

INTERPOLATION HUNTING IN SENECA TRAGEDY, OVID, AND HORACE

S. J. HEYWORTH

AMONG THE MANY DISTINGUISHED CONTRIBUTIONS that Richard Tarrant has made to the study of Latin poetry—the insightful commentaries, the informed and cautious textual criticism—his work on interpolation stands out. In the 20th century, there had been a deep divide between those critics (e.g., Jachmann, Knoche) for whom this had been the essential approach, the way to solve most textual problems, and those equally radical critics for whom deletion was an insult to their conjectural prowess.¹ Other scholars, such as Zwierlein in his work on Senecan tragedy and Nisbet on Juvenal, had combined both techniques, but what Richard did in two papers in the 1980s² and again in his elegant little volume *Texts, Editors, and Readers* (2016) was to provide a theoretical underpinning based on a good sense of how transmission works. Central to this is the move away from loaded language of forgery and fraudulence:³ interpolators are readers interacting with the text and trying to improve the experience of reading by correcting, annotating, or collaborating with the perceived aims of the author—in short they behave like philologists. But because their work has had effects on the manuscript tradition, it can seem pernicious: such

I am grateful to Irene Peirano and Lauren Curtis for the invitation to participate in the book, even though I was unable to attend the conference; and to Tristan Franklins and Tobias Reinhardt, who read the whole piece and suggested a number of improvements. Tobias and I have together conducted classes on the textual criticism of Seneca tragedy since 2005, and I owe much to our discussions in those.

¹ Cf. Tarrant 2016a:86 on Shackleton Bailey.

² Zwierlein 1986a and b; Nisbet 1995, items 2, 15, 17. And see Tarrant 1987, 1989a. Tarrant 1989b concentrates on verbal substitutions.

³ Tarrant 1987:283–284; revisited at Tarrant 2016a:87.

adjectives should be reserved for the results, however, not the motivation. The sublime climax of this approach came in the observation that “the first reader of the *Metamorphoses* to introduce a ‘collaborative’ interpolation in it may have been Ovid himself.”⁴

How better to pay honor than to use the skills I have learned from reading and applying these lessons? What follows are notes on poetic texts on which Richard has worked and is working: the tragedies of Seneca, Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, and Horace. All the notes discuss interpolation, though in one or two there are other focal points. As we shall see, the *Agamemnon*, the subject of Richard’s first commentary, still seems a rich hunting ground: though the edition puts 545–546 and 548 in square brackets⁵ (the latter deleted by Leo, the former by Richard himself), full boldness in following the quarry’s tracks seems to have developed later, mainly through work on the *Metamorphoses*, where the presence of alternative and additional lines in a number of passages forces the editor to confront what readers and scribes have been doing to the text.

I. SENECA AGAMEMNON 92–101

Nubibus ipsis inserta caput
 turris pluuiio uapulat Austro,
 densasque nemus spargens umbras
 annosa uidet robora frangi;
 feriunt celsos fulmina colles,
 corpora morbis maiora patent,
 et cum in pastus armenta uagos

95

⁴ Tarrant 1987:297.

⁵ Also the unmetrical 934 *is* an obvious sententious intrusion (see Fitch 2004b). In 545–546 *superasse nunc pelagus atque ignes iuuat, / uicisse caelum Palladem fulmen mare*, we have a metrically defective line, an obvious doublet, and in *Palladem*, an unparalleled form and a name that distracts from the direction of Ajax’s speech before he addresses the goddess in 550. An alternative to deleting both lines would be to suppose that the doublet has resulted from embellishment of Senecan material: perhaps the speech opened with *uicisse* (or *superasse*) *caelum pelagus atque ignes iuuat*.

uilia currant⁶,
 placet in uulnus maxima ceruix: 100
 quidquid in altum Fortuna tulit,
 ruitura leuat.⁷

The chorus reflects on how taller structures and larger creatures are more vulnerable to storms, lightning, selection for sacrifice, and, in short, the whims of fortune. Within this verse, line 97 stands out as unconventional and inaccurate: larger bodies are more open to storms and thunderbolts but not obviously to disease, to which “all bodies are vulnerable”⁸: compare the passage of Arellius Fuscus pater, quoted by the Elder Seneca at *Suasoriae* 6.6, arguing for Cicero to accept death: *nihil aliud intercidet quam corpus fragilitatis caducae, morbis obnoxium, casibus expositum, proscriptionibus obiectum*. Richard’s commentary cites *Florus* 1.45 *corpora quo maiora erant, eo magis gladii ferroque patuerunt* and the vaguer *περισσὰ ... σώματα | πίπτειν βαρείαις ... δυσπραξίαις* from Sophocles *Ajax* 758–759: no parallels for *morbis* here. According to Richard’s apparatus, Stuart⁹ conjectured *maius*, but (besides the lack of complement for *patet*) this is not normal Latin—*magis* is the adverbial form, and there is no adequate parallel in Seneca. This looks like an interpolation, a reader’s expansion of a sententious sequence; but it is also possible that it began from something like *corpora maiora patent*, a gloss summing up the sequence, with *morbis* added to turn the words into an anapaestic dimeter.

⁶ The *currunt* of some later manuscripts is appealing here: the *cum* clause is not causal, and the opposition between this and *placet in uulnus maxima ceruix* seems stronger if the sense is temporal (“when the common herd is running into the open pasture, the highest neck is the one that pleases for sacrifice”) rather than concessive. Tarrant (1976a:191) and Fitch (2004a:133) both use “while” for *cum*, which nicely fudges the distinction.

⁷ “The tower that sets its head amidst the very clouds is beaten by the rainy South Wind, and the wood that spreads dense shade sees its aged timber broken; thunderbolts strike high hills, bigger bodies are exposed to diseases, and though the common herd runs into the grazing pastures, the loftiest neck pleases for sacrifice: whatever Fortune has raised up high, she lifts to dash down again.”

⁸ Tarrant 1976a:191.

⁹ It does not appear in Stuart’s publications of either 1911 or 1912, so I assume it comes from his unpublished dissertation.

II. SENECA AGAMEMNON 610

Another gnomic intrusion in a choral passage of the Agamemnon comes in one of the **polymetricodes** (604–610, with Zwierlein’s text and numeration):

Solus seruitium perrumpet omne	
contemptor leuium deorum,	605
qui uultus Acherontis atri,	
qui Styga tristem non tristis ¹⁰ uidet	
audetque uitae ponere finem:	
par ille regi, par superis erit.	
O quam miserum est nescire mori! ¹¹	610

604 solus seruitium perrumpet omne Zwierlein:
p- o- seruitium E: p- o- solus A

So ends the first, generalizing section of the ode, before the chorus of Trojan women begin to describe their experiences in enduring the city’s fall. Truly heroic is the individual who dares to seek death, in the manner of Hercules, Socrates, or Cato, and indeed of Astyanax and Polyxena, as readers of Seneca may observe (cf. *Tro.* 1102 *sponte desiluit sua*; 1151–1159). The sequence comes to an effective climax with line 609. And then line 610 gives a surprising twist: how miserable by contrast is the one who does not know how to die. As the chorus are alive and miserable, this may seem relevant; but the diction, which reprises *miseros libera mors uocet* (591), gives less point to *miser*, which now reflects on the ignorance of others and not the misery of the chorus.¹² The words are to be condemned, not only for their

¹⁰ *trepidus* Giardina, perhaps rightly: the assimilation would be easy. Wills (1996:229–230) has nothing especially similar to the phrasing here (but note Ovid *Pont.* 3.9.35 *cano tristia tristis*).

¹¹ “Only the man who scorns the unreliable gods shall break out of all servitude, he who sees the face of dark Acheron and without sadness the sad Styx and dares to put an end to life: he is equal to a king and to the gods. Oh, how unhappy it is not to know how to die.”

¹² I owe this point to Tristan Franklins.

isolation from the run of thought but also for their meter: this is the only anapaestic verse in the two polymetric odes in the play.

III. SENECA *OEDIPUS* 709–712

Amid the polymetric sections of the *Oedipus* too, there is just one anapaestic line (709):

Non tu tantis causa periclis,
 non haec Labdacidas petunt 710
 fata, sed ueteres deum
 irae secuntur.¹³

This is the very start of the song, and the second half of the ode reverts to anapaests (738–763), so the inconcinnity is less marked, and the parallelism of phrasing does more to integrate the line within the context. Boyle 2011:278 comments on the absence of the copula; he compares *Herc.* 1122, but in any case *tu es* is easily conjectured here. And yet something seems to be wrong: on the one hand, *non tu* and *non haec* are in parallel; on the other, *non haec ... fata* has its sense determined by the contrasting *sed ueteres deum / irae*. What follows in the ode will illustrate the divine-sent monstrosities that have dominated Theban history; *haec fata* are today's ill-omened pronouncements reported by Creon from the mouth of Laius's ghost (626–658; n.b. *non ira deum*, 630). Leo conjectured *hinc* for *haec*, which Zwierlein rejects as un-Senecan in a causal sense.¹⁴ *Nunc* might be a better alternative, to contrast with *ueteres*.¹⁵ But deletion of 709 would simply remove the initial confusion—and also the conversational *tu* as Oedipus departs (708), unorthodox at the start of a choral ode, and the very vague use of *periclis*. The line is a reader's attempt to make the chorus engage with Oedipus, summarizing, if imprecisely, the substance of the ode.

¹³ “It is not you that are the cause of such perils, these fates are not aimed at the descendants of Labdacus, but ancient manifestations of divine anger are in pursuit.”

¹⁴ Zwierlein 1986b:259.

¹⁵ Tristan Franklino suggests *nec nunc*.



IV. SENECA AGAMEMNON 159

Mythology is another area that incites embellishment. Let us examine the debate between the nurse and Clytemestra at *Agamemnon* 155–163:

Nut.	At te reflectat coniugi nomen sacrum.	155
Clyt.	Decem per annos uidua respiciam uirum?	
Nut.	Meminisse debes sobolis ex illo tuae.	
Clyt.	Equidem et iugales filiae memini faces et generum Achillem: praestitit matri fidem.	
Nut.	Redemit illa classis immotae moras	160
	et maria pigro fixa languore impulit.	
Clyt.	Pudet doletque: Tyndaris, caeli genus, lustrale classi Doricae peperit caput! ¹⁶	

Clytemestra is committed to capping her adultery with a greater crime, and (as happens typically in the second episode of the tragedies¹⁷) the subordinate figure, here the nurse, tries to restrain her. In this passage she reminds her to respect the institution of marriage and then to remember who the father of her children is. Clytemestra responds that her husband has been away for ten years and left her a widow, and to the second point, she says that what she remembers is Iphigenia's wedding ceremony. The nurse argues that she brought an end to the calm and the fleet's inactivity, and Clytemestra in turn regrets that she has reduced her glorious line to being a source of sacrificial victims. This text all flows with rhetorical aptness—as long as we omit 159. That

¹⁶ “Let the sacred name of marriage turn you back.’—‘After ten years of being a widow am I to think of my husband once more?’—‘You ought to remember your children by him.’ ‘For my part I remember the wedding torches of my daughter, and my son-in-law Achilles: she (or he) showed loyalty to a mother.’—‘She bought an end to the delaying of the stationary fleet and set in motion seas frozen by sluggish inactivity.’— It shames and grieves me: daughter of Tyndareus, offspring of heaven, yet I have given birth to a sacrificial victim to purify the Greek fleet.”

¹⁷ So Medea and her nurse in the *Medea*; Phaedra and her nurse in the *Phaedra*, Atrous and his “satellite” (*satelles* E; *seruus* A) in *Thyestes*; Deianira and her nurse in *Herc. Oet.*; Octavia and her nurse in the *Octavia*. Tarrant (1976a:192) sees the origin of such figures in the nurse of the Euripidean *Medea*; but there is presumably a rich history (Euripides's *Phaedra* also has a nurse as confidante, and family slaves regularly play important supporting roles in comedy).

Achilles was the intended bridegroom is not relevant for Clytemestra's argument, but the real problems come in the second half of the line. Fitch translates "he kept true faith with the mother" and helpfully explains that "he" is Agamemnon (so too **Richard**).¹⁸ This cannot be right: normally in such a sentence *matri* would refer to the mother of the subject; more fundamentally two individuals have been mentioned since Agamemnon, and one of them is Clytemestra's daughter. Before lighting on Agamemnon, the reader or audience has to reject Achilles and Iphigenia as subjects, having determined that neither, in any relevant way, kept faith with their mother. There is also a grammatical point: after *memini* Seneca follows the norm that puts human beings in the genitive (e.g., 157, *Phaedra* 242). Richard's commentary sees that the shift of subject is very abrupt, considers emendation and positing a lacuna, but ends up retaining the transmitted text: "Here Seneca achieves compression at the expense of point." No, this is the embroidery of another, weakening the rhetorical concision with a display of mythological information.

V. SENECA AGAMEMNON 120

Deleting verse 159 deals with an acknowledged problem. It will be more controversial to find an interpolation in this passage from the **soliloquy**¹⁹ with which Clytemestra opens the scene (*Agamemnon* 116–124):

Tecum ipsa nunc euolue femineos dolos,
 quod ulla²⁰ coniunx perfida atque impos sui
 amore caeco, quod nouercales manus
 ausae, quod ardens impia uirgo face

¹⁸ Fitch 2004a.

¹⁹ The audience is told that the speech is to be understood as an internal monologue, partly by *tecum* (in your own mind) in 116 and then explicitly by the Nurse in 126–128 *quid tacita uersas ... ? licet ipsa sileas, ...*

²⁰ Tarrant (1976a:196–197) notes how unorthodox this usage is: "S. otherwise restricts *ullus* to negative, interrogative, and conditional utterances; here, if sound, it would probably be emphatic ('what any unfaithful wife has ever dared')." In the parallels he cites from Lucan, *ullus* is pronominal, and *lex ulla* at Juvenal 10.315 comes in a comparative sentence. We should look for a conjecture: *ausa* perhaps, parallel to *ausae* in 119?

Phasiaca fugiens regna Thessalica trabe: 120
 ferrum, uenena—uel Mycenaeas domos
 coniuncta socio profuge furtiua rate.
 Quid timida loqueris furta et exilium et fugas?
 soror ista fecit: te decet maius nefas.²¹

118 caeca Bentley²²

120 trabe A: graue E: rate recc.

Clytemestra urges herself to produce a dastardly plan, running through the crimes women have committed, the wife uncontrollably blinded by love, the stepmother, the maiden burning with desire that leads her to act against her family's or her country's interest, deeds produced by the sword or poison—or she might just choose to sail away from Mycenae with her lover. But stealing away into exile is a timid act, the kind of thing her sister Helen did. A greater crime suits Clytemestra. Part of the pleasure of such evocative generalizations is that they encourage the audience to find particular examples to match the type figures. Clytemestra illustrates the technique when she rejects adulterous flight because Helen has already done it. To my mind, it detracts from the climactic effect of that ~~choice~~ if the *ardens uirgo* has already been specified as Medea. Richard suggests Stheneboea and Phaedra as possible identities for the *coniunx* and the *nouerca*; Medea too exhibits love for her husband when she gets Pelias killed by his daughters; and later she is a wife whom love drives to commit infanticide as revenge on her husband; Procne's love of her sister Philomela will cause her to commit a similar crime. Medea (again) attempts to get her stepson Theseus killed by his father. As for the *uirgo*, the fratricidal Ariadne fits the description given in 119. Verse 120 then rules that out and distracts us from seeing Medea as the answer also to the earlier puzzles. It is a

²¹ “Now in your mind scroll through the tricks of women, what has been dared by any wife who was treacherous and out of self-control though blinding love, what the hands of a stepmother, what the maiden burning with disloyal passion as she fled the kingdom of Phasis in a Thessalian boat: blade, poison—or steal away on a boat from your home in Mycenae accompanying your partner. Why do you timidly talk of stealing, and exile, and flight? Your sister did such things: a greater crime suits you.”

²² For the source of this and other conjectures, see Billerbeck and Somazzi 2009.

verse written by a reader playing the collaborative game, but included in the text, it spoils that game.

VI. SENECA AGAMEMNON 267–277

- (Clyt.) Det ille ueniam facile cui uenia est opus.
 Aeg. Ita est? Pacisci mutuam ueniam licet?
 ignota tibi sunt iura regnorum aut noua?
 Nobis maligni iudices, aequi sibi, 270
 id esse regni maximum pignus putant
 si quidquid aliis non licet solis licet.
 Clyt. Ignouit Helenae: iuncta Menelao redit
 quae Europam et Asiam paribus afflixit malis.
 Aeg. Sed nulla Atriden uenere furtiua abstulit 275
 nec cepit animum coniugi obstrictum suae.
 iam crimen ille quaerit et causas parat.²³

267 dat Bentley lacunam ante

273 Tarrant, Axelson

273 sed] hunc Damsté: tunc Tarrant

The speech of Clytemestra that ends with line 267 has excused Agamemnon’s exploiting his rights as victor and pointed out that she can scarcely take a hard line on adultery when she is aware of her own culpability. My inclination is then to print Bentley’s *dat* in 267: the indicative makes for a more positive *sententia* and fits better with the adverbial *facile* (“he easily offers forgiveness who needs forgiveness”). If we read *det*, Agamemnon is denoted by *ille*: “he, who needs forgiveness, would easily grant forgiveness”; yet Aegisthus seems to take the *sententia* as applying to Clytemestra as well as Agamemnon when he responds with skepticism about “mutual indulgence” (268). As he points out, Agamemnon is a king, and kings do not expect to be held to the same standards of behavior as their subjects. Yet, the word *reges* never appears, even though kings are thought of as human actors, judging others and biased towards themselves (270); the subject for *putant* has to be extracted from *regnorum* in 269, a noun that is then repeated in 271 (*regni*). The combination of a superfluity and a lack points to corruption, and I suggest that Seneca wrote *ignota tibi sunt*

iura regum uel noua in 269.²⁴ He writes *uel* for metrical convenience where simple alternatives are presented and *aut* could otherwise have been used (*Oed.* 928, *Tro.* 363, 1085). With *regni* below and *noua* later in the line, I suspect that a scribe wrote *regnorum* for *regum*, and then *uel* was changed to *aut* to mend the meter. Or the synonym *aut* was written instead of *uel*, and the noun then adjusted.²⁵ Here therefore I postulate a metrical interpolation.

In the OCT Zwierlein adopted Richard's suggestion of a lacuna before 273, in which Menelaus was introduced as the focus, thus allowing *Atriden* in 275 to refer to him. However, this leaves *ille* obscure in 277, and the reference to Menelaus by name in 273 is awkward if he has already been introduced as the subject. Fitch thus prints Damsté's *hunc* in 275,²⁶ which at a single stroke removes the essential problems, pointing to the more recently named son of Atreus and setting up the contrast with *ille*.²⁷ The picking up of *Menelao* by *hunc ... Atriden* would be even clearer if 274 were omitted.²⁸ Moreover, the verse is irrelevant for Clytemestra's argument and Aegisthus's response: Helen's adultery has been pardoned—why not hers? And though Helen's guilt is compounded by the effects it has had, in this rhetorical context the notion that she has brought equal pain to Asia conflicts with the point. Richard cites a similar passage of Dracontius, *Orestes* 200–20†, where Clytemestra uses as evidence that she and Aegisthus may thrive after the assassination *Lacaenam / interfetricem tot regum, tot populorum, / uiuere felicem post funera tanta quiete*. This phrase may imply that 274 was in the text of the *Agamemnon* by the 5th century; it does not prove that Seneca wrote it.²⁹ If 274 is interpolated, it too may be classed as a mythological embellishment.

²⁴ Giardina (2009) prints his own conjecture *Atridarum*, but the lines are surely generic.

²⁵ As monosyllabic synonyms, the conjunctions easily interchange (*Georgics* 1.288 *aut*] *uel* R; *Georgics* 4.313 *aut*] *uel* bc).

²⁶ Fitch 2004a.

²⁷ Fitch 2004b:159.

²⁸ The line has one unusual feature: the elision of *quae*, not otherwise elided by Seneca when it stands “first in both the verse and its clause”; so Tarrant 1976a:224 (nor is *hae* elided). But as he goes on to note, *qui* (*Herc.* 593, 604) is elided in this position; and *quae* itself is elided at *Herc.* 674, *Thy.* 978.

²⁹ Cf. Tarrant 1989a:139 (on the presence of Ovid *Met.* 8.87 in Priscian 5.16) and 143n45.

VII. SENECA AGAMEMNON 456–484

The expansion of conventional scenes is a frequent source of intrusive lines,³⁰ as one can see in the storm described by Eurybates later in the *Agamemnon*. Richter deleted 481; Zwierlein and Fitch concur;³¹ discussion in our classes on the play led Tobias Reinhardt and me to doubt all of 479–484, an attempt to list the winds with their various weapons (cf. 477 *sua quisque mittunt tela*). Another tricky sequence in the messenger speech is 456–464, which uses anaphora of *iam* to describe the increasing effects of distance and the westering sun, an effect spoiled to my mind by the overemphatic and incoherent 461 *in astra iam lux prona, iam praeceps dies*, a doublet of 460 *iam lassa Titan colla releuabat iugo*.

VIII. OVID METAMORPHOSES 1.299–308

Similar phenomena can be found in the text of Ovid:

Et, modo qua graciles gramen carpsere capellae, nunc ibi deformes ponunt sua ³² corpora phocae.	300
Mirantur sub aqua lucos urbesque domosque Nereides, siluasque tenent delphines et altis incursant ramis agitataque robora pulsant. Nat lupus inter oues, fuluos uehit unda leones, unda uehit tigres; nec uires fulminis apro,	305
crura nec ablato prosunt uelocia ceruo; quaesitisque diu terris ubi sistere possit, in mare lassatis uolucris uaga decedit alis. ³³	

³⁰ See e.g. Tarrant 1989a:140–150.

³¹ Zwierlein 1986b:272; Fitch 2004b:165.

³² *sua* ought to be emphatic; if so, its force is apparently to apply *deformes* to *corpora* too: “now shapeless seals place the bodies characteristic of them (i.e. shapeless).” For such uses of *suus*, see *Fasti* 3.80 (*suus = bellicis*), Heyworth 2007:192, Heyworth and Morwood 2011 (on Propertius 3.13.16, 3.19.8).

³³ “And where slender goats recently plucked the grass, there now shapeless seals place their bodies. The Nereids wonder at groves beneath the water, and cities and houses, and dolphins occupy woods and run up against high branches and move the oak-trees that they strike. A wolf swims amid sheep, the waves carry tawny lions, the waves



At N.Q. 3.27.14 Seneca praises Ovid's vision of the universal flood, quoting 292 *omnia pontus erat, deerant quoque litora ponto* (everything was sea, even shores were lacking to the sea), before complaining about his failure to maintain such grandeur:

ni tantum impetum ingenii et materiae ad pueriles
ineptias reduxisset:

nat lupus inter oues, fuluos uehit unda leones. [304]

Non est res satis sobria lasciuire deuorato orbe
terrarum. Dixit ingentia et tantae confusionis imaginem
cepit, cum dixit:

exspatiata ruunt per apertos flumina campos, [285]

cumque satis arbusta simul pecudesque virosque
tectaue cumque suis rapiunt penetralia templis.³⁴

si qua domus mansit,³⁵ culmen tamen altior huius
unda tegit, pressaeque labant³⁶ sub gurgite turre. [290]

Magnifice haec, si non curauerit quid oues et lupi faciant.³⁷

Verses 286–289 and the first two words of 290 are absent from all the manuscripts save Z, a mid-12th century copy now in Geneva and the sole source for one half of the tradition at this point (see Hine's stemma³⁸). Given that the omitted material is no less sublime

carry tigers; nor is the power of the thunderbolt of use to the boar nor swift legs to the stag when they have been swept away; and, having sought long for the lands on which it might settle, the wandering bird falls into the sea, its wings exhausted."

³⁴ *templis* Z (Genève BPU Lat. 77): *sacris* codd. Ouidiani.

³⁵ Here Z omits the words *potuitque resistere tanto / indeiecta malo*, and it is not unthinkable that they were not in the text of the *Met.* known to Seneca or written by Ovid.

³⁶ *labant* ZHPRW: *latent* F (presumably a sign of contamination), codd. Ouidiani.

³⁷ "If he [Ovid] had not reduced such force of inspiration and content to childish follies: 'a wolf swims amid sheep, the waves carry tawny lions.' It is not entirely reasonable to be playful when the whole earth has been engulfed. He spoke impressively and conceived an image of enormous confusion when he said: 'Rivers spread out and flood over the open plains, and snatch up trees along with crops, herds, men, buildings, and sanctuaries with their temples. If any house remained, higher than its roof the wave still covers it, and under the pressure towers slip beneath the water.' This is sublimely said, if he had not bothered with what the sheep and wolves are doing."

³⁸ Hine 1996:XIII.

(especially 286–287), it seems more likely that the lack is due to a medieval scribe than to Seneca.³⁹ The presence of 304 in the Senecan text is evidence to support its authenticity. However, the discussion refers only to the first half of the line and not the lions of the second half; and the words *fuluos uehit unda leones* are in fact absent from **Z**, the source that has been judged more reliable in its handling of 285–290. In the direct tradition of the *Met.*, the two half-lines *fuluos uehit unda leones* and *unda uehit tigres* were omitted in **HMN**; and in the Berne anthology, the oldest source at this point, these clauses are reordered into a separate line and placed before 306, thus:

Nat lupus inter oues; nec uires fulminis apro,
unda uehit tigres, fuluos uehit unda leones,
crura nec ablato prosunt uelocia ceruo.

The similarity of the ending of *tigres* to that of *oues* could explain an initial omission, ineptly corrected in Berne 363. But these two half-lines are pointlessly repetitive and have none of the engaging paradox present in *nat lupus inter oues* or the observation that neither power nor speed are of advantage in the Flood; in this context the epithet *fuluos*, conventional for lions, is especially inert.⁴⁰ It is therefore tempting to think that in the omission and reordering the Ovidian tradition reflects the addition of these clauses to the original text; and the presence of *fuluos uehit unda leones* in some of the manuscripts of *Naturales Quaestiones* is due to contamination from interpolated copies of Ovid; none of the Senecan manuscripts date from before the 12th

³⁹ There are a number of similar cases in the text of Macrobius: for example the omission of (probably) two and a half lines from Euripides *Troades* 25–27 at *Sat.* 5.22.7, where the ensuing *qui uersus docent* shows that more than three words must have been cited initially, and *discessisse deos a ciuitate iam capta* picks up phrasing from 26 and 27.

⁴⁰ Contrast the instances where sight matters, such as Verg. *Aen.* 4.159 (Ascanius hopes to spot one), or the image of Hercules is in question (*Fasti* 2.339; Verg. *Aen.* 2.722, 8.552). Even at *Met.* 10.551 *impetus est fuluis et uasta leonibus ira* the combination of bright color and anger suggests the fieriness of lions, as touched on by Lucretius at *D.R.N.* 5.901. The phrase *fuluos ... leones* is part of an obviously interpolated passage at *Heroides* 10.85 (Sedlmayer deleted 83–88, rightly, I believe).

century,⁴¹ by which time the tradition of the *Metamorphoses* was widely established.

IX. OVID *METAMORPHOSES* 2.531–541

Di maris adnuerant: habili Saturnia curru
 ingreditur liquidum pauonibus aethera pictis,
 tam nuper pictis caeso pauonibus Argo,
 quam tu nuper eras, cum candidus ante fuisses,
 corue loquax, subito nigrantes uersus in alas. 535
 Nam fuit haec quondam niueis argentea pennis
 ales, ut aequaret totas sine labe columbas,
 nec seruaturis uigili Capitolia uoce
 cederet anseribus nec amanti flumina cycno.
 lingua fuit damno: lingua faciente loquaci 540
 qui color albus erat nunc est contrarius albo.⁴²

532 aethera *HMNUG*: aera *M^bBFLP^c* 541 qui] cui *N^{ac}UB*

Juno has received the assent of the gods of the sea: they will not allow the *paelex* Callisto to pollute the sea as well as the sky (ironically, she thus of course becomes one of the most familiar constellations, the Great Bear, always circling round the pole). Her approach to them has begun in the *aether* (512–513 *quaeritis aetheriis quare regina deorum / sedibus hic adsim?*), and it may well be the *aether* to which she returns in 532; but Juno in the *Aeneid* is associated with the *aër*, recalling the allegorical anagram of Hera, and it would be effective to have her returning to mid-air, where the narrative will leave her until, half a book later, she rises from her throne, covers herself in cloud, and appears on Semele's

⁴¹ Hine (1996:VI) dates the rediscovery to this period.

⁴² “The gods of the sea had nodded in agreement: Juno in her nimble chariot advances into the clear sky on painted peacocks, peacocks as recently painted after the slaughter of Argus, as you had recently been transformed into black wings, talkative raven, though you had been previously white. This bird was once silvery with snow-white feathers, so as to equal entirely spotless doves, and not to yield to the geese that would protect the Capitol with their vigilant cry nor the river-loving swan. The tongue did the damage: the talkative tongue bringing it about, the color that was white is now the opposite of white.”

doorstep (3.256–274).⁴³ Despite the contrast drawn at 1.23 *liquidum spisso secrevit ab aëre caelum*, we may compare 4.667, 11.194, *Am.* 2.6.11 for *liquidum ... aër*.⁴⁴

More troubling is the presence of two parallel ablatives with *ingreditur*: though *ingredi* normally refers to walking (or at least self-propelled movement), there is a parallel for *curru* at 13.251–252 *atque ita captiuo, uictor uotisque potitus, / ingredior curru laetos imitante triumphos*,⁴⁵ but it is surprising to have the additional *pauonibus*. Perhaps Ovid wrote *inuehitur*: then *habili curru* could be taken as a locative or associative ablative with *Saturnia*, and *pauonibus pictis* will be the instrumental with the verb: cf. 14.538 *perque leues domitis inuecta leonibus auras*; 14.597 *perque leues auras iunctis inuecta columbis*.

Mention of the peacocks takes the narrative in an extraordinary direction, back not to the transformation of their tails with the addition of Argus's eyes (1.722–723) but to something that happened “as recently” (*tam nuper ... / quam ... nuper*, 533–534). The changing of the raven from white to black is the start of a completely new narrative sequence, and the dislocation of time (which will continue as we head back into the past in 551–595) is introduced by comparisons evoking the distant future (geese protecting the Capitol, 538–539)⁴⁶ and then the recent past, the swan, created from *Cycnus*, friend of *Phaëthon*, who becomes a river-loving bird out of hatred for fire (2.375–380). The presence of an anachronistic simile here recalls the exemplum drawn from the future in Ovid's model, Callimachus *Hecale*, fr. 74.10–20 Hollis: the day will come “when the raven, which now would compete even with swans and milk in color and the pure crest of a wave, will have a gloomy wing on him as dark as pitch, as the reward *Phoebus* shall grant one day for his news” about *Coronis*.

⁴³ Cloud = ἀήρ/*aër* = *Hera* [by anagram] = *Juno*; see, e.g., Feeney 1991:132.

⁴⁴ *liquidum aether* is transmitted, and surely correct, at 1.67 and *Rem.* 6.

⁴⁵ Even here the ending of *imitante* might imply that it forms an ablative absolute with *curru* (as with *ingreditur iactatis aethera pennis* in 2.835), though the word order, with *captiuo ... curru* embracing *ingredior*, stands against that.

⁴⁶ These lines are the last reference to *Rome* until Book 14. For good discussions of the narrative complexities of the wider sequence, see Keith 1992:39–52, 137–46; Tissol 1997:157–162; Wheeler 1999:130–132; Feeney 1999:27; Zissos and Gildenhard 1999; Barchiesi 2005:279–282 (the last four focusing particularly on the play with time).

The last two lines are, however, the reason for including this discussion here. “The tongue caused the damage; the talkative tongue bringing it about, the color which was white is now the opposite of white.” Verse 541 is obvious nonsense: it is not the color white that has become the opposite of white, but the bird that was white. Grammatically that puzzle can be solved by reading *cui*, but the lack of antecedent is a little awkward, especially when the sentence has begun with a repetitive ablative absolute, and the gender of the bird, feminine in 536, returns to the masculine of the *coruus* (535). The change of gender would be eased if we read *hic* not *haec* in 536 (“He was once a silvery bird”): assimilation of the pronoun to the complement is common, but not universal,⁴⁷ and here it may be a change made in transmission.⁴⁸ The apparent problem of construing *contrarius* may also explain the intrusion of the unnecessary half line *qui color albus erat*: to readers thinking of the bird as a feminine *ales* or *avis*, the masculine *contrarius* needed a noun, and *color*, in its clause, provided that noun. Once we comprehend that *coruus* is the relevant noun, *qui color albus erat* can be omitted as an interpolation, and along with it will go the line-filling doublet *lingua faciente loquaci*.⁴⁹ Bömer points out that the employment of *faciente* to expand an ablative of cause is otherwise not recorded till rather later,⁵⁰ in grammatical and patristic texts.⁵¹ For the brief resumptive sentence, returning to the dominant subject (534–535), one could compare *Fasti* 6.362 *spes erat in cursu: nunc lare pulsa suo est*, where *nunc* introduces a reprise of *Alpino Roma sub hoste iacet* in 358.

⁴⁷ Roby (1889:28) cites Livy 2.38.5 and 3.38.3 as counterexamples; cf. also Vergil, *Aen.* 3.173 *nec sopor illud erat*.

⁴⁸ Anderson (1997) notes that *ales* takes the alternative, masculine gender in 544–545 *ales ... Phoebeius*.

⁴⁹ Cf. 8.190 *a minima coeptas, longam brevior sequente*, rightly deleted by Merkel and omitted by Hollis 1970, and Tarrant 2004.

⁵⁰ Bömer 1969:372.

⁵¹ See Hofmann and Szantyr 1965:133–134.

X. HORACE ARS POETICA 374–378

Another place where I suspect that grammatical supplementation⁵² has led to an interpolated verse is *Ars Poetica* 376:

Ut gratas inter mensas symphonia discors
 et crassum unguentum et Sardo cum melle papauer 375
 [offendunt, poterat duci⁵³ quia cena sine istis:]
 sic animis natum inuentumque poema iuuandis,
 si paulum summo decessit, uergit ad imum.⁵⁴

A reader has supplied *offendunt* as a verb to be read within the *ut* portion of the sentence, and the causal clause was subsequently added to complete the verse and provide what was seen as offensive in *symphonia discors*, etc. Wrongly: if you are enjoying a pleasant dinner, the last thing you want is a band playing out of tune. You would not be able to enjoy the company or the music, and the party would quickly turn to disaster (*uergit ad imum*): just so with poetry—it only works when the reader is confident that it is excellent and gives pleasure. Trickier within this run of thought are the perfume too thick to pour and the roasted poppy seeds coated with unpleasant flavored honey—judgment here is less absolute and, unlike the cacophonous music, the guest could simply avoid them, as verse 376 says. Perhaps Horace, the *bon viveur*, has added two pet hates to his list of things to avoid when giving a party, or perhaps this is a prior interpolation, due not to the poet but to a later reader. Without 375 (as well as 376), the sequence is easy to read, and it may be that here, as elsewhere,⁵⁵ one interpolation has provoked another.

⁵² On perceived syntactical incompleteness as a motive for interpolation, see Tarrant 1987:288–289.

⁵³ Brink (1971) questions the soundness of the verb.

⁵⁴ “Like discordant music at a pleasant dinner party, and a thick perfume and poppy-seeds with Sardinian honey [offend, because the meal could continue without them], so poetry, born and created to delight the mind, heads to the depths once it has fallen a little from the heights.”

⁵⁵ See Tarrant 2016a:98. Of course, the theory, though valid in itself, opens the way to an infinity of editorial pruning.

XI. HORACE *SERMONES* 1.4.2

Richard rightly stresses as a feature of interpolation “the use of language found elsewhere in the same author, often in the same work.”⁵⁶

An apparently unidentified instance comes in Horace *Sermones* 1.4.1–5:

Eupolis atque Cratinus Aristophanesque poetae
 atque alii, quorum comoedia prisca virorum est,
 siquis erat dignus describi, quod malus ac fur,
 quod moechus foret aut sicarius aut alioqui
 famosus, multa cum libertate notabant.⁵⁷ 5

The poets of Old Comedy freely named those who deserved to be described as criminals or bad characters. Though Eupolis, Cratinus, and Aristophanes were not the only writers of Old Comedy, it is hard to see why Horace has amplified these exemplary names⁵⁸ with the “vague etcetera” of verse 2.⁵⁹ The ungainly phrasing is an obvious reworking of *Serm.* 1.10.16:

Ridiculum acri
 fortius et melius magnas plerumque secat res. 15
 Illi scripta quibus comoedia prisca viris est
 hoc stabant, hoc sunt imitandi.⁶⁰

This line is clearly the original of the two: it has a function—providing the subject for *stabant* and *sunt*—and it carries the meaning “the writers of Old Comedy” just as the sequence of names does in 1.4.1.

⁵⁶ Tarrant 2016a:100.

⁵⁷ “The poets Eupolis, Cratinus and Aristophanes, and the other men to whom Old Comedy belongs, if anyone deserved to be depicted, on the basis that he was a rogue or thief, an adulterer or murderer or in some other way a figure of ill-repute, they used to point him out with considerable freedom.”

⁵⁸ The three poets appear together as the canonical figures (equivalent to Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Euripides) also at Velleius Paterculus 1.16.3 *una* [scil. *aetas illustravit*] *priscam illam et ueterem sub Cratino Aristophaneque et Eupolide comoediam*.

⁵⁹ Gowers 2012:153.

⁶⁰ “Ridicule generally cuts through important topics better and more firmly than severity. Those by whom Old Comedy was written based themselves on this, in this they are to be imitated.”

Once again we see interpolation arising from a habit of commentary, in this case the cross-reference.

XII. HORACE *EPODES* 5.29–40

Abacta nulla Veia conscientia	
ligonibus duris humum	30
exhauriebat, ingemens laboribus,	
quo posset infossus puer	
longo die bis terque mutatae dapis	
inemori spectaculo,	
cum promineret ore, quantum exstant aqua	35
suspensa mento corpora;	
exsuca ⁶¹ uti medulla et aridum iecur	
amoris esset poculum,	
interminato cum semel fixae cibo	
intabuissent pupulae.	40

Rudd's translation in the Loeb runs as follows:

Veia, inhibited by no sense of guilt, dug a hole in the ground with an iron mattock, grunting with exertion, so that the boy might be buried up to his face (as a swimmer's body floats with its chin just clear of the water), and suffer a slow death gazing at food that was changed two or three times in the course of the long day. Their intention was that, when his eyeballs had finally rotted away from staring at the forbidden food, his dried-up marrow and liver should be cut out and used as a love charm.

Watson notes that *quo* to introduce a purpose clause is archaic and cites no parallel;⁶² it seems worth wondering whether it has replaced *cui* (perhaps written *quoi*), which would give the dative found

⁶¹ So Cunningham 1721, and some later editors: see Brink 1982:37–38. Despite the translation “dried-up,” Rudd prints *exsecta*, “cut out” (2004:282).

⁶² Watson 2003:211.

elsewhere of burial in the earth, e.g., Vergil, *Aen.* 11.204–205 *corpora ... / multa uirum terrae infodiunt*.⁶³ In either case the text presents one final clause (*exsua uti medulla etc.*, 37–40) as dependent on another (32–36); this might explain why Horace chose to use *quo* for *ut*, but the inelegance would be lessened if the first clause was introduced with a relative. Rudd’s sense of elegance has separated the long sentence into two, and brought forward the implications (but hardly the phrasing) of 35–36. With *cui* 32–36 would mean “in which the boy might be buried and die amid the sight of food changed two or three times in the course of the long day when he was sticking out by the length of his face as much as bodies suspended by the chin stand above water.” Within this the couplet 35–36 is redundant, tautological, and awkward. In the first place, what is the force of *cum*? Surely “while”; and we could print *dum* (the subjunctive being attributable to the purpose clause). But more serious problems rather commend deletion: the *quantum* clause simply duplicates *promineret ore*; and what are these bodies “hung by the chin”? Mankin thinks there is an evocation of Tantalus here, and the water washing against his chin at *Odyssey* 11.583;⁶⁴ but *suspensa* indicates a comparison to bodies floating in water, which rules out Tantalus, who is standing (ἑσταότα, 583). On the other hand, bodies do not float with heads sticking above the water, and yet *suspensa mento corpora* is hardly a natural way to evoke swimmers. Without the couplet, the text tells us all that we need to know: the boy is to be buried alive but with his face uncovered so that he can see (34, 39–40). A reader’s attempt to draw out the implication precisely has been turned into the ugly tautology transmitted.

WADHAM COLLEGE, OXFORD

WORKS CITED

- Anderson, W. S. 1997. *Ovid. Metamorphoses Books 1–5*. Norman, OK.
 Barchiesi, A. 2005. *Ovidio. Metamorfosi*. Vol. 1. Rome.

⁶³ OLD s.v. *infodio* 1 adds later examples.

⁶⁴ Mankin 1995:120.

- Bömer, F. 1969. *P. Ovidius Naso. Metamorphosen: Kommentar, Buch I-III*. Heidelberg.
- Boyle, A. J. 2011. *Seneca. Oedipus*. Oxford.
- Brink, C. O. 1971. *Horace on Poetry: The Ars Poetica*. Cambridge.
- . 1982. “Horatian Notes III.” *PCPS* 28:30–56.
- Feeney, D. C. 1991. *The Gods in Epic*. Oxford.
- . 1999. “*Mea tempora*: Patterning of Time in the *Metamorphoses*.” In Hardie, Barchiesi, and Hinds 1999, 13–30.
- Fitch, J. G. 2004a. *Seneca. Tragedies*. 2 vols. Cambridge, MA.
- . 2004b. *Annaeana Tragica: Notes on the Text of Seneca’s Tragedies*. Leiden.
- Giardina, G. 2007–2009. *Seneca. Tragedie*. 2 vols. Pisa.
- Gowers, E. 2012. *Horace. Satires Book I*. Cambridge.
- Hardie, P., A. Barchiesi, and S. Hinds, eds. 1999. *Ovidian Transformations: Essays on Ovid’s Metamorphoses and its Reception*. Cambridge.
- Heyworth, S. J. 2007. *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*. Oxford.
- Heyworth, S. J., and J. H. W. Morwood. 2011. *A Commentary on Propertius Book 3*. Oxford.
- Hine, H. M. 1996. *L. Annaei Senecae. Naturalium Quaestionum Libros*. Stuttgart.
- Hollis, A. S. 1970. *Ovid. Metamorphoses Book VIII*. Oxford.
- Hofmann, J. B., and A. Szantyr. 1965. *Lateinische Syntax und Stilistik*. Munich.
- Keith, A. M. 1992. *The Play of Fictions: Studies in Ovid’s Metamorphoses, Book 2*. Ann Arbor, MI.
- Mankin, D. 1995. *Horace. Epodes*. Cambridge.
- Roby, H. J. 1889. *A Grammar of the Latin Language from Plautus to Suetonius*. Part 2. London.
- Rudd, N. 2004. *Horace. Odes and Epodes*. Cambridge, MA.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1953. “Some Recent Experiments in Propertian Criticism.” *PCPS* 2:9–20.
- Stuart, C. E. 1911. “Notes and Emendations on the Tragedies of Seneca.” *CQ* 5:32–41.
- . 1912. “The MSS. of the Interpolated (A) Tradition of the Tragedies of Seneca.” *CQ* 6:1–20.

- Tarrant, R. J. 1976a. *Seneca. Agamemnon*. Edited with a commentary. Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 18. Cambridge.
- . 1987. "Toward a Typology of Interpolation in Latin Poetry." *TAPA* 117:281–298.
- . 1989a. "The Reader as Author: Collaborative Interpolation in Latin Poetry." In *Editing Greek and Latin Texts: Papers Given at the Twenty-Third Annual Conference on Editorial Problems, University of Toronto, 6–7 November 1987*, ed. John N. Grant, 121–162. New York.
- . 1989b. "Silver Threads Among the Gold: A Problem in the Text of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*." *ICS* 14 (1/2):103–117.
- . 2016a. *Texts, Editors, and Readers: Methods and Problems in Latin Textual Criticism*. Roman Literature and its Contexts. Cambridge.
- Tissol, G. 1997. *The Face of Nature: Wit, Narrative, and Cosmic Origins in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Princeton.
- Watson, L. C. 2003. *A Commentary on Horace's Epodes*. Oxford.
- Wheeler, S. M. 1999. *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Philadelphia.
- Wills, J. 1996. *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*. Oxford.
- Zissos, A., and I. Gildenhard. 1999. "Problems of Time in *Metamorphoses* 2." In Hardie, Barchiesi, and Hinds 1999, 31–47.
- Zwierlein, O. 1986a. *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*. Oxford.
- . 1986b. *Kritischer Kommentar zu den Tragödien Senecas*. Stuttgart.