C. J. Herington: A thirteenth-century manuscript of the Octavia

man antworten müssen, daß dieser schon für die Quelle oder gar schon für die ihr vorausliegende Überlieferung so wenig mehr aufhellbar oder auch nebensächlich war, daß man nicht eigens vermerkte, w a r u m die 17. Kohorte von Ostia nach Rom verlegt werden sollte. Das eine dürfen wir mit Sicherheit sagen: wenn die Quelle auch nur die Spur eines Hinweises darauf enthalten hätte, daß der Waffentransport mit der Mobilmachung Othos zusammenhing, hätte, um von allem anderen zu schweigen, Tacitus kaum von einem p a r v u m i n i t i u m (80,1) gesprochen.

Werl i. Westf. 

Heinz Heubner

A THIRTEENTH-CENTURY MANUSCRIPT OF THE OCTAVIA PRAETEXTA IN EXETER

I. DESCRIPTION AND HISTORY.

Exeter Cathedral Library MS no. 3549 (B); vellum; assigned to the middle of the thirteenth century; 296 leaves (16 by 22.5 cm.) in 26 irregular gatherings. The text (with one negligible exception) is written in the same hand throughout, in double columns apart from the tragic items, which are in triple columns. There are 53 lines to the column.

The principal contents are Isidore’s Etymologiae and other works, followed by the majority of the younger Seneca’s prose writings. A complete list of these is given in the appendix; but the body of the present article is devoted to the Octavia and the short excerpts from the other Senecan tragedies, which are found towards the end of the manuscript.

Of the book’s history little is known. It belonged to John de Grandisson, one of the greatest of Exeter’s mediaeval bishops (born 1292, consecrated 1327, died 1369), but was to wander

1) The writer wishes particularly to thank the Librarian of the Cathedral Library, Mrs. A. Erskine, and Professor O. Skutsch for their unfailing help during the preparation of this article; for information and advice on various matters he is also very grateful to Professor C. R. Cheney, Professor F. W. Clayton, Mr. J. Fagg, Mr. N. Ker and Dr. R. Vaughan. None of these, of course, is to be held responsible for the opinions here expressed.
for more than five centuries before it reached the library of his cathedral. On the first page of the Isidore are the names of two private owners, R(?). ffoxton in a fifteenth-century hand, and Nicolaus Horsley in a sixteenth-century hand. In 1858 the MS appears in the catalogue of Thomas Kerslake, a bookseller well-known in his time, and apparently a loyal native of Exeter; for he presented the volume to the Dean and Chapter in 1889, shortly before his death. But even since then it has remained unknown to classical scholars, probably because the nineteenth-century catalogue of the library mentions only the first author in it, Isidore; it was only when he came to handle the MS itself that the present writer realized that it contained (among much else) one of the three earliest copies of the Octavia.

II. THE PLACE OF THE NEW MANUSCRIPT IN THE TEXTUAL TRADITION OF THE OCTAVIA.

It was long ago recognized that the corpus of the Senecan tragedies has come down to us in two separate recensions: the E-recension (represented by the eleventh-century codex Etruscus in Florence), and the "interpolated" or A-recension (to which the vast majority of our MSS belong). The great superiority of E has never been questioned. Opinions have differed on the degree of independent authority to be attributed to A — this century has been more favourable to it than the last — but in one respect it is of the greatest value: it, and it alone, preserves the Octavia.

Of this A-recension over 300 manuscripts (most of them Italian) survive, but almost all belong to the second half of the fourteenth century or later — already, then, to the dawn of humanism. As might be expected, they are difficult to classify, and offer a great variety of corruptions and interpolations. Those who in this century have attempted to reconstruct the original A-text have naturally neglected this mass of relatively late evidence more and more in favour of the only two thirteenth-century manuscripts hitherto recorded, the one in Cambridge (C), the other in Paris (P); to arbitrate be-

2) Grandisson has inscribed his name in three different places, besides briefly annotating the volume for about three-quarters of its length. Nicolaus Horsley may well be the person of that name who matriculated at Corpus Christi College, Cambridge, at Easter, 1544. For Thomas Kerslake see the Dictionary of National Biography, vol. XXXI, p. 70 f.
between them they call on a third MS in Madrid (S, or Scor.), which belongs, indeed, to the latter half of the fourteenth century, but appears to preserve a more authentic text than its contemporaries 3).

But we have now not two, but three MSS of the thirteenth century; and it is to them that this enquiry confines itself. It may well be that they suffice of themselves largely to reconstruct the archetype of the entire A-recension for the Octavia (where it is most wanted); even if not, it will be allowed that they bring us very much nearer to that archetype. What is more, the addition of the Exeter MS is of considerable importance to the textual tradition of all the tragedies; for at last we are enabled to determine the precise relationship between C and P.

At this point it should be recalled that C. E. Stuart, who first drew attention to C and P, assigned to P a place of unique importance in the tradition 4). He held, no doubt correctly, that C and "Scor." (= S) merely represented an earlier generation of the family to which all the later A-MSS belong. P, however, though showing all the main characteristics of the A-recension, contained many readings otherwise found only in the other recension, E. What was the solution? Stuart had little doubt. On what may seem rather inadequate grounds, he refused to explain these readings as due merely to contamination with an E-manuscript, and asserted the only possible alternative: that P is the sole surviving representative of a family which preserved the A-recension in a form nearer to E — therefore purer, less "interpolated" — than the form transmitted to us by C and all the other A-manuscripts. Thus P, in spite of its shocking scribal blunders, might in many passages rate as a valuable independent witness to the original text.

Such was Stuart's view of the relationship between C and P, which has prevailed ever since 5). But the evidence to be


4) C. Q. vol. VI (1912), pp. 6 ff., and stemma on p. 19.

5) So Sluiter, preface to his Oedipus, pp. 11 ff. He well summarizes the position on p. 13: Sic P et C duos vetustissimos huius traditionis testes diversi pretii habemus: P, quamquam minus accurate scriptus est propriis-
discussed here and in Section VII tends to show, almost beyond doubt, that he was mistaken: that P is in fact a close relative of C, and that its E-readings are due to simple contamination.

Using the symbols

\[ C = \text{Cantabrigiensis: Corpus Christi College no. 406, vellum, saec. XIII ineunt.} \]

\[ P = \text{Parisiensis: Bibl. nat. MS. lat. 8260, vellum, saec. XIII med.} \]

— Both the above MSS (which contain all ten tragedies) have been collated afresh for the Octavia, C in the original, P in microfilm 6).

\[ G = \text{the Exeter MS already described; the initial stands for Grandissoni} 7). \]

the stemma presents itself as follows:

(Archetype)

\[ \text{(5)} \]

\[ C \]

\[ P \]

(lost codex with Oct. and excerpts)

\[ G \]

Notes on the Stemma: —

(i) CPG preserve in common several trivial errors, which are not reported by the editors as being in the inferior MSS,
had therefore presumably been eliminated from them. For example:

46 veneris (for venenis)
166 tuo quoque (for tu quoque)
252 thalamis meis (for thalamis tuis)
463 opprimatur (for opprimar)
534 generato divo (for generata divo)
694 iuncta est tuo (for iuncta es tuo)

Compare also lines 80, 82, 88, 762, 795 (era), in the list of archetype-readings below.

Such mistakes not only show that the three MSS are descended from a common archetype; the fact that they are so obvious and so easy to correct suggests that that archetype does not lie very far back. If any lengthy transmission lay between, these mistakes would surely have been put right — as, indeed, they had been a century later in the inferior MSS.

(ii) P and G descend from a common “hyparchetype” δ, which differed from C in several important respects. Its peculiar nature is discussed in the concluding section; its more interesting readings will appear in Section IV. These readings should be enough in themselves to confirm the suggested relationship between P and G. Here we note only the most striking example: whereas C exhibits Oct. 669-685 in the traditional (and correct) order, both P and G transpose them thus:

668 linque cruentam principis aulam.
677b quae saepe duces ...
685a iuncta Neroni.
669 CHORUS
En illuxit suspecta diu ...
676b vis est populi? (677a) fregit claros.
685b Affigat humo violenta manus e. q. s.

(iii) G is not a transcript of P. For example:

214 pressusque om. P, habet G.

him as better qualified to judge of a library than almost any man of his time.” (M. R. James, quoted by F. Rose-Troup, Bishop Grandisson, Student and Art-lover, Plymouth, 1929).

8) All line-numbers refer to the second Teubner edition of 1902, which is followed by Moricca and the Loeb.
Conversely P (which, as the reader will bear in mind, contains all ten tragedies) cannot be a transcript of G.

(iv) G was probably not transcribed from δ itself, but from an intermediate codex, now lost, which had already made the selection of Octavia plus excerpts now found in G. This cannot be proved with mathematical certainty, but the condition of the excerpts (described below) is not such as one would expect had the scribe of G had the complete tragedies before him.

III. READINGS OF THE ARCHETYPE OF CPG.

If these arguments are accepted, we are in a good position to reconstruct the archetype of CPG: wherever they all agree, or CP agree against G, or CG agree against P, the archetype’s reading is no longer in doubt.

The following list shows all such archetype-readings which differ, for good or ill, from the readings attributed by the editors of the second Teubner to their “A” (whether expressly attributed in their apparatus criticus, or printed without comment in their text). This seems the simplest method of avoiding an immense list largely composed of readings already known; it does not imply a belief that the second Teubner is the best of all possible critical editions9), but rather that it is the most widely accessible to scholars. Where an Octavia-reading is not noticed either here or in the subsequent lists, it is to be understood that CPG (or CP or CG) agree with the Teubner “A”.

Passages of special interest are marked with an asterisk.

20 nox est CPG

before 34 NUTRIX CG; (CHORUS P)

36 subito latentis CPG

(C also has, in the margin, the note vel uno; i.e. it offers as a variant the reading sub uno which is actually ascribed to “A” by the second Teubner.)

9) Nor, in particular, that the “A” of the Teubner and other editors is a very satisfactory symbol. For criticism of its ambiguity see Sluiter, op. cit., pp. 21—2.
46 veneris CPG
(a misreading, not otherwise recorded, for vene-
nis)

52 mittit CPG
(this is in fact the reading of all recorded
MSS, but is included because the second Teubner,
by oversight, prints Bücheler’s vincit without
comment.)

80 omnia (sic) CG; P could be read either as omnia
or as omina.

82 sed vota (sic) regunt CPG

88 feraque sevi 10) CP; fera sevi G.

before 100 OCTAVIA — NUTRIX CPG

100 haud umquam CG (with “A”); aut numquam P.
(P’s reading, noted by Stuart in C. Q. 1912 p.
20, is therefore probably a mere blunder)

*105 grate PG and (?) C.
(all other recorded MSS read grata. — In C the
final letter is smudged, as if another letter had
been written at first; but the scribe’s final
decision was almost certainly for -e.)

112 frater post fata CG; fata post frateris P recte.

148 Silvanus CPG.

166 tuo quoque CPG.

*between 173 and 174 space of 30 lines left vacant in C, 26 lines
in P; no space left in G.
(Düring, in Hermes 1912 p. 184 n. 2, remarked
on the spaces in CP, and noted that such a space
must therefore have existed in the archetype.)

181 exspectas CG, expectas P — C has a question-
mark at the end of the line.

184 iste CG (with “A”); ille P.
(P’s reading, noted by Stuart loc. cit., is there-
fore probably a mere blunder.)

before 201 NUTRIX CPG.

234 bootes CG recte; boetes P.

10) CPG (like all MSS of this date) regularly write e for ae and oe.
It seems preferable to retain their spelling in the lists of readings.
238 typhona C; tifona G; thifona P.
252 thalamis meis CPG.
*254 violenti CPG
  (this seems the preferable reading in itself, and now has good MS authority.)
290 evo suadente metu CPG.
308 laceroque CPG recte.
374 mixtam CG (with "A"); missam P.
  (P's reading, noted by Stuart loc. cit., is therefore probably a blunder.)
*389 astra que CP; astra quam G.
  (astra quem edd., without recording any variant.)
*441 iusto CG; iuste (? - last letter uncertain) P.
463 opprimatur CPG (opprimat " CP, opprimat "? G.)
  (the true reading is opprimar? The mistake in our archetype must have been caused by the great similarity between t and r, and the easy confusion of a question-mark and the abbreviation for -ur.)
483 imperii CPG.
484 nutuque CPG.
507 sparsos per orbem CPG recte.
534 generato divo CPG.
615 flammisque CPG recte.
617 nasci CPG.
661 socerum CG (with "A"); socerumque P.
662 hoc demens CPG.
694 iuncta est tuo CPG.
*696 victum CPG.
  (the Teubner editors print vincum in their text, attributing victum to the inferior MSS only; but the latter seems the more forcible expression and, on this evidence, should probably be read.)
*762 loquar CPG.
766 Europem CPG.
772 Dane CPG.
779 hanelo CP; anhelo G.
*795 aut ara fulgens era CP; auara fulgens era G.
   (era is otherwise unrecorded; the editors give ora,
   without comment. Lipsius’ correction of the
   passage, aut aerf fulgens, ora is generally, and
   rightly, adopted.)

803 iunctus CPG.
805 iussa omittunt CPG.
*823 madent CG; mandent P.
   (madet is the only reading hitherto recorded.)
824 funerea CPG recte.
843 nutu CPG.
*849 compescis CPG.
   (so also some of Ageno’s MSS, cited by Moricca;
   “compescit A” according to the second Teubner.
   Leo conjectured Compescis? — which now ac-
   quires additional authority.)

*876 tumor CPG.
   (the Teubner editors ascribe to “A” the reading
   timor. Tumor should surely now be read; see
   Lewis and Short, s. v., for instances of its use
   with residere in Cicero and Seneca.)
883 quod plebis CPG.
   (otherwise unrecorded for quos plebis.)
895 possit CPG.
*927 per quem CPG.
948 rexit CPG.
954 violenta CP; violata G recte.
   (the other recorded MSS read violata with G.)
978 portare CP; portate G recte.
   (the other recorded MSS read portate with G.)

IV. PASSAGES IN WHICH PG AGREE AGAINST C,
   OR ALL THREE MSS DIVERGE.

The following is a complete list, orthographical variations
and obvious blunders by individual scribes alone excluded.
Here will be found some of the most interesting (and most
perplexing also) of the readings published in this article; such
readings are again marked with an asterisk.

5 tot annis C; tot tantis PG recte.
63 tua quem C; tua quam PG recte.
83 dabis C; dabit PG recte.
*90 superbos humilesque C, against metre;
superbos hominesque P, against metre;
superos hominesque G.

(G's reading, which is certainly correct, is found in no other MS; according to the editors it was first conjectured by Delrio 11).

140 preferre C recte; perferre PG.
157 quis C recte; qui PG.
161 seva om. C, habent PG.
*186 ipse C; ips P; ipsus G.
vetat vetat C; vetat PG recte.
187 caro C; cara PG recte.
*197 fassa C; falsa PG.

(Stuart, who noted P's reading in his article, reported that S read the same. All other recorded MSS read fassa.)

232 cometam C; comete PG 12).
*234 frigido arctoo rigens C

(note the dot under the c of arctoo, which re-

11) Yet the correct reading here seems to have been known to an Italian scholar two centuries before Delrio. Some time before 1390 Antonio Loschi composed his tragedy in Latin verse entitled Achilles (see Storia letteraria d'Italia: il Quattrocento, by Vittorio Rossi, 1945, pp. 524—5; text in the 1636 Venice edition of the works of Albertino Mussato, following Mussato's Eccerinis); in the first chorus of this we find Jupiter invoked as Genitor superum hominumque simul. Now it might be argued, at first sight, that Loschi could easily have evolved the phrase genitor superum hominumque for himself; but there are other considerations. First, his play is a patchwork of quotations from the Senecan tragedies, including the Octavia; thus in the same chorus Inclyta Iuno, cuius thalamos Iuppiter intrat is a reminiscence of Oct. 276—7. Second, simul is attached to the phrase in both cases; it is natural in the Oct. passage, in Loschi's phrase it becomes grotesque. Further, this happens to be the only place in the Achilles where simul occurs at all (apart from a simul atque at the beginning of Act V). Accordingly it seems very probable that Loschi has lifted superum hominumque simul bodily from the Octavia; and hence that he either had before him a MS which, like G, contained the correct reading of the passage, or had emended it for himself.

12) The right reading seems to be cometen, cf. Housman on the analogous case Juvenal VI, 407.
gularly means cancellation in this MS; i. e. ar-
too.);

frigidio archeo (possibly artheo) rigens P;
frigidio acteo rigens G.\(^{13}\).

249 insidivo ( nisi divo in margin) C; nisidivo P; nisi
divo G.

316 resonent C; resonant PG.

346 feriunt C recte; ferunt PG.

\(*^388\) solis alternas vices C (and all other MSS except
PG); sortis alternas vices PG.

(it has always been recognized that solis is
wrong, being a mere repeat of the solis standing
just above it in the preceding line. Whether
sortis — already noticed in P by Stuart — can
be right is very doubtful, but at least it is now

13) The only MS reading of this passage recorded before was frigido
arctoo rigens, which most editors, following a hint by Pontanus, emend
to frigore arctoo rigens (cf. Med. 683, where Mount Taurus is described
precisely thus; and frigore aeterno rigens in Oed. 546). The resultant sense
is excellent — but this very fact makes it hard to understand why, if it
was indeed the original reading, any scribe should have been tempted to
alter frigore to frigido.

Now the readings of our three MSS present a new problem, to which
the writer cannot offer a satisfying solution, but which he can only state
as follows. Frigido still stands in them, as in the other MSS, but they
disagree violently over the word following it — a word which has never
been suspected hitherto. C’s artoo is, indeed, probably intended for the
traditional arctoo (though the deliberate change in spelling is rather odd);
on the other hand P has a nonsense-word, but one which approximates to
the blameless Latin word acteo offered by G.

Are the readings of PG mere corruptions? There are two arguments
which should perhaps give us pause. First, the reading of C and the later
MSS is itself demonstrably corrupt, and we have already noticed that the
usual remedy, frigore for frigido, is based on an unlikely assumption.
Second, it would be extremely strange if a purely mechanical corruption
in G should have resulted in an adjective which is certainly used, though
very rarely, in connection with Bootes — the adjective Actaeus. Compare
Valerius Flaccus II, 68 Actaeus niteat qua luce Bootes; this is the only
such instance, but for the idea “Attic” in connection with him we should
also note Med. 314—5 nec quae sequitur flectitque senex / Attica (so E;
Arctica A!) tardus plantra Bootes. It comes to this: either there has been
a truly remarkable accident of corruption, or G (partly supported by P)
is right; and if G is right, then Oct. 234 is more seriously corrupt than has
ever been suspected. In that case we can only guess at what the original
reading was: it might (for example) have been something like sidere Actaeo
nitens — incidentally avoiding the jingle regit / rigens in this line.
clear that it stood in the hyparchetype, and cannot be dismissed as one of P's many eccentricities. See below, p. 374, n. 25.)

406 minus C recte; munus P; munus G.

410 auderet C recte; audent PG.

411-12 extrahere pisces rete (reti C) vel calamo levi decipere volucres crate vel calamo aut levi CG; extrahere (sic) pisces rethe vel calamo aut levi P (evidently conflating the two lines).

432 scelere C recte; secula PG.


450 sibi C; tibi PG recte.

467 absentum C; absentium PG recte.

*489 sap'ie sacra C; spiritu sacra (sic) PG — alone among recorded MSS; spiritu sacro coni. Gruter.

495 servare vices C; servire cives PG; "servare viros A"; servare cives later MSS, and edd.

512 nec gemere C; non gemere PG.

576 fractis C; fractus PG.

*584 varia C; vana PG and edd., without comment.

before 593 MATER C; PG have no heading, but leave one

line vacant.

597 vertet C (so "A"); vertat PG.

626 immensas C recte; universas PG.

---

14) Through the courtesy of the authorities of the Royal Library in Brussels, the writer has been able to collate the relevant part of this MS (no. 4791) in photostats. The excerpts from the Senecan tragedies here occupy Fol. 140 v, second column, to Fol. 142, second column. They are in two series, both in the order of the A-recension; are written as prose; and are of very varying lengths (of Oct., for example, we have lines 189—90, 443—60, 576 and 896—900). The selection coincides only partially with that of G, and even such coincidences are clearly due to chance. Yet there are enough striking agreements in reading with P or G to suggest that the Brussels MS too derives from δ. For examples see below, Section VI, on Thy. 396—7, 610—11, Phoen. 493—4, Tro. 1023, Med. 199—200. (A partial, and probably negligible, exception to this rule: ibid., on Thy. 211.). — We may also note here an unique, though dubious, reading of the Brussels MS at Oct. 896 b: contempta latet (contenta latet cett.).
639 iunctus C (so "A") recte; victus P; vincatus G.
669-85 C has in traditional order; PG transpose (see above, p. 357).
689 feris C and edd., without comment; feri P; G omits lines 687-9.
692 manant C, madent PG recte.
*716 vincita C; victa PG; iuncta edd., without comment; cuncta coni. Damsté.
(vincita seems the correct reading; but compare also the variants at 639, just above.)
728 intuor C recte; intueor P; intuor G.
736 pulsat pectus C; pulsatque pectus G recte; P omits the whole line.
744 laeta die C; laeto die PG and edd., without comment 15).
766 luctus C recte; fluctus PG.
801 sopire C; sepire PG recte.
817b diruit C recte; dirruit P; duruit G.
840 videat C; audeat PG recte.
845 nota om. C, habent PG.
850 cecidere C recte; recidere PG, against metre.
877 O funestus C recte; O om. PG.
*882 gratos C; graccos P; grecos (i.e. gracos) G.
(PG therefore imply the correct reading Gracchos, which is found in some of the later MSS; "gnatos vel gratos A").
*887 levis C (and "A"); levi PG; Livi corr. Delrio.
(Herrmann was mistaken in saying that C already has Livi — see the apparatus criticus of his edition of 1926.)
899 quodve tyrannus C; quidve tyrannus PG.

15) C's reading is certainly wrong. Dies does indeed occur in the feminine three times in the Octavia, but only when the masculine is excluded on metrical grounds (lines 670, 714, 928); where the masculine is admissible our author invariably uses it. Thus for example we have festo / laetoque die in 646-7, laeta nam postquam dies in 714 — both referring to the same occasion! As it does not seem likely that C's laeta 744 is due to chance corruption, we may suspect that the scribe has deliberately altered the gender here to make it conform with 714 — the nearest preceding occurrence of dies.
*916 pennis C and edd., without comment; penas (i. e. poenas?) PG.

924 Regitur C recte; Tegitur P; Legitur G.

(— the wild readings in P and G are no doubt due to the omission of the rubricated initial letter in the hyparchetype, a fairly common mishap.)

*930 iam multa C and edd., without comment; tam multa PG.

(P's reading was noted by Stuart, loc. cit.)

979 urbe est C recte; urbe e PG.

983 civis gaudet C recte; cuius gaudet PG.

V. THE CHARACTER OF THE INDIVIDUAL MANUSCRIPTS.

Of the three MSS, C is not only the most beautifully penned and consistently punctuated, but it contains by far the least scribal errors. A count of the obvious blunders by the individual scribes in the Octavia gives the following results: C, 16; P, 91; G, 52. It will be understood that these figures cannot be absolute (there are several borderline cases, where one cannot decide whether the reading is a simple blunder or a misbegotten correction), but they give a fair idea of the relative accuracy of the three scribes. As we have no "brother" of C to compare, it is not possible to say more of its character than this; on the other hand P and G throw considerable light on each other.

The first result of a comparison between these two is of some consequence to our estimate of P's readings in the other nine tragedies, where G is not available as a control[16). It is this: P's inaccuracies are not merely numerous but highly eccentric. It would be pointless to print a list of the more understandable scribal errors (such as dittographies, misspellings, and omissions — P is specially prone to omit — *que*); but the following mistakes will be instructive for P's peculiar character:—

21 ultimus (*for tulimus*)

[16] Except, of course, for the brief excerpts described in the next section, where it will be shown that (so far as they go) they confirm this result.
before 34 CHORUS (*for NUTRIX*)

56 utique (utinam)
262 solum (?) (soluta)
273 sana (fama)
276 nostros nostri
(coniunx nostri)
382 chorisci (Corsici)
405 tempus (tam piis)
419 et adarmavit (et armavit)
656 missos (invisos)
678 ducit (dedit)
704 superius (?) (sublimis)
710 que subdita vultus casus
(que subita vultus causa)
745 equora (pectorata)
775 tyrannidos (Tyndaridos)
826 patris (plebis)
865 Dii (si)

The only clearly correct reading peculiar to P is at line 112: *fata post fratris* (and so “A”; *fratris post fata* CG, against metre). The following unique readings might be intended as corrections, but it may be thought more likely that they are only further instances of P's curious mental habits:—

100 aut numquam (haud umquam CG and all other MSS).
374 missam (mixtam CG etc.).
379 mire (or mite?) (alte CG etc.).

G, on the other hand, tends to make only the normal scribal mistakes, but has several unique readings which are either clearly correct or at least plausible. Its odder mistakes are:—

114 a morte (et morte CP etc.).
336 que ter (que tibi CP etc.).
387 satius (sacros CP etc.).
414 imminere (immunem CP etc.).
596 victa quas victrix (iuncta quas vindex CP etc.).
617 postulat (poscit CP etc.).

Among G's correct (or plausible) readings, which are here given in full, are a few of great interest:—

* 90 superos hominesque
(anticipating Delrio's correction, see above p. 362).
363 geminansque necem (geminatque nefas cet.).
389 quam (que CP, quem all other MSS).
391 se senescit (sese nescit CP and “A”).
*414 vulnere in text, with all other MSS; vomere in margin, same hand.
   (anticipating the correction of the 1541 Bâle edition.)
*461 Respectus ensis (despectus ensis cet.).
   (G’s reading anticipates Buecheler’s conjecture, Rhein. Mus. XXVII, 1872, p. 474 17).
574 prohibebor (prohibebor CP and “A”; G’s reading also appears in some of the inferior MSS.)
779 anhelo (hanelo CP.)
789 diu parant (divi parant all other MSS).
   (G’s reading may well be a conjecture rather than a slip; for divi has puzzled several scholars since, and the sense given by diu is not unsatisfactory. But this reading is of course excluded by the metre: there is no parallel in the Senecan tragedies to a line ending in two iambs each contained in a separate word.)
842 victa (fracta all other MSS).
*860 ne peeeet manus (ne parcat manus all other MSS).
949 clara (cara all other MSS).
954 violata recte (so the later MSS; but CP read violenta).

17) Though G’s reading here may well be the true one, there is some reason to think that it may be merely a fortunate conjecture by our scribe. The facts are as follows: in these half-line interchanges the first letter of each half-line is regularly written as a capital in red or blue. The first scribe therefore leaves a blank space where the first letter should be, to be filled in afterwards by the rubricator; but he is careful to put the appropriate initial, in minuscule, in the margin. Here he has duly written respectus in the text, with the guide-letter r in the margin; but the rubricator has not filled it in. Now although this rubricator has made many mistakes in the Octavia, this is the only place where he has failed altogether to insert an initial; and we may therefore suspect that he had some special reason for hesitation. The most likely one would be that he had referred to the exemplar from which our MS was copied, and there found something different, e.g. the Despectus of the other MSS — or perhaps just espectus (cf. the readings at line 924, given above, Section IV, for the omission of an initial in the hyparchetype).
978 portate recte (so the later MSS; but CP read portare).

VI. THE EXCERPTS FROM THE OTHER TRAGEDIES IN G.

In G the Octavia is immediately followed by 46 short excerpts, (none more than 3\1/2 lines long) from the Senecan tragedies. They are arranged by plays, in the order of the A-recension (the E-recension, as is well known, presents the plays in a different order); all of these are represented except for the Herc. Oet. The beginning of each excerpt is marked simply by a marginal flourish.

In the following list of the excerpts it is to be understood that the reading of G is that of the Teubner text, unless a comment is added; in that case the Teubner reading comes first, followed by a square bracket. The relevant passages in C, P and the Brussels excerpts (see above, p. 364, n. 14) have been collated, and their readings also are given where they are significant.

RUBRIC IN G: Explicit Octavia Senece. Incipiunt quedam sumpta de Tragediis Senece.

H. F. 313b—315: moveri] amoveri CPG and “A”.

H. F. 328.
H. F. 437.
H. F. 463: quemcumque] quem G.
H. F. 1167—8.

*THY. 211: contingit] so PG; continget C; continget Brussels excerpt.

THY. 213: velit... volet] so CG; velit... velit (altered from velet... velet) P.

*THY. 307: miserias] so PG and Brussels excerpt, with E; miseris C, with “A”.

perferre est grave] so CP and Brussels excerpt; perferre grave est G.

THY. 311: redierunt] rediere G.

THY. 451—2: casas] casam G (assimilated, wrongly, to iacentem at the beginning of the line).

tutusque] -que om. G.

THY. 469: magna] so E; alta CPG and “A”.


THY. 453a: venenum in auro bibitur] in om. G.

THY. 529.

THY. 572.

THY. 596—7a: sors] fors CG and (?) P — a misreading otherwise unrecorded.

dolor ac] dolor et G.

P. omits line 597 entirely.

*THY. 610—11: vobis . . . vobis] nobis . . . nobis G.

expavescit] so G, with E! — extimescit CP and Brussels excerpt, with “A”.

PHOEN. 493—4: quotiens] cum G.

patiare] patiariis G, and Brussels excerpt.

ipse] om. G.

PHAEDR. 134—5.

PHAEDR. 249.

PHAEDR. 593b—594a: qui timide rogat / docet negare] docet negare qui timide rogat G.

PHAEDR. 735: impudicam] impudicum G.

facere non casus] non casus facere G.

PHAEDR. 881.

PHAEDR. 920.

OED. 526: ubi non licet tacere] ubi tacere non licet CPG, with “A”.

OED. 517: sanari piget] sanari quandoque piget G.

OED. 703b—704a: odia qui] so CG; odia que P.

OED. 834: tuto] so CG; tute P.

TRO. 291.

TRO. 336.

TRO. 581.

TRO. 869.

TRO. 1023: est miser] so CG; o miser P.

nemo nisi] so C and “A”; nemo non PG and Brussels excerpt.

MED. 154.

MED. 176.

*MED. 199—200: qui statuit] so G and Brussels excerpt; quis statuit CP. — CP both have a question-mark after altera at end of 199. Their reading is not otherwise recorded.

MED. 416.
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AGAM. 130: quit] so C and "A"; quid P; quivit G.
AGAM. 144: casum] so CG; casu P.
AGAM. 151: scelus scelere] so PG; scelere scelus C.
AGAM. 152: — marked as a separate excerpt in G.
AGAM. 243: — marked as a separate excerpt in G.
paene est innocens] so C; pene et innocens P;
pene innocens est G; fere innocens est Brussels excerpt.
AGAM. 267: ille] om. G.
est opus] opus est G.
AGAM. 287: parata] so CG, and Brussels excerpt; paratur P.
vincitur pretio fides] pretio perit fides G.
AGAM. 799.
OCT. 466.

SUBSCRIPTION IN G: Hec qui legerit de tragediis Senece sumpta esse noverit.

The excerpts, so far as they go, confirm the picture already drawn of the relationship between CPG, and of the character of the individual MSS. Thy. 596 provides another example of an obvious misreading shared by CG (and probably by P), and not elsewhere recorded; Med. 199 another of a tolerable new reading preserved by CP; Tro. 1023 another of an agreement between P and G which can hardly be accidental.
The repeated inaccuracies of G in the excerpts suggest that the scribe was copying not from a complete MS of the plays but from a selection of sententiae already compiled by someone else, who in his turn had before him δ or a transcript of δ. We note for example the recasting of several lines into a more natural, but unmetrical, word-order (Phaedr. 593—4, 735, etc.), and the treatment of juxtaposed lines as separate excerpts (Agam. 151—2, 242—3); to this it should be added that in several cases the proper line-divisions are ignored.
The most startling of G’s readings is expavescit in Thy. 610, a reading peculiar to E. This will be further considered in the next section.

VII. THE NATURE OF THE ARCHETYPE AND HYARCHETYPE.
It has been shown in Section II that CPG descend from a common archetype, and that probably at no great remove. All
that can be said of the date of this lost MS is that it can hardly have been later than c. 1200 A.D.; for C, the oldest of the surviving MSS, is itself assigned to the first half of the thirteenth century. More important, though, than any date, is the question whether this archetype is the common ancestor of all our surviving MSS; can it in fact be identical with that elusive “A” which has so long tormented Senecan editors?

It is not, of course, possible to answer this question definitively without a first-hand knowledge of all the later MSS. This knowledge is beyond the present writer’s reach — more than once, indeed, he has had cause to remember a remark made by an earlier student of G, shortly after arriving in Exeter: *nedum in mundi finibus, set — ut ita dicam — in finium finibus consisto*18). None the less, it is worth noting that such Octavia-readings of the inferior MSS as are available in print appear to be either (a) already found in CPG, or (b) corruptions or easy corrections which are plainly deducible from the readings extant in CPG. To this rule the writer has noticed only two possible exceptions: in 701, where CPG have *sacras*, but all other MSS (to judge, at least, by the silence of the editors) correctly read *sacrasque*; and in 805, where CPG omit the word *iusa*, which (again to judge by the editions) is read by all the rest19). But it is not too much to say that in both these passages the word lacking in CPG would practically supply itself to any careful reader. It is therefore justifiable to conclude provisionally that the archetype of CPG was indeed none other than “A”, from which all our MSS are derived; in which case the readings listed in Section III acquire an added authority20).

We turn now to the hyparchetype, δ. Section IV will have shown that, although it had its full share of mere blunders, it also offered a number of plausible readings which differ from those of C. How far can these be trusted?


19) The omission of *iusa* in CP was noted by Stuart, *op cit*. p. 18, who comes to the same conclusion on this point.

20) *Oct.* 795 is noteworthy in this connection, as a passage where CPG, though corrupt, seem to represent an earlier stage of corruption than any other recorded MSS. Here the MSS known to the editors read *aut ara fulgens*, ora; which Lipsius corrected, rightly, to *aut aere fulgens*, ora. The odd reading of CPG, *aut ara (aaara G) fulgens*, era most probably preserves the memory of *aere (= ere)*, but in the wrong place.
Notwithstanding Stuart's views\(^{21}\), one thing can safely be said about \(\delta\): in the other tragedies it had been "contaminated" by collation with a MS of the E-recension. Here we must recall once more that C and PG (= \(\delta\)) agree in a number of trivial and easily corrected scribal mistakes (listed above, p. 356 f.), so that their common ancestor must be close. Yet P, in many passages, presents readings which are not found in C, but in the other, E-recension; and in the only one of those passages which happens also to be preserved as an excerpt in G we again find an E-reading (Thy. 307, miserias). Of this state of affairs there are, theoretically, two possible explanations, as follows: — (a) \(\delta\) faithfully represents the archetype — which would, therefore, have been closely related to the E-recension — while C's text has been heavily worked over, to produce in effect what has ever since been known as the standard A-recension. But this explanation is hardly credible. First, could any mediaeval scribe have rehandled the text in this fashion without betraying himself repeatedly in matters of diction and metre? Second, granted that it was within his powers, the process presupposes a deliberate and detailed re-examination of the entire text, to see what changes were desirable; how then did the obvious errors already mentioned, those which C still shares with PG, escape the notice of the editor? — (b), the other theoretical explanation, is infinitely easier; it is that someone simply compared \(\delta\) with an E-MS, found a number of more forcible readings in the latter, and entered them in \(\delta\). Any mediaeval scribe was competent to do such a thing, indeed frequently did; and on this view it is not at all surprising that the obvious errors referred to were allowed to stand, for such collation does not involve critically working over every line of the text. Further, there is now some reason to think that the E-readings may have appeared in \(\delta\) as marginal or interlinear variants — just as we should expect on this theory. At Thy. 611 P reads extimescit, with C; this must therefore have been the reading — or rather, one reading — of the archetype and of \(\delta\). Yet the excerpt in G gives the distinctive E-reading, expavescit. Now since P and

\(^{21}\) See above, p. 355; it must be remembered that Stuart (whose work for the Senecan text was beyond praise) had only two MSS of the thirteenth century to work on.
G are both undoubtedly derived from δ, by far the most likely explanation is that it here presented a choice of readings.

We may then reasonably assume that δ was contaminated with an E-MS in the other tragedies; but clearly this fact need not necessarily affect the value of its readings in the Octavia, which must now be considered. Now a number of those readings are not merely correct (or at least nearer the truth) as against those of C; they are also such that they are unlikely to be deliberate interpolations. A clear example is line 887, where C reads *levis*, while PG read *levi*. The true reading here, which was not in fact restored until Delrio, is certainly *Livi* — to which the reading of PG, though in itself even more meaningless than C's, obviously approximates more nearly. For this reason we may assert that δ can on occasion reproduce the archetype more faithfully than C, and consequently that, unless there is some compelling reason to suspect interpolation, the readings peculiar to it deserve to be considered respectfully. To the present writer's knowledge there is only one such reading that is demonstrably an interpolation, and that is at line 388, where PG read *sortis* for the seemingly impossible *solis* of all the other MSS. There is, indeed, evidence that δ presented interlinear variants in the Octavia, but we have

22) Again we must pose the theoretical alternative, namely that P and G (or, more accurately, the MS from which G derived the excerpts) had each been independently collated with an E-MS. But this involves the improbable supposition that no less than three scribes both had access to, and took the trouble to collate an E-MS: not merely the scribes of P and of G's source, but the scribe of δ as well — for it seems unlikely that, in the partial collations which we must in any case assume, the scribes of P and of G's source would have both lighted upon the not very striking (though correct) *miserias* for *miseris*, Thy. 307.

23) It will be remembered throughout that the E-recension does not include the Octavia.

24) See Section IV, readings at lines 83, 161, 316, 450, 467, 495, 692, 766, 801, 840, 845, 882, 887.

25) *Sortis* cannot be what the author wrote. The whole of the impressive outburst in lines 385—90 concerns the delight which the exiled Seneca found in contemplating the physical universe, and all the phenomena mentioned are celestial; cf. the passage of Seneca's works which the author of the Octavia seems to be versifying, Cons. ad Helviam VIII, 4—6: *mundus hic, quo nihil neque maius neque ornatus rerum natura genuit, animus contemplator admiratorque mundi... propria nobis... sunt... Dum mihi solem lunamque intueri liceat, dum ceteris inhaere re sideribus, dum... spectare tot per noctem stellas micantes... quantum refert mea, quid calcem?* Here there is no mention, there could be no mention, of *sors*. 
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no means of saying whether these were outright conjectures, or had some ancient authority (they could well have existed in the archetype also). This evidence is to be found in line 90 (see Section IV), where δ must have read something like this: *superos hominesque spernit superbos humilesque simul*; here P adopted the second variant but not the first, G — rightly — adopted both. If this is so, at least some of the other good readings preserved in G alone, as well as P’s *fata post fratris* 112 (see above, pp. 367–369), may be ascribed to sensible selection of variants in the hyparchetype.

Naturally, there are bound to be doubts whenever δ disagrees with C; doubts which will remain unless yet another forgotten MS emerges from the shadows, which can judge between these two witnesses to the A-tradition. Yet perhaps enough has been said of δ’s character to show that C, for all its impressive progeny, need not always be in the right; that future students of the Octavia may find it worth their while to consider some of the readings peculiar to δ or even to G alone. Of the value of the archetype-readings listed on pp. 358 ff. (especially the starred items), we have already spoken at the beginning of this section.

* * *

APPENDIX

Since no full catalogue of the Exeter Cathedral Library MSS is likely to be published in the near future, the following list of the other contents of no. 3549 (B) may be of some use:—

FOL. 1: Isidore of Seville, *Etymologiae*.

FOL. 135v: Part of a Glossary in alphabetical order, beginning *Locium est urina* (etc.), ending *Sillogismus: consermocinatio* (etc.).

26) It seems rather unlikely that *superos hominesque* is merely a thirteenth-century conjecture. The other reading *superbos humilesque* (given by all MSS except PG) makes excellent sense; it could only have been doubted by someone who had enough practical knowledge of metre to realize, as he read, that the first word will not scan in an anapaestic line. Here it is relevant to recall that even the commentator Treveth (d. 1328), who can readily name the different metres which he encounters in the tragedies, rarely if ever recognizes a metrical slip in the text before him. Th. Düring (in the third part of his *Zur Überlieferung von Senekas Tragödien*) gives several instances where Treveth placidly comments on an unmetrical reading, and even a possible case of an unmetrical emendation by him.
FOL. 136v: Fulgentius, Expositio Sermonum Antiquorum.
FOL. 138: Isidore, Liber Sententiarum.
FOL. 169: the beginning of a sermon of St. Augustine (Appendix no. CCLXXXV in the 1836 Paris edition of his Works), breaking off in mid-sentence at: et licet fratres carissimi de vestra ferventi devotione confidam, tamen quia... This fragment is written in a different hand and ink from all the other items, but does not appear to be much later.
FOL. 169v: Isidore, Liber Differentiarum.
FOL. 175: St. Jerome, extract on Seneca the Younger from De Viris Illustribus; spurious correspondence between Seneca and St. Paul; Seneca's epitaph (Cura labor meritum etc.; Bahrens, Poet. Lat. Min., vol. V, p. 386, no. 73).
FOL. 175v: Seneca, Epistulae ad Lucilium, Letters 1—88 of the modern editions (in this MS, as in many others, they are actually numbered 1-89, Letter 48 being given as two).
FOL. 221: Seneca, De Beneficiis.
FOL. 247v: Seneca, De Clementia.
FOL. 254: “Seneca”, “De Copia Verborum”. In spite of this title, given in the MS, the treatise (which is not printed by Haase) is actually a patchwork of quotations from the earlier Epistles to Lucilius, in no very strict order. It begins Primum argumentum compositae mentis (Ep. 2,1); includes quotations from at least as late as Ep. 39, 6, ubi quae fuerunt vitia, mores sunt; and ends Turpisima iactura est quae per negligentiam fit (Ep. 1,1).
FOL. 256: Seneca(?), De Remediis Fortuitorum Malorum.
FOL. 257: Seneca(?), Ludus de Morte Claudii Caesaris.
FOL. 259: “Proverbia Senecae” in alphabetical order, metrical down to the letter N (= Publilius Syrus, Sententiae), thereafter in prose; cf. J. W. and A. M.

**FOL. 261v:** “Item Proverbia eiusdem”, again in alphabetical order, but all in prose, beginning *Avida est periculi virtus, et quo tenditur (sic), non quid passura sit, cogitat; ending Ultionis contumeliosum genus est, non esse visum dignum a quo petatur.*

**FOL. 262:** “De Memoria Senece. Seneca sic scribit de seipso in libro de causis; ostendens quam velocis et tenacis memorie fuerit.” The short extract under this heading is in fact from the elder Seneca, *Controversiae I praef. 2—3.*

**FOL. 262v:** Seneca, *Naturales Quaestiones.*

**FOL. 290v:** “Seneca”, *Octavia.*

**FOL. 294:** Seneca, excerpts from the tragedies.

**FOL. 294v:** Seneca, *Epistulae ad Lucilium,* Letter 102 only. It is headed *Hoc est finis cuiusdam epistule precedentis,* but the letter is given complete.

The University, Exeter C. J. Herington

---

**MISZELLEN**

**Aristophanes Frogs 819**

Commentators have always had to resort to conjecture to explain the expression ὁμνηκαλάμων παραξόνα satisfactorily, for the ancient explanations make nonsense. But though Van Herwerden’s παραξόνα, adopted by Wilamowitz (*Griechische Verskunst* 352) in conjunction with Blass’ ἀπλευματοεργοθ, is now considered less improbable, the received text should have preference, if it can be explained reasonably and more convincingly than by Taillardat (REG 1948) and Radermacher, both of whose explanations suffer from the weakness that they assume the association of subtlety (ὡμνηκαλάμοι) and noisiness, a most improbable conjuncture.

I suggest that a far more likely association for *subtleties* is the word *forensic,* and that the word παραξόνα, a most characteristic Greek adjectival formation (Debrunner, *Griechische Wortbildungslehre,* §51, §147) was used here by Aristophanes as the approximate equivalent of δικαίων, the reference being to the ἄξονας set up in the Stoa Basileios, pre-eminently a place of judgement (RE s.v. ‘Stoa’). The expression then means ‘forensic subtleties’, the construction being of the type of *strataviarum* (cf. Norden on Aen. vi 633).