

there are 32 transpositions unique to F among the principal MSS. 29 of these are found in Bas., e.g.:

1. praef. 1 *posuisset natura*; praef. 3 *eius secretiora*; 2.1 *urbem post reuersus*; 2.5 *nautici uentum*; 2.10 *a circumposito aere facilius*; 3.11 *solis imago*; 3.14 *est inquisitio*; *causas duas*; 5.6 *cesar nero*; 5.11 *apparet undique*.

Of the three passages where Bas. does not have F's transposition, in two the transposition materially affects the sense, so correction of Bas. by conjecture or contamination is plausible (2.9.4 *nisi quod*] *quod nisi* F; 2.34.3 *ad se fidem*] *ad fidem se* F). This leaves only 2.45.3 *quia sine illo nihil geritur* (*geritur nihil* F). So it is plausible enough that Bas. is a descendant of F, though given the degree of contamination one could never prove it conclusively. But there must have been at least one intermediary between F and Bas., for, although F does contain marginal and interlinear corrections, there are many interpolated readings that Bas. shares with other manuscripts that are not in F².

Martin Steinmann, keeper of manuscripts at Basle, has kindly given me further information about Bas.: it is English, from Oxford, written c. 1300, so it is likely that F was already in England by that date. Dr Steinmann has also confirmed that Basle F IV 62 is a direct copy of F III 34, for an entry on fol. 47^r says it was written at Basle in 1470, and F IV 62 gives the title *Seneca de officiis* to a treatise of Alkindi: the same title was added c. 1400 to the treatise in F III 34.

University of St. Andrews

H. M. HINE

SENECA'S HORRIBLE BULL: *PHAEDRA* 1007–1034

When Seneca comes to describe the appearance of the monstrous bull which appears out of the sea to kill Hippolytus in answer to his father's curse, he uses (among other things) a metaphor of birth: the sea's wave is said to be 'heavy with burdened womb' (1019f.: *onerato sinu / gravis unda portat*). If line 1016 is genuine – it was athetized by Leo¹ – the sea is said to be 'pregnant with a monster' (*tumidumque monstro*). The metaphor has not passed unnoticed in modern commentaries² but it has not been fully appreciated. I want to examine further linguistic aspects of the metaphor, and to consider its significance in its literary context. Seneca is a writer who likes – as he himself acknowledges – to re-work tradition:³ all the more significant, then, when he introduces a conspicuous metaphor into his text which does not appear to have literary antecedents.

Hippolytus sets off dejectedly from Athens in his chariot. Immediately the sea humps on the horizon, although there is no wind or other meteorological commotion, and surges toward the coast (1015: *consurgit ingens pontus in vastum ag-*

¹ F. Leo, *De Senecae tragoediis observationes criticae*, Berlin, 1878.

² Michael Coffey and Roland Mayer (edd.), *Seneca, Phaedra* (Cambridge, 1990), p. 178: '*onerato sinu* suggests pregnancy'; A. J. Boyle (ed.), *Seneca's Phaedra* (Liverpool, 1987), on lines 1016ff.: 'The imagery of pregnancy and birth here... seem Seneca's own. It occurs neither in Euripides nor in Ovid, *Met.* 15'. W.-L. Liebermann, *Studien zu Senecas Tragödien* (Beiträge zur Klassischen Philologie, 39) (Meisenheim am Glan, 1974), p. 37: '...wobei letzteres (*sc.* *gravis*, line 1020) freilich "schwanger" mitmeint'.

³ Cf. *Epist.* 79.5–6 and Mayer's note on this passage (1990: above n. 2), p. 121. Cf. J. T. Gahan, 'Imitation in Seneca, *Phaedra* 1000–1115', *Hermes* 116 (1988), 122–4; P. Grimal, 'L'originalité de Sénèque dans la tragédie de Phèdre', *REL* 41 (1963), 297–314.

gerem...terris minatur). Then we have the explicit allusion to pregnancy just mentioned (1019f.: *nescioquid onerato sinu / gravis unda portat*). Seneca's messenger wonders 'what new land will show its head to the stars' (1020f.: *quae novum tellus caput / ostendet astris?*) in language again reminiscent of birth. The wave's surge is said to be so great that certain landmarks on the horizon are blotted from view (1022-4). Then the sea 'bellows, and the rocky cliffs on all sides take up the shout' (1025f.: *totum en mare / immugit, omnes undique scopuli adstrepunt*). Since the pregnancy metaphor has been introduced, we are entitled at this point to recall other mythical births at which a group of attendants raise a shout when a mother is delivered of her child (*Hom. Hymn to Apollo* 119: *ἐκ δ' ἔθορε πρὸ φάωσδε, θεαὶ δ' ὀλόλυξαν ἅπασαι*, of the birth of Apollo on Delos; Callimachus, *Hymn to Delos* 255-8: *... ὁ δ' ἔκθορεν, αἱ δ' ἐπὶ μακρόν / νύμφαι Δηλιάδες, ποταμοῦ γένος ἀρχαίοιο, / εἶπαν Ἐλειθυίης ἱερὸν μέλος, αὐτίκα δ' αἰθήρ / χάλκεος ἀντήχησε διαπρυσίην ὀλολυγὴν*: 'and he (Apollo) leapt forth, while the Delian nymphs, daughters of the ancient river, recited the sacred melody of Eileithyia, and the metal sky straightaway echoed back the piercing cry').

The great wave is said to foam at its crest⁴ and to suck and eject water alternately (1027f.: *sumum cacumen rorat expulso sale, / spumat vomitque vicibus alternis aquas*). Perhaps we are meant to recall the contractions of labour at this point. The appearance of the wave is compared to a large whale which 'pours water off its head' (1030: *fluctum refundens ore physeter capax*). Unlike most commentators, I do not think this refers either to the whale's blow-hole, or to its mouth,⁵ but rather to the way the water swills round a whale's head when it is cruising at surface level (1029: *qualis per alta vehitur Oceani freta...*). This picture would perfectly correspond to the feature of the tidal wave which Seneca is describing: there is something large just below its surface, whose shape one cannot quite make out, but around whose submerged form the water swills and swirls. *Ore* would then be the whale's head, or face.

In the next few lines the birth metaphor surfaces more plainly again: '... the ball of waters released itself and delivered onto the beach a horror beyond imagination...' (1031f.: *undarum globus / solvitque sese et litori invexit malum / maius timore*).⁶ The language inevitably recalls the bursting of the amnion at birth and the flow of amniotic fluid accompanying delivery (1033f.: *pontum in terras ruit / suumque monstrum sequitur*). Finally, after the bull has done its evil work and Phaedra hears of Hippolytus' end, she returns to the metaphor (1161f.: *quidquid intimo Tethys sinu / extrema gestat...*: 'whatever furthest Tethys carries in her innermost womb').

In my opinion, then, the appearance of the bull is described by Seneca in terms of a monstrous birth from a pregnant sea: this is new; neither Euripides nor Ovid had it. Why? I would have to write a longer article if Boyle had not already seen the

⁴ Not the summit of the cliffs mentioned just before: cf. O. Zwielerin, *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien Senecas* (Mainz, 1986) (= Akademie der Wissenschaften und der Literatur zu Mainz, Abhandlungen der geistes- und sozialwissenschaftlichen Klasse, 6), p. 211: *sumum cacumen* does not refer to *scopuli*... 'und auch nicht vordergründig auf das *monstrum* sondern auf den Kamm des Wellenbogens (der durch das *monstrum* gebildet wird), also auf den "undarum globus" von 1031'.

⁵ Mayer (1990), p. 179: 'If S. is accurately describing the whale here, he refers to its method of feeding; it sucks in sea water which it then expels through its mouth by raising its tongue; *ore* ought not to refer to the blow-hole by which it breathes...'. This is an example of scholarly love of accuracy getting in the way of common-sense. At this point in heightened narrative we are not interested in the whale's feeding-habits, but in its enormity.

⁶ Liebermann (1976: above n. 2), p. 38: 'Hier geht die in *gravis* (1020) angekündigte Geburt eines Ungeheuers vor sich'.

essential point: 'Central emblem of history's efforming (*sic*) cycle, the bull from the sea deserves close attention. Though in a narrative sense appearing to be caused by Theseus' prayer to Neptune (945–58), the bull's generation seems patently to have its origin in the behaviour and history of Phaedra and Hippolytus as well as in the behaviour and history of Theseus.'⁷ He goes on to note some aspects of the birth-metaphor which I have analysed above (especially lines 1016 and 1019f.), and the monstrous nature of the child, and says that the passage

sets up immediately an analogy with that other bull-like *monstrum*, offspring of a pregnant womb, the Minotaur. This analogy, coupled with the preceding comparisons between Phaedra's love for Hippolytus and Pasiphae's for her bull, suggests that the monster from the sea is generated (the pregnancy imagery of 1016 and 1019f. is important here, as is the fact that the sea is Venus' native realm – see 274) by Phaedra's love for her stepson.

Boyle goes on to suggest some (in my opinion) slightly less convincing correspondences between Hippolytus' haughty nature and that of the bull, and between Theseus' transgression of nature's bonds and his son's unnatural death, but he has touched here on the essential point: Seneca hints that the bull is the monstrous fruit of the monstrous union Phaedra was planning with her step-son. Just as the Minotaur resulted from Pasiphae's union with a bull, so this grotesque bull from the sea (half bull, half sea-monster) is the appropriate child of a similarly perverse love. Phaedra's family history asserts itself vindictively, as Seneca underscores throughout the text (esp. 687–93: *o scelere vincens omne femineum genus, / o maius ausa matre monstrifera malum / genetrice peior! illa se tantum stupro / contaminavit, et tamen tacitum diu / crimen biformi partus exhibuit nota, / scelusque matris arguit vultu truci / ambiguus infans – ille te venter tulit: Hippolytus to Phaedra: 'You – your crime surpasses all women put together. You've dared an evil deed beyond even that of your mother, who bore a monster. You're worse than her. She only put herself to shame with adultery – and yet the child she bore with its double nature brought the crime she'd long kept hidden into the open: the ambiguous babe with its baneful face condemned the mother's sin'*).

If this is correct, Hippolytus is shown to be hunted down and killed by the (indirect) product of an unholy love. It is true, as Boyle says, that his own nature is unnatural in rejecting Aphrodite's pleasures and devoting himself to chaste Artemis: this is the theme which Euripides develops in his play,⁸ showing that Hippolytus brought ruin on himself by flouting a strong goddess. Aphrodite says in the prologue that she will hunt him down (and Phaedra too incidentally) for this negligence. The tragedy stems from Hippolytus' nature; Phaedra becomes a (relatively) innocent victim. But Seneca has changed the emphasis. The motif of Aphrodite's revenge on Hippolytus which ensnares Phaedra in its train is omitted: her passion for Hippolytus becomes the motor force of the drama, and the beautiful and chaste (if priggish) Hippolytus its innocent victim. Seneca's introduction of the birth-metaphor at the crucial dénouement of the play, the appearance of the bull, matches this bias: the bull, by analogy with the minotaur, is born of a sinful womb: woman's wrongdoing is man's undoing. This is not the place to enter the debate on Seneca's portrayal of Phaedra's

⁷ Boyle, 'In Nature's Bonds. A Study of Seneca's *Phaedra*', *ANRW* ii.32, 2 (1985), 1284–1347, esp. 1317–20. Quotation from p. 1317.

⁸ The so-called *Hippolytos Stephanephoros* as opposed to his earlier *Hippolytos Kalyptomenos*, of which only fragments survive: see W. S. Barrett, *Euripides, Hippolytos* (Oxford, 1964; corr. ed. 1966), pp. 10–45.

character throughout the play,⁹ but clearly my reading of this passage tends to support a negative view of Phaedra.

In this way, Seneca's choice of metaphor here emphasizes both the continuity between the generations in Phaedra's family, and her own active part in engendering the monstrous bull by loving Hippolytus. A third factor would appear to be the Roman interest in grotesque births as signs, *prodigia*, of an unholy state of affairs. Tacitus, for example, cites misshapen animal births as a possible evil omen (e.g. *Histories* 1, 86). Monstrous human babies could also be taken as divine signs (e.g. Julius Obsequens, *Prodigiorum liber* 25: a slave-girl bore a monstrous child in 136 B.C.). The Senecan stage is a place where human wickedness and depravity are matched or reflected by ominous physical signs: the blackening of the sky, the shaking of earth, fire not burning properly etc.¹⁰ Seneca's suggestion through the present metaphor that sexual depravity might result in a monstrous birth is in harmony both with contemporary belief in *prodigia* and his portrayal of weird natural phenomena as a corollary to human wickedness on stage.

The sustained birth-imagery also has implications for the text of this passage. At 1007 most editors print ω 's *tonuit*, 'thundered', against τ 's *tumuit*, 'swelled up'. Thus the beginning of the portent would be marked by a sudden thunder-clap from out at sea, rather than the sudden swelling up of the ocean. Which is preferable? Zwierlein argues that a sound is necessary to draw attention to the phenomenon as Hippolytus and his attendants are not yet looking out to sea (and would not therefore notice the silent appearance of a wave).¹¹ Moreover, he argues that *vastum* only gives good sense with *tonuit*, 'thundered mightily'. Grimal considers Euripides, *Hipp.* 1201f. decisive:¹² $\epsilon\theta\epsilon\nu\ \tau\iota\varsigma\ \eta\chi\omega\ \chi\theta\acute{o}\nu\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \beta\rho\nu\tau\eta\ \Delta\iota\omicron\varsigma\ /\ \beta\alpha\rho\acute{\upsilon}\nu\ \beta\rho\acute{o}\mu\omicron\nu\ \mu\epsilon\theta\eta\kappa\epsilon,\ \phi\rho\iota\kappa\acute{\omega}\delta\eta\ \kappa\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu$ 'then a subterranean rumble like the thunder of Zeus gave a low report, terrifying to the ear'. There are, however, problems in reading *tonuit*. It is very abrupt to say *tonuit...mare*, because the sea does not usually thunder.¹³ Euripides introduces the idea gently: a rumble 'like the thunder of Zeus' (i.e. the normal phenomenon in the sky). Next, there is no natural progression from *tonuit mare* to *crevitque in astra* – why should the sea thunder and then grow to the sky? – whereas *tumuit* introduces the

⁹ Boyle (1985, above n. 6) discusses this question, maintaining that the earlier view that Phaedra was a 'study in baseness' is now ceding to the opinion that she too (like the Euripidean heroine) is a reluctant victim of her passion, that she genuinely wanted to commit suicide to avoid shame, and that it is the nurse who finally induces her to give way to her passion. For what it is worth, I find myself more in sympathy with the view of Phaedra as villain of the piece. Seneca appears to depict Hippolytus as a polite and attractive young man from start to finish, although he does not like girls. The central scene between Phaedra and Hippolytus (589–718) shows Hippolytus first behaving gallantly to his step-mother when she pleads widowhood, then with righteous indignation when she confesses her love. Phaedra and the Nurse then join in a plot to feign rape (which deceives Theseus). Although Hippolytus finds himself guilty of attracting a step-mother's love (683ff.), this passage seems to me only to underline his innocence (how can he help being attractive?).

¹⁰ E.g. the terrible signs which accompany Atreus' 'sacrifice' of his brother Thyestes' children: the ground shook; a star shot across the sky: the sacrificial wine turned to blood; sacred images wept; the fire refused to burn; black smoke billowed forth; the sun darkened (*Thyestes* 696ff.). The whole universe seems to perform a *danse macabre* to the tune of human crime. Further examples: *Troades* 169ff.

¹¹ (1986: above n. 4), pp. 208–9. In 'Versinterpolationen und Korruptelen in den Tragödien Senecas', *Würzburger Jahrbücher* 2 (1976), 214f., he defends *tumuit* against *tonuit*, in particular by comparison with Ovid, *Met.* 15.508ff.

¹² P. Grimal (ed.), *L. Annaei Senecae Phaedra* (Paris, 1965), *ad loc.*

¹³ Zwierlein (1976: above n. 11), p. 214: '... bei Seneca müßte das Meer donnern, wofür ich keinen Beleg kenne' (cf. his note 117: 'Das Meer *fremit*, *stridet*, *mugit*').

idea smoothly: 'the sea swelled up suddenly and grew to the sky'. In the next lines Seneca emphasizes the silence surrounding the wave's formation: there was no wind, no thunder from the sky, the weather at sea was calm. Why does Seneca say that the sky did not thunder, if the sea just had? Is this not slightly irrelevant? I believe the emphasis on silence and calm in these lines goes better with a silent generation of the wave: the audience is shown a silent menace creeping up on Hippolytus; Seneca is less concerned with a realistic description of how Hippolytus' party noticed the wave in the first place, and how they reacted (unlike Euripides, who gives us this). Finally, *tumuit* is a good verb to pave the way for the birth imagery which becomes prominent later. It recurs at *Med.* 765f.: *sonuere fluctus, tumuit insanum mare / tacente vento*: 'the waves sounded out, the malignant sea swelled up although the wind was still'.¹⁴ There is no reason why we should not take *vastum* predicatively after *tumuit*: 'the sea swelled up huge'. This counters Zwierlein's claim that *vastum* only makes proper sense with *tonuit* (a verb of sound).

It should already be apparent that I would tend to keep line 1016: *tumidumque monstro pelagus in terras ruit*: 'the sea, pregnant with a monster, rushed landwards'. Leo deleted it arguing that the mention of a *monstrum* is too early. But Grimal rightly, in my opinion, points out that *monstrum* does not yet have to mean 'monster' but can carry the less specific sense 'menacing prodigy', which the tidal wave certainly was even at that stage, before the bull appeared.¹⁵ The line, if genuine, offers further (weak) defence of *tumuit* in 1007.

Heidelberg

W. D. FURLEY

¹⁴ Noted by Zwierlein (1986: above n. 4), p. 208. His parallel for *tonuit*: *nemus / fragore vasto tonuit* (*Troad.* 173f.) seems to me less good: certainly it does not parallel the adverbial use of *vastum* which he assumes in our passage. Liebermann (1976: above n. 2), p. 35 n. 62, does, however, have a point that sound is involved in the *Medea* passage (*sonuere fluctus*): 'Überhaupt scheint die Verbindung von Akustischem und Visuellem in derartigen Zusammenhängen ziemlich feststehend zu sein'. Note also *Thyestes* 577: *ex alto tumuere fluctus*.

¹⁵ (1965: above n. 11), *ad loc.* He compares Euripides' *ἱερὸν κύμα* (*Hipp.* 1206–7) maintaining that Seneca's *monstro* is not so different from Euripides' *ἱερὸν*, but this is going too far, I think.

CULEX 373 AND HEINSIUS

This line involves a variety of important points.

cogor adire lacus viduos, a, lumine Phoebi

vacuos C a interiectionem agnovit Heinsius

So Ribbeck;¹ the majority of editors agree but offer no critical comment inviting the conclusion that there is nothing irregular in the text. Heinsius saw that *viduus* with the preposition *a* is highly irregular, unparalleled I think, hence his interpretation *a!*, hence also *vacuos*.²

That the exclamation does not belong here I feel certain. Elsewhere in the *Appendix* this particle appears in the usual formulas: *tardius a miserae* (*Dirae.* 91); *a pereat*

¹ *P. Vergili Maronis Opera* (repr. Hildesheim, 1966).

² OLD s.v. *viduus* cites only this passage where the adjective is used with the preposition. A. Salvatore, *Appendix Vergiliana* (Turin, 1957) takes *a* to be the preposition and refers to line 209 *tristis ab eventu*; but the ablative there is causal and the preposition with such an ablative is not unknown, e.g. Ovid, *Her.* 10.9 *a somno languida*. C. Plésant, *Le Culex Poème Pseudo-Virgilien* (Paris, 1910), p. 165 compares Ovid, *Tr.* 4.3.36 *tempus et a nostris exige triste malis*.