In this edition, too, Camps offers clarifying introductory remarks on the elegies together with abundant, original and penetrating annotations: at 5, 27 Camps could also have referred to Varro de R.R. III 9, 6 and Colum. de Arb. III 3 to support his interpretation of exoriens = sol. An original interpretation is given of 7, 4 and, by means of punctuation, of 7, 52-4. Where grammatically different interpretations are possible, Camps states the alternatives (here and there this may lead to a less probable view, e.g. at I, 1 sacra Philitae: "poetry of Ph.").

In some cases one misses a more detailed explanation, e.g. at 6, 22; 8, 24 (why does he not mention Sandström’s emendation?); at 4, 19 the note that the Julii derived their descent from Venus could be missed, but scarcely the note at 11, 40 that the Ptolemies considered themselves descendants from Philip. There are instances of the "verschobenes Plusquamperfectum" in this book, too: 8, 1; 13, 38; 18, 15; 24, 20. At 1, 35 meque could have been mentioned as a specimen of -que = etiam (cf. Leumann-Hofmann-Szantyr, Lat. Gramm., 474-5). The note on 5, 39 would be more in place at 37; the last line of the note on 6, 9 becomes clear only when one consults the commentary of Butler-Barber. The annotation at 7, 36 is phrased in an obscure way.

Here also a short index grammaticus et stilisticus together with an index locorum would have been very welcome.

Notwithstanding these remarks this edition, too, presents a thorough, original, and sometimes surprising commentary (e.g. at 14, 3, where Camps accepts ludos but also tries to defend the reading of the mss. laudes).

ZUIDLAREN, Lindenhof 22

H. Schoonhoven


Mr. Scarpat has written a good book (cf. ep. 88, 37) about one of Seneca’s more interesting letters, or rather, he has taken ep. 65 to serve as a skeleton for a discussion-in-depth of some basic problems of Seneca’s philosophy. The most basic of these is the question whether we may speak of such an entity as ‘Seneca’s philosophy’. The structure of the book is to a large extent determined by this approach. Other books asking other interesting questions of this letter doubtless could have been written by other scholars, but it is one of the attractive aspects of the present book that it has obviously been conceived in a very personal reaction both to the letter and to
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much of the Seneca scholarship of the past half-century. So we find, after a text with translation, chapters on Seneca the philosopher, the framework of the letter, the problem of the ‘causes’, the unity of the Stoic system, sapientia, libertas, and death. These apparently unconnected themes are firmly linked together by the very progression of thought in ep. 65. In the treatment of each of them one is impressed by the author’s rich reading 1).

The following remarks 2) concerning details of greater and lesser importance are made in a spirit of constructive discussion.

It is the author’s conviction that Seneca was converted to serious philosophy only in the last years of his life (cf. e.g. p. 67). This hypothesis is in need of proof in view of such passages as ep. 78, 1-2 (not the language of one who was recently converted), 83, 5 and, of course, 108, 17. Since the hypothesis is the foundation for much of the structure of the book, a demonstration coupled with a careful indication of the author’s standpoint in the (still difficult!) question of the chronology of Seneca’s works would have been very welcome.

In the question of meditatio mortis (p. 72 n. 6) I sorely miss a reference to P. Rabbow’s work on spiritual exercises (and in this second edition also to I. Hadot), which would, moreover, suggest a ‘place’ for the present conversation about causes within the totality of Seneca’s moral-philosophical practice.

Concerning Seneca’s practice of quoting others, in particular those of other philosophical persuasions, Scarpat argues that we have to do with an element of independence rather than eclecticism. It seems to me that we must reckon with Seneca’s predilection for shock-tactics and with not a little sense of humour which is closely related to his obvious awareness of the rhetorical effect of his words. This awareness also makes unpalatable for me the argument (p. 180) that Seneca disliked logical subtleties because he had been fed them ad nauseam during his rhetorical training.

In the chapter on the framework employed in this letter I should have liked a more detailed discussion of the frame formed by the words dicunt ut scis Stoici nostri ... causam et materiam (2) and, in section 23, nempe universa ex materia et ex deo constant. On p. 120 we read that all Stoics would agree with Philo’s description of

1) Some of the more recent literature on Stoicism and Seneca seems not to have been taken into account in this second edition. I miss references to e.g. Reesor and Sambursky on problems of Stoicism, to Leeman on Seneca and Posidonius, to E.G. Schmidt’s dissertation on ep. 118.

2) The frequent misprints usually leave the sense clear, but on p. 1 line 23 materiae should be read instead of materia and on p. 288, note 28 the reference to ep. 92,27 is a mistake for ep. 102,27.
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