, had already suggested an explanation similar to what follows for the erasures.
scribe of A. The archetype (or hyparchetype) of A had also suffered damage between the De Vita Beata and the De Otio, but here without any apparent physical clue to the scribe who copied just what he saw in the manuscript. (He had no reason to consult the table of contents as he was now writing the 7th or 8th dialogue.) As the scribe finished what he thought was the De Vita Beata, he came upon an explicit such as Ad Serenum de otio explicit in­ cipit ad Serenum de tranquillitate. The scribe possibly was aware that it was the De Vita Beata that he had begun and hence omitted the subscription only to be more con­ fused by the strange beginning of the De Tranquillitate Animi. Turning to the table of contents of the manu­ script (see Hermes, p. vi) he found his solution in the three works listed Ad Gallionem De Vita Beata, Ad Serenum De Otio, and Ad Serenum De Tranquillitate Animi. With no real reassurance about either the title of the work or the name Serenum from what he had done of the De Otio and what he saw at the beginning of the De Tranquillitate Animi, he omitted the explicit altogether and possibly even erased the puzzling name. The manuscript today shows an erasure, probably of a name, before the De Otio, in the table of contents although the erasure could just as easily have been by the later hand that added the
notices for the spurious letters of Seneca and Paul and the epitaph of Seneca. The scribe of A may have also been responsible for the omissions and confusions at the beginning of the De Tranquillitate Animi, but this elaborate hypothesis has another point. The explanation above\(^2\) tends to show that there was no manuscript at hand with which the scribe could compare texts and remedy the corruption. If this is clear for the De Otio-De Tranquillitate Animi transitions,\(^3\) then it would seem that the scribe left the space at the beginning of the De Ira only because it was left in his exemplar. This exemplar then would be a hyparchetype for A and not the archetype of all the manuscripts. The date of the hand that added the portions of the De Ira missing in the manuscript A would not upset this hypothesis. The reason is that with space left in the exemplar of A, it must itself have been copied from a manuscript with the same condition, and these manuscripts could not be the source of the beginning of the De Ira.

\(^2\)I follow here for the erasures the procedure Alexander would use in the text, W.H. Alexander, Notes and Emendations to the XII Dialogues of L. Annaeus Seneca, Edmonton, 1934, preface: "Of these principles the most important is the belief that in many passages a proper explanation of the ms. reading proves much more satisfactory than emendation."

\(^3\)Even another defective manuscript would have given him some assurance that he could not improve the text.
The passage eventually filled in still leaves a lacuna; the scribe who filled it in would be the scribe of β to Reynolds. 4

For the De Ira at least this would mean that there must be another hyparchetype to account for the passage. If the hand a dates from the 12th century and the manuscript was at Monte Cassino to be interpolated into the A text, one has a terminus ante quem and a location for a second hyparchetype. This may be represented as follows:

\[ \text{Figure 1} \]

What is not clear is whether the a manuscript presents anything more than the text of the De Ira. The stemma could apply to corpus transmission or only to the text of the De Ira as one would prefer; for at least in the case

---

4See the quotation page 31, The filled-in portion also points to an archetype for this passage comparable in corruption to that found between the De Vita Beata and the De Otio.
of manuscript A there is ample evidence from the preceding arguments to show that A was copied from a hyparchetype containing a corpus of dialogues and that manuscript A was not the collecting manuscript of the dialogues. It is also evident that the damage to the text between the *De Vita Beata* and the *De Otio* found in A and all the later manuscripts so far surveyed was in the archetype for that text and any corpus archetype.

There is another bit of evidence in the *De Ira* to suggest that we are justified in positing, at least for this work, a hyparchetype independent of the one suggested for A. The pertinent passage is *De Ira* 3.8.8 *antequam* <robur accipiat> alit se, where the words in brackets are found only in some of the later manuscripts but impress many critics as genuine. Gertz, who in contrast to Rossbach was the staunchest proponent of the total superiority of A and gave it a position as the source of all the later manuscripts, was particularly puzzled at

---

5See Reynolds1 (p. 367). We do not suggest here that robur accipiat is the key to the classification of all manuscripts, but only that it gives a firm bit of evidence that a tradition of the *De Ira*, other than that found in A, exists. Giorgio Pasquale, *Storia della Tradizione e critica del testo*, 2nd ed., Florence, 1952, p. 392, discusses the passage in the context of readings derived from ancient codices outside the archetype. He has all Seneca manuscripts deriving from A for the *Dialogues*. 
this passage and wrote (Studia critica, p. 99): nunc, quid faciam, nescio. It is evident that here is another stream for the text of the De Ira beyond the portion filled in. Some critics, supporters of A, had hoped for a manuscript derived from the same source as A but before its corruption by loss. The extension of this textual stream to the other dialogues is not justified, but in view of this evidence the working procedure discussed in the introduction seems imperative, and that is to treat each of the manuscripts individually, keeping in mind that there may be an independent tradition of the text as well as a tradition derived from transmission within a collected corpus. Bourgery, who seems to advocate as much, hoped that the evidence that he found for the De Ira could be applied to the other dialogues.

---

6Bourgery, p. 376. It should be noted that his explanation of the hyparchetype of A is different (p. 370): Il est probable, d'ailleurs, que A est une copie directe de l'archétype; d'abord la lacune y est signalée par une feuille blanche (remplie seulement au xivᵉ ou au xvᵉ siècle), idée qui ne serait guère venue au copiste, s'il n'avait constaté de visu la détérioration de son modèle; d'autre part, certaines lectures fautives soit dans A, soit dans les autres manuscrits, laissent supposer que l'archétype était en écriture lombarde et qu'il n'est pas beaucoup plus ancien que A." See also Marouzeau, p. 47.

Viansino (p. 16*-17*) has a different view about the archetype with which I agree: "Come l'Ambrosiano, così l'archetypus degli altri codici derivano da un esemplare in scrittura maiuscola...e continua." He cites the following passages from De Providentia: P.2.6 ascendere excendere A extendere Ω; P.3.2 nécant; négant A Par.;
The evidence for the other Dialogues is not so striking in clarity either for principle or result. The question is further clouded by the problem of interpolations and the correcting hands in the Ambrosian manuscript. The suspicion that the Dialogues are interpolated is set very early with the example from the beginning of the De Ira. As fortunate as the inclusion of the beginning of the De Ira was, the usual problem is in ridding

P.1.2 ex dispositive relucentium FlF3, ex dispositive lucentium Scor, ex dispositive lucentium A, ex dispositive lucentium Ω; P.2.8 interritus: intus ictus ParE; inter ictus M; P.3.6 rus suum: rursum Par; P.6.6 quo deum; quod eum A quod EF3. The manuscripts under study could have added to this list; some passages from the categories I, II, III to come and the correcting hands are also instructive: P. 2.10 nobile sedet A, nobiles edet A²; P. 3.6 cingeretur A (g corr. ex c fort. m.2); P. 4.1 prospera/resed (d expuncta et t s. scr.) A¹-²; P. 4.4 aliter cum A¹ ut vid., corr. in aliter quam A²; P. 5.5 dii mortales A¹ corr. m. 2 in di immortales; P. 3.3 aquo (g corr. ex b) A²; sic sunt corr. ex sistunt fort. A¹; P. 2.10 una manu latam volq. una anulata A; P. 3.6 ad focum, ad focum ex aff. corr. A¹-²; P. 6.3 illo set A² corr. A³ in illos et. The picture for scriptura continua seems to be very clear and should remove the archetype to a period much before A. What is not clear is whether it was in Beneventan. There are other errors that one finds in A that point to such a feature, see Loew (p. 283): "The orthographic features which may be regarded as in a measure typical of Beneventan MSS, since they form rather constant traits of their physiognomy, are frequent confusion of b and u, d and t, and the spelling michi and nichil." There are examples of this which will be seen in the list of A corrections. A feature which seems to plague Vat5, ci and ti confusion, could stem from Beneventan even though a common error in late manuscripts. I mention it here only because such a passage of importance will be discussed later. Loew (p. 283) has: "The Beneventan scribe regularly reproduced assibilated ti in words like natio, petitionem, citius, etc /patientiā/ by means of
the archetypal text of interpolations. The great amount of correction in A casts the shadow of interpolation even later, not only for A, but particularly for the recentiores. These manuscripts are eliminated by some editors who use the fact that they are interpolated as the reason; but the fortunate and first instance of known interpolation has strange results for the recentiores as Reynolds¹ (pp. 368-69) points out:

But the really curious fact emerges when we consider the B manuscripts. Had the manuscript from which they descend (B itself) been copied from A before the addition of 1.1-2.3, we should expect them to omit this passage; if later, we should expect them to have it in the same form in which it is found in A. They do neither. They present us with this same

which is a form of ti especially reserved for soft ti. Save through some error he scarcely ever writes ci for the sound." A later scribe who probably pronounced -ci could easily mistake the symbols even if he were making a school effort to distinguish them. Loew is instructive throughout and should be closely consulted when constructing the text. A point will arise on the confusion of ego and ergo, the normal abbreviation being q with understandable confusion, for which the editor should consult Loew's list of abbreviations.

Returning to Viansino, the quotation above points to his working procedure of two hyparchetypes. Another editor of Seneca's Dialogues does the same and constructs a stemma much like that on p. 27, L. Castiglioni, "De quibusdam deterioribus codicibus Senecae opuscula de ira continentibus disputatio," Athenaeum, 1 (1913), 98. Marouzeau, Revue de Philologie, 37 (1913), p. 47, constructs a similar stemma, as did Gertz¹, p.xxvii, at first.
fragment of the de ira, but, although they have taken the bulk of their text from A, they have not taken de ira 1.1-2.3 from a. They have taken it from a different source, and one close to γ. This can only mean that the original β text was copied from A when A still had a blank at the beginning of the de ira, i.e., not later than the twelfth century; faced with an obvious lacuna, the scribe did exactly what a was to do under the circumstances—he filled up the gap by referring to another manuscript. The source from which αβγ have taken the beginning of the de ira must ultimately be the same, since they present us with the identical fragment. This makes it evident that this great monastery has preserved for us the whole sum of the text of the dialogi.

This last point is important for Reynolds, as is his dating of the hand to the twelfth century. He argues that the complete text of the Dialogues from a purely Italian source moved after this northward to France, which was something of a hotbed of Senecan activity in the twelfth century; but while the ultimate source may

---

7 See Klaus-Dieter Nothdurft, Studien zum Einfluss Senecas auf die Philosophie und Theologie des wölfften Jahrhunderts, Leiden, 1963, introductory chapters and especially his graphic map after p. 218. A cautionary note is found p. 15: "Die meisten Handschriften waren in den französischen Bibliotheken vorhanden. Hier bemerken wir zunächst Sammelbände aus deren Titel der Inhalt nicht hervorgeht." The presence of the Dialogues is not precluded by the catalogues. The fact that other works are mentioned by name leads to speculation that some references are indeed to the Dialogues; see for example, Nothdurft, p.19; in Pomposa in 1093 for Seneca are listed the Letters, De Beneficiis and De Clementia and "alii utiles." The Dialogues suggest themselves as worthy of the name to a
be the same, because of the exact coincidence of the material with a remaining lacuna, it is evident from Reynolds' own note three (p.368) that it was not the same manuscript that accounts for the text. Therefore, while a derives from the same stream as βγ for the beginning of the De Ira, the manuscript that accounts for a is not the same, nor does the evidence point to its location. A conjectural stemma with place locations might be constructed thus:

Christian, rather than for example, Natural Questions. Works such as De Formula Honestae Vitae have an early text tradition and cannot be discounted. The tradition of the Tragedies is not quite as old as that of the Dialogues. As for placing the various branches and hyparchetypes, a comparison with the text of the Natural Questions is suggested, which are relatively late and derive in their complete form from a family located in France, while in their defective form, they derive from an apograph of the archetype in Northern Germany which found its way to other areas of Germany and Italy. The Tragedies, too, have a text tradition divided between Italy and the continent. There is an ambiguous reference at the end of the 12th century in the catalogue of the Benedictine Monastery at Bamberg, Senecae Ad Novatum 1.1 which could be either the De Ira or the Declamationes of the elder Seneca. See Nothdurft, pp. 17-18 and Rossbach, p.6. This title for the Declamationes is not unusual as my catalogue shows and as the quotation of Paris 8542 by Nothdurft points out; they should easily be the alii utiles.
A had become the exemplar for a number of manuscripts $\beta$, both $A$ and $\beta$ lacked the beginning of the De Ira. A source $x^a$ existed for this portion of the text, but in at least three forms $\alpha\beta\gamma$, one of which found its way into the $A$ manuscript, i.e., $\alpha$, and another which found its way into the $\beta$ manuscript, with the possibility of interpolation even from the third. Only the $\alpha$ text can be placed at Monte Cassino with $A$, not the text $\beta$ or $\gamma$, nor the manuscripts copied from $A$ which had most likely been sent on their way. It should be cautioned again that the stemma conjectured speaks only to the text of the De Ira. A likely projection suggested is that two texts existed in the twelfth century, one of Italian origin lacking the beginning of the De Ira and another of unknown origin that had a faulty completion of the beginning of the De Ira. It is also suggested that both traditions go back to the
to an archetype faulty between the *De Brevitate Vitae* and the *De Otio* and faulty at the beginning of the *De Ira*. As it happens, no pure $\beta$ manuscript exists of those so far surveyed, i.e., one in which the beginning of the *De Ira* is totally absent.  

**A Method for Studying the Recentiores**

The need for working with the other dialogues to find sources possibly independent of A derives not only from the scepticism one gains from the text of the *De Ira* but also from the correcting hands in A, which Gertz has

---

8 The manuscripts copied from A, perhaps even A itself, as Loew suggests, were probably sent to other monasteries. It would be only natural that the scattered manuscripts would complete the beginning of the *De Ira* with different texts. Perhaps Desiderius caused some intensive search for those parts of the text. If so, possibly no manuscript existed even in the eleventh century to right all the omissions. The Monte Cassino Chronicle lists only the simple name Senecam between *Ovidium Fastorum* and *Vergilium cum egloga* at the end of a long list of classical and Christian authors (Loew, pp. 81-82).

Some Seneca, in a Beneventan hand of the twelfth century, exists in the British Museum in Harley MS 3021. See E.A. Lowe, "A New List of Beneventan Manuscripts," *Studi e Testi*, 220 (1962), 211-244. I have not seen the manuscript, nor do I know whether it is related to the entry in the 12th century Monte Cassino chronicle.

9 Gertz, L. *Annaei Senecae dialogorum libri xii*, Copenhagen, 1886. His identifications were taken over into Hermes' text, p. vii-x, from which I have taken the descriptions. On the matter of corrections in Beneventan manuscripts, see Loew (p. 294) where the impression is that correction was not a precise job.
labelled A² to A⁶. Reynolds¹ (p. 369) is doubtful of the dating and, indeed, Gertz in his Studia critica was not so certain on a number of points.¹⁰ Despite this caution about the identification and dating of the various correcting hands, they do, I feel, offer the best avenue to establishing the possibility of independent transmission for the individual dialogues. Doubt can reasonably be cast on such items as expunging dots, but marginal and textual additions are not so easily dismissed nor are they in the same category as additions or corrections written over erasures. Hands A² and A³, not later than the twelfth century, deserve our attention on these points because it is in this period that the A manuscript added the text at the beginning of the De Ira sometime after the production of at least one posited manuscript, β, that did not contain the fragment. The addition of the De Ira manuscript gives at least some probability that A² and

¹⁰The passages in the De Providentia Gertz discusses in dealing with the additions are: P. 1.3 quae alienis locis; P. 3.1 quae adversa et abhominanda; P. 3.9 fidei documentum; P. 3.11 idem istic taceat; P. 4.3 nullam occasionem difficilior; P. 5.5 vocem audisse memini with no clear distinction of hands. For the last passage Gertz writes: "Ergo si ipsius librarii manu hoc adscriptum est, sine dubio recipiendum est; sin autem posterioris lectoris (sic) conjecturae debetur..." The apparatus in Hermes follows Gertz closely, see p. ix, but it does not reflect any doubt on this passage.
A\textsuperscript{3} derive from manuscript sources rather than the conjecture of learned scribes.\textsuperscript{11}

The changes can be listed in three categories:

I. Additions of A\textsuperscript{2} and A\textsuperscript{3} in the text or in the margin.

II. Additions or corrections over erasures by A\textsuperscript{2} and A\textsuperscript{3}.

III. Corrections or additions assigned to A\textsuperscript{1}.

There are a rather large number of passages for the work of A\textsuperscript{1-3} in the text and point to a careless scribe\textsuperscript{12} or a corrupt hyparchetype of A. Their value for the later manuscripts seems to be this: Where later manuscripts read the pre-corrected A form in Category III above, one could assume that such readings existed in the hyparchetype of the tradition, X\textsuperscript{A},\textsuperscript{13} or even X\textsuperscript{A} if the transmission

\textsuperscript{11}The study of Hijmans and Forder results in a number of passages in which they feel the readings in the later manuscripts must derive from a source other than A; a number of these coincide with corrected passages in A. Their study was of many more manuscripts by a different process but arrived at some of the same significant passages.

\textsuperscript{12}This fits the picture we have already of the scribe of A, see Introduction, Note 31.

\textsuperscript{13}A desideratum as a test would be a pure B manuscript, i.e., without the beginning of the De Ira, a manuscript certainly derived from A before any known tampering with the text. The correcting hand A\textsuperscript{2}, non-Beneventan, Gertz dates to not long after the writing of A. The
only by corpus is proved. It is only a possibility that such readings exist in the hyparchetype because both the pre-corrected form and the corrected form are visible in the text and subject to selection by capricious scribes. A manuscript with a great preponderance of such pre-corrected A readings would more probably derive from the hyparchetype. None of the manuscripts studied had a preponderance of pre-corrected A readings.

Manuscripts of whatever source should contain the additions in the margins or text of A added by $A^2$ or $A^3$. If such readings are from an independent source with fewer omissions than A, then one would expect to find the passages in manuscripts derived from that independent source; manuscripts derived from A should also show the readings since they have been introduced into the text

Ambrosian manuscript had possibly left the sphere of Monte Cassino before the text was added at the beginning of the De Ira. A more intensive look at the dating of the a hand in the De Ira is in order. The Ambrosian manuscript itself has been variously dated, but with copying of the text pointing to the Abbot Desiderius in the 11th century, the question would seem to be resolved. See for previous debate on the Dialogues Faider, Études sur Sénèque, p. 115 with the note. Nothdurft (p. 11) still mistakenly associated the Abbot Disiderius (1058-87) with the Lombard King.

The process here is analogous to that for treating primitive readings of manuscript B of the letters, See Reynolds, pp. 54-56.
by hands earlier than the recentiores. There may, of course, be readings that had not found their way into the A manuscript. The A manuscript, although superior to the later manuscripts, has numerous defects so that even its supporters must accept corrections from hands A²-A³ and even some from the later correctors. To accept A as the best manuscript is not to deny that it has defects. The minimum number of these defects is the total of corrections in Categories I and II and the omission of the beginning of the De Ira. These defects have been corrected and not likely all by scribal conjecture.

Category I readings produce a negative check in that manuscripts which do not show the inclusions are probably derived either from A before it was corrected, the corrupt archetype of A if we assume a careful scribe, or from A again but copied by a careless scribe who selected at random what he wanted from the text offered. A more careful later scribe may have compared texts if his exemplar presented readings added in the margin or over other lections, or he may have simply written everything he found. This is the beginning of interpolation and inclusion of glosses. Category II readings are not very helpful in the beginning stages since here the original reading of A has been lost and it is against the original reading that we are testing the recentiores. They
do provide some assistance later in that manuscripts which through comparison with readings in Groups I and III show some signs of development from a hyparchetype provide a test for evaluation of the readings in Category II. The operative class, then, is Category III, but even here not all the readings are of a distinctive nature. These are points that will be discussed in evaluating the results and in the commentary on the text in light of the manuscripts.

The manuscripts and the sigla to be used are:¹⁴

F4  Florence, Laurentian. Pl. 89, sup. 70, 13th century, parchment.

Vat1  Vaticanus Latinus 5941, early 14th century, parchment.

Vat2  Vaticanus Basilicanus C 121, 14th century, parchment.

Vat3  Vaticanus Chisianus H. VIII 259 (2023), 15th century, parchment.

¹⁴A full description of the manuscripts and contents will follow in an appendix. All manuscripts were studied in person and preliminary collations were made to determine the texts for selection. Final collations, in my possession, were made from microfilms also in my possession. The general principles for selection were age and relationship to pre-corrected A as well as general closeness to the text of A. It was felt that manuscripts close to pre-corrected A provide the best hope for restoring a hyparchetype. Later manuscripts that had corrected A readings were selected to provide a control.
The first task is to check the working hypothesis against the manuscripts, i.e., to compare the manuscripts against the passages in Categories I, III, and II.

**CATEGORY I**

**ADDITIONS OF A² AND A³ IN THE TEXT OR IN THE MARGIN**

**P.1.3** quae alienis locis conspecta: quae alienis conspecta A locis s.v. add. A²

quae alienis locis conspecta
F4 Vat1 Vat5 Vat6

**3.1** quae adversa et abominanda: om. A¹ in marg.
add. A²

quae adversa et abominanda
F1 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

quae om. Vat1 s.v. add. sunt

**3.6.** fodit? quod bellum tam: verba quod bellum in marg.
add. A² punctisque significavit post fodit inserenda esse.

quod bellum tam F4 Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

om. tam Vat2 Vat3
3.9 illum documentum fidei, documentum: verba fidei
documentum in marg. add. A²
et post documentum inserenda
esse significavit

illum documentum fidei documentum F4 Vat1 Vat5

illi fidei documentum Vat6

3.11 idem iste taceat: iste s.v. add. A²

idem iste taceat F4 Vat1 Vat2
Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

4.3 nullam occasionem difficilior: occasionem in fine
versus omissum in marg. add. A²

nullam occasionem difficilior F4 Vat1 Vat5 Vat6

4.11 praeceptores, qui plus laboris: preceptores
laboris A¹ inter haec verba
s.v. add. A² qui plus

praeceptores qui plus laboris F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5
Vat6

4.4 vocem audisse me: audisse in marg. supplevit m,2
et post vocem inserendum esse
significavit

vocem audisse me F4 Vat1 Vat2
Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

5.10 timor et pavida: et s.v. add. A² cum codd.
Ovidii timor et pavida F4 Vat1
Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

5.11 via; escendo: via. exscendo (aut & scendo) A¹
via//escendo A³

via excendo F4 Vat2

via ascendo Vat1 Vat6
The readings in all cases have supported A corrected readings. This would be the case if the manuscripts derived from a source used in correcting A or if the manuscripts were derived from A or copies of A after it had been corrected by A² and A³. Comparison now with the readings in Category III, those ascribed to A¹, should separate the two classes. Any manuscript derived from A should have only the readings of corrected A while those that have pre-corrected A readings could either be from a source independent of A, or be derived independently from the hyparchetype of A or be interpolated copies of the A tradition, especially late manuscripts that have had time for the readings to insinuate themselves into the tradition. The last would be a difficult choice, but
another question arises. If manuscript A was being corrected by A^2 and A^3, why would not also the original corrections of A^1 have suffered change? Probably because they agreed with the readings found in the correcting manuscripts, but it also seems that the early correcting hands A^2 and A^3 do not make changes where a previous hand has corrected. Thus A^2 rarely adds anything where A^1 has corrected, nor does A^3 where either of the others has corrected. This was left to later correcting hands to take up. These late readings are not good for the process suggested here because they post-date some of the manuscripts under study. It is hoped, for example, that if early traditions can be separated, the source for later corrections can be found. For the moment it is presumed that they are more likely to be scribal emendation or possibly the reinterpolation of an earlier reading that has since lost its identity by scribal change and error.

CATEGORY III
CORRECTIONS OR ADDITIONS ASSIGNED TO A^1

P.2.5 matres indulgeant: indulgeant corr. A^1 ex indulgent
matres liberis indulgeant F4
matres indulgeant Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
2.11 spectasse: spectasse A corr. vid. ex. exsp-
spectasse F4 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat6
expectasse Vat1
exspectasse Vat5

3.3 necant: necant ex negant corr A1
necant F4 Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
negant Vat1 Vat4

3.7 damnaverunt causam: damnaverunt d causam (d del. m.1) A
damnaverunt causam F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

3.7 senatorum capita: senatorum et capita A1 sed et postea del.
senatorum capita F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

3.7 trucidata: trucidata A (ci s.v. add. m.1)
trucidata F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4

3.8 quid ergo: supra quid solito compendio scriptum i adpicta est in A

3.8 ostendi: ostendit in -di corr. A1
ostendi F4 Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
onedi Vat2 Vat3
3.9 erit gloriae: gloriae (corr. vid. ex -ria) A
gloriae F4 Vat

3.10 solacium: solacium (ci ex u corr.) A
solacium F4
solatium Vat1

3.14 honore: honore corr. ex. honere A
honore F4 Vat1 Vat5 Vat6
onore Vat4
Vat2 Vat3 om. a deterioribus... grave est

4.4 bello; Triumphum: belli triumpho nunc A, sed b
m.1 corr. ex u, i radendo factum est ex o [ultimum o in ras. scripsit A5 eraso ug (supra s deletam m) aut u]
belli triumpho F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

4.4 ego: ego (g corr. ex. r) A
ego F4 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

4.4 Tib. Caesare: tj (i.e. tibi) fort. A
G. Cesare Vat1 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
T. Cesare Vat4
Ti. Cesare F4

4.8 qui exeunt: qui (q corr. ex e) A
qui exeunt F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
4.8 imperator meruit: in ras. scr. A\textsuperscript{5}; ex A\textsuperscript{1} scriptum imp tantum dispicitur

ipo meruit F\textsuperscript{4} in margine

imperator meruit Vat\textsuperscript{1} Vat\textsuperscript{2} Vat\textsuperscript{3} Vat\textsuperscript{6}

imp\textsuperscript{2} om. meruit Vat\textsuperscript{5}

4.11 verberibus admotis: verberibus (corr. ex verbere) A\textsuperscript{1}

verberibus F\textsuperscript{4} Vat\textsuperscript{1} Vat\textsuperscript{5} Vat\textsuperscript{6}

4.13 sic sunt:

sicsunt corr. ex sisunt fort. A\textsuperscript{1}

sic sunt vel alia similia F\textsuperscript{4} Vat\textsuperscript{1} Vat\textsuperscript{2} Vat\textsuperscript{3} Vat\textsuperscript{4} Vat\textsuperscript{5} Vat\textsuperscript{6}

4.13 ferendo:

efferendo A\textsuperscript{1} sed ef corr. ex

ex ej sive quid aliud ante a fuit

sufferendo F\textsuperscript{4}

efferendo Vat\textsuperscript{1} Vat\textsuperscript{2} Vat\textsuperscript{3} Vat\textsuperscript{4} Vat\textsuperscript{6}

offendo Vat\textsuperscript{5}

4.16 animo ferre:

ferre A\textsuperscript{1} in ras., ante a esse

vid. scriptum

ferre F\textsuperscript{4} Vat\textsuperscript{1} Vat\textsuperscript{2} Vat\textsuperscript{3} Vat\textsuperscript{4} Vat\textsuperscript{5} Vat\textsuperscript{6}

5.3 configi:

configi A, figi in ras. (pro

stgi?)

configi F\textsuperscript{4} Vat\textsuperscript{1} Vat\textsuperscript{5} Vat\textsuperscript{6}

5.9 fati fuit ut bonis:

fati fuit ut bonis A\textsuperscript{1} in ras.

praeter litteras fat et nis

fati fuit ut bonis F\textsuperscript{4} Vat\textsuperscript{1} Vat\textsuperscript{2} Vat\textsuperscript{3} Vat\textsuperscript{4} Vat\textsuperscript{5} Vat\textsuperscript{6}
5.9 nectuntur: nectuntur A (un in ras. m.1)
nectuntur F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

5.10 escendere: escendere (aut extendere) A
escendere escendere F4
extendere Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

6.1 aliquid mali deus fieri, ille vero non patitur:
deus s.v. add A1 F4 Vat5 Vat6
om. totum versum Vat1
add. in marg. aliquid mali deus fieri et post viris patitur inserenda esse significavit Vat3
ille vero non patitur om. Vat3

6.2 repetituri: repetituri A (ti s.v. add. m.l)
repetituri F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
totum versum quidni cum...occiduntur om. Vat4

6.5 fulgetis: fulgetis corr. ex fulgentis A
fulgetis F4 Vat1 Vat4 Vat6
fugetis Vat4
fulgetis Vat5

6.6 felicitate: felicitate/// corr. ex
felicitatis ut vid. A1
felicitate F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
6.6 tristia:  

tristia corr. ex. tristitia A  
tristitia F4  
tristia Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6  

To summarize, Vat2, Vat3, and Vat6 do not at any time agree with a pre-corrected A reading. The other manuscripts in a few places agree with a pre-corrected form of A in Category III. (All the manuscripts had agreed with forms of A in Category I.) The hypothesis is that those manuscripts separated out by comparison in Category III would either be from a source independent of A or developed independently from a hyparchetype or be interpolated copies. It should be noted that manuscripts F4, Vat1, Vat4 are the earliest manuscripts of the group and less

---

15 This was expected from other studies not reported here in which Vat2 and Vat3 by a large number of common omissions showed themselves to be in one group of late manuscripts and though they occasionally shared an omission with the other manuscripts studied, they were in terms of relative stemmatic time far removed from them. By this is meant that no matter what the date of a manuscript its readings can be characterized as early or late in a stemmatic tradition. Thus a 15th century manuscript could be copied from some 9th century manuscript and be termed early compared to a twelfth century manuscript that had run through a number of apographs of the same 9th century manuscript with a presumed accretion of errors peculiar to each age. The situation exists in the Apocolocyntosis, for example, where the S manuscript is said to be earlier in the sense of closeness to the archetype even though the V manuscript is older in age and would in the more usual meaning of the words be closer to the archetype.
likely to be interpolated,¹⁶ Vat4, in fact, is the earliest known of the recentiores.

The passages in which the manuscripts agree with pre-corrected forms of A for each manuscript are:

F4: 
Vat1: 2.11 3.3 4.4
Vat4: 3.3 4.8
Vat5: 2.11

The passages are not many,¹⁷ but this was not expected in view of the doubtful attribution of hands in the Ambrosian manuscript and the nature of the readings. The doubtful passages seem to be these:

P.2.11  expectasse Vat1  exspectasse Vat5 which agree with the pre-corrected form of A but the

¹⁶According to, for example, Reynolds' hypothesis of using early manuscripts to avoid problems. Vat4 (Chisianus H.V. 153) derives according to Reynolds from A. If this is true, the process I have attempted here would seem to be invalid except that the two passages P.3.3 and P.4.8 by which Vat4 is included in the group are not significant in terms of the Introduction, note 34, or the principles of Paul Maas, Textual Criticism. Such results more likely invalidate the identification of hands by Gertz. The nature of the passage and the readings must be taken into account.

¹⁷It is presumed that the list could be lengthened from the study of other recentiores. Some passages, such as P.2.11, could eventually be added when independent manuscripts are found, but in the test stages the examples should follow the hypothesis conditions closely.
correction can not be certainly identified. There is considerable confusion, as one would expect, between sp- and exp- or exsp- in the manuscripts studied. The confusion is as much phonetic as graphic, see V. Väänänen, Intr. au Lat. Vulgare, Paris, 1963, p. 49 §83.

4.8 The passage is doubtful because of the work of A5.18

4.13 sufferendo F4 offendo Vat5. There is again no indication of a correction date which would invalidate this passage for test purposes, but such passages do offer possibilities for restoring pre-corrected A readings and hence the hyparchetype if independent manuscripts are found.19

18To have included later correctors would not have been valid since the manuscripts under study pre-date those correctors, particularly A5. A4 did not work in the De Providentia. A4 is still in the South Italian hand and makes it unlikely that the A manuscript has wandered far from its origin. The reading under discussion here is included inasmuch as it points to difficulties with abbreviations which will be discussed and which were touched on in the Introduction, note 34.

19The hypothesis and method I have suggested would do at least this and would provide service to A. Such a correction of A would be helpful in overcoming Marouzeau's
6.5 fulgetis Vat5 The change could easily have taken place independently with a careless scribe.

These doubtful passages eliminate Vat5 from the independent list. Of the other passages, the reading at P.3.3 negant Vat1 Vat4 does not make a strong case; for while Viansino hoped that the correction by A\textsuperscript{1} here pointed to a maiuscule script, the c and g confusion is a regular feature of Beneventan (See Loew, pp. 284-85 for the list). Viansino's argument still has some force in that the case for scriptura continua seems most likely and the two coupled point toward an archetype written earlier than just before A itself, i.e., earlier than the end of the 11th century, and not likely in Beneventan. A's hyparchetype could have been in Beneventan, but again, the real problems of the nature of the archetype of the manuscripts is simply postponed to a conjectural period.

The readings of F4 at P.6.6 and Vat1 at P.4.4 do mark these manuscripts off as retaining primitive readings, possibly from an independent source.\textsuperscript{20} These manuscripts objections to the text as it now stands (Introduction, note 31).

\textsuperscript{20} It could be remarked that all visible readings of A\textsuperscript{1} are in the hyparchetype if we have a careful scribe, the point of the process is that by testing those that have been corrected against earlier recentiores, one can
should help in determining which readings in Category II derive from early manuscript sources rather than later scribal conjecture. Where one of these manuscripts and uncorrected A agree, one should consider these as hyparchetypal readings whereas agreement with the corrected form is inconclusive. From the previous results, one should expect that it would be F4 or Vat1 which would agree with pre-corrected A. Occasional agreement among the other manuscripts should occur but most likely with the conjunction of F4 or Vat1 if the assumptions and results are to hold. Such readings in these manuscripts should be considered interpolations. It is Category II where the readings are most likely to vary, inasmuch as the assignment of a date to erasures is a very difficult matter, nor can one know certainly what the previous reading was or what was in the text as apographs were made at different times from A.

determine that for some readings these were likely in the hyparchetype and not the conjectures of later scribes. One is continually forced to make decisions where there has been change, not where there is nothing in any manuscripts to suggest difficulty. Whether the readings are authentic or not is not important. The passages that are thus developed can be used to test other recentiores with less fear of interpolation. It is hoped, again, that the process applied to other manuscripts will produce more passages. The critic's interest is easily drawn to passages that through manuscript variation invite even his later helping hand. Alexander's principle is to let the manuscripts do it themselves.
CATEGORY II

ADDITIONS OVER ERASURES OF A² AND A³

P.1.3 pluvias:  pluvias corr. m², plubias A¹
   pluvias F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

1.4 sed quereris:  sed quereris corr. m², sed queris A¹
   - quereris F₄²¹
   quereris Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5
   - qris Vat6²¹

1.5 escendere:  excedere A¹ corr. in escendere A²
   extende F₄
   extendē Vat1 Vat5 Vat6
   excēdē Vat2
   extedē Vat3²²
   ascendere Vat4

2.4 patientia:  patientia ex patia corr. A²
   patīa F₄
   pacīa Vat5
   patientia Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat6

²¹Inconclusive result because of abbreviations and concurrence of Vat6, but it does again suggest the abbreviation that was the cause of confusion.

²²This would weaken the premise that manuscripts other than F₄, Vat1 (Vat4) could not agree with uncorrected A unless in conjunction with one of those manuscripts, but
2.10 nobiles edet: nobile sedet A¹ corr. in nobiles edet A²
nobiles edet F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

2.12 initur: inicitur A¹; litt. ci linea transversa delevit A²
initur F4 Vat1 Vat4
inicitur Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6

2.12 spectare: spectare A¹ -rent corr. fort. m.2
spectarent F4 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
expectarent Vat2 Vat3

3.6 ad focum: ad focum ex aff - corr. A¹, A²
ad focum F4
ad focum Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

3.6 cingeret: cingeretur A (g corr. ex o fort. m.2)
cingeretur F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

3.7 tantum non retro cessit et: A¹ corr. in non tantum retro cessit A³
nō tm retro cessit sed F4

the reading could have evolved from independent scribal error. The nature of the passage and the reading must be taken into account. Vat2 and Vat3, despite their corruption, frequently agree with pre-corrected A, e.g., P.2.12; P.5.6; or agree with A against the B tradition, P.4.3 ipsi and P.4.5 si te. Thus Vat3 may have simply omitted the horizontal line for n.
3.13 aut: h ante aut add. A³ (?)
aut F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

3.13 remetientur: remetierunt A¹ supra runt A³
adscripsit ntur.
remetientur F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat6
totum versum quicquid...bilem om. Vat5

4.1 Prosperae res et in plebem:
prospera/resed (d expuncta et t s.
scr.) A¹, A²
prospere res in plebem F4
prospere sed in plebem Vat1
prospera in plebem Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
prospero re sed in plebem Vat4

4.1 proprium: proptium A¹ corr. in promptum A³
proprium F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

4.4 aliter quam: aliter cum A¹ ut vid; corr. in aliter
quam A²
aliter quam F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
4.5 consolareris: consolareris corr. ex -laris A²
cconsolareris F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

4.6 dixerit: dixerit corr. ex dixerim A¹, A²
dixit F4
dixerit Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

4.14 sustentat: sustentat A² sustat A¹
sustentat (vel sub-) F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

5.1 apparebit: apparebit A¹ apparebunt A³
apparebunt F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
apparebt Vat4

5.2 detestabilis: destavilis A¹ corr. m. 2 in detestabilis
detestabilis F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

5.3 at iniquum: adiniquum A¹ corr. m. 1-2 at iniquum
at iniquum F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

5.3 nobilissimas: nobilissimas (b corr. ex u m. 2) A
nobilissimas F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
5.4 Demetri: demetri A¹ corr. in -trii fort. m.2
demetrii F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
demet² Vat5

5.5 di immortales: dii mortales A¹ corr. m. 2 in di im-
mortales
dii immortales F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

5.6 fata: fata A³ facta A¹
fata F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
facta Vat3

5.9 fluctuetur ac: (r et ac in ras. fort. m.2; ac s.v. add.) A
fluctuetur F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

6.1 vindicat: vindicat (n s.v. add. m.2) A
vindicat F4 Vat1 Vat4 Vat6
vendicat Vat3 Vat5

6.3 illos et: illos et A¹ corr. A³ in illos et
illos et F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

6.6 at multa: admulta A¹ corr. m.2 in at multa
at (vel ac) multa F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5
quo d[m F4 Vat1
quod eum Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5
q deu Vat6

The results of these comparisons in number of passages are not great but they have the advantage over other methods for the elimination of codices in having been derived solely from within one dialogue, preserving the theoretical approach discussed in the introduction. The passages pointing to manuscript independence of A transmission or development from a hyparchetype independent of A are: P.4.1 proprium: proptium A1 corr. in promptum A3 proprium F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6; P.6.6 tristia corr. ex tristitia: tVititia F4 and P.4.4 ego (g corr. ex r) A1: ergo Vat1.23 Another possible reading of the

The confusion between ego and ergo may be very deep in the manuscripts. See, for example, P.3.3 quid ego istum: ego volg. ergo A. The manuscripts are again instructive for the development of the confusion from abbreviations: quid ego inquit istum F4 om. quasi dicat quid g istum Vat1
refugium dicat quid g ih istum om. quasi sed cum spatio; in ante istum fort. mihi quod om. post.
istum Vat2 (vide Vat3).
refugium dicat quid ergo ih istum adversarium Vat3 om. quasi sine spatio
quasi dicat quid istum Vat4 om. ego/ergo.

23The confusion between ego and ergo may be very deep in the manuscripts. See, for example, P.3.3 quid ego istum: ego volg. ergo A. The manuscripts are again instructive for the development of the confusion from abbreviations: quid ego inquit istum F4 om. quasi dicat quid g istum Vat1
refugium dicat quid g ih istum om. quasi sed cum spatio; in ante istum fort. mihi quod om. post.
istum Vat2 (vide Vat3).
refugium dicat quid ergo ih istum adversarium Vat3 om. quasi sine spatio
quasi dicat quid istum Vat4 om. ego/ergo.
primitive manuscripts would be P.2.4 patientia ex patia corr. A²; patia F4, pacia Vat5.²⁴ The manuscripts which require further testing for independence are F4, Vat1, and Vat5.

Reynolds¹ (p. 365) indicates that many manuscripts derived from A show this by omitting passages which correspond to exact lines of A, e.g., De Ira 3.7.1 tenerique iam...eius voluntas. It is unlikely that the lines in A follow the structure of the hyparchetype exactly; thus this is very strong evidence that some of the later manuscripts do, in fact, derive from A. Those who maintain that the hyparchetype of A was also in Beneventan and not

```
quid  istum  Vat5
q  m  istum  Vat6
```

This passage will be discussed in greater detail later. A comparable passage occurs at P.5.6 quid ergo est. There is also possible confusion between ergo and igitur, but the passage in A seems to suggest that the scribe saw quid and was about to write ergo when he noted the verb was first person, and then changed to ego. The tendency then is in the scribe to confuse g as ego or ergo whenever it occurred in his exemplar. This is not evident always in A when it preserves a full form. The normal confusion in Beneventan is between ergo and igitur, g, 1.

If the scribe of A is copying from Visigothic script, he may have mistaken the unusual g of that script before correcting himself.

²⁴There may again be confusion arising from an abbreviation. At P.3.10 a patientia, F4 reads patia, Vat5 appaciencia (ut vid.), and Vat6 adds to the previous list with apatia. The same occurs very clearly at P.4.13 patientia...patientia where variants have been included within the text: patia, patia F4 (preserving an old Beneventan sign for final m); patiam u potentiam... patientia Vat1; paciam k potencia... pacia Vat5 (with the
very much older than A should give some attention to the
possibility that A follows the structure of its hyparche-
type in length of line. Many of the omissions are not
letter perfect. Using this criterion, which actually
derives from corpus transmission, Vat5 can be eliminated
since it does omit the line at De Ira 3.7.1. There is
no evidence for F4 and Vat1 inasmuch as F4 contains only
the De Providentia of the Dialogues and Vat1 does not con-
tain the last book of the De Ira.

For the same reason, lack of Book III of the De Ira,
F4 and Vat1 cannot be tested against the strongest evidence
for an independent transmission of the text, at least of
the De Ira if not the collected dialogues. The evidence
is the inclusion of the words robur accipiat at De Ira
3.8.5 which would certainly show signs of independence in
these early and presumably non-interpolated texts. Other
passages used to test for an independent γ tradition are
inclusions at De Ira 1.5.2 quid; De Ira 2.9.4 in; De Brevi-
tate Vitae 15.4 in; Ad Helviam 14.3 in; Ad Marciam 4.2
est; Ad Marciam 15.2 tam; Ad Marciam 24.2 e; De Brevitate
Vitae 6.4 nec; and the correct reading Gynden at De Ira

same m sign); patia ul pocia...patia Vat6; Vat4 has greater
difficulty, striking through malitia in the text and adding
in the margin patietia. One would think that at least F4
has shown some consistency except at P.6.6 it has in both
places patietia while Vat1 in the later occurrence has
patiam.
3.21.1. The β class of manuscripts (derived from A) has within the *De Providentia* passages which Reynolds used to establish the class, the omission of *ipsi* at P.4.3 and *sì te* at P.4.5. Vat1, Vat4, Vat5, and Vat6 omit *ipsi* at P.4.3; Vat1, Vat4, and Vat5 omit *sì te*, while Vat2 and Vat3 have *ite* in the same passage. F4 is only in doubtful agreement here since, while it does omit *sì te*, *te* is added in the next line after *mentium*. F4, as the commentary will show, has occasional readings that appear to be remnants of the text and often produce unique passages. It is doubtful on the basis of Reynolds' tests for omissions that F4 should be considered in the group. Vat1, however, is apparently a β manuscript.

There is still one other passage for a β test, and that is the transposition at P.2.5 *numquam flère numquam contristari*. All the manuscripts studied have this reading. The earliest manuscripts seem only sporadic in their agreement with group classifications and F4 only in this one instance agrees. Preserving as it does other unique readings to be discussed in the commentary, F4 must still be considered very likely an independent witness to the text of the *De Providentia*. F4, as the study to come will show, is relatively free of the most destructive of errors, omissions. Those omissions that it does have are not serious and, in fact, show a consistency and
probability that suggests an independent text. F4 in not having many omissions is superior with respect to the pre-corrected text of A. It does show a tendency to transpose, which makes me doubt its inclusion in the β test group on the basis of the transposition at P.2.5 numquam flere numquam contristari.

The γ group which rests firmly on robur accipiat at De Ira 3.8.8 has very few other test indicators. The additions are of the most minor sort and certainly give the impression that not much different is to be expected from the group. The additions of F4 in the text have some significance which point to its importance for the construction of the text. Vat4, by reason of its age, should certainly be considered in any text. Vat1 and Vat5 are more difficult problems which we can postpone until the manuscripts have been tested for their relationships. Knowing how the manuscripts are further interrelated can help in determining their eventual textual value.

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE MANUSCRIPTS
F4, VAT1, VAT4, VAT5

Omissions
P.1.1 acciderent: om. Vat5

24Occasional reference is made to Vat2, Vat3, Vat6 where these agree with the other manuscripts since later they will show some family relationships with these and other recentiores.
1.1 nobis deum: om. Vat1
1.2 coetum discursumque: om. -que Vat1
2.1 bono viro mali: mali om. Vat1
2.4 esse faciendum: esse om. Vat5
2.5 et interdum: et om. Vat4
2.6 amat et operibus: et om. F4
2.8 hoc spectaculum: hoc om. Vat1
2.8 humanae oblectamenta: humanae om. F4
2.9 ad quod...par deo dignum: om. Vat4
2.9 pulcrius: om. Vat4
3.1 esse si: om. si F4
3.2 siti sed: sed om. Vat1
3.2 totius pernicie corporis: om. totius Vat1
3.3 quid ego: ego om. Vat4
3.6 infelix est Fabricius: est om. F4
3.6 et herbas: om. F4
3.6 infelix est Rulilius: est om. F4
3.8 L. Sulla: L. om. F4
3.8 gladio: om. Vat5
3.9 tormenti tanto: tanto om. Vat1
3.10 Maecenatem putas: putas om. Vat5
3.12 Socratem: om. Vat1
3.13 quicquid...bilem: om. Vat5
3.14 esse haec mala: haec om. F4
4.6 occasio est: est om. Vat1
4.8 quoque: om. Vat4
4.8 imperator meruit: om. meruit Vat5
4.9 pedes: om. Vat4
4.9 subinde mutata: mutata om. Vat5
4.14 glacie stagna: glacies Vat5 om. stagna
5.1 autem bona: autem om. Vat4
5.2 in templis: in om. Vat5
5.3 illa ad: ad om. Vat4
5.3 virum bonum: bonum om. F4 sed add. sup. lineam
5.4 saepe consultur: saepe om. F4
5.6 nunc quidem: quidem om. Vat5
5.9 et acerba: et om. F4 sed add. in marg.
5.10 sed quae molliat: quae om. Vat1
5.11 est tanti: est om. Vat4
6.2 illas bonae: illas om. Vat4
6.2 et occidunt... aliquando: om. Vat5
6.2 quidni cum... occiduntur: om. Vat4 sed add. in marg.
6.2 quidni cum: cum om. F4 sed manus recentior add. in marg.
6.2 ipse: om. Vat4
6.4 sordidi: om. F4 sed manus recentior add. in marg.
6.5 versaverit aliquis: aliquis om. Vat1
6.6 hoc est: om. Vat4
6.6 ille extra...paupertatem: om. Vat4
6.6 mortem quae...contemniste: om. Vat1
6.8 ille qui caput: ille om. Vat1
6.9 in caput: in om. F4

Omissions in Common
3.8 ille ille: ille om. F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
4.3 quidem ipsi ultro: ipsi om. Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
4.5 si te: om. F4 Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 sed F4 add. te post mentium
4.7 illum diu: diu om. Vat5 Vat6, om. F4 sed add. in marg.
4.8 aut aliis: om. aliis Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
4.12 spiritus deus: deus om. Vat5 Vat6
5.5 fortissimi viri: viri om. Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
5.8 ipse omnium: omnium om. Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
5.9 paupertatem et: et om. Vat3 Vat2 Vat5 Vat6
5.10 quae me: me om. Vat4 Vat5
6.1 aliquid...non patitur: om. Vat1 Vat3 sed Vat3 add. aliquid mali deus fieri in marg. et signavit post vi- ris patitur inserenda.
6.4 qua occurunt: qua om. Vat4 Vat5
6.6 quae vos: om. Vat5 Vat6 Vat3 sed post transfert add. vos Vat5 Vat3.
6.7 et quam: et om. Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
6.9 *vis pervium: vis om. Vat3 Vat5 Vat6*

6.9 *ut sentiri: ut om. Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6*

Additions

1.2 *est in praesentia: autem post est add. F4*

1.5 *optimos optimis: optimos optimos optimis Vat4*

1.5 *patitur ut unquam: patitur ut ut numquam Vat5*

1.5 *quidem bonus: post bonus add. vir F4*

2.2 *vir modo: vir mode et supra lin. post mode add. estus Vat1*

2.4 *bonis viris: de bonis viris F4*

2.5 *matres indulgeant: matres liberis indulgeant F4*

2.5 *in sinu continere: et add. F4 post sinu*

2.5 *volunt: et add. F4 post volunt*

2.6 *labore: in labore F4*

2.8 *venabulo exceptit: de post venabulo add. Vat5 sed postea delevit*

3.6 *formae feras: inter haec verba add. sed caperet ut vid. F4*

3.7 *id enim: id enim id enim Vat5*

3.10 *licet sopiat: licet licet sapiat Vat1*

4.3 *gratulor tanquam: inter haec verba add. tibi Vat5*

4.4 *etiam quod: inter haec verba add. hoc Vat5*

4.5 *inquam deus consultit: in marg. melius add. Vat5 et post deus significavit esse inserendum*
4.5 mentium pronus: te add. F4 post mentium sed om. si te in suo loco

4.11 cruditate dissiliunt: membra add. F4 post cruditate

5.4 impendunt impenduntur: inter haec verba add. et F4

5.5 queri possum: inter haec verba non add. Vat4

5.9 hoc passa est: hoc quod passa est Vat4

5.9 dicendus: post dicendus add. est F4

6.2 supra occidant add. Vat6 filios

6.5 sic mundus: sic vir bonus exteriora ut vid. F4

6.8 optatur: optatur optatur F4

6.8 committit incisus: committit et incisus Vat5

6.9 ecquid erubescitis: et quid non erubescitis etiam F4

Additions in Common

2.8 convertere puerilia: inter haec verba haec add. Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6

4.15 querendus: est add. Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 post querendus

4.16 multum: ante multum add. et F4, ut Vat1

5.2 bonum itaque: bonum itaque et Vat3 Vat5 Vat6

5.10 vadendum: post vadendum add. esse (aut est) F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

5.10 versus Ovidii: add. in marg. Ovidii F4; alia similiter ut vid. Vat6

Transpositions

1.1 si mundus providentia ageretur Vat5

1.5 bona noceant bonis Vat5
1.6 illus sibi Vat5
2.1 potest mali Vat5
2.7 ille deus Vat5
2.8 vultum in se Vat5
2.11 vir ille Vat4
2.12 est virtus ut Vat5
3.3 vultum meum sustainere Vat5
3.5 exigit a se F4
3.14 felicitatem illi Vat5
4.7 saepe se Vat5
4.8 loco aut praesidium Vat5
4.11 dii rationem F4
4.12 pares sibi Vat4
5.2 potest deus magis Vat4
5.6 est ergo F4
5.8 quod nos vivere sic, sic mori Vat5
5.11 animum acrem Vat5 (Vat6 om. acrem sed add. post animum)
5.11 me deterrer F4
6.2 accidere aliquando vult sibi F4
6.7 quam intrantibus vobis F4

Transpositions in Common

2.5 numquam flere numquam contristari F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
2.10 ab ullo mortem F4 Vat5
3.7 non tantum F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
3.14 sibi manus Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
4.2 magnus es vir Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
4.4 sit passura Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
4.5 animi tibi Vat3 Vat5 (om. Vat6)'
4.6 occasio virtutis Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
4.12 pars corporis est Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 pars est corporis Vat1
4.15 horrenda caeli iniquitas Vat3 Vat6. om. caeli Vat5 sed add. in marg. et post horrenda significavit esse inserendum
4.16 viris bonis Vat5 Vat6 viris o bonis Vat2 Vat3
4.16 inter formidolosa multum Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
5.1 malis tantum Vat1 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
5.4 in hac re magna publica Vat1 Vat5 Vat6 in hac re publica Vat4 et supra re scrip. magna
5.5 voluntatem vestram nostram F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
5.9 iter planum Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
6.1 bonorum etiam virorum Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
6.1 hanc ipsi deo Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
6.2 boni viri Vat4 Vat6
6.3 ipsi manus sibi Vat2 Vat5 Vat6
6.7 posui loco Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6
6.18 suum illi Vat1 Vat2 Vat3
The list of individual omissions, additions, and transpositions is lengthy enough to show that none of these manuscripts is a copy of any other; by the same token there are certain individual traits manifest in the manuscripts. Vat5 is an inveterate transposer, frequently in agreement with Vat2, Vat3, Vat6; yet Vat5 held no strong position as this study began. It is obviously a very corrupt manuscript although not much interpolated. Transpositions do have the virtue of retaining the words of the text, but Vat5 goes further by frequently omitting with Vat2 and Vat3. These last two manuscripts share an even larger number of omissions not listed and must be considered very late in the stemmatic line.

As for the transpositions, there are a few that must go back very far in the tradition, since they are shared by all these manuscripts: P.3.7 non tantum and a passage by which Reynolds demonstrated a 3 class of manuscripts, P.2.5 numquam flere numquam constristari. There is another passage transposed in all but Vat4, P.5.5 voluntatem vestram notam. Curiously enough, F4, which by a number of individual passages, shows a tendency to transpose, has only the above three examples in common with even one of the other manuscripts except for P.2.10 abullo mortem F4 and Vat5. But Vat5 transposes frequently on its own, and the two may simply be making an independent
error. The other transpositions have the mark of family relationship. F4 stands out as relatively early and unique in the list of omissions and additions. Vat1 and Vat4 share the same general description although they more frequently associate with Vat2, Vat3, Vat5, and Vat6.

In the omissions F4, Vat1, and Vat4, along with Vat5 share one important error at P.4.5, the omission of si te, although the passage is doubtful for F4 which adds te after mentium in the next line. This is the only significant place where F4 is related to the manuscripts in omissions, which are very important in family relationships. The sample of manuscripts is not random but based upon age and relationship to A or pre-corrected A. That F4 does not agree in common omissions is all the more significant and emphasizes its uniqueness. Not only, then, does this fact indicate the importance of F4 as a witness to the text, but it points as well to the validity of the individual dialogue approach. One possible correspondence between F4 and Vat4 at P.6.2 cannot be determined because Vat4 has omitted the whole passage by haplography.

Two other passages of common omission were indicated, of less significance, P.3.9 ille ille where all the manuscripts except Vat4 omit one ille. This is an error that could easily have been made independently, a satisfactory enough explanation and a bit of honor to Vat4 for not
concurring. F4 is free of one error shared by the other manuscripts and significant in establishing the manuscript classes and that is the omission of ipsi at P.4.3. Other than these passages, Vat1 and Vat4 show little agreement with the other recentiores in the test group. The three, F4, Vat1, and Vat4, important by my method for studying the recentiores, have here by more traditional methods exhibited the same superiority.

Additions do not share the same stemmatic significance as omissions and transpositions as witnessed, for example, by the complete agreement of the manuscripts with the additions in A in Category I corrections. The reason for this is the great likelihood of interpolation and the additional fact that if one expects that the readings of an independent tradition were early interpolated into the A manuscript (hands A² and A³), then manuscripts of whatever source will show the readings if stematically later. Yet there are some passages of interest, for it is here that F4 reveals its character.

There is only one common addition involving F4, P.5.10 vadendum esse: esse add. F4 Vat1 Vat5 Vat6 est Vat2 Vat3 Vat4. The inclusion of esse here is possible and natural, but within the ability of any scribe. That it should occur in so many manuscripts is very likely due to
an early inclusion in some stemmatic tradition. The est variation in Vat2 and Vat3 is clearly wrong. It possibly derives from an abbreviation such as one finds in Vat4, ë. The confusion between esse and est is not likely to occur in Benevantan, which even for esse and esset still used ëe and ëet where est is being represented by the insular ½. In this instance, P.5.10, one wonders whether F4 and Vat1 do not reflect the authentic reading which has been lost in manuscript A. The same must be said of the doubtful concurrence of F4 and Vat1 with et and ut at P.4.16. Another look at the list of additions clearly shows the character of F4, but whether the readings are, in fact, additions or authentic records of the Senecan text will be discussed in the commentary. Of the other manuscripts that have tried their hand at addition, there are only a few examples, and these are easily dismissed: P.3.7 id enim id enim Vat5 is a gemination easily developed at the turn of the page or from inattention; Vat5 had already shown this tendency at P.1.5 patitur ut ut numquam, nor have we expected much from Vat5 in the past. It shows certain school tendencies at P.4.3 gratulor tibi; P.4.4 etiam hoc quod; and at P.4.5 inguam deus melius consulit, all of which make the text more easily understood, much as Vat6 adds above occidant at P.6.2 the word filios. Vat4 adds non at P.5.5 queri non
possum, but the inclusion or omission of non is often a capricious thing and frequently arises out of momentary misunderstanding of a text. The same must be said of et at P.6.8 of Vat5. This is not to say that F4 does not have such additions: P.2.5 matres liberis indulgeant and P.1.5 quidem bonus vir and a number of instances of et and est insertion. (For a reading similar to P.2.5 see F1 filiis indulgeat, Viansino's apparatus.) A manuscript that has shown its worth otherwise should be taken more seriously, as such readings are just as easily left out as put in. Much would depend upon the possibility of independent traditions and the nature of the passages themselves. At P.2.5 the liberis could easily have been suggested to F4 from iubent liberos just following, but then it seems best to doubt the second passage rather than the first occurrence.

There is one interesting addition that occurs in Vat1, a manuscript that deserves some serious attention. Besides one negligible gemination of P.3.10 licet licet sapiat, this manuscript reads what could arise from abbreviation misunderstanding or faulty reading or scribal conjecture, but which gives in this instance a reading not easily rejected. The passage is at P.2.2 vir modo: vir mode et supra lineam post mode add. stus Vat1. This gives very good sense and could be authentic as one does not
expect an unqualified *vir* in this passage of *bonis viris; bono viro; viri fortis*, nor even in its very phrase, *vir... erectus ad honesta*. The resulting reading *vir* modestus et erectus ad honesta could well be true.\(^{25}\)

These then are the manuscripts of value: F1, Vat1, and Vat4. The list of omissions and transpositions shows that none was copied from any other and that there is only doubtful agreement among the three. F4 besides shows a certain amount of uniqueness which will be borne out by the readings discussed in the commentary to come. The readings here have been strictly limited to omissions, additions, and transpositions, which have great value in establishing relationships. In the commentary other readings will be discussed which reinforce the present impression.

Vat1 and Vat4 show more of a relationship with each other than with F4, although Vat1 has some individual readings of its own. This manuscript, Vat1, does provide an interesting, though not solid, link between the two oldest of the *recentiores*, Vat4 and Parisinus Latinus 15086. Vat4 breaks off in the middle of the De Tranquilitate Animi at 15.5 with the words *inutilis humanitas*

\(^{25}\)Marcianus Latinus 1548 has some pertinent glosses at this point. It reads *vir bonus* which could be a gloss on *modestus*; later in the passage it has *honesti* for *iusti*.  

flere quid and takes up again at Ad Helviam 9.2 aequus splen-dent. The ending at De Tranq. Animi 15.5 is at the bottom of the page with the same hand continuing the 12th dialogue on the next. There is no apparent break in continuity. A later hand has added running titles at the top of the page which indicate that the work has changed, but these could have been there before the loss in the text occurred. It would seem very definite that a loss has occurred with this manuscript rather than its exemplar.

Parisinus Latinus 15086, previously considered the oldest of the recentiores, is a curious admixture of two hands, first pointed out by Reynolds¹ (p. 370). The initial part is an Italian hand, ff. 129-189, that did dialogues 1-4 and part of 9.²⁶ The second hand, possibly of French origin, did dialogues 5-8, ff. 187-252. (The foliation given by Reynolds suggests the work begins on a new side, but does not say anything about any space left. No space would indicate that the manuscript suffered independent loss.) Now enters Vat1 which is certainly a little later than Vat4 and possibly the Paris manuscript. Like the Paris manuscript Vat1 contains only Dialogues 1-4

---

²⁶ I have not seen the manuscript and do not know at what exact point the break occurs or the appearance of the break. My description here is from Reynolds.
and part of the De Tranquillitate Animi breaking off at 15.6 dolor veniat. This is a little further in the text than the Chigi manuscript. It also stops with some space left in its second column indicating that there was no more text to copy from. Folio 46v was left blank and a new hand takes up with various spurious works. While VatI cannot derive directly from Vat4 because of its lengthier text, they end so conspicuously close as to suggest that at least these two share a certain portion of their text through some defective hyparchetype. The clearest link from the physical evidence is that VatI and the Paris manuscript are related; Reynolds has suggested that Berolinensis M.Lat.Fol. 47 is copied from the Chigi manuscript. A rough stemma could thus be produced that derives each of these two groups from some common hyparchetype that was defective about the 15th chapter of the De Tranquillitate Animi. One should particularly note the relationship of the readings of these manuscripts in the commentary.

The continued composition in the Paris manuscript from some other source suggests an error that might easily enter any study of the recentiores by corpus methods. This once earliest of the recentiores exhibits an interpolated corpus text. The two halves of the text in the Paris manuscript as a minimum should be considered separately
so that corpus errors are not intermixed. 27 Inasmuch as Vatl and Vat4 are free of this continuation of the text they could provide a basis for testing the earlier half. To return to the discussion of methods, the value of studying individual dialogues again seems advisable. Tests derived from these individual studies could then be applied to the two halves of the Paris manuscript. There is the possibility from these early recentiores that some manuscripts exist with a β text for one half of the dialogues and a γ text for the other portion. The most likely candidates for such manuscripts are those that have only the first two books of the De Ira; for the Paris manuscript continued with the last book, but after the portion of the De Tranquillitate Animi; Vatl was never completed, and any copies made from it may well have simply started with a new dialogue.

27 There is trouble besides at Chapter 15 of the text of the De Tranquillitate Animi. Scholars conjecture lacunae and transpositions at more than one place and this even working with the A manuscript. The physical condition of the exemplar of A or the hyparchetype of the tradition in which A is included is in doubt. It is not likely that A actually began with another exemplar at some point here on the model of the Paris manuscript. Our problems would be manifold if we were dealing with an interpolated A corpus; the discussion besides suggested that there was no manuscript at hand for the other damaged portions of the text, notably the beginning De Ira. An inference one could possibly make is that the faulty exemplar of A had a number of apographs. This would complicate a stemma even for the early recentiores, but account for the
The arguments up to this point may seem founded too much upon inference and probability, but every attempt has been made to be consistent and explain the facts as they appear. This is but a slight introduction to the commentary which will treat a number of passages where the confusion in later manuscripts seems to arise from misunderstanding abbreviations. In the face of the massive and conflicting evidence from the recentiores the general tendency on the part of editors has been to fall back on the A manuscript and use the later manuscripts with caution and discretion. The result has been more emendation than recension, with the later manuscripts serving simply as the indicators of where work was needed. A proper understanding of what happens in the recentiores can easily make some of the possibilities paleographically unsound. Such was not the case with vir modestus at P.2.2, but there is the possibility of confusion in any ego/ergo passage in the text. The individual passages must be examined on their own merits, and there may be some where the change can be made even though not suggested by any of the recentiores.

Thus at P.5.6 the reading can only be quid ergo est, number of passages in later manuscripts that seem to be authentic.
but at P.3.3 quid ego istum mihi adversarium adsumam the reading could quite possibly be quid ergo. The latter case is undoubtedly more difficult because of the verb adsumam and the collocation of pronouns at the beginning of the sentence. The phrasing istum mihi adversarium still maintains a collocation of the personae in the pronouns istum mihi. With the reading quid ergo there is no isolation of ego from this group, but F4 helps us to understand the passage even more by omitting quasi dicat. F4 has here quid ego inquit istum mihi adversarium adsumam, preserving as it does the possibility of ego/ergo confusion. Quasi dicat may be correct enough in this Senecan exemplum but it is only the reading of F4 that can explain paleographically both readings. Presented with \( \frac{\text{qd}}{\text{q}} \frac{\text{iqt}}{\text{iqt}} \) in the text and confused with both \( \frac{\text{q}}{\text{q}} \) and \( \frac{\text{iqt}}{\text{iqt}} \), a scribe may well have left out the abbreviation for inquit.  

---

28 For another verb difficulty see 1.3.4 gaudent, inguam where this is the vulgate reading also found in F4. A has inquit.

29 A period of the 10th-11th century is assumed to antedate A and correspond to the transition period in Beneventan abbreviations to suprascript letters.

30 See p. 59 for discussion of ergo-igitur and its relationship to the ego-ergo confusion.
is the added possibility that d and t could be confused, as this frequently happens in Beneventan; inquid and inquit are confusions found in the Ambrosian manuscript. A later attentive scribe, noticing that the passage had suddenly shifted from the third person to the first, would mark off the passage by quasi dicat, "As if Fortune were to say:". There is no comparable paleographic explanation if one assumes that it was quasi dicat that was omitted. To stay in the same area of the text where the pattern is in mind, one finds P.2.6 "operibus, inquit...", P.3.4 "gaudent, inquam...," and very closely so that that variation is not principle P.3.4 "quam bella inquit..." The use of inquit is, in fact, quite common in the Dialogues. If we should read inquit, the previous hesitancy about eliminating ego is gone.31 The phrase before the juncture would now be the standard quid ergo with no pronoun isolation. The resulting reading is derived from lections found in a number of manuscripts, but the complete reading is found in no one manuscript. One has been led to the emendation by F4's reading and the knowledge that ergo and ego confusion is a very early corruption in the manuscript traditions.

31The reading in manuscript A is ergo; ego is the vulgate reading.
Such passages give reason for considering the whole text of a manuscript and some hope that the study of the text of the individual Dialogues may produce significant results for the other recentiores. A principal objection to the classification of manuscripts in a corpus transmission is that the most telling passages have been confined to the De Ira, and one may reasonably doubt that the relationship of the texts there can be immediately applied to the other Dialogues. A better approach and possibly a clearer solution could be found in the study of the individual works and in the history of how the recentiores got to be in the order they are. Vat4, Parisinus 15086, and Vatl, show that the discussion has some merit for at least these early recentiores. F4 and Vat1 have the added virtue of not lending themselves to the De Ira arguments and forcing other methods for consideration. More attention should be paid to the texts of the De Tranquillitate Animi and the Ad Polybium as a start.
CHAPTER III
COMMENTARY

Comparison with the Results of Hijmans and Forder

In the preceding chapter a comparison of the manuscripts studied with passages in manuscript A that have been corrected by A1-3 has suggested a few passages in which the evidence points to the development of some manuscripts outside the tradition of the Ambrosian codex. The most extensive study of other recentiores of De Providentia was carried out by Hijmans and Forder using stemmatic methods. Their tentative stemma had only one manuscript, C, as derived from A, although B and M probably derived from an exemplar close to A. While Hijmans himself later repudiated the stemmatic results, the earlier work did indicate a number of passages in which the readings of later manuscripts seem not likely to be derived from the Ambrosian codex. The first part of the commentary will be on those passages which Hijmans and Forder felt were significant for establishing the relationship between the later manuscripts and A. The present commentary is in effect a comparison of the results from using different
methods to study the recentiores. The commentary later will treat passages from a textual point of view (see p. 101). Hijmans and Forder gather the readings into various categories. The lemma is in each instance from Hermes' text.

**Passages that show independence of A (A uncorrected):**

P.2.10 una manu latam: unā anulātā A (nec non A³) una lata alii

una manu latā F4 Vatl Vat4
una manu lata Vat5

The wrong word division is still not corrected as late as hand A³. Apographs must certainly have been made of the Ambrosian Codex before this period if one wants to explain other readings in later manuscripts. Since the correct word division is found for this passage in later manuscripts, one must consider that it derives from a manuscript independent of A, as then could many of the other variant readings. The better manuscripts of this study, F4, Vatl, Vat4, are possibly of this sort.

P.4.1 proprium: proptium A¹ promptum A³ proprium alii

proprium F4 Vatl Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

How the readings in A¹ and A³ could have arisen from the correct reading, found in the recentiores, is not clear. The reading in A¹ could possibly derive from an ri ligature confused as rt, but the r in Beneventan is very
distinctive. One wonders how the scribe of A, writing in Beneventan, could have mistaken the letter if his exemplar was also in Beneventan. The $A^3$ form is most difficult to explain paleographically if the original form was proprium. It is possibly conjectural from P.2.2 _ad officia...promptus._

In that neither $A^1$ or the corrector $A^3$ have the correct form, the passage fell outside my test limits, although it is certainly significant for establishing that the _recentiores_ are independent of manuscript A.

P. 5.7 restat:  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Prestat</th>
<th>Restet</th>
<th>A5 multi (H-F)</th>
<th>F4</th>
<th>Vati</th>
<th>Vat4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>restat</td>
<td>alii</td>
<td>Vat2</td>
<td>Vat3</td>
<td>Vat5</td>
<td>Vat6</td>
<td>Scor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>F3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The difficulty again is why A should have difficulties with _r_ if its exemplar is in Beneventan. F4, Vat1, and Vat4 group again with a number of manuscripts and with A$^5$, as they do often. The group is still too large to make any generalizations. The startling fact is that the authentic reading is found in all the manuscripts we have eliminated, which is not often the case. Possibly _restet_ is correct, although _restat_ has the support of the independent manuscripts F1 and F3. The termination _-at_ is additionally supported by A$^1$.

**Passages where the reading can not be derived from A but which are corrected in later manuscripts:**
P.2.7 capiunt spectandi: capiunt. spectant dii A cum multis spectandi Scor F1 spectandu F3

A number of the Hijmans' manuscripts have spectandi here as well as those noted from Viansino's apparatus. All the new manuscripts studied had the A reading except for Vat1 which has an unusual capiunt spectat deus. F1 apparently as an independent manuscript retains the correct reading which could easily have been corrupted into spectant dii in one hyparchetype.

P.3.2 ecferre: Bongarsius hec ferre A cum multis F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
effere nonnulli (H-F)

The sequence would have possibly involved the addition of h before the prefix ef- which would then have been separated. Some manuscripts show the correct remnant effere, but it could have arisen by a reversed process involving first the loss of h in the corrupted form, and then a reunion of the prefix.

P. 4.4 inquam: inquit A inquam nonnulli (H-F)
inguid Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
inqua F4 Vat2
inqua Vat3

The confusion lies in the abbreviations and will occur again. (See Loew pp. 190-192 where the forms for guid, qui, and quod show how quam, quid, and quod can be
confused: \( q = \text{qui} \) 8th century; \( q = \text{quod} \) 9th century, \( q^d = \text{quod} \) 8th century; \( qd = \text{quid} \) 9th century.) Now quam had no distinctive abbreviation but is found in one early manuscript as \( q \), i.e. very close to \( \text{quod} \). Loew assigns the abbreviation to something taken out of that manuscript's exemplar. Another curiosity occurs for \( \text{quid} \), \( q \), dated to the 12/13th centuries, something like a monogram (Loew) or possibly a conflation of regular and suprascript types. The confusions could occur at two crucial periods in Beneventan for the Dialogues, the 8/9th centuries or the 12/13th centuries. The first would indicate an early archetype, the second would coincide with the period in which the recentiores became more frequent. The sequence of confusion could be \( q, q^d, qd \) which stand in order for quam quod quod quid. inquid-inquit confusion is a regular feature of the A manuscript and arises from phonetic confusion.

P. 4.10 advocata virtute: advocat a virtute AEMP2 et multi(H-F) Vat1 Vat5 Vat6
avocat a virtute Vat4
advocat hominem a virtute Vat2 Vat3
advocata a virtute RY
advocatam a virtute N
advocata a uūtute F4 add. in marg.
\( a \uparrow \) advocata
The confusion seems to arise from an archetype in scriptura continua from which two traditions develop. One of the archetypes, from the evidence, went through a Beneventan stage represented by A^1; but with A^1 making so many errors, I am inclined to think that the manuscript it was copied from had an insular abbreviation system, possibly derived from France or Germany (see p. 148 and Chapter 5 for further arguments). The additional errors in the later family tradition then derive from the manuscript A in Beneventan. While it is true that there is no evidence that the Dialogues, i.e., the manuscript A to some critics, ever left Southern Italy in the early stages, the correcting hand A^2 was not a Beneventan type (see Hermes p.viii.). This would mean that any apographs of A at this early stage could be in non-Beneventan hands with subsequent confusion in some recentiores. The argument about the hand and the system is put here as a preface to the many instances to come where it is of some significance, so that it need not be continually repeated. The present example speaks for scriptura continua.

P. 4.12 duremur: duremus A^1 (us compendio solito scr; iuxta siglum A^5 litteras us add.)

The abbreviation is here m^3, but see Loew below where
this is cited as the usual form. A can not be faulted, but the number of manuscripts that follow it can, among them Vat1, Vat2, Vat5, Vat6. F4 has a similar abbreviation, i.e. durem. A number of H-F manuscripts do have mur. Vat4 strays far with duceremus, Vat3 with indueremur, which is a conflation of something like Vat4 and two of H-F's manuscripts. The difficulty is again with an abbreviation (Loew p. 164): "The 2-shaped symbol was used, sporadically in the 9th and 10th centuries, consistently after the beginning of the 11th, especially with m and t to signify mur and tur." A carelessly formed flourish on the 2 would result in the mistaken comma form occasioning obvious confusion with mus when the forms were expanded. The problem is complicated later (Loew p. 165 and especially p. 168) when the 2-shaped symbol is used indiscriminately with the horizontal line as the general symbol of suspension and contraction. A scribe copying in this period and not fully conversant with both insular and Beneventan systems could make any expansion, especially if he was the one doing the cross-hand copying. Once copied, the indiscriminate use of the symbols would give no

---

1By this is meant a copying of a text from one hand or system into another, for example, uncial into minuscule, Carolingian into Beneventan.
assurance to a scribe copying even in the same hand as his exemplar.

P. 5.3 percisos: Lipsius Vat Par

The reading of A is obliterated here by the work of A\(^5\)bisos. There is speculation besides (see Hermes' apparatus) about the original form of the \(b\), possibly \(p\), and as well between \(c\,b\), or \(v\). This eliminates a number of manuscripts with probisos or procisos. The real difficulty is in the per, prae, pro variation. One manuscript (H-F) cleverly drops out with cisos. Loew again is instructive, not merely in the abbreviation section, but in discussing the variations in the Visigothic, Beneventan, and Insular forms for the abbreviation of these words (see p. 153).

A scribe not fully aware of the variations in the systems, or writing the cross-hand copy, could easily stumble with \(F, P, D\). The manuscripts show the problem. cisos F4 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 p cisos Vat1 p cissos Vat2 Vat3. The passage is doubly confused by professos which follows, but it is not significant by my method of testing. (See Loew p. 101 and his alphabetical list of abbreviations.)

Passages in which manuscripts agree with later hand of A:

The passages are many and Hijmans and Forder give only a selection. It is here that their attempt to
establish an independent text could have been tightened up by restricting readings only in passages where A² and A³ have corrected. My assumption is that these earliest readings used to correct A were actually from manuscript sources which by their divergence from A could not have derived from it. These readings of A² and A³ would then be our earliest manuscript record apart from A. Whether they derive from the hyparchetype of A is another question. Hijmans and Forder by comparing with all the later readings have no probable check against interpolations or scribal conjectures. When the manuscript A had undergone correction by at least two hands from available manuscript sources, additional corrections are more probably emendations.

Their list shows that a number of interesting passages are found in the manuscripts where the later correctors have worked but these would be revealed in a collation or commentary anyway and do not have significance as a method for studying the recentiores and correcting hands in the Ambrosian manuscript.

P. 2.6 sed motu et ipso: sed motus et ipso A sed motu et ipso omnes (H-F) Vat¹⁻⁶ sed
imotu ex ipo F4
The Florence manuscript may be correct. The full passage in F4 reads: *languent per inertiam saginatam. nec in labore tantum sed *Imotu *ex ipso sui onere deficiunt.* Saginatam is a possible corruption if taken with inertiam; the correct understanding of Imotu also causes problems. The picture is of bodies refusing to work, filling up with their own inertia so that eventually they fall beneath their own weight. The subject of the sentence is usually taken as the neuter corpora understood, but the 3rd person verb has had a personal subject up to this point. The sentence is structured between the enclosing verbs *languent...deficiunt.* Men weaken and grind to a halt. How this happens is explained by *per inertiam* or as F4 has it, *per inertiam saginatam,* paradoxically in labore. The thought in Seneca is that mere work is not enough, the spirit has to be severely tried; for to achieve good by working does not adequately explain the thesis of why the good suffer evil while the evil prosper. A providential god, like a father, tests his children. The transition from *languent* to *deficiunt* is a process of becoming spiritually immobile, a passive observer as at P. 1.2 ... ut terrarum gravissimum pondus sedeat immotum. Men grow weak on an inertia fattened even as they work so that unable to move they collapse beneath their own weight.
The sentence in F4 has a full stop after saginatam, but this causes no problems for interpretation. The verbal contrast or transition is emphasized by the contrast in labore and immoti (F4 has Imotu with no et following). To read immoti here would give the personal subject that has been in the previous sentences. The reading would be: languent per inertiam saginatam; nec in labore tantum, sed immoti, ex ipso sui onere deficiunt. Another possibility may be sed immoti etiam; the omission of a dot or horizontal stroke over the Tironian note would result in et instead of etiam (see Commentary on p.6.1). Most manuscripts do have an et rather than the ex of F4. The reading of F4 should be given some consideration if the manuscript demonstrates textual value elsewhere.

The thought of the passage is repeated at p.4.6: qui nimia felicitate torpescunt, quos velut in mari lento tranquillitas iners detinet. See also p.4.9; p.5.9; and p.6.8. For further discussion on the passage in question see Aubert, "Adnotationes in Senecae dialogum I," Rhein. Mus. 63(1881), 178-195.

P. 2.11 spectasse: spectasse corr. vid. ex exsp- A expectasse Vat1 Vat5 spectasse F4 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat6 multi (H-F)
The confusion occurs frequently in manuscripts and is usually as much a phonetic problem as a graphic one. (For the phonetic, see Väänänen, p. 49, §85.) The correction by A of this common variant suggests a possibility of graphic transmission through any apographs as well as through normal phonetic variation. S and x are frequently confused in Benevantan (Loew, p. 285; see also the ligatures xp and sp on pp. 148 and 146.). The words are common in the dialogue, and the sp- or exsp- variation is not consistent within the manuscripts. See for example the variation at P.1.2; P.2.11; P.2.12; P.4.7. Comparable confusion, but not for the same phonetic reason, occurs at P.3.9 aestimasse: estimasse F4 Vat6 extimasse Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 exstimasse Vat4.

There is additional difficulty in the passage at P.2.12 between spectare and spectarent, P.1.1 accidere and acciderunt; P.5.1 ostendere and ostenderet. The confusion has an answer in the Beneventan script. The earlier abbreviations for -runt were not misunderstood (Loew, p. 192), but by the end of the 9th century there was a recurring form of the suspension that looked like reversed s with r, \( \chi \). This is most likely a ligature \( \chi \) much as one finds in \( \chi \) types. The form hastily made or incorrectly understood by a copying scribe would result in \( \chi \). The correct
reading in some of the manuscripts could derive from independent copies of one hyparchetype or the presence of one hyparchetype that did not have the variant. A crucial period for the abbreviation of -runt coincides with the writing of the Ambrosian manuscript; see Loew, p. 169: "We find -runt abbreviated in the same MS. by three different signs." A relatively poor scribe, who did not know Latin well, could be the cause of the error even if copying from an exemplar in his own script.

P. 3.9 illum documentum fidei, documentum patientiae:
   fidei documentum add. A² in marg. fidei et patientie F J K X fidei patientie n illi fidei documentum Vat6 illum documentum fidei documentum patientie F4 Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 alii(H-F)

Category I insertions in the Ambrosian manuscript, i.e., additions in the margin or the text by A² and A³, have caused other errors beyond that noted earlier for Vat6. These would be particularly common in manuscripts derived from A. The loss of either documentum in the text could easily occur by haplography by scribes working independently. The Hijmans' manuscript n shows the haplography in a pure state; a scribe faced with the reading might simply insert et as F, J, K, and X have done. The insertion of either fidei or the second documentum, shows that the
Passage had made its way into the A tradition for manuscripts eventually derived from A, since these were the words originally omitted. What is needed for the A hyparchetype is a manuscript that has no record of either word, i.e. reading documentum patientiae. None has yet been reported.

P.4.7 grave est tenerae cervici iugum: Muretus te**rere cervicib; A (ras -r )

The passage has numerous variations in the manuscripts of Hijmans and Forder and in those under study. The passage is not significant by my criterion in that the expunging hand can not be identified. F4 has tenis with a wavy vertical stroke above the n for teneris. Vat2 has a comma over fere or tere for terere. The others have horizontal strikes over frere or tre, while Vat6 and Vat3 have ferre.

Passages in which only A or a few other manuscripts retain the correct reading:

P. 4.1 prosperae res et in plebem:  
prospera/ resed in plebem A₁-² 
prosperae res et in plebem c  prospera in plebem alii (H-F) 
prospere sed in plebem Vat₁ prospere res in plebem F₄
prospero sed in plebem Vat4 prospere in plebem Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6

Significantly the better manuscripts of my study, F4, Vat1, and Vat4, depart from the path of the many recentiores. The passage will be discussed below (p. 125). A may not have the correct reading.

P. 4.4 Tib. Caesare: omnes exceptis A B M pro Tib., Gaio aut C.

Ti. F4 ut vid.

T. Vat4

The passage had been tampered with by A5 and fell outside my test procedures. Few manuscripts have the correct reading; the concurrence of F4 and M should be noted.

P. 4.13 nauticis A et pauci(H-F) F4 Vat1 Vat4 nautis Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 alii (H-F)

The same manuscripts of this study stand out as carriers of the authentic reading.

P. 5.1 apparebit A 0

The other manuscripts of Hijmans and Forder read apparebunt with which F4, Vat1, Vat2, Vat3, Vat5, and Vat6 agree, all abbreviating with a horizontal stroke over the u of ut. Vat4 retains perhaps the old abbreviation in
Beneventan by having a comma over \textit{bt} where the ascending stroke is a remnant of the generalized 2-symbol, which along with the horizontal stroke became the normal form in later manuscripts. The earlier form was \textit{bt}. (See Commentary at p. 5.1 \textit{apparebit}, p. 147).

\textit{P. 5.10 vadendum A $\delta$}

The passage has been discussed before (p. 74). \textit{Vadendum est} or \textit{esse} is the reading of most of the manuscripts; four manuscripts of Hijmans have \textit{esse vadendum}. If the reading \textit{esse} is authentic, \textit{A} and $\delta$ would simply have an independent scribal error. The confusion must be very early in the stemmatic tradition.

\textit{P. 6.2 sibi manus A F4 Vat4 nonnuli (H-F)}

\textit{A} and five manuscripts of Hijmans have this reading while the majority including Vat1 and Vat5 transpose.

\textit{P. 6.4 aspicis...videris A}

Few manuscripts show consistent forms: \textit{aspicus A W aspicitis ceteri F4 Vat$^{1-6}$ videris A W B M Vat4 Vat2 videris multi Vat1 Vat6 videtis multi Vat3 Vat5 vide...ris F4 aegre legitur, fort. videritis.}

\textit{P. 6.9 destinavi: estimavi A F4 Vat5 et pauci(H-F)}
Destinavi is the vulgate reading. Other manuscripts read exstimavi (with normal ex and es variations). The sense of the passage is not merely to point out a place for the suicide, but to evaluate the worth of the place. Certum with locum likely influenced this emendation of Erasmus, but the manuscripts may well be right.

The evidence of these passages, important for Hijmans and Forder, suggests a relationship between F4, Vat1, and Vat4 in one group and between Vat2 and Vat3 in another. (The commentary will further show that Vat2, Vat3, Vat5, and Vat6 are related.) F4 and Vat4 contain the correct reading frequently, and this is a test of the value of a manuscript that cannot be easily rejected. At P. 2.6 F4 contains a unique reading that is possibly correct, as it may also at P. 4.1. My own collation of the manuscripts under study will suggest through the commentary even more passages that have significance either for the text of the history of the confusion in the later manuscripts. Family relationships will be suggested that make the occasional unique reading in some manuscripts of little value. The passages of greatest interest occur in

\[2\] Of the passages covered above, see P. 4.1, P. 2.10, P. 2.11, P. 3.9, P. 4.4, P. 4.13, P. 6.2.
the manuscripts F4, Vat1, and Vat4. These have already shown their value in the numerous tests attempted here and especially in comparison with the extensive results of Hijmans and Forder. Comparison with their numerous manuscripts gives reason to believe that the position of F4, Vat1, and Vat4 is not likely to be shaken by the inclusion of an even greater number of manuscripts in the study.

While it is true for the text of De Providentia that the total independence of F4 from Vat1 and Vat4 has not been conclusively shown, its few unique readings point in that direction. The more frequent association of Vat1 and Vat4 with other recentiores in the collation where F4 does not agree do the same. The evidence of corpus and independent transmission of the Dialogues is not yet complete, but the position of F4 suggests that the study would be of value. It has clearly been associated with the Letters by way of having a common addressee, Lucilius.

In the following commentary the recentiores, other than those studied here for the first time, are cited from Viansino's text or the article of Hijmans and Forder. The conspectus siglorum identifies the manuscripts more fully. Manuscripts that have no siglum in Viansino are identified by a fuller citation. The commentary covers passages of
textual significance, stemmatic significance, or paleographic significance. No attempt is made at a full citation of variants in the new manuscripts studied, although F4, Vat1, and Vat4 have been noted more fully. The comparison of passages was facilitated by a typed draft of an Index Verborum being prepared by Professor Kenneth Abbott of The Ohio State University. Viansino provides some comparative passages for content in the commentary to his text. The lemma is from the text of Hermes in each instance.

**Commentary**

P.1.2 ex disposito relucentium: ex dispositore lucentium A

ex dispositione lucentium

F4 Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

multi

ex dispositione relucen-
tium F1 F3

The difficulty in A is with word division. The independent manuscripts F1 and F3 have the correct reading.

P. 1.2 fugam spectet: fugam expectet F4

The confusion has been mentioned above (pp. 94-95). There is no consistency even within manuscripts on these orthographic variants. Such passages have no stemmatic
value. Spectet makes better sense in the context.

P. 1.4 quod tu: Vat4 quo tu F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat6 multi quo intuitu non dubitas Vat5

The confusion results from wrong word division with the possible loss of a letter by d/t confusion. Quo tu is found in numerous recentiores. There is an erasure in A after tu which possibly indicates deeper corruption in the text. The reading of Vat5 is unique.

P.1.5 durius educat: educant Vat1 Vat5 Scor Par Ven

This is a possible family; the relationship between Vat1 and Par should especially be noted, since they show other signs of relationship.

P.1.6 parat

This reading is found only in the Ambrosian codex. All other manuscripts have some form of praeparat, the manuscripts under study using various positions of horizontal strokes except for Vat5, which preserves a 2-form for the generalized abbreviation, it has $\bar{p}$pat. The reading in A could have arisen from a form $\bar{p}$parat with eventual loss of the abbreviation stroke and then the first $p$. The manuscripts have the same confusion at P.2.3 praeparantur. The recurrence of such passages suggests that the
abbreviation difficulties are early in the tradition. For another discussion of the passage, see Hijmans' p. 57 where the question of prose rhythm is raised in choosing between readings that both make sense. The reading parat produces a double cretic which is among Seneca's prefered clausulae. See Axelson, Neue Seneca-studien, pp. 23-27.

P.2.1 eveniunt: accidi:t ut vid. F4

The reading in F4 may have been influenced by accidere just following.

P.2.1 mali: om. Vat1

The sense of the passages requires mali to contrast with bono viro. Without this contrast, Seneca's sententia would have no point: non miscentur contraria.

P.2.1 mali potest: potest mali Vat5 F1 F3

The position of the two Florence manuscripts in relationship to the other recentiores is not clear. See the section on family relationships, p. 188.

P.2.1 tantum superne: tot F4 ut vid. sup. ras. tantorum Vat1 E P2 M
The passage could be very confusing to a scribe with the sequence tot...tantum...tanta. F4 has possibly corrected itself although it is not clear what was read before the erasure. The group with Vat I had made the word agree with imbrium. The passage reads tot amnes, tantum superne deiectorum imbrium, tanta...vis. It is not clear how tot or tantum fits in the passage.

P.2.1 medicatorum: medicatorum F4 sed in marg. a medi
|ram•e| rum fortasse mediterraneorum
mediterraneorum Vat I E V P2 M

The phrase medicatorum vis fontium must mean the strength of mineral waters.

P.2.4 querantur: coquerantur F4

This manuscript F4 uses both co and the Tironian note, inverted c, for the abbreviation of con. All the other manuscripts read querantur here, nor does Viansino list any variants. The reading may only be a trait in F4 which reads congelatus for gelatus at P.3.12.

P.2.5 excitari: exercitari A

The text reading is taken from the recentiores, and is normally found in editions. The better recentiores
(see Viansino's apparatus) usually retain exercitari
which is likely the reading in one of the hyparchetypes. The problem certainly arises from an abbreviation in the early manuscripts. What is involved, as even the later manuscripts show, is a wavy line either vertical or horizontal signifying vowel + r or r + vowel or simply r. Vat1 and Vat4 read the expanded form exercitari, whereas Vat2 and Vat3, which one expects to agree (see family relationships Chapter IV), read excitari. The confusion could arise from a manuscript like Vat5 excitari; the full possibility for confusion is seen in F4 excitāi. While either word would fit the passage, exercitari was in at least one hyparchetype.

P.2.5 fovere in sinu, continere: et add. post sinu F4

The addition of F4 is not supported by any other manuscript and in normal style of Seneca could be omitted, as the negative tricolon following shows asyndeton; but the inclusion is possible and breaks the rather long series of infinitives into two groups, the first fovere... et continere; the second, the negative tricolon numquam contristari numquam...numquam...

P.2.5 numquam flere: numquam flectere Vat1 F2
The agreement of these two in a passage that is already complicated in establishing stemmatic relationships (most manuscripts transpose) suggests a definite family relationship although Vat 1 more frequently associates with other recentiores.

P. 2.6 et operibus: et Vat 3 ut etiam H W
et om. F4 Ven V

One might look for a family relationship here between F4, Ven, and V. H and W are manuscripts studied later by Hijmans that have a commentary in the mss but are textually of little value. The dropping of the et before the presumed quotation of the deus pater fits the pattern of such interlocutions. There is really no series here, but only deus habet...et...amat with a full stop. The divine fiat then has the same structure as the interlocution of fortuna at P. 3.3.

The ut of the three manuscripts cited possibly derives from the ut before verum just following, constituting the length of a line in some exemplar.

P. 2.6 languent per inertiam...

See above, p. 93; read: languent per inertiam saginatam; nec in labore tantum, sed immoti, ex ipso sui onore
deficiunt.

P. 2.8 honestior: honestius Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat6

A number of other recentiores have this reading. Honestior is clearly the authentic reading.

P. 2.8 possint: possunt Vat1 E Scor(corr.) M Par B

This is a clear family relationship as it will turn out.

P. 2.8 convertere puerilia et humanae: haec add. post puerilia Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6

Other recentiores add haec either before or after puerilia. Vat4 is unusual of the manuscripts studied in not adding haec, as is F4 who does other things with the passage. The addition is not likely to be correct.

P. 2.8 humanae oblectamenta levitatis: om. humanae F4

F4 is the only manuscript to have this omission. The passage reads as well without it, but humanae is not likely to have been added in this place unintentionally and is probably correct. The coincidence of the addition of haec by some manuscripts just before this and the omission of humanae here by F4 suggests the passage may be more deeply corrupted. But both variations make sense; at
least in a senseless passage, there is a garbling that one can manipulate.

P. 2.10 nobiles edet operas

See below on P. 5.2 illas et Elius and at P. 6.1 etiam virorum. Compare at P. 5.1 militare et edere operas. The manuscripts usually read operas with edere and operam with dare. Important variants occur at De Otio 6.2 nudas edere operas: nuda sedere operam A corr. fort. m. and De Ira 3.43.3 perdis operam: Hense perdis operas A L perdis operam C. In other passages operam perdere is usual.

P. 2.10 concuerrunt: concurreunt F4 Vatl F1 Par B, Erasmus 2

Some of the best recentiores read concurreunt and it may be correct. The text reading from A is certainly a lectio difficilior that some of the other manuscripts have had difficulty with, concurrent M, corruerunt E Scor F2 G V Ven. The word is rare in the perfect. Other than this passage, there are only two certain occurrences in Seneca with a variation in the reduplicated compound perfect form: De Ira 3.15.1 concurrit and Ad Helviam 6.3 con- cucturrit. The simplex in the perfect occurs in Natural Questions 1.14.3 with a compound as a manuscript variant,
concurrerunt. In the Ad Helviam passage, F1 and F3 have concurrunt. The word is very rare in the perfect in Cicero who uses the non-reduplicated perfect form for the compound.

P. 2.10 mortem abullo: abullo mortem F4 Vat5 mortem ab aliquo Vat4

See p. 71.

P.2.12 initur: inicitur A¹; litt. ci linea transversa dellevit A²

The correction in A, crossing out by a transverse line, is a normal feature of Beneventan scriptoria (Loew p. 294). The original reading was possibly influenced by repetitur which follows. The recentiores regularly have the form initur as do most of the manuscripts studied here: initur F4 Vat1 Vat4: but the others show affinity to pre-corrected A, thus: inititur Vat2 inicitur Vat6, and some strange readings: initri Vat3 (= initrius?) and inititius?, Vat5. The reading of F4 Vat1 and Vat4 suggest that the reading initur was in one of the hyparchetypes. Vat2's lection is difficult in terms of the family relationships to be discussed.

P. 3.1 si nolit: om. si F4
There may be corruption in this passage; see following.

P.3.1 fato ista sic ire et eadem lege

This passage has elicited enormous emendation and manuscript variation. The difficulty, I think, lies in a mistaken abbreviation with a variant then included within the text. F4 in its uniqueness points to a possible solution. The readings in Vat\textsuperscript{1-6} are easily derived from what is found in A; they have fato ista sic ei recte eadem lege Vat1 Vat4 Vat5, sic eis recte Vat6, sic et recte Vat2 Vat3. F4 alone of all the recentiores reads: fato ista recte et eadem lege omitting, it would seem, sic et or sic ei or whatever that lection conceals. What sic et and the like conceal is, I think, recte. A confusion has developed out of an abbreviation in a hand in which re and si are mistaken. The Beneventan hand with an unusual r or r- ligatures or ligatures of r and i with the i extending below the line could have been confused with elongated s forms. The confusion is more likely in cross-hand copying of the text. The transition from a continental system to the Beneventan system is a possibility. (We have already noted that rt could be mistaken as re in ligature with r in Beneventan writing.) The c would be in the same position in each variation. The ei or et
possibly derives only from the inclusion of the variant in the text, or the confusion that -te et would have caused if the reading were, in fact, recte et. The variant was either interlinear or in the margin as sic et. This was later added in the text before recte with no clear indication that it was anything more than a gemination. The conjunction put between recte and eadem lege fits the sense of the passage. The previous dignos esse malo seems best continued by the presence of recte here. This is much better than the sic et recte of Vat2 and Vat3 which gives the unlikely combination of recte eadem lege in the latter half of the passage. These two manuscripts may be showing the variants that were eventually included in the text, sic or recte. At another place they retain the primitive reading, but give it in a garbled form, P.4.5 si te: ite Vat2 Vat3; others omit.

There is a contrast in the passage. The idea is that those who are unwilling really get what they deserve from fate, whereas those who willingly accept their fate (These have been the boni throughout the passage, men aspiring to be Stoic sages by the training of their souls), have things turn out according to the same law by which they are considered boni, namely a courageous resignation to adversity. The reading of F4
preserves these meanings in the text. Read: *his adiciam fato ista recte et eadem lege bonis evenire qua sunt boni.* Fickert believed the words *sic enim recte* were a gloss that confused the passage; *sic ire* could be a gloss on *evenire.* For Hijnmans' arguments see pp. 60-61. The phrase *sic ire* occurs in Seneca at *De Beneficiis* 6.23.2; *Letters* 5.8, 46.2, 71.14.

P.3.2 *pro is:* *pro eis* Vat5

A few *recentiores* have this reading with Vat5, but *eis* and *hiis* give problems throughout the text. The manuscripts show no more than standing medieval spelling variations. F4 has *pro hiis* as do many others, but the passage is not stemmatically significant.

P.3.3 *necant*

This passage has been discussed before (p. 52) in showing possible independence of some manuscripts or the presence of a hyparchetypal reading. The variant is *nегant.* Viansino suggests the passage as one which shows that the archetype was written in a majuscule script. There is not much textual significance in the variation. The idea of death permeates this passage, which has extensive medical images. That *voluptas* can be the cause
of death has more point than that it can deny some greater good. The latter may well be true, but the idea is not present in the passage.

P.3.3 quasi dicat," quid ego...: quasi dicat om. F4;

Erasmus I

This passage has been discussed extensively above (p. 81). Read from F4: Quid ergo, inquit, istum mihi adversarium adsumam? The other variant with ego is less likely.

P.3.3 possimus: possumus Vat1 M possimus conferre Vat5 E Ven

Vat1 has had possumus/possimus variations before (P.2.8). The difficulty may be paleographical, but the relative purpose clause could have caused a scribal emendation to the incorrect indicative in this instance.

P.3.3 cum quo: cum q F4

The passage can only have the relative although F4 uses this same abbreviation for ergo. The confusion can be manifold, see below at P.5.6 quid ergo est where F4 has the same abbreviation for ergo and possibly for quod or quo at P.5.6 quod scio. The era of suprascript abbreviations had introduced greater possibilities for error.
P.3.4 in Catone: F4 Vat1 Vat6 cane Vat2 Vat3 catē catoe Vat4 Vat6 catonem A.

The Vat4 and Vat6 abbreviation is the type that likely caused the confusion in the A line. One wonders how F4, Vat1 and Vat6 could have the correct readings if they are derived from A, but the possibility exists that they either contain an independent tradition or have received a rather easy scribal emendation. Cato is a constant figure in Seneca's Dialogues.

P.3.5 premit: premium F4

The reading is not likely to be correct in F4. This scribe seems to confuse the verb ending -it or -et for -um. He does the same thing again at P.5.10 where he has trepidum for trepidet.

P.3.6 infelix est Fabricius: est om. F4

The question here is: Has F4 or the manuscript he was copying from omitted the est or have others from a different line added it? F4 has below at P.3.7 infelix Rutilius and in both places is not clearly wrong. The whole section begins with infelix est Mucius which sets the syntactic pattern. Ellipsis is used extensively throughout before the quod clauses and in rapid rhetorical
passages seems a regular feature of Senecan style. The noble Mucius, Fabricius, and Rutilius are contrasted with Sulla, represented by his own counterbalancing series Sullae...Sullanae...Sulla. The ellipsis of est after its occurrence with Mucius is not difficult, particularly as the structure is repeated in a subjunctive contrast. The passage stripped of the intervening words is: infelix est Mucius?...felicior esset?...infelix Fabricius?...felicior esset?...infelix Rutilius?...Sullae...Sullanae...felix est L. Sulla? The inclusion of est with Fabricius and Rutilius would clutter the construction. The consistency of the omission of the est but not the esset points to a conscious hand in the passage and would have stemmatic significance even though in other places the addition or omission of est is a capricious matter.

F4 carries the variation further by eliminating the L. before Sulla. The L. certainly seems superfluous with the clear designation of the man by his deeds, including the derogatory adjective Sullanae. What is more, L. Sulla does not fit the pattern set with the others where only the one common name is used for each.

P.3.6 et herbas: om. F4

If F4 is an independent manuscript, these words now accepted in the text may be a gloss on radices that has
found its way into the text. Radices has literal and metaphorical meanings and herbas would have simply differentiated the two. The words do occur in other texts together so there is no certainty here. (See De Ira 3.20.3 radices quoque et herbae). For a similar situation see P.4.5 gubernatorem.

P. 3.6 vulsit: evulsit Vat5 M F1

P. 3.6 cingeret: cingeretur A F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 multi

P. 3.6 formae feras: forme sed caperet feras F4, fort. caperet, aegre legitur.

The two passages above should be taken together. The passive verb in the manuscripts has been a puzzle, since there is an obvious accusative object in feras. The common solution has been to make the verb active cingeret with feras as the object with the sense of surrounding his catch with mounds of luscious fruit, but the passage has a deeper significance. The description is of what would make Fabricius happier. He was a simple farmer who had done noble service to his country in war but was happy to eat his simple vegetables by his hearth, a great contrast to what one finds with Sulla and the
proscriptionis Sullanae spoliarium which was the heads of senators dripping blood like hanging wild meat. The passage here is only preparing for that bitter contrast; thus captas multa caede venantium is not a simple description of feras but an important element in the contrast that the horrors of war may be justified but not the senseless slaughter of men and animals in the hunt or the even more senseless slaughter of men in civil war or the political repercussions of war. The simple life of Fabricius is better maintained if he eats only fruits and vegetables. The solution to the difficulty in the text is offered by F4. His reading sed caperet solves the problem of the verb and maintains the necessary sense. Would Fabricius be happier if he were surrounded by mounds of the finest fruit but was hunting wild beasts at the cost of the lives of many hunters? F4's reading could easily have dropped out of the text since the transition caperet feras captas might possibly have looked strange to a scribe; the inclusion would be better sense were there some verb with the idea "dining on," but the passage seems better with caperet, as difficult as it may be. F4 can not be clearly read here but, at least, sed cape. t feras captas is clear.

P. 3.7 dicent: diceret Val E Ven B Par
The confusion arises from an abbreviation stroke above et. A straight line would be taken as dicent, a wavy line as diceret. The group of manuscripts that reads diceret shows a mixed family relationship that will be discussed in the next chapter. The reading does show that some of these groups of manuscripts are related early in a stemmatic line.

P. 3.7 tantum non: non tantum F4 multi

Transposition is very extensive in the manuscripts, and is possibly influenced by the normal correlative non tantum (solum)...sed etiam. All the manuscripts except A¹ read some form of non tantum retro cessit sed, whereas A¹ also has et in this last instance. A¹ was corrected by A³, and the correction is probably right. The independent manuscript Fl preserves, perhaps, the correct reading non tantum non retro cessit sed longius fugit; the others preserve a correct remnant in what looks like a transposition when compared to manuscript A.

P. 3.8 ille ille: ille om. F4

All the manuscripts under study omit one ille except for Vat4. Most other recentiores also omit one, a few have omitted both, and one, manuscript M, reads ille ipse which
Hermes had conjectured but hesitated to put into the text. The omission of one ille could be an independent error in a number of manuscripts, but because the omission is so extensive, many must have received the reading through stemmatic transmission.

P. 3.12 gelatus: congelatus F4

This reading is found only in F4. It could possibly be influenced by constitit which follows, but in such instances it would seem more reasonable that a later form would be influenced by some earlier one. F4 has shown a tendency to select the con- word in these linguistic variants. He had at P.2.4 conquerantur for querantur of the other manuscripts and may be showing here no more than that preference. g elo and con g elo are rare in Seneca, occurring only in Natural Questions and in this one passage of the De Providentia.

P.3.13 libens: bibens Vat1

Vat1 illustrates the principle mentioned above, namely that a second passage is likely to be assimilated in form or sound to an earlier one, rather than vice versa. The sequence is here biberunt...bilem...libens hauriet. The change to bibens would not be unusual, and it also makes sense although the better sense is that Socrates
drank the draught willingly, as the sequence *laetus et libens* would surely stress.

P. 3.14 quem: quem F4 quem A (i.e. quoniam, Loew, p. 191)

The reading *quem* is common in the *recentiores*. The difficulty in some of the manuscripts under study must surely arise from the abbreviation one finds in A which is normal in the Beneventan script for *quoniam*. F4 seems to be avoiding the problem by abbreviating with a stroke over *que*. The manuscripts show a conflation of the various types for this relative form: *que* F4; quem Vat1 Vat4 Vat5; quem Vat2 Vat3; quem Vat6. Vat2, Vat3, and Vat6 seem certainly to be abbreviating *quoniam*, while it is unclear what Vat1, Vat4, and Vat5 intend. In another place (P.3.5) for *quem* F4 had *quem* while there Vat1 had *que*. What look like contemporary corrections in Vat1 show another interesting confusion in the *qu-* words. In most instances Vat1 had first written out the full form *quam*; this has been altered into an abbreviation, but not consistently in every instance. Thus at P.3.9 *uam* has been crossed out by a diagonal stroke and a wavy line put over the *q*. At P.3.13 the form had been *quā* with a horizontal stroke over the *a* for the *m*. In this instance a diagonal line has been drawn through the *u* and another through the *a*, a
wavy line has been put over the q and its lower stroke has been crossed by a diagonal line: \( \surd \). At P.3.14 the -ua has been crossed out by an x, the lower stroke has been crossed by a diagonal line and a wavy line put over the q: \( \div / \). In other places the latter part of the word is simply erased, e.g. P.6.7 and P.6.8. Thus there is no consistency even within this one manuscript on this form although one should expect a certain amount of confusion between manuscripts. A similar uncertainty is found for quid and quod. The confusion could possibly arise from an exemplar in Beneventan copied into another script using suprascript letters for the gu- words or a manuscript copied from such a script into Beneventan.

That the error is found in A seems to suggest that it was copied from some hand other than Beneventan; by the same token Vatl seems to show very strong influence of a Beneventan manuscript, since quam was not normally abbreviated in Beneventan script (see Loew, p. 190). The scribe of Vatl copied exactly what he saw, because it was possible strange for him to see quam not abbreviated, but then later he or some contemporary corrector went through the manuscript changing each instance into an acceptable abbreviation. A comparable situation occurs in the manuscript Vat4, where in two instances in the De Providentia
the first hand had written simply u with a stroke for vester and u with a superscript a and a stroke for vestra. (See Traube, Nomina Sacra, p. 212ff.) In the first instance the word comes at the end of the line of the first column, but a contemporary hand has completed the word in the very small interior margin and in the second instance has completed it above the line. It was not the scribe of Vat4, since in another instance to be discussed later (pp. 202ff.) he scrupulously avoided marring his work. The implication for Vat4 is that his exemplar had such a form for vester, but that the manuscript was being read in a place where this was not the usual abbreviation. The abbreviation ur with a horizontal stroke above is found in a few Beneventan manuscripts, but is not usual (Loew, p. 196); the form is peculiar, however, to Visigothic manuscripts. For general notices of the Spanish practices, I note from an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation at The Ohio State University, by Jon R. Weaver on a separated manuscript of Lucan in the script. The text is dated to a period approximating the writing of the

Jon R. Weaver, Vaticanus Ottobonianus Latinus 1210 and Vaticanus Palatinus Latinus 869 FF. 62-69 of the Bellum Civile of Marcus Annaeus Lucanus, an unpublished Ph.D. dissertation, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio, 1970. This work will be referred to throughout as Weaver and will be discussed again in connection with the geographic placement of the archetype.
Dialogues in manuscript A, and should give an idea of that other peculiar system of abbreviation, and significantly in a Classical author.

P.3.4 opponatur...postferatur: apponantur...post fantur Vatl
opponantur...postferantur E
opponat' ... post ferat Vat4
opponat' ... pferat Vat5
opponat' ... post ferat Vat6
opponatū ... om. postferatur Vat3
oppoat' ... om. postferatur Vat2
opponat' ... pferat F4

The manuscripts above show varying stages in the confusion between the singular and the plural. Vat2 especially shows a form possible as a source for the misplacement of the n on expansion with a subsequent horizontal stroke then taken as the n for the plural ending.

P.3.14 afferre: inferrē F4

P.3.14 haec mala: haec om. F4

Haec is a word more probably added than omitted in a passage such as this; F4 may be showing independence and correctness.
P. 4.1 prosperae res et in plebem: prospera/resed (d exp.; t s.scr.)

\[A^1-2\] prosperae res et codex Ambros. C85 inf.

The new recentiores show a variety of readings here:

prospera in plebem Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 multi
prospero re sed in plebem Vat4
codex Berolin. M. Lat. Fol. 47
prospere sed in plebem Vat1 E M B
prospere res in plebem F4

Vat4 and Berolinensis are clearly related in this difficult passage. It is the opinion of Reynolds that the Berlin manuscript was copied from Vat4.

F4 is conspicuous in preserving res, which is the essential word in restoring a passage which has been confused in A by wrong word division. Ambrosian C 85 inf. (See Hijmans\(^1\), p. 47) clearly reads et after res, the et apparently by the Tironian 7- symbol. Hijmans is somewhat at a loss to explain how this latter manuscript has come up with what seems to be the correct reading. The passage reads well without et; so F4 possibly has the correct reading. What function does et serve except that it occurs in A after one rearranges the word division and accepts the d-t correction? The confusion has obviously arisen from the ending of prosperae (-re) and the word res. Some variations with wrong word division and a
confusion between r and elongated s could account for the et or sed of the other manuscripts. The transitions could have been as follows: prosperes - prospereres es-prospereres et - prospere res et. Abbreviations could have helped the confusion further prospere res et (the reading of Ambrosianus C 85 inf.); or they could have arrived at sed by the following sequence: prosperes et - prospere set - prospere sed. Where there is more than one element of possible corruption (here word division, r-s confusion, t-d confusion, and abbreviation stroke addition or loss), the permutations of the possibilities make the exact sequence unclear, but the possibility very likely. The essential word in the passage is res, which only F4 and Ambrosian C 85 inf. preserve. The development of et or sed can be paleographically explained; so F4 may possibly be correct in this passage. F1 and F3, the independent manuscripts, read prospera in plebem. There was no sed or et in its hyparchetype. Prosperae res and prospera would present a difficult editorial choice, but could possibly be the readings in two different hyparchetypes.

P.4.2 magnus vir es: A F4 es vir (vel est vir) ceteri

This is a rare agreement for these two manuscripts.
P.4.3 experimendo: glossema add. Vat5 in margine:

nemo vires suas in pace cognoscit.

Viansino suspects that in the same passage quid quisque posset nisi temptando non didicit is a gloss on the same word, but it would not be unusual for Seneca to repeat the basic thought with a more pointed sententia; Vat5, however, clearly shows that scribes are not above adding even another pointed sententia in such passages.

P.4.4 Tib. Caesare: Ti. F4 T. Vat4

The passage has been mentioned above (p.98). Most manuscripts have G. which could have easily developed from a t in which the top stroke bends to the left almost touching the baseline or even the base of the vertical stroke. The confusion between c and t in a number of hands is of this origin, the Visigothic and Beneventan scripts have the confusion enhanced by ligatures for ci and ti. An old nota for Tiberius is Ti. preserved in Valerius Probus, De Litteris Singularibus (see Th. Mommsen, "Notarum Laterculi," in H. Keil, Grammatici Latini, IV, reprint Hildesheim, 1961, p. 271.)

P.4.4 tendat: Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 tendit F4 Vat1 Vat4

Tendit is the reading in A and is found in the
majority of codices. Hijmans\(^1\) (p. 61) cites ten other manuscripts that read \textit{tendat}, which is also the vulgate reading.

\textbf{P.4.5 gubernatorem: glossema navis s. scr. Vat1}

The addition of the specific type suggests how \textit{et herbas} (P.3.6) could have been added to the text after \textit{radices}. \textit{Gubernator} has literal and metaphorical meanings, and in this work one of its metaphorical relationships is with \textit{providentia} which rules and guides the world. The scribe wishes to make sure that \textit{providentia} is not misunderstood here so he adds the specific type \textit{navis}. Vat. Palatinus 1539, f.112r has: \textit{Incipit liber Senece de mundi gubernatione Providentia Divina quare multa mala bonis viris accidunt.}

\textbf{P.4.5 si te: om. Vat1 Vat5 Vat6 E Scor F2 M Par G}

\textit{om. F4 sed add. te post mentium}

\textit{ite Vat2 Vat3}

Reynolds posited a \(\beta\) class of manuscripts on this as well as other omissions. F4 is not normally in agreement in the omission group, and is only doubtfully so here, where it adds \textit{te} later in the passage. The passage still makes sense with \textit{te} after \textit{mentium} since the
conjunction still could be *si* before *inter plausus*. The structure and pronoun are repeated below, *si te ipse consolation ... si te ipse dolore*. The omission here for F4 may be similar to that of *est* discussed above at P.3.6. The question of why the manuscripts should generally omit, or possibly include the *si te* in this early instance rather than one of the later occurrences is not easily answered. One would think that the initial occurrences of the structure should not be omitted. *Si te* here is apparently correct, but confusion enough exists to make it only probable that F4 should be included in the β class. Further doubt is cast on the passage when it occurs in Vat2, Vat3, and Vat6 but not in the earliest manuscripts Vat4 and Par. Lat. 15086 or even in the earliest manuscript of the family group, Vat5 (see p. 186).

P.4.6 *vetuisses*: *metuisses Vat1 Vat5 F2*

This may be an independent error, but Vat1 and Vat5 even though they are generally in different larger family groups, sometimes share a common reading with very few other manuscripts (p. 188). The correct reading here must be *vetuisses* to explain the syntax of *te...dolore*.

P.4.7 *audacter*: *audaciter F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 audacter Vat6 audact Vat4 audacit Vat5*
Vat5 suggests how the variants could have arisen, by the omission or inclusion of an expunging dot beneath the i. Both forms are possible, audacter being the more usual. Viansino cites no recentiores with the form audaciter. In other Senecan works, audaciter is read five times, audacter nine times. In three instances of audaciter, audacter is a variant. For manuscript A, an important passage is De Vita Beata 23.3: audac/ter A (eras. i). For the Letters see 3.2 and 74.32.

P.4.7 spectat: F4 Vat1 Vat4

Other manuscripts read expectat, for the confusion see above pp. 94-95. The variation is not stemmatically significant.

P.4.7 se saepe: saepe se Vat5 Scor F2 G

Vat5 agrees with these manuscripts in other places. Transpositions are not likely to be corrected since they retain the correct words of the text. This is a significant family agreement (see p. 186).

P.4.7 veniet <et>

Gruter adds et here, but it is not really necessary. He may have been influenced by such passages as P.5.2
habeat illas et Elius and P.2.6 sed motu et, but the text is not sound in either of these instances.

P.4.7 diu: om. Vat5 Vat6 Scor G; om. F4 sed add. in marg.

The agreement of Vat5 is again stematically significant. F4 has not agreed with these manuscripts in the past and may only be correcting itself. The inclusion of diu is necessary to the sense of the passage where there is a contrast of time. See the commentary on P.4.10 advocata virtute; compare perpetuam infelicitatem and infinitis bonis P.4.10.

P.4.8 quisquis videtur...optimum: vid quisquis dilatus e quare deus optimum Vat5 esse om. Scor G B C

P.4.8 valitudine: A (eras: m) valitudine F4 Vat5

The error in A could have come about by mistaking a horizontal stroke for final m when it was actually for the intervocalic n found in F4 and Vat5. The usual form of omitted m in Beneventan was the 3-shaped sign, "occasionally ... a horizontal stroke." (Loew, p. 184; 171-172). The ordinary minuscule form was the horizontal stroke. Loew traces the 3-shaped stroke from the "capricious abbreviation strokes of the 8th and 9th centuries." There
was no regular omission of \textit{n} in Beneventan; it is found in later manuscripts, and rarely before the 11th century (Loew, p. 185). If the error in A has arisen as I have suggested, it would again appear that A is not copying from a Beneventan exemplar in which the various abbreviation strokes for final \textit{m} would have been distinctive and in which in the 11th century he would not expect to find omitted \textit{n}. The mistake would be best explained if he were copying from a continental manuscript. The late 10th and early 11th centuries seem to be the crucial period for admixture in Beneventan of the continental and South Italian systems, particularly in the area of superscript letters. Since the scribe of A is writing in that crucial period and does not seem to have a great knowledge of Latin, he could easily have made the error if his exemplar was not in the hand he was being trained in. That the scribe has made a number of errors arising from abbreviations would make it less likely that his exemplar was very old, but the type of error discussed here, confusion of the horizontal stroke for final \textit{m} or medial \textit{m} or \textit{n} could be possible even in older hands.

\textit{P.4.8 aliis: om. Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 Par Scor E Ven F2 M G}
This is an admixture of two families, as the next chapter will show. The two must ultimately go back to some common exemplar on the basis of passages such as this and the ones previously discussed for the β and γ classes of manuscripts developed by Reynolds. F4 noticeably is absent again from the passages that are the oldest in the stemmatic development of the recentiores.

P. 4.8 imperator: ipo F4 in marg. add. manus recentior
imperator.

The passage has been discussed before. Of the words of A only imp is decipherable from the correction of A⁵ over an erasure. Vat4 has imp which may indicate that this was also the reading of A which A⁵ simply tried to make clearer. F4's reading is for ipso and is the normal abbreviation of the word which usually retains the terminal morphology. Its reading explains how imperator could have arisen in the other manuscripts. The horizontal stroke over the ipo could have been taken for a medial m, i.e. imp, while a hastily formed o, possibly in union with the p, could have been mistaken for the 2-shaped form at the end of a word as -or. The result is impor. If the germination of the error was such as to retain the horizontal stroke, it may well have been taken
as a stroke on the vertical of p extending below the line, i.e. imperor. The change is additionally affected by the wording above: imparatur: dux.... Vat5 has the abbreviation impa which is the medial form predicted above. The previous use of the word dux makes imperator less likely here since it seems a little strong for the passage. If F4 is actually independent, its reading must be given strong consideration.

P.4.9 sopiti: sopiuntur F4 Feldmann

The passage will be discussed in another context (p. 240). The passage needs a finite verb which most editors supply earlier in the phrase. Most manuscripts read sopiti with A; manuscript M has sopiti sunt which seems to be an off-hand correction since the sense of the passage needs a present verb. Editors supply manent or languent. Vat5 has sopita, the independent manuscripts F1 and F3 have sopitam which Hijmans thinks should be accepted. It would modify enervantem felicitatem. The passage does have some thematic relationship with the passage, P.2.6 languent... per inertiam... It is probably from there that Viansino conjectured languent for this passage. The phrasing offered by F4 in the previous passage, per inertiam saginatam, makes Hijmans' acceptance of the reading of the independent manuscripts possible,
but F4 has another likely solution, and does offer the finite verb that editors feel is necessary. *Sopitam* would perhaps be too far separated from *felicitatem*. The problem should be reexamined, but the reading of F4 is possible. Editors have been reluctant to look for a solution at the end of the phrase because *sopiti* forms a cretic which is one of Seneca's favorite endings, but—*ebrietate sopiuntur* is acceptable.

P.4.10 *periclosissima: periculosa F4*

The word had occurred just before at P.4.8 *quia in castris periculosa fortissimis imperantur* and could have influenced the reading in F4. The sequence of the thought seems to need a superlative: among the many things that can harm, the one that has the greatest peril is *intemperantia*. Seneca uses military metaphor throughout the dialogue to emphasize the harsh training the soul needs to face adversity. The reading in F4 is, at any rate, an independent one.

P.4.10 *quidni satius sit: quid ne is satius A Par Vat1 quidine id satius F4 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 multi recentiores*

The text reading is from Muretus. The confusion of
of is and id is not likely stemmatically significant before satius, even though one expects Vat1 and Par to agree. The d/s could be influenced by the beginning of satius. But the manuscripts do support the presence of a pronoun which would have to be id. Scor deletes id. Once the principle is set that readings not in A have more significance than scribal conjectures, then an apparently incorrect reading in A can not be easily expunged from the textus receptus when a similar, and possibly correct reading is found in the other recentiores.

P.4.10 advocata virtute: advocat a virtute A Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 que advocat hominem a virtute Vat2 Vat3 advocata autute F4, sed add. in marg. aR advocata

Vat2 and Vat3 form a clear group which tries to make the best of what is found in A and a number of other recentiores. advocat cannot be right grammatically, and the relative clause of Vat2 and Vat3, while taking care of the syntax, introduces an idea that does not fit the passage, as the rest of this discussion will show. They also have no great manuscript authority. The usual solution has been to assume that the letters have been wrongly divided and write: ’advocata virtute. The passage as it
then stands is not altogether satisfactory. *Quidni satius sit perpetuam infelicitatem advocata virtute sustinere quam infinitis atque immodicis bonis rumpi?* A picture of a man enjoying great opulence had been presented just prior to this. A man protected from the elements in a warm house, with warm dining halls, and warmers for his feet is not likely to withstand even a *levis aura*. The luxuries really represent a false sense of security. Then occurs the passage under question followed by the note that death by starvation is a slower death. Those who gorge themselves literally burst apart (*dissiliunt*).

Lucilius had been unhappy because the spirit is so sorely tried. While he is not specifically said to be unhappy, his counterpart is *felix* (*P.4.7 veniet <et> ad illum diu felicem sua portico*). The passage offers him the alternatives: *perpetuam infelicitatem…sustinere* or *infinitis atque immodicis bonis rumpi*. The difficulty is with *advocata virtute* taken as an ablative absolute. Its meaning must be "with virtute to defend" or "plead." But does it mean to defend Lucilius or to defend the *infelicitas*? The passage yields an answer. *Calamitas virtutis occasio est* (*P.4.6*) occurs at the very beginning of this *exemplum*. The very next clause calls those truly *miseri* who by *nimia felicitate* grow sluggish, like those
becalmed at sea. These are the very contrasts that occur later as the choice for Lucilius. Seneca merely intends to show that his perspective is wrong, that by looking at the immediate, he misses the true significance of the *occasio virtutis*. And even if one worries about death, is not the death of one who is *infelix*, as Lucilius sees him, a better death? Seneca is asking Lucilius to question whether happiness is related to poverty or luxury. He is trying to show that, in a sense, virtue is occasioned by misfortune. At the end of the *exemplum*, the point must be related to the conflict that Lucilius has to resolve. The choice is between a lasting unhappiness marked by the opportunity to show one's virtue, or an immoderate luxury that has the appearance of bliss, but produces, in the end, sudden and complete destruction. For those tempered in poverty, death is slow, just as for those wallowing in luxury it is a sudden rupture. The manuscript reading that allows the theme *calamitas virtutis occasio est* in the present passage is found in F4. *Quidni satius sit perpetuam infelicitatem advocatam a virtute sustinere quam infinitis atque immodicis bonis rumpi?* The unhappiness is at the invitation of virtue, it is the occasion to show one's virtue. *Infelicitas* corresponds to *calamitas; occasio to 'advocatam; virtus* is the link. This is the only reading that unifies the images of the
exemplum beginning at P.4.6 nolite, obsecro vos... and ending at dissiliunt, P.4.10. The boundary is clearly marked by hanc itaque rationem which is the application of the abstract just studied. It is not so much a reasoning as an accounting of ideas. The concepts are now in balance in Lucilius' mind.

The reading can not be a slip of the pen in F4 since it adds the variant advocata in the margin and apparently by the same hand.

P.4.11 cruditate dissiliunt: cruditate membra dissiliunt F4

For the sense of the passage see P.4.10 above. The verb dissilio is not frequent in Seneca; apart from three occurrences in the Letters and one in the De Clementia, it is found only here and four times in the Natural Questions. The verb is intransitive; membra would have to be the subject here, and is possible.

P.4.12 spiritus deus: deus om. Vat5 Vat6 Scor F2 G

This is a clear family relationship.

P.4.12 quod quo saepius: quo add. Thomas et Hermes
quoi id Gertz
quod saepius A Vat4
quo sepius Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat6
The reading solves the grammatical problems editors have been trying to correct. They have been reluctant to accept the reading of the late correcting hand A⁵₅, but the occurrence of the same reading in a better manuscript should remove that hesitancy.

P.4.12 corporis pars est: A F4 Vat⁴ pars est corporis
Vat⁰ Par E M Ven V pars corporis est Vat⁵
Vat⁶ Scor B F2 C G

The reading is given only to show the family relationships. Since the families neatly divide in different ways on this transposition, it would be natural to assume that their eventual common exemplar possibly had the word corporis written above the line from where it entered the different families in different positions. See P.5.2 magis potest deus.

P.4.12 illam: A F4 Vat⁰ Vat⁴ ipsam Vat⁵ Vat⁶ Scor Ven F2
G V

P.4.12 duremur: F1 F3 Ven durem₅ F4 similiter Vat⁵ Vat⁶
duremus Vat⁰ A multi recentiores
The passive is a necessity in the passage and is offered by the two independent manuscripts F1 and F3 along with Ven, which moves in a number of families. The abbreviation of F4 is not clear, but is probably for -mus.

P.4.12 faciet: codex Gryphiswaldensis Vat6; F4 ut vid.

aegre legitur

P.4.13 nauticis: A F4 Vatl Vat4 nautis Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 M Scor E Ven F1 F2 F3

P.4.13 ferendo: volg. efferendo A Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat6 Ven F1 F3 offerendo Vat5 multi recentiores sufferendo F4

There is a correction in A that leaves its reading in doubt (the ef- is from ej- or some such lection) but the reading in F1 and F3 would put efferendo in one of the hyparchetypes. F4 is unique, and is certainly independent in its reading. It gives a satisfactory meaning for this passage that has generally been corrected by changing to the simplex of the verb, a common enough element in Senecan style. The manuscripts, of whatever origin, are unanimous in supporting a compound. F4 offers the only plausible
one. Editorial attempts at introducing a preposition before ferendo do not seem satisfactory.

P.4.13 patientiam: patientiam vel potentiam Vatl Vat5

Par Scor G

The passage has been discussed before (p. 60) on the question of confusion of abbreviations. The readings given here are for the family relationship of Vatl and Vat5.

P.4.13 ad contemnendam patientiam: ad contemnendam malitiam eorum Vat4 sed malitiam linea transversa del. et add. in marg. patientiam et supra malitiam significavit esse inserendum.

No recentior other than Vat4 has this reading, malitiam. The passage in the text is possibly difficult at first. Why should the spirit through patience come to despise patientam malorum. A scribe might easily feel that malitiam eorum is better sense. There is the beginning of another exemplum, here on the theme id in quoque solidissimum est quod exerceat. Viansino feels this sententia is a gloss, but such a statement fits the pattern of theme and illustration that Seneca has used before. The exercise is the training of the soul by
patience and longsuffering, so that it comes to despise the ills that afflict the body. This Vat4 easily changes to malitia eorum, but the passage that has confused Vat4 is really to be explained by the true meaning of patientiam...patientia. They must mean here suffering. The soul by suffering comes to disregard the suffering of evil. Patience may be an acceptable equivalent in the one, but patientiam malorum must certainly mean the suffering of evil. Malitia is possibly a gloss that has found its way into the text just as others, who have the abbreviation confusion, read patientiam vel potentiam.

A scribe could have momentarily forgotten the etymological significance of patientiam, generalized for him as a Christian virtue. The idea is repeated at the end of the Dialogue in contrasting god and man. P.6.6 ille extra patientiam malorum est, vos supra patientiam. This is the final goal, the sudden leap of the soul to a supra-temporal ataraxy accomplished through patientia. A proper understanding of the passage will avoid the rash acceptance of Vat4's reading. Malitia is a common word in the Letters, but occurs in the Dialogues only at De Vita Beata 16.1 and Ad Marciam 12.6.

P.4.14 nudis: timidis Vat5

The Vat5 reading is possibly a contrast to
fortioribus, but it does not make good sense, and timi-
could have arisen from minim confusion in nudis. Vat5 is
wrong just before this, having the nominative natio
while also retaining labor. It is not correct here.

P.4.14 sustentat: sustat A¹ sustentat A² F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3
Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 omnes.

P.4.15 quaerendus: quaerendus est Vat5 Vat6 Scor F2 B C G

This is the usual family relationship for Vat5 and
Vat6, a relationship made clear from the inversion in
the next passage: horrenda caeli: Vat6 Ven Scor G V.
Here Vat5 adds caeli in the margin, indicating that it
should be added after horrenda. There is no clear evi-
dence that the other manuscripts derive from Vat5, but
transpositions frequently occur in just this way. A
manuscript first omits the word, and later inserts it in
the wrong place, where it is found in manuscripts derived
from it. There are enough individual omissions and trans-
positions in Vat5 and Vat6 to show that Vat6 did not
derive directly from Vat5.

P.4.16 pro ipsis ergo: pro ipsis enim Vat1 Par ergo om.
Ven pro viris ipsis Vat2 Vat3

Vat1 and Par again appear as a probable family,
as do Vat2 and Vat3. This will be confirmed in the next chapter. There is also some problem with *enim* or *ergo*. Ven could possibly have had *ego* in its exemplar as a product of *ego/ergo* confusion. As *ego* is clearly wrong, Ven then omitted it.

P.4.16 *multum*: *ante multum add. et F4 ut Vat1*

The *et* of F4 may be correct as a correlative to the *et* following. If F4 is an independent manuscript, passages such as this present difficult editorial decisions. The *ut* of Vat1 is not grammatical and possibly influenced by *ut esse* in the same passage, but its presence suggests that something should be read before *multum*. F4 presents a likely reading.

P.4.16 *aprica*: *opaca Vat4 Berolinensis M. Lat.Fol. 47 M.*

This is a possible family.

P.4.16 *multum inter formidolosa*: *inter formidolosa multum Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor Ven F2 G*

This common transposition shows a large family group.

P.5.1 *adice: adicite Vat1 Vat5 M*

Seneca shows frequent change between the singular and the plural of verbs, especially in the 3rd person where
the general subject may be at one time *vir bonus* and at another *boni*. Even in the case of the interlocutor, the singular or plural seems a capricious choice which shows up in the manuscripts. See P.6.7 *ad tendite modo et videbitis*; also P.4.9 *fugite...fugite*. See especially Hermes' apparatus note at P.2.4, line 20.

P.5.1 *ostendere*: *ostendere/ A (t in ras.)*

All the manuscripts have some form of *ostenderet*, the beginning varying between *host-*, *obst-*, and *ost-*. Vat6 has *oneret*. The reading of F4 is not clear, but it does read something at the end, and is probably *ostenderet*. The problem in A is not exactly the same as that discussed for *ere/ runt* which was founded in an *rt* ligature with an abbreviation stroke in the Beneventan script; but the confusions are similar in that an *re* ligature could possibly be taken for *rt*, which a later scribe could expand to *-eret* even without an abbreviation stroke. The reading in the archetype may have been *ostenderet*. The syntax would be: *hoc propositum deo... [ut] ostenderet*. Aubert has suggested the reading from the *recentiores*; F1 and F3 have *ostenderet*.

P.5.1 *reformidat*: *formidat Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor F2 B C G*

This is a clear family relationship.
The normal abbreviation for -bunt in Beneventan script from the 10th century that would have been -bt (Loew, p. 177). A variation of this was that for -bis the form was a horizontal stroke through the b with no terminal consonant written. The analogy to a scribe unaware of this would be that if -b is -bis, then -bt must be -bit. The -bis form is found with the pronouns nobis and vobis and would have had a higher frequency rate than the second person alone would suggest, and in those instances the words could not be taken as the nonsense nobit and vobit. Since this discussion stems from confusions arising from Beneventan script, one would not consider that A should be wrong if it had an exemplar in the same script, but the scribe of A makes other surprising errors which makes him somewhat unreliable.

The readings both make sense in the text, but the verbs are generally confused throughout this passage where Seneca does not make it clear just who or what is the subject. (See also above pp. 98-99).

The other manuscripts have the correct form
detestabilis. The confusion in b-v is similar to that in pervisos and perbisos discussed before, but is common in a number of hands, as well as being a standard linguistic variant. The previous discussion was confounded by the addition of pro and per confusion that could be traced to Visigothic (see p. 91 and commentary on p. 5.3 percissos). Weaver (pp. 28-35) gives a good summary of the confusions that can be found in Visigothic at the turn of the eleventh century. The errors indicate the influx of non-Spanish elements and are similar to many of the errors found in A and the later manuscripts. See especially quod, per, and -er-. This last form, rare in Visigothic, is prendre for prendere, a likely source of confusion for prenderem, prendet, prendem, prenderem. Among orthographic variations Weaver includes which have significance for the Seneca manuscripts are: b and u confusion (e.g. perbisos, pervisos); d and t confusion (e.g. inquit, inquid); intrusive p between m and n (e.g. contemplenda at p. 5.13 of A); t and d confusion, c and d confusion, and b and d confusion with extensive permutations. The exemplar of A shows a number of slips that are best attributed to an exemplar in a script other than the Benevantan. While it could possibly be Visigothic, the most likely candidates are manuscripts using a script with continental influence. This would be highly confusing to a scribe writing in
Benevantan. Loew's study shows that it was particularly at this time that a number of abbreviations began to show continental influence. The Visigothic manuscript studied by Weaver from the same period shows that it was--likely a common phenomenon of the period. The question of word division is not resolved for the $A$ manuscript by these mistakes, but they were likely carried over from an exemplar copied from a manuscript in *scriptura continua*. That the majority of the *recentiores* do not have the letter confusions is not a sign of independence of $A$, but it would be very likely that $A^2$ and $A^3$ are correcting from manuscripts copied from the archetype independent of $A$, and containing fewer word division problems.

P.5.2 bonum itaque: itaque et *Vat3 Vat5 Vat6*

No other *recentiores* are reported as having this reading in Viansino, but for these manuscripts the suspicion of a family relationship is strengthened.

P.5.2 *illas et Elius leno: illa sedet Elius leno* (ed *punctis del.*) $A$ *illas// et $A^5$ illas et Helius leno $F4$ illas et Elius leno *Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6* illas et dis leno *Vat2 Vat3*

The case for a family relationship of Vat2 and Vat3
is strengthened. The problem in A is again word division, but not merely word division. The scribe of A may have been faced with a tall s abbreviation of sed, β, or simply a tall s confused as sed. There are a number of places in A where there is general confusion between, s, 治理, and t so that there is no certainty in determining what he had before him. (See also the commentary on P.6.1 etiam virorum.) Mention has been made before of inquid and inquit variation; other problems found in A are illustrative: P.6.3 illo set A¹ corr. A³ in illos et; P.6.6 quod eum A¹ corr. A² in quo eum; P.2.7 ad A¹ at A⁵ corr. But a more crucial passage is found at P.2.10 nobile sedet A¹ corr. A² in nobiles edet. Sedet of the first hand is the same form we have here at P.5.2 in precorrected A where besides problems of word division, ed had to be expunged. Possibly at P.2.10 a rearrangement of the letters is not the only solution. A may have confused a final s for sed which is conjectured here at P.5.2. If this is the case, the correction should be nobiles et which may conceal nobiles det or dat. Sed could have developed from an s confusion, and -at would have been changed to et to give an acceptable form sedet rather than sedat. The difficulty is that the simple correction of word division gives a possible reading, nobiles edet operas. Seneca
has this again in this dialogue at 5.1 edere operas. In other places he has operam with dare, and operas with edere, with other verbs usually operam. This is not to say that nobiles det or dat could not be the reading. P.5.2 may be the key to correcting P.2.10 in a different manner. The confusion in A seems to be the same in both places. At De Tranquillitate Animi 3.5 where A has sed qui, the vulgate reading is sed et qui.

P.5.2 deus: ipse deus Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor B C G

This is a clear family relationship.

P.5.2 magis potest deus: potest deus magis Vat4
potest magis deus F1 F3

Vat4 agrees with the independent manuscripts F1 and F3 in transposing magis but not to the same place. Magis was possibly written above the line in one of the hyparchetypes. See also P.4.12 corporis pars est and P.5.8 quid est boni viri. Similar problems in the hyparchetypes can be suspected where double readings occur in one family, while other manuscripts show only one or the other lection. See P.4.13 patientiam vel potentiam Vat1 Vat5 Par Scor G. Viansino in his text of the Consolationes lists a number of such instances involving A and the independent manuscripts F1 and F3 (F3 has the siglum F2 in that text)
see p. vii, e.g. 12.2.4 esset habere* A, esset C, haberes F1 F3 and especially the notes there.

P.5.3 ad turpissimos: a turpissimis Vat3 Vat5 Par E Scor F2 turpissimis Vat4 M G

P.5.3 quid porro: om. Vat2 Vat3; om. Vat6 sed add. in marg. est inicum: iniquum est Vat2 Vat3 Vat6

Vat2 and Vat3 form a clear group within a larger family. This is confirmed by an even larger number of passages not reported here. Of the other manuscripts in the family Vat6 seems to be an occasional member of the smaller subgroup. The larger family is composed of Vat5, Scor, B, C, and G, although these last manuscripts are stemmatically older since they have fewer omissions.

P.5.3 fortes viros: F4 add. in marg.

P.5.3 obligatis: ligatis Vat5 Scor F2 B C G

P.5.3 percisos et professos

The passage has been discussed before, p. 91. All manuscripts agree in readings professos, but percisos has a number of variations. A comparison of the abbreviations for these words is instructive (Loew, p. 101):
The confusion in *percisos* and *procisos* could easily stem from a crosshand copying of the work from Visigothic to Beneventan or even through an intermediate in the continental system. Weaver's study of a Visigothic manuscript contemporary to the writing of A shows a mixed system. For the most part that manuscript does not abbreviate *pro* (Weaver, p. 30), the general tendency noted by Loew, but there are a few instances where *p* is used for *pro*. (It is usual for *per* in the manuscript.) The examples cited from the Lucan manuscript are at 7.411 *p* for *pro*; at 1.461 *pana* for *prona*; and at 8.90 *p*una for pronuba.

P.5.4 saepe: om. F4 M

P.5.4 magna re publica: re magna publica Vat1 E M P2; *supra* re scripsit magna Vat4

This is a family relationship for Vat1.

P.5.4 impenduntur: et impenduntur F4 Scor E M G

F4 and M repeat in agreement here as they did at
P.5.4, but they rarely agree. M is most frequently found with E and the family represented by Vat1. The reading here cuts across a number of presumed families and may be an independent insertion between impendunt and impenduntur.

P.5.4 volentes: volentes F4 supra scripsit i no

P.5.4 trahuntur a fortuna: a fortuna trahunter Vat5
   a fortuna non trahuntur Vat3 Vat6
   a forma trahuntur Scor F2 G B C

These manuscripts form a large presumed family. They show that here by transposing, but interestingly enough they break up into clearer subgroups. Scor, F2, G, B, and C form one subgroup, while Vat3, Vat5, and Vat6 form another; Vat5 shows its earlier stemmatic age by not inserting non as do Vat3 and Vat6. The non in these last two manuscripts was not transmitted by the exemplar of the family.

P.5.5 viri: om. Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor Ven F2 G

This is the larger family again.

P.5.5 notam voluntatem vestram: voluntatem vestram notam
   F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Par F2 Ven E M
Vat4 is conspicuously absent from this large group that transposes.

P.5.5 adsum: sum F4 Vat5 Scor F2 G V

There seems to be no stemmatic reason why F4 should agree with the manuscripts in the last two examples.

P.5.5 sustuli: substulistis Vat1 sustulistis F2 abstuli Vat3

P.5.6 patieritis: A patiemini Vat5 nonnulli(H-F) patieritis patiemini H W

P.5.6 quid ergo est: quid est g F4

The ego/ergo confusion has been discussed before, see P.3.3. Ergo is the only possibility here, but F4 has the abbreviation that possibly gives trouble.

P.5.6 nunc quidem: om. G quidem om. Vat5 Scor (add. in marg.)

These manuscripts are part of a presumed family.

P.5.6 retinenti: resistenti Vat3 Ven renitenti Vat4 F3

P.5.6 quod scio: § scio F4 quo Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Ven Scor G

See also P.3.3 cum quo. F4 has used the abbreviation here to indicate quo in other passages. The same
confusion in quod or quo is found at P.1.4 quod tu. See also P.6.6 quo deum where the problem begins as word division and ends with abbreviation confusion.

P.5.7 restat: prestet A I restet A 5 F4 Vat1 Vat4 multi recentiores restat Scor Fl F3 G

Discussed above for its stemmatic value (p. 86). Why restet has been rejected by editors is not clear. AI is clearly wrong and editors have been generally hesitant about accepting the corrections of A 5 and a few other recentiores, but the better manuscripts of this study, F4, Vat1, and Vat4, give the reading some manuscript standing. The subjunctive would be possible as an indirect question with disposuit. There is no sequence problem. Disposuit is clearly a present perfect. With birth is associated fate (see P.5.8 parti sumus), that ordains and continues to ordain.

P.5.7 distingui: F4

All other manuscripts read distinguuit. Distinguui is the Vulgate correction. The syntax requires an infinitive which F4 provides.

Distinguuit was possibly influenced by constitutum est, but the subject would have to become personal and
the subordinate clause would have to be *quanta videatur*. This would be difficult, and an infinitive would still be needed.

P.5.7 summa in unum: sumarium Vat3 F2 ali

summam murium Vat5

sum marium Vat6

The family manuscripts Vat3, Vat5, and Vat6 show a progression in error enhanced by word division and minim confusions, that is, confusion of the down strokes of \( \text{i, u, m, and n} \) written usually without lifting the pen, as in *minimum*. A number of the m's are represented by horizontal abbreviation strokes.

P.5.8 accipimus: accepimus Vat1 E et antea Fickert

Not much can be made stemmatically of this *e/i* confusion which also occurs in the manuscripts for intel-lego/intelligo.

P.5.8 quid est boni viri: quid boni viri est F4

F4 has a number of independent transpositions, and on such points gives very little certainty. Even if F4 is an independent manuscript, the number of transpositions exceed a reasonable amount of interlinear material in the
hyparchetype which seems to be the explanation of the transpositions found in other manuscripts, e.g. at P.4.12 corporis pars est and P.5.2 magis potest deus.

P.5.8 sic vivere, sic mori: vivere sic sic mori Vat5

This is an interesting variation, but there is little reason to suspect that it is correct.

P.5.8 inrevocabilis: inrevocabilit\' Vat3 Scor G
    irrevocabili\'t Vat5
    inrevocabili\'r Vat6
    irrevocabili\' F4 Vat1 Vat4

The abbreviation of F4 and others has been the difficulty for other recentiores who expand as the adverb, showing part of the termination as t or r.

P.5.8 parti: parati A F4 omnes

The text reading is by Gertz, but he is wrong. Viansino restores the manuscript reading parati sumus in his text. The whole dialogue has centered about the preparation of the soul for the onslaughts of fortune. Our fortune is decided at the very first hour of our birth (P.5.7), but its hold does not continue beyond that first setting of fate. One must obey it, true, but it is a passive obedience; god too obeys it (P.5.8), but there
is a way out, as the end of the dialogue shows. The end of one's life is his own choice. He may choose to give up the fight and end it all. In this respect man is above suffering, above fate. Seneca relates the concept closely to man's birth again to show the freedom he retains. Non tam longas in exitu vobis quam intrantibus moras posui; alioqui magnum in vos regnum tenuisset, si homo tam tarde moreretur quam nascitur. (P.6.7)

In this way the hold of fortune is broken. Thus at P.5.7 accipimus peritura perituri; but this has been decided: olim constitutum est (P.5.7). We accept what comes because we have trained, for this we are prepared. Fortiter omne patiendum est, quia non, ut putamus, incidunt cuncta, sed veniunt (P.5.7). Nihil cogor, nihil patior invitus (P.5.6). We are not born for death, our death makes us free. Whatever other fatalistic trends might exist in this philosophy, Seneca asserts this one freedom for man. To live is to assent willingly to fate, to commit suicide is to exert one's freedom from fate. Thus in the present passage, we accept the misfortunes sent by fate, not because we have been born to them, but because by exercise of the soul we have prepared for them. Parati sumus gives this necessary meaning.

Some manuscripts, F4 among them, read simus for sumus. There is no conjunction to join the clause with
querimur as an indirect question, nor does the subjunctive seem to be a deliverative. Minim confusion could explain the variants.

P.5.8 ille ipse: illa ipse A F4 Vat1 F1 Scor M Par

ille ipse volg. Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

The correction to ille is necessary.

P.5.8 omnium conditor et rector: conditor et rector omnium

Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Ven F2 G conditor omnium Scor (om. et rector sed. add. in marg.)

P.5.9 fati fuit ut bonis: A¹ in ras. praeter litteras fat et nis

This reading could not be assigned to one of the test categories since the erasure could not be identified with any of the hands in manuscript A. All the manuscripts under study read fati fuit ut bonis.

P.5.9 et vulnera: et om. Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 B C F2

P.5.9 et acerba: et add. in marg. F4 et ante acerba significavit inserendum esse.

P.5.9 ut efficiatur: autem add. F4 inter haec verba
P.5.9 dicendus: dicendus est F4

F4 is not likely to be correct in adding est, but autem seems possible. Whether it is, in fact an authentic reading depends on the ultimate judgment one has for F4 as an independent variant carrier.

P.5.9 planum iter: iter planum Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor Ven F2 G

P.5.10 quae molliat: quae om. Vat1 E M

P.5.10 escendere: excendere aut extendere A extendere F4 extendere Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 multi excedere Scor in marg.

The passage has been discussed above (p. 95). The variation is not significant. Scor's reading may arise simply from an omission of an abbreviation stroke.

P.5.10 vadendum: esse add. F4 multi, alii est

Discussed above (p. 99). The variation is widespread in the recentiores and must be early although the stemmatic significance would be difficult. It is just as easily an independent addition to the text.
P. 5.10 scies: A F4 Vat4 sciens Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor Ven F2 Par G

F4 and Vat4 avoid other widespread errors at P. 2.8, the addition of haec, and at P. 2.8, honestius for hones-tior.

P. 5.10 in margine add. Ovidii F4, fortasse prima manu

There are other marginalia in F4, some are definitely by the first hand making corrections in his text. To add Ovidii here suggests that F4 or some manuscript in its stemmatic line has consulted a text of Ovid. (See Chapter IV, p. 193 and commentary on P. 5.10 ima.) F1 and F3 add two other verses of Ovid at this point.

P. 5.10 pavida trepidet: trepidet A
trepidum F4
pavidi Vat1 Par M

Vat1 and Par show a family relationship again, here with M which has in the past occasionally agreed with F4. For the reading of F4, see P. 3.5 where it has premium for premit.

P. 5.10 quae me: te Vat3 Vat6 F2 B alii om. Vat4 Vat5
The reading *una* could have arisen by *minim confusion* from *ima*. F1 and F3 have other lines of Ovid at this point and may well have received their reading from the Ovidian tradition. The lection must be interpolated into Scor which shows family relationships other than with F1 and F3. F4 which at this point has the marginal note *Ovidii* still has what must have been the archetypal reading.

**P.5.10** escendo

See above, p. 94.

**P.5.11** acrem animum: animum acrem ~ Vat5 Scor F2 B C G

acrem add. ~ Vat6 post animum

acrem om. ~ Vat2 Vat3

Vat2 and Vat3 are a clear subgroup. Vat6 has agreed with them in the past and is likely doing so here, taking its addition from a manuscript of the Vat5 Scor group, but originally it read with the subgroup, Vat2 and Vat3.
P.5.11 deterreri me: me deterreri F4

This is an independent transposition shared by no other recentior.

P.6.1 aliquid mali...non patitur: om. Vatl
aliquid...fieri add. in marg. Vat3
sed om. omnino ille...patitur

The omission in the two manuscripts is due to haplography. The error could be independent. Why Vat3 only adds part of the omission in the margin is unclear since most manuscripts likely had the full text or none at all, as we find in Vatl.

P.6.1 ac: aut Vatl E Par

P.6.1 vindicat: vidicat F4 vindicat (n add. m²) A

Other manuscripts have vendicat or vindicat with an e/i confusion seen before. A possibly just missed a horizontal stroke for the omitted n.

P.6.1 virorum etiam: etiam virorum: Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor F2 B C G

This is a clear occurrence of the large family; but beyond that, etiam is the vulgate reading. Manuscript A
has \textit{etimi}; M has simply \textit{et}. The reading of M could have arisen from the abbreviation preserved by many of the manuscripts, a \textit{7}-shaped form with a superscript dot or horizontal line, \textit{7} or \textit{7}, even \textit{7 Vat6}. Only Vat3 of the manuscripts studied expanded fully to \textit{etiam}. One may not be justified in restoring the abbreviation system on the basis of these late manuscripts, just as one would not be justified in restoring spelling from them. But there is still the fact that if there are at least two traditions from the archetype, each may show some different variation based on an early misunderstanding of an abbreviation. A certain amount of nonsense enters the text in this way and is passed on in the traditions so that even in late manuscripts one can gain some knowledge of what went wrong. In the case of manuscript A, we are dealing with an earlier manuscript. On the basis of letter confusions and word divisions, it apparently derives from an early manuscript; others feel that its exemplar was in Benevantan and not much older than A itself. Traube (\textit{Nomina Sacra}, p. 211) gives one example, illustrative for the \textit{Dialogues}, of an abbreviation misunderstanding in the case of \textit{noster}. He traces the history of the abbreviation of this word into the later minuscule period. In \textit{De Tranquillitate Animi} 3.1, manuscript A reads \textit{in opere esse non longe pulcherrima est}. 
Non is found in a few recentiores while other omit it altogether, since the negative makes no sense. Gertz had conjectured nostro which Traube thinks is correct. The abbreviation no was frequently mistaken for non, rather than the correct nostro; the confusion points to an exemplar in the 6th century, since the type by the 8th century is with r, e.g. nro. Traube gives numerous illustrations from other works, as well as a list of likely errors (p. 226). Among confusions that result from a misunderstanding of contraction and suspension systems, two are of interest for the recentiores, tamen and tantum confusion, quomodo and quoniam confusion (pp. 264-265). These last two continue into the manuscripts of Seneca, see for similar confusions e.g. P.3.14 where A has an abbreviation that is usual for quoniam in the Beneventan script while the recentiores have quem; and in the manuscripts studied, the abbreviation tm is found frequently for tamen or tantum. Similarly it has been suggested that manuscript A, because of its consistent confusion in passages with sedet, has an exemplar in which there was a tall s abbreviation of sed, i.e. s followed by a ;-form with which the scribe was unfamiliar, treating it variously as _s et or _sed et, or _sedet. A has general difficulty with word division, so it is difficult to know just how
he will misunderstand the text; but at De Tranquillitate Animi 3.5, Muretus had *sed <et>* where *et* is not in the manuscripts, but has become the vulgate reading. The pattern of error in A gives the reading a certain probability. In the same way, the pattern of error in A (which we are suggesting derives from an old hyparchetype) allows an emendation *nobiles det* (or *dat*) at P.2.10, the pattern set by P.5.2 *illa sedet*, P.6.3 *illo set*; P.5.10 *trepidet*.

P.6.2 *contemnunt*: *contempnunt* F4 Vat1 Vat5 Vat6

*contempdunt* Vat4

*contendunt* Vat3

The intrusion of *p* between *m* and *n* eventually produces the change found in Vat3. Omitted here are the abbreviation strokes that isolate the consonant *p* which readily changes to *d*, e.g. *-epūt* for *-empnunt* with the stroke over the *u* standing for both omitted *n*’s.

P.6.2 *accidere*: *accidē* F4 accidens Vat1

P.6.2 *viri boni*: *boni viri* Vat4 Vat6 F3 M Scor Ven G

This is a strange mixture of manuscripts and families.
P.6.2 et occidant...cum aliquando: om. Vat5

P.6.2 quidni cum...occiduntur: om. Vat4

These last two examples are by haplography.

P.6.2 sibi manus: manus sibi Vat1 Vat5 Vat6 Scor F2 Ven G

P.6.2 afferant: auferant Vat1 M F2 G aufferant Vat6

P.6.3 circumdidi: ortum dedi ut vid. Vat3

P.6.3 fallacique: facilique Vat1 E Par falsoque F4

F4's reading has the appearance of a gloss that has found its way into the text, but the reading appears in no other manuscript. Vat1 and Par appear as a family as one would suppose from their physical texts.

P.6.3 somnio: sompno F4 somno Scor E M G

P.6.4 aspicis...videris: A cd. Palat. Lat. 1541 aspicitis

F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

videritis Vat1 Vat6 F4 ut vid. videris

Vat2 videtis Vat3 Vat5 vidis Vat4

P.6.4 qua occurunt: currunt F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5

Vat6 Ven Par F2 V qua om. Vat4 Vat6
The reading *currunt* shows extensive mixture of the families, the possibly independent F4, and the more difficult manuscript Vat4. The reading must be very old stemmatically.

P.6.4 *et quidem*: *et om. Vat3 equidem Vat4 M*  
*Berolin.M.Lat.Fol.47*

Reynolds feels the Berlin manuscript is a copy of the oldest *recentior* Vat4. The manuscript M has on occasion agreed with F4.

P.6.4 *stare et*: *et om. Vat3 F2*

P.6.4 *disturbet*: *disturbet Vat1 sed supra scr. l scopiata*

P.6.4 *ac detegat...ac verae: om. Vat3*

P.6.4 *foeditatis: felicitatis Vat3*

Vat3 has just omitted prior to this, and may be lost picking up his reading here from the numerous examples of *felicitas* present which he then writes for *foeditatis* by general resemblance.

P.6.5 *aliquis: om. Vat1*

P.6.5 *sic mundus exteriora: sic vir b...)* exteriora *(fort. vir bonus) F4
P.6.6 tristia: tristitia F4 Vat4

The passage has been discussed before for its stemmatic importance, see p. 59.

P.6.6 vos istis: illis F4 vobis Vat2 Vat3

P.6.6 ferte: ferre F4(ut vid.) in marg add. ai for|rs (ut
vid.) forte Vat1 M Par fere Vat6

P.6.6 hoc est: om. Vat4

P.6.6 quo deum: quo deum F4 Vat1 q deum Vat6
  quod eum Vat2 q eum Vat4 Vat5
  quod eum A

The passage is one where A has wrong word division, but in this instance the confusion is found in many of the recentiores as well.

P.6.6 ille extra...paupertatem: om. Vat4

P.6.6 mortem...contemnite: om. Vat1

Both by haplography

P.6.6 quae vos: om. Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Ven Scor F2 V

A clear family group.
P.6.7 quo feriret: q feriet *Vat4* (quod?)

Vat4 gets more difficult to read in these last few lines of the dialogue.

P.6.7 fugere: effugere *F4*

The prefix on F4 may have arisen by a dittography licet et fugere or by reason of haplography -et/ef may have been lost in the other manuscripts. The process of assimilation is not complete in the manuscript traditions. Fugere seems more likely here.

P.6.7 ideo: *A F4* ideoque ceteri

This is a rare concurrence of F4 and A in a correct reading.

P.6.7 loco posui: posui loco *Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor F2 B C*

This is a rather clear family grouping.

P.6.7 modo et: modo qui *Vat3*

P.6.7 et quam: et om. *Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor F2 B C G*

P.6.7 in exitu vobis quam intrantibus: in exitu quam intrantibus vobis *F4*
The separation of longas from moras in this same passage would suggest that the word order of the text reading is intended, rather than F4's facile alteration.

P.6.7 moreretur: moriretur Vat2 Vat3 Vat5

Likely just e/i confusion rather than a transmitted grammatical error.

P.6.8 munus: mun F4 alii munis A corr. A

Some of the new recentiores even read the expanded form munus.

P.6.8 illi suum: suum illi Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 E M Ven V

This is not the usual family group. One would have expected Vat5 or Vat6 to be present for the Vat2 and Vat3 group. Possibly Vat2 and Vat3 are transposing independently, since the other manuscripts have sometimes agreed.

P.6.8 dum optatur vita: dum optatur vita: dum optatur vita F4

Of the reading of A only op tu ta can be made out; A has corrected optatur vita. The other recentiores have the corrected reading of A. F4 may possibly be correct, but it is a difficult reading. The meaning would be, while
there is a desire, life is desired, even amidst solemn rituals of sacrifice. But learn also of death there. The juxtaposition of *vita, mortem* shows the clauses are adversative. The theology of the dialogue would not suggest that the sacrifice has eschatological meaning, but rather that one sacrifices to propitiate adverse fortune and to better his own position. These are temporal aspects and reflect upon the choices offered Lucilius in his previous complaints on why those apparently evil prosper.

Seneca is telling Lucilius that even while he chooses to live and makes sacrifices to the gods to better his life, he can learn how to die, just as the sacrificial animal falls at the blow of a human hand. This would have to be the explanation to accept F4's reading. It is possible, but difficult.

**P.6.8 opima: optima Vat4 Vat5 Scor G**

**P.6.8 abrumpitur: adrumpitur Vat1 M Par**

One expects Vat1 and Par to agree, and M shows signs of being in that presumed family.

**P.6.8 ille qui: ille om. Vat1 E M Ven V**

**P.6.8 committit: connectit F4 F2 Ven V**
F4 has seldom agreed with these manuscripts, but this variant seems not likely to be an independent variation even though there could be minim confusion, e/i confusion, and ot/tt confusion. It is too much to expect that they have arrived at the same reading independently. Ven and V along with F2 do form an occasional group. The reading may be interpolated into F4 or the other group.

P.6.8 illa: illi Vat5 F2 alii illi Vat6

This is a case of Vat6 including the variant; it is a later manuscript in its family and probably interpolated.

P.6.9 penitus impresso: impresso penitus Vat5 Vat6 Scor F2 B G

P.6.9 destinavi: volg. Erasmus I estimavi A omnes (vel existimavi)

The sense of the passage is that there are a number of places where one can effect suicide, Seneca neither points out a certum locum nor does he evaluate the places. The force needed is not great, nor must one probe deeply. The manuscript reading possibly should be retained, although a d may have dropped out between -us es-, as one already has visions of problems in A arising from sedet.
Vis is also found in F1 and F3 and marks F4 as being possibly independent. The progression in the other manuscripts is what one might expect, Vatl, an early manuscript, faithfully reads its tradition, while those later generally omit the difficult reading. Vi is found in E, Ven, Par, and V.

This is an example omitted from the correction list in A because the expunging dot could not be assigned, but it does seem to have been an early correction, as witnessed by the development in the recentiores. It is a passage that in the wider analysis could show a manuscript as independent of A.

The overlooking of an expunging dot explains how readings such as Vat5 and Ven arise.

The ut must certainly be in the archetype as witnessed by A and the independent F1 and F3. F4 again agrees in the correct reading with very few other manuscripts, and here with the best.
F4 possibly meant to abbreviate in both places, but after writing the full second form inadvertently gave it an abbreviation stroke. A similar process for other words could introduce errors in texts. The su abbreviation is a regular nota juris, see Mommsen in Keil, Grammatici Latini, vol. IV, p. 280.

F4 has already omitted the in before caput allowing that word to become the object of the verb, which makes better sense. It crushes a man's skull, rather than the man who has fallen on his head.

The negative seems to make sense, and may not be a capricious addition since etiam is added as well. "what,
you don't blush even?"
CHAPTER IV
STEMMATIC THEORY AND THE MANUSCRIPTS
OF THE DIALOGUES

The introduction briefly mentioned that the construction of a stemma for the Dialogues of Seneca is a difficult task and would not be attempted. The reason given was interpolation. Interpolation confuses any stemmatic presentation because it upsets the basis of stemmatic theory, the transmission of error. Interpolation stems from the comparison of texts already in existence to produce a new text or to mark variations between texts. Manuscripts are then copied from these corrected texts incorporating the variations. If the corrections derive from within one family, the difficulty in creating a stemma is great enough, but more destructive interpolation takes place when manuscripts of different families are compared.

Indicative errors such as omissions would not particularly help in determining a stemma for interpolated

---

1For stemmatic theory and types of errors, see Paul Maas, Textual Criticism, Oxford, 1958, passim, translated by Barbara Flowers; see also, L.D. Reynolds and N.G. Wilson, Scribes and Scholars, Oxford, 1968, pp. 137ff.
manuscripts; for the comparison of manuscripts would especially have eliminated omissions. Those errors that remain would probably derive from some of the earliest copies of the text. The Ambrosian manuscript of the Dialogues is a perfect example of the process. There are in it at least five correcting hands from various chronological periods. The advantage the critic has here is that he knows the basic manuscript is early and that some of the corrections are much later. Nor is the Ambrosian manuscript the only one likely to have caused this problem. The larger the number of manuscripts available for comparison, the greater the opportunity for comparison and the greater the likelihood that the comparison has taken place. Seneca was a popular author and there are numerous manuscripts of his works. It has been noted that for some of the spurious works attributed to him the number is over 400. The number of manuscripts of the Tragedies is over 300. While the number of manuscripts for the Dialogues is often said to be about 100, my own handlist for Italy alone approaches that number. As will be demonstrated in this chapter, there are clear examples of interpolation in the later manuscripts, but this should be expected where the earliest known manuscript exhibits the start of the interpolation process. The important feature of manuscript A is that it has not been
lost, and as a manuscript corrected by at least five hands it provides almost all the readings of the recentiores. This number of original and corrected readings in A has confused the establishment of a stemma for the manuscripts. It is, however, the earliest manuscript we have and was corrected by two hands at least prior to any of the recentiores.

What can one do stemmatically when faced with an interpolated tradition? My method for studying the recentiores presented in the previous chapters is one approach. For the tradition of the Dialogues it means that by comparison with those parts of the text of A that have stemmatic significance one can determine whether the readings of a later manuscript are likely independent or in a hyparchetype. Readings of stemmatic significance do occur in A. The stemmatic theory is based on the transmission of error. The Ambrosian manuscript has been corrected and critics accept some of the corrections as records of what Seneca wrote. It is not reasonable to assume that all of the early corrections in the Ambrosian manuscript have simply been scribal conjectures that have hit upon Seneca's words. Some are, no doubt, of this nature. At the same time, the first correction of the text could have been made against the manuscript's exemplar (the corrections of A\textsuperscript{1} in the Ambrosian manuscript)
and the corrections after this from comparison with whatever other manuscript available. The reasonableness of this is shown by the fact that the missing portion of the De Ira was added to the text from a manuscript source at an early period in the history of the Ambrosian manuscript. It seems very possible, then, that the first corrections in the manuscript after A1 were also from manuscript sources, or at least a great part of them. This is also evident since A2 and A3 are not making changes just in forms, but are adding words to a defective text. The additions (see list p. 41) do not seem to be scribal conjectures. These corrections would be the earliest manuscript record after the Ambrosian manuscript itself for the text of the Dialogues and have stemmatic significance even though the whole manuscripts may be lost. The question that has always plagued critics is whether these manuscript corrections are simply from other early copies in A's stemmatic line or from some different family tradition (see Figures 3 and 4).

Figure 3

Figure 4
The descent of A² and A³ may be different, but it is essential for the contrast in possibilities that they derive from z and not the exemplar of A represented in the figures as y. Figure 4 is similar to the stemma proposed to account for the inclusion of the beginning of the De Ira in the Ambrosian manuscript (see Figure 2).²

There is at least the possibility that these correcting hands represent a different family. My method of studying the recentiores attempts, by comparing those passages in error in A and corrected at a relatively early period, to arrive at even a few passages for which it can be said that the errors were in a hyparchetype. Frequently no more is found than a confusing abbreviation, but to establish the abbreviation system of the hyparchetypes is an important advancement in studying the manuscript traditions. If such errors (though they have been corrected in A) are then found in later manuscripts, the assumption is that such manuscripts contain a stemmatically early text at that point and quite possibly a whole text independent of the Ambrosian manuscript if the

²Of the many possibilities, this figure gives the simplest working procedure that still maintains a stemmatic idea. Marouzeau Rev. Phil., 1913, p. 47, establishes the same general figure; from the hyparchetype y he derived A, Berolinensis m. Lat. Fol. 47, and a manuscript in Breslau; from the hyparchetype z the manuscripts represented in Viansino's text by the sigla B, C, F₁, and F₂.
readings are in a hyparchetype. Interpolation confuses chronological arrangements of manuscripts in that instead of a manuscript chronologically later deriving from only one manuscript, the manuscript may derive from two or more manuscripts representing different stemmatic times and families. My starting point, the readings $A^2$ and $A^3$ as early manuscript sources, produced only a few test passages, but others developed which are discussed later in this chapter and in the commentary. Others have tried other methods, such as assuming for working purposes that the oldest manuscripts exhibit the earliest stemmatic text and the least possibility of interpolation. The results produced under these methods are not much better, since the texts available of the dialogues may have already been rather numerous in the period of our earliest recentiores.

Given all these problems, there is still something that can be salvaged, I think, from the stemmatic theory. Manuscripts were not interpolated to confuse later scholars, but simply to produce a more accurate or complete text. This seems to be the prime motivation. That all the additions of $A^2$ and $A^3$ have found their way into the later texts studied is some assurance of this. A transposition or a manuscript variation is not likely to cause a scribe or a scholar as much consternation as an
omission. Manuscripts show ample evidence of the working process of a scribe, in that he writes both variants in a text rather than omit one. Thus even in an interpolated text a substantial agreement in omissions would show some family groupings. Where these rough family groupings occur, variant readings in error are also likely to be symptomatic of family relationships. Thus the concept of agreement in error is still, to a certain point, valid in an interpolated tradition. What is needed is a preponderance of material rather than just a few passages.

It was because the test passages (p. 61ff.) were so few that no firm conclusions could be drawn about the relationships between the manuscripts studied here and the two major family divisions developed by Reynolds. The evidence of the omissions, additions, and transpositions proved only that the manuscripts were not copied from one another. My method for determining a relative stemmatic date for some readings indicated that manuscripts F4, Vat1, and Vat4 were those most likely to have early or independent texts. Further comparisons in the early part of my work gave me some guiding relationships for later studies. The conclusions from those comparisons are verified in the broader studies presented next.
The Manuscripts and the Other Recentiores

Since the manuscripts of the Dialogues studied here have not, except for Vat4, come to the attention of other critics, it would be of service to show how they are related to recentiores already known. The publication of Viansino's text of the De Providentia with a rather full apparatus for some recentiores facilitated the comparison. I have noted concurrences in error with other recentiores from his text. The passages presented show large family groupings and subgroups within families. While fewer passages are cited for subgroups, it should be remembered that according to general stemmatic theory, the second groups contain additional errors. Thus the interpretation of readings for manuscripts of a subgroup is that they contain those additional errors besides all those listed as family errors. A selection of passages will illustrate the interpolation problem. The readings have been restricted to those presented in the commentary so that the reader will have a reference for the new manuscripts under study. Rather full collation are provided for the new manuscripts. A survey of the apparatus of Viansino will show that the results are justified. The list here is not exhaustive. The commentary should be consulted for the nature of the error.
A very clear family picture for the Vat2, Vat3, Vat5 and Vat6 manuscripts is built up. This can be supplemented by consulting the complete list of additions, omissions, and transpositions for these manuscripts (pp. 63ff).

I. Manuscript Family 0 Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor G F2 B C

| P. 6.7 | posui loco | Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor G F2 B C Ven V |
| 5.1 | formidat | Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor G F2 B C |
| 6.7 | et om. | Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor G F2 B C |
| 4.16 transp. multum | Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor G F2 Ven |
| 5.5 | viri om. | Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor G F2 Ven |
| 6.1 | etiam virorum | Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 G F2 B C |
| 5.2 | itaque et | Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor G F2 |
| 5.2 | ipse deus | Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor G B C |
| 5.9 | et om. | Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 F2 B C |
| 6.6 | quae vos om. | Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor F2 Ven V |
| 4.12 | pars corporis est | Vat5 Vat6 Scor G F2 B C |
| 4.15 | add. est | Vat5 Vat6 Scor G F2 B C |

A full collation of Vat2 and Vat3 was not made when my preliminary work showed that these two manuscripts were related and stemmatically removed from the older Vat5 and Vat6. That they are indeed close is shown by the passages cited for their subfamily grouping. The absence of one or the other in the large family citations only means that the reading was not recorded. Full collations were made of the other manuscripts I studied. All other manuscript citations were dependent upon the fullness of Viansino's apparatus.
6.9 impresso penitus

Vat5 Vat6 Scor F2 B C

4.12 illam

Vat5 Vat6 Scor G F2 Ven V

6.9 vis om.

Vat3 Vat5 Vat6

5.4 a fortuna non

Vat3 Vat6

6.4 et om.

Vat3 F2

4.15 horrenda caeli

Vat5 Vat6 Scor G V

5.3 ligatis

Vat5 Scor G F2 B C

4.7 saepe se

Vat5 Scor G F2

II. Subgroups

4.10 advocat

Vat2 Vat3

3.4 cane

Vat2 Vat3

3.14 om. post-feratur

Vat2 Vat3

4.8 esse om.

Scor G B C

4.5 ite

Vat2 Vat3

4.16 pro ipsis viris

Vat2 Vat3

4.8 esse om.

Scor G B C

5.4 a forma

Scor G F2 B C

4.7 om. deus

Vat5 Vat6 Scor G F2

Vat2 and Vat3 are a subfamily. Scor, G, F2, B and C also form a subfamily. Vat5 and Vat6 seem to have early stemmatic texts since they rarely give any clear indication of grouping except within the larger family of manuscripts.
The same is true of V; it seems to have an early stemmatic text which I have not included in this family since it turns up in other family groups as well. There are some results that do not fit the family picture. They involve what seem to be the oldest stemmatic texts.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Passage</th>
<th>Manuscript 1</th>
<th>Manuscript 2</th>
<th>Manuscript 3</th>
<th>Manuscript 4</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>potest mali</td>
<td>Vat5</td>
<td>F1</td>
<td>F3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>possumus conferre</td>
<td>Vat5</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Ven</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>evulsit</td>
<td>Vat5</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>metuisses</td>
<td>Vat5</td>
<td>F2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Vatl</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adicite</td>
<td>Vat5</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>Vatl</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The passages are too few for certainty, but at some time the tradition of Vat1 and Vat5, apart from other manuscripts, seems to have come from a text much like that of the Florence manuscripts. F1 and F3 are γ family manuscripts along with Vaticanus Latinus 2214 and Vaticanus Latinus 2215. These four manuscripts form a clear family (see Hijmans, p. 53 and stemma p. 55). Vat5 and Vat1 in no place agree alone in error in those passages that Hijmans uses to illustrate the γ family grouping, but there are a number of other places where the γ family does share readings with other manuscripts. The results above are probably of the same sort, and similar to those found for Hijmans' α manuscript. They show an early stemmatic
tradition, but not one necessarily independent. Of the other manuscripts in the family, Scorialensis $Q\ I\ 8$ is said to have a very pure text (Viansino, p. 18*) very similar to $F2$, and at some point influenced by $F1$ and $F3$. It is part of the difficulty in establishing the tradition of the recentiores that most of the earlier manuscripts show at one place or another ties to manuscripts such as $F1$ and $F3$ which are more clearly independent of $A$. Marouzeau, for example, had placed manuscripts $B$ and $C$ in a hyparchetypal transmission independent of $A$. $B$ and $C$ are clearly related between themselves and more clearly after that with Scor. But the independence from $A$ does not seem justified in view of Reynolds' results which show that lines are omitted in some of the later manuscripts that correspond almost exactly to lines in $A$ (see p. 60). The only hesitancy that one could have in accepting this evidence is the possibility that manuscript $A$ and some other apograph of its hyparchetype retained very closely the line arrangement of their exemplars. This tendency to show independence in Vat1, Vat4, and Vat5 causes the greatest difficulty in establishing their tradition. They surely deserve further study in the other texts they contain.
This is a clear family picture for Vatl, Par, E, and M; and within that group for a subdivision of Vatl, E, and M. Now Vatl and Parisinus 15086 share the phenomenon of having the first four Dialogues and only part of the ninth. The Paris manuscript had the remaining Dialogues added later to complete its text, but the order was still Book II of the De Ira, part of Dialogue 9, and then the last book of the De Ira followed by the rest of the Dialogues. The coincidence of the first part of their texts led to speculation that the two manuscripts were in fact related. That is substantiated here.

It was also suggested earlier that since the text of Vatl and Vat4 ended very close in the middle of Dialogue
9 that they may have a related text as well, but possibly more removed through some common ancestry that showed physical deterioration of at least a folio at Chapter 14 and Chapter 15. It will be noted that Vat4 does not share any of the readings here. This suggests that it and the Berlin manuscript must be fit into the stream of the recentiores in some other area. A more complete crosstable of its readings with the other recentiores will be provided. The same is true of F4. Both of these manuscripts have only a few places in which they agree with the cited recentiores in error, but no clear family picture is presented. In the first family, F4 is represented by the common omission of diu at P.4.7 but it adds the word in the margin and clearly seems to be correcting itself in view of the solid grouping of the other manuscripts. In the second family F4 is represented by the reading concurrerunt for concurreurrerunt, P.2.10, but there is possibility of independent error or even correctness. Erasmus had the F4 reading in his second edition. Another variation of the text corruerunt, has a family transmission by E, Scor, F2, G, V, Ven. There are other instances in which manuscripts from these two large family groups agree with one or the other manuscripts from the other family. These are not presented here, but a survey of Viansino's
apparatus would show as much.

There is evidence to suggest that these two families are early interpolated with one another. The most telling instance involves Parisinus 15086 (13th century) and two of the manuscripts studied. The difficulty arising in the texts from the abbreviation *patia* for *patientia* has been noted before. One passage cited for this was P.4.13 where Vat1 and Vat5 have *patientiem vel potentiam*; they are joined in this by Par, Scor, and G, manuscripts from both families. This is a clear example of the inclusion of variants within the text that confuses later traditions. Reynolds uses the omission at P.4.5 of *si te* as one of the passages for the demonstration of the B tradition. It is very extensively omitted: F4, Vat1, Vat5, Vat6, E, Scor, F2, Par, G. This is a comprehensive showing of both families. The reading is not certain for F4 which adds the *te* in the next line after *mentium* (see commentary). The difficulty that it causes for the families is that the two manuscripts, Vat2 and Vat3, include a remnant of the reading in having *ite*. This is in spite of the fact that within their family they show a decidedly late text, i.e., besides showing the common errors of the family they commit a number of joint errors that places them later in that family's tradition. The only satisfactory answer is that they have received the reading by interpolation, and at
that, in a corrupt state.

Other passages within the manuscripts that seem to suggest the source for certain family errors. It would be best to treat these at this point while the two large groups are still under discussion. At P.5.11 some manuscripts of the first family transpose to *animum acrem* Vat5, Scor, F2, B, C, and G. Vat6 has first omitted *acrem* but then added it after *animum*. Vat2 and Vat3 omit the word altogether. This is an instance of how some transpositions and eventual omissions occur. At P.5.10 Seneca is quoting from Ovid; and where the Ovid codices have *ipsa*, most Seneca manuscripts show a confusion between *ima* and *una*, which has been explained in the commentary as confusion among minims. Scor, F1, F3, and β agree with the Ovid codices. The only conclusion for the family manuscript Scor is that the reading has been interpolated from an Ovid text. F1 and F3 have shown some affinity to Vat5 and would seem to need this explanation. F4 adds in the margin at this point *Ovidii* which would suggest that he has possibly consulted the text of Ovid or someone in his family has, but he reads the erroneous *ima* with the Ambrosian manuscript (F1 and F3 add two other verses of Ovid at this point, Viansino, p. 19*). At P.5.7 the confusion of the readings is developing within the family; for *summa in*
unum Vat6 has sū mariū, which seems to be the first mistake. Vat5 has suma muriū; Vat3, F2, and others complete the error with sumarium which seems right from Vat6. There are other passages; some have been treated in the commentary. It is something of a pleasure in these instances to see the scribe at work even though the results are destructive to the text; once a scribe can be classified as a transposer or omission or confuser or the like, his readings can be viewed with a more critical eye.

The family groupings shown by comparison of errors seem clear. The further question is whether the two family groups are in fact related somewhere earlier in their stemma. This seems to be the case from a number of passages where the agreement in error shows either extensively across family lines or pervades both groups entirely. Some of these errors have been discussed just above and previously in treating the decisive passages for Reynolds' division of families β and γ. A selection of other readings showing early family unity which one can consult in the commentary are P.4.8 om. aliis; P.5.5 voluntatem vestram notam; P.6.7 ideoque. The question is more neatly answered by Reynolds' results which show that a number of passages are omitted in later manuscripts which correspond nearly to lines of the Ambrosian manuscript.
For those portions I have on microfilm, Vat3, Vat4, Vat5, and Vat6 fall into this category and most likely derive from the Ambrosian manuscript. F4 does not contain the De Ira so a comparison could not be made; nor does Vat1 have the third book of that work. The evidence of family relationship with manuscripts related to ones derived from A suggests that Vat1 is derived as well from the Ambrosian manuscript and that this would be verified by comparison in a few other passages.

But there seems to be another approach that would help in any preliminary selection of manuscripts for study. Vat1 and Parisinus 15086 were first suspected of family relationship because of the coincidence of the texts they contained. The fact had been obscured for some time since the Paris manuscript was eventually completed from another source. It would seem that the texts a manuscript contains, as well as their order, can give some idea about the relationship of the manuscript to other recentiores and to a manuscript's stemmatic age. A tabular comparison of the new manuscripts shows some points of interest.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Vat1</th>
<th>Vat2</th>
<th>Vat3</th>
<th>Vat4</th>
<th>Vat5</th>
<th>Vat6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>7&amp;8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9&amp;12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7&amp;8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7&amp;8</td>
<td>10&amp;11</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>7&amp;8</td>
<td>10&amp;11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10&amp;11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7&amp;8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>xxx</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>xxx</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: The arrangement of the works within the manuscript is maintained. Intervening spurious material is marked by ***. The works are indicated by numbers as follows:

1. De Providentia
2. De Constantia
3. De Ira I
4. De Ira II
5. De Ira III
6. Ad Marciam
7. De Vita Beata
8. De Otio
9. De Tranquillitate Animi
10. De Brevitate Vitae
11. Ad Polybium
12. Ad Helviam
13. Epistolae
14. De Beneficiis
15. De Clementia
16. Quaestiones Naturales
17. Apocolocyntosis
18. Declamationes
Vat5, Vat6, and Vat2 are the only new manuscripts to have the complete text of the Dialogues. They have already shown family relationships; this could be substantiated for Vat5 and Vat6 by the fact that they both contain the Dialogues except in one instance in an identical order, but an order different from that found in the Ambrosian manuscript. The only difference is that Vat6 has logically put the three consolationes together pushing the De Ira to the end of the Dialogues, whereas it had intruded in Vat5 between the Ad Polybium and the Ad Marciam. Vat5 is possibly from the early fourteenth century and Vat6 is clearly from the fifteenth. The order in the intervening century had been cleared up in their family. Vat2 and Vat3 have the first part of their manuscript in an identical order although the latter half becomes confused. Vat3 has omitted 6 & 12 which figure predominately in the rearrangement in Vat5 and Vat6. The position of the De Ira after the De Tranquillitate in these latter manuscripts also suggests that the manuscripts derive from Parisinus 15086 at some point in the stream of the recentiores. These last examples show that the order of the works can give some clue to manuscript descent. It is interesting, also, to see that the Ad Marciam, which seems out of order in the Ambrosian manuscript, has by
the 15th century been combined into something of an edition of the Consolationes. The number and order of the works in Vat1 would not suggest that it is closely connected to fuller editions of the work found in manuscripts Vat5 and Vat6. It is certain that, for the early part, the Paris manuscript is clearly associated with Vat1. None of this gives any clues to the family position of F4 which contains only the Letters and the De Providentia. The common addressee had certainly facilitated the combination. The joining of the two works was possibly a Florentine invention since there are a number of Italian translations there of such a combination, nor have I noted the arrangement elsewhere, but this may be due simply to defective inventories, since even in Florence, F4 is noted as containing only Letters. Vat4 continues to be something of a problem. Reynolds believes that Berolinensis M.Lat. Fol. 47 is copied from it. Hijman's initial stemma had the Berlin manuscript derived independently from the archetype. A fuller crosstable of the readings of Vat4 is in order. The Berlin Codex and M are cited from Hijmans.

AGREEMENT IN ERROR OF Vat4 AND OTHER RECENTIORES

P.1.3 fulminum: fluminum Vat4 Vat3
1.3 ingentia: indulgentia Vat4 cd. Berolin.M
1.6 escendere: ascendere Vat4 Fl F3 Scor
1.2 modo et: et om. Vat4 sed add. supra lineam; om. M Scor E F2
2.4 quantumque polleat: quantaque polleat Vat4 cd. Berolin. M.
2.7 spectandi: spectant dii Vat4 A multi
2.7 atque: quam Vat4 cd. Berolin. M
2.8 voluptati: volutati Vat4 sed p supra lineam scrip; volutat Vat3
2.10 purum et: parū Vat4 puqrum om. et Vat3
2.10 concucurrerunt: concurrent Vat4 Fl Par B F4 Vat1
3.2 delectaverunt: delectaverint Vat4 ut vid. Par B Vat1
3.3 umquam: om. Vat4 sed supra lineam add; om. B Ven F1 F3
3.3 quid ego: om. ego Vat4 Fl F3
3.6 in repurgando: in repugnando Vat4 cd. Berolin. M
3.11 maluisse: voluisse Vat4 ma Voluisse Vat5
3.11 Regulum: Reguli Vat4 cd. Berolin. M
3.14 manus sibi: sibi manus Vat4 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor Ven F2
4.1 prosperae: prospero Vat4 cd. Berolin. M
4.2 magnus vir es: magnus es vir Vat4 omnes (praeter A et F4)
4.2 unde: inde Vat4 cd. Berolin. M
4.3 una: unam Vat4 Vat5 E Scor M F2 G
4.3 bohō viro: bono um Vat4 bonoviz cd. Berolin. bonorum M
4.3 ipsi: om. Vat4 omnes (praeter A, F4, Vat2, Vat3)
si te: om. Vat4 Vat1 Vat5 E Scor F2 M Par G; om. F4 sed add. te post mentium (si te A, Vat2, Vat3)

audacter: Vat4 sed corr. in audaciter ut vid; audaciter F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 audacit' Vat5

perpetua: propria Vat4 cd. Berolin. M.

felicatatis: felicitatas Vat4 felicitas Vat5

aprica: opaca Vat4 cd. Berolin. M

modo magis potest deus: modo potest deus magis Vat4 modo potest magis deus F1 F3

illa ad turpissimos defert: illa turpissimis desunt Vat4 a turpissimis Par B Scor F2 turpissimis M G refert Scor F1 F3

percisos: precisos Vat4 multi

retinenti: renitenti Vat4 F3

restat: restet Vat4 A F4 Vat1 multi

me: om. Vat4 te F2 B alii

ima: una Vat4 M F2 Par Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat6

aliquando ipsi: ipsi om. Vat4 ipsi aliquando F3 F3 ita

puta itaque: puta q ita Vat4 ita Ven

aspicis . videris: aspicitis . videris Vat4 alii similiter


tristia: tristitia Vat4 A (corr.) Ven F4

quo deum: q eum Vat4 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 A quod B F3

ille extra...contemnite paupertatem: om. Vat4 patientiam...contemnite paupertatem om. cd. Berolin. M

ideoque Vat4 omnes (praeter A et F4)
Of the over 90 places in which Vat4 is in error, it has only the previous list in common with other manuscripts and is not clearly connected with the previous families, but is clearly associated with cd. Berolinensis and Hijmans' M. After these, it seems to associate most frequently with Ven which would explain its occasional inclusion within the θ family. But Ven is another problem manuscript in that while it is, for the most part, a θ text, it has some of the common errors of the φ family. Vat4 also shows a number of errors with Par and, not surprisingly, with Vat1; but these latter have early mixed texts. Vat4 must be considered of the same sort, agreeing with no large family on a firm basis. It even has omissions and errors with F1 and F3 which are independent γ texts, even as in Hijmans' stemma, B. M. and α have agreements with the γ group.

In spite of the fact that Vat4 is the earliest of the recentiores, it does not seem to have fostered many apographs, although the relationship with Berolinensis is clear. That codex may be a copy of Vat4 as Reynolds has
suggested. Vat4 does show a number of lengthy omissions due to haplography which it occasionally writes in the margin. The scribe corrects another passage in a classic manner, which reinforces the impression that very few manuscripts have derived from this early recentior. The instance is at P.2.9 where Vat4 omits ad quod respicit... par deo dignum. The omission is due to the occurrence of dignum both at the beginning and at the end of this phrase. The scribe had finished the first part, spectaculum dignum, at the bottom of the first column, and as he began at the top of the second column his eye jumped ahead to vir fortis which occurs after deo dignum. This accounts for the haplography, and more so when one sees that it has occurred at the change of a column. Vat4 adds to this classic example by noticing that he had missed a part of the text after writing through to conpositus. Rather than erase, he simply writes the portion he has omitted after this, i.e. conpositus ad quod respecit.... He continues by repeating the clause vir fortis... conpositus in its proper place so that the appearance in the text is that this phrase has actually been repeated. All that is needed to make the error come to a full circle is for some later scribe to notice that vir fortis...conpositus has been repeated and then omit that phrase in its
proper place, producing a tranposition out of what started as an omission. This has not happened in the recentiores reported; nor is it reported that any manuscript repeats the vir fortis passage.

Vat4 does, however, have some curious errors that, as before, appear to have been the cause of error in later manuscripts. In these instances, perhaps a common exemplar must provide the solution, see in the list P.2.10 purum et; P.3.11 maluisse; P.4.7 audacter; P.4.10 felicitatis; P.6.3 puta itaque; and P.6.8 sacrificium. Another instance suggests some hyparchetypal confusion: Vat4, F1 and F3 show a similar transposition at P.5.2. Inasmuch as Vat4 is the oldest of the recentiores and F1 and F3 are independent texts, the confusion may well arise from a hyparchetype in which the word magis was written above the line, but was inserted into different places in different traditions. If the manuscripts actually go back to different hyparchetypal texts, the source of the error may well be an interlinear magis in the archetypal of all the manuscripts. It could be, as well, that there are more than two hyparchetypal traditions. Vat4's group of Dialogues, which is not complete, may have derived from a number of sources, taking its De Ira perhaps from an A tradition, which gives it the general
appearance of an A manuscript. It is because of such con-
flicting results for a number of manuscripts that Hijmans
and Forder's first attempt at a stemma (p. 55) resulted
in a tripartite structure in which F1, F3, Vat. Lat. 2214,
and Vat. Lat. 2215 formed one family, manuscript A formed
a second, barren family, and the other recentiores formed
a third very large family derived from an independent
apograph of the archetype. While an exact division
of the largest family may be difficult to delineate, the
general grouping would seem to be sound. The startling
result would be that from a position of considering all
the manuscripts as derived from the Ambrosian text,
one would now hold that very few manuscripts at all
derive from it, that the inclusion of all the added
readings in A and a number of the corrections would stem
from more complete and more accurate apographs of the
archetype. The only evidence that seriously confounds
this position is Reynolds' notice that a number of the
later manuscripts omit almost letter perfect lines of the
Ambrosian text. The question quickly passed over before
has become more important, and that is, to what extent
there may be apographs of the archetype or hyparchetypes
which preserve the same lineation, and whether this same
lineation is then found in the Ambrosian manuscript. A
more detailed study of the omissions in the manuscripts
should be made to see whether, except in the case of
passages influenced by haplography, there is any consistent proportion in segments omitted. If A does follow the hyparchetype closely, its lineation will be there to compare with the results of the omissions in other manuscripts. The pertinent passages would be those that are not letter perfect with A, since a variation of a few letters would not upset the general hypothesis that a number of hyparchetypes exist, reflecting the line division of the archetype; at the same time, a preponderance of passages in which the omission is not letter perfect with A would suggest that the Ambrosian manuscript is not the exemplar of all these later texts. The study may even contribute to the question of the age of the archetype and manner of its writing. The basic position of the Ambrosian text would not be weakened, but rather strengthened if we were to know that it is not only the earliest manuscript of the Dialogues, but retains the physical layout of its hyparchetype. My general inclination is to believe that the manuscripts which have line omissions similar to lines in A are in fact derived from it. The nature of the readings of a number of these does give some pause to consider the other possibility.

There remains the continued question of the relationship of F4 to the other manuscripts, especially the other known recentiores. F4 varies in over 90 places from the
standard text, including some usual spelling variants. In a third of those places, it has an error or variant in common with other manuscripts. A complete list of these follows. The other individual variant passages have been covered for the most part in the list of omissions, additions, and transpositions. Significant individual readings have been covered in the commentary. Where the error extends to all but a few of the recentiores, the term multi is used.

**F4 ERRORS AND VARIANTS IN COMMON**

P.1.4 quod tu non: quo tu non F4 multi

1.6 parat: praeparat F4 omnes (praeter A)

2.4 viris bonis: de bonis viris F4 bonis viris Ven V

2.5 excitari: exercitari F4 A Scor Ven E F1 F3 Par Vat1

Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

2.5 numquam contristari numquam flere: numquam flere numquam contristari F4 multi

2.7 spectandi: spectant dii F4 multi

2.10 concucurrerunt: concurrerunt F4 F1 Par B Vat1 Vat4

2.11 mortem ab ullo: ab ullo mortem F4 Vat5

3.7 tantum non: non tantum F4 A3 multi

3.8 ille ille: ille F4 Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 Scor

F1 F2 F3 Par G

3.10 avocet: somnum avocet F4 Ven F1 F3

4.4 tendat: tendit F4 Vat4 A E M F2 Par B C Vat1

4.5 si te: om. F4 E Scor F2 M Par G, sed F4 add. te post mentium
4.7 tenerae cervici: teneris cervicibus F4 F1 F3 Scor
4.7 diu: om. F4 sed add. in marg.; om. Scor G
4.10 quidni satius: quod ne id F4 multi (praeter A et Par)
4.12 quod quo saepius: quod si saepius F4 A5
5.1 ostendere: ostenderet F4 multi
5.1 apparebit: apparebunt F4 A3 multi
5.4 saepe: om. F4 M
5.5 notam voluntatem: voluntatem vestram notam F4 Par F2 Ven E M Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
5.6 quod scio: q scio F4 Vat3 Vat5 Vat6 quo Ven Scor G
5.7 restat: restet F4 Vat1 Vat4 A5 multi restat Scor F1 F3 alii
5.10 vadendum: A Ven vadendum esse (vel est) F4 ceteri
6.3 somnio: somno F4 Scor E M G
6.4 aspicis...videris: aspicitis...videritis F4 multi
6.4 occurrunt: currunt F4 Ven Par F2 V Vat1 Vat2 Vat3 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
6.6 tristia: tristitia F4 Vat4 Ven A (corr. A2)
6.8 committit: connectit F4 F2 Ven V

The results are inconclusive. F4, apart from those passages where there is widespread corruption in the manuscripts, shows at one time affinity to manuscripts of both families discussed above as well as with the independent F1 and F3. The results in this respect are like the difficult passages discussed on page 188 for
Vat5. The manuscripts that cut across the lines there are \( F_1, F_2, F_3, \) Ven, M, E, Vat1, Vat5. These are the same ones that cause problems in the list above even where the readings are of the significant error type, e.g. 

P.2.11 mortem ab ullo mortem \( F_4 \) Vat5, a transposition; 
P3.10 avocet: somnum avocet \( F_4 \) Ven \( F_1 \) F3, an addition; 
P.5.4 saepe: om. \( F_4 \) M, an omission. \( F_4 \) has more significant errors in common with Ven and M, but Ven is another manuscript that found its way into many of the families, as does, for example, Scor with which \( F_4 \) is found in error. The text of \( F_4 \) is relatively free of errors, and does not contain major omissions, as do some of the other new recentiores studied here. It shows hopeful signs of independence by occasional agreement with \( F_1 \) and F3, but in a number of other passages listed in the apparatus of Viansino, \( F_1 \) and F3 show independent errors in which \( F_4 \) does not join. In fact, in the list above, \( F_4 \) joins \( F_1 \) and F3 only in conjunction with some other manuscript. Discounting the passages where there is widespread corruption, the most significant passages for agreement with \( F_1 \) and F3 are: P.3.10 somnum avocet; P.4.7 teneris cervicibus; P.2.5 exercitari; and P.2.10 concurreunt. The relationship or independence of \( F_4 \) must be established on some other ground.
The Independence of Manuscript F4

In the preceding discussion it has emerged that F4 cannot be associated certainly with any of the recentiores. It does at one place or another share a common omission or transposition, but these are usually with different manuscripts which through tests of their own show clear family groupings. The ultimate test of the independence of the Florentine manuscript must rely not on indicative stemmatic errors, but rather on manuscript variants where F4 by itself or with only a few manuscripts preserves the authentic reading. The focus is again on manuscript A since it is from this manuscript that one is trying to prove independence. The readings divide themselves into certain descriptive categories.

**Authentic Readings Found Only in F4:**

P.1.1 acciderent: F4 (etiam Parisinus 8530 sed transpōsuit post viris)

5.7 distinguī: F4

**Authentic Readings or Possibly Authentic Readings in F4 Alone (I.) or with Other Manuscripts (II.):**

I. Alone

2.5 in sinu continere: et add. F4 post sinu

2.6 languent...deficiunt: languent per inertiam saginatam. nec in labore tantum
sed imotu ex ipso sui onere
deficiunt F4

3.3 fato ista sic ire et recte: fato ista recte F4

3.6 quasi dicat quid: quid ego inquit F4, om. quasi dicat

3.6 infelix est Fabricus: est om. F4

3.7 infelix est Rutilius: est om. F4

3.8 L. Sulla: L. om. F4

4.1 posperae res...: prospere res in plebem F4 (sc. -e est -ae)

4.8 de me imperator: de me ipso F4

4.9 sopiti: sopiuntur F4 et antea Feldmann

4.10 advocata virtute: advocatam a virtute F4

4.13 ferendo: sufferendo F4

II. With Others

4.12 quod quo saepius: quod si saepius F4 A5

4.12 faciet: F4 Vat6 Codex Gryphiswaldensis

5.7 restat: restet F4 multi recentiores

6.8 munus: F4 multi recentiores

Readings in F4 Less Likely Authentic but Independent of Other Manucripts:

2.4 querantur: conquerantur F4

3.6 et herbas: om. F4

3.12 gelatus: congelatus F4

3.14 haec mala: haec om. F4

4.10 periculosissima: periculosa F4
6.9 erubescitis: non erubescitis etiam F4

Readings in F4 not Likely Authentic but Independent of Other Manuscripts:

4.5 si te: om. multi; om. si F4, add. te post mentium
4.6 fallacique: falsoque F4
6.5 sic mundus: sic vir bonus F4 ut vid.

Authentic Readings in F4 With Others but Where A, Prior to Correction, Was in Error

2.10 nobiles edet: F4 multi recentiores
2.12 spectarent: F4 multi recentiores
2.12 initur: F4 multi recentiores
3.3 necant: F4 multi recentiores
3.4 parato: F4 multi recentiores
3.7 senatorum capita: F4 multi recentiores
3.13 remetientur: F4 multi recentiores
4.14 sustentat: F4 multi recentiores
5.2 habeat illas et Elius: F4 Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 alii
6.6 quo deum: F4 Vat1

Authentic Readings in F4 and a Number of Manuscripts but Where Manuscript A Is in Error

2.4 felicitas: F4 multi
2.10 una manu latam: F4 Vat1 Vat4
3.4 in Catone: F4 nonnulli recentiores
3.14 quem: F4 multi recentiores
4.1 proprium: F4 multi recentiores
4.4 inquam: F4 nonnulli recentiores

Authentic Readings in F4 and A but Only a Few Other Manuscripts:
4.1 magnus vir est: A F4
4.3 ipsi: A F4
4.13 nauticus: A F4 Vat1 Vat4 pauci(H-F)
5.1 tantum malis: A F4 Vat4 F1 F3
5.10 scies: A F4 Vat4
6.2 sibi manus: A F4 Vat4 nonnulli(H-F)
6.7 ideo: A F4
6.9 vis: F4 F1 F3
6.9 ut: A F4 F1 F3

Even in those instances where one does not accept the reading of F4 as authentic, it is still true that the reading does not derive from any known manuscript. The only passage where it shares an error found in most manuscripts is the transposition at P.2.5 numquam flere numquam contristari, but this may well be some archetypal confusion like that found at P.5.2 for Vat4, F1, and F3. Numquam flere looks suspiciously like a gloss on contristari that
has found its way into the text, but in a different order in the different traditions. The passages presented point to F4 not only as an independent manuscript, but an important one as well. The lists could have been expanded by including the numerous places where F4 has a reading originally omitted in A, but these have been listed extensively above (pp. 63-68). There are other places where F4 has made errors of its own, most of these have been covered in the commentary; they are not more numerous than the errors in A, even after it had been corrected by a number of later hands. A considerable portion of the variants found in F4 produce a reasonable text, only a few of these have been included in the above list although they have all been covered in the commentary. Should the independence of F4 be accepted, the majority of its variants, omissions, and transpositions take on a different significance. The complete lists are supplied in chapter II and need not be repeated; the variant readings seemed of the most importance here since it is particularly these that have a great impact on the text and need be given more serious attention by critics. Among these readings in F4 are passages that have been the most difficult in constructing the text of the De Providentia. They include: P.3.1 fato ista sic ire et recte, P.4.1 prosperae res..., and P.4.9 sopiti. It shows the importance of the
Florence manuscript that in each of these instances it offers a unique reading that makes good sense, and in the latter instance solves a grammatical crux by supplying a needed finite verb that has some 13th century standing because of its citation by Bacon. For these reasons other passages in F4 to be given consideration are: P.2.6 languent...deficiunt; P.3.3 quasi dicat quid...; and P.4.8 de me imperator; for although there has been no indication of corruption in the past, the readings in F4 provide evidence that it may exist, while at the same time offering a possible solution.
CHAPTER V

CONCLUSIONS FOR OTHER DIALOGI

De Ira

The previous discussions have shown that the manuscripts F4, Vat1, Vat4, and possibly Vat5 are of some value in constructing the text of the De Providentia. It was not the aim of this dissertation to provide collations of the manuscripts studied, but rather to test a hypothesis for studying recentiores, and to discover to what extent some new recentiores could be of value. The hypothesis was verified to the extent that it did not eliminate Vat4 which for other reasons commends itself to critics. It is the oldest known recentior. The other manuscripts showed their value in a number of passages discussed in the commentary. The basic superiority of the Ambrosian manuscript is not undermined, but in significant areas this study has revealed that manuscript's weaknesses. The second direction of this study was to demonstrate that the Dialogues should be studied separately and that the manuscript relationships developed out of these individual studies could then be compared to see whether we are, in fact, justified in eliminating so many codices because they appear to
have a corpus derived from the Ambrosian manuscript. Even if one should not accept the premise that manuscripts outside of the A tradition exist, the recentiores have value for the text where the Ambrosian manuscript has suffered damage.

For this reason, a collation of the beginning of De Ira is provided here of the manuscripts Vat1, Vat4, Vat5 and Vat6.1 The lemma in each instance is taken from Hermes' text. Additional manuscripts have been quoted from the apparatus of Viansino's text in the Paravia series. The manuscripts are for the most part the same as he used in his later edition of the De Providentia, but there are some different ones. The selection is limited here to those manuscripts used for comparison in the previous study of De Providentia and a few others where the agreement in error with one of the new recentiores involves so few manuscripts as to suggest a family relationship.2

The Collation of De Ira 1.1.1-1.2.3

I.1.1.1 ut scriberem: om. Vat1

1Manuscript F4 does not contain the De Ira.

2The sigla of the manuscripts have been adjusted to those used in Viansino's text of the De Providentia. Laurentianus pl. 76,32 is cited as L, the designation in Hermes' text, since Viansino's designation as F3 is used for an independent manuscript, Laurentianus pl. 76,41, in De Providentia where he does not use Laurentianus pl. 76,32 at all.
1.1 posset: poss; Vat4 Vat5 poss; Vat6
1.1 praecipue affectum: affectum praecipue Vat6
1.1 rabidum: rapidum Vat1
1.1 quieti: queti Vat1 quem Vat4 quem Vat5 quietis Vat6
1.1 in impetu: in'petu Vat4 impetum Vat5 in impetu Vat6
1.1 doloris est: a est doloris Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
1.1 ultorem: Fl L multa rem Vat4 multi multam rem Vat1 multi multarem Vat5 invitam rem Vat6
1.1 tractura: tractare Vat6 alii
1.1 negligens: negligens Vat1 Vat6 a
1.2 e sapientibus: Vat5 ex sapientibus Vat1 Vat4 a sapientibus Vat6
1.2 viris iram dixerunt: viris vendiret Vat6
1.2 intenta rationi: inepta arcem Vat6
1.1 ad dispectum: L Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 ad inspectum Vat1 F3
1.2 verique: vimque Vat1
1.3 oppressere: possere Vat5
1.3 ipsum illorum: ipsorum illorum Vat1
1.3 sunt audax: sunt.audax Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 omnes
1.3 color versus: om. Vat5
1.4 flagrant ac micant: flagrant emicant Vat1 Vat5 multi
frangant emicant Vat6
1.4 exaestuante: L et estuante Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 a multi
et extuanti Vat6 multi
1.4 humus: unius Vat1
1.4 magnas ire: magnasque ire Vat1 Vat4 Vat6 a L
    magnas ire Vat5 Parisinus Ms. L. 6379

1.5 depravantium se atque...: depravantium se atque intum escentium Vat4
    depravantium se atque Vat1 Vat5 Vat6 multi

1.5 utrum: om. Vat1

1.5 magis: magna Vat1

1.5 et in abdito: Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6

1.5 non vides: non videns Vat1 Vat4

1.5 omnium animalium: omnium corpora animalium Vat5 multi

1.5 insurrexerunt, praecurrant: insurrexerunt quo in eis praecurrant Vat6

1.5 notae ac: nocte ac Vat4 notce ac Vat5

1.5 quietumque: L quetumque Vat1 Vat5 Vat6 quetumque Vat4 quietum a

1.6 et harena: et arena Vat1 Vat6 et harena Vat4 Vat5

1.6 rabidarum: Vat5 rapidarum Vat1 Vat4 Vat6 rapidorum B C

1.6 aspectus: Vat5 ad spectus Vat4 aspectus Vat1

1.6 horrendum: obrendum Vat1

1.6 tam perniciosumque: a Vat1 Vat4 tamque horrennum quam perniciosumque Vat5 tamque per-
    niciosum Vat6 L B C F1 F3 alii

1.6 simul ira: si ira illud Vat6 si illud B C alii

1.7 neque enim nulla: neq; ei nulla Vat5

1.7 intrat concitatio quae: intra colgitatio est quae Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 int tn cogitatio est Vat6 B C

2.1 iam: nam Vat4 Vat5
2.1 damnaque: dānāpqē Vat4
2.1 et reorum: ā et eorum Vatl Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 ceteri
2.1 clades: clāndes Vat6
2.1 hasta: asta Vat4 Vat5
2.1 faces: facies Vat4 Vat5
2.1 coercitos: cohercitos Vat4 Vat5 Vat6
2.2 exhaustit: Vatl Vat5 exhaustit Vat6
2.2 proditos: productos Vat1
2.2 cubili: cubiculo Vatl B C alii
2.2 mensae iura percussit: mensa ira percussit Vat5
2.2 intra leges: int le/leges Vat5 intra Vat4 a int Vatl
2.2 in cruce membra distendere: in cruses membra dif-
fundere Vat1 Vat5
L alii in cruces membra
diffindere Vat4 M M V
Ven alii in cruces mem-
bra distendere Vat6 B C F3
2.3 si tibi: tibi si Vat1 Vat4 Vat5 Vat6 ceteri
2.3 libuerit: Vat1 Vat4 Vat6 libuit Vat5
2.3 viritim: Vat4 viri non Vat5 nonnulli virium Vat1
a Fl virus exāsit Vat6, alii aliter
2.3 aspicere: aspice Vat5 B C
2.3 capitis damnatos***tamquam: dampna passos tamquam
Vatl F3 Paris. 6376 alii captos Vat6
om. damna; captos B

The readings are again rather inconclusive, although
one could not expect too much from such a short text.
There is great variation in a number of passages. Of the passages in which variation is limited to a few manuscripts, those that seem important for VatI are 1.1 ad inspectum where it agrees with the independent manuscript F3 as well as 2.3 damna passos where it agrees again with F3 and a few other manuscripts; but there is cross-family confusion here also, for example, 2.2 cubiculo VatI B C alii; B and C had been in a clear family with Vat5 and Vat6, as they are for the most part even in this brief passage. Because of the possible independence of VatI in this text, I did a complete collation for the rest of Book I of the De Ira. The manuscript followed the Ambrosian manuscript very closely. It only occasionally agreed with the L manuscript. The text seemed to be of an early stemmatic type preserving even a pre-corrected A form at De Ira 1.3.6 multa VatI; muta corr. ex multa A.

Ad Polybium De Consolatione and the Archetype

In discussing the text of the Dialogues in manuscript A and their relationship to an archetype or a hyparchetype, it was shown that manuscripts other than those derived

---

3The collation was done against Hermes' text; the general closeness of the manuscript to A readings did not recommend it for additional collation against the recensiores listed in Viansino's apparatus.
from the exemplar of A account for the completion of the beginning of the De Ira in the Ambrosian Codex. By offering a reasonable explanation of the situation that faced the scribe of A, some conclusions could be drawn about the availability of texts other than the exemplar of A. The significant passages were found to be the beginning of the De Ira and the transition between the De Vita Beata and the De Otio. Although mention was made of the possible significance of the beginning of the Ad Polybium De Consolatione, that work in the Ambrosian manuscript was not discussed at the time. It does seem to present a different situation.

The text has again suffered in the Ambrosian manuscript; what is left of the Ad Polybium is the subscription of the previous work with an altered incipit: L A. Senece Ad Paulinu De brevitate vite explicit // inci pit //!!!!// de consolatione. The text takes up at 11.17.2 magna discrimine and goes for a page and a half to the end (fol. 77r and 77v). What was lost of the text before this remnant is a considerable amount (24 Teubner pages) that has been supplied in the recentiores, but remains lost in the Ambrosian manuscript which later suffered an erasure even in the remnant. What makes this case different from that of the De Ira is that there is

---

4 The description is from Hermes' text, pp. 309-311.
no evidence that the loss was in the exemplar of A since no space has been left. One added difficulty is that the portion we have in the fuller recentiores is mutilated at the beginning, and this for all the manuscripts whether derived from A or an independent tradition such as that of F1 and F3. The text in A when it was more complete must have been of the same sort.

One small corroboration of this comes from my previous conjecture in which it was suggested that the scribe of A was responsible for the erasure of the name in the table of contents for the De Otio and the omission of the subscription which is filled in by another hand. With the beginning of the work mutilated in his exemplar (assuming it began nostrae compares with no personal addressee) the scribe again would have turned to the table of contents only to find Ad Polybium and Ad Helviam with no title, just as there had been none for the Ad Marciam. He then likely erased the name he had already written in the incipit only to come to the end of the work and there erase the explicit after he had already written it. The Ad Helviam presented none of the difficulties of the beginning of the Ad Polybium or the De Tranquillitate Animi.

5The erasures could just as easily have taken place in the correction period after the manuscript was written (see Loew, pp. 294-295). The general conclusions would still be the same since the corrector would have had no more texts available than the original scribe.
The obvious objection to this theory is to ask why it could not be some other later scribe who was responsible. In order to answer this objection, it is necessary first to examine the mischief in the text. Since it is really the same type in all places, it is most likely the same scribe or corrector responsible. The alterations fall into the following categories.

I. Omissions in the Table of Contents, Incipits, Explicit:

1. No incipit or explicit between the De Vita Beata and the De Otio with no sign of omission.

2. No explicit to the De Otio or incipit to the De Tranquillitate Animi but a space left in which a later hand has added an incipit to the latter work.

3. No explicit to the Ad Polybium.

4. No explicit to the Ad Helviam or incipit to the spurious works.

5. No reference in the table of contents to the spurious works.\(^6\)

\(^6\)For a description of the latter part of the Ambrosian manuscript, lacking in Hermes, see, C. W. Barlow, Epistolae Secceae ad Paulum et Pauli ad Senecam, quae vocantur, Rome, 1938, pp. 14-16. Manuscript A has the siglum L in Barlow's text.
6. The first two works have long titles in the table of contents repeated in the incipits and explicits; the other works have shorter titles repeated in their subscriptions; the Consolationes are listed in the contents only by addressee but preserves a longer title in the subscriptions where we have them.

II. Erasures in the Table of Contents, Incipits, Explicitis:

1. Name in the table of contents before De Otio.
2. Name in the incipit to Ad Polybium.
3. Complete explicit to Ad Polybium.
4. Fol. 77r and 77v, portion of the text of the Ad Polybium which A contains.

III. Blanks Left:

1. 88r, at the beginning of the spurious works.
2. Five blank sides at the beginning of De Ira.
3. 68v, before the De Brevitate Vitae.

It is not likely that we can blame the scribe for items I.5 and I.6, and he certainly deserves praise for leaving blank spaces where he knew or suspected the text was defective. The question is for how much of the rest is he responsible. He must have been responsible for omitting the explicit to the Ad Helviam, which was a complete work in his text. He left it most likely because the works
following were defective. He had no clue to this from his table of contents where reference to these spurious works is omitted. He had written an incipit to the De Ira although he was faced with a defective beginning there. The scribe, at any rate, must be responsible for these spaces which occur where there is some major textual problems; so it seems likely that he was also responsible for the minor mischief of erasing names where there is some textual problem.

There is one major erasure of folio 77r and 77v, that portion of the text of the Ad Polybium in A that can still be deciphered from the erasure. Affecting the same text is the erasure of the name in the incipit, and the complete erasure of the explicit. Is the same scribe responsible for this? One would be inclined to think so were there not some evidence that has received little attention. Gertz notes that in the portion of the Ad Polybium written by A, A had omitted a lengthy section of the text which was added in the margin by A², but subsequently erased. It was Gertz's opinion that the section omitted by A constituted a full page of the archetype [or hyp-archetype]. Whoever erased the text of A probably erased the marginal addition of A² as well. It is apparent, then, that it was not the scribe of A who was responsible for this lengthy erasure, but it is also clear that one has
here a problem similar to that at the beginning of the De Ira since the portion added by A² is found in the recentiores. I am inclined to doubt that the Ambrosian manuscript ever contained the complete text of the Ad Polybium, but the erasure is not evidence for this. The added portion of A² in the margin must have come from a text independent of A, and one could suspect that the same independence would be found in the recentiores for the Ad Polybium. The erasure must be dated after the hand A², and the loss of any text of the Ad Polybium must have preceded and, in fact, have occasioned the erasure.

The evidence from the arrangement of the Dialogues in later manuscripts would be helpful at this point. One should expect a certain amount of violent transposition and even frequent omission of the text of the Ad Polybium. The evidence makes it less likely that recentiores derive from A over some lengthy period of time, although the latter inclusion of the text would cause no more problems than the gathering of opera omnia which included selections from the whole range of the works of the elder and younger Seneca as well as selections from the spurious works, which have a text history older than the Dialogues. But there are still grave problems in this latter assumption which could possible be cleared up by knowing just how the text traditions of the individual Dialogues are related. One
can assume, for the moment, that there are at least two hyparchetypes. The one of the manuscript A, lacking the beginning of the De Ira and possible part of the Ad Polybium and with an unnoticeable corruption between the De Vita Beata and the De Otio. The second corpus hyparchetype had this last defect, as well as the mutilated beginning of the De Ira between damna and tanquam. The second hyparchetype had the whole of the Ad Polybium except for some minor corruption at the beginning, amounting to only a few words. That there may have been Dialogi transmitted outside this corpus can not be proved until the evidence of each of the Dialogi is collected.

As for the text of the Ad Polybium, it is not included in the F4 manuscript, nor in Vat1. Vat4, which would normally be of great help in reconstructing the A family tradition, is itself lacking a great part of the text from the middle of the De Tranquillitate Animi to the middle of the Ad Helviam. Vat5 does offer a unique reading at the beginning of the Ad Polybium, but it has been added by a later hand and may well be an emendation by some owner trying to correct the minor corruption that exists. The Vat5 manuscript begins nostra compares as do F1 and F2 and others. Most read nostrae compares. A few others retain a form of vita or natura. Out of these bits and pieces editors have fashioned various completions for the corrupt
beginning. Gertz tried the most ambitious one: **Urbes ac monumenta saxo structa si vitae compares, firma sunt.** Vat5 adds the words **tempora si** between nostra and compares. Nostra has the support of the independent manuscript Fl. Using vitae rather than naturae, which occurs a little later, the passage could be restored: **nostra tempora si vitae compares, firma sunt.** This attempt on the part of Vat5 does not affect the evaluation of its text since the addition was by a later hand. Whatever the source of the reading, it does provide a fairly simple and satisfactory reading for the corrupt passage.

**The Archetype Again**

Beyond the corruption in the last two texts discussed, which suggest an archetype or hyparchetype physically about to break apart, there are problems of the type of writing in the archetype as well as where the archetype could be geographically located. It is really very unclear where the Dialogues were in the early Middle Ages; and were it not for the later Ambrosian manuscript, there would be very little evidence that the Dialogues were ever in Southern Italy. The large number of recentiores in France would

---

7 Reynolds has shown the Guaiferius of Salerno, a monk at Monte Cassino under Desiderius, used the text of the Dialogi in his Vita S. Lucii, among the passages, the beginning of the De Ira, still lacking in A at that time, and parts of the Ad Polybiun which I have suggested were
possibly have suggested that country as the most likely one from which the work disseminated to the rest of Europe. The discussion on the beginning of the De Ira\(^8\) suggested that at least three traditions of the added portion existed, and that only one of these can be placed at Monte Cassino. It would serve some purpose, then, to look at the evidence for places other than Southern Italy.

A number of errors discussed in the commentary pointed to mistakes arising out of the Beneventan or Visigothic script that would suggest that at least one of the hyparchetypes was in Southern Italy or Spain. Although some scholars, such as Traube, had suggested a connection between the two scripts, Loew traced their similarities to independent development from cursive (Loew, pp. 92-101).

lacking. Reynolds concluded that a twin of A or the archetype itself was Gualiferius' source; but one wonders why the Ambrosian codex had to wait until the 12th century to complete, defectively, the beginning of the De Ira if the more complete archetype of a twin was available at about the same time at Monte Cassino. The discussion of the letter of Ternisio di Atina also rest on a passage in the Ad Polybium. The evidence suggests that the Dialogues were in Southern Italy, but points to a fuller text not represented by manuscript A. (See also Appendix C) The coincidence of the two traditions in one area makes it possible that some individual Dialogi from the other tradition are now included in the various corpora extant. For these latter, the archetype must still be identified after these possible independent texts have been identified.

\(^8\)See Chapter II, pp. 33-34 and figure 2.
Loew felt that there were significant early differences in the two scripts to suggest development independent of each other, and independent of the scripts on the continent. One serious objection for later influence was provided by Rodolico⁹ who indicated that there did exist in Southern Italy some Visigothic manuscripts, three, in fact, an Ambrosius and an Augustine both of the 9th century and both at Monte Cassino, and at Cava the Danila Bible of the 9th century.¹⁰ In the rest of Italy, Loew adds only three manuscripts, all between the 8th and 10th centuries. It is here that Weaver's work on a separated manuscript of Lucan adds to our knowledge of the Visigothic script of a later period, the presence of such a manuscript in Italy, and the use of the script for a classical author.¹¹ Weaver (p. 37)

⁹His arguments are from Loew's summary, see N. Rodolico, "Genesi e svolgimento della scrittura Longobardo-Cassinese," Archivio Storico Italiano, series 5, 27 (1901), 315-333.

¹⁰For the Augustine fragment, see D.M. Inguanez, "Un frammento visigotico del secolo viii del De Trinitate di S. Agostino," Miscellanea Cassinese, 9 (1931), 1-4, who dates it to the 8th century and has it from a scriptorium in central Spain. The case of the Cava Bible shows some of the identification problems in early Visigothic and Beneventan texts. It was first identified as Beneventan by Silvestre and Wattenbach, but Paoli showed that the script was, in fact, Visigothic. See Paoli's review of W. Wattenbach, Anleitung zur lateinischen Palaeographie in Archivio Storico Italiano, series 4, 3 (1879), 255.

¹¹There are only two other classical texts in the Visigothic script (Weaver, p. 17), a Terence and an Ausonius.
suggest a date for the Lucan manuscript of the late 11th or early 12th century, written possibly in Northern Spain. This solid evidence for a manuscript of a classical author in Visigothic suggests the possibility that Seneca's Dialogi and other of his works could have existed in this same script and have made some impact in Italy either directly or through the continent where Spanish and continental scripts had begun to interact in the 11th century (See Weaver, p. 36 and p. 40).

The history of the parts of Lucan manuscript is unclear. The Ottobonian half apparently never left Italy, and Palatini manuscripts usually had a circulation in Germany from where the collection came in part to the Vatican. The date of the manuscript puts it close to the writing of the Dialogues in the Ambrosian manuscript, but it is not close to the dates of other Visigothic manuscripts in Italy. Loew's own opinion (p. 109) was that the Visigothic manuscripts at Monte Cassino came there in the eleventh century. My impression is that it is unlikely that included in this lot were either the Lucan

12 Weaver, pp. 41-43; but as Weaver suggests, some manuscripts in the Palatini collection seem to have been added to the collection once it had arrived in the Vatican; thus, one is not certain that the Lucan fragment there ever circulated outside of Italy. See also, Kristeller, Iter Italicum, Vol. II, p. 389.
manuscript\textsuperscript{13} or a Seneca manuscript that could have served as the exemplar of the Ambrosian text. But that Seneca did at one time exist in the Visigothic script seems more than likely since we have preserved one manuscript for Lucan, his relative and compatriot.

This possibility of Spanish influence and dissemination from Spain can be substantiated from another source and one that has more significance for the text of Seneca. Loew and Rodolico unwittingly give evidence from a paleographic point of view, but there is evidence of other Spanish influence on the text of Seneca. St. Martin of Braga (d. 580) made an epitome of the De Ira of Seneca and another epitome possibly of the De Officiis; the former went under the name De Ira, the latter under a variety of names but especially De Formula Honestae Vitae.\textsuperscript{14} Clearly this Spanish bishop had a text of Seneca, but one can be

\textsuperscript{13}There does exists at Wolfenbüttel a Lucan manuscript, Herzog-August Bibliothek MS. 52.5 Aug. 4\textsuperscript{a} in Beneventan script of the Monte Cassino type, dated saec. xi ex. The relationship of this text to the Visigothic manuscript of Lucan has not been studied. For a fuller description see, H. Butzmann, "Über eine beneventanische Lukan-Handschrift," Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, 66 (1952), 108-120.

\textsuperscript{14}See Chapter I, note 8. For a full text and apparatus of Martin of Braga, see Barlow's Opera Omnia cited in that note. A convenient text of the epitome of the De Ira is found in Viansino, L. Annaei Senecae Dialogorum Libri III. IV. V (De Ira) Turin, Corpus Scriptorum Paravianum, 1963, pp. xxvi-xxxv. The text he feels has significance in the construction of the De Ira of Seneca; he includes two
certain only of a text of the De Ira and possibly of the lost De Officiis. This adds more evidence to the hesitancy one has about explaining the corpus transmission of the Dialogues by too frequent reference to the De Ira. This is, I feel, one of the unanswered questions that faces the critic and the text of the Dialogues.

These epitomes (as early book copies) cannot have been in Visigothic, since they would antedate the development of that script. The problem for the reconstruction of the archetype of the Dialogues is the question of what script it was in. It has been suggested that because of the large number of incorrect word divisions one finds in the Ambrosian manuscript that it, at least, was copied from an exemplar in scriptura continua or from an apograph of such a manuscript. The confusion of the letters frequently found in the Ambrosian copy as well as other manuscripts suggested to some critics that A was copied from a manuscript in the Beneventan script and not much older than A itself. But the letter confusion could have derived from a majuscule script; this added to a clear preponderance of readings from it in the textus receptus and cites others in the apparatus. See Appendix C; the epitome suggests that the Spanish text was complete, at least for the De Ira.

15 Bourgery, for example. See Chapter II, note 6.
evidence for scriptura continua seems to suggest that the
manuscript of the archetype could have been in uncial.
This would account for some letter confusion and provide a
bookhand in which scriptura continua was more likely. The
question is whether one can postulate the movement of such
a manuscripte to Italy. It is here that Rodolico and Loew
give evidence for the possibility.

Rodolico\textsuperscript{16} cites a letter from "between 616 and 620
by the Visigothic king Sisebut to Adaloald, son of Queen
Theodolinda, in which reference is made to some books sent
to the Lombard prince to bring about his conversion." Loew
rejects this as evidence that Spain influenced the develop­
ment of the Beneventan script by noting that these books
must have been in uncials, or possibly semi-uncials. This
is a movement of books from Spain to Italy that could have
included Seneca, and have been in a script that would ac­
count for the errors found in our manuscripts of the
Dialogues. Is it possible then that Seneca was among the
books sent to Italy at this time? I think so.

St. Martin of Braga was of some importance in the
Spanish church in the 6th century and had used the text of
Seneca in some of his own works, one a clear use of at
least part of the Dialogues, the \textit{De Ira}. Seneca already

\textsuperscript{16}Loew, p. 104 for this and the summary following.
had some reputation among Christians; he had been quoted at the Council of Tours in the 6th century, and had a germinating reputation as a convert to Christianity himself. Seneca had addressed his *De Clementia* to no less princely a person than Nero and had served as his tutor and advisor as well. These are facts that could impress a Lombard prince destined to rule over part of Rome's decayed empire, but the possibility that Seneca's works were sent need not rest on anything more than the obvious moral value that St. Martin had found in his fellow Spaniard's work, addressing the one epitome to a bishop, and the other to a king.\(^{17}\) Seneca could well have provided the necessary texts for moral conversion just as later Bacon found the *Dialogi* an excellent source for discourses on moral philosophy. That the *Dialogues* were sent can not be ruled out, although the firmest possibility would be for the epitomes of Martin of Braga.\(^{18}\)

---

\(^{17}\)See Barlow, *Epistolae Senecae ad Paulum...* p. 6-7; the question of Seneca's being a Christian is discussed in the first chapter there. Reynolds, *The Medieval Tradition of Seneca's Letters*, pp. 81-89, treats the question as well. See his notes for the literature, which is voluminous. The impression that the legend of Seneca's conversion to Christianity influenced the transmission of his works is widespread. Reynolds rejects this idea; Seneca possibly did not have such a firm reputation as a Christian before the twelfth century; but by then his texts had become fixed in medieval traditions.

\(^{18}\)While the *De Officiis* of Seneca is lost and cannot be
These may not have been the only books sent, but they support the possibility of a movement of some Seneca text from Spain to Italy in the early seventh century, written possibly in an uncial script, but at least one likely to be in *scriptura continua* and majuscule, and possibly the early archetype of the *Dialogues* of Seneca (See Appendix C).

France or Germany could also be the source of the early archetype although even here an eventual transmission from Spain, or Northern Spain, could not be ruled out. The text may have found its way into France from Northern Spain or into France and Germany from Northern Italy from the seventh century to the twelfth century when we have our first sure notice of Seneca in those areas. France suggested itself because it was something of a center of Senecan activity in the twelfth century; Germany because of an

compared to the work of the same name by Cicero, there do seem to be vestiges of Cicero's work in Seneca that would suggest that the Senecan work could have been close in spirit to Cicero. Many of the thoughts in such a work are moral commonplace; see for comparative tables, C. Atzert, *M. Tullius Cicero, De Officiis*, Leipzig, Teubner, 1963. Atzert's opinion from a few passages in the *De Formula Honestae Vitae* is that in his *De Officiis* Seneca was an imitator of Cicero.

19 There is also evidence of direct contact between Beneventan and French scribes in the 10th and 11th century; see E. A. Lowe, "A New List of Beneventan Manuscripts," *Studi e Testi* 220 (1962), 213.
analogy with the text history of the *Natural Questions.* Is there any other evidence to suggest an origin from one of these countries? As it turns out, only possibly so.

The text of manuscript A contains at the end the spurious letters between Seneca and Paul. There is no notice of these in the table of contents except by a later hand, nor has the scribe of A included an incipit to these works at the end of the *Ad Helviam,* where he has omitted the explicit to that work as well. Thus we have no real assurance that these spurious letters were included in the exemplar from which the scribe copied the *Dialogues.* The working procedure suggested for the scribe earlier in this chapter, namely that he is likely to omit an explicit or an incipit if the following work is defective, gives us some reason to think that the letters were actually in his exemplar. The beginning of the works was corrupted by loss and fol. 88r had been left blank by the scribe for their completion since he is the hand that continued on fol. 88v. The most serious problem is the omission in the table of contents, nor is there any evidence that a reference to them has been erased as we have for the other mischief at

---

20 The text history of the *Natural Questions* shows a movement from France to Northern Germany, from there to the rest of Germany and Italy. See Chapter II, note 7. The early *recentior,* Parisinus 15086 shows geographic problems by having the first part of its text in an Italian hand, and the completed portion in a hand possibly French.
the beginning of the manuscript. Despite this negative evidence, the text of these letters provides some possible evidence of a text transmission from Germany.

The text of the spurious letters found in the Ambrosian manuscript agrees stemmatically with two manuscripts that have their origin in Germany. The only Seneca these German manuscripts contain, however, is the spurious letters. The hyparchetype of these manuscripts is the source for interpolation into another groups also located in Germany. These German manuscripts antedate the Ambrosian manuscript. It is evident then that at least for the text of the spurious letters in the Ambrosian manuscript, a source in Germany must be the explanation. More care and attention in writing the explicit to the _Ad Helviam_ and the incipit to the spurious letters would have given more solid evidence that the exemplar of manuscript A contained the _Dialogues_ and the spurious letters. Reynolds has these same points, but makes a more cautious note (p. 370):

> This seems to me to be a clear result of the strong ties existing in the eleventh century between Germany and Monte Cassino, which had recently had two German abbots. But the _Dialogues_ need not have come

21 For the stemma, see Barlow, _Epistolae Senecae ad Paulum_..., after page 164. The manuscript descriptions are on pp. 8-26, arranged alphabetically by sigla assigned.
From Germany; there is no evidence that they had ever left southern Europe.

Other attempts\(^2\) to trace the early history of the text of the Dialogues produce no sure results. It is still curious, as Reynolds suggests (p. 372) that this is the

\(^2\)Because the reference in the eleventh century Monte Cassino chronicle was also to Ovid's Fasti and Vergil's Ecolques, a search was made through the references to these authors prior to the twelfth century in the medieval catalogues Max Manitius, Handschriften antiker Autoren in Mittelalterlichen Bibliothekskatalogen, Beiheft 67, Zentralblatt für Bibliothekswesen, Leipzig, 1935. References to Vergil's Eclogues are numerous before the twelfth century. The references to Ovid are not clear, although at Wessobrunn in Germany in the twelfth century there is a "Glose in Ovidium magnum et librum pastorum." The magnum refers merely to the size of the book, as other references show, see the Monte Cassino entry, p. 71. Seneca has a number of references by specific title and some more hidden notices as simply Seneca, as we have in the eleventh century Monte Cassino entry. Curiously enough, in the twelfth century, Monte Cassino has a Seneca which it is holding in trust for another Seneca. Presumably the two manuscripts contained different works but little can be divined on the contents. If the Dialogi are involved in the exchange, it would account for the early dissemination of the text from Monte Cassino. One monastery in Spain, Oña, in the twelfth century contains a Vergil, an Ovidius Magnus, and a Lucan, but no Seneca. The earliest reference in Spain to a Seneca is at S. Floridi in the twelfth century; the notice is simply Senecam.

There are eight Vergil manuscripts in Beneventan script, most contain the Bucolics, Georgics, and the Aeneid. One that can be attributed to Monte Cassino at the end of the 11th century is Vaticanus Graecus 2324, a palimpsest, containing 1117 lines of Vergil of which 149 are from the Bucolics. See E.A. Lowe, "Virgil in Southern Italy," Studi Medievali, N.S. 5 (1932), 47-51. I have noted no Fasti of Ovid in Beneventan. A Lucan in Beneventan is listed above, note 13. There is a 12th century Beneventan manuscript containing Seneca, British Museum, Harley MS 3021, which may figure in the 12th century Monte Cassino entry mentioned above.
only one of the classical texts preserved by Monte Cassino
to have had a medieval tradition, if in fact it is true
that the whole of the text has been preserved by Monte
Cassino; it does not seem likely that this monastery has
been the sole preserver of the tradition of the Dialogues,
but it is not easy to find evidence against the possibi-

The tradition in the north of Europe is confused by
the "discovery" of the Dialogues by Bacon. This would im-
ply that the works were not very well known there; Reynolds
has suggested that Bacon came into contact with the
Dialogues in Paris and that the Paris text should be attribu-
uted to a manuscript that percolated its way northward
from the south of Italy. Bacon's text (Reynolds p. 371)
is not necessarily the parent of the English tradition, and
quite possibly an attempt to reconstruct his text would be
of little value for the English tradition. But there are
curiosities, and especially one that involves manuscript
F4. Reynolds (p. 371) points out some of the pitfalls in
using the indirect tradition:

For example at 1.4.9 the manuscripts read velut
perpetua ebrietate, but the structure of the
period demands a finite verb. Beeson has pointed
out that Bacon (p. 71.8 in Massa's edition) sup-
ports Feldmann's sopiuntur. But if we read fur-
ther, we find Bacon quoting the same passage again
(p. 106.30), and this time he has sopiti. Bacon
does not support anyone; he has just had the same
idea as Feldman did a long time before him, and
both are wrong: a finite verb has to be inserted
somewhere, but the rhythm shows that the end of the period should be left undisturbed.

The F4 manuscript reads here *sopiuntur*. This is clear support for Feldmann's emendation and a solution for the grammatical difficulties. No other *recentior* except M offers any other solution. M has *sopiti sunt* which could be an offhand insertion of *sunt* to satisfy the grammatical needs. The sense of the passage goes back to F4's unique reading at P.2.6 *languent...deficiunt*. It is from here, no doubt, that Viansino drew his verb for inclusion in this latter passage. He inserts *languent* in the text where others have *manent*, but the previous passage suggests a verb in last position as well: *nisi aliquid intervenit...ebrietate sopiuntur*.

One is left from all of this no assurance about the location of the archetype of the *Dialogi* in the early Middle Ages. That they are relatively little quoted makes it less likely that the vague references to a *Seneca* or a *Senecam* in the earlier medieval catalogues refer to the *Dialogi*, and adds reason to suspect that the text was in some isolated spot such as Spain or Southern Italy out of the awakening stream of intellectual activity on the continent.
SUMMARY

The value of the recentiores manuscripts of the Dialogi of Seneca has been debated for some time. While numerous readings from these manuscripts have been incorporated into the textus receptus, it has never been resolved whether the lections derive from some tradition independent of the Ambrosian manuscript (C 90 inf.) or whether they are merely the enlightened conjectures of medieval scribes and correctors.

The present study, treating seven new manuscripts of the De Providentia, attempts to illuminate several problems in the tradition of the manuscripts. The first of these is the important observation that the correcting hands A² and A³ not only antedate any of the recentiores known, but also are responsible especially for filling lacunae in the Ambrosian codex. These corrections appear in the later manuscripts so that the question remains whether the recentiores derive from corrected A or the manuscripts represented by the sources of A² and A³. I have proposed that since one finds in some of the recentiores the variant readings of A before it was corrected by A² and A³, there is the probability that these
readings represent not just original errors in A, but rather errors of the hyparchetype of A, and that the recentiores which have such pre-corrected A readings derive not from A, but from that hyparchetype possibly through an apograph containing fewer word division problems. There appears to be an independent apograph for another reason, namely that areas of the text clearly wrong in the Ambrosian codex are found correctly in the later manuscripts.

The most serious evidence to confound this hypothesis is that many of the later manuscripts have line omissions that correspond almost exactly to line divisions of the Ambrosian manuscript, pointing to descent from that codex for such recentiores. The only caution to be recalled is that first proposed by Gertz who said it could not be denied that the lineation could also derive from a hyparchetype or the archetype; these could then be responsible for the omissions in the later manuscripts. This problem is related to others that have received little attention, particularly the matter of erasures, omissions, and spaces in the Ambrosian manuscript and how they are related to the recentiores. I have attributed most of these problems to the scribe of A who was apparently confused at the transition between some works, notably where there is textual damage in the tradition.
Some later manuscripts, for example, show a fusion between De Brevitate Vitae and Ad Polybium due likely to A's omission of the explicit and incipit between these works. Other manuscripts have no problems here and may well derive from some other codices, although all manuscripts must ultimately derive their texts of De Vita Beata and De Otio from an archetype in which these two works are fused.

The principal motivation in this study has been to show where there is reasonable doubt in the text tradition and to urge that texts prepared at this point reflect the current debate. The working procedure suggested is that the tradition of each of the Dialogi be done individually so that they may ultimately be compared. The loss that has occurred at the beginning and ends of a number of works would indicate that the individual Dialogi early had separate text traditions, although the earliest corpus text must have exhibited a fused De Vita Beata and De Otio. The new manuscripts studied reflect the variety in text arrangement found in recentiores. Two of the manuscripts have texts related to pivotal manuscripts in the previous debate. Vaticanus Latinus 5941 (Vat1) has a text clearly associated with Parisinus Lat. 15086, but unlike that manuscript it contains only the original dialogues of the group, 1-4 and part of 9. Chisianus H. V. 153
(Vat4) is related to Berolinensis M. Lat. Fol 47; The Berlin Codex is probably a copy as Reynolds suggests.

The state of the question at this point still demands that some preliminary classification, such as that of Hijmans and Forder, be made to focus attention on those manuscripts that exhibit the earliest stemmatic texts. This is particularly desirable since there is at least one independent tradition, γ, represented by four manuscripts and since this study has demonstrated that another manuscript, Laurentianus 89, sup.70 (F4), has a text of the De Providentia that can not be clearly related to either of the manuscript traditions β or γ. It shows, besides, in a number of places unique solutions to thorny textual problems. That the manuscript contains, besides the Letters, only this one dialogue urges even further that scholars study the tradition of each work separately. For some of the texts there may ultimately be the need to work out a tradition involving the corpus archetype and the archetype developed independent of the corpus. The strongest evidence points to an archetype of the corpus located in Southern Italy, although at least for the text of De Ira a Spanish archetype is likely.
APPENDIX A

DESCRIPTION OF THE NEW MANUSCRIPTS

F4 Florence, Laurentianus pl. 89, sup. 70, 13th century, parchment. The manuscript was donated to the Laurentian in 1760 by the emperor Franciscus III. It contains: f.1r-3r De quattuor virtutibus, f.3v-5r De moribus, f.5v-8r Proverbia, f.8v-10r Notice of Jerome and the Letters of Seneca and Paul, f.10r epitaphium, f.10r-146r Letters, the last, numbered 123, ends: ...esse felices. vale expliciunt epistole Senece ad lucillum deo gratias amen., f.146r-150v [De Providentia] alia epistola ad lucillum. cum mundus providentia regatur. quare multa mala bonis viris accidat malis bona., f. 151r-156v additional Letters.

Vatl Vaticanus Latinus 5941, early 14th century, parchment. The manuscript contains: f.1r-7v De providentia, f.7v-15v Incipit liber secundus [De constantia sapientis], f.15v-36r De ira libri II, f.36r-46r De tranquillitate animi, ends chapter 15 dolor veniat, space remains on folio, f. 46v blank, f.47r [new hand] Notice of Jerome,
f.47r-49r De moribus, f.49v-51v De prudentia, incipit: quisquis prudentiam sequi desideras..., f.51v-57v Proverbia, f.57v-58v De paupertate, incipit: honesta inquit epicurus res est leta paupertas, f.59r De clementia [extracts], f.59v De magnitudine et clementia, f.61v De morte, incipit: licet cunctorum..., f.64r-74r De beneficiis [extracts], f.74r-76r De praecipientis sapientiae, f.76r-78v De formula honestae vitae, f.79r-83r [new hand] De doctrina civitatis, f.83r-87v De universitatis constitutione, f.87v-100r De continentia, f.100r-102v Flores, 103r-[106v] De moribus et vitiiis evitandiis, f.106v[108v] varia moralia, f.106v[108v] epitaphium [All of the above works are attributed to Seneca.], [f.109r]-119r varia moralia, f.120r-126 sententiae excerpte ex epistoliis Hyeronymi.

Vat2 Vaticanus Basilicanus C 121, 14th century, parchment.
The manuscript contains: f.1-4 Letters of Seneca and Paul with Jerome's notice, f.4-91 Letters, with scholia to the first two books, f.91-106v Proverbia, f.106v-108 De moribus, f.108-111 De remediis fortuitorum, f.111-116 De Clementia, f.116v De tranquillitate animi,
f.122 De ira libri III, f.171-205 Declamationes, f.202 De quattuor virtutibus, f.208v Tractatus de virtutibus, f.210v De beneficiis [extracts], f.217 De septum liberalibus artibus, f.219 Ad marciam de consolatione, f.224-228 Ad Helviam de consolatione, f.228v-236 De brevitate vitae and Ad Polybium de consolatione, f.236v-239 De providentia, f.239-242v Liber secundus [De constantia sapientis], f.242-248 De vita beata and De otio, f.248v Liber qui ludus Senecae dicitur, f.250v De quaestionibus naturalibus libri vii, f.282 De beneficiis libri vii, f.313 De paupertate, f.313v De copia verborum, f.323v-335 De virtutibus et vitiis. There are two folia in the beginning, f.I. illumination, f.II epitaphium, f.IIv Table of contents. Folia 336-338 are blank.

Vat3 Vaticanus Chisianus H. VIII.259 [2023], 15th century, parchment. The fly leaf has: *IA* P I C *DE CASTELLA * ARAGONIAQ* EX BENEFICENTIA POSUIT. The first page after the fly leaf is numbered 2 and illuminated with a coat of arms. Some illumination throughout. The manuscript contains: f.2-140r Letters, f.140v-143r De remediis fortuitorum,
f.143v-154r De Clementia, f.154-164 De tranquilitate animi, f.164v-198 De ira libri III, f.198v-201 De quattuor virtutibus, f.201-205 Tractatus de virtutibus, f.205-218 De beneficiis [Extracts], f.218v-221 De septum liberalibus artibus, f.221v-226v De providentia, f.226v-233v Incipit liber secundus [De constantia sapientis], f.233v-245v De vita beata and De otio, f.245v-249v Annaei Senece viri illustissimi claudii ludus incipit.

Vat4 Vaticanus Chisianus H. V. 153 [1917], 13th century, parchment. The manuscript contains: f.1-110v Letters, f.111r-114v De providentia, f.114v-119v De constantia sapientis, f.119v-140r De ira libri III, f.140-148r Ad marciam de consolatione, f.148r-157r De vita beata and De otio, f.157r De tranquillitate animi, ends on an unnumbered folio before 163 at 15.6 of the text humanitas flere quod, f.163r Ad helviam de consolatione begins at 9.2 aeque splendent, f.167v Epitaphium,f.168r incipit: quid agas... explicit: vita peracta.vale. [same hand as f.109v-110v], f.168v Table of contents [same hand as 168r], contents not accurate.
Vat5 Vaticanus Reginensis Latinus 1454, early 14th century, parchment. The manuscript was owned by Alexander Petavii, senator Par. 1637, f.3r. The manuscript contains: f.1v-2v [in a hand different from the text] Table of contents to an astrological work, f.3r Notice of Jerome, f.3r Epitaphium, f.3r-4r Letters of Seneca and Paul, f.4r-10r De clementia, f.10r-12r Summaries of some Letters, f.12r-107v Letters, f.108r-109v De remediis fortuitorum, f.109-112 De liberalibus artibus, f.109v-130r Declamationes, f.130v-131v blank except for pen designs, f.132r-166r Quaestiones Naturales, f.166r-171v Proverbia, f.171v-184r De beneficiis, f.184r-187v De providentia, f.187v-191v De constantia sapientis, f.191v-198r De vita beata and De otio, f.198r-204r De tranquillitate animi, f.204r-212v De brevitate vitae and Ad polybium de consolatione, f.212v-230 De ira libri III, f.230v-237v Ad marciam de consolatione, f.237v-243r Ad helviam de consolatione [space left blank in second column], f.243v Epitaphium, f.243 Table of contents in different hand.
Vat6 Vaticanus Rossianus Latinus 559, 14th century, parchment. This is a large manuscript, 450 folia, including Cicero, Macrobius, and Boethius. Seneca comes f.1r-178v. There is an illumination on f.6r similar to another on 180r, the beginning of the Cicero. The writing of the two parts is similar, but not the same; the illuminator seems to have been the same. The manuscript has recently been rebound. The Seneca part contains: f.1r-v Letters of Seneca and Paul with the notice of Jerome, f.Iv-IIIv Epitaphium and Titles to the Letters, f.IV-V Blank, f.6r-68v [pages numbered mechanically later] Letters, f.68v-70r De liberalibus studiis, f.70v Blank, f.71 Blank, f.72-95v Quaestiones Naturales, f.96r-99v De clementia, f.100r-101v De providentia, f.101v-104r Incipit secundus [De constantia sapientis], f.104v-108v De vita beata and De otio, f.108v-112r De tranquillitate animi, f.112r-115v De brevitate vitae, f.115v-118r Ad Polybium de consolatione, f.118r-112r Ad marciam de consolatione, f.112r-125v Ad helviam de consolatione, f.125v-126v De remediis fortuitorum, f.126v-127v De quattuor virtutibus, f.127v-128v De moribus, f.128v-129v Proverbia, f.129v-130v
Flores, f.131 blank, f.132r-143r De ira libri III, f.143v blank, f.144r-162v De beneficiis, f.163 blank, f.164r-178v Declamationes, f.179r blank, f.179v blank except for "silus italus de cicerone," and four lines. This is in the same hand as the scribe who takes up at 327v although the Cicero beginning on f.180r is in a hand similar to the Seneca; the illuminator and rubricator seem to be the same in the early part of the Cicero.
APPENDIX B
A PRELIMINARY LIST OF MANUSCRIPTS OF THE DIALOGI IN ITALY

Bologna: Biblioteca Universitaria
1) 1137 M xiv

Brescia: Biblioteca Queriniana
2) C VII 1 C xv f.195-208

Caesena: Biblioteca Malatestiana
3) II 20.1 M xiv opera omnia

Cortona: Biblioteca del Commune e dell'Accademia Etrusca
4) 81 ? xiv f.32-98

Florence: Biblioteca Laurenziana
5) Plut. 33,31 M xiv f.3, excerpta, De tranq. animi
6) Plut. 76,32 M xiii f.21- ?
7) Plut. 76.35 M xv f.78-222
8) Plut. 76,38 M xiii f.112-137
9) Plut. 76,41 M xv f.1-134
10) Plut. 89,sup70 M xiii f.146r-150v
11) Fesulanus 180 M xv f.213-296;364-369
12) Eccles. 161 M xiv f.30-45

253
13) Fondo San Marco
283n C xv

Florence: Biblioteca Marucelliana
14) 323 C xvi

Florence: Biblioteca Nazionale Centrale
15) Magl.VI 171 C xiv f.31-36
   (II,I,26)
16) Panciatich 132 M/C xv f.34r-35v
   (69,II,2)
17) Magl.I,V,2 M xiv

Florence: Biblioteca Riccardiana
18) 391 M xiv
19) 709 C xv

Lucca: Biblioteca Civica
20) 1439 C xv
   (L.151,rub.129)

Milan: Archivio della Chiesa di S. Ambrogio
21) sine numero M xiv

Milan: Biblioteca Ambrosiana
22) B 2 sup. M xiv
23) C 85 inf. M xiv
24) C 90 inf. M xi f.1-85
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Catalogue Number</th>
<th>Institution</th>
<th>Page(s)</th>
<th>Remarks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25)</td>
<td>C 293 inf.</td>
<td>Modena: Biblioteca Estensis</td>
<td>M xiv</td>
<td>f.113r-179v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26)</td>
<td>I 193 inf.</td>
<td>Modena: Biblioteca Estensis</td>
<td>xv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27)</td>
<td>Estensis K.a.5.3</td>
<td>Modena: Biblioteca Estensis</td>
<td>M xv</td>
<td>ex.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28)</td>
<td>358 (IV G. 50)</td>
<td>Padua: Biblioteca Antoniana</td>
<td>M xiv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29)</td>
<td>360 (IV G. 52)</td>
<td>Padua: Biblioteca Antoniana</td>
<td>M xv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30)</td>
<td>361 (IV G. 53)</td>
<td>Padua: Biblioteca Antoniana</td>
<td>C xv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31)</td>
<td>I 9</td>
<td>Padua: Biblioteca Antoniana</td>
<td>M xiv</td>
<td>opera omnia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32)</td>
<td>304 (Aldini 50)</td>
<td>Pavia: Biblioteca Universitaria</td>
<td>C xv</td>
<td>f.1-43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33)</td>
<td>5 (B.1)</td>
<td>Perugia: Biblioteca Communale</td>
<td>C xiii?</td>
<td>f.41-136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34)</td>
<td>Mazz.44 (16)</td>
<td>Pesaro: Biblioteca Oliveriana</td>
<td>C xv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35)</td>
<td>Mazz.114</td>
<td>Piacenza: Biblioteca Communale</td>
<td>C xv</td>
<td>f.144r-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36)</td>
<td>Mazz.63(67)</td>
<td>Pisa: Conventus S. Catherinae</td>
<td>M xiv</td>
<td>f.90v-99r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37)</td>
<td>Fonte Colombo</td>
<td>Rieti: Biblioteca del Convento</td>
<td>C xiv</td>
<td>f.64-? excerpta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>G.II.51 Mazz.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Rome: Biblioteca Angelica

38) 505(D.8.9) M xiii/xiv f.29-44
39) 1356 (T.4.21) M/c xv f.18r-49v

Rome: Biblioteca Casanatensis

40) 294 (D.V.13) C xv f.65v-66v fragmenta
41) 1436(B.VI.16) M xv f.1-144

Rome: Biblioteca Nazionale

42) Fondo Gesuitico M xv 973

Rome: Biblioteca Vallicelliana

43) R 19 C xv f.1-76v

San Daniele del Friuli: Biblioteca Communale

44) 74 M xiv/xv
45) 75 M xiii/xiv opera omnia

Subiaco: Biblioteca dell'Abbazia

46) Mazz.133 M xiv (CXXIX)

Vatican City: Biblioteca Apostolica Vaticana

47) Basilicanus C121 M xiv/xv f.116v-248
48) Basil. H 47 C xvi f.1-16
49) Chisianus A VI 189 C xv excerpta, f.199-231r.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Pages</th>
<th>Additional Information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>Chis. H IV 105</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>xiv/xv</td>
<td>f244-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>Chis. H V 153</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiii</td>
<td>f.111r-167v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>52</td>
<td>Chis. H VIII 245</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiv/xv</td>
<td>f.51-59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>53</td>
<td>Chis. H VIII 259</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiv/xv</td>
<td>f.154-245v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>54</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 925</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>excerpta, De vita beata</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 1769</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>f.64v-115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>56</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 1888</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xv</td>
<td>f.27-101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 2204</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>58</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 2207</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>Ad Polybium</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>59</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 2209</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 2210</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xv</td>
<td>excerpta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>61</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 2211</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>f.17-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 2212</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiv-xv</td>
<td>f.168-282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>63</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 2213</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>'xiv/xv</td>
<td>f. ?-80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>64</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 2214</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiv/xv</td>
<td>f.204-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 2215</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiv/xv</td>
<td>f.1-202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>66</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 2217</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xv</td>
<td>f.51-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>67</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 3083</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>f.18-96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>68</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 5118</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1493</td>
<td>f.64-67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>69</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 5131</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>xv</td>
<td>f.3-10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 5941</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>xiv</td>
<td>f.1-46r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>71</td>
<td>Vat.Lat. 14211</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>excerpta f.108r-114r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>72</td>
<td>Ottobon.Lat.456</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>?</td>
<td>f.82-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>73</td>
<td>Palat.Lat.607</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>xv</td>
<td>f.117v excerpta De tranquillanimi</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Page</td>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>Pages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>74) Pal.Lat. 1539</td>
<td>M xiv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.112r-158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75) Pal.Lat. 1540</td>
<td>M xv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>76) Pal.Lat. 1541</td>
<td>C xv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.304v-401v</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>77) Pal.Lat. 1545</td>
<td>M 1417</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.1-69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>78) Pal.Lat. 1553</td>
<td>M xiii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.57-66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>79) Reginensis.Lat. 358</td>
<td>M xv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.57v-59v excerpta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80) Regin.Lat. 1454</td>
<td>M xiv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.184r-f.243r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>81) Regin.Lat. 1545</td>
<td>C xv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.1-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>82) Rossianus 559</td>
<td>M xv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.100r-126v; 132r-143r</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>83) Rossianus 604</td>
<td>M xv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.79r-; f.242v-283</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>84) Urbinat. 340</td>
<td>M xv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.95-119; 129v-?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85) Urbinat. 544</td>
<td>M xv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.136-160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>86) Urbinat. 1355</td>
<td>M xv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>f.2-194</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Venice: Biblioteca Marciana**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>87) 1548 (CCLXVIII)</td>
<td>M xiv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>88) 1697 (CCLXVII)</td>
<td>M xiv/xv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>89) CCLXXXVI (Val.149)</td>
<td>C xvii</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>excerpta</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Incerta**

**Lucca: Biblioteca Civica**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Page</th>
<th>Volume</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>91) 1434 (L.146)</td>
<td>C xv</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Seneca&quot;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Florence: Biblioteca Laurentiana

92) Fondo San Marco
532 M xiv in fine, De prudentia; fortasse De providentia
APPENDIX C

THE LACUNA IN DE IRA BOOK I

The text of this dissertation has discussed the lacuna in Book I De Ira and its relationship to establishing the archetype of the manuscripts, but there has been some progress in establishing the actual content of the lacuna beyond the quotation from Lactantius De Ira Dei 17.13 first proposed by Lipsius. C.W. Barlow has discussed the textual value of the epitome of the De Ira made by St. Martin of Braga. His general conclusion is that the epitome supports the readings of the Ambrosian codex; this would be of some textual value in restoring especially the passage lost at the beginning of the De Ira and later filled in by another hand. The epitome there supports the following readings: De Ira 1.1.4 depravantium se atque...; 1.1.4 in abdito; and 1.1.5 quantoque maior est, although in this last instance, Barlow accepts the possibility that the est was added later. The epitome has value even in other

\(^1\)C.W. Barlow, "A Sixth-Century Epitome of Seneca, De Ira," TAPA, 68 (1937), 26-42.
portions of the text; Viansino, for example, accepts two readings from it into the textus receptus. It offers no help on the difficult robur accipiat (De Ira 3.8.8), but Barlow argues very convincingly that a portion of the epitome actually derives from the lacuna which Muretus recognized between damna and tamquam. The passage fits the subject, the description of the effects of anger, and is surrounded by other extracts from Book I. The fragment to be supplied in the lacuna, according to Barlow, is:

Ira omnium ex optimo et iustissimo in contrarium mutat. Quemcumque obtinuerit, nullius eum meminisse officii sinit. Da eam patri, inimicus est; da filio, parricida est; da matri, noverca est; da civi, hostis est; da regi, tyrannus est.

There is a difference of opinion between Barlow and Bickel on the first line which may be a conflation of De 1.3.8 mutantur in contrarium and 1.5.3 optimo...et emendatissimo. Barlow believes the parallels are slight in this instance. Seneca may well have repeated the thought. There is, however, general agreement that the other lines they must derive from the portion of the text lost in the De Ira. Bickel and Barlow both demonstrate Martin's epitomizing process that results in some changes, but is otherwise faithful to the text of Seneca. Bickel, for

example, showed that the basis of Martin's clausula is accentual. He shows a preference for two or four syllables between the final accents. Thus *mutantur in contrarium* would violate Martin's rhythm by having three syllables between the final accents while the change to *in contrarium mutat* produces for Martin an acceptable clausula of two syllables intervening between the final accents. Barlow shows that Martin is likely to combine portions of Senecan text that treat the same subject and make necessary grammatical changes in adapting the material; but in general, one must conclude that the portion *quemcumque obtinuerit... tyrannus est* follows Seneca very closely and adds to our solution of the lacuna.

The conclusion for the archetype must be that the loss in Book I took place after the 6th century, in which Martin was writing. In view of the previous speculation that the text of Seneca was possibly sent to Italy in the 7th century, one must conclude that the fuller text was

3 Besides one 17th century manuscript, the text of the *De Ira* epitome rests on the manuscript Escorial, M. III. 3. of the 10th century and written in Visigothic. This, of course, antedates, the Ambrosian Seneca manuscript and is in marked contrast to Martin's other Seneca epitome, that of the *De Officiis* as *De Formula Honestae Vitae*, for which there are over 600 manuscripts. The text of the *De Ira* also rests on some early editions, possibly from other manuscripts.
available at some time in Italy, even as Reynolds has shown that Guaiferius of Salerno quoted from *De Ira* 1.1.1-1.1.4 in a period contemporary with the writing of the Ambrosian manuscript, which did not add this section until later. He must have used some other manuscript for the text, and possibly one that, as the Spanish text of Martin shows, contained the material of the lacuna.

The scribe of manuscript A was aware, I think, of the passage now that Reynolds has made clear that two leaves and one side were originally left blank. Reynolds suggests that this was possibly the length of the text to be filled in, and I think quite rightly so. Albertini⁴ had argued that since Book II of the *De Ira* contained 1200 lines and Book III 1500 lines, the 900 lines of Book I pointed to a considerable loss. One can arrive at some closer figure. Barlow states that the epitome represents about one-seventh of the text of the *De Ira*; assuming a somewhat constant selection over the complete text, a mean figure⁵ of 195 lines represents a reasonable assumption for

⁴E. Albertini, *La Composition dans les Oeuvres Philosophiques Sénèque*, Paris, 1923. I have not seen this work but take Albertini's working method and conclusions from Barlow's article.

⁵That is the average of one-seventh of each of Book II and Book III. I am aware that the portion filled in at the beginning of the *De Ira*, 70 lines, confuses the figure, but the error is only ± 5 lines and does not substantially move the figure between the limits
the lacuna.

If one assumes, from another viewpoint, that the five sides left in the Ambrosian manuscript correspond to some real knowledge on the part of the scribe as to what is needed to fill in the portion missing in his exemplar, one arrives at a figure of 180. This is close to our other figure and I think one can conclude that the lacuna in the text represents a loss of about 200 lines. The length of the Book would then be 1100 lines which corresponds to the length of Book II and supports Albertini's theory that the first two Books were written at a time different from that of Book III. The knowledge on the part of the scribe of manuscript A then possibly corresponds to some text, which would be the Spanish text, the only one in which we know the lines were included. This, or one like it, must have come to Italy at some time, and the early 7th century is a possibility.

175-220. Because of the length of Book III and its loose structure Albertini had argued that it was not written until after 48 A.D., whereas the first two books were written just before the exile.

6 The Ambrosian manuscript averages about 55 Teubner lines for each manuscript page of 37 lines. The scribe then was leaving space for 225-275 lines, the error is ± 55 lines since the scribe could have ended anywhere on the last line. The hand that filled in part of the text must be taken into account. It has squeezed 70 Teubner lines onto one side of 41 lines. Thus the actual line limit for the lacuna is 155-205 lines or an average of 180.
APPENDIX D

This appendix is to clarify a number of points that have come to my attention through the late acquisition of a copy of Gertz's text. I find that he has considered a number of points about the physical condition of manuscript A which have been generally neglected by later editors. He had already suggested, for example, that it was the scribe of A who was responsible for the erasure at the end of the De Otio and in the table of contents, and for the same reasons as I have noted. He adds a fact not stated in Hermes, namely that folio 68v was left blank and that the end of the De Tranquillitate Animi is found on 68r. He suggests that the scribe is still confused about the work, particularly the strange beginning and the difficulties that carried over from the De Vita Beata and De Otio (see Gertz, p. xxv, note).

Gertz saved me from one major error about the erased portion of the text of the Ad Polybium and the marginal addition of A² (see p. 193 above). The matter of the addition in the margin has received little attention, principally because it is not clearly stated in editions after Gertz. Gertz himself notes that Koch had not
mentioned the addition in his edition. Gertz's apparatus and introduction is a model of clarity on the physical state of the manuscript and the nature of the various readings. He is particularly clear on the nature of the correction in each instance, reproducing superscript letters and expunging dots. He notes as well the general abbreviations of the Ambrosian manuscript and provides a number of appendices on errors and confusions in A. A number of these points would have materially contributed to my commentary, but I do not feel that my general conclusions have been affected.

Gertz in considering the descent of the manuscripts first comes to the conclusion that the various material added in the Ambrosian manuscript, particularly the beginning of the De Ira, the additions A² and A³, and the addition of robur accipiat in some manuscripts, points to a second hyparchetype independent of A. He describes (p. 27) a stemma similar to figure 1 to account for the additions; but he proceeds to show, as did Reynolds, that there are a number of lacunae in the manuscripts, even in those placed in the independent tradition, which are almost letter perfect with lines in A. He concludes then that the later manuscripts could still be derived from the Ambrosian codex.

He adds, as I have suggested, that one cannot deny
that the lacunae could represent lines in the archetype or in an independent apograph of it. He makes some tentative assumptions about the physical formation of the archetype which he derives from the major omissions in A (see especially p. xxv and p. 373). I have not discussed this question at any length in the dissertation.
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