

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*.

(*Copa* 34); *a nimio* (*Catal.* 11.2); *a miser* (*Priap.* 34). Less usual is *Culex* 239 *terreor a tantis insistere terreor umbris* (where *H* reads *et*), but cf. Calpurnius, *Ecl.* 3.34 *a vereor*.

Heinsius could elsewhere be indiscriminate in proposing this particle. The text of Propertius is a good example. In Smyth's *Thesaurus* we find (e.g.) *a sparsis* (1.12.16); *possim egone a curae* (2.20.28); *a sano* (3.24.18).³

In the present passage there are two choices: either understand *a* as the preposition, or emend. Taking the latter course I thought of the simple correction *viduatos*, soon to find that Heinsius himself had proposed this reading as an alternative to the particle. Of his two suggestions, then, the one with a very fair chance of being right has been neglected almost entirely, while the other, surely wrong, has been widely accepted.⁴

Not only is *viduatos* Virgilian, cf. *arvaque Rhiphaeis numquam viduata pruinis* (*G.* 4.518), but our passage is echoed in Silius *nec Stygis ille lacus viduataque lumine regna* (*Pun.* 3.601).

Penn State University

ALLAN KERSHAW

³ W. R. Smyth, *Thesaurus Criticus ad Sexti Propertii Textum* (Leiden, 1970).

⁴ Only Salvatore (op. cit., n. 2) notes *viduatos*. The particle is accepted by Leo (Berlin, 1891); Plésant (op. cit., n. 2); Vollmer-Morel (Leipzig, 1930); Giomini (Firenze, 1953). Heyne (Leipzig, 1832) prints the preposition: Ellis (Oxford, 1907) distinguishes the particle with commas at *Catal.* 11.2, but not elsewhere so it is unclear how he understood our verse.

THE PREFACE TO TACITUS' *ANNALS*: MORE SALLUST?

Commentators on the *Annals* naturally observe that the famous first sentence of Tacitus' preface ('*Urbem Romam a principio reges habuere*') alludes to the preface of Sallust's *Bellum Catilinae* (6.1 '*Urbem Romam, sicuti ego accepi, condidere atque habuere initio Troiani*'). But it seems that none of them has observed a further allusion to Sallust's preface in the *last* sentence of Tacitus', which is almost equally famous (1.1.3):

inde consilium mihi pauca de Augusto et extrema tradere, mox Tiberii principatum et cetera, sine ira et studio, quorum causas procul habeo.

The expression *procul habere* appears to occur ten times in authors earlier than Tacitus: Sall. *BC* 4.1, Liv. 2.52.4, 4.21.8, 58.12, 24.45.8, 37.28.1, 41.5.12, Ov. *Ex P.* 3.2.44, Plin. *NH* 5.51, Curt. 4.2.15. In all but one of these cases the expression is used literally of geographical location (thus Liv. 37.28.1 '*haud procul inde Antiocho statua habente*'); the exception is Sallust, who uses it metaphorically of location in the course of the following long sentence (*BC* 4.1–2):

ubi animus ex multis miseriis atque periculis requieuit et mihi relicuam aetatem a re publica *procul habendam* decreui, non fuit *consilium* socordia atque desidia bonum otium contere, neque uero agrum colundo aut uenando (seruilibus officiis) intentum aetatem agere; sed, a quo incepto studioque me ambitio mala detinuerat, eodem regressus statui res gestas populi Romani carptim, ut quaeque memoria digna uidebantur, perscribere, eo magis quod mihi a spe, metu, partibus rei publicae animus liber erat.

It will be seen that Sallust, after offering a disingenuous account of his ignominious retirement from politics ('*ubi animus... decreui*'), provides various justifications for his writing history: the first of them is negative ('*non fuit consilium... agere*'); the last of them, appended to the rest of the sentence ('*eo magis quod... animus liber erat*'),