

NOTES ON SOME PASSAGES IN SENECA'S TRAGEDIES: II

A list of the principal works referred to is given in my previous article, 'Notes on Some Passages in Seneca's Tragedies and the *Octavia*', *CQ* 39 (1989), 186–96.

H.F. 506–8 congerite siluas: templa supplicibus suis
 iniecta flagrent, coniugem et totum gregem
 consumat unus igne subiecto rogos.

After Megara's refusal of marriage the angry Lycus instructs his servants to prepare an awesome pyre in the temple¹ for the destruction of Megara and her family. The victims are to be burnt alive on the pyre with the resultant collapse in flames of the entire temple; the location of this is not specified. The passage is of importance for the understanding of the following.

H.F. 514f. ego, dum cremandis trabibus accrescit rogos,
 sacro regentem maria uotiuo colam.

Here Lycus' words *cremandis trabibus* have caused uncertainty, though I have not seen this admitted. H. M. Kingery² remarks obscurely '*trabibus* abl. of means or of material'. Fitch has no comment. Miller, evidently perplexed, translates 'while the pyre feeds on the burning beams' as though *ardentibus*. In view of *rogus* we should indeed expect *trabibus* to denote the timbers of the pyre (cf. *H.O.* 1637f. 'alternae trabes / in astra tollunt Herculi angustum rogam', 1647, 1748), but *cremandis* is very obscure. With *trabibus* ablative the gerundive would denote necessity, viz. 'with timbers that must be burnt',³ a ludicrous labelling of the obvious: cf. 506–8 (above). To render the gerundive as 'about to be burnt' (= future participle passive) would involve a usage not found before late Latin.

Far nearer the mark is Herrmann's general paraphrase 'tandis que s'élève le bûcher qui consumera l'édifice'. The present scene differs entirely from the self-immolation of Hercules on the open-air pyre in *H.O.* 1642ff.; the action is now due to take place in the temple and this is to collapse in a mass of flame on its victims (506–8 quoted above). The word *trabes* may denote timbers of all kinds and the constituents of a pyre represent but one. *trabibus* in 514 must denote the roof-beams or rafters as in *Phaed.* 644 'ut agilis altis flamma percurrit trabes', where editors compare *Lucr.* 2.191f. 'cum subsiliunt ignes ad tecta domorum / et celeri flamma degustant tigna trabesque'.⁴ This interpretation of *cremandis trabibus* (dative) fits in well with *accrescit*, 'while the pyre mounts upwards for the burning of the roof-beams' (and

¹ *templa* plural for singular as in 521, 616, and elsewhere.

² Text with commentary of *H.F.*, *Tro.*, *Medea* (New York, 1909).

³ Cf. *Juv.* 7.47 'quaeque reportandis posita est orchestra cathedris': the chairs have to be returned.

⁴ For *trabes* = 'roof-beams' or 'ceiling' cf. too *Phaed.* 497, *Thy.* 347, 646, 674 (or 'trees?'), *Hor. Od.* 3.2.28, *Ov. Tr.* 3.12.10, etc.

subsequently the entire temple), a meaning which the Roman reader would not fail to see. Such language may well cause surprise, but Silver Latin is not short of surprises.

Phoen. 110–14

flammas potius et uastum aggerem
compone; in altos ipse me immittam rogos
[haerebo ad ignes, funebrem escendam struem]
pectusque soluam durum et in cinerem dabo
hoc quidquid in me uiuit.

112 *herebo...funebre escendam* E, *erectam...-em asc-* A. Zw., following Richter, deletes 112 arguing⁵ that between *in altos ipse me immittam rogos* and (113) *in cinerem dabo* the words *funebrem escendam struem* are feeble and useless, and that the interpolator betrays himself also in the strange expression *haerebo ad ignes*. Oedipus bent on death states that he will leap into the lofty pyre, cling to the flames, climb up the funeral pile, set free his obstinate soul, and commit to ashes every particle of life within him. I cannot see anything unnatural in O.'s desperate words about his entry into the *uastus agger* (110), but what demonstrates the authenticity of the line is the significant expression, *haerebo ad ignes*, which Zw. condemns as linguistically strange: 'Seneca kennt nirgends *haerere ad*.'⁶ But see *TLL* s. *haereo* 2500.16ff., where a number of examples in both prose⁷ and verse are noted: in the poets Catull. 21.6 'haerens ad latus [pueri]', Prop. 4.1.110 'bene haerentis ad pia saxa ratis', Val. Flacc. 3.641 'supplex haeret ad ora ducis', Grattius 490; it is significant that in each of these poets, as in Seneca, the use of *ad* with *haereo* occurs once only.⁸ What is distinctive about Seneca's *haerebo ad ignes* is that in the normal usage the hostile element, the fires, would be the subject and Oedipus their victim (contrast Virg. *Aen.* 9.537 'postibus haesit [flamma] adesis', Liv. 30.5.7 'casis iniectus ignis haesit'), but *haerebunt ad me ignes* would be unsuited to the desired sense: O. speaks as one eager for death and welcomes the fires with enthusiasm; he will cling to them as his friends (cf. Prop. loc. cit., where the rocks, things normally hostile, are helpful and friendly).

Medea 22–6⁹

iam notus hospes limen alienum expetat;	23 ^a , 22 ^b
me coniugem opto, quoque non aliud queam	22 ^a , 23 ^b
peius precari, liberos similes patri	
similesque matri – parta iam, parta ultio est:	
peperi.	

22^a *opto* is the conjecture of Axelson, adopted by Zw., in place of *optet* ω. Medea has just prayed for the death of the new wife (Creusa) and the royal family. On Jason, her husband (19–21) she invokes an even direr curse, viz. *uiuat*, a continuance of life: may he wander in unknown cities, a needy, timorous, hated, and homeless exile. For the conjecture *opto*, accepted by Zw., see his discussion in *K.K.* 132–4, where he claims that *optet* does not yield a suitable sense. Myself I find the manuscripts' reading *optet* entirely in character with Medea's savage outburst. The expression *me coniugem optet* follows most naturally on the previous wish (*expetat*), as *me coniugem opto* does not, and the words are themselves followed by the bitter hatred and iron conveyed in

⁵ *Gnom.* 41 (1969), 767f.

⁶ *K.K.* 117.

⁷ Varro, *Rust.* 1.31.5, Cic. *Cael.* 75, *N.D.* 2.135, Vitruv. 7.3.6, Liv. 38.49.10.

⁸ I have commented with examples on the frequent existence of a 'Unikum' in a poet's language in *CQ* 30 (1980), 127; 34 (1984), 459 n. 50; and 39 (1989), 194 n. 51.

⁹ The transposition of the initial hemistichs of 22 and 23, proposed by Leo, certainly seems right. Cf. my note below on *Thy.* 57–9.

[*optet*] *liberos similes patri similesque matri*, a natural desire in the case of normal parents, but here sinister indeed (cf. M.'s preceding words 'quoque non aliud queam / peius precari'): significant are 933f., where Medea states 'scelus [liberorum] est Iason genitor et maius scelus / Medea mater'.

Phaed. 184–7 quid ratio possit? uicit ac regnat furor,
 potensque tota mente dominatur deus.
 hic uolucer omni pollet in terra impotens
 ipsumque flammis torret indomitis Iouem.

186 For *potens* ω have been conjectured *impotens* Heinsius, *nocens* Gronov., *patens* Herrmann, *puer* Enk. Phaedra stresses to the nurse the ubiquitous power of the god of love. Objection has been taken to the repetition of *potens* in 186 and the conjecture *impotens* has been approved by some editors including Zw. It is assumed that the first *potens* (185) is safeguarded by *Oct.* 432 'turpi libido Venere dominatur potens';¹⁰ it is the second (186) that is under attack. Zw. (*K.K.* 179f.) gives several examples of *impotens* used of an unbridled ruler, but none of its combination with *potens* both in respect of the same being and in the same context: in *H.F.* 738f., which he cites, two characters are contrasted and here the two adjectives are carefully distinguished: the *impotens tyrannus*, 'the intemperate tyrant', and the ruler who *placide potens* governs with sobriety and justice. In *Phaed.* 276f. the god of love appears in a different role as a *lasciuus puer* who is *impotens flammis*, etc.; above, the poet, if permitted, concentrates on the god's domination and power.¹¹ P. J. Enk,¹² while disliking the conjecture *impotens*, objects, apart from the iteration of *potens*, to *pollet* and *potens* bearing the same sense. In actual fact the combination *pollet* – *potens* goes far to confirm the manuscript reading. *TLL* s. *potens* 288.37f. indeed specifically notes the combination *pollens potensque*, citing Sall. *Iug.* 1.3, Arnob. *Nat.* 4.7 and adding 'cf. Sen. *Phaed.* 186... [*impotens* con. Heinsius elegantius quam uerius]. sim. al.'; we may note e.g. Plaut. *As.* 636 'xx minae quid pollent quidue possunt', Liv. 1.24.8 'potes pollesque', 8.7.5, 8.33.8, Sen. *Dial.* 1.2.4 'polleat... possit'. Finally, the structure of 185f. is carefully balanced in its arrangement: the two verses are closely linked (as pointed out by J. W. Beck¹³) and I would thus punctuate:

 potensque tota mente dominatur deus,
 hic uolucer omni pollet in terra potens

both verses stressing the immensity and ubiquity of the god's power. Herein *potens* is both the first and the last word, *tota mente* is balanced by *omni in terra*, the verb *dominatur* by *pollet*, and *deus* by *hic uolucer*. The substitution of the sudden and unexplained *impotens* for *potens* destroys the poet's intentions, whether or not these coincide with modern taste.

Phaed. 1223–5 pinus coacto uertice attingens humum
 caelo remissum findat in geminas trabes,
 mittarue praeceps saxa per Scironia?

The shocked Theseus cries out in despair (*remissum* sc. *me*). There are two forms of killing associated with Sinis, the robber. (i) He would oblige his victim to share with him the task of bending a pine-tree to the ground, possessing inhuman strength

¹⁰ Cf. too *Tro.* 1f. 'quicumque... magna potens | dominatur aula'.

¹¹ Commentators have compared *Frag. Eur.* 269 (Nauck, *Trag. Graec. Frag.*², 1889) **Ἐρωτα δ' ὅστις μὴ θεὸν κρίνει μέγαν | καὶ τῶν ἀπάντων δαιμόνων ὑπέρτατον, | ἧ σκαίος ἐστὶν ἡ καλῶν ἀπειρος ὧν | οὐκ οἶδε τὸν μέγιστον ἀνθρώποις θεόν*, *On. Her.* 4.11f. 'quidquid Amor iussit, non est contemnere tutum: / regnat et in dominos ius habet ille deos'.

¹² *Mnem.* Ser. 4.13 (1960), 371.

¹³ *Mnem.* N.S. 41 (1913), 178f.

himself, and would suddenly let go of the tree causing the other to be flung up with it and suffer fatal results.¹⁴ (ii) In a more elaborate version¹⁵ the victim would be bound to the tops of two pines which had been bent down to the ground facing each other; the trees would then be released and, in their struggle to rise and separate, the man would be torn apart. The above reference to *geminas trabes*, 'the two trees',¹⁶ makes it clear that we are here concerned with the second mode of killing.¹⁷

I have seen no satisfying interpretation of the above lines and it is most improbable that there can be one. Certainly, the Latin cannot yield anything like Miller's 'shall a pine-tree, its top bent down to earth, split me in two, shot back into the air?' or Boyle with 'should the top of a pine...split me in two as it shoots to heaven?' (no note in commentary); Herrmann vainly tries 'faut-il qu'un pin...se redresse vers le ciel en m'écartelant entre les deux moitiés de son tronc?'; no more convincing is P. Grimal's rendering.¹⁸ Zw. prints as above in his text without comment. M. Coffey and R. Mayer in their recent work¹⁹ come to the wise conclusion that the text is doubtful (I do not myself, however, find *trabes* suspicious).

Line 1224 is reasonably clear: the *geminæ trabes* must denote the pair of trees employed by Sinis in his second method. The difficulty lies in the pair being preceded by the singular *pinus* and the latter badly needs a companion tree; this, I suggest, is supplied in a lost intermediate line. The latter can only be conjectural, but the basic sense might be thus expressed:

pinus coacto uertice attingens humum
 <comitique iuncta pariter actae desuper>
 caelo remissum findat in geminas trabes?

'Is a pine that touches the ground with its enforced top and is linked with a partner likewise drawn from above, when I am skywards discharged, going to split me asunder between (against) the two trees?' Cf. *H.O.* 1392-4 'surgat hinc illinc nemus [= *arbor*]²⁰ / artusque nostros dirus immittat Sinis: / sparsus silebo', *Ov. Met.* 7.441f. '[Sinis] poterat curuare trabes et agebat ab alto / ad terram late sparsuras corpora pinus' (cf. *pinus*...trabes *Phaed.* loc. cit.).

Oed. 467f. diuite Pactolos uexit te Lydius unda,
 aurea torrenti deducens flumina ripa.

468 The expression *torrenti ripa* seems open to misunderstanding: 'along its burning banks' Miller, 'between its sun-scorched banks' E. F. Watling,²¹ 'dans son courant rapide' (a paraphrase? – see below) Herrmann; but rightly 'am brausenden Ufer' K. Heldmann.²² The epithet *torrens*, normally applied to the river (cf. *Lucr.* 4.1100

¹⁴ Hygin. *Fab.* 38, Apollod. *Bibl.* 3.16.2 (Frazer, Loeb, see pp. 122-5).

¹⁵ Diod. 4.59.3, Paus. 2.1.4 ὁ ληστής Σίνις λαμβανόμενος πιτύων ἦγεν ἐς τὸ κάτω σφᾶς· ὁπόσων δὲ μάχῃ κρατήσκειν, ἀπ' αὐτῶν δῆσας ἀφήκεν ἀνὰ τὰ δένδρα ἄνω φέρεσθαι· ἐνταῦθα ἑκατέρω τῶν πιτύων τὸν δεθέντα ἐφ' αὐτὴν εἰλκε, καὶ τοῦ δεσμοῦ μηδετέρωσσε εἰκοντος ἀλλ' ἀμφοτέρωθεν ἐπ' ἴσης βιαζομένου διεσπᾶτο ὁ δεδεμένος.

¹⁶ Note the use of *trabs* ('tree-trunk') in the extended sense of 'tree', e.g. *Sen. Ben.* 3.29.5 'adspice trabes...altissimas'; and the corresponding word in Paus. l.c. τὰ δένδρα ἄνω φέρεσθαι. The usage is not noted in *OLD* nor seems generally recognized.

¹⁷ For the legend of Sinis see *RE* III A.1. 238ff., Roscher's myth. lexicon IV 921ff.

¹⁸ Seneca, *Phaedra*, ed. with comm. (Paris, 1965).

¹⁹ Seneca, *Phaedra*, ed. with comm. (Cambridge, 1990).

²⁰ See Zw. *K.K.* 405, noting e.g. *Oed.* 452f. 'uerno platanus folio uiret / et Phoebus laurus carum nemus'.

²¹ Seneca, *Four Tragedies and Octavia*, translated (Harmondsworth, 1966).

²² Seneca *Oedipus*, text and translation, (Stuttgart, 1974 (1981)).

torrenti flumine, Phaed. 701 *unda...torrens*), is above effectively applied, not to *flumina*, but to *ripa*. In its irresistible haste the river swirls over the banks, and in 'along its raging, or swirling, banks' the transference of the epithet from its normal noun lends added sense and vigour; cf. Stat. *Silv.* 1.2.97 'torrentis sanguine campos', where Vollmer contrasts Luc. 2.220 'sanguine...torrenti' and 7.637.

In 468 the referee holds that *ripa* denotes the contents of the river and cites for such a sense L. Håkanson's views on passages of Statius and Virgil²³ based on a note of P. H. Damsté²⁴ (p. 143); it is a sense I do not find easy to accept. The two obvious parts of a river are (1) its waters and (2) its banks. How could the same word *ripa* stand for both and yet be intelligible?²⁵

<i>Oed.</i> 726–30	aut anguis imis uallibus editus annosa circa robora sibilat superatque pinus, supra Chaonias celsior arbores erexit caeruleum caput, cum maiore sui parte recumberet.	727 ^a 727 ^b
--------------------	--	--------------------------------------

Our land, states the chorus, has produced strange monsters. In 727^a for *supra* ω Zw. reads Reeve's conjecture *circa* and writes (*K.K.* 248) 'Während Birt²⁶ die anstössige Wiederholung von *supra* in diesem Passus durch *curuans robora* hatte beseitigen wollen, hat Reeve die glückliche Emendation *circa robora* gefunden'. He does not, however, explain what he finds so alien to the poet's style in the repetition of *supra* as to require its replacement in 727^a by a word that both lacks manuscript evidence and also weakens the sense. He aptly compares Ov. *Met.* 3.41ff., where we note the words '[serpens] erectus in auras / *despicit omne nemus*'.

In 727^b the question is whether the right reading is *superatque* E or *supraque* A: while the former is the easier and matches the preceding *sibilat*, a strong case can be made for *supraque*, the less obvious reading. For a twofold use of *supra* or *super* cf. Cic. *Verr.* 3.77 'uersus plurimi *supra* tribunal et *supra* praetoris caput scribebantur', Virg. *Aen.* 12.839 '*supra* homines, *supra* ire deos pietate', Luc. 4.739f. '*super* ardua ducit / saxa, *super* cautes', 7.748 '*ire super* gladios *supraque* cadauera patrum'. If these writers can repeat *super* or *supra* once, why may it not be that Sen. should repeat it twice? As indeed he frequently does in the case of monosyllabic prepositions: cf. *H.F.* 441–5 '*post* tot...facta *postque* pacatum...quodcumque Titan...uidet, *post* monstra...*post* Phlegram...*postque* defensos deos...', where Fitch compares *Medea* 478–81 (*per* five times, in entreaty), *Phaed.* 1179f. '*per* undas *perque* Tartareos lacus, / *per* Styga, *per* amnes igneos...sequar' (both lines deleted by Axelson and Zw.);²⁷ note too *H.O.* 1521–4 '*dic sub* Aurora positis Sabaeis, / *dic sub* occasu positis Hiberis, /...quique *sub* plaustro patiuntur ursae'. For the threefold use of disyllabic

²³ Statius' *Silvae* (Lund, 1969), 67f.

²⁴ *Spicilegium in Silvis Statianis, Mnemosyne* 51 (1923), 135–78.

²⁵ Citing *Silv.* 2.3.17, where a nymph fleeing from Pan eventually 'niueae posuit se margine ripae', H. thinks that here '*ripae*' means *the pond*:...at the edge of the cold water', but fails to compare the language, for example, of Ov. *Met.* 1.729f. '*positisque* in *margine ripae* / procubuit genibus', and its meaning 'at the edge of the bank', id. ib. 5.598, *Her.* 5.27, Stat. *Theb.* 4.703, *Sil.* 6.165 'caput aduersae ponebat margine ripae', etc. The use of *ripa* meaning 'water' H. following Damsté finds also in Stat. *Silv.* 1.3.107 'flauis ripis' and 4.3.90 'tacente ripa', where the word again has its usual sense (see Vollmer *ad loc.*). In Virg. *Aen.* 9.104f. also cited we find an obvious reference to the two parts of the underworld river, the Styx, *per flumina* (the waters) and *per...ripas* (the banks); cf. too Stat. *Theb.* 7.325 '*ripis* animosus gurgis anhelis...'

²⁶ *Rhein. Mus.* 34 (1879), 555.

²⁷ *K.K.* 221: 'ein komisch anmutendes Verspaar'.

prepositions cf. Tibull. 2.1.67f. '*inter agros interque armenta Cupido / natus et indomitas dicitur inter equas*', Quintil. *Declam.* 255 p. 46.17f. '*inter ..., inter ..., inter*', Liv. 35.14.11 '*me ... et ante Alexandrum et ante Pyrrhum et ante alios omnes imperatores esse [dicerem]*', etc.

In *Oed.* loc. cit. we may then read as Peiper-Richter (apart from their 727^b *superatque pinus*):

aut anguis imis uallibus editus	
annosa supra robora sibilat	727 ^a
supraque pinus,	727 ^b
supra Chaonias celsior arbores	
erexit caeruleum caput,	
cum maiore sui parte recumberet.	

Oed. 751-4 Quid? Cadmei fata nepotis,
cum uiuacis cornua cerui
frontem ramis texere nouis
dominumque canes egere suum?

751 The introduction of a question-mark after *quid* does not seem to me happy. Cadmus' grandson, Actaeon, was changed into a stag by Diana (cf. Ov. *Met.* 3. 155-252). It is worth noting that in 752 the epithet *uiuacis*²⁸ is liable to mistranslation and its significance lost: 'cerf rapide' Herrmann, 'wild stag' Watling, 'kräftigen Hirschs' Heldmann, but rightly 'long-lived' Miller (see *OLD* s.v., *TLL* s.v. 953.23ff.); cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 3.69 'ceruis... uitam diuturnam..., hominibus... exiguum uitam [dedit natura]', Juv. 14.251 'longa et ceruina senectus', the stag being popularly considered long-lived. An obvious irony caused by Actaeon's transformation into a stag lay in his receiving, not long life, but an immediate death inflicted by his own dogs.

<i>Ag.</i> 835-41	morte fecundum domuit draconem	835
	uetuitque collo pereunte nasci,	
	geminosque fratres	
	pectore ex uno tria monstra natos	
	stipite incusso fregit insultans	
	duxitque ad ortus Hesperium pecus,	840
	Geryonae spoliū triformis.	

The subject is Hercules. The hydra of Lerna (*draconem* 835) had numerous heads and, if one was cut off, it was replaced by *two*: cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.70ff. '*nec ullum / de centum numero caput est inpune recisum, / quin gemino ceruix herede ualentior esset*'. Geryon was a creature with three bodies and/or three heads (838). Both horrors were demolished by Hercules. According to the generally accepted text the first two lines above are devoted to the hydra (835f.), and the remaining five to Geryon. Vain attempts have been made to reconcile *geminos f.* (837) with *tria monstra* (838) and *triformis* (841). How can the figures, virtually two and three, conceivably be viewed as equivalent, and why has the first monster, the head-rich hydra, no number of heads ascribed to him, while the second, Geryon, has three ascriptions, one being true of the hydra only. 'The use of *geminus* in the sense *trigeminus* appears unparalleled' comments Tarrant, '... In our passage, as Professor Brink points out to me, the sense of *geminus* is clarified by the following *tria monstra natos*': clarified? *OLD* s. *geminus* 1 b has '(poet.) born at the same birth', citing the above passage alone. *TLL* s. *geminus* 1741.18ff. notes 'singulariter de triplici partu in Sen. *Ag.* 837'. Miller on 836 rightly comments 'It was the nature of the hydra that as each head was cut off two

²⁸ The expression *uiuacis cornua cerui* occurs in Virg. *Ecl.* 7.30, Ov. *Met.* 3.194 (see Böhmer *ad loc.*).

appeared in its place', but strangely adds on 837 '*geminos* here = *trigeminos*, referring to the triple-man monster, Geryon' and translates *geminos fratres* 'the mated brethren'. Herrmann, again, for *geminos* f. gives 'les frères hybrides'. The traditional text in short attributes to Geryon the twin-brother heads that properly belong to the hydra, replacing any one head cut off (cf. Ov. quoted above and below). It is indeed obvious that the text is untrue, yet nowhere have I seen this admitted.

What Sen. actually wrote is open to conjecture. The right sense could be achieved by the omission of *que* in *geminosque* (inserted, it may be, through *uetuitque* close above) and reading *geminos fratres*; the comma after *nasci* (836) would have to be removed and a full-stop placed after *fratres*; the present chorus (808–66), however, though a *canticum polymetrum*²⁹ with no lack of anapaest feet, contains no anapaest verse.³⁰ Another possibility is the assumption of a manuscript gap after *geminosque fratres*, e.g. (836f.)

uetuitque collo pereunte nasci
geminosque fratres <demisit Orco>.

Cf. Ov. *Met.* 9.192f. '*nec profuit hydrae / crescere per damnum geminasque resumere uires*', and Virg. *Aen.* 2.398 '*multos Danaum demittimus Orco*'. In both of my suggestions *nata* must be read for *atos* (caused by *fratres*) in 838.

Thy. 1–4 quis inferorum³¹ sede ab infausta extrahit
 auido fugaces ore captantem cibos?
 quis male deorum Tantalo uisas domos
 ostendit iterum?

The ghost of Tantalus appears in the upper world. 3 *uisas* E, *uiuas* A; *domos* A, *domo* E. The reading *uisas* is followed by e.g. Leo, Peiper-Richter, Tarrant, and Zw.; *uiuas* by Miller. *uisas* involves unnatural order and unsatisfying sense. '*quis... iterum*' explains Tarrant, 'probably = *quis ostendit iterum Tantalo male uisas domos deorum?*' ('...the homes of the gods he saw to his ruin?'), but later in his note 'the "home of the gods" is the sky, here standing for the upper world in general'. He suggests that 'the disjointed word-order, especially the placing of *male*, may reflect Tantalus' distress at finding himself again in the upper world'. Miller's translation of *uiuas domus* 'abodes of the living' he considers 'unparalleled and unlikely'.

T.'s word-order is indeed hard to accept: *deorum* taken naturally is clearly dependent on *quis* (cf. *Phoen.* 200 '*quis iam deorum...?*' etc.),³² and joining *male* with *uisas* is again very awkward.³³ With the reading *uiuas domos* properly interpreted no such difficulty arises. The word *domus* is sometimes used with particular reference to those who dwell within the house, the inmates: cf. *Thy.* 33 '*dubia uiolentae domus fortuna*', 46 '*impia stuprum in domo*', 240 '*domus aegra [est]*', *Med.* 945 '*afflictiae domus solamen*', *Oed.* 627 '*Cadmi efferat, / cruore semper laeta cognato domus*'.³⁴ Thus *uiuas domos* means 'dwellings or homes that are alive (with inmates)', and the

²⁹ See Zw.'s lists in *OCT*, pp. 467–9 and Tarrant's notes on polymetric cantica in his *Agamemnon*, pp. 372–81.

³⁰ Cf., where the metre is anapaest, *Ag.* 86 *tulit ex alto*, 318 *bibis Ismenon*, 665 *lacerant curae*.

³¹ In line 1 an interesting variation lies in the readings *inferorum* E and *me furor nunc* A, both of which make sense and are metrical, but that of E seems the superior, A representing the errors *me* for *in*, *furor* f. *feror*, and *nunc* f. *um*. Farnaby, I note, follows A, but records E.

³² Del Rio gives examples of *quis deus* or the like: Virg. *Aen.* 6.341 *quis...deorum*, 9.601 *quis deus*, Ov. *Met.* 10.611; so too Sen. *Thy.* 561.

³³ Unsatisfying also is Herrmann's rendering 'Quel dieu fait revoir à Tantale cette maison qu'il a vue pour son malheur?'.

³⁴ See *OLD domus* 6; *TLL domus* 1980. 26ff., 1982. 76ff.

confusion: cf. *H.F.* 1050 *in ortus* E for *motus* A, *Tro.* 438 *iam* E f. *alma* A, ib. 639 *uno* A f. *imo* E, *Phoen.* 197 *uelle* A f. *nemo* E, *H.O.* 1151 *una* E f. *uana* A, ib. 1840 *tu nunc conditit* E f. *in uno condidi* A, etc.

In the above passage I would suggest that the manuscript reading *unum* represents *nuum* + *o*, i.e. *nouum*, and that what the poet wrote was *nouum feroci stamen intorquens manu*, i.e. 'twisting with rough hand the new(born) thread'. Note the nice antithesis *nouum feroci*.

H.O. 465–7 quas Pontus herbas generat aut quas Thessala
 sub rupe Pindus aluit inueniam malum
 cui cedat ille?

Deianira plans revenge against Hercules. 466 *aluit ubi* E, *aut ubi* A, *aluit* Rossbach, *alit*: *ubi* Peiper–Richter strangely. With the above text, recommended by Axelson,³⁸ where *ubi* is omitted, *quas* – *quas* are interpreted as relative, and *malum* predicative, Zw.,³⁹ though he reads as Ax., is rightly unhappy and puts forward an entirely new solution. He believes we should preserve both *aluit* and *aut ubi* and assume the loss of some words between them. The reading *aluit* does indeed call for consideration, but cannot be read without our either omitting *ubi* or assuming a gap in the text; moreover, the alternative question introduced by *aut* is characteristic.⁴⁰ Zw. accordingly suggests *quas Pontus herbas generat aut quas Thessala / sub rupe Pindus aluit* <*quis possim ferum / domare pectus*> *aut ubi inueniam malum / cui cedat ille*? Apart from the spondee in the fourth foot of 466 (where perhaps read *ut* for *quis*),⁴¹ there is much to be said for a text on such lines.

H.O. 592–5 nos Palladias ire per aras
 et uirgineos celebrare choros,
 nos Cadmeis orgia ferre
 tecum solitae condita cistis, ...

The chorus addresses Deianira. 592 Miller translates 'together were we wont to fare to Pallas' shrines', Herrmann 'qui aimions à aller avec toi aux autels de P.'. While these renderings may express the general sense of the words, it should be noted that *per* does not here have the force of *ad*. Such a force is indeed found in late writers, but no convincing earlier example is cited by the grammarians (Hofm.-Sz. 240). The meaning must be 'wont to pass from one altar of P. to another': cf. *H.O.* 410 '[Hercules] quem per urbes ire praeclarum uidēs', 'going, big with fame, from town to town' (Miller), note too 418, 619.⁴² A passage where *per* has been expressly interpreted as = *in* is Luc. 1.543 'fugiente per ortus sole', on which R. J. Getty notes '*per ortus* = *in ortus*',⁴³ and similarly others; the meaning must be 'through the eastern regions' (cf. 2.642 'totos ... *per ortus* bella feres').

H.O. 1200f. ubique mors me fugit, ut titulo inclitae
 mortis carerem.

Hercules laments his deprivation of an illustrious death. In 1200 for *leto* (ω) Heinsius conjectured *titulo*, which Zw. adopts; 1201 *mortis* E, *fortis* A, *sortis* Leo. Zw. (*K.K.*

³⁸ *Korruptelenkult: Studien zur Textkritik d. unechten Seneca-Tragödie H.O.* (Lund, 1967), pp. 109f.

³⁹ *K.K.* 363f., *Gnomon* 42 (1970), 270f.

⁴⁰ Zw. compares *Thy.* 221f. 'quid enim reliquit crimine intactum aut ubi / sceleri pepercit?'. Cf. too 'aut quas [herbas] ...' in 465 (above), *H.F.* 1321ff. 'quem locum profugus petam? / ubi me recondam quae tellure obruar? / quis Tanais aut quis ...' etc., *Phaed.* 1169f., *H.O.* 95f.

⁴¹ Cf. *OLD* *ut* C 28 d.

⁴² The referee well compares Virg. *Aen.* 4.56 'pacemque per aras / exquirunt'.

⁴³ Ed. Lucan 1, Camb. Univ. Press, 1940 (1955), Introd. lxxv. See my note in *CQ* 34 (1984), 453.

394) maintains that E's *ubique mors me fugit, ut...inclitae / mortis carerem* is too rhetorically good to be doubted, and *inclitae mortis* is supported by 1481 *mors...inclita*; the corruption, he argues, must therefore lie in *leto*, which is successfully healed by H.'s *titulo*. Can this drastic alteration really be accepted? The following up of *mors* by *leto* is very typical of Seneca's style: cf. *H.F.* 1048 f. '*leto* [te] dedit / idem tuos qui misit ad *mortem* furor?', *Tro.* 783 '*o morte* dira tristius *leti* genus!', *Phaed.* 855 (Nutrix) '[Phaedra] *morti* imminet', 856 (Theseus) '*quae causa leti*?', 1219f. '[ego] inuoco *mortem* ... [tu] *leti* artifex ...'. In the above passage all that is needed for language characteristic of Seneca is Leo's one-letter correction (in 1201), *sortis* for (1) E's *mortis*, an error readily caused by *mors* in 1200, and (2) A's *fortis*, caused by the common confusion in manuscripts of *s* and *f*;⁴⁴ such is the reading of Peiper-Richter and others, viz. *ut leto inclitae | sortis carerem*, 'that I might be deprived of a death that was an illustrious lot' or 'the lot of an illustrious death'.

H.O. 1361-3 quae tanta nubes flamma Sicaniā secans,
 quae Lemnos ardens, quae plaga igniferi poli
 uetans flagranti currere in zona diem?

The poisoned Hercules is distraught with pain. In 1361 Zw. reads Axelson's conjecture *secans* for *secat* E (*bibit* A, 'absorbs', is less striking). In *K.K.* 403 he agrees that the line as transmitted in E corresponds in structure to 285f. '*quis ignis tantus in caelum furit / ardentis Aetnae*?', but argues that in the two succeeding clauses *nubes Sicaniā secat* would then have to be supplied and this can be ruled out; Ax.'s *secans* is inescapable, he holds, and the sentence is to be explained *quae tanta (est) nubes flamma Sicaniā secans, quae (tanta est) Lemnos ardens, quae (tanta est) plaga* etc. Both alteration and explanation I find forced in the extreme, if not impossible. Placing a question-mark after *secat* (retained) I would render 'What flame as great as mine cleaves the Sicilian clouds? What (in comparison) is blazing Lemnos, what the fiery region of the heaven ...?' The use of *quae ... quae* in 1362 clearly differs from that of *quae* in 1361.

H.O. 1707-9 [o pater] nube discussa diem
 pande, ut deorum coetus ardentem Herculem
 spectet.

1708 Zw. adopts Heinsius' conjecture *coetus* for *uoltus* ω, stating (*K.K.* 427f.) that H. has rightly refused to accept the strange ('wunderliche') expression *ut deorum uoltus ... spectet* and cited the model *H.F.* 961f. '*en ultro uocat / omnis deorum coetus et laxat fores*'. But this yields no evidence that *uoltus* should be replaced by *coetus* nor is the *H.O.* expression strange. The use of *uoltus* = 'gaze' or 'eyes' is anything but rare⁴⁵ and a close parallel occurs in *H.O.* 1978f. '*fallor [Alcmena] an uoltus putat uidisse natum?*'; so *H.F.* 595f. '*si quid inlicitum tui / uidere uoltus*'; cf. too *Thy.* 635 '*haeret in uultu truci | imago facti*'.

H.O. 1723f. animo faces inuade quo Alciden uides
 uoltu iacere. respice arsurum, miser.

Hercules lying on the unlit pyre bids the reluctant Philoctetes apply a flame, so reports Phil. The construction is not immediately clear. Contrast *Thy.* 719 '*quo iuuenis animo, quo tulit uultu necem?*'; note too *H.O.* 1607f. '*effare casus...Hercul-*

⁴⁴ Cf. *Oed.* 101 *fortis* A for *sortis* E, *Phoen.* 632 *sors* ω f. *fors* Ascensius var. lect., *Med.* 26 *fero* Af. *sero* E, *Oct.* 114 *morte* Af. *sorte* Lipsius.

⁴⁵ Cf. *Ov. Am.* 3.6.28 '*rapuit uultus, Xanthe, Neaera tuos*', *Met.* 7.133 '*demisere metu uultumque animumque Pelasgi*', 10.601 '*uultuque in uirgine fixo*', etc.

eos...uoltuue quonam tulerit Alcides necem'. Miller has 'Come, seize on the torch with courage, with face thou seest on prone A.'; but it is difficult to separate *quo* from *animo*, which needs a qualifying adjective or clause. Much closer is Herrmann: 'Saisis la torche avec les sentiments que tu vois à Hercule étendu sur son bûcher'; but *uoltu* is not represented. The literal rendering must be 'seize a firebrand with the courage with which you can see from his face A. lies there'. For *uides uoltu* cf. Petron. 126.3 'ex uultibus...hominum mores colligo', Curt. 7.8.1 'animo disparem uultum'.

H.O. 1743f. gerit aliquid ardens. omnibus fortem addidit
 animum ministris; urere ardentem putes.

Hercules, on his funeral pyre, encourages the flames to spread. The twofold sense of *ardens*, 'ablaze' (a) with flames, and (b) with enthusiasm, strengthened as it is by the word's repeated appearance, is not always reflected in translation. 1743 'gerit aliquid ardens': 'il agit même au moment où il se consume' Herrmann, 'is active still, though all aflame' Miller; perhaps 'he is active still, all afire'. This is followed by a clear double sense in 1744 'urere ardentem putes', which may grammatically be taken in two ways: (a) *putes* + accusative (sc. *eum*) and infinitive, 'l'on croirait qu'il brûle et non qu'il est lui-même brûlé' Herrmann, and (b) *urere* in dependence on *ardentem*, 'you would deem him all on fire to burn' Miller, with good effect. Interpretation (a) misses the surely inescapable pun on *ardentem*, which suggests both a literal and a figurative sense. In 1708 'ardentem Herculeum' the meaning can only be the literal 'ablaze'.⁴⁶

Aberystwyth

A. HUDSON-WILLIAMS

⁴⁶ My thanks are due to the editors for their help, and to the referee for his comments, in presenting this article.