Veritatis Amicitiaeque Causa

Essays in Honor
of Anna Lydia Motto
and John R. Clark

Edited by
Shannon N. Byrne
and
Edmund P. Cueva

Claudian *Castores*: Seneca and Crispus

George W. Mallory Harrison
Xavier University

During late antiquity, the middle ages, and into the Renaissance, a *corpus* of seventy-two poems, largely composed in elegiac couplets and early imperial in style, preserved in the *Anthologia Latina*, had come to be attributed to Seneca.[1] The *Codex salmasianus* (Paris lat.10318; *saec.* VIII) and the *Codex thuanaeus* (Paris lat. 8071; *saec.* IX–X) attribute three of the poems to Seneca in the *lemma* to each poem, while the *Codex vossianus* (Lat. Q. 86; *saec.* IX) gathered the *corpus* together without attribution or comment. The supplement to Haase's 1852 Teubner was the first to accept nine of these poems as genuine, the first three of which are the ones attributed to Seneca in the two oldest surviving manuscripts. Subsequent scholars have, with one exception, been more critical, although everyone has taken Haase's judgment as his or her starting point.[2] The only full text and commentary to all of the poems is that of Prato, whose 1964 second edition to the *Epigrams* is in many senses less bold and sanguine

---

[2]Prato (2 esp. n. 7) has gone so far as to admit unease over even the poems which have manuscript authority because of lack of verbal parallels in the plays. Estefanía (124–27) adduces several instances in which the *Codex salmasianus* incorrectly attributes poems to well-known writers.

than his original 1955 publication. His text is largely that of Riese's 1894 Teubner edition of the *Anthologia Latina* while further advances in the text have been made more recently by D. R. Shackleton Bailey in his 1982 edition of the first volume of the Teubner *Anthologia Latina*.

Although some doubts persist, a consensus favoring authenticity has formed around these poems, making them an appropriate place to start:

Haase 7, Riese 232, Shackleton Bailey 224, Prato 1

Omnia tempus edax depascitur, omnia carpit,
    omnia sede movet, nil sinit esse diu.
flumina deficiunt, profugum mare litora siccat,
    subsidunt montes et iuga celsa ruunt.
quid tam parva loquor? moles pulcherrima caeli   5
    ardebit flammis tota repente suis.
omnia mors poscit: lex est, non poena, perire;
    hic aliquo mundus tempore nullus erit.

Haase 1, Riese 236, Shackleton Bailey 228, Prato 2

Corsica Phocaico tellus habitata colono,
    Corsica, quae patrio nomine Cyrnus eras,
Corsica, Sardinia brevior, porrectior Ilva,
    Corsica, piscosis pervia fluminibus,
Corsica terribilis, cum primum incanduit aestas   5
    saevior, ostendit cum ferus ora Canis.
parce relegatis, hoc est, iam parce sepultis:
    vivorum cineri sit tua terra levis.

Haase 2, Riese 237, Shackleton Bailey 229, Prato 3

Barbara praeruptis inclusa est Corsica saxis,
    horrida, desertis undique vasta locis.
non poma autumnus, segestes non educat aestas,

canaque Palladio munere bruma caret.
umbrarum nullo ver est laetabile foetu   5
    nullaque in infausto nascitur herba solo.
non panis, non haustus aquae, non ultimus ignis;
    hic sola haec duo sunt: exsul et exsilium.

Although much of the language is conventional, these three poems by repetitive cadence and word choice nevertheless convey the despair, the anger and the anguish[3] of Seneca's relegation to Corsica from AD 41 to AD 48, putatively on a charge of adultery with Julia Livilla, one of the sisters of Caligula and niece to the newly enthroned Claudius. No one has ever challenged the assumption that any of the other poems accepted by Haase or in the *Codex vossianus*, if composed by Seneca, should belong to this period, and thus stylistic and other affinities to these three must form the first level of evidence on which arguments for or against authenticity of these poems and the two about Crispus must be based.

Another level of evidence is literary reminiscence: echoes from Ovid are only to be expected and are not hard to find. Such influence is hardly remarkable since Ovid's poems, the *Metamorphoses* in particular, were rich veins continuously mined by almost all of the early imperial writers. For Seneca's epigrams, however, echoes seem to come principally from the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto*, and the echoes are intelligent ones, appropriate to their context. Further, Seneca seems to have been one of a discrete number of admirers of Catullus and Tibullus among the later Julio-Claudian and early Flavian writers.[4]

---

[3]One might conveniently compare the less charged language of Seneca's *consolationes* to his mother and to Polybius; parallels in tone and emotional color are more readily to hand in Catullus' farewell to his brother or Ovid's brief in *Tr.* 2.

[4]The evidence here, however, may be skewed since most of the literary remains of the reigns from Tiberius through Titus are in prose. The poets drawn to the court of Nero form the only exception.

A more weighty kind of evidence is afforded by the verbal echoes and reminiscences, and the similarity of language, diction, and rhetoric which one notices between the *Codex vossianus* epigrams and Seneca's plays. The themes of the nine poems accepted by Haase and the plays are remarkably similar: violence, treachery, injustice, ingratitude, and desolation. Although these themes animate all of his work of all periods, there are definable differences in tone and language between his plays and poems and the philosophical essays. Even so, one is struck by the continuity of thought and style among the plays and poems and earliest philosophical works, such as *De Ira*, generally dated to the beginning years of his exile.

Comparisons are complicated, however, by the apparent lack of consensus among scholars on the absolute dating of the plays, even though some general areas of agreement exist. Tarrant's surmise that the *Thyestes* and *Phoenissae* belong to Seneca's years of retirement from court has found approval and been seconded by Fantham's credible reconstruction of the *Phoenissae*.[5] The relative chronology established by Fitch in 1981 has been met with almost universal agreement.[6] The majority of the plays must thus belong to the period of exile or to the years of his restoration to court up to the death of Claudius. Few have been as assured as Costa in dating the plays specifically to the period of exile,[7] although no one is willing to dismiss the possibility.[8] At the very least if the epigrams are not contemporary with the plays, they are very nearly so.

One poem among the nine Haase considered genuine stands out for its tenderness:

---

[5]Tarrant (1985) 12; Fantham (1983) 61–76.
[6]Fantham (1982) 14 is the exception.
[7]Costa 7.
[8]Scholars are united in preferring the death of Claudius as the *terminus ante quem* for the plays other than *Thyestes* and the *Phoenissae*. The disagreement is on a *terminus post quem*; see, for example, Ahl 14, Coffey and Mayer 3, and Pratt 12–13.

Haase 6, Shackleton Bailey 401, Prato 14

Crispe, meae vires lassarumque ancora rerum,
    Crispe, vel antiquo conspiciende foro,
Crispe potens numquam nisi cum prodesse volebas,
    naufragio litus tutaque terra meo,
solus honor nobis arx et tutissima nobis   5
    et nunc afflicto sola quies animo.
Crispe, fides dulcis, placideque acerrima virtus
    cuius Cecropio pectora melle madent,
maxima facundo vel avo vel gloria patri,
    quo solo careat si quis, in exsilio est: 10
an tua, qui iaceo saxis telluris adhaerens,
    mens mecum est, nulla quae cohibetur humo?

Its repetitions and sequence of phrases in apposition immediately associate this poem with the ones which have manuscript authority. Among many other kinds of similarities, it shares with the first poem rhetorical questions and a much more limited use of superlatives than is generally observable in the works of other Late Augustan and in Silver Latin poets; with the second it shares a need to establish identity through ancestry; and with the third it shares the images of rocks and of exile. Allusions cannot be expected to be as numerous or obvious as one might like or should expect, since the tone of this poem is markedly different from the other three.[9] The echoes from the *Aeneid* and from the *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex*

---

[9]Even here one would expect a poet of the first rank to be able to invert the same language in diametrically opposite contexts, such as Martial, who used *notam, superbam, nobilem, locupletem* to describe Erotion (5.37.22) in the longest of his *epitaphia* but sarcastically styled Fabullus (5.37.6) than whom *numquam nequior fuit clavis* as an *equiti superbo, nobili, locupleti.*

Ponto assure an early imperial date and at the very least point to Seneca.[10]

If so, the addressee most probably is C. Sallustius Passienus Crispus,[11] namesake of the historian, Seneca's close friend,[12] and perhaps most importantly husband of Agrippina during the AD 40s.[13] The allusion to Crispus' death in the closing phrase of line 12 and the conceit of death-as-exile in line 10, itself an inversion of the conceit of death-as-exile so familiar from Ovid's *Tristia* and *Epistulae ex Ponto* and Seneca's epigrams, would assign this poem and the following one to the closing months of AD 47 or the first half of AD 48. In addition to its formal structure as a lament, it almost certainly also was written out of gratitude for attempts to effect Seneca's recall. It adds to the *pathos* of these two poems that Crispus himself seems to have died just before the petition of recall could be granted and thus narrowly missed being re-united with his friend in Rome.[14]

---

[10]For example: *Aen.* 1.45 *scopulo infixit acuto* parallels line 11; *Aen.* 4. 3–5 on the virtues of Aeneas are echoed by verses 5–7. The imagery of the exile as sunken ship in *Tr.* 1.5.36 *naufragio, Tr.* 2.470 *naufraga, Tr.* 2.99–100 is picked up by verse 4; *Tr.* 2.577–778 prefigures verses 5–6; *Tr.* 1.6.12 *nulla positum cernere possit humo* is restated in verse 12. Although Vergil and Ovid remain a staple of Latin authors of all periods, up to and including such poets as Claudian and Sidonius Apollinaris, Ovid's *Tristia* and *ex Ponto* are less often cited in later literature. The conjunction of reminiscences from Vergil and from Ovid's poetry from exile, neither of which is significant in isolation, places these poems on a standing with the *Einsiedeln Eclogues*, the poems of Statius, and other late Julio-Claudian and Flavian poems and distinguishes them from poetic practice of later centuries.

[11]Also known from Martial and Juvenal, both of whom shared Seneca's high opinion of Crispus.

[12]It is not without significance that they built upon a friendship inherited from their fathers who were apparently on familiar terms.

[13]He had formerly been the husband of Domitia, sister of Nero's father, and was thus at once Nero's uncle and his step-father. In excoriating Agrippina for marrying her uncle, one often forgets that she had already married her brother-in-law.

[14]The timing of Crispus's death, which was suspiciously convenient for Agrippina's purpose, fueled speculation of complicity by her, which has largely been accepted.

Shackleton Bailey 443, Prato 53

Ablatus mihi Crispus est amicus,
pro quo, si pretium darem liceret,
nostros dividerem libenter annos
****

nunc par⟨s⟩ optima me mei reliquit,
Crispe, praesidium meum, voluptas,   5
†custos†, deliciae. nihil sine illo
laetum mens mea iam putavit esse.
consumptus male debilisque vivam
plusquam dimidium mei recessit.

My friend Crispus has been taken from me,
for whom, if I were allowed to pay such a price,
I should gladly divide my remaining years
****

As it is, the greatest part of me has deserted me,
Crispus, my protection, my pleasure,   5
†my guide†, my delight. My mind has already
decided that there can be no joy without him.
So, diminished, ill shall I live and feebly
as more than half of me has gone away.

1. amihi *V*: amicus *Baehrens*, amici *Scaliger*: *fortasse* amice (=*xenie*)
ut singularis vocativus scriptus ad lectorem Graecis stelis. 3. post v.
3 unum versum excidisse suspicor. 4. pars *Prato*: par *V.* 6. custos
scripsi: pectus *Prato*: lusus *Francius*: decus *Wakefield*: portus
Baehrens. 7. putavit *V*: putabit *Prato. V.* 8. iam male *V*: male
Shackleton Bailey

There should be little doubt that the same writer was the author
of both of these poems. The epithets of Crispus in both poems are
complimentary. The bittersweet tone of both is consistent,
particularly in the *chiaroscuro* of moving from warm imagery to
dark. In both cases Seneca, as also in his *consolationes*, cast his
plight in mythological terms, first seeing himself as Ajax the

Locrian defiantly clinging to the rocks[15] and then wishing that he could share his remaining years, like Castor and Pollux. It would be wrong to push the analogy too far, identifying Seneca with the immortal Pollux.[16] Seneca himself was careful to call Crispus the *pars optima mei* and *plusquam dimidium mei* (10); this last is especially touching since it draws its inspiration from Horace's *propempticon* (*Carm.* 1.3.8) to Vergil.

This is one of only three non-elegiac poems among those collected in the *Codex vossianus*, and so the meter requires some explanation. This poem and also *Anth. Lat.* 442 and *Anth. Lat.* 458 were composed in hendecasyllables, yet while this poem is a lament the other two are diatribes against other philosophers (*Anth. Lat.* 442) and against a faithless lover (*Anth. Lat.* 458).[17] The threnody to Crispus, however, bears many similarities to the meter, especially of the choruses, in Seneca's plays in that there are no resolutions, few substitutions, and fewer elisions.[18] Each line

[15]This was one of Seneca's two favorite myths for representing his plight; cf. *Ag.* 528. The other frequent myth in Seneca is Hercules's constant reproach that no one, mortal or deity, was grateful that he rid the world of monsters. Although it might be objected that Ajax the Locrian was an unflattering comparison, the other two heroes who clung to rocks, Ulysses and Philoctetes, were also unsavory types in Roman literature of the Empire.

[16]Ovid writing to an unnamed friend at *Tr.* 1.3 and 1.5 intriguingly compares them to Theseus and Pirithous. Like Ajax the Locrian, this metaphor cannot be read too closely since Ovid unlike Theseus went unaccompanied into his Hell.

[17]Although discussion and documentation belong elsewhere, both of these poems by word choice, caesura and cadence are unlikely to have been by Seneca.

[18]That tragedies were performed during the Roman Empire is incontrovertible and thus the production of Seneca's tragedies seems probable; see Rosenmeyer (1993) 235–44. Anecdotes in Suetonius and Tacitus point to production, and Greek revivals (Jones 39–52) would imply Roman dramas as well. Theater construction and modification, as attested in the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan and in the physical evidence, are senseless without an audience, and *stelai* recording salaries paid to actors survive (Harrison 174). Side-stepping the issue of production, recitation was popular and animated (Goldberg 265–86) and is parodied by Persius in his first satire, and even in private one read

begins with a spondee, such as also many of the choral odes in the plays, followed by a choriamb, two iambs, and a syllable anceps. Diaeresis occurs almost uniformly after the choriamb. Likewise, octo- and decasyllabic lines in the choruses normally start with a spondee and often end with rhythms similar to *Ablatus mihi Crispus*, such as many of the lines in the first chorus of Seneca's *Hercules Furens*, particularly 125, 133, 146, 159, 182, and elsewhere. Examples are as readily to hand in the other plays.

The case for a Senecan composition of *Ablatus mihi Crispus* is very strong even without reference to *Crispe, meae vires*. Comparison with the *Agamemnon* alone, one of the three earliest of the plays,[19] should suffice. Lists of character traits are a standard feature of set speeches, such as at line 43 and elsewhere. Early in his career, Seneca seems to have distinguished between *credo* and *puto*, using the former for positive thoughts and outcomes, and the latter for negative ones. Thus *putavit* (8)[20] points to a world without joy, while at *Agamemnon* 694 the leader of the Chorus of Trojan Women sums up by saying *miseris colendos maxime superos putem* ("I would think that the gods should be especially worshiped by the distraught"), and Clytemnestra sneers at Electra's threat to kill her and Aegisthus with *et esse demens te parem nobis putas?* ("are you mad enough to think that *you* are a match for *us*?" *Ag.* 961). *Credis* would imply that Electra was equal to the task; *putas* exposes its futility. In the sticomathy between Agamemnon and Cassandra after 790, Agamemnon chides Cassandra as she stares vacantly with *credis videre te Ilium?* implying that (1) she does see

aloud, if the evidence of Caesar's lip reading and Jerome's silence is allowed.

[19] The three groups of plays as defined by Fitch and commonly accepted are: 1. *Agamemnon, Oedipus*, and *Phaedra*; 2. *Hercules Furens*, [*Hercules Oetaeus*], *Medea*, and *Troades*; 3. *Phoenissae* and *Thyestes*. There is also consensus that 1 and 2 are closer in date to each other than 2 is to 3.

[20] The perfect *putavit* should be retained rather than Prato's *putabit* since *consumptus* (9) makes it clear that Seneca's mind was made up; unfortunately *iam* cannot be used as testimony since it appears with verbs of all tenses in the plays.

it and (2) that she thinks it a good thing. After Agamemnon assures Cassandra that Mycenae was not Troy, Cassandra, knowledgeable that Clytemnestra is the half-sister of Helen and likewise an adulteress, replies *Ubi Helena est Troiam puto* ("Wherever there is a Helen there is a Troy," *Ag.* 795), implying that she can see prophetically that no good shall come from it.

So, too, *laetus* in the poems and plays points to a happiness which is ephemeral,[21] unfulfilled, or bound to be disappointed; *gaudium* is the norm for a true joy, although even *gaudium* can be used ironically. It is thus appropriate that the joy which is impossible without Crispus should be *laetum* (8), just as Eurybates when about to describe losses at sea on the return voyage, complained to Clytemnestra that *infaustum iubes / miscere laeto nuntium. refugit loqui mens aegra* ("you order me to mix an unsuitable message with a happy one. The mind shrinks from sad tidings," *Ag.* 416-417). Likewise, Strophius near the end of the play (*Ag.* 924) comes upon Electra crying and asks what cause is there for tears in a house which should be happy *(fletus causa quae laeta in domo est?)*.

There are enough indications to presume that one or more lines are missing after line 3. *Dividerem* (3) privileges the well-known story of Castor and Pollux relieving Seneca of the obligation to retell it. Nor, following his practice in the plays, does it presume that he intended to inform the reader to what purpose he wished to put the years he proposed to apportion with Crispus. *Libenter* here and *libens,* which occurs throughout the plays, generally receive elaboration, and thus *libenter* wants either an *ut*-clause or a *qui*-clause to round out the period. Just as *annos* (3) never ends a

---

[21]*Laetum . . . diem (Her. O.* 1187) was supposed to have been his wedding day, but became his funeral instead, an inversion of the tradition of singing threnodies to a bride; see Oakely and Sinos (4 n. 5), who document this practice in Greek art and literature. Senecan distinctions in his use of near synonyms, such as *puto/credo* and *laetus/gaudium* are discussed in greater detail in the fourth chapter of my forthcoming book, *Fortunate for Two Senecas and Lucan.* What is remarkable is the consistency of these nuances from his earliest works, such as *De Ira,* through to the *Epistulae ad Lucilium.*

sentence in the plays, *nunc* (5) almost invariably starts one.[22] Further, except when governed by an imperative, *nunc* normally marks either a conclusion in which the parts are linked chronologically, or a shift in subject. One is, therefore, tempted to posit a brief *lacuna*, yielding a ten line poem. Although there are no observed patterns of length for threnodic hendecasyllables, such as there are for elegiacs, Seneca in the other poems (all of which are elegiac couplets) most often thought in two and four line units. Iambic *epitaphia* in Martial, for example, vary greatly in length as well as depth of sentiment. It is likewise observable in Martial that subjects of iambic *epitaphia* often have other poems written about them in elegiacs.

The polyptoton of *me mei* (5) is a typical feature of Seneca's and one which recalls Ovid's two collections written in exile. The device is used three times within a hundred lines in the *Hercules Furens* 99, 110, and 197, as well as *Troades* 916 and 994, *Medea* 969, and elsewhere. The repetition can be taken to be a sign of the self-absorption of the speaker, but in this poem as in Ovid *Tr.* 1.2.20 and 22 and *Tr.* 1.11.12 it seems equally also an expression of despair and desertion.

Crispe (6) is a vocative in apposition to *pars optima*, and hence *praesidium, voluptas, custos,* and *deliciae* are all also appositional vocatives. This makes more difficult any conjecture for the mutilated text at the beginning of line 6; it should be an *os/us* vocative, thereby making the choice a fourth declension noun, a third declension noun in -*os*, or a Greek loan word.[23] Prato's *pectus* has been printed by Shackleton Bailey, yet *pectus* in the plays is used more literally of a chest which is beaten (women) or one which is struck (men); it is generally absent as a term of endearment. The fourth declension plural *lusus*, suggested by Francius, would have a parallel at Martial 4.87.2. Even though Martial is one of Seneca's

---

[22]*Anth. Lat. 401 SB* line 6 is an inconvenient but interesting exception from Senecan practice.

[23]The problem with the text may go as far back as the Vandalic recensions and recensions under Justinian, and thus belong ultimately to uncial manuscripts; see Estefanía 123.

more frequent and astute imitators, the context of this poem is so different that it is of dubious value. At 4.87 *lusus* and *delicias* are cooed over an infant, while Bassa's devotion to motherhood (*pedere Bassa solet*) is questioned.

The vocative *custos* is not entirely satisfactory, but it offers the advantages of fitting the meter and the context. Seneca, like Plutarch, often thought in pairs of near synonyms, a contributor to forceful *clausulae* as well as a habit of mind. Thus in lines 6 and 7 *voluptas* and *deliciae* both speak to the pleasantness of their relationship, while *praesidium* acknowledges one in which Seneca found himself obliged to the courtesies which Crispus could extend. A kindred expression of such a relationship, which is not so formal or socially stratified as that of a *cliens* to his *patronus*, is *custos*, which would seem to speak to an aggressive protection, rather than the defensive *praesidium*.

The case for Senecan authorship, if strong, is entirely circumstantial. One thus has a responsibility to investigate the possibility of other authors and addressees. Although there are over a hundred known Crispi, and countless others unknown to history, the style of the Crispus poems is definitely that of Silver Latin. The reminiscences from Ovid plus the imitations in Martial yield twin *termini* which make it all but certain that the Crispus addressed is the consul of AD 44. A date far after his death in AD 48 is unthinkable since the widow Agrippina and the widower Claudius would surely have found his memory uncomfortable. The writer of *Ablatus mihi Crispus* was clearly conversant with *Crispus, meae vires* and well disposed towards it. He thus had to be within the circle of dissemination of Seneca's poems between AD 44 and AD 48. One presumes a very limited group since Seneca was officially *persona non grata*.[24] Echoes in structure, sense, word usage, and

---

[24]One dismisses the possibility that the latter poem could have been written in ignorance of the former. Literacy rates, particularly at the highest attainment levels, were exceptionally low in antiquity, and the existence of well-defined circles fairly guaranteed that all major literary figures knew each other. For literacy rates, see Bowman and others in Humphrey's collection of essays.

rhythm look to the same hand. Given such skill in handling a meter other than the elegiac couplet or epic hexameter, only one poet active at the time is a plausible candidate, Seneca.

The two Crispus poems are of great importance to an understanding of Seneca and a re-evaluation of his personality and position at court and for this reason their authenticity must be rigorously established and then staunchly defended. Too often Seneca is viewed too glibly as a dour Stoic or as a Stoic who preached moderation while he amassed obscene wealth. The Crispus poems, however, show a man capable of deep tenderness and even more importantly genuine gratitude.

After word. If one accepts that Seneca was the author of the five poems reproduced in this article then there might be grounds to revisit Leo's dismissal in 1878 of the *Hercules Oetaeus* as genuine.[25] The case is not without difficulties and the thesis complex enough to deserve to be examined with reservation. That said, if one triangulates preferred sources of verbal reminiscence and techniques of composition among the poems, the *Hercules Oetaeus*, and Seneca's other plays, the over-lay of patterns for these three groups would favor a surmise that the author of one was the author of all. Catullus and Tibullus, for example, find echoes in the *Hercules Oetaeus*: the chorus of Oechalian maidens at *Hercules Oetaeus* 104 enters singing *Par ille est superis*, a strong echo of Catullus 51.1, particularly strong since both Lesbia and Hercules proved disappointments.[26] Similarly, *vagus per artus errat (Her. O. 706)* and *Tu quicumque es (Her. O. 592)* look to Tibullan models.

Cadence and rhythm in the choruses of the *Hercules Oetaeus* are also remarkably similar to the plays and to *Ablatus mihi Crispus*. *Her. O.* 641 closely parallels lines 5 and 10 of *Ablatus*

---

[25]The case against Senecan authorship was best laid out by Friedrich. Rosenmeyer (1989, xvi), while voicing doubts, is unwilling to distance the play from Seneca, as is also (if less so) Sandbach 160–61.

[26]So, too, *tantum ut* is extremely rare yet occurs at Catullus 72.3 and Seneca *Hercules Oetaeus* 639; these references are owed to a discussion by Carmine Ianicelli and Luciano Stupazzini on ClassL 28 Aug 1997.

mihi Crispus, while the cadence of *Hercules Oetaeus* 1336 is equivalent to line 5. The strongest parallel is at 1344–1345 where *quis tibi exiguam tui partem reliquit* matches the rhythm, words, and sentiment of line 4.

The *Hercules Oetaeus* conforms to Seneca's distinction between *puto* and *credo*. At 1301–1303 since Hercules is trying to provoke Jupiter he reverses *crede* and *puto*. Hercules similarly reverses the two verbs sarcastically when he bemoans his paternity; compare as well *meus credetur Amphitryon pater* (1248), *credi novercam Juno* (1500), and *credi meus pater* (i.e. Juppiter, 1507). References to Orpheus and Thebes follow Seneca's normal pattern, such as, *vati credere Thracio* (1100) and *Semelenque puta* (i.e. Alcmena, 1916). One might also adduce *putant Getae* (1041). *ardere credas* (i.e. Mt. Pindus) would seem problematical except that it is contrasted almost immediately with *urere addentem putes* (i.e. Hercules, 1744); that is, it is much more likely that Pindus will burn than that Hercules will. The strongest evidence of Senecan dichotomy in his use of *credo* vs. *puto* is at 1978–1981 where Alcmena sees Hercules *ex machina*. First she says *fallor an voltus putat* but when she comes to believe she says *credo triumphis*.

The disjunction between *laetus* and *gaudium* is also observed in the *Hercules Oetaeus*, such as when Hercules put on a brave face while surmounting his funeral pyre: *laetus adeone ultimos / invasit ignes?* (1608–1609). Later on, Hercules advised his mother not to cry so as to deprive Juno of *Schadenfreude*: *Iuno cur laetum diem / te flente ducat? paelicis gaudet suae / spectare lacrimas* ("Why make Juno's day with tears? She exults to see the sadness of her rivals," *Her. O.* 1675–1677). None of this evidence is in and of itself decisive nor is its sum incontrovertible; yet, it seems full enough to point more to the master than a mimic.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Ahl, Frederick. 1986. *Seneca: Three Tragedies*. Ithaca.

Shackleton Bailey, D. R., ed. 1982. *Anthologia Latina I: Carmina in codicibus scripta*. Leipzig.

Bowman, Alan K. 1991. "Literacy in the Roman Empire: Mass and Mode." In *Literacy in the Ancient World*, edited by John H. Humphrey, 119–31. *JRA*, Supplement 3, 1991. Ann Arbor.

Burriss, Eli Edward. 1932. *Seneca in Corsica*. New York.

Coffey, Michael and Roland Mayer, eds. 1990. *Seneca: Phaedra*. Cambridge.

Costa, C. N. D., ed. 1973. *Seneca: Medea*. Oxford.

Estefanía, Maria Dulce. 1991. "Il codice salmasiano e gli epigrammi di Seneca." In *Seneca e la cultura*, edited by Aldo Setaioli, 121–29. Perugia.

Fantham, Elaine. 1983. "*Nihil iam iura natura valent*: Incest and Fratricide in Seneca's *Phoenissae*." In *Seneca Tragicus: Essays on Senecan Drama*, edited by A. J. Boyle, 61–76. Victoria.

—, ed. 1982. *Seneca's Troades*. Princeton.

Fitch, John G. 1981. "Sense-pauses and Relative Dating in Seneca, Sophocles, and Shakespeare." *AJP* 102:289–307.

Friedrich, Wolf-Harmuth. 1954. "Sprache und Stil des *Hercules Oetaeus*." *Hermes* 82:51–84.

Goldberg, Sander M. 1996. "The Fall and Rise of Roman Tragedy." *TAPA* 126:265–86.

Griffin, Miriam T. 1976. *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics*. Oxford.

Haase, Friedrich, ed. 1852. *L. Annaei Senecae 'Opera quae supersunt': Supplementum*. Leipzig.

Harrison, George W. M. 1994. *The Romans and Crete*. Amsterdam.

Jones, C. P. 1993. "Greek Drama in the Roman Empire." In *Theater and Society in the Classical World*, edited by Ruth Scodel, 39–52. Ann Arbor.

Leo, Friedrich, ed. 1878. *L. Annaei Senecae tragoediae*. Berlin.

Oakley, John H. and Rebecca H. Sinos. 1993. *Weddings in Ancient Athens*. Madison.

Prato, Carlo. 1964. *Gli epigrammi attribuiti a L. Anneo Seneca*. 2nd ed. Rome.

Pratt, Norman T. 1983. *Seneca's Drama*. Chapel Hill.

Riese, A. 1894. *Anthologia Latina*. Leipzig.

Rosenmeyer, Thomas G. 1993. "Seneca's *Oedipus* and Performance: the Manto scene." In *Theater and Society in the Classical World*, edited by Ruth Scodel, 235–44. Ann Arbor.

—. 1989. *Senecan Drama and Stoic Cosmology*. Berkeley.

Sandbach, F. H. 1975. *The Stoics*. London.

Segal, Charles. 1986. *Language and Desire in Seneca's Phaedra*. Princeton.

Tarrant, R. J., ed. 1985. *Seneca's Thyestes*. Atlanta.

—. ed. 1976. *Seneca: Agamemnon*. Cambridge.

Westman, Rolf. 1983. "*Fore, fore ut* und *futurum* bei Seneca." In *Studies in Classical and Modern Philology Presented to Y. M. Biese on his 80th Birthday*, edited by Y. Blomstedt, 163–69. *Annual of the Academy of Sciences*, Series B 223. Finland.

Zwierlein, Otto, ed. 1986. *L. Annaei Senecae tragoediae*. Oxford.