TEXTUAL NOTES ON *HERCULES OETAEUS* AND ON SENECA'S *AGAMEMNON* AND *THYESTES**

HO 64–91 Although one does not look for tight rhetorical structure in *HO*, a positive impression of disorder is generated by the fact that a passage on reordering the earth (79–86) intervenes between two passages on danger in the heavens (64–78, 87–91). If we bring the latter two passages together by transposing 79–86 after 87–91, the thought immediately becomes clear: the danger to the gods represented by the presence of Leo and other beasts in heaven offers an opportunity for Hercules to be promoted to heaven, *at least* (*saltem* 87) as the gods' protector, if not as a god in his own right. *Dabitur* (78) is now taken up by *da da* (87) in the following line, and the thematic phrase *non habent pacem dei* (64) is answered by 91 *hac esse superos parte securos puta*.

When the appeal of 87–91 falls on deaf ears, lines 79–86 then follow 87–91 adversatively: 'but if I have not yet earned a place in heaven, I must do more on earth'. The theme of *earning* a place in heaven (*merui* 80) is now taken up in *meruit* 93 and 97. A further advantage of the proposed transposition is that the second-person *iubes* in 82 now follows the address to Jupiter in 87 and picks up *iubes* 90, whereas in the transmitted order *iubes* in 82 comes thirty lines after the last second-person address to Jupiter (52).

HO 183 Why earth (*tellus* EA)? A reference to her as mother of all (Gronovius) seems too general and unspecific. Even to an exceptional individual such as Hercules himself (1544) she is a mother only in a transferred sense; the notion of her as a source of particular characteristics for an ordinary person seems improbable. I suggest that *tellus* should be corrected to *sexus*, which gives a specific connection to both mourning and breasts. Mourning and *planctus* were associated with women particularly, cf. 1688–9 *ipsa quam sexus iubet/ maerere . . . Alcmene*. *Plura . . . pectora* will imply 'more than the two breasts given me by my sex'; for the familiar play on number, cf. Medea's wish to have borne twice seven children, not two (*Med.* 954–7). For specific reference to *ubera* in a context of *planctus*, cf. *Tro.* 120–1 *tibi maternis ubera palmis/ laniata iacent, HO* 1670 *ubera in planctus ferit,* 1678; for *pectora* = *ubera*, cf. Stat. *Silv*. 1.2.270–1 *ne mollem uterum, ne stantia laedas/ pectora.*

HO 271 The first half of the line, *ego sum noverca*, seems not to have been rightly understood: it derives from, and is explained by, Ov. *Her*. 9 (Deianira to Hercules) 54 *unde ego sum Lydo facta noverca Lamo*, this Lamus being Hercules' son by Omphale. Bentley restored point to the second half of the line by correcting *potes* to *potens*: 'I am a stepmother who *can* destroy Alcides', in contrast to Juno herself.

The line is clearly out of place. At this moment Deianira is offering herself merely as an instrument of Juno's hatred, not as a replacement for Juno. Only after Juno appears

* My thanks to Harry Hine for helpful comments. Abbreviations: STrag = the tragedies ascribed to Seneca, exclusive of *HO* and *Oct.*; Leo = Friedrich Leo, *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*, 2 vols (Berlin, 1878–9); *Korr*. = Bertil Axelson, *Korruptelenkult: Studien zur Textkritik der unechten Seneca-Tragödie Hercules Oetaeus* (Lund, 1967); Zw. = Otto Zwierlein; *KK* = Zw., *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien Senecas* (Stuttgart, 1986). Where I do not give a full citation, it will be found in *KK* or *Korr*.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

to flag in her role of hostile stepmother (272b–4) does it make sense for Deianira to speak of taking over that role. With the line transposed after 274, *ego* contrasts well with *ipsa*; and 'this my anger is sufficient' in 275 implies 'sufficient to destroy Alcides unaided.'

HO 318 Editors agree that emendation must begin from E's *angor. in istos terra consurget lares*:[1] A's *rogos in istos terra consurget parens* represents a further stage of corruption, including deliberate rewriting. Leo 1.3 writes of E's text,

> quae verba adhuc sensu cassa ita emendanda esse patet ut comperiamus qualis terra fuerit quam *in istos lares* incessuram esse nutrix nuntiat. quae cum statim adiciat: *vindicem tellus suum defendet omnis*, priore loco tantum Herculis patriam nominare potuit.

This consideration suggests some adjective denoting 'Argive', which also offers a possible source of E's *angor*. (Leo himself conjectured *Graiorum*, which is less close paleographically.) This will give a satisfactory distinction between two stages of vengeance for Hercules: first (N.B. *prima* 319) a local stage in which the Greeks attack Aetolia, second a cosmic stage in which the whole world attacks Hercules' killer. (There is a comparable two-stage progress, from local to cosmic vengeance, at *Herc.* 1285–94.)

One thinks first of *Argolica* or *Argiva* (cf. respectively *Thy.* 185 *Argolica tellus* and *Tro.* 277 *Argiva tellus*), but neither of these familiar forms is likely to have puzzled scribes. The adjective *Argeus* is less familiar, and its *e* tends to be altered by scribes to *o*.[2] I suggest, then, that an original *argea* was corrupted via *argoa* to *angor*. Other proposals have difficulties. Birt conjectured *Argorum*, but since *Argi* is the name of the city, *Argorum terra* is an unlikely phrase; in addition, the form *Argorum* is nowhere found (*TLL* 2.532.10). Rossbach proposed *Argolis*, but the phrase *Argolis terra* is improbable since *Argolis* is used substantivally of 'the Argolid'. Giardina[3] proposes *Argoa*, but *Argous* is the adjective of the ship, not the city.

HO 388–90 There are several difficulties in these lines, perhaps connected; Leo's discussion at 1.196–200 remains helpful. In 388 E's *et pariter labat* yields no sense, and A's *et partu labat* looks like an attempt by the A interpolator to offer a comprehensible text, drawing on the content of 389. In 389–90 motherhood and old age seem to be paired as spoilers of beauty, yet the *-que* in 389 and asyndeton in 390 both work against this pairing. The gist of line 390 should surely be that old age is approaching quickly, not that it is already upon Deianira (she still feels strong *amor* for Hercules, 450–2); furthermore the verb *eripuit* lacks a clear object.

The combination of a dysfunctional *pariter* and *-que* in 388–9 suggests that what has been displaced is a noun parallel to *mater*, since *pariter* often underlines the linking of two items, especially with rhetorical point, as at *Pha.* 1101–2 *et pariter moram/ dominumque rumpunt*, *Ag.* 978 *consors pericli pariter ac regni mei*, *HO* 280 *num flamma cursus pariter et torrens feret?* The displaced noun is surely *soror*. For the extravagant

[1] Zw. establishes from E's practice that the dot between *angor* and *in* is punctuation interpreting *angor* as a separate statement, not a compendium for *-um* as Axelson believed. So emendation must be based on *angor*, not *angorum*.

[2] At *Culex* 343 *argea* (assuming that reading is correctly restored) becomes *argoa* in some MSS, *argo re-* in others. At Ov. *Am.* 3.6.46 a few MSS have *argoi* for *argei*. At Mart. 4.57.3 *argei* is a generally accepted emendation for the readings *argoi* and *argii*.

[3] G. Giardina, 'Note al testo delle tragedie di Seneca', *Paideia* 52 (1997), 159.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

mourning and self-wounding of Meleager's sisters, see Ov. *Met*. 8.533–46; all but Deianira and Gorge were metamorphosed through grief. Deianira refers to herself as Meleager's sister in both the chief Ovidian antecedents of *HO*, *Her*. 9.151 and *Met*. 9.149. The conjunction *soror*/*mater* is used of Meleager's mother Althaea at Ov. *Met*. 8.463 and Sen. *Med*. 779; here the *HO* author transfers it to Althaea's daughter Deianira. Someone who did not understand the reference of *soror* replaced it with *labat*.

In 390 the solution perhaps lies in Courtney's conjecture *adrepit* for *eripuit*, which solves both the line's problems (see above). Courtney writes, '*Repere* indicates a stealthy approach, and that usually carries the secondary implication of slowness; but not necessarily so (see Cic. *Cato* 4 *obrepere aiunt eam* (sc. *senectutem*) *citius quam putavissent*; *obrepere* again in a similar context at Juv. 9.106).'[4] But the fact that the line echoes *Tro.* 385 *aetas Pegaseo corripiet gradu* (*KK*) suggests that Grotius' emendation *eripiet* may be correct. Then the paronomasia *rapuit–eripiet* implies that the object of the first verb (*multum*) is to be supplied with the second: cf. *Herc.* 274–5, *Phoen.* 337, *Thy.* 313. Less probably we could postulate a lacuna before 390 with Leo, who supplemented <*si quid relictum est, id quoque actutum mihi*>.

HO 472 *Flectet* has no subject. If we supply 'a magic spell' from 467/9 or *malum* from 466, the unannounced change of subject within a sentence is awkward. Unannounced change of subject usually occurs between sentences, and involves persons. Rather an original *nil* has been displaced by *non*, through confusion of compendia or through sheer inadvertence.

HO 680 Leo printed E's *petens* without comment, though he had earlier identified it as corrupt (1.40–1). Most editors have followed him, but the reading is all but ungrammatical.[5] *Sed* indicates that we need a clause coordinate with the *dum*-clauses of 677–9, not a participial phrase; the latter could only be coordinate with *per solitum . . . iter*, which is highly awkward. The obvious correction to *petit* is supported by *Oed.* 893 *astra dum demens petit*, especially since *HO* 675–99 is heavily dependent on *Oed.* 882–910.[6] Perhaps the E scribe lost track of the construction and thought he should subordinate *petit* to *perdidit*, overlooking the fact that it is subordinated by the *dum* of 677.[7]

A's *secat* could be right. But given the nature of the two transmissions, it is more probably an attempt to enliven the line.[8] It is an extravagant usage, as Zw. shows, though hardly impossible.

HO 727 *Coma* in 735 refers to the woollen nap of the cloth, which burns away first. In 727 the word seems likely to refer similarly to this woollen surface, which is heated first. *Comam* (EA) is accusative of respect, indicating that the cloth is 'heated on its surface' (*comam tepefactus*) by the sun. *Comam*/*-as* is used in the accusative of respect

[4] E. Courtney, 'Emendations in Seneca's tragedies', *RFIC* 113 (1985), 297–302 at 300.

[5] Miller and Herrmann both print *petens* but translate as though the reading were *petit*.

[6] The passage in *Oedipus* describes Icarus rather than Phaethon. But Phaethon in STrag and *HO* is an Icarus-like figure who deliberately veers off the safe track, cf. *Pha.* 1092 *Phaethonta . . . devium* [Axelson], *Med.* 600 *immemor metae iuvenis paternae, HO* 853–4 *errantem . . . Phaethonta*. Consequently it is not surprising to find a Senecan line about Icarus adapted to Phaethon in *HO*.

[7] Similarly E misunderstands the construction at 1094 (see below), writing *digerit* for *digerens*.

[8] For this as one of the A interpolator's characteristic motives, see R. J. Tarrant, *Seneca, Agamemnon, Edited with a Commentary* (Cambridge, 1976), 62.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

at *Oed.* 403, 586, 625, *Thy.* 780, *HO* 376, 578, 789. The accusative of respect is most often used of humans, but for other applications see *Herc.* 216–17, *Oed.* 300, 538 *amara bacas laurus*, *Ag.* 355, *Thy.* 734, *HO* 722 *nulla nube respersus iubar*.

It appears, then, that *Phoebi* (EA) has replaced a dative of the agent *Phoebo*; for a stylish dative normalized to a genitive, cf. *Herc.* 722, *HO* 21, 41. For a perfect participle passive qualified by an accusative of respect and a dative of the agent, cf. *Oed.* 439 *tibi commotae pectora matres* with *KK* ad loc. With an instrumental ablative rather than a dative of the agent, the construction is not uncommon in *HO*: 413, 578, 722, 919.

Previous editors have retained *Phoebi* and accepted the alteration of *comam* to *coma* by recc., so that the word now refers to the sun's rays. This solution is open to objections: it creates an awkward shift in the metaphorical reference of *coma* from 727 to 735; there is no obvious reason, such as proximity of a transitive verb, for the supposed corruption of *coma* to *comam*; and *coma*, because of the basic meaning 'hair', naturally refers to flames *surrounding* a source of heat, as at *Oed.* 311 and *Oct.* 2, not at a great distance from it.

HO 746 The fact that the A scribe omitted lines 746–7 while leaving a space for them (a space transmitted in CSV) suggests that there was something puzzling about the lines in the archetype. E's meaningless *regna* may tell us that *regina* had been inserted unmetrically in the archetype to fill a gap: Deianira has just been called a *regina* (702), and vocative *regina* is addressed to queens by new interlocutors at *Herc.* 631, *Tro.* 80, *Phoen.* 387, *Ag.* 125. The original word at the beginning of 746, then, may have been nothing like *regna*.

Damsté's emendation *certae triumphi templa Iunonis pete* is strongly buttressed by his citation of 1548–9, 1655, and 882–3, and won the support of Axelson, *Korr*. 74–5. It may be right, but the syntactical awkwardness of a genitive noun dependent on a genitive adjective 'arouses suspicion' (Watt):[9] I have found no parallel in STrag or *HO*.[10]

A word associated with *triumphus* is *spolium* (*Ag.* 804 *triumphi spolia*; similarly *praeda triumphi*, *Tro.* 150, *Phoen.* 578). A hero's wife might become a *spolium* or *praeda*, i.e. an emblem of triumph over him, as might his mother, cf. 1789 (Alcmene) *ego praeda ducar*, *Tro.* 990–1 (Hecuba) *Hectoris spolium feret/ qui tulit Achillis?*[11] *Spolium* is used of persons elsewhere at *Tro.* 305 and *Ag.* 176 (similarly *praeda Tro.* 150 and often).

HO 1079–80 E has:

sic cum inquirens inferos
Orpheus carmina funderet.

The second line is fine, but *inquirens* is faulty in both sense and metre. A has:

[9] W. S. Watt, 'Notes on Seneca, *Tragedies*', *HSCP* 92 (1989), 329–47 at 342.

[10] Zw.'s objection to Damsté's conjecture on grounds of sense seems to me overprecise: *certus* would be close in meaning to *potitus* here, as at 1655. Zw.'s conjecture *plenae* is open to the same syntactical objection as Damsté's. In addition it assigns too subjective a meaning to *triumphus*, i.e. 'elation, triumphal feeling'.

[11] Although these two half-lines are rightly regarded by Leo and Zw. as an interpolation, they or a source may have been known to the *HO* author. (As Keulen notes ad loc., their germ is in Ov. *Met*. 13.486–7.)

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

sed cum linqueret inferos
Orpheus carmina fundens.

Here *linqueret* looks like a characteristic attempt by the A interpolator to patch over a corruption with the nearest material to hand; it cannot be right, since Orpheus did not begin to leave the underworld *before* Eurydice was restored to him. The presence of *sed* and the unmetrical *fundens,* both designed to complement *linqueret*, confirms that A is tinkering with the text.

Conjecture must therefore focus on 1079, where *inquirens* is so obviously astray that it looks like a foreign body. I suggest that it has intruded from a gloss along the lines of *uxorem inquirens*, 'searching for his lost wife', and has displaced the original reading, which may have been quite different.[12] The gloss perhaps explained why Orpheus wandered *through* the underworld, which points to *per inferos*. Then metre suggests that the preceding word was an adjective for *carmina*. I offer *blanda*, which suggests the success of the songs and so prepares for 1083–4; the word is used in the same context, and with the same suggestion, at Stat. *Theb*. 8.58–9 (Pluto speaking) *vidi egomet blanda inter carmina turpes/ Eumenidum lacrimas iterataque pensa Sororum* (where the last phrase is close to 1083–4 *iterum deae supplent colus*).[13]

Richter, followed by Axelson and Zw., rewrote the lines so:

sic cum *vinc*eret inferos
Orpheus carmin*e* fund*itus*.

But the imperfect tense of *vinceret* rings false, since Orpheus had to overcome the resistance of the underworld *before* Eurydice was restored to him. And *funditus* gives an unnecessary emphasis; no doubt it was inspired by Gronovius' equally unpersuasive conjecture *funditans.*

HO 1092–9 Leo thought that the beginning of Orpheus' song was lost after 1092, and that it was in direct speech. He gave no reason, but his text shows that his motive was to save the E reading *digerit* in 1094, with which 1094–6 are direct speech: 'and the god who arranges the seasons has set in order the headlong year's four changes'. But lines 1094–6, so interpreted, do not fit the context well, since they connote mutability rather than the mortality that is Orpheus' theme. Müller argued that *haec* 1092 naturally introduces direct rather than indirect speech;[14] but as forms of *hic* can introduce an infinitive or a finite verb (cf. respectively 1808 and 1487), so they can introduce either indirect or direct speech (*OLD* s.v. *hic* 12a and b). Since we are no longer constrained, as Leo and Müller were, by the doctrine of the codex optimus, the right course is clearly to accept that Orpheus' theme is given in indirect speech in 1093–9, just as it is in 1035 *aeternum fieri nihil*; A's *digerens* is right in 1094, where *et qui* is a brachylogy for *et in eum qui* (Gronovius).[15]

[12] Cf. *Ag.* 746, where E has the impossible *connectens vinculo gravi* in place of the universally accepted A reading *et saucios vinclo gravi*. Zw. *Gnomon* 41 (1969), 767 cites this as an example of E corruption which cannot be explained. However, the allusiveness of the passage surely points to the explanation: *connectens* has intruded from an explanatory gloss about Achilles 'fastening' Hector's hands to each other, and to the chariot, with the *vinculum* in question. *Tenens* at *HO* 918 may be another example of an explanatory participle intruding into the E text.

[13] Zw. notes other similarities of language and phrasing between Statius and *HO* at *KK* 328–38.

[14] M. Müller, 'In Senecae tragoedias quaestiones criticae', dissertation (Berlin, 1898), 54.

[15] At first sight *legibus obrutis* 1102 seems to conflict with 1093, but I suggest that the language

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

In view of the above, the transmitted *poterit* in 1099 must be wrong (as most editors agree), since there cannot be a shift into direct speech in the last line recounting Orpheus' song. *Poterit* was no doubt introduced by a scribe puzzled about the construction of *mori*. Since the line overtly echoes 1089 *quae nata est iterum perit*, I suggest its original form was *quod natum est iterum mori.* Such parallel lines are characteristic of *HO* (*KK* on 1521ff.), but here we have the subtlety that *iterum* changes its connotation from 'a second time' in 1089 to 'back to the original state' in 1099 (for the latter meaning, cf. *Pha.* 371, *Oed.* 238, *Thy.* 832–3, *HO* 310, *OLD* s.v. 1c). Birt's conjecture *quod natum est, quod erit, mori* shifts the line's focus towards the universality of death; but *quod natum est* points rather to the Senecan paradox that birth entails death (my comm. on *Herc.* 868–74; *KK* 389). If the explanation of *poterit* offered above is correct, the original reading need not have closely resembled *poterit*.

HO 1220–1 It has long been recognized that *iecur* makes no sense in 1221, and has intruded from 1222. What has not been realized is that *sanguinis* is out of place in 1220, and has intruded from 1223. Blood in the lungs would of course indicate disease, not the quondam health needed here: cf. *Oed.* 367–8 *non animae capax*/ *in parte dextra pulmo sanguineus iacet*.[16] The phrase *animae capax* there, and Celsus' description of the healthy lung as *spongiosus, ideoque spiritus capax* (4.1.4) suggest that the original phrase here was *aëris quondam capax*. *Sanguinis*, though suggested by 1223 *sanguinem*, may have been imported deliberately by someone wishing to stress that absence of moisture causes the lungs' malfunction (possibly under the influence of Luc. 4.326–7 *nulloque umore rigatus*/ *aëris alternos angustat pulmo meatus*).

What of the noun displaced by *iecur*? Baden's *vigor*, accepted by Zw., is clearly inappropriate in view of Hercules' extreme debilitation;[17] in two passages cited in support of Baden's conjecture, *vigor* refers to normal healthy functioning in specific contrast to sickness (Sen. *Prov*. 3.12, *QNat.* 6.18.7). Furthermore the abstract *vigor* can hardly be described as *aëris* (or *sanguinis*) *capax*.

What is needed is presumably a noun referring to the physical form of the lungs; *arentes fibras distendit* indicates that there is some transference, since it is actually inhalation, denoted by *tumidi* rather than the displaced nominative, that stretches the tissue. I suggest the original word was *specus*, which is used of hollows in the body at Pliny, *HN* 11.182 (the heart's chambers); *cavum* is similarly used ibid. 9.163 *cavo capitis* and Gell. 16.3.3. *esuritionem faciunt . . . cava intus ventris*. *Specus* is also used of hollows in the body caused by wounds at Verg. *Aen.* 9.700 *specus atri vulneris*, Sen. *Thy.* 9 *poena Tityi qui specu vasto patens*. Of course the ancients knew that the lung is not actually empty: Pliny describes it as *fistulis inanibus cavus* (11.188). But in less anatomical contexts it is natural to think of the lung or chest as hollow, cf. Luc. 9.777–8 *cavumque*/ *pectus*.

is deliberately paradoxical: the cataclysm will end all laws (1102), including the law of 1093 that everything must end—in the same way that Death will paradoxically decree its own death (1116–17)

[16] The inappropriateness of *sanguinis quondam capax* to the lungs is reflected in the plethora of conjectures (listed and rejected at *Korr*. 54–5) that introduce *cor* in 1221, e.g. Bothe's *tumidi ecce cor pulmonis*.

[17] The force of *quondam* cannot extend to *vigor*, since *distendit* denotes what is happening now, as opposed to formerly.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HO 1254–5 *Est* in 1255 must be wrong in this second-person context. If we delete it with Gruter, what is the construction? Leo, by placing a comma at the end of 1255, implied that we supply *es* in 1254–5 from 1256. But the *numquid . . . an* of 1256–7 should constitute a separate question from the *utrum . . . an* of 1254–5. Zw. believes that *te genuit* is to be supplied in 1254–5 from 1251–2. But this seems difficult after the construction has been interrupted by *o dirum malum*, particularly as the supposed subjects of 1254–5 are different in type from those of 1251–3. Rather *est* should be corrected to *es* in 1255, as it was long ago in 1258 by recc. For the elision in this place in the line, cf. 1260 *quaecumque es fera*, and for the suggestion that Hercules has some noxious beast within him, cf. 1218–9, 1360.

HO 1402 Avantius' conjecture *procedat agedum* <*huc*>, designed to cure the hiatus, is rightly questioned at *Korr.* 48 fn. on the grounds that *huc* is superfluous in sense, and that the only monosyllable used in elision at this point in the line in *HO* is *et*.[18] Axelson's tentative suggestion of a lacuna after *agedum* may be right, though there is no obvious lacuna of meaning, and lacunae beginning in the middle of the trimeter are rare in the corpus.[19] Another possibility is that the exclamation *ei mihi*, familiar in *HO* (1024, 1172, 1205, 1784), has displaced an original *vae mihi*, perhaps after corruption of *vae*. (The author will have used *vae* instead of his usual *ei* to convey Alcmene's sense of imminent danger.) Ovid has four uses of *vae*, and a fifth in tragedy if *feror huc illuc, vae, plena deo* is correctly read in a fragment of his *Medea*.

HO 1459 E has *recte dolor es*, A *ceci dolores*. I suggest that the original text was *caecus dolore es*, and that *dolore es* became *dolores* by haplography. Faced with *caecus dolores*, A simply assimilated *caecus* to the apparent plural *dolores*. E's text, on the other hand, looks like a corrective intervention, namely 'the correct reading is *dolor es*'. That is, either because of the singular *caecus*, or because of some indication that *es* should be a separate word, E made the (unmetrical) conjecture *caecus dolor es*; 'Grief, you are blind', and its corrective *recte* later displaced *caecus*.

According to Hercules, then, Hyllus' advice to drop his anger, and to regard Deianira as sufficiently punished, is wrongheaded and shows him to be 'blinded by grief'. For *caecus* used metaphorically with an ablative of cause such as *dolore*, see *OLD* s.v. 2a, *TLL* 3.44.7–22; in STrag *caecus* often qualifies such nouns as *furor, error, cupido, amor, temeritas*. For the elision *dolore es*, cf. 1256 *cruore es* (where E's *cruoris* reflects a comparable absorption of *es* through haplography).

Thirteen conjectures are recorded in Giardina's app. crit.[20] Among them Richter's *cecidit dolose*, accepted by several editors including Zw., bears some resemblance to A's reading. It is not, of course, immune from objections: *dolose* does not appear in verse after Lucilius; there is no other suggestion in *HO* that Deianira's suicide was intended to avoid punishment by Hercules; the notions of *dolus* and *fraus* in this play belong rather to the context of the poisoned robe[21] (cf. 1468). Müller's conjecture *aucti dolores*

[18] See Zw., *Prolegomena zu einer kritischen Ausgabe der Tragödien Senecas* (Wiesbaden, 1984), 214–16.

[19] The only examples persuasively identified so far are the pair at *HO* 718 and 739.

[20] Corrigenda to Giardina's reports: *recte dolo eius* (Birt), *iacet? ei dolori est* (Peiper), *aucti dolores* (L. Müller). Addenda: *certe dolose* (Axelson, *Korr*. 76–7), *clepsit dolo se* (Delz, *MH* 46 [1989], 59–60), *fecit dolose* (Giardina [n. 3], 159).

[21] So M. Billerbeck, *Senecas Tragödien: sprachliche und stilistische Untersuchungen, Mnemos.* Suppl. 105 (Leiden, 1988), 159, n. 24.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

will mean 'my sorrows are increased,' but *sorrow* does not describe Hercules' reaction to Hyllus' news, as his following words show.

HO 1506 The transmitted phrasing *quin ipse, quamquam Iuppiter,* is flat in the context and immediately after *Iovis* in 1505; I suggest that *Iuppiter* is an instance of a proper name intruding from a gloss.[22] In that case it has displaced an adjective, most probably *maximus* (cf. *Herc.* 1036 *maximi . . . Iovis*). *Quamquam* appears only once elsewhere in the corpus, in conjunction with an adjective at 1860–1 *expedi in planctus tamen/ defessa quamquam bracchia*.

HO 1562–3 After *regnabas* A has *minimum cruentis/ in tuas urbes licuisse fatis*; E has *minus in procellis/ in tuas urbes licuisse fatis*.

The model for this apostrophe to rulers in the context of underworld punishments was *Herc.* 737–47, where the emphasis, as here, is on abstinence from despotic bloodshed. In this context A's *cruentis* is apposite, cf. *Herc.* 737 *cruentos duces*, 741 *incruentum imperium* (so *Korr.* 98). But the reference to fates or fate (*fatis* EA), however subtlely interpreted, is inapposite: how could rulers be expected to control fated events, or be held accountable for them? Leo 2.384 adheres to E's text, and explains that Fate had *less* power over the ruler's cities because the ruler diminished the impact of its 'storms' by succouring their victims. This is a great deal to supply. Jac. Gronovius' blending of E and A, *minimum procellis/ in tuas urbes licuisse Fati*, is adopted by Zw., who identifies the 'storms of Fate' as nothing other than potential tyrannical acts by the ruler: perverse, even obscurantist, phrasing in the context. Axelson's interpretation of *fatis* as 'deaths' is also unconvincing: deaths would hardly be called 'fates' when the ruler's responsibility for them is at issue; if the 'fates' are those of individuals, that does not jibe with the collective *urbes*; and the context simply does not guide us to understand *fatis* in this way.

In view of the frequent confusion of *fatum* and *factum* (*TLL* 6.126.31–3, 355.19–33) there can be little doubt that *fatis* should be corrected to *factis*: renown for the ruler lies in giving no rein to bloody *deeds* (his own or his underlings'). This follows well after the reference to deeds being judged in the underworld (*facta* 1559). For *licet* in contexts of despotic exercise of power, cf. *Herc.* 489, *Tro.* 335–6, *Phoen.* 658, *Ag.* 272, *Thy.* 214. The notion of giving rein to bloody deeds is comparable to that of indulging military *furor* (Stat. *Theb*. 5.669–70 *absistite ferro . . . neve indulgete furori*) or soldiers' *licentia* (Livy 29.19.4); for the personification of bloody deeds, cf. that of anger, victory, and the sword at *Tro.* 280–5 (similarly *Herc.* 403–5). Once *fatis* had displaced *factis*, a reference to storms intruded in E because of the familiar metaphorical association between storms and fortune or fate (*TLL* 10.2.1511.41–5, Verg. *Aen*. 7.594 '*frangimur heu fatis' inquit 'ferimurque procella'*).

Urbes is sometimes used in *HO* to mean 'regions' (979) or 'peoples' of certain regions (1020, 1233, 1325, 1788); the latter is the sense here, so there is no suggestion of attacks by external forces on cities, but only of rulers' deeds against their subject peoples.

HO 1595 The last word of the line is missing in A, the sole witness (E omits 1564–1606). Following recc. most editors supply *maeret*, giving *mundus sonat. ecce*

[22] Examples of this phenomenon include *Herc.* 460, *Oed.* 246, *HO* 891 (all in E). See below on *Thy* 58–9.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

maeret,/ maeret Alciden pater. Zw. convincingly disposes of this gemination of *maeret* combined with *ecce*, and argues that *ecce* belongs with *sonat*: for the postponed *ecce*, cf. 72 *invasit omnis ecce . . . fera*, 1603 *laeto venit ecce vultu, Med.* 738 *sonuit ecce vesano gradu*. In this case the missing word probably belongs to the same clause as *mundus sonat ecce*, and is an adverb modifying *sonat*. Zw. conjectured *caecum* 'indistinctly' (see *OLD* s.v. *caecus* 8a), but later accepted *maestum* 'sadly', the conjecture of Watt.[23]

The development of 1595–1606 is worth considering. The chorus hears a sound (1595) and speculates about its source: is it Jupiter mourning, or an outcry of the gods, or Juno shrieking in terror, or Atlas staggering (1596–9)? Or the shades in panic and Cerberus in flight (1600–2)? None of the above: it is the sound of Philoctetes' approach (1603–6)! Since the sound turns out to be made by the joyful Philoctetes (*laeto vultu* 1603), then, it must not be characterized initially as *sad*. It must, however, be *loud*, since it fills the *mundus* and seems to the chorus to come from heaven or hell: compare those sounds that have to reach into other realms, *Herc.* 1112–14 *pectora . . . / non sunt ictu ferienda levi:/ uno planctu tria regna sonet*, *Tro.* 112–14 *audiat omnis pontus et aether . . . / pulsu pectus tundite vasto*. This consideration gives a clue to the point of 1595–1606. Loud and puzzling sounds once turned out to herald the approach of Hercules, *Herc.* 522–3 *infernus imo sonuit e fundo fragor./ audimur! est est sonitus Herculei gradus*, *HO* 1128–30 *sed quis non modicus fragor/ aures attonitas movet?/ est est Herculeus sonus.*[24] So now such a sound turns out to herald the approach of *Herculis heres* (1606), bearing the hero's massive weapons.

A probable supplement, then, is *vastum*; cf. *Pha.* 1007 *vastum tonuit* and *HO* 803 *vasta Chalcis sonuit*, where *vasta* is used adverbially like *maesta* 187. For adverbial accusatives with *sono*, cf. *Oed.* 98 *sonuit horrendum* with Töchterle ad loc., 570 *sonuere maestum*, *KK* p. 416, *OLD* s.v *sono* 6; for *vastus* of sounds, cf. *Herc.* 784 (*sonitus*), *Tro.* 174, *Oed.* 232 (*fragor*), *Herc.* 1104 (*gemitus*), *Pha.* 1171, *HO* 800 (*mugitus*), *OLD* s.v. *vastus* 3c.

HO 1716 The line was probably omitted early in the transmission and then placed in a margin, since A reinserts it in the wrong place (altering *edidit* 1715 to *addidit* to accommodate it), while E omits it.

Its content indicates that it belongs with the theme of witnessing and testing Hercules' valour in enduring the fire (1708–15), to assess his worthiness to enter heaven. Since Juno is potentially the chief opponent of his deification (the theme of Act 1 of *Herc.*), a specific mention of her is likely in this context. Much of the phrasing of 1708–10 comes from *Herc.* 960ff. (*KK* on 1708), where Juno is similarly singled out (963); for specific mention of Juno in such contexts, cf. also *HO* 1437, 1596–7 and Ov. *Met*. 9.256–8. The line fits well after 1712 *approba natum prius*, 'first demonstrate your son's qualities' (i.e. to others, such as Juno); *noverca* will play off *natum*. Zw. rightly argues against Gronovius' transposition after 1718, but his own placement of the line after 1724 has little to commend it.

[23] Watt (n. 8) at 344.

[24] Zw. *KK* 416 cites these parallels but does not recognize the significance that I claim for them. Christine Walde, *Herculeus labor: Studien zum pseudo-senecanischen Hercules Oetaeus*, Studien zur klassischen Philologie 64 (Frankfurt am Main, 1992), 226 follows Ackermann in interpreting 1603–4 to mean 'We are wrong, as Philoctetes' joy shows, about Hercules having gone to Hades', and in taking the sound of 1595 to indicate that Hercules has entered heaven. The sequence of thought in 1923–30 might be thought to support Ackermann's interpretation of 1603–4, but the parallel is not conclusive.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

HO 1885 The transmitted reference to Nemea must be wrong, as Nemea is neither a mountain nor in Arcadia. There is, however, an Arcadian mountain with a similar name: Mt Nomia, mentioned by Pausanias at 8.38.11.[25] Corruption of that name to the familiar Nemea was almost inevitable, particularly in a play containing several references to the Nemean Lion, the closest at 1892. Since Nomia is in the far west of Arcadia and Parthenius in the east, they form a polar pair.

HO 1951–3 1951 envisages a situation that would offer all shades, not only Hercules, the possibility of escape from the underworld: the river Acheron is now sluggish, and can be crossed.[26] By contrast, 1952 envisages a special dispensation for Hercules, and 1953 similarly suggests that his unique qualities have allowed his escape. Consequently *et* at the beginning of 1952 should be corrected to *an*. Studley's version published in 1566 perceives the contrast, and anticipates my conjecture at least in English: 'May any scape from Acheron? *Or* dost thou scape alone?' (my emphasis).

AGAMEMNON

Ag. 315 The transmitted invitation to *Theban* women can hardly be right, since it is duplicated later in this short list at 318–22. Probably 'Theban' originated as an explanatory gloss on line 318, and later displaced the original adjective in 315, perhaps because the latter was corrupt or not understood. A's phrase *Thebana manus* looks like a secondary corruption arising from failure to appreciate the use of the collective singular in *Thebais hospes* (E).

Women at Argos would naturally begin by inviting neighbours from the Peloponnese. Those from the southern Argolid are are designated in 316 (R. Erasinus),[27] and those from Sparta in 317 (R. Eurotas). Perhaps, then, *Parrhasis*, 'Arcadian'. If *Parrhas-* was corrupted to *Parnas-* vel sim. (as, for example, at *HO* 1281, Verg. *Aen.* 8.344, Ov. *Trist*. 2.190, Sil. 12.710 in some MSS), which would make no sense in the context, the nearby gloss 'Theban' might well have been imported as a replacement.

The only recommendation of Richter's *Thespias* is a certain similarity to E's *Thebais*, but it seems unlikely that the corruption was purely mechanical (see above). Why should the Argives begin by inviting women from Thespiae, an obscure town in Boeotia?

Ag. 496–7 Although clearly designed to be pointed, this sentence lacks the anticipated point, as Tarrant notes ad loc.[28] One expects something like 'light was so sweet to these wretches that they longed even for this dangerous kind of light'. But *malae* places the paradox in the first clause, leaving the second anticlimactic. Suspicion is strengthened by the paratactic construction of the consecutive clause, which is

[25] Pausanias regards the name as a neuter plural, but 'the Arcadians say it is the name of a nymph'. (Pausanias mentions the nymph Nomia again at 10.31.10.) Hence the genitive form *Nomiae* is not improbable.

[26] This is an exact reversal of the picture of an impassable Acheron given at *Herc.* 714–16 *tumultu rapitur ingenti ferox/ et saxa fluctu volvit Acheron invius/ renavigari*.

[27] The Erasinus flowed through the southern Argolid; presumably, then, the line refers to Argive women from that area (as opposed to the city of Argos proper), and *fontes* has the sense 'waters' (*OLD* s.v. 1e).

[28] Tarrant (n. 8).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

unparallelled in STrag and rare in literary Latin, though Zw. cites examples from Ovid.

Both issues are addressed by writing *miserisque lucis tanta dulcedo, ut male/ hoc lumen optent*. (This builds on Bothe's *miserisque lucis tanta dulcedo est, male/ hoc lumen optant*.) For *ut* in elision in this position in the line, cf. *Herc.* 395, *Tro.* 596, *Med.* 848, *Oed.* 72, 353, 678, *Ag.* 245; for ellipse of forms of *esse* with *tantus*, cf. *Med.* 579–80, *Oed.* 372, 709, *Thy.* 875. *Ut* is not infrequently omitted in MSS or replaced by *et*; here *est* crept in because of its ellipse in the first clause. Tarrant judges Bothe's proposal 'fatuous, if *male* means "unwisely" '. But *male* is indefinite in itself, indicating only (in this usage) that an action is a 'bad' idea: translation will depend on context, and here one might render 'perversely', as one could do for example at *Thy.* 3.

Ag. 738 E's *sublimis* gives a standard description of a dominant animal (or human), 'with neck/head held high'.[29] Tarrant correctly notes, 'If sound, the words must describe the lion's customary or former state.' But in Senecan usage an adjective adjacent to *iacere* regularly describes a current condition, e.g. *Tro.* 320 *segnis iacebat*, 455 *iaceret tota*, 805, 894–5 *iacent inhumata*, *Pha.* 666 *supplex iacet*, 1174 *exanimis iaces*, *Ag.* 879 *sublimis iacet*, *Thy*. 75–6 *iacet pavidus*; the same is true of the frequent use of participles with *iacere*, e.g. *Herc.* 1160 *confecti iacent*, *Tro.* 238 *iacuit peremptus, Med.* 630 *sparsus iacuit*, *Pha.* 5 *subiecta iacent*, *Oed.* 789 *defunctus iacet,* 1040 *iacet perempta, Ag.* 465–6 *iacent deserta, Thy.* 197 *abiectus iacet*. A's *vexatus*, 'mauled,' fits the context, but does not quite cohere with the *sub* of *sub dente*; and if the original had been *vexatus*, E would hardly have written *sublimis*.

The original word may have been *summissus* (perhaps written *subm-* as at *Tro.* 708 in E), which would offer a good antithesis to *victor*. *Summitto* is often used with parts of the body, especially head or neck, cf. *Med.* 1024 *colla summissa*, *Pha.* 500 *colla summittunt, Herc.* 803 *capita summisit*, 811 *ore summisso*, 1045 *capite summisso*; for the accusative of respect, cf. particularly *Oed.* 300 *colla depressam*.[30] Perhaps the original word was partly lost in the archetype, and E inserted a word that matched what could be seen, borrowing from *Pha.* 1036 *colla sublimis* and *Ag.* 879 *sublimis iacet*, while A characteristically invented more freely.

Ag. 810 The asyndeton between this clause and the next (811) is surprising, since asyndeton is usually found when the clauses are so similar in content or structure that they 'bind' themselves together without need of a linking word, cf. *Herc.* 529–30 *serpentis resecet colla feracia,/ deceptis referat mala sororibus*, 1078–9, *Med.* 744–5, *Pha.* 75–6 *retia vinctas tenuere feras,/ nulli laqueum rupere pedes*, 981–2, *Ag.* 96–7 *feriunt celsos fulmina colles,/ corpora morbis maiora patent*, *Thy.* 855–7. That is not the case here, since 810 describes a permanent characteristic of Argos, while 811 describes a particular instance. In addresses and hymns permanent characteristics are usually conveyed either by a relative clause or by a participle along the lines of *Ζεῦ πάντ' ἀνάσσων* (Soph. *OT* 904), cf. *Herc.* 658 *dominantem*, 1070 *miscens*, *Med.* 5 *dividens*, 6 *praebens*, *Pha.* 755 *temperans*, 756 *cohibens*, *Oed.* 560 *obsidentem*, *Ag.* 383 *pollens*, *Thy.* 789 *potens*. An example with *semper* is *Oed.* 253–4 *sororque fratri semper*

[29] Examples in *OLD* s.v. *sublimis* 6a, *celsus* 3, *arduus* 2, *altus* 1 and in Tarrant ad loc.

[30] Gronovius' conjecture *subcisus* must be ruled out as a category error, since it refers literally to what is here being conveyed symbolically: the lionness has wounded her mate with bloody bites (740), not an axe.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

occurrens tuo,/ noctivaga Phoebe. It appears, then, that an original *educans* has been corrupted to *educas* through loss of *n*.[31]

THYESTES

Thy. 41–9 The allusions to future events in 41–4 are clear:

1. *liberi pereant male* refers to the deaths of Thyestes' sons;
2. *peius tamen nascantur* refers to the incestuous birth of Aegisthus;
3. *immineat viro/ infesta coniunx* refers to Clytemnestra;
4. *bella trans pontum vehant* e.q.s. refers to the Trojan War.

Why, then, does the threat to Agamemnon from Clytemnestra *precede* the Trojan War? The answer clearly lies in rhetorical organisation: after listing crimes *within* the house of Pelops, the Fury envisages crime travelling outwards, to affect every land (44), the leaders of nations (45) and even heaven (48–51).

Commentators take the phrase 'great leaders of nations' as a generalizing reference to Agamemnon, and 'victorious Lust' (46) as symbolizing either his passions for Briseis and Cassandra or else Clytemnestra's adultery with Aegisthus. But after the phrase 'all lands' in 44, the plural *magnos gentium duces* would be disappointing if it referred solely to Agamemnon, particularly as he has already been mentioned as a victim of crime (*viro* 42). Although Agamemnon is certainly one of the *duces*, a reference to him alone hardly suits the rhetoric of the spreading stain of crime. The leaders are surely all those involved in the Trojan War, and *victrix Libido* symbolizes primarily the fact that adulterous Helen caused their battles. Both the *duces* and Helen's sway over them are found at *Tro.* 893–95 *cernis hos tumulos ducum/ et nuda . . . ossa . . . ? haec hymen sparsit tuus*.

Now we encounter a puzzle. After the picture of crime affecting all lands and the leaders of nations, the paradosis returns us oddly to specific crimes in the guilty house of Pelops (*impia . . . in domo* 46), before moving on to the heavens. It seems probable, therefore, that 46b–8a are out of place where transmitted,[32] and belong after 43a. Replacing the lines there allows the rhetorical structure to emerge clearly, in two respects. First, the words *et fas et fides/ iusque omne pereat* form a suitably general conclusion to the Fury's list of crimes *within* the family, after which we move outward (*trans pontum*). Second, we now move directly from the blood-soaked earth to the heavens. This sequence is confirmed by comparison with Ovid's account of the Iron Age at *Met*. 1.144–51, a passage rightly adduced by Tarrant[33] as Seneca's inspiration: first comes the breaking of all proper relationships between individuals (146 *imminet exitio vir coniugis, illa mariti*), then the soaking of the earth (149–50 *caede madentes . . . terras*), and finally the threat to heaven (151 *neve foret terris securior arduus aether*).

The transmitted *fratris* in 47 yields the following sense: 'in this impious house let the least serious *stuprum* be a brother's'. The brother's *stuprum* will be that of Thyestes

[31] Examples of loss of *n*: in EA *HO* 1196 *victus* for *vinctus;* in E *Pha.* 743 *laceras* for *lacerans, Thy.* 164 *insultat* for *insultant, HO* 1363 *vetat* for *vetans,* 1517 *omem* for *omnem*; in A *Med.* 988 *potes* for *potens, Oed.* 284 *serpit* for *serpens, HO* 1283 *movet* for *movens.*

[32] Perhaps *stuprum* was placed next to *Libido* because these are the only words in the speech concerned with sexual misconduct.

[33] R. J. Tarrant, *Seneca's Thyestes, Edited with Introduction and Commentary* (Atlanta, 1985).

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(with Atreus' wife Aerope), and the more serious *stuprum* implied will be a father's (namely that of Thyestes with his daughter).[34] This rhetorical point is satisfactory in itself, but the reference to Thyestes–Aerope and Thyestes–Pelopia does not fit either where transmitted or if transposed after 43a. Like Tarrant ad loc. and Zw.,[35] therefore (though for different reasons), I would accept Bentley's *facinus* for *fratris*. The *stuprum* of 46 is now Clytemnestra's adultery, and the more serious *facinus* is her murder of her husband. It would be odd if this reference to Clytemnestra were separated from that in 42b–3a, as would be the case in the transmitted line-order; the proposed transposition has the further advantage of placing them together. Seneca first reuses Ovid's line 146 (quoted above) to refer to Clytemnestra, then adds *stuprum* and husband murder (not in Ovid) to this list of crimes in the family.

Thy. 58–9 A notorious crux. Difficulties centre around the phrase *et quando tollet?* with its unexpressed object *liberos* (from 58). In so pointed and allusive a speech, the very brevity of this phrase suggests a double meaning. In fact two meanings can be perceived for *tollet*, namely 'raise' (to consume) and 'make away with' (by consuming). But Tarrant notes the awkwardness of both senses: if this alone is the point of the phrase, it is feeble by Senecan standards.[36]

Another difficulty lies in the plainness of line 58. An unpointed use of a proper name must be suspect in this speech where much is riddling and allusive, and where persons are identified by roles not names (except Tantalus himself).

Tarrant excises line 58.[37] The subject of *tollet* is now *patruus*, namely Atreus, and the object *dextram*. This solution leaves several doubts, whose effect is cumulative. First, if the questions *dextra cur patrui vacat?* and *et quando tollet?* are designed to be juxtaposed, it is awkward that the second changes the construction, requiring us to supply not *patrui* but *patruus*, and not *dextra* but *dextram*. Second, *tollet* is now reduced to a single sense, 'raise,' but the context calls for something more pointed, as noted above. Third, the inferential *et quando* ('And when . . .' in the sense 'So when . . .' or 'When, then . . .') does not fit well after the *cur* question. But emendation to *ecquando* (Ascensius) is risky, since *ecquando* is weakly attested in poetry.[38] In any case, one is reluctant to lose this *et* introducing a question, which is a favourite usage of Seneca, cf. *Tro.* 330, 429, 598, *Med.* 525, *Pha.* 673, 1121, *Oed.* 221, *Ag.* 292, 961.

Perhaps, then, suspicion should be directed not at line 58 *in toto*, but specifically at the proper name *Thyestes*. That name could have been introduced deliberately for clarification, or accidentally as an intrusive gloss.[39] It will have displaced a noun that referred allusively to Thyestes, and at the same time provided the point which is now missing. I suggest *stuprator*, a noun used in this position in the trimeter at *Pha.* 897.

[34] So Axelson in *KK*. Presumably Commelinus had understood the lines so, since he punctuated after *fratris*.

[35] Zw., *Senecas Phaedra und ihre Vorbilder* (Stuttgart, 1987), 90–2.

[36] Puzzlement about the sense was evidently felt by the A interpolator. He appears to have specified the sense of *tollet* as 'will raise', by altering *spument aena* in 60 to *spumante aeno*, i.e. 'raise [the flesh] from the foaming cauldron' (a brachylogy for 'eat flesh raised from the cauldron'). Gronovius, Leo, and editors since Leo have seen that *spument aena* (E) must be right, the subjunctive parallelling those that follow.

[37] Zw. defended this line hesitantly in *KK*, but shortly thereafter accepted Tarrant's deletion of it.

[38] A. Hudson-Williams, 'Notes on some passages in Seneca's tragedies and the *Octavia*', *CQ* 39 (1989), 186–96 at 194, citing *TLL*.

[39] For the latter source of corruption see n. 22.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

This word gives a special twist to *suos* at the end of the line: Thyestes by his adultery with Aerope *may* be father of Agamemnon and Menelaus (as noted several times, 240, 327–30, 1098–9), but he is *certainly* father of the sons to be killed by Atreus: N.B. *certos* used of those sons at 1102. The conjecture also gives a further sense to *tollet*, since *tollere liberos* can be used of a father lifting children in recognition of relationship to them (*OLD* s.v. *tollo* 2):[40] this sense of *tollet* will be brought out by the issue of paternity just raised by *suos*, and *tollet* in this sense will anticipate the issue of recognition in Atreus' famous *natos ecquid agnoscis tuos?* (1005). *Tollet* will also retain the senses 'raise/do away with' noted above, and this complexity of meaning explains why *et quando tollet?* is set off as if for display.

Such conjecture must be *exempli gratia* because of the lack of paleographical clues to the original word. Another possibility would be *nondumne adulter* for *nondum Thyestes*; but *-ne* is little used in the late plays *Thyestes* and *Phoenissae*.[41]

Thy. 267–8 Editors rightly accept EP *tumet* in 268, where CST *timet* does not fit the context. Presumably, then, they take *nescioquid maius et solito amplius* as an adverbial accusative. But such a construction is highly improbable. The adverbial accusative is found in STrag only in *nihil* and and in the neuter form of adjectives as in *sonuere maestum* (*Oed.* 570). There is no instance of its use even with a simple pronoun such as *hoc* or *aliquid*, much less with an elaborate pronominal phrase such as the present one. Elsewhere in STrag *nescioquid* is either subject of the verb (*Oed.* 334 *pudet deos nescioquid*) or direct object (*Pha.* 858 *verba nescioquid tegunt*). Here it is surely subject, and *animus* must be corrected to *animo*.[42] (The phrase *hoc anime occupa* 270 makes better sense if the *nescioquid* is swelling *within* the *animus*.) The probable cause of the corruption is reminiscence of passages containing *nescioqui*/*-quis* where *animus* is the subject, *Herc.* 1147–8, *Med.* 917–8 *nescioquid ferox*/ *decrevit animus intus*, *HO* 718 *nescioquid animus timuit*, 745.

Thy. 591 This line is traditionally taken as describing the *navis*, with sails spread 'here and here' (fore and aft?); despite her size, she fears to face the storm ('maria . . . non ausa est tentare valida et velivola navis', Farnaby). This interpretation surely requires A's *spatiosa* rather than E's *speciosa* (*pace* Zw.[43] and Tarrant), since it is her size, not showiness, that might allow her to survive rough weather. But this interpretation has an obvious weakness, namely that the ship's size is designated by her spread of sail under the very circumstances when her sails would be furled, not spread.[44]

Leo was therefore right to attach 591 by punctuation to 592, so that it describes the deep (*alta*) *after* the storm has subsided, 'arrayed with sails spread far and near' (reading *speciosa*). The focus of the simile is, after all, the sea, not the ship. This interpretation reveals that the order of lines is disturbed, since it is 592, not 591, that makes a contrast with 590 and reinforces what was said in 589: *sterno*, as often, denotes the calming of the sea (*OLD* s.v. 6b), and *patuere* is a 'perfect of instantaneous result'

[40] The standard context is one of acknowledging a newborn infant, but here the phrase is transferred to a different context.

[41] Only *Thy*. 731 and 1032 in alternative questions, and *Phoen.* 579.

[42] This *animo* might be mistaken momentarily for an ablative of comparison under modern conditions of silent reading. But in antiquity an actor or recitator would have prevented any such confusion by his inflection, as e.g. at *Oed.* 17 *nobis maius* and *Thy*. 210 *animo magis*.

[43] Zw., *Gnomon* 41 (1969), 768.

[44] Seneca shows acquaintance with the principles of sailing at *Med.* 321–8 and *Ep*. 77.1–2.

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press

(Tarrant on 110 *stetit*). 591, then, should be transposed after 592. For timid ships in a storm (590) juxtaposed with calm seas (592) cf. *Herc.* 553–4 *timidis . . . navibus/ stat . . . pelagus. Navis* regularly designates a substantial vessel, and that connotation is underlined here by the contrast with *cumbae*. The aesthetic appreciation of the scene in 591 follows well after the appearance of the pleasure craft in 592, and in turn the visual pleasure of 592 is well followed by that of 593.

University of Victoria JOHN G. FITCH
jfitch@uvic.ca

https://doi.org/10.1093/cq/54.1.240 Published online by Cambridge University Press