CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY

VOLUME LXV, NUMBER 2

April 1970

ORIGINALITY IN SENECA'S *TROADES*[1]

WILLIAM M. CALDER III

THE first step in detecting the original is to isolate the derivative. In a Rostock lecture I argued that Seneca used four Greek sources in the composition of his play.[2] The use of Euripides' *Hecuba* and *Troades* has been regularly assumed.[3] Euripides provided Hecuba, Helen, and the chorus of captive women,[4] and he especially influenced Seneca's lyrics. The kommatic parodos is pure Euripides. Seneca used as well a famous tragedy, Sophocles' *Polyxena*, which may be reconstructed with some confidence and which was concerned with ideas treated later in the *Antigone*.[5] From the *Polyxena* derived the famous *Fürstenstreit* between Pyrrhus and Agamemnon and the brief subsequent scene with Calchas (203–370). The messenger speech in the exodos describing the death of Polyxena descends from a similar speech delivered by a messenger in the exodos of Sophocles' play.[6] Finally, the presence of Polyxena as a *persona muta* and not the loquacious Euripidean prisoner reflects the unsatisfactory dramatic situation of the Sophoclean heroine. As the fourth source I postulated a post-Euripidean *Intrigenstück* which was used for the second epeisodion (409–813), the long, occasionally comic, scene dominated by Andromache and Ulixes.

Seneca thought that by gathering what he believed good from four earlier versions he could compose a fifth and best play. He was wrong. He gathers twelve characters, more than any extant Greek tragedy (E. *Ph.* has eleven); and even so he must leave some out. Menelaus is omitted. Andromache "replaces" him in the Helen scene as judge. But, though twelve, none dominates the action long enough to be remembered. The necessity to compress so many scenes results in a lack of dramatic plausibility. The action does not precede κατὰ τὸ εἰκός: for example, the entrance of Calchas.[7] Nor is there any clearly discernible unity of action.[8] We seem always to be on the trail of red herrings. Hecuba begins and ends the play but is forgotten in the middle. After one tantalizing ap-

1. An earlier German version of this paper was delivered as a public lecture at the Karl Marx Universität, Leipzig, D.D.R., on 21 June 1967. I learned much from the ensuing discussion.

2. See my "Senecas *Troerinnen*: Eine Untersuchung über die Kompositionsweise der Sekundär-Tragödie," *Wissenschaftliche Zeitschrift der Universität Rostock Gesellschafts- und Sprachwissenschaftliche Reihe*, XV (1966), 551–59.

3. For earlier work on the sources of the *Troades* see L. Herrmann, *Le Théâtre de Sénèque* (Paris, 1924), pp. 267–75. The most important contribution since Herrmann's review of the question has been W.-H. Friedrich, *Untersuchungen zu Senecas dramatischer Technik* (Borna-Leipzig, 1933), pp. 99 ff.

4. Sophocles earlier (?) had one in the *Αἰχμαλωτίδες*.

5. For a recent reconstruction of the *Polyxena* see *GRBS*, VII (1966), 31–56.

6. See further *CP*, LXII (1967), 42.

7. See Friedrich, *Untersuchungen*, pp. 102–3.

8. Scholars nonetheless have alleged unity: see recently W. Schetter, "Sulla struttura delle *Troiane* di Seneca," *RFIC*, XCIII (1965), 396 ff.

pearance we never see again the Sophoclean Agamemnon, the most engrossing character of the drama. Helen appears too late and too briefly in the action to be developed. Sophocles and Euripides were wise enough not to elaborate the pathetic ends of both Polyxena and Astyanax in one play. Seneca plays them off against one another in a way that denies force to both and weakens the pathos by seeking to double it. Thus are the defects of *contaminatio* on a scale that Terence would not have dared.

The multiplicity of Seneca's sources necessarily curbed originality. One would like to believe that he grew bolder and less extravagant with experience.[9] Naturally in the *Troades* as in the other tragedies occasional anachronisms slip in.[10] There existed Euripidean precedent.[11] Most obvious are the references to Roman triumphs (*Tr.* 150 ff.; cf. *Phoen.* 577–78) and the yoke (*Tr.* 147). More unfortunate is the comparison of the eager spectators watching the execution of the children to a holiday's theater crowd: "crescit theatri more concursus frequens" (*Tr.* 1125). No Athenian would have been guilty of such an atrocity.[12] Hints too of astrology intrude (*Tr.* 386 ff.). The sun becomes *astrorum dominus* (*Tr.* 388; cf. *Thy.* 835, *dux*). One might here too recall the variation of a famous phrase of Vergil, Horace, or Ovid. Typically and obviously of Priam: "Sigea premis litora truncus" (*Tr.* 141), Vergil's "iacet ingens litore truncus" (*Aen.* 2. 557). Or take: "Dulce maerenti populus dolentum; / dulce lamentis resonare gentes" (*Tr.* 1009–10). Is it fanciful to recall Horace's (*Carm.* 1. 22. 23–24) "Dulce ridentem Lalagen amabo / dulce loquentem"? The meter is the same. There is the anaphora of *dulce* in both; and the sounds of *maerenti, lamentis* recall *ridentem, loquentem.*[13] The inclusion of such echoes enhanced the richness and learning of the poetry but the nuance would be as irrelevant as unhistorical. Thus Ovid in the *Medea* (Frag. II R.) used a Vergilian tag; cf. Sen. *Suas.* 3. 7 (p. 550, Müller).

Then there are the passages with which Seneca must stitch together the action that he has gathered from his several sources. A fine example is the brief Calchas speech (360–70). Only eleven verses long, it is divided into two equal parts. The first half derives from Sophocles' *Polyxena.* Seneca has drastically abbreviated a scene, similar to the Creon-Tiresias scene in Sophocles' *Antigone,* where the seer by declaring the will of the gods convinced Agamemnon that he must sacrifice Polyxena. But the second half concerns the murder of Astyanax, a crime not found in Sophocles' *Polyxena.* Seneca adds the verses in a clumsy effort to unify the action that is split between the murders of Polyxena and Astyanax, both of whom, while they live, will delay the return home of the Greek fleet. Seneca writes the verses in his typically rhetorical manner, using apostrophe,[14] a favorite device found numerous times in

9. Attempts to establish either an absolute or relative chronology for the tragedies fall victim to various fallacies (L. Herrmann, *Théâtre,* pp. 78 ff., will amuse the critical reader) and are futile; see the intelligent remarks of M. Coffey, *Lustrum,* II (1957), 150, esp. "in general the tragedies may have belonged to any stage of Seneca's literary career."

10. See in general R. B. Steele, "Some Roman Elements in the Tragedies of Seneca," *AJP,* XLIII (1922), 1–32, and M. Hadas, "The Roman Stamp of Seneca's Tragedies," *AJP,* LX (1939), 220–31.

11. See conveniently Schmid-Stählin, *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur,* I: 3 (Munich, 1940), 763 with n. 12.

12. Seneca was again (*HF* 838–39).

13. For Vergilian influence on Senecan tragedy see H. M. B. ter Haar Romeny, *De auctore tragoediarum, quae sub Senecae nomine feruntur, Vergilii imitatore* (Diss.; Leyden, 1887); on Senecan philosophical works see H. Wirth, *De Vergilii apud Senecam philosophum usu* (Freiburg im Breisgau, 1900). For Horatian influence see J. Spika, "De imitatione Horatiana in Senecae canticis chori," *Programm des Staatsgymnasium im 2. Bezirk Wien* (Vienna, 1890), pp. 3–53.

14. See H. V. Canter, "Rhetorical Elements in the Tragedies of Seneca," *Univ. Ill. St. Lang. Lit.,* X (1925), 143 ff. For Calchas' prophecy here see R. Staehlin, "Das Motiv der Mantik im antiken Drama," *Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten,* XII (1912), 139–46, who is wrong on a possible Sophoclean source (145–46).

his tragedies, here addressed to Polyxena, who is not present on stage: "nobilior tuo, / Polyxene, cruore debetur cruor" (*Tr.* 366–67). There is polyptoton too (*cruore . . . cruor*)[15] and a bit of *studium doctrinae*. Astyanax is not mentioned directly; the author prefers a paraphrase by patronymic: *Priami nepos Hectoreus.*

Here too one may set the stage directions.[16] Sometimes they are hopelessly obvious as in the parodos: "Vertite planctus: Priamo vestros / fundite fletus, satis Hector habet" (*Tr.* 130–31). Sometimes commentators misunderstand them. Again in the parodos (*Tr.* 79–80) the chorus direct their queen: "miseramque leva, / regina, manum." Thomas Farnaby (1575–1647), the English Jesuit (he traveled in 1595 with Sir Francis Drake), approved by Gronovius and more recently Kingery, held that Hecuba is being requested to direct the chorus in their mourning. Kingery (on *Tr.* 79) hastily compares "the handling of his baton by the conductor of a modern orchestra." The queen in fact raises her hand to greet the dead, not the chorus, a traditional part of the tragic *threnos* which Seneca found in the *exemplaria Graeca.*[17]

But these are details. Can we adduce larger passages provably Senecan? I think that we can. There is the prologue.[18] Of Seneca's putative four sources we know the prologues of three. Sophocles' *Polyxena* began with the Ghost of Achilles appearing to Agamemnon above his tent and demanding the sacrifice of Polyxena. The prologue of the later *Ajax* was modeled on it.[19] Euripides' *Troades* begins with the speech of Poseidon, followed by his famous dialogue with Athene, that provides the exposition and sets the mood of delusion and hopelessness for the following action.[20] Both these alternatives Seneca discarded, not only to keep the number of his characters down but also because he disliked a "dramatic prologue" and regularly chose a single prologist, whether speaking or, as in the *Phaedra*[21] (cf. *Octavia*), singing. If we exclude the unfinished *Phoenissae*, only the *Thyestes* with its opening dialogue between Tantali Umbra and Furia (*Thy.* 1–121) approaches what one may call the Sophoclean manner. The model of Euripides' *Hecuba* remained. There the prologue is a monologue (*Hec.* 1–58) delivered by the Ghost of Polydorus. This Ghost was a derivative figure devised by Euripides after the model of Sophocles' Ghost of Achilles, whom Sophocles himself had

15. See Canter, *Rhetorical Elements*, p. 161.

16. This is not the occasion to reopen "eine alte Streitfrage, ob die Tragödien Senecas zur Aufführung bestimmt waren" (Schanz-Hosius, II[4], 467). Herrmann's careful review of earlier scholarship on the matter rewards attention: see Herrmann, *Théâtre*, pp. 153–232 and for more recent work Coffey, *op. cit.*, pp. 162–63. Arguments against performance regularly derive from (1) unjustified a priori assumptions, (2) a naïvely literal idea of realism, and (3) mere assertion of opinion. One must first distinguish between actual and intended performance. We have no ancient testimony that Seneca's tragedies were or were not performed, possibly because they were staged—if they were—privately. We know from Renaissance and modern revivals that they may be easily and effectively staged. We can never know that Seneca composed his plays with the intent of production but lacked funds or an opportunity. The analogy of every other extant ancient drama, however, urges us to assume he did. Yet scholars continue to quarrel: see lately the learned and unconvincing O. Zwierlein, "Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas mit einem kritisch-exegetischen Anhang," *Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, XX (1966).

17. One should compare A. *Cho.* 8 (with Schol. on E. *Alc.* 768), E. *Alc.* 768 with Paley[2] *ad loc.*, and E. *Supp.* 772. For the stage gesture involved see A. Spitzbarth, *Untersuchungen zur Spieltechnik der griechischen Tragödie* (Zürich, 1946), p. 32. Error persists at A. Cattin, *Les Thèmes lyriques dans les tragédies de Sénèque* (Neuchâtel, 1963), p. 53.

18. For the most recent general treatment of the Senecan prologue see F. Stoessl, *RE*, XXIII (1959), 2416–29. Stoessl does not speculate upon the source of the prologue in the *Troades*.

19. For the details of reconstruction see *GRBS*, VII (1966), 43–45. F. Stoessl at *RE*, XXIII (1959), 2325. 19–21 first compared the prologue of the *Ajax*.

20. For a study of the prologue and its relevance to the ensuing action see E. O'Neill, Jr., *TAPA*, LXXII (1941), 288–320. I shall be surprised if any scholar accepts a recent attempt to excise the dialogue between Poseidon and Athene (E. *Tr.* 48–97) as an interpolation: see J. R. Wilson, *GRBS*, VIII (1967), 205–23.

21. Such is the title and not *Hippolytus*: see Schanz-Hosius, II, 456 with n. 4.

taken from the cyclic epics.[22] Seneca had no interest in the Euripidean tale of Polydorus and Polymestor and therefore discarded this variation too. I query any alleged influence of Accius' *Astyanax*.[23] It is the merest guess that Hecuba delivered Accius' prologue,[24] and the fragment allegedly from it (165–66 R².) provides factual exposition of a sort quite unlike the almost sheer lamentation that Seneca gives us.

In short, Seneca required something that no source gave him, a brief monologue spoken by someone already in his cast. He wanted a human prologist, for there were no gods in his play. He chose Hecuba, easily recognizable and a tried symbol for the horrors of war. He could spare her sixty-six verses (only *Medea* and *Agamemnon* have shorter prologues); for there was involved action to follow.

Can we isolate indications of Senecan originality? Or, to phrase the question another way, what is not Greek about the prologue? First the technique: there is no stated motivation for the speaker's entrance and a consequent lack of dramatic verisimilitude. Hecuba simply enters and begins to speak. Not until verse 36 does she even tell the audience who she is. This is thoroughly un-Greek; in Athenian tragedy the spectators were informed as soon as possible (cf. E. *Hec.* 3, *Tr.* 2, both known to Seneca).[25] One may note too that Seneca's opening address to *Troia* rather than to the audience is unusual in Greek tragedy although not unprecedented (see *TAPA*, LXII [1931], 81). Seneca would have found an example at Euripides *El.* 1, where the farmer addresses Argos. The device would have appealed to his rhetorical extravagance.

Next there are the Roman touches in the prologue; first, touches of vocabulary. One finds the untranslatable *numen* (*Tr.* 28), and Priam becomes *rectorem Phrygum* (*Tr.* 29), the Ciceronian *rector rei publicae* (e.g., *De orat.* 1. 211). At verse 17, Troy is called *Assaraci domus*. Ἀσσάρακος, a king of Troy in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 20. 230 ff.), is found nowhere in Greek tragedy, although he is common in imperial sources, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Diodorus Siculus, and especially Vergil's *Aeneid* (six times).[26] He was king of the Dardanians and grandfather of Anchises. His inclusion by Seneca is a chauvinistic touch. Such "Roman Mythology," if one may call it so, always provides a clue. Compare the lyric digression on the nymph Echo at *Tr.* 109 ff. Seneca had found the barest hint at Euripides *Hec.* 1110–11 and elaborated it. The nymph gained prominence only with the popularity of Pan. She is rarely found in classical literature, rather in Roman and imperial Greek authors.[27]

Verses 12–13 deserve attention: "et quae vagos vicina prospiciens Scythas / ripam catervis Ponticam viduis ferit." The couplet was deleted by Leo (I, 209) and optimistically banished to the bottom of his page.

22. See Wilamowitz, *KS*, IV, 229, and W. H. Friedrich, "Euripides und Diphilos," *Zetemata*, V (1953), 34. Contrarily, in his *Hecuba* Ennius presumably retained Polydorus as prologist: see Frag. 162 Ribbeck².

23. The view is rightly discarded by Herrmann, *Théâtre*, p. 269 with n. 2. In general when dealing with Seneca one ought to look to Athenian rather than Republican tragedies: see F. Leo, *Plautinische Forschungen zur Kritik und Geschichte der Komödie*² (Berlin, 1912; repr. Darmstadt, 1966). p. 26: "Seneca verfasst seine Tragödien nach den griechischen Originalen, ohne die römischen Bearbeitungen auch nur zu kennen; die Verse der altrömischen Tragödie, die er in seinen prosaischen Schriften citirt, stammen sämtlich aus dritter Hand"; U. von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff, *Einleitung in die griechische Tragödie* (Berlin, 1907), p. 173, n. 105: "von römischen tragödien [hat Seneca gelesen] natürlich nur die beiden der augusteischen zeit, nicht die barbarischen übersetzungen des 2. jahrhunderts"; K. Ziegler, *RE*, VI (1937), 2008. 11 ff.; and my remarks at *Zeitschrift Rostock*, p. 552.

24. E. H. Warmington, *Remains of Old Latin*, II (Cambridge and London, 1936), 371 with note *a*, defends Hecuba in Accius by citing Sen. *Tr.* 1 ff.!

25. Shakespeare, too, occasionally nodded. In the opening dialogue of *The Merchant of Venice* he neglects to name his speakers.

26. See Schirmer, *Lex. Myth.*, I:1 (1884–86), 644–45.

27. See Von Sybel, *Lex. Myth.*, I:1 (1884–86), 1213–14, where the reference to E. *Hec.* must be corrected (for *110* r. *1110*).

The reason was that the geography of the passage is so muddled that Seneca could not possibly be responsible for it. Hecuba alludes to the three great allies of Troy—Rhesus, Memnon, and Penthesilea; but Rhesus is made to drink the Don (Tanaïs) when he ought to be in Thrace, and Penthesilea becomes neighbor to the Scythians. Leo removed the couplet that had Penthesilea and her spinster bands next to the Scythians and with the Etruscus read *quae* not *qui* at *Tr.* 8. Now Penthesilea drinks the Don as she ought and Rhesus has been banished from the play. The cure is more drastic than the disease. Seneca has simply confused the Danube and the Don, as in fact he does again at *NQ* 6. 7. 1. We can detect the source of his error. Vergil at *G.* 4. 517 had made the same mistake and put the Tanaïs in Thrace. No reader of Apollonius Rhodius will be surprised at the geographical vagueness of the *poetae docti.*[28] Seneca's error came from an uncritical imitation of his source. Inspection confirms the suggestion. Vergil speaks of the *Tanain nivalem*, a vivid epithet, which Seneca varies to *Tanain frigidum* to provide an unimaginative antithesis to his *tepidum Tigrin.*[29] Leo's deletion, therefore, is unnecessary and the text with its error should be retained.

The grotesque sentiment at *Tr.* 50 that when Priam was stabbed the dagger emerged from his senile throat dry, "ensis senili siccus e iugulo redit" (*Tr.* 50), has long puzzled me. Seneca enjoyed the idea and used it again of Priam's death at *Ag.* 656–58.[30] The immediate source (thus Gronovius *ad loc.*) is Ovid *Met.* 13. 409–10: "exiguumque senis Priami Iovis ara cruorem / conbiberat . . ." (cf. Ov. *M.* 7. 315). *Metamorphoses* 13 was in his mind while composing the *Troades.* Some lines later in the parodos (*Tr.* 126) Seneca calls Hector a *murus.* The metaphor is a Latin translation of the Homeric ἔρκος or πύργος found at Ovid *M.* 13. 281, *Graium murus Achilles.*[31] I know no Greek source for the bloodless Priam. Certainly the sentiment is not found in any Greek tragedy. Perhaps Ovid reflects Hellenistic or Roman medical theory. I cannot be more precise.

Delight in obscurity, *studium doctrinae*, indicates Seneca's Alexandrian heritage. To call Cassandra, "Cassandra," would be too easy; rather (*Tr.* 34), *Phoebas.* The source is Euripides *Hec.* 827 (cf. Ov. *Tr.* 2. 400 with Owen; *Am.* 2. 8. 12): ἡ φοιβὰς ἣν καλοῦσι Κασάνδραν Φρύγες. The prologue is rich in learned echoes. The description of Priam, "quem Troia toto conditum regno tegit" (*Tr.* 30), means that his whole kingdom is the tomb of Priam. It recalls Thucydides' (?) epitaph for Euripides (*AP* 7. 45. 1): Μνῆμα μὲν Ἑλλὰς ἅπασ' Εὐριπίδου.[32] Athenaeus' quotation (5. 187D) shows that this poem was still famous in the Empire. The later passage about Paris the firebrand, "meus ignis iste est, facibus ardetis meis" (*Tr.* 40), resumes the long tradition of Alexandros as the δαλός

28. The Don because of its remoteness was peculiarly vulnerable to error: see Herrmann, *RE*, IVA (1932), 2162, 34 ff.

29. For antithesis in Seneca's tragedies see Canter, *Rhetorical Elements*, pp. 151 ff.

30. See Leo, I, 156–57 with n. 12. Leo further compares Lucan 2. 128 (death of the aged Scaevola), but his citation of Ov. *M.* 7. 599, Sen. *Oed.* 348, and Prop. 3. 16. 19 (correct the reference and read *spargatur*) must only be for the superficial verbal parallel. The passages are not evidence for the sentiment that old men have little blood.

31. *PLM*, IV, 147, 2 (p. 149, Baehrens) follows Seneca with Hector as *murus miseris*; cf. Silius Italicus 16. 68 (of the Spaniard Larus). R. Wertis observes that *vivax senectus* (*Tr.* 42) represents a contamination of Ov. *M.* 13. 517 (*annosa senectus*) and 519 (*vivacem . . . anum*).

32. This verse in turn recalls the famous phrase of the Funeral Oration (Thuc. 2. 43. 3): ἀνδρῶν γὰρ ἐπιφανῶν πᾶσα γῆ τάφος. The similarity suggests that the epigram is the work of an imitator and not the historian. The two phrases are set together by Gomme, *Historical Commentary*, II, 138; cf. J. T. Kakrides, "Der Thukydideische Epitaphios ein Stilistischer Kommentar," *Zetemata*, XXVI (1961), 92, n. 1. Timotheus was also credited with the authorship: see Schmid-Stählin, I: 3, 324, n. 9.

beginning with Euripides' *Alexandros*,[33] repeated in the *Troades* (Eur. *Tr.* 921–22 with Paley[2]), imitated in Republican tragedy, probably Ennius' *Alexander*.[34] It was reflected in Vergil too (*Aen.* 7. 320; 10. 705).

The surest indication of Senecan innovation is to catch him in a mistake such as no Greek could make with his own mythology. There is one in Seneca's prologue. At verse 60 Seneca gives the Trojan seer, Helenus, the twin brother of Cassandra, a wife whom he nowhere else has.[35] Later of course he will marry Andromache but until then he remained a bachelor. Possibly mention of Andromache at *Tr.* 59 recalled Helenus to the tragedian who carelessly added a wife to set among the prisoners awaiting raffle.

I have found another error in Seneca at *Tr.* 415: "Peliacus axis pondere Hectoreo tremens." Here *Peliacus* is the adjective of *Peleus* and *Peliacus axis* means Achilles' chariot[36] contrasting properly with *pondere Hectoreo*. The Greek Πηλιακός however derives from Πήλιον; and, if Seneca had been accurate, *Peliacus axis* would have to mean what it does not, "a chariot built on Mount Pelion."

Thus for the prologue, surely a Senecan invention. Another passage may also be argued Senecan, the speech of Talthybius (*Tr.* 164–202). The motivation for the murder of Polyxena is the demand of Achilles' Ghost. A problem for any dramatist treating the story was to convey the cruel demand to the audience. How did Seneca proceed? Strauss and K. Liedloff[37] contend that he followed Sophocles' *Polyxena*. This is not true; for in the prologue of Sophocles' *Polyxena* the Ghost of Achilles appeared over the tent of Agamemnon and made his demand personally to the reluctant king.[38] Seneca declined to imitate such a dramatic prologue that entailed bringing another character, a supernatural one, into the cast.

Balsamo, Braun, Moricca, Pais, and Werner[39] oddly derive Seneca's speech from Euripides' *Hecuba*. But in the *Hecuba* the Ghost of Polydorus (Eur. *Hec.* 34 ff.) narrates the epiphany to the audience and again at 108 ff. the chorus of Trojan women, eyewitnesses of the epiphany, relate it to Hecuba, who had been in her tent during Polydorus' appearance. As Seneca has no need for the Polydorus-Polymestor incident, itself a melodramatic Euripidean invention, he could not use the ghost as prologist and so is driven to discard not imitate Euripides' *Hecuba*. Neither does Seneca have the chorus relate the epiphany because Hecuba is not to know of Achilles' demand until Helen unwittingly reveals it in her presence (*Tr.* 938 ff.). Hence Hecuba faints (*Tr.* 950–51) on first learning the news. The ignorance of Hecuba enhances her pathos. That the audience knows makes the duplicity of Helen (*Tr.* 861 ff.) more sinister. The actor playing Hecuba,[40] therefore, must exit at verse 164 to return as Pyrrhus at verse 203, and Talthybius' speech is addressed to the chorus. This confirms the "scaenae inscriptum," *Talthybius, Chorus*. The chorus, consequently, in the

33. See esp. G. Murray, "The Deceitfulness of Life," *Greek Studies* (Oxford, 1946), pp. 127–48.

34. See *Inc. inc. fab.* 5–6 Ribbeck[2]: "máter grauida párere se ardentém facem / Visa ést in somnis Hécuba . . ." Also see Ennius *Alexander* 48 Ribbeck[2]: "Adest, adest fax óbuoluta sánguine atque incéndio!"

35. See R. Engelmann, *Lex. Myth.*, I: 2 (1886–90), 1980. 43, and W. Süss, *RE*, VII (1912), 2847. 19–21 ("nur ad hoc fingiert").

36. W. Pape and G. E. Benseler, *Wörterbuch der Griechischen Eigennamen*[3] (Braunschweig, 1863–70), p. 1191, are right.

37. See Herrmann, *Théâtre*, p. 269.

38. See *GRBS*, VII (1966), 43–45.

39. See Herrmann, *Théâtre*, p. 269, who also cites A. Widal, *Étude sur trois tragédies de Sénèque imitées d'Euripide* (Paris, 1854), as arguing Senecan originality. I have been unable to consult a copy of this book.

40. I assume that men still played female roles: see Columella *RR* 1. *Praef.* 15. At Dio 62. 9. 5 τῶν γυναικῶν more easily refers to female characters than to actresses.

classical manner, and not Hecuba, as Seneca would have preferred, must deliver the exhortation to relate the worst at *Tr.* 166–67.[41] Presumably the chorus will exit after their ode at 860 thereby avoiding the embarrassment of not interrupting Helen in her lies (*Tr.* 861 ff.) nor of warning Polyxena, who by *Tr.* 871 is present with her mother, after Helen had delivered her soliloquy to an empty stage.

There are weaknesses in Seneca's solution. First with Talthybius he creates a colorless character who is not even named in the dialogue but could be simply *Nuntius.* He delivers some thirty-six rather hyperbolic verses and exits silently. Secondly, there is no motivation for Talthybius' entrance and recital within the action itself. He does not, as the Ghost of Achilles in Sophocles' *Polyxena*, inform Agamemnon, who enters (*Tr.* 203), already having learned elsewhere and quarreling about the matter with Pyrrhus.[42] Nor does Talthybius enter as at Eur. *Hecuba* 484 to drag off the hapless Polyxena, who is much later removed by her executioner. Nor need he enter to inform the chorus. There is no reason for the chorus to be informed. They never later utilize their information; and, indeed, because their knowledge is embarrassing, they must exit before the Helen scene. Finally, Seneca's decision to assign the exposition to Talthybius has the side effect of leaving very little for Hecuba to say in the prologue, where she is reduced largely to lamentation.

Talthybius' speech, in short, is Seneca's own creation. It was in neither of the two sources that are relevant to the matter and its defects are readily explicable if we assume Senecan invention. In only a vague sense can one say that he may have been indebted to Euripides' *Hecuba.* The character Talthybius exists there as well as in Euripides' *Troades*; and the idea of presenting the epiphany of Achilles' Ghost in narrative rather than in a visible scene was first in *Hecuba.* These two matters are too general specifically to require *Hecuba* as a carefully scrutinized source.

Before leaving Seneca's Talthybius Speech, a word on *Nachleben.* In 1559 Jasper Heywood published a famous and influential translation of Seneca's *Troas* to which he added a scene, expanded from the Talthybius Speech, where the Ghost of Achilles appeared to demand Polyxena. Unknowingly he was returning to the original Sophoclean version in the *Polyxena.* Heywood's Ghost was the first of a long line of Elizabethan specters and demonstrably influenced the one in *Hamlet* among many others. Students of English literature ought therefore to be grateful for Seneca's attempt, however unskilled it be.[43]

If I have been successful in eliminating the *Hecuba* as source for the Talthybius Speech, does a passage exist in the *Troades* that indubitably and solely derives from the *Hecuba*? There is the second stasimon (*Tr.* 814–60). Both Euripides' plays that treat the fate of the Trojan survivors contain a stasimon (E. *Hec.* 444–82; *Tr.* 197–229) concerned with the fate of the prisoners: "Where shall we all end up?" Presumably the original was found in Sophocles' *Αἰχμαλωτίδες*, for the choreuts of the *Polyxena* were Greek soldiers and the play avoided the trope. Seneca, not the most imaginative innovator, could scarcely avoid its inclusion. Probably once in Sophocles, surely twice in Euripides, Seneca found a chorus of captive Trojan

41. For the decline of the postclassical tragic chorus see now G. M. Sifakis, *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama* (London, 1967), pp. 113 ff.

42. For the quarreling entrance see W. Steidle, *Philologus,* XCIV (1941), 279, n. 41, and *Zeitschrift Rostock,* p. 555.

43. See H. de Vocht, *Jasper Heywood and His Translations of Seneca's "Troas," "Thyestes" and "Hercules Furens"* (Louvain, 1913; repr. Vaduz, 1963).

women speculating in lyric meter upon their eventual fate in Greek lands. So much was derivative, very little else.

Look for a moment at the *Hecuba*. The ode begins (E. *Hec.* 444–47) with the query, "Where shall the sea breeze bear us?" Doris and Phthie are suggested, and next a stanza each is devoted to Delos and Athens. The ode ends with a lament for ruined Troy. Seneca too begins with a question: "Quae vocat sedes habitanda captas?" (*Tr.* 814). But of the place names in the *Hecuba* only Phthie survives. Achilles and Neoptolemus made inclusion inevitable. Delos, where indeed it was improbable that any captive would be brought and which perhaps was included by Euripides for contemporary political reasons,[44] is entirely omitted and so is Athens characteristically extolled by Euripides. The *Hecuba* was no source for Seneca.

Euripides *Troades* 197 ff., the later reworking of the ode in the *Hecuba*, likewise begins with a question. Again we find "the blessed land of Theseus." Sicily is suggested. The Sicilian Expedition had recently left Piraeus. Seneca discarded the island. Of special interest is Euripides' prayer "may we never be slaves on the banks of Eurotas to Menelaus, sacker of Troy" (E. *Tr.* 210–13). Seneca works the sentiment into his ode embellished with an apostrophe and anaphora (*Tr.* 853 ff.). But notice the differences. Numerous names in Seneca are in neither of Euripides' plays. He used the most obvious source beneficially, Homer's *Catalogue of Ships* (*Il.* 2. 494 ff.). Of Seneca's thirty-two place names, twenty-six are in the *Catalogue*. *Bessan et Scarphen* (*Tr.* 848) were taken from the same Homeric verse (*Il.* 2. 532). Without Homer Seneca was liable to error: "Attica pendens Peparethos ora" (*Tr.* 842). The slenderest tradition alleges Peparethos to be an Attic deme[45] as well as the island known for its wine. Inscriptions have not confirmed the allegation. Delrio would redeem Seneca by changing *Attica* to *arctica*. Rather, as we have seen elsewhere, a naïve error. The poet wanted a reference to Athens but bungled the whole. Innocuous Vergilian tags confirm an impression of Senecan originality, for example, "Olenos tectis habitata raris" (*Tr.* 825) from Vergil *G.* 3. 340 (cf. *Aen.* 8. 98). The effect of the whole is discouraging.

I propose in conclusion that the prologue (*Tr.* 1–66), the first half of the first epeisodion (*Tr.* 165–202), and the second stasimon (*Tr.* 814–60) were composed by Seneca without recourse to a specific Greek tragedy. Because Seneca's parodos (*Tr.* 67–164) was modeled after Euripides' *Troades*, no passage remains in Seneca's *Troades* that requires Euripides' *Hecuba*. We must conclude, therefore, that, unlike his admired Ovid,[46] Seneca discarded the *Hecuba*. His play was a contamination of three Greek sources filled out with occasional original scenes.[47]

COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY

44. See G. H. Macurdy, *The Chronology of the Extant Plays of Euripides* (Diss.; Columbia, 1905), p. 41; R. Goossens, "Euripide et Athènes," *Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe des Lettres; Mémoires* 55, Fasc. 4 (1962), 315–16.

45. Schol. on S. *Ph.* 549 (367. 11 Papageorgius): see R. Herbst, *RE*, XIX (1937), 558. 60 ff.

46. Ovid in *M.* 13 certainly used E. *Hec.*: see P. Venini, "L'Ecuba di Euripide e Ovidio, *Met.* XIII, 429–576," *RIL*, LXXXV (1952), 364–77.

47. The table at *Zeitschrift Rostock*, p. 558 must be corrected. A case could be argued from language and sentiment that two other "Senecan passages" exist, the first and third stasima (*Tr.* 371–408; 1009–55).