NOTES ON SENECA, *EPISTVLAE* AND *NATVRALES QVAESTIONES*

(A) *EPISTVLAE*

By far the best edition is that of L. D. Reynolds (OCT, 1965). Other modern editions referred to are those of W. C. Summers (*Select Letters*, 1910); R. M. Gummere (Loeb edition, 1918–25); F. Préchac (texte) et H. Noblot (traduction) (Budé edition, 1945–64).

13.14. pudet me *ibi sic* tecum loqui et tam lenibus te remediis focilare.

'*ibi* sunt qui defendunt [in the sense of 'in eius modi re']…sed uix sanum est neque feliciter adhuc quisquam emendauit', Reynolds. The infelicitous emendations which he rightly rejects are *tui, si uis, et, Lucili*, and *diu*. I think that *sic*, as well as *ibi*, is corrupt, and that its initial *s* belongs to the preceding word; I would read *ūbis* (i.e. *uerbis*) *his*; cf. *TLL* 7.2.1671.81ff.

14.13. quid aliud quam uociferatus est Cato et misit inritas uoces cum modo per populi leuatus manus et obrutus sputis †et portandus† extra forum *traheretur*, modo e senatu in carcerem duceretur?
   et portandis L^1

Modern editors read either *exportandus* (the vulgate) or *exportantium* (Rossbach); neither is convincing. *Exportandus*, 'marked for exile' (Gummere), presumably refers to the dispatch of Cato to Cyprus in April 58 B.C., but it is odd that Seneca should couple this with the manhandling incident, which occurred a whole year earlier. With *exportantium* the meaning is 'couvert des crachats de ceux qui l'emportaient' (Noblot); this seems to ignore the force of the compound verb, and even if *exportantium* is replaced by *portantium* (Linde) it remains a weak and otiose expression.
   Seneca mentions this manhandling of Cato again at *Dial.* 2.1.3, '[Cato] a rostris usque ad arcum Fabianum per seditiosae factionis manus traditus uoces inprobas et sputa et omnis alias insanae multitudinis contumelias pertulisset.' This passage suggests that *et portandus* conceals a second noun in the ablative with the same general meaning as *uoces inprobas* or *alias contumelias*. Either Rossbach's *et exprobrationibus* or Busche's *et probris infandis* (or *nefandis*) satisfies the sense, but neither has much transcriptional probability. Better, I suggest, *et ⟨probris⟩ portentosis* (or, with better rhythm, *portentuosis*); this adjective, which occurs also at *Epp.* 87.23 and 114.7. is quite in keeping with *insanae multitudinis* at *Dial.* 2.1.3.
   Apparently *traheretur* has never been queried, but (a) the heroic clausula arouses suspicion, (b) the sense which it gives is hardly compatible with *per populi leuatus manus* and *per factionis manus traditus*. The latter phrase might suggest *traderetur*, but this does not go well with *extra forum*. The word we require is, I suggest, *truderetur*.

27.2. clamo mihi ipse 'numera annos tuos et pudebit eadem uelle quae uolueras puer, eadem *parare*.

The meaning of *parare* is not clear: 'pursue' (Gummere), 'viser aux mêmes

satisfactions' (Noblot); it seems much too vague a word in this context. Palaeographically easy would be ⟨s⟩*perare*, but I think that *optare* would give a more appropriate sense; cf. 31.5, 'quid contingere tibi uelis, quid optes'.

40.2. hoc non probo in philosopho, cuius pronuntiatio quoque, sicut uita, debet esse composita;...itaque oratio illa apud Homerum concitata et sine intermissione in morem niuis superueniens oratori data est, lenis et melle dulcior *seni* profluit.

The contrast is between the style of the orator (exemplified by Odysseus) and that of the philosopher (exemplified by Nestor), not between the styles of youth and age. Hence Summers rightly says that instead of *seni* one might expect *sapienti*. One might equally well suggest ⟨*sapienti*⟩ *seni*, Nestor's age being mentioned merely as a source of his *sapientia*.

40.9. recte ergo facies si non audieris istos qui quantum dicant, non quemadmodum, quaerunt, et ipse malueris, si necesse est, †uel P. Vinicium dicere qui itaque†. cum quaereretur quomodo P. Vinicius diceret, Asellius ait 'tractim'.

Several attempts have been made to restore the obelized passage; most of them change *uel P. Vinicium* to *ut P. Vinicius*. I should prefer to keep *uel P. Vinicium* and to alter *dicere* (an infection from the two other occurrences of this verb) to *uincere*, 'outdo' (as at 60.3, 'animalium auiditatem uinceremus'). Then *qui itaque* can become '*quid ita?*' (put into the mouth of his correspondent), 'why do you say so?', for which see *OLD* s.v. *ita*, sense 9, and *TLL* 7.2.520.23ff. The superfluous *-que* could have come from the following *cum*.

42.1. nam ille alter [the real *uir bonus*] fortasse tamquam phoenix semel anno quingentesimo nascitur. nec est mirum ex interuallo ⟨magno⟩ magna generari: mediocria et in turbam nascentia saepe fortuna producit, eximia uero ipsa raritate commendat.

I have inserted the word which I think the context demands. Both the reference to the phoenix and the words *ipsa raritate* show that the real *uir bonus* comes into existence not 'after an interval' but 'after a *long* interval'. Similarly at *Dial.* 2.7.1 Seneca says of the Stoic *sapiens* 'qualem conformamus exhibuimus exhibebimus raro forsitan *magnis*que aetatium interuallis unum.'

48.1. quanto magis hoc mihi faciendum est, cum longiore mora opus sit ut soluas quaestionem quam ut proponas?

This sentence is always punctuated as a question, but it is an exclamation. The same is true of 95.27, 'quantulo autem hoc minus est, testas excerpere atque ossa et dentium opera cocum fungi?'; 108.37, 'quanto maiore putas uitam tempestate iactari quam ullam ratem?'; 114.15, 'quot genera tibi in hac dabo quibus peccetur?'; 124.8, 'atqui quantulum interest inter eum qui cum maxime uitam accipit et illum qui maternorum uiscerum latens onus est?'

48.7. alium mors *uocat*, alium paupertas urit, alium diuitiae uel alienae torquent uel suae.

'In *uocat* muss ein Verbum stecken, das dem folgenden *urit* und *torquent* entspricht, vermutlich *uexat*', H. Georgii, *Philol.* 84 (1929), 85. Similarly D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *CQ* 20 (1970), 352, regards *uocat* as an impossible companion for *urit* and *torquent*. I agree with this view; for one thing, death 'beckons to' all men, not merely to some.

In favour of Georgii's *uexat* is the fact that Seneca uses that verb with such subjects as *honor* (74.2, a context very similar to ours), *uerminatio* (78.9), and *fortuna* (79.14). As an alternative Shackleton Bailey suggests *uellicat*, comparing (for the use of the word of mental annoyance) 63.1, 'illum...ista res [the death of a friend] uellicabit'. Yet another possibility might be *coquit* (both the *c/u* and the *qu/c* interchanges are common); cf. 70.4, 'alios macerauit et coxit (*sc.* uita)'; *OLD* sense 6; *TLL* 4.928.33ff.

52.5. puta enim duo aedificia excitata esse, *ambo disparia*, aeque excelsa atque magnifica.

It seems high-handed just to write *paria* for *disparia*, as most editors have done. Professor R. G. M. Nisbet has suggested to me that *amb ⟨it⟩u* should replace *ambo*; I would then read *ambitu ⟨non⟩ disparia*. Area thus balances height.

57.4. quaedam enim, mi Lucili, nulla effugere uirtus potest; admonet illam natura mortalitatis suae. itaque et uultum adducet ad *tristia* et inhorrescet ad subita et caligabit si uastam altitudinem in crepidine eius constitutus despexerit: non est hoc timor sed naturalis adfectio inexpugnabilis rationi.

Vultum...tristia does not mean 'will contract his brow when the prospect is forbidding' (Gummere) or 'ses traits se crisperont devant une scène de tristesse' (Noblot), but 'will grimace at bitter tastes'. This sense of *tristis* is adequately illustrated in the dictionaries; for the involuntary distortion of the face caused by a bitter taste cf. Virgil, *Georg.* 2.246f., 'sapor...ora/tristia temptantum sensu torquebit amaro'.

82.4. quacumque te abdideris, mala humana circumstrepent: multa extra sunt quae circumeunt nos †quae† aut fallant aut urgeant, multa intus quae in media solitudine exaestuant.

'Beaucoup viennent du dehors et font ronde autour de nous, cherchant le point favorable à une surprise, à un écrasant assaut', Noblot. This translation suggests that the corrupt *quae*, an erroneous repetition of the preceding *quae*, should be emended to *qua*, not (as all editors print) to *quo* (so the codd. dett.); instances of final *quo* without a comparative should probably not be increased by conjecture (Hofmann-Szantyr 679f.). But ⟨*si*⟩ *qua* would express the sense more clearly.

92.9. huic tamen Scyllae fera animalia adiuncta sunt, horrenda *uelocia*.

The irrational part of the human soul resembles the Virgilian Scylla, which was compounded of parts of various animals; Virgil (*Aen.* 3.426–8, lines which Seneca has just quoted) mentions the *pistrix*, the wolf, and the dolphin. No doubt these animals could be called 'swift', but this attribute has no relevance to the human soul. I suggest *atrocia*, comparing *Dial.* 4.36.3, 'effigies atrox et horrida'. The clausula is still a good one (hypodochmius).

98.1. fragilibus innititur qui *aduenticio* laetus est: exibit gaudium quod intrauit.

Considerations of concinnity suggest *aduenticiis*.

124.24. tunc beatum esse te iudica cum tibi ex te gaudium omne nascetur, cum uisis quae homines *eripiunt* optant custodiunt nihil inueneris, non dico quod malis, sed quod uelis.

Eripiunt is very odd in this context; 'clutch at', says Gummere, but that ought rather to be *arripiunt*. The word should have been emended long ago to *cupiunt*, of which it is a very simple corruption (*c > e: u > ri*). For an attempt to distinguish between *cupere, optare*, and *uelle* see Seyffert-Müller's note on Cicero, *Lael.* 59 (p. 389).

(B) *NATVRALES QVAESTIONES*[1]

The following modern editions are referred to: A. Gercke (Leipzig, 1907);
P. Oltramare (Budé edition, 1929); T. H. Corcoran (Loeb edition, 1971–2);
H. M. Hine (Book 2, New York, 1981). Page-references are given to B. Axelson's two
brochures, *Senecastudien* (Lund, 1933) and *Neue Senecastudien* (Lund, 1939), and to
D. R. Shackleton Bailey's notes in *CQ* 29 (1979), 448–56.

1.1.2. Aristoteles quoddam genus horum capram uocat;...satius erit de re ipsa quaerere quam
mirari quid ita Aristoteles globum ignis appellauerit *capram.*

The last word looks like a gloss, although its deletion would produce a less good
clausula.

1.5.9. ut nubes infici possint,...sol ad hoc apte ponendus est; non enim idem facit undecumque
effulsit, et ad hoc opus est radiorum idoneus *ictus.*

Seneca is discussing rainbows.
    Axelson (1933, p. 26) objects (a) that *radiorum ictus* is poetical; (b) that instead of
ictus, which is too general and indefinite, we need a word like *locatio* (corresponding
to the preceding *ponendus*); (c) that the clausula *idoneus ictus* is 'möglichst schlecht'
(he does not add that this is the only instance in which Seneca construes *opus est* with
a nominative, a construction which can perhaps be tolerated). He would therefore
alter *ictus* to *situs*. But 'location', although apt enough of the sun itself in relation to
clouds, is not appropriate of the sun's swiftly moving *radii*. I suggest ⟨*tr*⟩*actus*,
'direction' (*OLD* sense 2).

1.6.4. proprium enim hoc speculi est, in quo non per partes struitur quod apparet sed statim
totum fit; aeque cito omnis imago aboletur in illo quam *ponitur.*

'Every image in a mirror is abolished with as great a speed as it *is formed*', Corcoran.
It seems very doubtful if *ponitur* could mean 'is formed', Muretus's emendation
⟨*com*⟩*ponitur*, never mentioned nowadays, is much more likely (*OLD* sense 7); *com*
could have been omitted because of its similarity to the preceding *quam*.

1.15.4. at quibus longior mora est et ignis fortior motumque caeli *sequens* aut etiam proprios
cursus *agunt*, cometas nostri putant.

'Syntax will be salved by adding *qui* after *etiam* (Erasmus) or by changing *agunt* to
agens', Shackleton Bailey (p. 450), who prefers the latter alternative. There is a third
and (I think) preferable alternative, to change *sequens* to *sequuntur*; it is perfectly
normal Latin to supply a nominative from the preceding *quibus* (Kühner-Stegmann
ii. 323 ad fin.). This is another old emendation (of Fortunatus) which has been
suppressed in modern editions; it is not so bold a change as it might seem, since the
ending would be abbreviated and the *t/s* interchange is frequent; the rhythm remains
good. The opposite corruption, of a participle of this very verb (*consecuturus*) to a
finite form (*consequuntur*), has occurred at 1.17.4.

1.16.1. Hostius fuit Quadra, obscenitatis in *scaenam* usque perductae.

That *scaenam* is corrupt has been convincingly maintained by Shackleton Bailey (p.
450). It is true that in its favour Axelson (1933, pp. 30f.) adduces §6 below, where
Seneca says that Hostius 'obscenitatem suam spectaculum fecerat', but that passage

is irrelevant: *spectaculum* there is a private show (cf. ib. 'sibi ostentabat'; §5 'sibi ipse ostendit'), whereas *scaenam* in our passage must be a public exhibition. Shackleton Bailey proposes to change *scaenam* to *can⟨iti⟩em*, 'right up to old age', a sense which fits the context admirably; but why think of *canitiem* when *senium* (corrupted because of the preceding *obscenitatis*) is available?

1.17.3. praeterea duorum siderum occursum, quo interpellari dies solet, non uideremus nec scire possemus quid esset quod solem nulla obuersante nube subduceret, nisi *liberius* humi solis lunaeque imagines uideremus.

Eclipses should be viewed in some sort of mirror (e.g. a basin of water), since our eyes are too weak to stand direct sunlight (§2, 'imbecilli oculi ad sustinendum comminus solem').

Z's *interpellari* (also conjectured by Schottus, for *interpolari*) and *quod solem ...subduceret* (omitted in the main tradition) are clearly right. It only remains to emend *liberius*, 'rather freely' (Corcoran), 'plus aisément' (Oltramare). *Sustinendum* in §2 suggests *tolerabilius*; at Quintilian 6.3.83 *liberali* has been corrupted in the tradition to *tolerabili*.

1.17.6. et mox huic proprie ministerio praeparatus est orbis nondum argenti nitor sed *fragilis* uilisque materia.

The final stage in the development of mirrors. Man first saw his reflection in water, then in metal objects (like cups) made for some other use; finally came the making of mirrors as such.

It is difficult to accept the construction offered by the paradosis, in which *nitor* and *materia* are in apposition to *orbis*. The only plausible solution is the reading of E (doubtless a conjecture), *argentei nitoris*, followed by *materiae*.

What was the 'fragile and cheap material' referred to? Gercke takes it to be pottery, but even if Seneca imagined that glazed pottery was ever used for mirrors, he can hardly have thought that man reverted to this unsatisfactory material after the discovery of bronze and other metals. The reference must be to the baser metals (as contrasted with silver); therefore *fragilis* should, I think, be emended to *parabilis* (a word used by Seneca elsewhere).

1.17.8. et pluris unum ex his (*sc.* speculis) feminae constitit quam antiquarum dos fuit [non] illa quae publice dabatur imperatorum pauperum liberis.

It is usual just to delete *non*, but its presence in the text seems inexplicable; and the result of deleting it is an unsatisfactory linkage of the dowries of 'women of old' in general with those of the daughters of a very few penniless generals. We should expect the latter, provided at public expense, to be mentioned as exceptionally sumptuous for the times; and we could obtain this result by reading *non ⟨excepta⟩ illa* e.q.s.

2.5.2. omnium quidem rerum natura, quantum in nutrimentum sui satis sit, apprehendit; mundus autem, quantum in aeternum *desiderabat*, inuasit.

I suggest that *desiderabit* would be a good emendation. I am reminded of *Epp.* 93.9, 'quemadmodum omnia quae usquam *erant* cluserit (*sc.* natura)', where Axelson (1939, p. 200) convincingly emended *erant* to *erunt*.

2.9.2. hoc (*sc.* spiritu) attollitur (*sc.* aqua) inserto et cogente; contra naturam suam *multa conatur* et ascendit, nata defluere.

Under the pressure of air water rises upwards.

Multa conatur may well arouse suspicion. It is true, as Axelson (1939, p. 58) points out, that in some contexts *conari* can be almost equivalent to a verb of motion;

however, if it were given that sense here *multa* seems incompatible with it and should perhaps be changed to *sursum*. Elsewhere in this book (13.1) Seneca has 'quare ignis, quem natura *sursum uocat*, defluat' and (58.2) 'natura ignem *sursum uocat*'; these passages suggest that here he may have written *sursum uocatur*, and that *uocatur* became *conatur* by a very common type of error.

2.10.4. adice nunc ignes, non tantum manu factos et *certos* sed opertos terris.

'The point of adding *certos* is to mark a contrast with the *opertos*' (Hine). It strikes me as a very poor contrast, and I would change *certos* to *cultos* (the two words are variants at Martial 11.29.6). The meaning will then be 'man-made and man-tended'; for *ignem colere* cf. *TLL* 3.1675.53.

2.11.2. sed ceterae quoque stellae non minus terrena quam incumbentem terris spiritum afficiunt et cursu suo occursuue contrario modo frigora modo imbres aliasque terris *turbide* iniurias mouent.

Turbide, 'in a confused or disorderly manner', has aroused justified suspicion; nothing has been said in the preceding lines about earth, sun, or moon which would provide a credible contrast to *turbide*. However, none of the conjectures reported by Gercke is worth a second thought. I suggest *terris ⟨e⟩t urbibus*, the former noun meaning 'countries' (*OLD* sense 7b); this finds a perfect parallel at 6.31.2, 'in urbes terrasque saeuitum est'; cf. also 6.1.14, 'urbes oraeque terrarum'. It is natural that cities should receive due mention in Book 6, which deals with earthquakes, and equally natural that they should be mentioned here, since Seneca at once goes on to deal with another destructive force, lightning.

2.18. quid est ergo ipsa fulguratio? aeris diducentis se *corruentis*que iactatio languidum ignem nec exiturum aperiens.

Hine casts grave doubts on *corruentis*, 'rushing together': (a) this would be the only example in pre-Christian Latin of the primary sense of the word; (b) this sense is not very appropriate in the context, since 'contraction' is not elsewhere mentioned in connection with lightning. Hine himself conjectures *conitentis*, 'straining', but with this verb one would expect some sort of further definition (e.g. mention of goal). Palaeographically good would be *coeuntis*, but that also would give the sense of 'contraction' to which Hine objects. So perhaps *circumeuntis*, a form used by Seneca at 7.8.1.

2.27.4. hic (*sc.* sonus) fieri illo quoque modo potest, ut inclusus aer caua nube et motu ipso extenuatus diffundatur; deinde, dum maiorem sibi locum quaerit, a quibus inuolutus est sonum patitur.

Shackleton Bailey (p. 450) rightly protests that the last six words are meaningless, and suggests that something like 'ruptis quibus inuolutus est sonum facit' might represent the sense. I think that this is right, and that it only remains to propose a more plausible wording: *a quibus inuolutus est ⟨ictus⟩ sonum parit*; cf. below (ch. 29) *ictus aer*.

2.32.7. summissiora forsitan propius in nos uim suam derigunt *et ea quae* frequentius mota aliter nos aliterque prospiciunt.

The awkwardness of *et ea quae* as a second subject of *derigunt* could be eliminated by writing [*et*] *eaque*.

2.34.4. non refert an aliud sit per quod *quidem* quaerimus, quoniam de quo quaeritur idem est.

If *quidem* appeared in the paradosis (it is omitted by Z and other manuscripts), it must be a corruption of another word; I suggest *uerum*, 'the truth', already mentioned

half-a-dozen times earlier in this chapter. For a word beginning with *u* acquiring an initial *q* (particularly easy here by perseveration from *quod*) cf. Livy 3.67.11, where *uidemus* has become *quidem*; Martial 11.79.3, where *uiae* has become *quidem*; Ovid, *Ib.* 291, where *uictus* has become *quintus*.

An alternative possibility is *per quod quidem ⟨uerum⟩ quaerimus*.

2.35.1f. 'quid ergo? expiationes procurationesque quo pertinent, si immutabilia sunt fata?' permitte mihi illam rigidam sectam tueri eorum qui ⟨risu⟩ excipiunt ista et nihil esse aliud quam aegrae mentis solacia existimant. fata *aliter* ius suum peragunt, nec ulla commouentur prece; non misericordia flecti, non gratia sciunt; cursum irreuocabilem ingressa ex destinato fluunt.
risu *add.* Oltramare

Hine follows Axelson (1933, p. 37) in interpreting *aliter* as an elliptical expression meaning 'otherwise (than so as to be influenced by *expiatio* and *procuratio*)' although Axelson himself admits that this is 'unbestreitbar etwas hart' in view of the separation of *aliter* from *expiationes procurationesque*. On the other hand none of the half-dozen replacements which have been suggested for *aliter* is really convincing. I should read ⟨*non*⟩ *aliter*, sc. 'quam constituerunt': the fates exercise their rights 'no differently' because of all human *expiationes procurationesque*; this leads on satisfactorily to what follows.

2.38.2. hic diues erit, sed si nauigauerit; at in illo fati ordine quo patrimonium illi grande promittitur hoc quoque protinus *ad fatum* est, ut et nauiget: ideo nauigabit.

The manuscript offers *adfatum*, but there is no such word (see Hine); *ad fatum* must be intended. Even that can only be construed by taking *ad* in the sense of *secundum* (*OLD* sense 34), but after *in illo fati ordine* the repetition of *fatum* is both unnecessary and unpleasant. I suggest that *ad fatum* be deleted as a gloss; then 'at in illo fati ordine hoc quoque protinus est' corresponds to the preceding 'at eodem fato continetur' and to the following 'at hoc quoque in fato est'.

2.39.3. illud (*sc.* fulgur consiliarium) suadet dissuadetque, hoc (*sc.* fulgur monitorium) solam euitationem impendentis periculi continet, ut cum timemus ignem, fraudem a proximis, insidias *aut* *** a seruis.

Hine mentions three possibilities: 1. delete *aut*; 2. transpose *aut* to precede *insidias*; 3. mark a lacuna in which stood the first of two parallel *aut* phrases. I think that the last alternative is the best, and as a plausible supplement would suggest *aut* ⟨*ab hostibus aut*⟩.

2.45.2. uis illum (*sc.* Iouem) prouidentiam dicere, recte dices; est enim cuius consilio huic mundo prouidetur ut inoffensus *exeat* et actus suos explicet.

Hine justifiably finds *exeat* puzzling; rejecting Gercke's unconvincing explanation, he suggests [*ex*]*eat*. I think that a small lacuna is more probable, e.g. *ex* ⟨*ordine*⟩ *eat*.

2.48.1. omnium ergo fulminum et omnis euentus dies stata *sit*; non potest enim ulla incerti esse comprehensio.

The 'jussive' subjunctive *sit* is certainly wrong. The indicative *est* (a humanist conjecture) is recommended (a) by sense, (b) by clausula (hypodochmius), (c) by palaeography: *statast* mistaken for *stata sit*; for examples of this common mistake see C. F. W. Müller's critical note on Cicero, *Fam.* 1.6.2 (his p. 8.20).

2.54.1. e terra terrenisque omnibus *pars* umida efflatur, *pars* sicca et fumida; haec fulminibus alimentum est, illa imbribus.

To make the meaning and construction clear, the first *pars* should be preceded by a genitive; I suggest *halitus*, which could easily have been omitted after *omnibus*.

2.56.1. hoc apud Caecinam inuenio, facundum uirum et qui habuisset *aliquando* in eloquentia nomen nisi illum Ciceronis umbra pressisset.

I submit that *aliqn* (i.e. *aliquando*) is a misreading of *aliqd* (i.e. *aliquod*).

2.59.11. sed pauescis ad caeli fragorem et ad inane nubilum trepidas et, quotiens aliquid effulsit, *exspiras.*

Hine obelizes *exspiras* because death is not in question here. Seneca is talking of the terror caused by lightning, and we want an expression with the same sort of meaning as *pauescis* and *trepidas.* Rather than Leo's *desperas* or Hine's tentative *extimescis* I would write ⟨*prope*⟩ *exspiras.*

3.15.5. in corporibus nostris sanguis, cum percussa uena est, tam diu manat donec omnis effluxit aut donec uenae scissura *subsedit* atque *interclusit,* uel aliqua alia causa retro dedit sanguinem.

The meaning of *subsedit,* if *scissura* is its subject, is not at all clear; can a cut in a vein be said to subside? Much more probably it means 'abate' (of a discharge; *OLD* sense 6); then its subject is the same as that of *manat* and *effluxit,* viz. *sanguis.* In that case *scissura* must be an ablative, and there must be a small lacuna before *uenae* in which stood either Gercke's *in* or perhaps something like *coeunte* (just below we find *uena coit*; *TLL* 3.1419.11ff.). The subject of *interclus-* must likewise be *sanguis,* so that a passive, *interclusus est,* is required.

The variant reading *iter clusit* has found some favour, but *iter* seems the wrong word to use of a bleeding gash; *intercludere* is the right word if it can be given a satisfactory construction.

3.19.2. erant enim pinguia et differta, ut ex longo otio, corpora, ceterum inexercitata et *tenebris* saginata et lucis expertia, ex qua salubritas ducitur.

Unhealthy fish, fattened in dark regions underground, cast up in Caria.

Tenebris may be a local ablative without a preposition or an instrumental ablative with *saginata,* although it is difficult to accept the idea of darkness fattening fish; in either case it anticipates *lucis expertia.* With *saginata* we should expect a word denoting some sort of food. Busche (*Rhein. Mus.* 70 [1915], 575f.) suggested the insertion of *caeno* before *tenebris.* Perhaps rather *tenebris* conceals *taetris,* 'foul matter'; cf. *Epp.* 5.4, 'cibis taetris et horridis'.

3.25.7. sunt enim multi pumicosi et leues (*sc.* lapides), ex quibus quae constant insulae in Lydia natant; Theophrastus est auctor.

The abruptness of the last three words led Garrod (*CQ* 9 [1915], 41) to propose the change of *natant* to *natare.* Palaeographically preferable would be *natant,* ⟨*ut*⟩ *Theophrastus est auctor.*

3.27.5. solutis quippe radicibus arbusta procumbunt, et uitis atque omne uirgultum non tenetur solo, quod molle fluidumque est. iam nec gramina aut pabula laeta *aquis sustinet.*

The universal deluge which will destroy the world: its effect on the soil, and on things growing in the soil.

I take *nec* before *gramina* to mean 'not even', so that it is not co-ordinated with the following *aut.* If *sustinet* is sound, it must mean 'hold up', 'support' (cf. the preceding *tenetur*), with *solum* as its subject, but *aquis* is then impossible to construe unless (with Shackleton Bailey, p. 452) one inserts a participle like *laxatum* or *uictum.* Madvig (*Adv. crit.* ii. 445) advocated the change of *sustinet* to *sustinent* (which is actually the reading of the 12th century manuscript F), 'hold out' (intransitive), but the difficulty of *aquis* remains. This difficulty, however, disappears if one reads the accusative *aquas* and takes *sustinent* as transitive (*OLD* sense 4): 'hold out against', 'withstand', the floods.

3.27.7. [torrens] urbes et...trahit...populos;...in materia magna gentium clarus onustusque diffunditur.

The final destruction of the world by flood.

Shackleton Bailey (p. 452) has made an important contribution towards the restoration of this very corrupt sentence by proposing *in maria magna gentium clade onustus diffunditur*. I regard *maria* for *materia* as excellent, but *clade* for *clarus* does not commend itself, and one would like, if possible, to retain the *-que* after *onustus*. I suggest *in maria magna gentium ⟨strage⟩ elatus onustusque*. In support of *elatus*, which is the reading of E, I adduce 3.28.4 (of the part played by the sea in the final deluge), 'in miram altitudinem erigitur', 3.28.6, '[hic aestus] supra cacumina ...montium creuit'. The torrent is at once 'raised above' the heavier objects which it sweeps along and 'burdened' by the lighter ones, which float.

Other possibilities are *in maria magna ingenti ⟨strage⟩* and *in maria ⟨immania⟩ magna gentium ⟨strage⟩*. Finally, instead of *diffunditur*, Z offers *effunditur*, which may be preferable.

3.28.1. faciet pluuia segetes malas, fructum grando decutiet, intumescent *riuis* flumina, sed resident.

In this description of the final deluge it is odd to find the rivers swelling up 'with streams'. J. Müller emended *riuis* to *nimbis*, 'with waters', but the true emendation, I submit, is *riui et flumina*; cf. 3.6.2, 'riuis et fluminibus', 3.9.2, 'flumen aut riuum', 3.4 ad fin., *TLL* 6.961.79ff.

3.28.3. deinde ubi litus bis terque prolatum est et pelagus in alieno constitit, uelut amoto †malo† comminus procurrit aestus ex imo recessu maris.

The sense of the corrupt ablative absolute is clearly 'as though an obstruction had been removed', so that Z's *amoto*, not the rival reading *admoto*, must be right, and a word for 'obstruction' is required. Shackleton Bailey (p. 452) suggests that *malo* be changed to *uallo*, but I do not believe in this military metaphor, despite the presence of *comminus*. The obvious word is *claustro*, as at 30.2 below, 'non uides ut illi (*sc.* the sea) perpetua cum claustris suis pugna sit?' So perhaps *uelut amoto magno ⟨claustro⟩*; *magnus* has been corrupted to *malus* at [Quint.], *Decl. mai.* 2.6 (p. 25.24 H.).

3.28.4. deinde in miram altitudinem erigitur (*sc.* aqua) et *illis* tutis hominum receptaculis superest.

Like Kroll, I am suspicious of *illis*. He suggested *illinc* ('from there'), but I think that this may be yet another instance of the common confusion between forms of *ille* and forms of *ipse*; cf. *TLL* 7.2.297.34ff.

3.30.5. cum semel aliquid ex hac *idonea* diligentia remiserit mundus, statim undique ex aperto et abdito, superne, ab infimo, aquarum fiet irruptio.

The final deluge will come when the universe relaxes its present careful guard.

It is difficult to see what *idonea* means as an epithet of *diligentia*. Kroll suggested *diutina*; that is the sort of adjective which is required, but superior both palaeographically and in point of sense would be *⟨cot⟩idiana*; cf. *Clem.* 1.3.3, 'cuius (*sc.* regis aut principis) curam excubare pro salute singulorum atque universorum *cotidie* experiuntur'.

3.30.7. nec ea semper licentia undis erit, sed peracto exitio generis humani extinctisque pariter feris, in quarum homines ingenia *transierant*, iterum aquas terra sorbebit.

I see no reason why Seneca should have avoided the future perfect *transierint*, the normal tense in a sentence of this kind (main verb in the future tense).

4a. pr. 19. omnes ait [*sc.* Menander] malos uiuere...et adicit non singulos peccare nec paucos, sed iam *scelus* esse contextum.

In the light of *Dial.* 3.16.3 (adduced by Oltramare), 'animus sceleribus scelera contexens', read ⟨*sceleri*⟩ *scelus esse contextum*, a much more convincing expression.

4a.2.29. ob hoc Pontus in *inferum* mare assidue fluit rapidus.

The manuscripts are divided between *inferum* and *infernum*. The latter is ruled out by the fact that elsewhere Seneca uses *infernus* only of things underground or things otherwordly. On the other hand *mare inferum* is a standard expression for the *mare Tuscum*, off the west coast of Italy (*TLL* 7.1.1389.38ff.). What we want here is a designation either of the Propontis (cf. *TLL* 8.388.15 and *OLD*, s.v. *infernus*, 1d) or, just possibly, of the Mediterranean. The former could be obtained quite easily by reading *in finitimum mare*; the trouble could have started with the dittography of *in*.

4b.12. nam uicinus aer et plus habet frigoris quam ut in aquam imbremque transeat et minus quam ut duretur in grandinem: hoc medio frigore *non nimis intento* niues fiunt coactis aquis.

Non nimis intento looks like a gloss on *medio*, which might well have been thought to require a gloss.

5.4.1. cum magna et continua *ex imo* euaporatio in altum egit quae emiserat, *mutatio* ipsa halitus mixti in uentum uertitur.

Wind is produced by exhalations from the earth.

This passage is discussed by Axelson (1939, pp. 231f.). He convincingly emends *ex imo* to *e summo*, and equally convincingly rejects both the manuscript reading *mutatio* and two suggested emendations of it (*nutatio* and *immutatione*); he argues for *luctatio*, adducing 7.9.2, 'uentorum inter ipsos luctatio', and 5.12.5, 'in exitum nitentis (*sc.* spiritus) luctatio'. In both of these passages, however, *luctatio* has a further definition, here it would have none. As an alternative, therefore, I suggest *iactatio*, quoting 2.18, 'aeris diducentis se...iactatio'; 2.58.1, '[aer] fortius ipsa iactatione se accendit'; 6.28.3, 'uentorum iactatio'.

5.13.3. et fere omnia pericula uenti erupti de nubibus *produnt*, quibus armamenta rapiantur et totae naues in sublime tollantur.

This passage is discussed by Axelson (1933, p. 72). He convincingly reads *et fere* for *haec fere*, and also proposes *praebent* for *produnt*. I agree with him that the latter cannot stand; the evidence produced by *OLD* (sense 2b) for *prodere* in the sense of 'give rise to', 'cause', does not inspire confidence. But *praebent* also has been questioned: it has been pointed out by Summers (*CR* 48 [1934], 80) that in the two passages of Livy (26.5.5 and 26.10.7) which Axelson adduces the verb has as its object a state of mind or the result of such a state of mind (*terrorem*; *tumultum ac fugam*). Summers could have added Livy 32.17.17 *trepidationem*, 37.23.10 *tumultum*, even possibly 37.54.7 *deliberationem*; but 37.1.3 *magnum certamen* clearly falls outside Summers's limits, and Axelson's *praebent* in our passage remains a possibility. Also possible in meaning, although inferior in rhythm, would be *produ⟨cu⟩nt*, which Seneca uses in the required sense at (e.g.) *Epp.* 42.1 (*mediocria*) and 65.2 (*uaria opera*).

The antecedent of *quibus* (I am doubtful whether Axelson's insertion of *ut* before it is essential) is *uenti*, not (as Corcoran) *pericula*. But in that case *omnia* calls for remark. Axelson takes it to mean 'all sorts of'. Perhaps rather we should consider *omnia* ⟨*maritima*⟩ (cf. Livy 42.52.12, 'omnibus casibus maritimis') or *omnia* ⟨*marina*⟩ (cf. *TLL* 8.397.59ff.).

5.15.3. a tergo lucem relinquere quae tanta spes fuit?

The folly of mining for gold.

Editors accept *spes fuit* with an infinitive, although the construction is apparently unparalleled; however, they record Schultess's emendation *iussit*. Palaeographically preferable, I suggest, would be *fecit*. This use of *facio* with an infinitive is not common in prose before later Latin, but it is found; see Kühner-Stegmann i. 694 and *TLL* 6.115.37ff. At *Epp.* 114.17 Seneca jeers at Arruntius' excessive use of *facio*, and in one of the examples which he gives it is construed with an infinitive.

5.18.10. sic Alexander ulterior⟨a⟩ Bactris et Indis uolet quaeretque quid sit ultra magnum mare.

Shackleton Bailey (p. 453), rightly adopting Gercke's *ulteriora* (for *ulterior*), proposes to replace *uolet* by *uoluet* (sc. *in animo*). Much more probably *uolet* is sound and an infinitive is missing in front of it. I think that the best insertion would be *noscere*, comparing §14 below, 'ad ulteriora noscenda', and *Epp.* 119.7 (likewise of Alexander), 'scrutatur maria ignota'.

6.2.1. ego uero hoc ipsum solacii loco pono, et quidem ualentissimi, quoniam quidem sine remedio timor stultis est: ratio terrorem prudentibus excutit, imperitis magna fit ex desperatione securitas.

Man's natural fear of earthquakes can be overcome by the knowledge that they are unavoidable.

The difficulty is to see how the *quoniam* clause fits the development of the argument. The transmitted text states that the foolish (i.e. the philosophically unenlightened) have no remedy against fear; this contradicts the next sentence but one, 'the ignorant (*imperiti* is practically synonymous with *stulti*) derive from despair a freedom from fear'. Axelson (1933, p. 76) was the first to tackle the problem; he proposed to take *sine remedio* as attributive (with *timor*), not predicative, and to change *stultis* to *stultus*: 'since fear which lacks a remedy is foolish'. No wonder that he himself was dissatisfied with this and tentatively suggested *tutus* for *stultus*. Shackleton Bailey (pp. 453f.), rightly pointing out that the foolish or ignorant *do* have a remedy against fear—the knowledge that they are doomed beyond possibility of escape—, would insert *salutis* after *stultis* (like Axelson, he takes *sine remedio* as attributive): 'since fear which lacks a remedy is a means of salvation for the foolish'. I think that the solution is much simpler: *quoniam quidem ⟨non⟩ sine remedio timor stultis est*: the foolish do *not* lack a remedy against fear: 'whereas reason delivers the wise from terror, the ignorant derive from despair a profound feeling of freedom from fear.' It is possible, but no more, that *et* should be inserted between *timor* and *stultis*.

6.2.9. egregie Vagellius meus in illo inclito carmine 'si cadendum est [mihi],' inquit 'e caelo cecidisse uelim.' idem ⟨mihi⟩ licet dicere: si cadendum est, cadam orbe concusso.

One should not be frightened by earthquakes.

Housman (*Classical Papers* 1247f.) points out that *e caelo* and *orbe concusso* are not 'the same thing' (*idem*), and suggests changing *idem* to *item*, a change which, 'without entirely removing the fault, would diminish it'. There is a more satisfactory solution: for *e caelo* read *c̄* (i.e. *cum*) *caelo*, which can be regarded as synonymous with *orbe concusso*; cf. 6.32.4, 'frangatur licet caelum'. Housman proceeds to mend the metre by writing *si⟨cunde⟩ cadendum est*; apart from the fact that *sicunde* is a thoroughly prosaic word, there can be no certainty about how many words in Vagellius' original line have been omitted in Seneca's quotation of it.

6.6.2. in nauigiis quoque euenit ut, si inclinata sunt et abierunt in latus, aquam sorbeant, quae †in omni eorum onerum quae uehit†, si inmodice depressa sunt, aut superfunditur aut certe dextra sinistraque solito magis surgit.

The meaning is clearly explained by Shackleton Bailey (p. 454): 'when ships list they take in water, and also, when they are weighed down by their cargoes, the sea washes over the decks or at any rate comes up closer to their level.' He therefore suggests *quae momine eorum onerum quae uehunt*. I regard *uehunt* as excellent, but *momine* as a word which should not be foisted on Seneca; instead I would read *quae nimio ⟨pondere⟩ eorum onerum quae uehunt* or *quae nimio eorum pondere quae uehunt*. The fact that *in omni* occurs three lines previously may help to account for the corruption of *nimio*.

6.7.5. iam uero nimis oculis permittit nec ultra illos scit producere animum qui non credit esse in abdito terrae sinus maris uasti. nec enim uideo quid prohibeat aut obstet quominus *habeat* aliquod etiam in abdito litus et per occultos aditus receptum mare, quod illic quoque tantundem loci teneat aut fortassis hoc amplius quod *e.q.s.*

If this text is sound the subject of *habeat* must be *terra* supplied from the preceding *terrae*. This may be considered awkward enough to justify us in seeking an alternative solution, perhaps *pateat* for *habeat*; the extent of the sea is mentioned both in the preceding *maris uasti* and in the following *quod* clause.

6.14.4. at si ne rimam quidem per quam efflueret inuenit, conglobatus illic furit et hoc atque illo circumagitur, aliaque deicit alia intercidit, cum tenuissimus idemque fortissimus et *inrepat* quamuis in obstructa et quicquid intrauit ui sua diducat ac dissipet.

The subject is air trapped inside the earth.

Two variants offered by Z, *deiecit* for *deicit* and *interscidit* for *intercidit*, may be preferable, but my concern is with *inrepat*. This seems much too mild a word for this context. The obvious emendation is *inrumpat*.

6.19.1. Metrodorum Chium *quia* necesse est audiamus quod uult sententiae loco dicentem.

Quia, omitted in the vulgate text, may be genuine; in its defence Gercke adduces 5.11.1 and 6.5.2, *(mihi) dicendum est*, but that phrase lends it no support, and *necesse est audiamus* is very attractive. However, instead of deleting *quia* I would replace it by *quoque*; another mistake due to the abbreviation of *quoque* occurs just below, at 22.1, where *quoque eorum* has become *quorum* in all manuscripts except Z.

6.19.2. quomodo, cum in dolio cantatur, uox illa per totum cum quadam discussione percurrit ac resonat, et *tam* leuiter mota circumit non sine tactu eius tumultuque quo inclusa est.

Cantatur is Salmasius's emendation of *cantantis*. Other conjectures for this word, and some wild changes of *uox illa*, can be ignored.

Et tam leuiter mota, 'si légère que soit l'impulsion qu'elle a reçue', Oltramare. This is clearly the right sense, but *tam* is not the right word to express it. We might have expected *quamuis*, but *et ⟨et⟩iam*, a much easier change, will do just as well; for this combination see *TLL* 5.2.941.32ff.

6.21.2. nam nec succutiuntur tunc omnia nec inclinantur sed uibrantur, res minime in eiusmodi casu noxia, sicut ✶✶✶. longe perniciosior est inclinatio concussione *e.q.s.*

Gercke is certainly right in marking a lacuna after *sicut*; it is impossible to follow those editors who take *sicut* with what follows (*longe* must begin a new sentence). Whether Gercke's supplement *sicut ⟨dixi⟩* is right is not so certain (elsewhere Seneca uses not *sicut* but *ut* before *dixi*). If he is right in taking the reference to be to the Campanian earthquake mentioned in 6.1.1ff., one possibility would be *sicut ⟨nuper experti sumus⟩*; in that case one might point to 6.1.2, 'uillae…passim sine iniuria tremuere'.

6.27.4. oues uero mollioris naturae, *quo* propiora terris ferunt capita, correptas esse non miror, cum afflatus aeris diri circa ipsam humum exceperint.

Shackleton Bailey (p. 455) clearly explains the meaning: 'sheep are...prone to catch the pestilence, firstly because they are naturally more delicate that the larger domestic animals and secondly because they keep their heads closer to the infected soil'. He therefore rejects *quo*, 'in proportion as', and would replace it by ⟨*et*⟩ *quae*. Much better, I suggest, would be *quoniam* (which would be abbreviated); note 'because' in Shackleton Bailey's paraphrase.

6.32.12. mors naturae lex est, mors tributum officiumque mortalium malorumque omnium remedium est: *optauit illam quisquis timet.*

'Whoever is afraid has been longing for death' (Corcoran). This is manifestly untrue: many fears are trivial. *Timet* must be transitive, governing *illam* (= *mortem*); the whole context concerns the fear of death, not fear in general. But again it would not be true to say that anyone who fears death longs for it (*optauit* gnomic aorist) as 'malorum omnium remedium', and a similar objection applies to *optabit*, the less well attested variant which used to be the vulgate. But if *optabit* is taken not as an ordinary future but as equivalent to *optare debet*, we have a convincing Senecan *sententia*: 'anyone who fears death ought to long for it'. For this use of the future see Kühner-Stegmann i. 144, Hofmann-Szantyr 311, and Holden's note on Cicero, *Off.* 1.18 *adhibebit*.

7.10.3. credamus ignem circumacto turbine accendi et *hunc* expulsum in sublime praebere nobis opinionem speciemque sideris longi.

Seneca is refuting the theory that comets originate in whirlwinds.
    '*hunc* (*ignem*) is misleading (at first sight the reader might refer it to *turbine*) and superfluous. hinc, "from our (lower) regions", may be offered instead', Shackleton Bailey (p. 455). I should prefer to offer *tunc*.

7.14.4. praeterea nihil te adiuuat ista stellarum passim euntium turba; nam quo plures fuerint, saepius *in aliquas incident*; rari autem cometae et ob hoc mirabiles sunt.

Seneca is refuting the theory of Artemidorus that comets are casual planets.
    In aliquas (sc. *stellas*) *incident* (sc. *stellae*) is scarcely intelligible, and in any case the collision of planets seems out of place in this context, which requires some sort of contrast with *rari*. Of the three suggestions reported by Gercke, the best is his own *in aliquas* ⟨*oculi*⟩ *incident*. The more usual expression, however, would be *in* ⟨*oculos*⟩ *aliquae incident* or *aliqua incidet*; cf. *Dial.* 6.9.2, 'in oculos incidit'.

7.23.2. *nullis ignibus nisi* in suo mora est, illis dico diuinis quos habet mundus aeternos.

Axelson (1933, pp. 99f.) has shown the impossibility of retaining the paradosis *nullis ignibus nisi*; he suggests a transposition, to produce *nullis nisi ignibus*. Better perhaps a small lacuna, e.g. *nullis ignibus nisi* ⟨*caelestibus*⟩.

7.24.2. uide ne hoc magis deceat magnitudinem mundi, ut in multa itinera diuisus †hinc et† nec unam deterat semitam, ceteris partibus torpeat.

The corrupt passage must have contained a verb in the subjunctive corresponding to *deterat*. Many attempts have been made to emend *hinc et* to such a verb, e.g. *micet*, *migret*, *incedat*, *uigeat*, *meet*, *incitetur*. But perhaps *hinc et* is sound and there is a lacuna after it, e.g. *hinc et* ⟨*inde pateat*⟩, *nec* e.q.s. Seneca uses *hinc et inde* at 3.16.4.

7.25.5. utrum *mergeretur* Iuppiter an occideret an retrogradus esset (nam hoc illi nomen imposuere cedenti) ante paucos annos didicimus.

Mergeretur must mean not 'was rising' (Corcoran) but 'was setting', a synonym of *occideret*. Now the paradosis is not *mergeretur* but *mergeret*; so read ⟨*e*⟩*mergeret*, as Fortunatus did, and for *emergere* of heavenly bodies cf. *TLL* 5.2.474.55f. Similarly at 7.27.3 *emergit* (but after *tardissime*) has been corrupted to *mergitur*.

Aberdeen   W. S. WATT