

units). In the cases of *invaserit* and *machinator* Tacitus has also turned what was literal in Virgil into metaphor.

Tacitus is also following a larger Virgilian narrative line. Hitherto in *Aeneid* 2 we have had the elaboration of the *dolus* itself – the pretence of the horse to be what it is not (*votum pro reditu simulant*, 17) and the brilliant rhetorical stratagem of Sinon who with consummate guile can, in order, free himself, open the gates of the city to the mendacious *monstrum*, and liberate Epeos, its crafter, and his colleagues from its womb.<sup>3</sup> Only then can the city be invaded, with ruinous consequences. Tacitus' sentence, and Octavian's career, follow a similar progress. Both begin with subterfuge:

pietatem erga parentem et tempora rei publicae obtentui sumpta ... simulatam Pompeianarum gratiam partium; ...

And only after this deceit has worked its magic can Octavian, as he contrives his ascent to unique power, play the metaphorical role of an attacking army, 'invading' the rights of praetor and then 'occupying' the forces of consuls, one of whom, it is implied, he did to death. In each author emphasis on the cunning behind this necessary deception comes at a crucial moment of transition when, in the case of Octavian, disguise is lifted and latent greed for power more fully revealed. Through Tacitus' Virgilian allusion Octavian emerges as at once a Sinon and an Epeos, first insinuating his nefarious way into Roman institutions and then bringing more into the open his attack on the doomed republic.

It may not be accidental that Tacitus' next sentence contains an apophthegm worthy of attention by those pondering Aeneas at the end of his epic, *ira terribilis* in the face of Turnus' plea – his last words – for an end to hatred: *ulterius ne tende odiis* (*Aen.* 12.938). In the case of Octavian both deceit (*sed Pompeium imagine pacis, sed Lepidum specie amicitiae deceptos*) and hatred (*sane Cassii et Brutorum exitus paternis inimiciis datos*) continue. The latter abstraction would seem to help motivate Aeneas too, *furiis accensus* as he kills, spurning Turnus' prayer. On Octavian's continuing hatred Tacitus comments: ...*fas sit privata odia publicis utilitatibus remittere*. I do not consider it impossible, given his sympathetic, skilful adoption of Virgil in the preceding phrases, for Rome's greatest historian to have made this further, final leap toward a judgemental reading of the *Aeneid*'s final moment.

Brown University

MICHAEL C. J. PUTNAM

<sup>3</sup> There are other notable instances where the phraseology of *Aeneid* 2 stayed with Tacitus as he wrote. Elsewhere, for example, he draws from Virgil's description of the wooden horse, *instar montis* (*Aen.* 2.15; re. *Ann.* 2.61), and of the spectre of death that looms over Troy's final night (*mortis imago*: *Aen.* 2.369, *Ann.* 15.70).

### MANILIUS 1.88

Manilius begins his first book with a brief summary of the early history of astronomy, leading to a sketch of the rise of civilization. In the following passage, printed as it is found in one of the principal manuscripts *M*, he describes the invention of language, agriculture and navigation:

1.85                    tunc et lingua suas accepit barbara leges,  
                             et fera diuersis exercita frugibus arua,  
                             et uagus in caecum penetrauit nauita pontum,  
                             fecit et ignotis inter commercia terris.

88 itiner *GLN<sup>mg</sup> V*: iter *N*: iter in *Gron.*: linter *Hous.*

Gronovius' correction *iter in* is printed by the most recent editor G. P. Goold, whose reports of the manuscripts are cited above, in both his Loeb (1977) and Teubner (1985) editions. In his Loeb edition line 88 is translated, 'and established trade-routes between lands unknown to each other'. This emendation has much to recommend it over Housman's *linter*; for a change of subject would spoil the rhetorical articulation of the rising tricolon. But the resulting expression is awkward, and it is not adequately paralleled by Sen. *Nat.* 4.2.4 *harenas per quas ad commercia Indici maris iter est*. Housman notes that no decisive support for either proposal is provided by the parallel at Man. 4.170 *totque per ignotas commercia iungere terras*, but it does suggest a simpler change: *fecit et ignotas inter commercia terras*. The corruption arose when the preposition was mistakenly construed with *commercium*, which intervenes between *iter* and the noun it governs. The word order here is guaranteed by the examples cited by Housman in his note on 1.245, which include one other from Manilius: 5.372 *medios inter uolucrum prensare meatus*.

Columbia University

PETER E. KNOX

### SENECA, *TROADES* 1109–10

quis tuos artus teget  
tumuloque tradet?

teget *codd.*: leget Bentley

The English critic Bentley first proposed emending the transmitted text of *Troades* 1109 from *teget*, the reading of all manuscripts, to *leget*.<sup>1</sup> Bentley's suggestion subsequently gained wide acceptance and was printed in many later editions of the tragedies, including those of Leo (1878–9), Richter (1902), and Moricca (1917–23). More recent critics have favoured retention of the manuscript reading. Carlsson, for example, underlines the distinctive alliterative quality which the reading *teget* imparts to the line;<sup>2</sup> and the latest commentator on the *Troades* has produced a spirited defence of the transmitted text:

Andromache has not yet realized the condition of the corpse, and is thinking, not of gathering up fragmented limbs, but merely of the formal requirements of burial. What Carlsson (I p. 50) defends on grounds of alliteration should be retained on grounds of sense: *teget tumuloque tradet* is a doublet of which the second part makes clear the religious meaning of the first, more general, word.<sup>3</sup>

To the arguments put forward by Carlsson and Fantham, I can now add yet a third. *Teget* should be favoured not only on grounds of sound and sense, but for its

<sup>1</sup> Bentley never produced an edition of the tragedies. However, he did leave marginal jottings on the text which have been collected by E. Hedecke in *Studia Bentleiana* fasc. 2 (*Seneca Bentleianus*) (Freienwaldiae, 1899), pp. 9ff.

<sup>2</sup> G. Carlsson, *Die Ueberlieferung der Seneca-Tragoedien* (Lund, 1926), p. 50. For an opposing view, see Otto Zwierlein, *Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas* (Meisenheim am Glan, 1966), p. 193.

<sup>3</sup> E. Fantham, *Seneca's Troades. A Literary Introduction with Text, Translation, and Commentary* (Princeton, 1982), p. 374. Zwierlein in his new Oxford Classical Text of the *Tragoediae* (1986) retains the manuscript reading *teget*. In an earlier discussion of the passage (*Würzburger Jahrbücher für die Altertumswissenschaft* N.F. 4 (1978), 152 n. 51), he has also argued in favour of *teget*: 'In Tro 1109 verteidigt Axelson das überlieferte *artus teget tumuloque tradet* als einen Doppelausdruck analog Verg. Aen. 6.152. *Artus leget* (Bentley) würde die folgende Schilderung – so führt er aus – unpassend antizipieren: Andromache möchte sich ja gern vorstellen, dass die Leiche des Astyanax wenigstens heil ist.'