The Classical Review

<http://journals.cambridge.org/CAR>

Additional services for *The Classical Review*:

Email alerts: [Click here](#)

Subscriptions: [Click here](#)

Commercial reprints: [Click here](#)

Terms of use : [Click here](#)

The Authorship of the Hercules Oetaeus

Walter C. Summers

The Classical Review / Volume 19 / Issue 01 / February 2005, pp 40 - 54

DOI: 10.1017/S0009840X00991261, Published online: 27 October 2009

Link to this article: http://journals.cambridge.org/abstract_S0009840X00991261

How to cite this article:

Walter C. Summers (1905). The Authorship of the Hercules Oetaeus. The Classical Review, 19, pp 40-54 doi:10.1017/S0009840X00991261

Request Permissions : [Click here](#)

familiar to Horace, which may be illustrated by 'ordo-ordinis' in 41, 2: see also Keller's note (*Epilegomena*, 1879) on *Epist.* 2, 1, 101, which he would with Lachmann read after 107; and so Wilkins and the *Corpus* (1893).

(2) 128 (*Difficile est proprie*, etc.) is surely the starting point of a new topic. Horace has done with the subject of $\eta\theta\eta$, and starts a fresh paragraph abruptly and sententiously. This is the manner of the *Ars Poetica* throughout; it is also the manner of our own classical poets, as Pope and Cowper; but in the *Ars Poetica*, the opening words are, as pointed out by Orelli on this passage, and more generally by Professor Nettleship, (*Journal of Philology*, xii, p. 52) upon the express authority of Porphyryon, quoted from the writer of some Greek handbook, Neoptolemus of Parium or another. I do not wish to say a word upon the interpretation of this vexed passage, except, for the sake of clearness, to express concurrence in Orelli's (and Dr. Johnson's) view of the meaning of 'communia'; and to add that such difficulty as may be felt in the use of the two legal words 'communia' and 'publica' with a different reference must be at least softened by the widening of the interval between them by three or four lines.

If it be granted that the lines in question would read well after 130, can any plausible account be given of their removal to where they now stand?

Apart from any *mechanical* process by which lines might be removed from their place and reappear at an interval of 110 vv.¹ there are two considerations, which may be set down for what they may be worth:—

(1) Schütz finds a difficulty in the change from the second person of 128–130 to the first person of 240. A comparison of *Sat.*

¹ Such as that suggested by Chr. Brennan for Aeschylus, *Journ. Phil.* xxii, p. 62.

2, 4, 72–3, where the same change of persons occurs, may remove this; and the sententious tone of the gastronomic professor is not unlike that which Horace archly assumes in parts of the *Ars Poetica*. But the change of person may have offended some $\delta\iota\omicron\phi\theta\omega\rho\acute{\eta}\varsigma$, and suggested a removal of the lines to a passage written in the first person.

(2) As noticed above, *communia* and *publica materies* are terms in legal use. Justinian (*Inst.* ii. 1) gives a series of methods by which property is acquired in such things, and Horace's lines as to *publica materies* might be a parody of some earlier text book of law (see Roby, *Roman Private Law*, iv. 3). *de medio sumptis* would stand in a legal context, but such phrases are more often quoted in a literary or general use. In *Epist.* 2, 1, 168 'ex medio quia res arcessit' is said of Comedy. Is it possible that this one line (243) rightly stands before 244, but should immediately follow 239? It would then point and conclude the advice given to the Satyric dramatist to give some dignity to his quasi-comic subjects. 'So much dignity is (or will be) given (in my Satyric drama) to themes drawn from common life.' The variant 'accedet,' which is found in a tenth century MS., would make this easier. The three lines 240–2 are complete in themselves, and might have originally followed 130, though our ear misses the familiar cadence of the sequence of the fourth. If this hypothesis were correct, the $\delta\iota\omicron\phi\theta\omega\rho\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ would have had a motive for bringing together the two 'tantum' lines.

The $\delta\iota\omicron\phi\theta\omega\rho\acute{\eta}\varsigma$ himself is hypothetical, though *Epist.* 2, 1, 101, seems to suggest his handiwork; and I fear that my two suggestions, taken together, do not amount to a 'vera causa,' but possibly some one else may be willing to strengthen them.

A. O. PRICKARD.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE HERCULES OETAEUS.

G. RICHTER was the first to subject the Hercules Oetaeus to a systematic examination¹ with the object of deciding as to whether it was written by Seneca² or not.

¹ De Sen. tragoediarum auctore, Bonn, 1862.

² The Senecan origin of the seven plays which precede H.O. in the Florentine MS. (H.F., Tro., Phoen., Phaed., Oed., Ag., Thy.) is assumed throughout this paper. To these seven the expression 'the other plays' applies throughout.

Whilst his investigations led him to answer the question in the negative, Leo, who in the first volume of his edition had gone far more thoroughly into the points involved, came to the conclusion that ll. 1–705 came from Seneca. This position however has been shaken by G. Tachau, who has shewn³ that the choral passage 104–172

³ Philol. 1888, pp. 378 sqq.

exhibits the very features which led Leo to reject the latter portion of the play.¹

More recently P. Melzer² has attempted to maintain the Senecan origin of the whole work. He believes that we have only the rough sketch, full of duplicate scenes between which Seneca would have eventually had to make his choice. Richter himself, in the new Teubner edition of the plays, writes on p. 319 :

Argumenta a Leone prolata acriter impugnavit ac maximam partem uel infirmavit uel diluit P. Melzer . . . Neque noua Pauli Barthii Lipsiensis argumentatio per litteras mecum communicata eo ualet ut stare possit Leonis sententia.

The conversion, at least in part, of the scholar who first took the trouble to investigate seriously the question might so easily lead to a general acquiescence in what I regard as an absolutely impossible position that I feel bound to put forward a solution to which the study of the play had driven me before I had seen any of the literature on the subject, and in which the perusal of that literature has only confirmed me.

A summary of Leo's arguments will give a good idea of the main points involved. The peculiarities of H.O. fall under two heads: (A) frequent resemblances in thought and expression to passages of the other plays, especially the *Hercules Furens*, and (B) weakness and generally un-Senecan character of the style and thought. A noteworthy example under (A) is the passage 1402 *sqq.*, shewn by Leo³ to be 'paene cento ex Hercule furente decerptus et inepto loco insertus.' Very characteristic too is the repetition of complete (or practically complete) iambic lines from other plays. Under (B) we get slovenliness of grammatical construction, metrical phenomena, such as the shortening of the first syllable of *Hebrus*, *Cyclas*, and *fibra*, laxity and weakness of thought, poverty of language (evinced by frequent repetition of a word or phrase) and peculiarities of style (especially of vocabulary).

Leo's investigation, excellent piece of work as it is, suffers from three defects. He is not clear in his own mind as to the value of the A. class of evidence. On p. 51 he thinks everyone will allow that the

parallelisms he cites cannot come from one and the same author. But on p. 53 he is less confident and says that he is aware that his examples do not prove that the parallels came from different hands—they only shew that *if* Sen. wrote the H.O. passages, he did so after he had written, *e.g.*, the *Hercules Furens*, so that the immaturity of youth cannot be pleaded in explanation of the weaknesses of the play. Again, some of the points raised under (B) are by no means decisive—least of all, the examples he gives of the illogical and feeble character of some of the writing. Leo's failure to press home his attack here is the more surprising as one of the most obvious differences between H.O. and the other plays is the monotony, the absolute lack of point, and the effort to make up for this by mere rant which certain parts of it display. Of this however I shall say more anon: I pass now to the third and last point in which Leo's method fails to satisfy me. It is not until p. 69 that we learn that his criticisms apply *with force* only to 706 *sqq.* ('eorum quae attulimus perpauca nec e grauioribus illa ad hanc partem [1-705] pertinere'): in the next few pages he proceeds to gloss over and minimise any blemishes which he has previously pointed out in the other portion of the play. So abrupt a turn is calculated to weaken the reader's faith in his guide. As an actual fact Leo quietly drops all mention of some of these blemishes, forgets to remind us that H.O. 484 comes almost direct from the *Phaedra*, that H.O. 361 contains an example of that use of *forsitan* with a present tense which he previously regarded as important enough to merit a page or more of investigation, that in H.O. 63 *genus* stands for *genus humanum* in just the same way as it does in three passages of the rejected part of the play. If these omissions are fatal to our belief in Leo's sense of equity, still more fatal to our faith in his theory is the fact that the blemishes in the first part are much more numerous than his examination of it reveals.⁴ To some of these (*e.g.* the use of *sonare* in the sense of *uocari* in 692), Birt⁵ has drawn attention and I shall presently point out many others. Here it is enough to remind

¹ Birt indeed (*Rhein. Mus.* 1879, pp. 516 *sqq.*) maintains against Leo the spuriousness of the whole play. Some of his arguments will be mentioned further on: as a rule he does not examine the passages with sufficient minuteness to be able to prove his case. Emendation of the existing text is his main consideration.

² De *Hercule Octaëo* Annaeano, Chemnitz, 1890.

³ Pp. 50 *sqq.*

⁴ How completely Leo's judgment is blinded by his faith in the theory is best seen by his extraordinary contention that the *Deianira* of part 1, as distinct from the D. of part 2, sends the garment with the intention of killing her husband. Birt and Melzer have answered him at some length, but the most cursory reading of the play will be enough to settle the question.

⁵ *l.c.* p. 516.

the reader that Tachau has shewn that ll. 104-172 contain the same kind of patch-work as ll. 1402 *sqq.*, the same inaccuracy of thought and strangeness of diction as disfigure the portion which Leo rejects.

The secret of the success of Melzer's attack lies in the fact that it is directed against these weak places. His paper is an extremely able one, testifying to keen interest and intelligent study of the plays. He is often very happy in his refutation of Leo's criticisms under (B). But his arguments on (A) seem to me distinctly mis-

leading. We are asked to concede that the 'imitation' in this play is much the same as we find in others.¹ Leo himself admits, as every student of the tragedies must admit, 'Senecam semet ipsum exscribere in reliquis fabulis.' It is necessary therefore that we should understand clearly what this means, and, fortunately, it is not difficult to do so.

I. Confining myself to the first two plays alone, I find the following half lines, etc. recurring in other plays.

H.F.

50 nidi ipsa uidi	=Tr. 170 (ipse)
953 uultus huc et huc acres	=Tr. 1092
1012 quo misera pergis	=Pha. 142
1027 uinax senectus	=Tr. 42
1138 quis...locus, quae regio	=Tr. 498
1148 animus grande praesagit	Pho. 278 magna praesagit
malum	mala...animus
1189 his pater	O. 828 malum timeri maius
quicquam timeri maius...	his aliquid potest?
potest?	

An examination of the other plays would lead us to similar results. In one or two

O. 688 domus ciuium coetu uiget.

A. 8 hinc auspicari regium capiti decus.

II. As for mere phrases, they of course recur from time to time—not more frequently in these plays than in other Latin writings.² I have noted more in the Troades than anywhere else: *talis incessu* . . . *sic tulit* 465, 466, H.F. 330 (*talis incessu*), Pha. 656 (*sic tulit*); *fidem alligare* 611, Th. 972; *retro patefacere iter* 724, H.F. 55 (*via-m*); *in cinerem dare* 739, Pho. 113; *scelerum artifex* 750, M. 734; *scrutari ore* 812, Th. 499; *ad (in) auctorem redit* 870, O. 706.

III. Again, when particular *loci* recur, the language is sometimes very similar in both cases. Compare the dogs of the hunting-scene, Pha. 31 *sqq.*, with that of the simile in Th. 497 *sqq.* (*sagax, lorum, teneo,*

Tro.

450 squalida obiectus = O. 625 (except that *squalidam-coma* *comam* is written here)

519 dehisce tellus tu- = O. 868

que

630 bene est: tenetur = M. 550

passages I have found curious, probably quite accidental, combinations. Thus

Pha. 436 domus sorte felici uiget.

482 ciuium coetum cole.

Th. 657 hinc auspicari regna.

H.F. 257 regium capitis (*capiti* E) decus.

presso, rostro, occur in both passages), the Bacchus of H.F. 472 *sqq.* with him of O. 423, 441 (*syрма, thyrsum leuem uibrare*). But variation is Seneca's rule even here: observe the different forms in which he dresses his favourite theme *medio tutissimus* in Pha. 1123 *sqq.*, O. 882 *sqq.*, A. 57 *sqq.*, Th. 391 *sqq.*

IV. Where, as often, a *sententia* is repeated, the language is carefully altered: see the variations on the *mot* 'death often a boon' in H.F. 511 *sqq.*, Tr. 329, A. 995, Th. 246 *sqq.*

From the Senecan usage as described above, H.O. varies in two important respects. (1) Nowhere else can I find an example of the transference of practically a complete iambic line from another play. The nearest approach to such a thing is H.F. 1189 cited above, and I know no parallel to it within the compass of the 7 plays. In H.O. we have five examples: 27, 484, 745, 1680, 1797. (2) The repetitions in H.O. are not merely frequent: they are often

¹ See what he says on p. 22. If it is more frequent in H.O. than elsewhere, he thinks it will be because that play is *ceteris multo minus eliminata*.

² Repetition of pet phrases, often part of the common rhetorical stock in trade (such as *derat hoc solum, pars quota, hoc non est nouum*), is a different thing, and the consideration of it does not belong here.

continuous. I do not think I can illustrate what I mean better than by shewing how

Iole's monody¹ (173 *sqq.*) echoes a similar passage of the Agamemnon.

H.O.

- 173 *sqq.* templa suis collapsa deis.
 181 quae prima querar, quae summa
 gemam
 197 *sqq.* coniunx Ceyca gemit . . .
 natumque sonat flebilis Atthis
 198 sibi facta superstes
 207 uidi uidi

Nor is the author so engrossed by his reminiscences of the Agamemnon passage that he cannot work in something from

- 178 alio nostras fortuna uocat lacrimas.
 185 Sipylum flebile saxum.
 211 *sqq.* si tumultum fata dedissent
 quotiens quaerendus eras.
 215 *sqq.* 'My parents were lucky to die in
 the sack of the town.'

It is this continuity, this use of patchwork as distinct from mere untimely reminiscence, that seems so important to me. That Seneca in a rough draft might, to an extent he would never allow in the finished work, repeat phrases used in other plays, that he might borrow a *sententia* in an almost unchanged form, is possible enough. Even a Vergil required *tibicines*. But I cannot think that he would allow reminiscences of a similar situation in a previous play to obtrude themselves in such a way as to completely paralyse the very qualities of his genius on which he pinned his reputation. Of course frequently the tags do not fit their new surroundings very well. But this is a criterion which often fails us, and Melzer has met Leo very successfully in several cases where the latter has tried to apply it. In this very monody, one can hardly say that the words are ill suited to the occasion, which is of course practically the same as that of the Agamemnon chorus. But the fact remains that the whole thing is a mere cento from the Agamemnon, patched up with loans from other plays, and this seems to me decisive. On the same principle I hold Leo mistaken in regarding H.O. 863 *sqq.* as a bare-faced plagiarism from Pha. 1104. The thought itself, as I shall presently shew, thoroughly suits the context, and the surroundings are entirely free from suspicion.

In attacking Leo's arguments under (B) Melzer has done well in shewing that the

A.

- 653 templa deos super usta suos
 649 quid nunc primum . . . quidue extremum
 deflere paras.
 671 cantat aedon Ityn 680 licet alcyones
 Ceyca suum . . . sonent
 709 superstes sibi
 = 656

other plays, or other parts of that. So we have

Tr. 142 alio lacrimas flectite uestras.

A. 394 Sipyli uertice summo flebile saxum.
 Pha. 1274 saepe efferendus.²

Tr. 142 *sqq.* 157 felix Priamus—secum
 excedens sua regna tulit.

train of thought, etc. in several of the passages cited by Leo is perfectly satisfactory, or at any rate worthy of Seneca. A fair example is his defence of H.O. 844: *reddendus orbi est* (sc. Hercules): *quod potes, redde exhibe* (sc. poenam). Leo objected to the word-play in this verse, although he was able to quote, in a footnote, something very similar from Seneca's prose—and of course the thing is only too characteristic of the most brilliant Silver work. Melzer appositely quotes Ag. 987 *fratrem reddat aut animam statim*. At times however Melzer's success is due entirely to the fact that Leo has not observed the worst point in the passage in question. Thus at H.O. 1272 *sqq.* Melzer disposes of his criticisms by reading *durius*—*uulnus*. But he leaves the extraordinary phrase *rictus meos infregit* (1274) untouched: Leo found no fault with this. Compare what I have to say further on about H.O. 574. I quite accept Melzer's position that little can be proved by the repetition of words and slovenliness of grammar that we find in H.O. I think the evidence with which he supports it excellent.

The question of vocabulary raises a more important issue. Richter indeed tried to

¹ The parallelisms have not, so far as I know, been noted before. Birt is the only scholar who has examined the speech; his view of its spuriousness is based simply on the verbal repetitions which it contains (*l.c.* p. 535).

² Both passages refer to the burial of the remains of men torn or smashed to pieces.

support his views as to the spuriousness of H.O. by shewing that it did not contain certain particles (e.g. *etiam*) which are found in the other plays—a method against which Melzer justly enters a protest. More plausible are the arguments drawn from the occurrence in this play of particles etc. not found in the others, and Leo, who tacitly dropped Richter's other arguments, takes the trouble to refute some of his statements under this head,¹ and draws attention to the use of *haudum* in 80 and appositional *quamquam* in 1506, 1861.² Melzer, who evidently distrusts this kind of evidence,³ might have given strong reasons in support of his attitude. The fact that a line contains a word not used in the other plays is in itself no evidence against its genuineness. In the seven Senecan plays words so common as *adeo*, *breuiter*, *ceu*, *comminus*, *coram*, *fere*, *graviter*, *iampidem*, *ideo*, *iuxta*, *merito*, *nuper*, *propter*, *siquidem*, *subinde*, and *uerum* ('but')⁴ occur each in one play only and the 1344 lines of the Hercules Furens contain some 130 words which recur in none of the other plays—there are, in fact five lines which contain two such words.⁵ On the other hand one may go too far in Melzer's direction. Considering the hysterical tone of the plays, the tendency of the characters to exclaim, Leo's observation that *ei mihi* is never found in them whilst H.O. shews it, or signs of it, in five places,⁶ is surely very important.

But grave doubts often arise as to the very Latinity of this play. Melzer admits this as regards the four passages where *genus* stands for *genus humanum* and 1604 where *quem tulit* *Poceans* means 'whom P. begat.' I cannot think he has been successful in his attempts to dispose of the six cases

¹ He might have mentioned that *fere* does occur in the plays (Tro. 438, 1143).

² Neither Richter nor Leo seems aware that *quamquam* does not occur at all in the other plays.

³ See his remarks on pp. 33, 35.

⁴ *Necum* I have only noted in Pha. 1109: if this is the only place, we have a close parallel to the isolated use of *haudum* mentioned above.

⁵ There is therefore nothing suspicious, in itself, in the use of *interim* in H.O. with the meaning 'sometimes.' It is a common Silver (and Senecan) use. It is curious it does not occur in the other plays, but so is it that the equally Silver and Senecan *tanti est* is found only in the Phoenixis (where, like *interim* in H.O., it occurs twice). But the fact that in both places (481, 930) *interim* is in bad company makes a difference.

⁶ Melzer will not allow 1172 and 1205 to count as instances, because in the former A reads *male*, in the latter E (not A, as he says) *mihi*. I think there can be no question that *ei mihi* must be read in both places. In Leo's sixth instance (1181) I admit that the reading is too uncertain for us to reckon it,

cited by Leo where the genitive of the personal pronoun is used, after the most approved manner of the beginner, with possessive force. M.'s eclectic view of the relative merits of the two recensions A and E allows him to choose, in five of the instances, an alternative reading which gets over the particular difficulty, but these alternatives are not in themselves free from objection,⁷ and one can hardly believe that the MSS. would by mere coincidence so often shew traces of the genitive. The worst example of all, *dextra tui* of 1217, cannot be got over—certainly not by M.'s explanation that the genitive is thus used for emphasis. As for the passages from Seneca rhetor which he cites after Leo, one can only say that, although it is quite permissible to make use of weapons with which your adversary supplies you, it is advisable to be sure that they are reliable weapons. Both passages⁸ are clear instances of the objective genitive, governed in the one case by *obiurgator*, in the other by *alimentum*.

Curiously enough, some of the most glaring shortcomings of H.O.'s vocabulary have as yet escaped the eyes of the critics.

I. QUOTUS.—The phrase *pars quota est* so dear to Ovid is not uncommon in the Senecan plays. It is however always used there in the literal sense. The only parallel I know to such a use as we have in H.O. 51 *pars quota est Perseus mei* is (apart from a passage of Claudian) Ou. M. 9. 69 *pars quota Lernæae . . . eris echidnae*, 'what will you be compared with the Hydra?' What Ovid could write, Seneca may have written. But at l. 95 we read

quota est mundi plaga
Oriens subactus? aut quota est Gorgon
fera?

The meaning is obvious—'The East is only one quarter, the Gorgon one monster; what is that compared with the many that I have subdued?' Apart from the fact that in the other plays *quotus* is only used in the phrase *quota pars*, I question if any parallel can be produced to the force with which the word is here employed.

II. IECUR.—Horace certainly uses this word in connexion with the passions of anger and love, but I cannot believe that Sen. would treat it as a satisfactory synonym for

⁷ For instance *nunc ueram tuam | agnosce prolem*, A's reading at 954, is only a shade better than E's.

⁸ Contr. 2. 2. 9, 3. 7 (excerpt).

cor and *pectus*, as is done in the following lines of H.O. :

574¹ sed iecur fors horridum flectam mendo.

709 pauidumque trepidis palpitat uenis iecur.

1677 comprime infirmum iecur.

1732 o durum iecur !

III. SICCUS.—This epithet, applied absolutely to persons, ordinarily denotes the teetotaller or at any rate temperate drinker.² In 1269

siccus aerumnas tuli

it is used with the meaning 'without shedding a tear.'

IV. PENSARE.—In 1747 *sqq.* we read

nec properat uri, cumque iam forti datum leto satis pensavit . . .

Hercules is in no hurry to get the ordeal by fire over : he wishes to shew such fortitude in bearing the pain as will ensure his end being reckoned a noble one. *Pensavit* appears to mean 'he deemed,' a presumably very late force of the word.

V. GIGANS.—Alcmene, alluding to the heap of ashes which is the only relic of Hercules, says in 1759

huc ille decreuit gigans !

I know of no other case where the word is used to denote simply a huge man.

Melzer's theory explains much. Admit that we have in H.O. the rough sketch of a play, and we cannot be surprised by slight laxness in the treatment of details, especially metre, by the abnormal length of this tragedy, its wearisome repetitions, its contradictions, above all the aimless, drifting character of some of its scenes. But such a theory does not help us to face the three phenomena on which I have laid stress above, the pointlessness, the patchwork, and the bad Latinity.

Before explaining my own solution of the problem, I should like to call attention to

¹ Curiously enough Leo and Birt have objected to the use of *fors* as contrary to the custom of the other plays, Melzer has defended it, and put an emendation at the disposal of anyone whom his defence fails to satisfy, but no one has attacked *iecur* in either this or any other of the passages.

² *Udus aleator* in Mart. 5. 84. 5 is no doubt meant to denote the opposite tendency. No one will believe it means that he begs for mercy in tears. *Sicca* (*uda*) *puella* in Martial is no doubt a piece of the argot of the day.

some small points relating to the use of anaphora which I have noted as distinguishing H.O. from the other plays. Anaphora is common in these and I have what I feel sure is a tolerably complete record of the instances. Those in which a single emphatic word is repeated and a word intervenes between the pair are not uncommon. In all of them the emphatic word³ either forms part of the first foot (*uidi ipsa uidi*; *sed fateor, Atrou, fateor*) or follows immediately on the penthemimeral caesura (*parta iam, parta ultio est*; *matris, en, matris sonus*). In three passages of H.O. (two of them within a few lines of each other) we find this anaphora in a different place : 756 *o lares, miseri lares*; 770 *pro diem, infandum diem*; 1201 *pro ferae, victae ferae*. In another part of H.O. we find two instances of the addition of *nam* to the word when it is repeated (1338 *ubi natus, ubinam* and 1399 *ubi morbus, ubinam*); this again is peculiar to the play. In general I would note that in various parts of it, anaphora, the italics of the ancients, is used in a forcibly-feeble manner for which I can find no parallel in the other plays : two instances will be mentioned in the course of this paper.

The fact that so careful a student of the plays as Leo could accept part of the Hercules Oetaeus as the work of their author, and that Richter seems now ready to believe that the whole of it is genuine is in itself testimony that there must be considerable merit in this composition, of which so far mainly the faults have occupied us. I propose now to examine in detail⁴ ll. 1-103, which form the Prologus of the play and seem to offer me the best means of introducing to the reader the views for which I am seeking his approval.

1, 2 sator deorum, cuius excussum manu
utraeque Phoebi sentiunt fulmen domus.

Sator deorum = Pha. 157; *tuas* (sc. Titanis) *utrasque domus* is in H.F. 1062. The rest seems due to H.F. 517 *cuius excussis tremunt | humana telis*.

³ I might say the *first* of the pair, but for H.F. 1147 *nescio quod mihi | nescio quod animus grande praesagit malum*.

⁴ Birt has criticised this part of the play (pp. 532 *sqq.*). So far as his objections apply they may be taken as supplementary to those pointed out above. Tachau (l.c. p. 381) states that he intends to prove the spuriousness of the prologue, but I cannot find that he has ever done so.

13, 14 quid astra, genitor, quid negas? mors
me tibi
certe remisit.

Anaphora of interrogative particles is altogether rare in the other plays: here it seems very feeble in the mouth of the imperious Hercules, and the fact that *numquid* has undergone anaphora in l. 11 makes things worse. The second sentence recalls H.F. 1143 where Hercules says *certe redimus* (from the quest of Cerberus, to which of course the present passage refers).

19 Hæbro.

See above p. 41. The point has been noted by my predecessors: I would add that there is distinct reminiscence in the whole passage of A. 842 *sqq.*, where, in reference to the same Diomedes, the four words *grex, Hebrus, hospites, and cruor* occur as here.

26 una est Geryon sparsus manu.

The sentence is barely intelligible until we illustrate it by the line of which it is an abridgment, H.F. 487 *nec unus* (i.e. *triplex*) *una Geryon uictus manu*.

27 taurusque populis horridus centum
pauor

It is curious that Leo¹ has not noted the parallelism to H.F. 230 *taurumque centum non leuem populis metum*.

Here then, in the space of less than 30 lines, we find collected most of the points which Leo very justly regards as un-Senecan. The subject-matter itself is very poor. When I pass from the *Controversiae* of Seneca pater to the plays of Seneca filius I feel that I am simply continuing my studies in a rather more vitiated atmosphere. But in this passage of H.O. I look almost in vain for the *sententiae vibrantes, the colores* and all the gay paraphernalia of rhetorical tragedy. If we exclude from consideration the borrowed plumes, we shall be able to muster only three 'points,' and their quality hardly atones for their numerical weakness. L. 6 = 'I have saved Jove many a bolt,'² l. 12 = 'Can't Atlas carry a' heaven weighted by my presence?' l. 23 = 'The daylight feared Cerberus, and he the light' (which is really only an amplification of H.F. 60 *uiso labantem Cerbero uidi diem* with the aid of the description in 813 *sqq.*, esp. 824 *diem inuisum expulit*).

¹ On pp. 51, 52, where he notes parallels much less complete.

² The writer seems pleased with this: it recurs at 850 *sqq.*, 1143, 1912.

Contrast with the passage we have just reviewed ll. 28–46. There is no obscurity; in only one place can there be any suspicion of 'imitation,' and the 'points' are numerous enough to satisfy Ovid himself—29 *iratis deis non licuit esse*, 31 *redde nato patrem uel astra forti*, 38 *in tutum meas laudes redegi*, 43 *nec meos lux prosequi potuit triumphos*, 45 *intraque nostras substitit metas dies*, 46 *terra defecit gradum*. The suspicious passage referred to is this:

34 uel si times ne terra concipiat feras,
properet malum quodcumque, dum terra
Herculem
habet uidetque.

In H.F. 937 *sqq.* Hercules exclaims

si quod etiamnum est scelus
latura tellus, properat.

The idea suits H.F. l.c. perfectly well. The hero is eager for rest: if he is doomed to more toil, let it come now that he may get it over. But it suits the H.O. passage, where Hercules is disposing of any possible objection that Jove may raise to his release, even better. As there is no imitation³ in the rest of the passage I think we may recognise what we have here as genuine Senecan repetition.⁴

At l. 47 we are amidst dross again. *Lassata prior est* (sc. terra) is a feeble (and mistaken) comment on the *terra defecit gradum* of the previous line.⁵ In 47, 48 Hercules says *nox et chaos in me incucurrit*, whereas the point was that he invaded *them*. *Hunc orbem* of 48 is, I think, an unusual way of contrasting the upper earth with the realms below.⁶ The boast of 50 *sqq.*—'no storm could⁷ toss the ship that had me on board' is very curious. In the first place pride in mere weight is but a poor thing. And the legends take rather a different view of *Hercules nauta*. Statius (Th. 5. 401) describes him as rendering Argo unsteady; in Valerius (3. 475 *sqq.*) he catches something very like a crab and

³ H.F. 83 *sublimis alias Luna concipiat feras* might be compared with l. 34. But Leo rightly regards the line as an interpolation there—possibly it came hence.

⁴ Anyhow this one blemish (if blemish it be), like the one oasis in the desert of 47–71, can easily be reconciled with the explanation I offer for the whole problem.

⁵ So at 763 *luctum occupasti* receives the feeble addition: *prima, non sola, Herculem maeres*.

⁶ In H.F. 821 the earth above is called *orbis* in contradistinction to the realm below.

⁷ It is worth noting that *ualet*, which never takes an inf. in the other plays, does so here and elsewhere in the play.

falling back flattens out several of the oarsmen behind him—a catastrophe which might well have sunk any bark save the good ship Argo. I am sure I have somewhere read of a legend which made the Argo (through the medium of its speaking stem from Dodona) absolutely decline to take him aboard, for fear of his sinking her. Of the unusual force given in 51 to *pars quota* I have spoken above. In 53 *sqq. feras tellus timet concipere* (which echoes 34 *terra concipiat feras*) is at once repeated by *ferae negantur*, itself an echo of l. 30 (*si negat mundus feras*). The idea that no ‘monstra’ are now left except Hercules himself, who *monstri loco iam coepit esse* (55) is ridiculous. At 63 comes the brachylogical use of *genus* already mentioned more than once. The thought, too, seems very weak. After ‘what good has freeing my fellow creatures been?’ we expect to hear examples of their base ingratitude, instead of which we learn that the gods are now in trouble, and we see, what it was impossible to see before, that *prodest* does not mean *mihi prodest*, but is used quite generally. Then in 67 *sqq.*, quite after the model of H.F. 6 *sqq.*, we have the ‘spheres of activity’ of the constellations Cancer and Leo described. Of the latter we read:

69 annum fugacem tradit Astraeae leo,
at ille iactans feruidam collo iubam
austrum madentem siccatur et nimbos
rapit.

L. 69 of course simply alludes to the fact that the Sun passes from Leo to Virgo. But why the adversative particle and the demonstrative pronoun¹ in the next line? Does the writer mean that the lion throws this work over to the just and virtuous Virgo (much as it is rumoured that some professors hand theirs over to their assistants) and flies off on a wild tour of exploration, ‘drying’ liquid Auster and ‘culling’ the clouds. It seems improbable, especially as Leo surely has no power except when the sun is in his sign, and l. 70 vividly recalls the *Leo . . . rutila iubam | ceruice iactans* of H.F. 948. Amid all this rubbish I find one gem:

61 o quanta fudi monstra quae nullus mihi
rex imperavit. institit uirtus mihi
Iunone peior.

The idea of this seems to me excellent in itself, but it also answers a passage of H.F.

¹ Surely *ipse*, which Gronovius under a misapprehension attributed to E (it being probably his own conjecture), is necessary in any case.

(*laudanda feci iussus* 1268) in a way which suggests a son who had studied to some purpose the *pro* and *con* arguments of the paternal *Controversiae*.

At 72 begins another lucid interval. The first part of the passage forms a doublet to ll. 63–71, a point to which I must presently recur. The writing, though not so good as in the passage 28–46, is clear and forcible. *Antecessit* of 73 is very Senecan; *astra portentis prius* (quam mihi) *Iuno tribuit* of 74, 75 is the typical bitterness of rhetoric. The idea of *committat undas Isthmos* 83 is found in M. 36, but it is just the kind of thought Seneca loves to repeat (cf. his frequent references to the narrowness of the Isthmos), and we find it copied by Lucan, Silius, and Statius.

The tone begins to fall off at l. 89. Ll. 89^b–91 only repeat the sense of ll. 87–89^a; *glacialis polus* is in H.F. 6 and recurs in a highly suspicious context at 336; *feruida* is not used in the other plays of the torrid zone, whilst the use recurs in 1218, 1797 of this play; the repetition of *partem* in l. 90 by *parte* in the next line is the more odious as *parte* stands also in l. 88. In l. 91

hac esse superos parte securos puta

securus very much more definitely loses all idea of ‘freedom from care’ than in any of the 13 passages of the other plays in which I have noted its occurrence.² By l. 92 the decline becomes a downfall. We borrow openly from H.F. 13 *sqq.* by quoting the cases of Phoebus (here styled Paean, a name unknown to the other plays), Bacchus, and Perseus as precedents for the translation of a hero; at 95, 96 comes the extraordinary use of *quotus* to which I referred above.³

The strong contrast between the merits of the passage 28–46 on the one hand and those of 1–27 on the other, of 72–89^a on the one hand and 47–71 or 92–96 on the other,

² Of course if we had *iube* in place of *puta* the case would be different. The fact that *iubes* stands at the end of the previous line will doubtless check the enthusiasm of any one who wishes to emend accordingly.

³ The rest of the prologue is, I believe, spurious. The plural *triumphos* (of a single victory) seems suspicious. I must take the opportunity of protesting against Rutgers’ *acta* which Richter admits to the text of l. 102. I believe we ought to read *ora* for the *ara* of the MSS. For *templa tollens ora . . . spectat mare* cp. V.F. 2. 9. *attollit tondentes pabula Magnes | campus equos*, and Pha. 285 *quaeque nascentem uidet ora solem*.

can, it seems to me, be explained in only one way. The work of a good writer (and I see no reason why he should not be the author of the other plays) has been contaminated with that of a bad one. A rough draft left behind him by Seneca (in a much less complete condition than the *Phoenissae*, although, as we shall see, some of the choruses had been attempted) was supplemented by a person of literary pretensions, whose work is sometimes original (in which case the style is bombastic and wearisome, the language often illiterate), sometimes simply a more or less skilful patchwork of tags from other plays.

This theory explains, I think, the problems which meet us. Take for example the duplicate passage of 63-78. Melzer's explanation would doubtless be that we have here alternative compositions of Seneca's. But could he, even in his first sketch, write such Latin as *genus* of 63, such nonsense as *at ille* of 70? How much more likely that his amplifier, to whom I shall henceforward apply the long-suffering name of editor, felt bound to expand the little which Seneca had left, and did so with the success which his method and his talents deserved.

There is no knowing what liberties this worthy may have taken with his 'nucleus.' Probably Seneca left many lines unfinished. Not only does one of the incomplete *Phoenissae* scenes end with such a line (319), but even the polished *Troades* admits one at the end of a speech (1103). I cannot help thinking that E has preserved some trace of the condition of the draft at l. 739 where it offers, in the midst of complete iambic lines, these two fragmentary ones :

tumensque tacita
quassat caput.¹

H.O.

247 in uultus dolor processit omnis.

251 nunc inardescunt genae :
pallor ruborem pellit et formas dolor
errat per omnes.

253 queritur, implorat, gemit.

Secondly, its style is peculiar. *Dolor in uultus processit* seems a bold metaphor; *pectori paene intimo nihil est relictum* is mere nonsense; in 252 (cited above) *nunc*

¹ That A here gives us a single line *tumensque tacita sequitur et quassat caput* is a thing to be remembered against it.

² This *ut* would be very awkward after the temporal

A clear case of an interweaving of the two threads so closely that only the minutest care can enable us to unravel them is, I think, to be found in the nurse's speech 233 *sqq.* The first seven lines of this seem to me thoroughly Senecan: the subject is the radiant beauty of Iole when Deianira first meets her. Deianira's behaviour is next described :

240 stetit furenti similis ac toruum intuens
Herculea coniunx, feta ut Armenia
iacens
sub rupe tigris hoste conspecto exilit
aut iussa thyrsus quaterne conceptum
ferens
Maenas Lyaeum, dubia quo gressus
ferat
245 haesit parumper: tum per Herculeos
lares
attonita fertur.

Now l. 240 is a medley of *furenti similis* in H.F. 1009 and *toruum . . . intuens* in Th. 706. This medley is quite out of place here. In H.F. the *furens* is in rapid motion, and so one would suppose here when she is compared to a tigress leaping from its lair. And yet l. 240 says definitely *stetit*, and, as if it was feared we might miss the point, l. 245 repeats the verb with *haesit parumper*. The second simile, though very like M. 382 *sqq.* (*incerta qualis entheos gressus tulit | cum iam recepto maenas insanit deo*) thoroughly suits its environment: the dazed Bacchante and Deianira take time to realise what they are to do. If we omit ll. 240-242 and read *ut* for *aut* in 243, I believe we shall have what Seneca's draft had.² Unfortunately there is no doubt that the rest of the speech is due to our editor. For, first, the *Medea* pervades it.

M.

446 totus in uultu est dolor.

858 flagrant genae rubentes, pallor fugat
ruborem,
nullum uagante forma seruat diu
colorem.³

390 aestuat, queritur, gemit.

is needed with *pallor ruborem pellit*; 254, 255 run thus :

sonuere postes: ecce praecipiti gradu
secreta mentis ore confuso exerit.

ut of 237, but possible enough in a draft.

³ The tigress simile of 241 *sqq.* may be due to this passage, which continues *huc fert pedes et illuc, ut tigris orba natis, etc.*

where the double ablatives and the use of *exero* with *secreta* in the sense of 'betray' are most objectionable. As an actual fact, if Seneca left the speech unfinished, the editor was bound to notify the arrival of Deianira on the stage. *Sonuere postes* may come from O. 911 where the words 'sed quid hoc? postes sonant' introduce the entrance of a messenger.

This closeness of intertexture makes me resign all hope of resolving the play into its two factors. The attempt would occupy many more pages of this journal than it deserves, and I for one am not sanguine enough to believe that every detail would receive general acceptance. I am however convinced that the double character of the style which the examination of the prologue has revealed can be traced at various points right through the rest of the play. To this task I turn next.

The long scene between Deianira and her nurse is very rich in Senecan passages. Among them I reckon ll. 278 *sqq.*, where the appeal to Jove and the Sun (cp. H.F. 592 *sqq.*, O. 249 *sqq.*, Pha. 888-9, etc.) in ll. 290-1 and the thoughts *Hercules tantum | fui coniunx timentis and uota cessere captae: paelici felix fui* (291, 292 *sqq.*) are characteristic enough. So with ll. 307 *sqq.*¹, where amidst much Senecan language is the brilliant *pares eamus* with which Deianira reproaches her cooling anger. At l. 344 begins a very good passage,² from which I select: 348 *me nuptiali victimam feriat die | infectus Iolen dum supra exanimem ruam*, 351 *sqq.* *quid ipsa flummas pascis et uastum foues | ultro dolorem?* 357 *illicita amantur: excidit quidquid licet*, 361 *ipsas misericors* (sc. Hercules) *forsan aerumnas* (sc. Ioles) *amat*, 365 *nullamque amoris Hercules retinet notam*.³ Ll. 380 *sqq.* are still better: see

380-4, 385 *sqq.* *nostra...forma | deperdit aliquid semper... | nec illa uetus est*, 389 *materque* ('maternity') *multum rapuit ex illo mihi*, 394 *sqq.* *nihilque ab illa* (sc. Iole) *casus... | nisi regna traxit*,⁴ 400 *nuribus Argolicis fui | mensura uoti*, 406 *alte illa cecidit quae uiro caret Hercule*. Equally genuine I think are ll. 444-464, where note especially how independent the witchcraft locus (452 *sqq.*) is of the similar passages M. 707 *sqq.*, 754 *sqq.*⁵

Twice, I think, we get a trace of the imperfect condition in which Seneca left the play. L. 307 runs:

quid hoc? recedit animus et ponit minas?

Yet the lines immediately preceding breathe nothing but bitterness, culminating in the thought 'the day that ends our wedlock ends your life'! Seneca is no Shakspeare, to express by such abruptness the whirl of Deianira's passion. How he would use such a line can be seen from Th. 324 where Atreus, after deciding not to involve his children in the horrible crime he is planning, suddenly turns and rails at his own attempt to be only half a villain—*male agis: recedis anime?* In H.O. too, no doubt, Seneca meant the words to follow on signs of softening on the queen's part, but never completed the corresponding portion of the speech.⁶ The other trace is at l. 407 where '*Conciliat animos coniugum partus fere*, 'the birth of children often wins back for a mother the father's love,' is a direct answer to Deianira's complaint that child-bearing has diminished her beauty. But between the two intervene some sixteen lines of her speech. Probably Seneca, after writing the latter, jotted down a reply to part of it, as the germ of a speech for the nurse.

As for the editor's hand, it appears on almost every page of the scene. At 314 *sqq.* the nurse tries to frighten her mistress. 'Even if you can escape man's wrath, after killing Hercules, you will not escape his father's bolts,' she says, and continues (327)

Nemeaeus hardly commends itself, and the year's stay with Omphale is not a very good example with which to console D., I must admit the possibility of interpolation here: there is, moreover, distinct reminiscence of H.F. 471, and *marcidus myrrha comam* seems an extraordinary expression.

⁴ L. 399 is presumably corrupt.

⁵ For brevity's sake I say nothing in this paragraph of shorter passages such as 428-432^a, 569-574^a.

⁶ Ll. 299-303 may be part of such a passage; they certainly give an opportunity for a transition to a more lenient view of Hercules' offence. But I do not believe the lines are Senecan.

¹ In l. 314 Richter's *uel* is quite an unnecessary change. Deianira says, 'Juno will be here to guide my hands *nec invocata*,' and (or 'even') without being summoned.' This force of *ne* is common in the plays, and *invocata* is p. p., as in Pha. 423, 944.

² In l. 344 the anaphora of the infinitive (*ire, ire*) seems objectionable and occurs nowhere else in the plays. I would read LIBET *ire ad umbras Herculis nuptam, libet*, comparing H.F. 1156 *libet meum uidere uictorem, libet*. In l. 364 I think *concessa FAMULO est* of ψ is necessary: *concessa* distinctly wants a dative. The application of the word to Telamon is an example of rhetorical exaggeration not unlike Pha. 94, where Theseus is called Pirithous' miles: cp. too Ou. M. 7. 483, where Telamon is *pars milii* in reference to Hercules.

³ Leo has rightly pointed out that the repetition of *nempe* in this passage is natural enough. But the *nempe* of l. 374 is peculiar and quite different from those in ll. 353, 363, 366, 369, which introduce the nurse's answer to D.'s fears. As Heinsius' conjecture

mortem quoque ipsam, quam putas tutam,
time:
dominatur illic patruus Alcidae tui.

The idea comes (with verbal borrowing) from Pha. 149 *sqq.* ('You won't be able to hide your guilt from Neptune, from the Sun, from Jupiter'). But it is ridiculous to picture Pluto as eager to avenge the death of his old enemy, the man whom Juno saw (H.F. 51) *Dite domito spolia iactantem patri | fraterna*, so that she goes on *cur non uinctum et oppressum trahit | ipsum (Plutonem)*? The words *quam putas tutam* have no basis in anything that precedes, for D. has not said a word about her own death. And how feeble it is for the nurse, after threatening her with all the pains of earth, heaven, and hell, to say at 332 '*moriere*'! At 434 we read:

DEI. quid stupes, segnīs furor?

435 scelus occupandum est...

436 NUT. perimes maritum? DEI. paelicis certe meae...

439 NUT. quis iste furor est? DEI. quem meus coniunx docet.

As commentary I quote: Pha. 719 *anime, quid segnīs stupes?* A. 193 *scelus occupandum est*, H.F. 1263-4 AMPH. *Perimes parentem?...genitore coram?* HERC. *cernere hunc docui nefas*. I pointed out above the merit of the passage 452-464: contrast therewith 465 *sqq.*, where the influence of the Medea passage at once makes itself felt (cp. esp. 469 *bruma messes uideat* and M. 761 *messem uidet hibernam Ceres*) and the form *deprehensum* (470) is a unique exception to Seneca's practice of contracting the verb *prehendere* and its compounds.¹ There is a pretty sample of the editor's work in ll. 480 *sqq.* Deianira, about to make use of the drug, implores the nurse to preserve secrecy, assuring her that her plans '*non tela sunt, non arma, non ignis minax*.' The following dialogue ensues:

480 NUT. praestare fateor posse me tacitam
fidem
si scelere careat: interim scelus
est fides.

DEI. circumspice agendum, ne quis arcana occupet...

485 NUT. en locus ab omni tutus arbitrio caret.

That the phrase 'I confess' ill applies to the statement 'I can keep a secret if doing so involves no crime' is perhaps a small

matter. The use of *interim* is, as mentioned above,² striking, but possible enough. But 482 is a most instructive line. Scaliger suggested *aucupet*, no doubt rightly, but as far as I know neither he nor anyone else has noted that the whole line is due to Mostellaria 472-3 *circumspicedum, numquis est | sermonem nostrum qui aucupet*. I know of no parallel to this in the other plays. And, curiously enough, at 484 we have an example of that borrowing of a practically complete iambic from another play (Pha. 601) which, as we saw above,³ distinguishes H.O. from the wholly Senecan plays. Ll. 563 *sqq.*⁴ again shew unintelligent borrowing. It is bad enough that the nurse is sent to fetch what Deianira would more naturally fetch from the secret spot in which it was hidden (486). It is still worse that what is fetched is not the drugged robe, but the drug—and the robe, so that the drugging apparently takes place '*coram populo*.'⁵ Worst of all are the words with which the nurse reenters:

prolata uis est quæque Palladia colu
lassauit omnem texta (tela ψ) famularum
manum.

nunc congeratur uirus.

In M. 843, whence the use of *uis* probably comes, *peracta uis est omnis* may easily mean 'the whole tale of my magic power is told.' As however Valerius Flaccus certainly uses *uis* in the sense of φάρμακον (see 7. 355, 450, 460) it is impossible to say that Seneca would not have done so. Even the use of *colus* in connection with weaving may be defended: *nere* is certainly used in similar context. But the verb *congeratur* only suits a case where several poisons are mixed, as is the case in the passage which, I have no doubt, our editor had in mind: M. 706 *congerit in unum frugis infustae mala*. The only way to make sense here would be to translate: 'Let the poison (and the robe) be put together,' but this seems to me almost impossible. And the presence a little further on⁶ of that stormy

² P. 44⁵.

³ P. 42.

⁴ Of the long narrative 485 *sqq.* little, if any, is likely to come from Seneca. Ou. M. 12 has been freely used: e.g. the witch Mycale (525) comes thence. The prayer to Cupid (541 *sqq.*) may contain some genuine material (e.g. 552-555): as a whole, it is hardly consistent with D.'s departure at l. 580 to pray to Venus.

⁵ Can anything else be meant by l. 565 *congeratur uirus et uestis bibat* | *Herculeā pestem: precibus augebo malum*?

⁶ L. 574. See on p. 44.

¹ I find at least nine examples of this contraction.

petrel, the use of *iecur* with the meaning of *pectus*, saves us from all need to strain our powers of interpretation; *ars cessit malis*, as Seneca says of the tempest which befel the Greeks returning from Troy.

Coming next to the chorus of 583-705 we see at once that from 675 onward the theme *medio tutissimus* is handled in a way closely reminiscent of O. 892 *sqq.* The reference to Icarus comes in both passages: both borrow the *veras aues* of Ovid (Met. 8. 195). This is in itself, as I pointed out on p. 42, contrary to Seneca's habit. And a cursory examination of the two passages will I think illustrate very clearly the difference between Seneca and the editor; cp. among other things O. 898 *nomen eripuit freto* with the *nulli dedit* (sc. Daedalus) *nomina ponto...dedit* (sc. Icarus) *ignoto nomina ponto* of H.O. 685, 690. This part of the ode too contains the unprecedented use of *sonare* referred to above,¹ as well as the very bold construction of l. 677 *dum petit unum praeberere diem*, where the object of *petit* (the subject of *praeberere*) has to be evolved from *patrio* in the next line! I accordingly reject ll. 675-699; it is noteworthy that no other chorus in Seneca reaches the length of 123 lines—only one, and that exceptional in other respects, exceeding the century.² The rest of the ode is, for the most part, genuine Seneca: as characteristic I cite 588 (*Achelous*) *poneret undas*, 589-599, 608 *in tot populis uix una fides*, 614-5 *noctem quotiens summouet Eos* | *regem totiens credite nasci*, 616 *pauci reges, non regna colunt*, 644-672.³ At 622 however we are rudely startled by the application of the epithet *gemmifer* to Hister. A glance around shews that we have fallen into the snare of our editor, who, in confused remembrance of M. 724, 5

Danuuius illas (sc. aluit), has per arentes
plagas
tepidis Hydaspes gemmifer currens aquis,
improvises

nec tamen omnis plaga gemmiferi
623 sufficit Histri...

627 nec si totus seruiat Hebrus
ruraque diues iungat Hydaspes.

How far his interpolation goes is difficult to say. The feeble anaphora *avidis avidis*

¹ P. 41.

² The polymetric chorus beginning O. 403, which reaches a total of 111. The passage Tr. 67-163 (104 lines) is dialogue between Hecuba and the chorus. The longer odes generally vary between 80 and 90 lines.

³ I agree with Richter and others that 673, 4 seem out of place here.

Natura parum est (631) is surely his, as well as *non ut presso uomere SEMPER | NUMQUAM cesset curuus arator* of 633, 4.⁴ Probably we give him his due by assigning him ll. 622-636.

We come now to the consideration of the part of the play which even Leo rejects entirely. Certainly the scene between Hyllus and his mother starts badly enough. Not only do we find stumbling blocks (referred to in the earlier part of this paper) at 745, 756, 760 (*genus*), 770, but ll. 751-4 present a typical example of the editor's method. In O. 858 the herdsman, describing the plight of the babe whose life he spared, says: *uulneri innatus tumor | puerile foeda corpus urebat lue*, whereupon Oedipus says *quid quaeris ultra?*—i.e. 'no further inquiry is needed, the facts are manifest.' The H.O. passage runs:

Herculeos toros
*urit lues*⁵ nescio qua: qui domuit feras
ille ille uictor uincitur maeret dolet.
quid quaeris ultra?

The patchwork is obvious, and one notes the anaphora *ille ille*, which seems doubly weak after the relative clause.

Yet it behoves us to use care. That l. 738 is a valuable remnant of the Senecan draft I have shewn above.⁶ And contrast ll. 706-9 with ll. 710-14. The first passage is by no means free from 'reminiscences' and contains an example of the fatal use of *iecur* to which I have more than once referred. But the other is excellent and may well be from Seneca. With the previous one it coheres only in the most superficial way. For whereas there the whole position is that Deianira has had a fright and is still terribly frightened (*impulsis adhuc | stat terror animis et cor attonitum salit*, etc.), the Senecan lines compare her condition to that of the sea after a storm: her *mens adhuc uexatur* EXCUSO METU. It seems quite probable to me that Seneca meant the fear to be her fear of her rival: she has allayed this by sending off the robe, but still feels uneasy. But even if this be fanciful and

⁴ The thought is rather striking. This man loves wealth—not because it enables him to give employment to a number of deserving people, but *solas optat opes*. But one might add to the linguistic objection the material one that there is no difference between this man and that of 621 (*cupit hic gazis implere famem*).

⁵ In O. l.c. the Etruscan actually reads *lues*.

⁶ P. 48.

the fear in both cases refers to the crumbling of the wool in the sunlight, there is no question as to the discrepancy itself, and very little as to the authorship of the first passage.

Here, however, I must not stop to claim for Seneca fragments so brief as this. At l. 775 we enter on a vigorous description of the sacrifice and the agony which suddenly comes on Hercules. The shortening of the first syllable of *Cyclos* in 803 may mean that the editor here interpolated a line or two: on the other hand Seneca ventured on *Sigēon* (Tro. 932), *rēi* (Th. 332), *cui* (Ag. 146, where the 'i' is actually elided) and may have ventured on *Oýclas*. I am much more exercised by another matter—the somewhat numerous 'reminiscences' which the passage contains: 775 *uertice immenso* (H.F. 1208¹), 786 *sordidum tabo* (ib. 785), 788 *veste tum fulgens tua | cana reuinctus populo horrentem comam* (cp. H.F. 467 *fulsitque... veste...horrentes comae*—likewise of Hercules), 792 *splendescat ignis* (Th. 56), 800 *uasto...mugitu replet* (Pha. 1171—in each case of a bull). Most of these are brief enough: perhaps the only one important in itself is 788 *sqq.* But it is certainly unusual in Seneca to find so many within so small a compass. I can only say that in every instance the words thoroughly suit their new context, so that it seems likely we have here what I suggested at the outset was possible enough: Seneca has repeated himself in the draft to an extent he would hardly have admitted to the finished work. The quality of the passage lasts until l. 808 when it receives an effective foil in an insertion by the editor. Hercules has suddenly burst into groans: without a word to tell us² that his agony was evidently due to the robe he wore, we find him suddenly turning on Lichas. The borrowing at once begins to take its usual slavish and tasteless form: l. 811 repeats the thought of H.F. 1023 (l. 808 has already recalled H.F. 1022), l. 815^a = A. 528^a (*ecce alia clades*). Obscurity and straining of expression resume their revels. Most important of all, these lines (808–822) obviously disturb the narrative. Accept them, and Hercules after hurling Lichas into the sea says abruptly enough, at l. 823, 're-

sistite...non furor mentem abstulit.' Omit them, and this follows most naturally on 806 *sqq.*: *vulgus antiquum putat | rabiem redisse: tum fugam famuli petunt.* The rest of the speech is, I think, genuine: note such turns as 825 *via pestem indicat | et saevit*, 828 *hoc solum Herculem | non posse vidi*, 832 *nec causa...patet | sed causa tamen est*, 838 *o sortem acerbam: fuimus Alcidae pares.*³

Deianira's speech (842 *sqq.*), though not free from reminiscences, I claim also for Seneca: witness 843 *natum reposcit Iuppiter, Iuno aemulum*, 844 *quod potes, redde exhibe*,⁴ 854 *perdidi in solo Hercule | et ipsa* (like Phaethon) *populos*, 869 *huic decet ferro immori*,⁵ 883 *aemuli, Iuno, tui | mortem occupavi.* One part of it certainly craves medicine, for the application of which it is necessary to quote at some length:

858 a me petatur (*sc. mors*): occupa ferrum ocius.

cur deinde ferrum?

861 haec haec renatum prima quae poscit diem

Oeta eligatur: corpus hinc mitti placet;

abrupta cautes scindat et partem mei ferat omne saxum: pendeant lacerae manus

865 totumque rubeat asperi montis latus.

leuis una mors est. leuis: at extendi potest.

Leo objects to the use of *deinde* in 859. I am much more offended by the isolation of 866, which not only comes in abruptly, but is followed by no explanation of the way in which D. proposes *extendere mortem*. I would transpose it to precede 861: by falling down the precipice she will be torn in pieces, each part as it were dying separately. In the light of this I can now understand *Contr.* l. 3. 3 (see *C.R.* 1904, p. 221), where a precipitous cliff is chosen for the place of punishment *ut saepius deiciantur*.⁶ The dialogue (889 *sqq.*) is

³ Fond as Seneca is of violent contrasts I can hardly believe he wrote l. 840 *Austerque lenis pondus Herculeum rapit*.

⁴ For the asyndeton cp. Tr. 967 *laetare, gaude, M. 449 discedo exeo, O. 1053 fugio exeo*.

⁵ Leo's objections to the allusion to Hercules' sword (p. 52) seem to me answered by Melzer, p. 29. It is true we do not hear much of that weapon, but the MSS. give it in H.F. 1229, and Seneca was thinking of Dido and Aeneas more than of Hercules and Deianira.

⁶ Ll. 859–60, with the objectionable *deinde*, may be the editor's addition, to give the transition from 858 to 861 (rendered necessary when once 866 had got displaced). There may be other work of his in the neighbourhood: ll. 885–888 are weak.

¹ And elsewhere, so that it is hardly a case of 'reminiscence' such as we are investigating. In the same way the fact that in 784 *uoluium pecus* = A. 806 *pecore uoluium* seems to me of no importance.

² In the *Trachiniae* 767 *sqq.* προσπύσσειτο πλεν-
ραϊσιν ἀρτίκολλος... χιτῶν fulfil this office. In H.O. the dress has not been mentioned since 788 (and then only quite casually).

thoroughly Senecan.¹ But from l. 910 onwards the editor's hand is clearly visible: one need only select for criticism the extraordinary feebleness of 911, 2 *si novi Herculem* (= H.F. 642) *aderit cruenti* FORSITAN victor mali, and the inaccuracy of 918 ELISIT *hydram*.² Pha. 246 *sqq.* have inspired ll. 925 *sqq.*,³ 1229 *sqq.* of the same play have produced ll. 942 *sqq.* In 949–963 (possibly more) I believe we return to Sen ca: 951 *seu mater nocens | seu dira soror es* (to Medea), 961 *in me suas agnoscat ...manus*, 962 *coniugum turba*, 963 *sed et illa fugiet*, and the indicative in the deliberative question at 971.⁴ There is, however, a serious difficulty in l. 954:

nunc ueram tui
agnosce prolem.

We have seen above⁵ that this use of the personal pronoun is characteristic of the editor. Possibly Seneca wrote *uteri tui: proles fulminis* of M. 84 is much bolder. Of the rest of the scene I can only say that ll. 1000 *sqq.* seem to contain a thoroughly Senecan situation. Deianira has begged for death at her son's hands⁶: suddenly the vision of the Furies bursts upon her and she cries *scelus remitto*—‘I can excuse you from matricide: the Furies will give me all I need.’ Very possibly Seneca meant her to stab herself at l. 1006 (*poenas poscis Alcidae? dabo.*); at any rate this would be quite after his manner: see O. 1038 *sqq.*, M. 970 *sqq.* If so, the duplicate passage that follows is probably due to the editor—as the last six lines and a half most certainly are.

From this point onward I can be brief. Amidst all the rubbish that certainly predominates in the latter half of the play seven considerable passages stand out in marked contrast to their surroundings. To them I confine my attention, regardless on the one hand of occasional flashes in the gloom (e.g. at ll. 1346 and 1376), on the other ignoring the editorial work⁷ except in

¹ Especially 891, 894, 896, 897.

² This may be due to confused recollection of H.F. 221 *sqq. gultura elidens* (of the snakes at his cradle) | *prolusit hydrae* or to Ovid's *elisos hydros* (H. 9. 85), which of course refers to the cradle-snakes. We have seen the editor using Ovid's work above.

³ In l. 919 *obrutus artus ueneno read oblitus*.

⁴ For which cp. H.F. 964; Tr. 642, 686; Pho. 220, 450, 497.

⁵ P. 44.

⁶ Ll. 984–6 then may be quite genuine.

⁷ I cannot refrain from calling attention to some points hitherto ignored: the miserable line *quod nulla fera est, nullusque gigans* (1215), the use of

so far as the contrast between the two styles is of assistance in deciding the question of genuineness.

(1) 1100⁸–1127. The rest of this chorus is so full of absurdity, commonplace, and reminiscence that the best way of testing my view is to compare it with the portion I have selected.

(2) 1249–1268*. Note 1258 *omne es malum nullumque*, 1261 *palam timere* (both phrases addressed by Hercules to the mysterious agony that is attacking him), 1264 *o malum simile Herculi* (with which cp. O. 925 *secum ipse...grande nescio quid parat | suisque fatis simile*).

(3) The dialogue 1352 *sqq.* Very characteristic is the indignant or surprised *et (καὶ πῶς; etc. in Greek tragedy)* of l. 1355: cp. Tr. 429, 598; Pho. 243; M. 525; Pha. 673; O. 954; A. 292; Th. 196, 1075.

(4) 1564–1592. Here, as in (1), the Senecan chorus is imbedded in the editor's trash. L. 1518 is a medley of O. 250 and Pha. 678 (*o...mundi decus; radiate Titan*); in 1524 *quatiuntur* is a meaningless reproduction of the sound of *patiuntur* in the previous line; l. 1531 runs *quando, pro Titan, ubi, quo sub axe* (!); the monosyllabic ending of the Sapphic in 1543 is paralleled only⁹ by *licet sit* in Tro. 1018 (a much less objectionable case, as the two words cohere so closely); in general, the thought, though fairly free from reminiscence, is very ‘thin.’ At the other end occurs the impossible use of *tulit* referred to on p. 44. Turning to the lines I regard as genuine, we at once note in the passage beginning *loca quae sereni | deprimes caeli* resemblance to the thought of Verg. G. 1. 24 *sqq.*, Luc. 1. 52 *sqq.* The idea of the hero's proving a *burden* to the sky, which is not in Vergil, is common to Lucan and this passage. I think Seneca was more likely to affect Lucan than Lucan the editor, who shews no other signs of the nephew's influence. Another point that is Senecan is involved in the *ἀνὰ ποταμῶν* of ll. 1582 *sqq.*: here, along with stock examples, appears an unusual one (‘the salt sea shall become fresh’), and this is the case with the other passages H.F. 374 *sqq.*,

elidere in 1270 (*tot elisit mala*) in the general sense of *domare*, the imitation of H.F. in ll. 1294, 1308, 1313–4, 1351, the use of *quamquam* in 1506 (*quon ipse, quamquam Iuppiter, credi meus | pater esse gaudet*). In general, one need only refer to Leo's criticisms and the points noted in the earlier part of this paper.

⁸ Possibly the Senecan work begins at 1092. But the text of the passage there is too uncertain to build upon.

⁹ Leo, p. 60.

M. 401 *sqq.*, Pha. 568 *sqq.*, Th. 476, *sqq.*¹ The use of *non* with the optative (1589) is also Senecan; see H.F. 936; Pha. 946; O. 258, Th. 48, 185. The only difficulty presented by the passage is the transitive use of *quiescere* (in the sense of *tacere*) in l. 1586. I know nothing like it in the other plays, and must admit the possibility of editorial interference here.

(5) 1619–1641 and (6) 1693–1707^a. I put these together because all the rest of the description of the scene at the funeral is full of our editor's characteristic faults: e.g. we read at l. 1644 *quis illum credat ad flammam rapi*? The meaning is of course that his face was so joyful that none could imagine him at death's door, but the simile of a moaning lion which immediately precedes is a very bad introduction to the thought. And again in ll. 1679–1681 occur four clauses, three of which come almost verbally from the other plays.

(7) 1863–1898 (at least).² A passage similar to (1) and (4) above, and like them choral. Here, however, Seneca precedes the editor: see 1867 *ipsa quiddam plus luce perit*, 1880 the allusive *funus plangite uerum* (addressed to Cretans), 1884 *nondum Phoebe nascente genus* (of Arcadia), 1897 *non stabulis nascitur infans* (as it did in the time of Thracian Diomedes). The only objection taken to the passage is the fact that in l. 1883, an anapaest follows a dactyl: the same however occurs, as Leo observes, in H.F. 1064. In case some may object to *caerula Crete* of l. 1874 I quote from a recent article in the *Archiv*³ dealing with

¹ The only passage where no novelty is introduced is Pho. 84 *sqq.*, which however is very brief.

² I think ll. 1849 *sqq.* quite Senecan. Leo himself (p. 66) notes, in answer to Richter's criticisms (p. 25), that *aliqua* is 'ualde ex Senecae more' (Melzer well compares Pho. 249): so is *grex* in 1850 (cp. H.F. 507, 1149, Tr. 32, 959, A. 701), and 1852 *sqq. matribus miseris adhuc | exemplar ingens dera*l seems to me to have a thoroughly Senecan ring.

³ 1905. 1. p. 81.

this adjective: 'So dürfen wie uns also gar nicht wundern wenn selbst die Insel Creta als *dominatrix uasti freti* (Pha. 85) Sen. H.O. 1874 das Attribut *caerula* bekommt.' *Caeruleis equis* of H.F. 132 is much harder. The other half of the chorus is not Seneca's: observe the ineptness of *mundi turba citati* in l. 1903 (in A. 827 the epithet *concitatus* is applied with full force), *mundum . . . caelumque tulit* of 1906, the phrase *uector Olympi* (= Atlas) of 1907, the absurd anaphora of *nempe*⁴ in 1911–2. The exact line of demarcation between the two sections is doubtful: it must be either at 1898 or 1900.

Here then we say farewell to Seneca. It seems, at least, to me impossible to ascribe any of what follows to his pen. There is not, it is true, much 'reminiscence' here,⁵ but matter and style are intolerably weak. The question as to when the editor did his work I do not feel qualified to attack. Some indeed may think that too much time and space have already been devoted to the question of the genuineness of a Senecan play. The present age, with a literature that shares several weaknesses with silver Latin, has little sympathy with the writers of that style. Ovid, to whom Spenser owes much, is nowadays labelled a mere trifler; Valerius, a real poet, is classed with, even below, the pointed but wearisome Lucan. When we come to Senecan plays, the tendency to say that nothing is too bad to stand there seems almost irresistible to a certain class of critics. It is therefore desirable that those who are interested in the literary work of the first century after Christ should satisfy themselves that the inferior metal which they affect is at any rate pure.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

⁴ Which he never uses elsewhere in chorus.

⁵ This feature is, in fact, much less noticeable in the latter half of the play.

THE AMBROSIAN MS. OF PRUDENTIUS.

To have a decided prejudice in favour of a manuscript solely on the score of antiquity has long been proved a false principle; but to entertain a prejudice against a manuscript on that score and no other, is a peculiarity that I think one may fairly say is reserved to editors of Prudentius. I

have several times treated in this journal of their neglect of the old Paris MS.; and now I would speak for its brother, at Milan. In the Ambrosian library is a MS. of Prudentius (D. 36. Sup.) in an uncial hand of the seventh or eighth century coming from Bobbio.