relevé des citations ou des réminiscences, mais ils sont tous rejetés (p. 286–288, n. 1). Les derniers qui ont eu une connaissance directe du poème sont donc du IXe s. : Ermenrich d’Ellwangen († 874), le compilateur anonyme du Florilegium Sangal- lense (s. IX) et peut-être Heiric d’Auxerre († 876). Le chapitre se termine par une discussion détaillée des soi-disant ‘Fragmenta’, des vers ou des parties de vers attribués dans les sources à Luкрèce sans être attestés dans la tradition directe; ils pourraient correspondre à des lacunes dans le texte, et parfois on a essayé de les y insérer à des endroits plus ou moins vraisemblables. Des seize ‘Fragmenta’ treize sont rejetés, pour la plupart comme de fausses attributions; il n’y a que trois qui ont mérité un examen plus approfondi, qui pèse soigneusement le pour et le contre et qui permet de conclure que même s’ils sont très douteux, on ne peut pas exclure absolument qu’ils se soient trouvés dans des passages manquants, bien qu’il soit difficile de les placer à des endroits appropriés.

Le livre de DB constitue un guide solide pour les futurs éditeurs du DNR et prodigue des conseils judicieux et précis sur la manière d’établir le texte, laquelle est devenue beaucoup plus simple puisqu’il n’est plus besoin de tenir compte des leçons des mss descendant de π et des corrections postérieures à la copie dans les mss anciens, sauf celles de Ο1 qui sont confirmées par Q et/ou Σ ou qui peuvent être expliquées par des corruptions dans ceux-ci. DB propose également de reléguer dans des appendices les ‘capitula’ et les tables qui, bien qu’ils ne soient pas de Luкрепce, présentent un grand intérêt pour l’histoire du texte, ainsi que, si l’on veut être complet, une liste des corrections dans les mss anciens, laquelle est déjà préparée.

Le premier à profiter de ces conseils sera certainement DB lui-même puisqu’il prépare actuellement une nouvelle édition pour les ‘Oxford Classical Texts’, qu’on attend avec confiance.

Copenhagen

Birger Munk Olsen


The third volume of Giancarlo Giardina’s (G.) critical edition of Seneca’s tragedies contains Hercules Oetaeus and presents the text of the play with a full apparatus criticus, but without an introduction, bibliography or sigla codicum. These omissions are unfortunate. Readers are given no information on the debate surrounding the authorship of this play or about the manuscripts and methods used in establishing the text. G.’s belief that the play is spurious is declared on the cover and title page, which ascribes the play to ‘Pseudo-Seneca’. Most would agree with this designation, yet the case is not entirely settled. The amount of conjectures printed in G.’s text and the size of his critical apparatus makes this edition’s lack of any introductory material even more problematic. Readers must have recourse to volume one (2007), which contains Hercules, Troades, Phoenis- sae, Medea, and Phaedra, in order to learn about G.’s editorial rationale. In it, he admits that his edition will print conjectures much more readily than other recent editions (1.51). At the end of the first volume’s introduction, G. suggests that his text is a response to the status which Zwierlein’s OCT has enjoyed as an
«epochemachende Ausgabe» (1.63). Rather, G. feels that there is much work to be done to establish a definitive, or even 'satisfactory', edition of Seneca’s plays. As he notes, «non vuole questa edizione dare un testo standard o canonico, ma segnare una tappa del progressivo avvicinamento a un testo soddisfacente della importante opera drammaturgica di Seneca» (1.64).

Those who have not consulted G.’s new critical edition and are only familiar with his 1966 edition of Seneca’s plays may be surprised to note how innovative the new text is. The conservatism of the earlier edition has been contrasted with the innovation of Zwierlein’s OCT. Yet elsewhere G. himself has disavowed this strict dichotomy. He notes that because of the particular character of the manuscript tradition of Seneca’s tragedies, which rests on two main branches, the «genuine» E and the interpolated A family, the texts of two editors will not be radically different. When deciding between variant readings in the two branches, the E class must be turned to when we seek «genuineness» and the A class «when we seek a more accurate transcription of ordinary words». Thus, «both an innovator (like Zwierlein) and a conservative (like Giardina) in the last analysis offer almost the same text». While there are few major divergences between G.’s new edition of Hercules Oetaeus and Zwierlein’s OCT, there are upwards of 670 textual differences, not to mention changes in punctuation and line breaks in the choral odes. Of these textual changes, over 420 of them are G.’s own conjectures.

G.’s apparatus is nearly as important as the text itself. Its importance is stressed by the fact that it appears in almost the same size typeface as the text of the play and frequently takes up a quarter of each page. G.’s apparatus does not simply list variant manuscript readings and modern conjectures. In addition, he occasionally cites grammatical and lexicographical sources to buttress his points, and regularly cites several parallel passages, ranging from Ennius to Apuleius, in order to support an emendation, whether it be his own or another’s. To take only the first page as an example of the amount of information provided in the apparatus, G. writes that secure of line three is to be read as a vocatius praedicatius and cites Kühner-Stegmann I 235 sq. for support. The apparatus also suggests possible variant readings. For urbes in line 16, the apparatus reads «fort. oras (cf. Ovid. trist. 1.3.19. Stat. Theb. 6.332. Sil. 1.433)). In the same line he attributes the emendation of Argolicas to Iac. Gronouius, adding «cf. 1932 Argolico…leoni», in favor of the manuscript reading of arcadias or archadias. He then adds his own possible reading, «fort. Arcadias aper (cf. Sen. Ag. 832, Ovid. met. 9.192, Mart. 5.65.2, 9.101.6, Quint. 6.3.55, Hyg. fab 30)). In line 19 he accepts Heinsius’s emendation of virus for the unanimous manuscript reading of vires and proposes his first emendation as well: lotos for notos, which again has unanimous manuscript authority. He invites the reader to compare Sen. Oed. 714 and Verg. Aen. 7.663. Thus, when approaching this play via G.’s new text, readers must be prepared to do a good deal of intellectual work, which involves not only considering the conjectures printed, but also tracking down parallel passages and

---

thinking about other options that G. believes might have been printed. His text is a provocation to the reader and challenges us not to be passive consumers of the text. Reading through G.’s text and apparatus reveals how conjectures, both G.’s own and those of others, affect the story. In what follows, I will discuss a few of these instances.

The conclusion of Deianira’s impassioned opening speech about how she might destroy Hercules reads, …odiis accipe hoc telum tuis / dignum, noverca. perdere Alciden potes: / utere furente, quod ube fieri nefas? / profer malum quotidumque: quid cessas, dea? / propera: quid haeres? (270–74). Line 271 is a difficult crux for editors. The manuscripts give the impossible, ego sum noverca perdere Alciden potes. Bentley emended potes to potens, which G.’s 1966 edition, Zwierlien’s OCT, and Fitch’s Loeb edition adopt. G.’s new edition rejects Bentley’s conjecture in favor of the manuscript reading. He transposes verses 272 and 273, and prints four other conjectures, one by Bothe (profer 272), and three of his own (dignum 271, malum 272, propera 274). Deciphering the language of an impassioned character is particularly difficult, but accepting the manuscript reading of potes in 271 requires a series of drastic emendations which raise the question of Deianira’s agency. In G.’s version, the focus is squarely on Juno. Whereas, if we accept Bentley’s correction, Deianira appears more willing to declare her ability to destroy Hercules with the goddess’s help.

How does Nessus give his poisoned blood for safe keeping to Deianira? Giardina’s 1966 edition, Zwierlein’s OCT, and Fitch’s Loeb read, with minor variants, [Nessus] traditque nobis ungulae insertam suae, / quam forte saeva sciderat avolsam manu (521–22). The use of Nessus’s broken hoof is a particularly baroque, some might say clumsy, method that may be unique to Hercules Oetaeus. Sophocles’s Thrachiniae only states that Nessus told Deianira to take his poisoned blood with her hands (573) and that she stored it in a bronze pot (556). Ovid’s version, however, states, calido velamina tincta cruore / dat munus raptae (Met. 9,132–3). Later, Ovid mentions the imbutam Nesseo sanguine vestem (9,153). Citing these passages for support, G. prints, traditque nobis tunicae infectam suae, / quam sponte laeva sciderat avolsam manu. G. also justifies this change by drawing our attention to the frequency of the conjunction of scindere and tunica, e.g. Ovid her. 11,59, ars 3,569, Priap. 12,11. This is a bold change; tunicae is a relatively uncommon word. There are manuscript problems, however. G prints ungulae, while A reads ungula; insertam is the reading of A, while E prints insertum. Yet these discrepancies and the parallel passages that G. cites may not be enough to encourage readers to accept his conjectures. Indeed, it remains unclear throughout this edition how exactly the reader is to interpret G.’s frequent citation of parallels. On what level are they justifying a conjecture? Are we to assume that the poet is always bound to follow precedent and set turns of phrase? That may often be the case, particularly for our anonymous poet, whom many consider to be second-rate and overly reliant on the literary tradition. We should not assume, however, that he was simply a mechanical author and cannot be granted a level of innovation that departs from his models.

Who lights Hercules’s pyre? According to Zwierlein’s OCT, Philoctetes started the blaze, tremente pinum dextera ardentem intuli (1727). Yet intuli is Zwier-
lein’s own conjecture for the readings of *impuli* in A, which G. accepts in his 1966 edition, and *impulit* in E. Now G. hands the job over to Hercules himself. He emends the final word to *imprimit* and cites Val. Max. 5,4 ext. 6 and Sen. contr. 1,7,4. This image of Hercules’s hands trembling as he lights his own funeral pyre adds a different dimension to the hero’s celebrated resolve and fearlessness in the face of death.

Another noteworthy conjecture refers to the end of Amphitryon’s life. Alcmena addresses her dead husband and states that he is blessed to have died and entered Tartarus *florente nato* (1780). G. changes *florente* to *ducente* but adds in the apparatus that he hesitates to do so («dub.»). The image of Hercules leading his stepfather into the underworld seems unprecedented, and G. is right to express his doubts. Alcmena does go on to surmise that the *inferi* were possibly afraid when Amphitryon arrived (1780–82), but there does not seem to be any need to infer that the shades would only tremble if he came with his stepson leading the way. G.’s change appears to necessitate that Amphitryon died just before what is often considered to be Hercules’s final labor, and that as the hero went to the underworld to bring back Cerberus, his father’s shade followed. This fact would contradict this play’s major intertext, Seneca’s *Hercules*, in which Amphitryon is very much alive after Hercules’s return.

G.’s text does have its conservative elements as well. Compared to Zwierlein he is less willing to transpose verses or to posit lacunae in the text. Yet there are problems in the rare instances when he does print *lacunae*. Following Leo, G. prints a lacuna after 1092, but line 1091 (*quaerens flebilibus modis*) seems to have dropped out of the text. He prints another lacuna after 1096, stating in the apparatus, «post 1096 lacunam statuit Peiper». By contrast, Zwierlein, who does not print a lacuna here, notes, «lacunam suspicatus est Peiper». Line 1402 presents further difficulties. As Zwierlein points out in his apparatus, Axelson posited a large lacuna after Hercules’s command and the start of Alcmena’s lament. G., however, does not acknowledge this supposition in his apparatus. He prints a full stop after Hercules’s metrically incomplete *procedat agedum* (1402), and then prints the start of Alcmena’s lament in 1403 as the impossibly long, *vae mihi, sensum quoque excussit illi nimius incursans dolor*.

In conclusion, it is hoped that G.’s new stand-alone edition of *Hercules Oetaeus* will lead to more work on this neglected play and encourage readers to reconsider their preferred editions. Because G. presents such a bold new text, however, the fact that this is a stand-alone edition without an introduction is also a drawback. Scholars will of necessity need to consult other works in order to navigate fully the text and apparatus presented by G.
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