Biagio Santorelli

Bibliographical updates to Sussman’s “The lost Histories of the Elder Seneca” (1972–2019)

The lost Histories of the Elder Seneca was completed by Lewis Sussman in the early 70s; part of the conclusions reached in this work were later exploited in Sussman (1978), esp. 137–152, but the bulk of this paper remained unpublished. The publication of the proceedings of a conference devoted to the ‘re-emerging’ of Seneca’s Histories seemed an appropriate occasion to make Sussman’s work available to the scholarly community, in the aim of fostering new reflection on the work of Seneca the Elder; to this end, I here append to Sussman’s text a brief overview of the subsequent scholarship, with special focus on the issues addressed in the present essay.

In the original version of Sussman’s paper, all texts from Seneca the Elder’s Controversiae and Suasoriae were quoted from the edition of Müller (1887); in preparing the essay for publication, however, I have quoted all texts from Håkanson (1989), which is now the standard edition of Seneca’s works. In recent years, a new critical edition of the Suasoriae, with introduction and commentary, is provided by Feddern (2013); as for the Controversiae, the only commentary available at present is Håkanson (2016): I refer to my Aktualisierung in that volume (Santorelli (2016) for details on recent bibliography on the elder Seneca in general.

The fragment of the De vita patris (fr. 15 Haase - Appendix T1), as well as the testimonies on Seneca’s Histories by Suetonius (Tib. 73.2 - Appendix F1) and Lactantius (inst. 7.15.14 - Appendix F1) can now be read in the commented edition of FRHist: see I 505–508 (introduction); II 982–985 (texts and translations); III 596–597 (commentary). Pecere (2010) 129–133 offers insights on the preservation of texts left unfinished, or unpublished, at the death of their author; on the possibility that the elder Seneca may have left other unpublished works, beside the Histories and the rhetorical anthology, see Lausberg (1989) 1937–1941.

While it is generally agreed upon that Seneca must have covered at least the years of Tiberius’ principate, and perhaps even the earliest years of Gaius’ reign (see FRHist I 506), the scholarly debate on the possible beginnings of the Histories is still open. Most recently, FRHist I 506 suggests that the initium bellorum civilium mentioned in the De vita patris as the starting point of Seneca’s Histories should be associated with the wars between Pompey and Caesar; on the other hand, Canfora (2000) 165–168 and (2015) 143–149, maintains that the arché of the political
turmoil recorded by Seneca should be dated back to the Gracchan age (see already Sussman (1978) 142. In his essay published in the present volume (see especially 9–10 and n. 3), Cornell brings new arguments in support of his view, and challenges the interpretation of \emph{veritas} as “truth, righteousness, and integrity” suggested by Sussman (see 172–173 and n. 146); on the meaning of \emph{veritas}, with its implications on the assessment of the most plausible beginnings of Seneca’s \emph{Historiae}, see now in detail the essays by Mazzoli (95–100), Berti (103–104 n. 11), and Rich (348 n. 71). As for the possible date of publication of the \emph{Historiae}, which Sussman and Canfora (2015) trace back to the early principate of Gaius, see now Damon (128–129 and n. 26).

The attitude of Seneca to history, which he considers a higher \emph{genus scripti} than declamation, has been further analysed in Canfora (2000) 167–169 and Feddern (2013) 380; 431–432.

On Seneca’s moralistic approach to both literature and history, and on his view of history as a cycle of moral decay, see now Berti (2007) 213–2018, as well as his essay in this book (especially 109–116); the division of Roman history in phases corresponding to the ages of the human life, and the tradition of this conception in Roman historiography, are studied in depth in Bessone (2008) and Pittà (2015) 266–274. See also Canfora (2015) on the connection between Florus and the \emph{gens Annaea}, with further insights by Mazzoli in the present volume (94). On the influence of Seneca’s experience of the horror of the civil wars on his conception of history see Danesi Marioni (2003); Mazzoli (2006).

As for Seneca’s critical use of his sources, Canfora (2000) 160–161 focuses on the case of \emph{suas}. 6, with its survey of different accounts of Cicero’s death, considering it a case-study to understand Seneca’s working method; on the diverse historiographical traditions recorded by Seneca in this section see also Berti (2007) 326–328 (with further references in his essay in the present volume, 102 n. 3), and more recently Lentano (2016). In particular on Cremius Cordus’ account, which has Cicero deliberate whether to resort to the help of Brutus, Cassius or Sextus Pompey (almost as in a \emph{suasoria triplex}), see now Mancini (2018). Seneca’s occasional inaccuracy in reporting facts and ascribing quotations is discussed in Feddern (2013) 62; 181–182 (\emph{ad suas}. 1.5); 269–270 (\emph{ad suas}. 2.11); 395–396 (\emph{ad suas}. 6.3).