

εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν εὐρηγῆ' ἂν πάλαι, ἐνεκά γε τοῦ μηδὲν ἡμῶς αὐτοὺς ποιῆν εἰλέειν, ἀλλ' οὐκ εἰσίν. Questo periodo, che non va accolto nel testo perchè è una glossa da riferire a ποιήσοντας, manca in molti manoscritti tra cui il Parigino greco 2934 (= *J*) ed il Marciano greco Z 416 (= *F*). Il contesto tuttavia, se si prescinde dalle considerazioni stilistiche che impongono l'omissione di questo periodo, ne esigerebbe lo spostamento dopo ποιήσοντας: dove appunto proposero di collocarlo Gottfried Heinrich Schaefer (*Apparatus ad Demosthenem*, London 1826, I, p. 608) e Peter Paul Dobree (*Adversaria*, II, p. 31 ed. Wagner). Che dopo ποιήσοντας fosse traslocato nel Dresdese Da 11 (ora a Mosca, Archivio degli Atti Antichi, con la stessa segnatura) notò Wilhelm Dindorf (quinto volume dell'edizione oxoniense, 1849, p. 201<sup>2</sup>).

Invece nei seguenti manoscritti εἰ γὰρ ἦσαν ... εἰσίν si trova dopo ποιήσοντας:

- 1) Harley 6322 (XIII secolo) con le sue copie, il Malatestiano D 29 3 ed il Parigino greco 2937;
- 2) Vaticano greco 68e Vaticano greco 70;
- 3) Marciano classe VIII, 4 e Vaticano Barberini greco 104, e inoltre nel Fitzwilliamense 229 (secolo XIV), nel Laurenziano plut. 59. 29 e nel Vaticano Urbinate greco 80. Come variante marginale nel Marciano greco Z 420 e nel Parigino greco 2995.

Καὶ γὰρ ἐπὶ Βυζαντίου πορεύεται συμμάχους ὄντας; οὐχ ἡμῶν, εἰ τάλῃ, ἀλλὰ Χερρονήσου τῆρ μεγίστην ἔχει πόλιν Καρδίαν; (paragrafo 35). Questa interpunzione figura solo in alcuni manoscritti. Gli umanisti lessero e tradussero interpungendo con interrogazione non dopo ὄντας ma dopo ἡμῶν. La mano che ha copiato il Parigino greco 2998 (= *k*), del secolo XIII/XIV, ha notato in margine: „ἢ τὸ οὐχὶ ἀραιωτέον καὶ ἀνευ ἐροσήσιως ἀναγνωστέον ἢ καὶ τοῦτο οὕτως ὡς καὶ τὰ πρὸ αὐτοῦ, ἀλλὰ κατὰ ἀναστροφὴν συντακτέον τὸ οὐχὶ καὶ λεγέσθω γὰρ οὐχὶ ἐπὶ Βυζαντίου;“. Una mano recente ha copiato la stessa nota sul margine del Laurenziano conventi soppressi 168.

2) Questa interessante lezione non è ricordata da Karl August Ruediger nella dissertazione del 1845 *De codice Demosthenis Dresdensi*: e degli editori successivi a Dindorf solo Johann Theodor Voemel (*Demosthenis Contiones*, Halle, 1857) notò la correzione del copista del Dresdese. Friedrich Blass (1885) ed Henry Butcher (1903) presentano lo spostamento come propria proposta; Karl Fuhr (1914) lo attribuisce a Gottfried Heinrich Schaefer; Maurice Croiset (1925) lo attribuisce a Butcher.

3. *Papiro Michigan inv.* 918. - Nel 1925 J.G. Winter pubblicò la trascrizione del papiro inv. 918 della Michigan University („Classical Philology“, 20, 1925, pp. 97-114). Esso contiene i paragrafi 29-35 (τὸν ἀνθρώπων ... εἰ τάλ[λα]) e 61-68 ([προσι]όντος ... ἂν ᾗ[ρήθη]) della *Terza Filippica*, e può essere datato all'inizio del V secolo d. C. Nessuno degli editori di Demostene ha potuto giovare delle varianti di questo papiro. L'unica collazione del quale resta dunque quella di Winter.

Ho riletto il papiro su buone riproduzioni fotografiche: la trascrizione di Winter risulta imprecisa in qualche punto.

1) colonna III, rigo 12 (paragrafo 32). Dopo τους τοποῦς la sillaba cancellata dal copista in fine di rigo probabilmente non è το μα τον

2) colonna IV, rigo 7 (paragrafo 33). Dopo ευχομενοι c'è μὲν (μῆ) non με

3) colonna VII, rigo 16 (paragrafo 65). Non c'è ὁ (lezione che, come Winter osserva a p. 113, concorderebbe con quella del solo *J*) ma ὦ, cioè il solito compendio per ὦ ἄνδρες Ἀθηναῖοι.

Bari

Istituto di Filologia Classica

Luciano Canfora

## THE MEANING OF THE CHORAL METERS IN SENECAN TRAGEDY

Seneca employed a limited number of meters and combinations of them in the choral odes of his tragedies. This is in sharp contrast with the seemingly endless variety found in Greek tragedies. While the apparent barrenness of Latin metrics may be noteworthy principally by comparison with Greek, a language of admittedly greater plasticity, it may also be due to a minor lack of rhythmic finesse in the character of the Romans and other non-Greek Latinists; but it may also be due to the principle that certain meters convey certain attitudes - ethopoeia -, just as in music three quarter time is for waltzes, four quarter for marches, the minor mode for sadness and introspection, and so on. Perhaps another factor is the possibility

2011 III

197-117

1968

that infinite metrical variety and depth of thought may be strange companions; indeed Seneca's polymetric odes may seem less intense, less powerful than many others of his. And it may also be that didactic poetry, such as that of Lucretius, induced Seneca to write long passages of monometric verse: certainly even when he is most lyrical, the burden of his verse in relation to the phases of his dramas is both didactic and philosophical. But if *ethopoeia* was practiced by Seneca and his contemporaries, then not every meter is suitable for inclusion in tragedy; or rather, there are certain varieties of situations and attitudes with which tragedy is not particularly concerned, but others which are basic to tragedy; thus the choice and variety of the meters is subsumed by the situations in the tragedies themselves. Granting this trend of thought, one would expect not only a narrower range of meters than the lyric poets used but also a similarity of theme or motif or mood in all the odes or parts of odes which Seneca wrote in any one particular meter. The relation of function to form in Seneca's choral odes was first examined by Wilhelm Marx over a generation ago in his monograph *Funktion und Form der Chorlieder in den Seneca-Tragödien* (Köln: Peter Kappes 1932, diss. Ruprecht Karls Universität, Heidelberg; this is a German summary of the Latin diss. accepted in 1928 and was published with some additional material on Senecan dramatic technique). Marx discovered that there is a relation between meter and theme; and he made the first steps in analyzing that relation. But since his study did not account for all the odes in any one meter and since some odes in the meters he did analyze do not support his analysis, we will examine the odes and their meters anew. After our examination we will scrutinize Marx's findings.

The meters used by Seneca include anapests, sapphics, glyconics, asclepiads, polymetric structures, iambic ternaries, and dactylic tetrameters and hexameters. These occur in the choral odes. Lyric meters occur also outside the odes in several of the tragedies, but they do not concern us now. By far the most numerous are the anapestic odes; the others are listed as above in order of lessening frequency down to the iambs (one ode only: Med. IV) and the hexameters (metrical variety in the polymetra and the polyschematic odes).

In order to have a handy form of reference, I have labelled each ode by the abbreviation of its play followed by a roman numeral showing its position in its series. For ease in locating

the odes in a text of Seneca – I have used Umberto Moricca's second edition (1947) in the *Corpus Paravianum* – I append here a chart of line numbers; the respective parts of dischematics and polyschematics can be easily identified; the choral inserts in Act IV of HO, all in dimeter anapests, are not included here on the technical but perhaps not really convincing basis that they do not separate acts but merely punctuate one act.

1. Ag. I	57-107	2. HI <sup>2</sup> I	125-203
II	310-407	II	524-591
III	589-637; 638-692	III	830-874; 875-894
IV	808-866	IV	1054-1137
3. HO I	104-172; 173-232	4. Med. I	56-74; 75-92; 93-109; 110-115
II	583-705	II	301-379
III	1031-1130	III	579-669
IV	1518-1606	IV	849-878
5. Oed. I	110-153; 154-201	6. Phaed. I	274-324; 325-357
II	403-508	II	736-752; 753-823
III	709-737; 738-763	III	959-988b
IV	882-914	IV	1123-1148; 1149-1153
V	980-997		
7. Thy. I	122-175	8. Troad. I	67-163
II	336-403	II	371-408
III	546-622	III	705-735
IV	789-884	IV	814-860
		V	1009-1055

#### Anapests

Tabulation and analysis of the subjects of the odes will show whether there is a valid subject-meter relation. The polyschematic odes are listed after the purely anapestic odes; the meters of the separate parts are listed for convenience's sake, as also their subjects.

Ag. I	<i>fallax Fortuna</i>
HI <sup>2</sup> I	<i>casus vitae</i>

Troad. I		<i>fletus Troiae</i>
Ag. II		<i>carmen Phoebæ, Junoni, Palladi, Triviae, Iovi</i>
HO II		<i>casus ambitionis</i>
Med. II		<i>audacia Argonautarum</i>
Phaed. III		<i>fallax Fortuna</i>
HF IV		<i>luctus Herculi furenti</i>
Thy. IV		<i>mundi vices</i>
Oed. V		<i>fatis agimur</i>
HO I	ascl.:	<i>vis Herculis</i>
	anap.:	<i>casus Iolæ</i>
Oed. I	sapph.:	<i>interitus Thebarum; pestis</i>
	anap.:	<i>dira facies leti: pestis</i>
Phaed. I	sapph.:	<i>Cupido impotens</i>
	anap.:	<i>sacer ignis Amoris</i>
Ag. III	polymetra:	<i>planctus Troiae</i>
	anap.:	<i>non lacrimis modus</i>
Oed. III	polymetra:	<i>veteres iræ deum</i>
	anap.:	<i>tanta monstra</i>
Phaed. IV	anap.:	<i>casus humana rotant</i>
	sapph.:	<i>eiulatus Palladi</i>

Metrically, the purely anapestic odes are dimeters with an irregular scattering of monometers except for Ag. II and Troad. I. In manuscript E, Ag. II consists of alternating dimeters and monometers, a format completely different from that of the others; manuscript type A however reverts to the usual form: dimeters, this time with only a final monometer. The schema of E seems to be preferable on the grounds of subject and genre, since Ag. II is a hymn to Phoebus, Juno, Pallas, Trivia, and Jupiter. No other anapestic ode is a hymn; all other anapestic odes in general use stichic anapestic dimeters and fall into categories as outlined below. Other hymns are Med. I (ascl., glyc., ascl., dact. hex.), the epithalamium; Oed. II to Bacchus (polymetra); Ag. IV to Hercules (polymetra). HO 1983-96, not a regular *canticum*, closes the play with an anapestic prayer to Hercules; Phaed. IV ends with a five-line outcry to Pallas in sapphics. Of non-choral lyrics, Medea's incantation invokes the abyssal throng in troch. octon., and Trivia in alternate iamb. sen. and quatern., the epiphany and deadly rites being in anap. dim.; Hippolytus's prayer to Artemis (Phaed. Act I) is in anap. dim. Troad. I presents a contrast between the trimeters and

dimeters of E and the dimeters of A. The subject, the genre, is *fletus Hectori Priamòque*, poured forth by the new captives. No other purely anapestic ode presents wailing for the dead; but of the dischematics, two of which are anapestic in the second half, Ag. III *planctus Troiae* (by the captives as they arrive at Argos) and HO I *planctus Oechaliae* (by Hercules's captives as they huddle in Euboea), do.

The anapestic parts of the dischematic odes are generally dimeters. Ag. III *planctus Troiae* belongs to the same genre as Troad. I, though the handling is different because of the different circumstances. Phaed. IV, the only dischematic anapestic ode not approximately half anapests and half the other meter, has a four-line intrusion of other meters inside the anapests; a similar intrusion is found only in Phaed. II. The five-line prayerful postscript in sapphics is not really tightly bound organically to the preceding anapests in Phaed. IV, though its tone and thought are appropriate to the action and to the development of the disaster-catastrophe sequence.

Minor line variations between E and A, excepting Ag. II and Troad. I, may be tabulated as follows: Ag. I none; HF I 151-152 trim., 153-154 tetram. E; 195, 197 monom. A; HO II 691 monom. E; 690 monom. A; Med. II none; Phaed. III 969, 988b monom. E; 967, 988 monom. A; HF IV 1114 monom., 1136-7 trim. E; 1111 monom., 1135-6 trim. A; Thy. IV 829-830 trim. E; 843, 877, 881 monom. A; Oed. V none, but 996a-b dim., 997 monom. E; 996a-997 dim., 996b monom. A, which is a text variation, not a metrical variation; HO I 207-209 trim., 184 and 212 monom. E; 218-220 trim. A; Oed. I 159 monom. E; 158 monom. A; Phaed. I none; Ag. III 656-658 dim. plus monom. E; dim. plus trim. A; 665-668 trim., dim., trim., 676-678 trim., 681-685 trim., dim., dim., trim., A; Oed. III none; Phaed. IV 967, 988 monom. A; *colla leonis Cererem / magno fervore coquant* 969-970 E. We have here an interesting range of variations in the manuscript tradition: irregular scatterings of monometers, trimeters, tetrameters, frequently without agreement between E and A as to the number of metra in the varied lines. In many cases the difference between the two MSS points not to copyist error but to two separate lyrical arrangements depending, it may be, on two separate musical schemata. I cite only three examples. 1) Oed. I 159 monom. E, 158 monom. A, with 159 ending the sentence. E gives a heavy prefinal line and a light final; A, a light prefinal and heavy

final. 2) HO I 207-9 trim. E, 218-20 trim. A. At the point where Iole recalls her father's death E gives two trimeters and a monometer but A three dimeters and a monometer. Where Iole turns her attention to her own slave state, A gives two trimeters but E three dimeters. The contrast in attitude between the two text types is interesting. 3) Ag. III 664-92 dim. E; 665-8 trim., dim., trim., 676-8 trim., 681-5 trim., two dim., trim. A. This is the passage where the chorus compares their sad song with those of Philomela, Cycnus, the halcyons, the priests of Cybele. A's treatment is here much more lyrical than E's; usually it is the reverse.

Marx, who used the Peiper-Richter text of Seneca, states (p. 19) that monometers, when used, mark the ends of periods. But this marking is not done with any degree of regularity, though editors have often put the monometers where they thought this period-making function to be the most useful to their editing. E and A do not agree on the location of the monometers in a little more than one-third of their occurrences. Scribal variations perhaps; perhaps variations reflecting other kinds of pressure on the text.

The anapestic odes may be arranged in three groupings with well-defined gradations within each group and between them.

1) Odes of lamentation over death and destruction: Troad. I, HO I, Ag. III, HF IV. Three are laments by captives over the death and destruction leading to their captivity; the fourth, HF IV, is the lament over the death and destruction centering around Hercule's madness.

2) Odes expressing change of fortune, generally understood to be for the worse, as is proper for tragedy: Ag. I, HF I, HO II, Phaed. III, Phaed. IV, Oed. V. Within this group, the concept shifts from the fact that while Natura is steady, Fortuna is not (Phaed. III), to the complaint that Fortuna is treacherous, especially to the high and mighty (Phaed. IV, Ag. I), to the idea that a man's own mode of life draws down its own variety of *casus rerum* (HF I), to the statement that the drive for power affects everyone's lot (HO II), to the observation that fate drives a man's life to its fated conclusion whatever the route and despite attempts at interference (Oed. V).

3) Odes of disaster, past, present, or future: HF I, Oed. I, Phaed. I, Med. II, Oed. III, Thy. IV. The disaster may be a disease (Oed. I: the workings of the Theban *pestis*); or the

deranging impact of a god (Phaed. I: the workings of Cupido); or the incipient collapse of the universe (Thy. IV: as if the universe either is at the end of an era or is being returned to chaos); or the workings of the ancestral curse (Oed. III: a foreboding of its workings on Oedipus); or the inexorable working of a divine natural law (HF I: the thematic material drawn from the haunting pastoral points out that each man by his own life creates his own rewards: punishment for those who transgress the bounds of human propriety, as Lycus the example found out and beyond him the main character, Hercules); or delayed disaster regulated by divine law (Med. II: delayed, but imminent, for this ode establishes the violation, Jason's culpability, and the means of producing the disaster).

These groups center on the elements of flux, of non-equality, of unevenness in continuity, of disproportion, of instability in the world, of disruption, of the ruin which comes to men and their affairs, often as a result of divine regulation of the universe. Since the plays are tragedies, the prevailing emotional climate is not happiness, joy, or the upswing in human affairs, but the downswing, the grief, the defeat, unhappiness, the "trap" of life whether already sprung or yet to snap shut. Group 2 specifically expresses the downward turn; group 3, the disasters, the collapses; group 1, the grief for life which has "bottomed out". There seems to be only one exception to this orientation: Ag. II which seems to be connected with these groups only by meter, for it is a hymn invoking five great gods to be near; but even then, the ode carries a double value: not only as a prayerful invocation but also as a sort of divinely ironic summoning of various parts of the disaster-catastrophe sequence. Perhaps this is the explanation of the fact that A reads the dimeters characteristic of the *casus rerum* odes, while E reads a more lyric format, perhaps more suitable for the other aspect of the hymn. Whichever arrangement we accept as Senecan, either the fact that the ode is a hymn permits the use of anapests or, and the anapests add the touch of disaster; for the hymn is a tragic prayer: the gods invoked do not prevent the terrible round of disasters and catastrophes, but contrary to the hymn they countenance them and wait for their occurrence. Indeed my study of the contribution of the odes to the development of the tragic in Seneca's plays shows that the divinities, their attributes, and their actions in this hymn provide essential components for the action as it develops into tragedy.

## Sapphics

The subjects of the odes are tabulated as follows.

Med. III	<i>audaces puniendi</i>
Thy. III	<i>vices vitae</i>
Troad. III	<i>quae sedes habitanda?</i>
HO IV	<i>vindex perit</i>
Troad. IV	<i>miser nemo nisi comparatus</i>
HF III	sapph.: <i>campi silentes Mortis</i> glyc.: <i>laeta dies</i>
Oed. I	sapph.: <i>interitus Thebarum: pestis</i> anap.: <i>dira facies leti: pestis</i>
Phaed. I	sapph.: <i>Cupido impotens</i> anap.: <i>sacer ignis Amoris</i>
Phaed. II	sapph.: <i>forma Hippolyti</i> ascl.: <i>anceps forma bonum</i>
Phaed. IV	anap.: <i>casus humana rotant</i> sapph.: <i>eiulatus Palladi</i>

Of these odes, Med. III presents regular stanzas closed by adonics; no adonics: Phaed. I and IV, HF III; irregularly spaced adonics without final adonic: Troad. III and IV, Oed. I; irregular but with final adonic: Phaed. II; final adonic only: Thy. III, HO IV. The regular stanza form of Med. III shows stanzas of three sapphics, one adonic 579-606; stanzas of eight sapphics followed by one adonic 607-669, except that 660, which should be an adonic according to this schema, is in EA -u-u--// -uu--, a pentapody consisting of an ithyphallic and an adonic; this verse substitutes for the next-to-the-last adonic. There is so far no explanation for this substitution. The shift from four-line stanzas to nine-line stanzas occurs when the ode shifts from Jason and his troubles to the rest of the Argonauts and what befell them.

The underlying unity seems to be the idea of an external power, a power outside men and their own wills, which brings pressure, events, changes of one kind or another to bear on man, the dramatis personae, the situation. In Med. III we have the clear statement that the destinies of the Argonauts have been dictated by the powers-that-be of the universe because of their rash trespass; this is a major step in the thematic development of the supernatural in the *Medea*. In Thy. III, the peace and quiet is so contrary to the Pelopids' normal fraternal rela-

tions that the chorus feels it is the hand of the god Amor; nevertheless Thyestes is at the mercy of a tyrant and his fortunes will change. HO IV is a lament for the dying Hercules whose death will leave the human race bereft of its great vindicator and savior; the great pressure on Hercules pales beside the bereavement of humanity and its great danger. In Troad. III the captives wonder where they will be forced to live. Here the power is apparently principally human, their captors'; this is happening by Jupiter's will, their captors are heroes, and masters have *dominium* over their slaves. A further difference between the Greeks of the *Troades* and Atreus of the *Thyestes* is the curse implanted through Tantalus by the Fury. In Troad. IV the external power is even more clearly that of the master over his slave; by comparison the master forces the slave to grieve; though that divinity is not mentioned here, one sees a typical example of Fortuna's work. In HF III the external force is Hades, to whom we all go willy-nilly. In Phaed. I Cupido provides one of life's basic compulsions which is in varying degrees beyond our control, but certainly is god-produced and god-directed. In Phaed. II, the exterior power producing the involuntary change is Hippolytus's divine beauty over which he has no control; because of it he is and would be pursued by various supernatural agents and is subject to some kind of universal law which brings the beautiful one to disaster. In Phaed. IV the outcry to Pallas concerns the dreadful power of Hades to exact lives in equal numbers despite the special actions of the other gods. In Oed. I the external power is the plague, curse-caused as we soon find out.

The varieties of external force include a deity in Thy. III (Amor or some other deity), HF III and Phaed. IV (Hades), Phaed. I (Cupido), Phaed. II (Cupido, the Nymphs, Diana); a supernatural power in Med. III, HO IV, Oed. I; divine beauty in Phaed. II (perhaps equivalent to Pindar's Hebe); slaves' masters in Troad. III, IV; a tyrant in Thy. III: in Ode IV this tyrant is given the Giants, Tityos, Typhoeus as his parallels.

## Glyconics

The tabulation of the subjects follows the pattern set for the anapests and sapphics.

Thy. II	<i>verum regnum</i>
HO III	<i>sacer Orpheus</i>

Oed. IV		<i>medium iter</i>
Med. I epithalamium:	ascl.:	<i>invocatio deorum</i>
	glyc.:	<i>laus Creusae Jasonisque</i>
	ascl.:	<i>nuptiae</i>
	dact. hex.:	<i>versus Fescennini et deductio</i>
HF III	sapph.:	<i>campi silentes Mortis</i>
	glyc.:	<i>laeta dies</i>

Thy. II is an encomium of the true king who in the play is identified with Thyestes; HO III is praise of Orpheus, done in a very Greek way by recounting his myth, his *res gestae*; Oed. IV is praise of the sagacity of Daedalus in holding to the *medium iter*; Med. I praises the celebrants of the marriage; and HF III praises Hercules directly and by beginning a festival in his honor. We must therefore conclude that glyconics are reserved for praise, a category Marx had correctly designated but had assigned to the two polyschemata only.

The sapphics in HF III, on the gloom of Hades and the inevitability of death, abruptly give way to the joyful glyconics in one of the sharpest transitions in Seneca. The break parallels the ecstatic reversal felt by Thebes and permits the development of an emotional peak from which the disastrous madness will bring the fall.

#### Asclepiads

The subjects of the odes are listed as for the anapests.

Thy. I		<i>poena Tantali</i>
HF II		<i>labor Herculis</i>
Troad. II		<i>post mortem nihil</i>
HO I	ascl.:	<i>vis Herculis</i>
	anap.:	<i>casus Iolae</i>
Med. I epithalamium:	ascl.:	<i>invocatio deorum</i>
	glyc.:	<i>laus Creusae Jasonisque</i>
	ascl.:	<i>nuptiae</i>
	dact. hex.:	<i>versus Fescennini et deductio</i>
Phaed. II sapph.:		<i>forma Hippolyti</i>
	ascl.:	<i>anceps forma bonum</i>

Whereas sapphics depict a power external to man or to the situation, which produces a certain effect on man and the situation, asclepiads point to the forces, the spheres of operation of divine beings, and to the practices due them. Thus Med. I invokes the gods (a prayer) by title, function, and acts of worship

due them, and under their aegis the ode celebrates the marriage rites. HO I is a peculiar kind of hymn: it celebrates the godlike power of Hercules not as a third-person recital of myth, or a recollection of a previous time when the power had benefited the singers, but as a first-person recital of suffering from that godlike power of Hercules who in the course of the play does become a god. This is the difference between HO I and Ag. III, Troad. I; for the latter two are laments for the present state without exaltation of the conquering Greeks; but HO I is praise of Hercules; not in glyconics, which is the praise meter but reserved for praise of men, but in asclepiads, thus anticipating his apotheosis. HF II recounts Hercules's great exploits, recalling the hypomnesis of a hymn, prays that he may overcome again, and ends with what amounts to a credo of his divine power. Troad. II is an Epicurean hymn to the power of Death to kill and kill completely. In Thy. I we have the prayer for release from the curse, coupled with a description of the punishment of Tantalus meted out by the gods. In Phaed. II, after the sapphic declaration of Hippolytus's beauty, the asclepiads discuss the natural operations of beauty and the peculiar powers of Hippolytus's own magnificent physique. The encomiastic tone is strong; Hippolytus is described in terms recalling the description of Hercules. It is interesting that, after 17 lines of sapphics and adonics most of which praise Hippolytus's beauty, the first eight lines of asclepiads praise Hippolytus by admonishing Bacchus that Hippolytus is more beautiful than he is. At this point there is a three-line insert of dactylic tetrameters as an apostrophe to the fleeting treacherous quality of beauty. Then the asclepiads resume but only to discuss at length the topic of the insert. A similar insert of two asclepiads, a glyconic, and a pherecratic occurs in Ode IV just after it begins, as we noted above p. 201; there too the inserted meters introduce the main burden of the ode: the mighty suffer the most. Nowhere else in the surviving Senecan corpus is this technique duplicated.

#### Polymetra, Iambic Ternaries Dactylic Tetrameters and Hexameters

The subjects of these four groups follow in order.

Oed. II	polymetra:	<i>hymn to Bacchus</i>
Ag. IV	polymetra:	<i>hymn to Hercules</i>

Oed. III	polymetra:	<i>veteres irae deum</i>
	anap.:	<i>tanta monstra</i>
Ag. III	polymetra:	<i>planctus Troiae</i>
	anap.:	<i>non lacrimis modus</i>
Med. IV	iambic ternaries:	<i>furor Medeae</i>
Med. I	epithalamium: ascl.:	<i>invocatio deorum</i>
	glyc.:	<i>laus Creusae Jasonisque</i>
	ascl.:	<i>nuptiae</i>
	dact. hex.:	<i>versus Fescennini et deductio</i>
Phaed. II	sapph.:	<i>forma Hippolyti</i>
	ascl.:	<i>anceps forma bonum</i>
	dact. tetr.:	<i>anceps forma bonum</i>
	ascl.:	<i>anceps forma bonum</i>

The two purely polymetric odes are hymns and reflect apparently the metrical freedom of the genre; cf. Ag. II (reading the text of 13, though the anapests do seem to show their peculiar meaning), Med. I (though here the meters follow the subjects). The other two polymetric odes seem to be only casually related. Oed. III discusses the *veteres irae deum*; but Ag. III is the lament by the Trojan captives. There seems to be no way to bring all four together under a thematic classification. Med. IV is the helpless wail by the chorus between the incantation scene and the report by the Nuntius which begins the disaster sequence. There is a feeling of calamity, tragedy, the irresistible overwhelming of humanity which is common to Oed. III, Ag. III, and Med. IV. These are emotions and attitudes properly to be found in tragedy. This normal condition of tragedy utilizes the high, up-lifting solemnity, the reverence, joy, exaltation of Oed. II, Ag. IV, and Med. I to create, outline, deepen the emotions and feelings in the tragedy. The anapests of Oed. III and Ag. III fall into their proper subject category. The use of polymetra in those odes, when compared for example with the anapestic lament for Troy, Hector, and Priam in Troad. I and the ascl.-anap. lament of the Oechalians and Iole in HO I, shows that a particular effect was sought in the production aside from any thematic association with the meter. The lack of further material in iambic ternaries and dactylic hexameters conduces to a similar explanation for them. It is of interest however that the dactylic hexameters which open Oed. II are directions for beginning the religious act of praise; those which close the ode are a vow to continue the

worship of Bacchus; those which close Med. I begin the *deductio ad domum*; all of which point to hexameters as the meter for human observance of ritual. The hexameters within the polymetric ode Oed. II - 429-431, 445-448, 466-471 - do not observe this point but are embedded for some other reason (A reads only one of these hexameters since it omits 430-471).

Dactylic tetrameters occur only in the polyschematic ode Phaed. II. The passage is brief, only three lines (761-3), hardly enough to show or develop a subject-meter relation. It does however apostrophize beauty but so as to reduce its high status by pointing to its decline. Perhaps its function as an insert, as also that of the insert in Phaed. IV, is best described as above: to introduce the main point. Alcmena's lament for Hercules turns to tetrameters when his voice is heard from the heavens, HO 1944-62, the only other occurrence of that meter in the tragedies. That passage is one of rising excitement in which Alcmena very nearly deduces Hercules's translation. Perhaps the point of contact is the idea of slipping away, escaping, eluding, getting out of a particular state or condition or situation one way or another, that is, the idea of change of condition, perhaps being a mark of incipient or semi-divinity.

\* \* \* \* \*

To summarize, anapests convey the instability of human affairs, whether expressed in lamentation for the death and destruction connected with the reversal, or merely in the statement that fortunes do change, or the notice that the disaster has happened, is, or will happen. Sapphics express the idea of an external controlling power of force which may be a deity, an unidentified supernatural power, an overwhelming personal characteristic conceived as a disembodied entity whether curse or blessing, a temporal master. Glyconics are used for praise and celebration. Asclepiads point to the powers and spheres of divinities and to men's relations to them. In the polymetra, iambic ternaries, dactylic tetrameters and hexameters, traces of thematic relations do appear; but it may be that these meters were chosen for other reasons, perhaps music, dance, or other aspects of production. Closer definition of all the choral meters must wait on a closer analysis of the themes and structure of the odes than so far has been done and on a closer analysis of the function of the odes and their themes in the drama themselves.



*Critique of Marx's**FUNKTION UND FORM DER CHORLIEDER*

W. Marx treated not only the relation of meter to subject, but also the "stichic" structure of the odes, that is, the continuous run of a single meter for large blocks of lines; in addition, he examined the technical development of the meters used by Seneca, especially the anapests and the polymetra; and he attempted a description of the interplay of meter and word placement as a means by which Seneca achieved variety in his monometric odes and the polymetra. We will begin with Marx's concept of the relation of subject to meter.

Marx states p. 14 that "catastrophe odes" and odes with philosophic contents reserve the anapests, and that the monopoly of the anapest has negative value for itself, since there is only one anapestic ode not belonging to this category; cf. also fn. 13: "(Katastrophenlieder) ... Abgekürzt für: die Lieder, deren Gegenstand die Katastrophe ist; anapästisch sind HF 1054; Phaed. 959, 1123; Oed. 980; Thy. 789. Med. und Ag. haben kein Lied nach der Katastrophe." The exception to the anapest-catastrophe rule, Med. II, Marx says is anapestic not because of subject, but because it occupies the only position open to anapests in the play (p. 15). Ode I, he explains, is an epithalamium whose form is prescribed; Ode III is suitably in sapphics which express a detached point of view; and Ode IV cannot be anapestic because only six verses stand between it and the long anapestic close of Medea's incantation scene (56 lines in length). But this is an ad hoc hypothesis and as such constitutes a valid test of his categories.

Only four verses lie between the close of Medea's incantation and Ode IV, says Marx (p. 15). This is a minor slip; but there are various other loosely related statements, a few of which create some confusion. For example on p. 15 he says, "Bis auf eine Ausnahme gilt das Monopol der Anapaeste auch negativ für sie selbst; einzig das anapaestische Lied Med. 301 *andax nimium, qui freta primus* gehört einer anderen Kategorie an." But on p. 14 he says, "Wenn die eigentliche Katastrophe in HO 1518 ebenso wie in den Troerinnen 1009 in einem sapphischen Lied besungen wird, so besagt das nur, daß Katastrophenlieder gedämpfteren Charakters auch in Sapphikern abgefaßt werden." And in just the sentence before, "Im wesentlichen sind den Anapaesten vorbehalten die Katastrophenlieder und

die Lieder philosophischen Inhalts"; while he lists the "catastrophe odes", he does not list the philosophic odes. A few lines farther down he says, "Von den philosophischen Liedern sind drei ... in Glykoneen abgefaßt; auch das ist also keine Ausnahme sondern eine Regelform: die Glykoneen sind eben für Philosophica gleichfalls zuständig." Cf. p. 17, "Von den glykoneischen Liedern sind drei bereits als in ihrer Gruppe (Philosophica) legitim anerkannt; das vierte, ... HF 875, hat 'praktische' Funktion: Preis des Herakles... Die Glykoneen des Medea-hymenaeus sind gleichfalls preisend." Also p. 15, "Das eben gewonnene Ergebnis scheint gefährdet durch die Tatsache, daß die oben S. 12, Anm. 12 von mir aktionspartizipierend genannten Lieder alle oder fast alle nicht in Anapaesten gedichtet sind." These odes are Oed. II, Ag. II, Med. I, and HO II, of which Ag. and HO are anapestic, Oed. and Med. are not: hardly "alle oder fast alle". We will look more closely at some of these statements below.

Sapphics, says Marx (p. 16), are reserved for the *febile*, and, *steris paribus*, are the favorite meter (p. 17); cf. p. 14: "Katastrophenlieder gedämpfteren Charakters auch in Sapphikern abgefaßt werden." Glyconics, first noted as reserved for *philosophica* (p. 14), later are extended to include a "practical function": praise (p. 17). Asclepiads produce only a "local" feeling, since "as a rule" they occur in the first ode, actually so in Thy. and HO (p. 17). In HF and Troad. where asclepiads occur not in Ode I but in Ode II, the explanation Marx offers is that the asclepiads really are the first odes of their plays since the *cautica* in the first position are hardly closely connected with their plays and must occupy the first position. The third clear exception, Phaed. II, - three exceptions out of six occurrences, the *Medea* epithalamium being the sixth - Marx dismisses equally cavalierly as a quasi-polyschematic ode.

Let us examine his categories and reasoning in detail.

*Anapests*

As just noted, Marx stressed the connection between the catastrophe and the anapests; his examples are HF IV, Phaed. III and IV, Oed. V, and Thy. IV. He notes that Med. and Ag. have no odes following the catastrophe, that Med. II is the exception to the catastrophe-anapest rule, and that HO I is an asclepiad ode with anapests rather than vice versa or a two-part



ode. Four of this list are entirely anapestic, but Marx omitted six others which are purely anapestic: Ag. I and II, HF I, Troad. I, HO II, Med. II; one Marx cites as dischematic – Phaed. IV – though mostly anapestic, but five other dischematics are passed over: HO I, Oed. I and II, Phaed. I, Ag. III.

Thy. IV, one of Marx's "catastrophe odes", has as its subject *mundi periere vices* 813. The ode takes no notice of the banquet; it is concerned only with the reversal of the sun's course, with the fact that celestial bodies, the constellations, have lost their secure positions with relation to the sun and will tumble into the abyss. But Act IV, containing Nuntius's report to the chorus of the butchery, closes with an exclamation to Phoebus: *fugeris retro ... sero occidisti* 776–8. This may seem to be mere rhetoric, an exaggeration which will suddenly materialize as the act ends and Ode IV begins; but as preparatory rhetoric, it is of a piece with the description just preceding: the fire refuses to roast, the flesh refuses to be barbecued, and the smoke refuses to obey the normal laws of convection. This is an eye-witness report of a supernatural event and must be accepted at face value: all of it, every detail of it. The words actually herald the darkening, for as far as the Nuntius is concerned, the eversion of the natural order of daylight is connected with the banquet, though the chorus seems in some way to lose this information before it begins to sing. Obviously "catastrophe" as used here by Marx can mean only the eversion, the *conversatio* (CGL 5. 352. 11), of the world order whether related to the human mishap or not. Since Ode IV does not discuss the human aspect of the catastrophe, the term cannot refer to the disaster which the human beings have had and are experiencing. In fact the chorus is at a loss to explain the unnatural darkness, cf. 793, 802 ff, which are specific questions expressing ignorance in a paragraph devoted to the fact of the darkness and possible supernatural occasions for this chaotic event; to be sure, the question is not one of complete ignorance but of searching for a deeper meaning beyond mere corroboration of what their senses perceive. The third possibility is that the ode merits the title of "catastrophe ode" only because it comes just at that point in the dramatic action. Apparently this is Marx's view, since he says that the *Medea* and the *Agamemnon* have no odes following the catastrophe, though he also says that Med. II is not a "catastrophe ode" since it does not discuss the catastrophe.

In analyzing the syndrome of the Thyestean "catastrophe", we find two distinct but connected events which are ruinous, followed by a revelation coupled with a recognition and acceptance. The two disasters are the butchery of the sons and the banquet; the catastrophe is the revelation by Atreus and the recognition by Thyestes. The ode is sung after the butchery, during the banquet which has already started, but before the catastrophe. Both disasters take place off stage; a third, the drinking of the bloody wine, seems not to take place at all (983–989). But the catastrophe takes place on stage. At this point we must redefine catastrophe not as the disaster, which is Marx's view, but as the awareness of the disaster. The disaster is physical injury or ruin or misfortune; but the catastrophe is the psychological realization of the enormity of the disaster, the reorientation of one's life because of the disaster.

HF IV, on the *luctus Herculi furenti*, likewise a "catastrophe ode", is sung after the disaster (the killing of Megara and the sons), during the period of unconsciousness, and before the period of recognition which is the catastrophe. The subject is connected with the disaster but does not parallel Thy. IV, which has an extra claim to the title because of its subject. There is a slight implication that the disaster is contrary to what is normal; and the ode does express briefly universal mourning and does foreshadow somewhat the realization which will come.

Phaed. III, the third "catastrophe ode", is sung after one disaster (the accusation-curse sequence), during another (the accident), but before the report of Nuntius which initiates the catastrophe sequence. Ode IV breaks that sequence into three parts: 1) Theseus's initial realization that he has lost his son; 2) Phaedra's realization of what she has caused, which results in her suicide; and 3) Theseus's further and final realization of the tragic mistake. The subject of Ode III is the contrast between the *ordo mundi* and *fallax Fortuna*, which seems much closer to Thy. IV than to HF IV in its topic. While the choral discussion does not mention the disastrous lie and curse, it does look forward somewhat to the second disaster and the catastrophe in a general way; for this is tragedy, the curse predicted is not yet the curse fulfilled, and Fortuna has barely begun to be *fallax* and that to one character only.

Oed. V, the fourth "catastrophe ode", states that *fatis* occur 980. One catastrophe, Oedipus's realization of his parentage, occurs in Act IV; the Nuntius reports the disaster, the

blinding, in Act V; then our ode notes the relation of *fata to res humanas*; and Act IV presents the complicated catastrophe-disaster-catastrophe sequence of Jocasta's suicide on stage. The meeting of Jocasta and Oedipus is part of the catastrophe of Act IV; the realization drives Jocasta to suicide, which in turn brings a further realization to Oedipus. The ode comes long after one catastrophe, after one disaster, and before another disaster and catastrophe, none of which is discussed by the ode. The topic is very close to that of Phaed. III.

These four "catastrophe odes", Thy. IV, HF IV, Phaed. III Oed. V, are entirely anapestic. They occur after (and/or during) the disasters and before the catastrophes. Oed. V tests this statement: there is a catastrophe prior to Ode V, but it is two acts beforehand. When therefore Marx says that the *Medea* and the *Agamemnon* have no odes following the catastrophe, he refers to what we call the disasters. And since, as we have seen, the odes, while presenting topics which are apropos, discuss neither the disasters nor the catastrophes, the designation "catastrophe ode" can refer only to the position of the ode in the play. The only possible exception is HF IV, which expresses grief for the madness and the deeds. It seems not to be a major exception, for the ode is concerned more with the present state of Hercules and the boys and with the deliverance of Hercules than with the deed's doing, more with grief than with moral criticism. When therefore Marx notes that Med. II is the exception to the catastrophe-anapest rule because it does not discuss the catastrophe, he contravenes his own rule; when he proposes that HO I is an asclepiad ode with anapests rather than vice versa or a dischematic ode (p. 14) his lack of explanation is bemusing.

Phaed. IV, a dischematic ode containing only five sapphics as the second and closing meter, is the second of a pair of dischematic "catastrophe odes". It discusses the *casus humanarum rerum* 1123, a theme paralleled by Ode III and Oed. V. Act III closes with the accusation-curse sequence; Ode III, on *fallax Fortuna*, is the first "catastrophe ode"; Act IV is Nuntius's account of Hippolytus's death and contains the first part of Theseus's catastrophe; Ode IV then further develops the thought of Ode III; and in Act V come Phaedra's catastrophe and disaster and the deepening of Theseus's catastrophe. Again Marx's term refers only to position in the play, to the requirements of form.

Of the remaining odes using anapests, Marx notes only

that Med. II (monoschematic) and HO I (dischematic) are not "catastrophe odes".

Med. II, on *audacia*, its manifestations by the Argonauts, and its results, is, according to Marx, anapestic because it is the only position available in the *Medea* for anapests. Since this is the only example of such a formal requirement, the validity of such an ad hoc rule should be questioned; and we are justified in searching not for a formal but a contextual, or better yet, a thematic reason for the anapests. We should note that of the odes not treated by Marx nearly all come very early in their plays, both monoschematics and dischematics: HF I, Ag. I, Troad. I, Phaed. I, Oed. I, HO I, Med. II, Ag. II, HO II, Oed. III, Ag. III. This array, contrasted with the five odes Marx did categorize, certainly destroys the hypothesis that position and meter go together for it holds in only about one-third the number of cases. The count includes not only the anapests but also the non-anapestic odes in what might be called the "catastrophe position", following Marx, i.e. HO III, Med. IV, Oed. IV, Troad. III, IV. An interesting variation in the light of Marx's theory is the fact that the formal relations of Oed. IV and V to the disaster-catastrophe sequence are paralleled by Phaed. III and IV. But formal considerations give way here also, for Phaed. III is anapestic, but Oed. IV is glyconic. Another parallel seems to be Troad. III and IV, both in sapphics.

### Sapphics

Marx uses three classifications: 1) "catastrophe ode" of a more restrained type: HO IV, Troad. IV (p. 14); 2) the meter reserved for the *flebile*: HO IV, Troad. IV, HF III, Oed. I (p. 16); 3) the meter used by preference when a choice was available: Thy. III, Troad. III, Phaed. I (p. 16f). He does not categorize Med. III, Phaed. II, IV. The "catastrophe ode" category, a formal one already proven unsatisfactory for anapests, is not consistent with his other two categories. Even though Marx shrewdly observes that when no clear *ratio* is discernible the *variatio* becomes the *ratio* (p. 16), nevertheless we have already found a proper *ratio*: the concept of an external power which applies some kind of force or pressure or change to the characters or the situation (pp. 204 ff above). Why Seneca, given a free choice for a meter, would choose sapphics which have two distinct uses within Marx's theory is an interesting

question; for if Seneca had a free choice, then he did not need the "catastrophe" tinge nor the *flebile* tinge; why then would he select the one meter which gives both tinges? Thus of Marx's three categories, only the classification of *flebile* stands for examination. But of the ten sapphic odes only four are characterized as *flebile*, three are characterized as having no relation between subject and meter, and three he neglects completely. Such a method and such percentages hardly carry ironclad conviction.

Of the odes classed as "free-choice" odes, Troad. III on the captives' destinations is probably *flebile*. But Thy. III is hardly *flebile* since the chorus celebrates the happy cessation of fraternal hate, though it is true that this attitude of celebration gives way in the last third of the ode to the *casus mobiles rerum* motif 605f which insists that the present calm and concord is, so to speak, the eye of the hurricane. The use of sapphics may be a fine irony in that it betrays the basic feeling in the chorus: this reversal is heartening, but situations change with lamentable suddenness. Phaed. I, on the undirected power of Cupido, of itself is not *flebile* and is an exception to Marx's rule; but if sapphics can be used to express the *flebile* of the context, surely they can add that flavor to a context which of itself is not *flebile* especially if the dramatic context calls for and can utilize the idea of the *flebile* in the dramatic line, though it is highly debatable whether this is true so early in the *Phaedra*. Med. III presents the *grave* and the *saevum* rather than the *flebile*; but there is little difference between the *eiulatus Palladi* of Phaed. IV and the outcries in Med. III 595ff and 668ff. The straight-forward tale of the disasters already suffered by the Argonauts is as readily *flebile* as the collapse of Thebes in Oed. I. Phaed. IV, on the shiftiness of Fortuna for the high and mighty, is not a happy, pleasant ode; but it can hardly be called *flebile* until the anapests give way to the sapphic outcry to Pallas. However, five sapphics as a coda to an anapestic ode seem to be only interesting corroboration but not to make the rule. Phaed. II, which praises Hippolytus's beauty, also presents the *lacrimae rerum*, for he has fled from Phaedra's unholy advances which his beauty provoked. Perhaps it really is *flebile* rather than *mirabile* or *novum* or *dirum* that something so good, so universally sought and admired as *forma* should turn out to be a tragic flaw.

Though a few sapphics clearly present the *flebile*, themes of actual mourning, laments for disaster, death, destruction,

rain, captivity, all of them found in sapphics, are not in sapphics but in anapests. Phaed. I and Oed. I show that the destructive power expressed by the sapphics leads easily to the destructive eversion of nature expressed by the anapests. Similarly in Phaed. IV, it is the alternations of Fortuna expressed by the anapests which produce the tearful outcry in sapphics over the taking of Hippolytus in place of Theseus by Hades, who is a power beyond even Pallas's control. Clearly the relation is something other than the *flebile*.

### Glyconics

Glyconics, says Marx, are reserved for "*philosophica*" without exception, and he so classifies the three purely glyconic odes: Thy. II, Oed. IV, HO III (p. 14, where he notes that anapestic odes also present philosophic contents). But in the two mixed odes, the glyconics have a "practical" function, praise: Med. I, HF III (p. 17). It is true that Thy. II and Oed. IV have a strong philosophical cast which seems much stronger in Thy. II because the discussion is kept in the abstract whereas in Oed. IV an excellent human example becomes the focus for the praise; but nevertheless Thy. II points directly at Thyestes as the true king even if only because as the victim of a tyrant he must as foil be a true king or his disasters and catastrophe lose meaning and sense. The third of Marx's "*philosophica*", HO III on the Orpheus myth, is practically devoid of philosophic content and seems to be a victim of Procrustean classification. One must conclude that glyconics, like sapphics (e.g. Med. III, Troad. IV), handle *philosophica* only because as a general rule Senecan choral odes have a very strong religio-philosophic orientation.

### Asclepiads

Marx believes that asclepiads have a "local" function: they occur only in the first ode of the play (p. 17). He is rather hard put to explain why half the occurrences are in the second ode; and he does not explain why the *Oedipus* and the *Agamemnon* do not have asclepiads at all, let alone in the first or second ode. But it is an interesting fact that asclepiads, aside from their incidental occurrence in the polymetric odes, really do occur only in the first two places. But this is due perhaps to the struc-

ture of tragedy; for the later odes are in a dramatic locale requiring thoughts of tragic responsibility and acceptance. Nevertheless his arguments appear more heroic than necessary because of their ad hoc nature. He classes HF II and Troad. II as actually being in first place because HF I and Troad. I have topics which run rather far afield from their dramas and therefore they can occur only in the first place. Oed. IV presumably therefore also might come in first place, for its topic is similar to HF I. Phaed. II finds another ad hoc reason: it is really a quasi-polyschematic ode, and so it either may come or properly is in second place, even though the genuinely polyschematic Med. I does come first as also the dischematic HO I. Marx does admit that the asclepiad Troad. II as a philosophic ode is barred from anapests because Ode I is the anapestic *amoebaeum*, though twinned anapests occur in Phaed. III and IV, HO I and II, and tripled in Ag. I and II and III, not to mention other twinned meters. Place is therefore an inadequate explanation for the choice of asclepiads.

The remaining choral meters are entirely omitted by Marx.

Marx's classifications rest partly on a formal, partly on a thematic basis, with few comments on the difference and on possible interrelation. The formal aspects are inadequate since they do not deal with the exceptions to his rules nor do they explain odes which do not come under his rules. His thematic considerations are not extended far enough. Hence the need to find a consistency for Senecan use of the choral meters, one based on thematic considerations. The relationships uncovered in the first portion of this study indicate a greater development and a deeper range of Senecan technique and thought than can be possible on a purely formal basis.

One further point which may be of interest though it is not concerned with the topic of this study is Marx's discussion of the polymetric odes (pp. 35 ff), covering Senecan practice in deriving metrical verse forms, and their relation to contemporary metrical theory as seen in Caesius Bassus. I cannot evaluate the theoretical discussion, though it seems adequate; but the tabulation of Senecan polymetra is faulty. Out of nearly 200 "Senecan" meters and fragments of meters, over 25% are readings lacking the support of EA; four out of Marx's 45 categories, about 9%, are thus eliminated before redistribution into textually provable categories, i.e., categories which our evidence proves without dissent that Seneca did use and which

therefore are not based on the reasoning of a modern scholar; three categories, 6.6%, are removed from one play but not from the other before redistribution; and 12 times out of 69, about 17%, the category is reduced to half or less in either play before redistribution. Of the text used by Marx and quoted in extenso in his diss., that of Peiper-Richter, about 48% of the lines rest on EA; about 11% follow E instead of A; about 17% follow A instead of E; and about 24% follow neither. It is quite obvious therefore that his picture of Senecan metrics in the four polymetric odes is not very sound. A further interesting idea is that the flow of the meters contributes meaningful sound and rhythmic patterns to the sense. To illustrate his idea, he subjectively points out how to read the Peiper-Richter text; but there is no formal system adduced or deduced for suiting the rhythm to the sense or vice versa. In any case this attempt to discover the liquid artistry of Seneca's Silver Latin would have to be done again when we know better why we have two text types and what each type was expected to do; and that problem is more than just deciding between two lections.

Wheaton College, Massachusetts J. David Bishop

---

## DULCE ET DECORUM . . .

*Wilhelm Süß in freundschaftlicher  
Verehrung zum 85. Geburtstag am 9. 3. 1967*

---

### I.

Der vielzitierte und vielmißbrauchte Vers 13 der zweiten Römerode des Horaz hat für dessen europäische Leser seit den beiden Weltkriegen in steigendem Maße seine Problematik erkennen lassen. Sie findet im jüngsten Kommentar zu dem Gedicht ihren treffenden Ausdruck und zugleich eine etwas verzweifelte Lösung: „der Tod, auch der *pro patria*, an und für sich ist niemals „süß“, aber „weil der Tod fürs Vaterland *decorus* ist, kann er trotz aller Bitterkeit *dulcis* sein: der Ruhmgedanke ver-