

5009-

Tp 493 p/2



**THE NUX
MAECENAS AND
CONSOLATIO AD LIVIAM**

**By
R. B. STEELE**

1933

433 p/2
Tp

Bibliothèque Maison de l'Orient



139397

The Nux, Maecenas and Consolatio ad Liviam



BY R. B. STEELE

I. THE NUX

Carl Ganzenmüller, basing his conclusion on an extensive collection of material, decides that the Nux is a work of Ovid, and that for humo radix curvaque vincla tenent, one might read Ager Ovidianus (p. 87). S. Wartena, utilizing the same material and adding some more, concludes (p. 14):

Ut autem ex his omnibus nil certi sumi potest, sic puto me probavisse multis de causis in dubio ponendum esse, scripseritne Ovidius Nucem elegiam.

This certainty or uncertainty in conclusions arises from the consideration of data belonging to the age of Augustus, and we have deemed it worth while to examine other data belonging to a later period.

The poem begins with nux ego which differs from Vergil's dux ego (Ecl. 8, 38) by only one letter, and the pronoun has the same position as in other lines (6, 45, 159 O ego, 25 certe ego). Ego has the same position as often in the Aeneid, and still oftener in Propertius, following both monosyllables and dissyllables with elision. At begins a line ten times, hoc occurs five times (27 ff.), praeda three (108 f.) as also sic and si in alternate lines (41; 177). Si sciat (27 f.) varies with audiat (31 f.), and there is a similar variation in the verbs tollat . . . auferat . . . tollat . . . tolluntur (140 ff.). Single terms are frequently repeated, either exactly or with variation, as optavi quotiens (160 f.), si merui videorque nocens (177-179), si fiat (99), quam (171-172), quid si . . . quid nisi (117; 119), peccavi . . . peccare (5), Laedam . . . laedere (61), officium . . . officiosa (122), cruor . . . cruore (157). The repeated terms are sometimes put in chiasmic order, as laesa . . . laesaque (22), nocet, nocet (107). There is also a noticeable variation of subjunctive and indicative in conditional statements (27 ff.). These illustrations are enough to show that the writer was a proficient rhetorician, and that he freely applied rhetorical coloring. Not only this, but he also drew material from many sources.

The writer makes use of terms found in Cicero, and this

¹ Die Elegie Nux und ihr Verfasser. Tübingen, 1910. 87 pp.

² Nux Elegia. Groningae. 106 pp.

may be due to the fact that they were reminiscences of his works, or else that they had become a part of the current phraseology. Among the similar terms are nocentes (5: Verr. 4, 3, 5), reus (41: Verr. 1, 2, 5); edere fetus (93: de Or. 2, 30, 131), fere (41: de Inv. 1, 46), oculis destinat (168: in Cat. 1, 1, 2); vitare . . . moto . . . trunco (169); vitare . . . corpore (in Cat. 1, 6, 15); docetur (5: de Inv. 2, 36); potuere . . . negari (153: Rosc. Am. 31, 86). *Nimias umbras* (63) is probably a suggestion from the words of Cicero (de sen. 15, 42). *Manifestos . . . nocentes* (5) is similar to *quos manifestos habeant* in Sallust (Cat. 41, 4). A few may be recollections of Caesar: *Exemplo* (15: B. G. 1, 7, 3), *praeter humum* (58: B. G. 1, 11, 5 solum); *strepitus rotarum* (89: 4, 33), *rubus et sentes* (113: B. G. 2, 17, 4-que). Compare *exciipiunt . . . saxa repulsa* (50) with *tela missa exciperent* (B. G. 3, 5, 3). The statement in regard to the Caesar, *non pacem intra moenia finit* (45) is parallel to that of Justinus (1, 1, 3) *intra suam . . . cuique patriam regna patiebantur*, which probably goes back to Pompeius Trogus. There is much more evidence of the use of Livy: *Neque . . . et* (21: 21, 29, 5), *venire in notitiam* (29: 22, 26, 1 pervenit); *de quo victoria* (41: 8, 12, 4); *reum agi* (56: 24, 25, 1); *nuda cacumina* (101: 21, 37, 4); *iuris idem* (138: 22, 39, 3 rev.).

A few expressions found in Curtius may have been drawn by him from Livy: *Certo . . . ictu* (73: Curt. 7, 5, 41; 7, 9, 9 hastas), *suffugium* (119: Curt. 8, 4, 7), *vitare . . . moto . . . trunco* (169: Curt. 6, 1, 4 corpore), a suggestion from Cicero.

The reference to the *meliora . . . tempora* (7 ff.) has *prius . . . tum cum . . . cum . . .*

*Saepe tuas igitur, Liber, miratus es uvas
Mirata est oleas saepe suas Minerva,*

and *At postquam*. This outline is based on the words of Catullus (64, 382 ff.) *ante . . . saepe . . . saepe vagus Liber . . . cum . . . saepe . . . sed postquam*, with change of *sed* to *at* in the last. With this in

*At postquam platanis sterilem praebentibus umbram
Uberior quavis arbore venit honor,*

there is associated an adaptation of the words of Vergil (Georg. 2, 7) *steriles platani*, and of Horace (A. P. 400 f.) *honor . . . vatibus . . . venit*.

The closing lines (166 ff.) are also made up from different sources. The interrogation, *quid mihi tunc animi est*, goes back to Terence (Ad. 665; Eun. 1015) with *credis*.

Ovid also has the query with and without *credo*, and Vergil a variation (Aen. 4, 408) *quis tibi tunc . . . sensus? Nec vitare . . . volnera* preserves the *v*'s in Vergil's *ullas vitavisse vices* (Aen. 2, 432 f.). There is also Vergilian material in line 170:

Quem sub humo radix curvaque vincla tenent.

The first part adapts *sub terra . . . quem* (Aen. 2, 472), and the latter part, which equals *radix radicesque*, was suggested by *lenta radice tenebat* (Aen. 12, 773).

There is a noticeable simile in 173 f.:

Utve gravem candens ubi tolli vacca securim
Aut stringi cultros in sua colla videt.

Ovid also introduces the *vacca* twice (Fasti 1, 327; Met. 15, 133 ff.):

An, quia praevisos in aqua timet hostia cultros
A pecoris lux est ipsa notata metu?
Imponique suae videt inter cornua fronti
Quas coluit, fruges, percussaue sanguine cultros
Inficit in liquida praevisos forsitan unda.

These two pictures are the same, but the absurdity is relieved in the last by the use of *forsitan*. Both writers probably had in view the account by Lucretius of the sacrifice of Iphigenia (1, 84 ff.).

Candens vacca (Aen. 4, 61) and *securim* in the same position (Aen. 2, 224) are both Vergilian. *Corpora praebemus plagis* reverses the thought of Lucretius (5, 1061) *fugiunt summisso corpore plagas*.

The lines (177 ff.) show a mingling of Vergilian material:

Si merui videorque nocens: excidite ferro
Nostraque fumosis urite membra focis.
Si merui videorque nocens: imponite flammae
Et liceat miserae dedecus esse semel.

Si merui videorque nocens transfers to an opposite meaning, and transforms a part of the words of Dido (Aen. 4, 217):

Si bene quid de te merui, fuit aut tibi quicquam
Dulce meum.

The imperatives in the verse endings change to the plural similar endings in Vergil (Georg. 4, 329 ff.) *erue silvas . . . interfice messes . . . molire bipennem*. *Dedecus esse semel* can be compared with *sed periisse semel* (Aen. 9, 140) and *semel . . . vidisse* (Aen. 3, 431). Ovid has *cum fumosis focis* three times, but not the intervening *urite membra*. The concluding words *coeptum perficiatis iter* may be taken

as a variation from *coeptum perface, dixit, opus* (*Fasti* 4, 16) or from *susceptum perface munus* (*Aen.* 6, 629).

Between the opening and the closing lines are many indications that the author utilized the works of most of the writers preceding him whose works have come down to us. He seems to have been indebted to Catullus for some matters rhetorical and some metrical. Among the pieces of phraseology which are similar may be placed *annua poma* (6) : *annua sacra* (64, 368) ; *rectas* (73) used as in *recto stipite* (64, 287), *maculata cruore* (157) : *sanguine maculans* (63, 7). The local placing in *extremo margine* (62) corresponds to the temporal in *ultima ex origine* (4, 15). There is the same elision in *certe ego* (25: 64, 149), and *praefestinato* (98) forms the first half of the pentameter as does *Protesilaeam* (68, 74). *Praetereunte* (2) is used the same way in the second half, as also in Tibullus (1, 1, 28). Rhyming in the two parts of the pentameter is noticeably frequent in Catullus, e.g. 68, 68, 72, 78, 80, 84, 86, and 68 b, 60, 64, 66, 68. The repetition of practically the same thought, as in *peperisse nocet, nocet feracem esse* (106) is not unknown to Catullus, as in *toto animo, tota mente* (64, 70; 141) :

Sed conubia laeta, sed optatos hymenaeos;

egregias virtutes claraque facta (64, 348) ; 63 94 :

Alios age incitatos, alios age rabidos.

Dissyllables as the stereotyped ending for pentameters passed down from Tibullus to the Nux with some phases emphasized by Catullus. *Parcite* (182: Tib. 1, 1, 34) is the first word in the pentameter, while Ovid uses it nine times not in the same position. The pentameter ending *inficiente manus* (156) is the same as *inficiatque comas* (2, 2, 28). The lines Tib. 1, 1, 27 f. :

*Sed Canis aetivos ortus vitare sub umbra
Arboris ad rivos praetereuntis aquae,*

furnish *praetereunte* for the Nux (2), and apparently the substance for 117 :

*Quid si non aptas solem vitantibus umbras,
Finditur Icario cum cane terra, darem?*

Cf. Tib. 1, 7, 21 *arentes cum findit Sirius agros*; and *Icarii stella proterva canis*. Another line (120) was apparently fashioned after one in Tibullus (1, 2, 30) :

*Non expectata cum venit imber aqua:
Non mihi cum multa decidit imber aqua.*

There are some other parallel statements: *agricolas deos* (10: 1, 1, 14 dat. sing.); *irriguae aquae* (66: 2, 1, 44); *mala nostra* (96: 1, 2, 87); *peperisse nocet* (107: *teti-gisse nocet* (1, 8, 25); *Quid prodest* (147: 1, 2, 75; 1, 8, 9; 61); both have the unusual *conspiciendus* (34: 1, 2, 70). The rhetorical repetition *praeda praeda praeda* is the same as in Tibullus 2, 3, 34 ff.

Catullus has *sed postquam* (64, 397) which in the Nux (17) is changed to *at postquam*, as in Propertius (2, 8, 39; 4, 2, 9; 4, 9, 63). Some other expressions are the same, as *ex ordine* (35: 3, 17, 15), *felix quae* (87: 1, 12, 15; 2, 24, 71 qui), *arida facta* (160): cf. *facta beata* (2, 6, 6; 3, 7, 2); *libera facta* (1, 3, 4); *formosa videri* (23: 2, 28, 29); *cetera turba* (46: 4, 1, 36); *maculata cruore* (157): *maculanti sanguine* (4, 10, 43). *Ipse meos* (164), not in Tibullus, but in Propertius (2, 22, 28. Cat. 75, 2). Other similar collocations are *pertica saeva* (68: 4, 1, 130 *tristis*); *volnera ramis* (69: 1, 1, 13 -e -i); *distincta gradibus* (83: 1, 16, 42 *nixa*). *Certo arcu* (1, 7, 15) has the same position and is equal to *certo ictu* (73). *Peregrinos lapillos* (141) occurs also in Seneca Phet. (Contr. 2, 5, 7), but for the Nux may have been suggested by *peregrinis muneribus* and *nativis lapillis* (1, 2, 4 and 13). *Sertis ornare* (9) differs a little in form from *sertisque Ornabit* (3, 16, 23 f.).

Some individual terms are the same, as *inanis* "empty handed" (44: 4, 5, 47); *facilis* (58. 2, 24, 5); *petulantia* (137: 1, 16, 37). *Improbe*, a favorite of Ovid, is used by Propertius (1, 3, 39), by Horace (Sat. 2, 2, 104) and by Vergil, any one of whom may have furnished a suggestion to the writer of the Nux.

One line

Cum sibi suppositis additur una tribus,

has parts of two lines of Propertius (1, 15, 39 and 1, 13, 30) both in the same position. There is the same elision (25: 2, 26, 43), and the rhyme *viae vitae* (1) has numerous parallels in Propertius, as *suis ocellis* (1, 1, 1), *toto anno* (7), *Partheniis antris* (11). There is a noticeable example of alliteration (Ganz. p. 35) *sole licet siccae siti*, but the same adjective is used in *sed non sanguine sicca suo* (4, 10, 12), and *sicco torquet sitis ora palato* (4, 9, 21). The declaration (2, 15, 22):

Viderit haec, si qua iam peperisse pudet,

may have suggested *peperisse nocet* (107), as well as the contrast with the good old days when (16):

Nullaque non illo tempore mater erat.

There are a few touches in the *Nux* resembling the words of Horace, as *carpit . . . iter* (44: 2, 17, 12) following Vergil's diction in the epitaph on Ballista. The expression *vis formosa videri* (*Odes* 4, 13, 3) is repeated in *volt f. v.* (23) which differs slightly from the setting in Propertius with *poterit* (2, 18, 29). *Expedit* with the infinitive (146) is also in Horace *e. . . . fallere* (*Odes* 2, 8, 9 f.), and *saxis* is used with *petere* (2: *Ep.* 5, 97). The declaration in regard to Caesar (146):

Auxilium toto spargit in orbe suum,

gives the extent, for which Horace gives the limits (*Odes* 4, 15, 13 ff.):

Famaque et imperi
Porrecta maiestas ad ortum
Solis ab Hesperio cubili.

Non equidem invideo (33) is taken over unchanged from *Ecl.* 1, 11, and the negative was later changed to *haud* by Livy (22, 59, 12); cf. *haud equidem credo* (*Georg.* 1, 415). At the end of the line we find *sine crimine vitae* (1: *Aen.* 4, 550 *vitam*), and *arma virum* (110) is transferred from the beginning of the line (*Aen.* 1, 1) to the end; but it still may be taken as a key to the source of the words, just as *arma virumque* at the end of the line in Martial (8, 56, 19). The retention of terms at the beginning of the line is not uncommon: *Sponte mea* (59: *Georg.* 2, 11; 47; 50 *sua*); *felix . . . quae* (87: *Georg.* 2, 490 *qui*, and also in Propertius). The statement *forsitan hoc aliquis dicat* (133) is modelled after *forsitan . . . requiras*, *aliquis* taking the place of the indefinite second person as subject of the verb. *Quid mihi tunc animi est* (167), although evidently taken from Terence, expresses the same sentiment as *quis tibi tum sensus* (*Aen.* 4, 408).

Examples of the transfer of material from end to end of lines are somewhat more numerous. *Viator . . . tutum carpit inanis iter* (43 f.) are a rearrangement of the closing words of the elegy on the robber Ballista, *tutum carpe, viator, iter*. Other examples of the adaptation of end material are *tuas . . . miratus es uvas* (11): *suas mirantur . . . messes* (*Georg.* 1, 103), and with change of a letter *verba sequuntur* (*Aen.* 12, 912: 53 -*antur*). *Munus inane petant* (98) has as its model *tempus inane peto* (*Aen.* 4, 435), as 89 has *Aen.* 5, 334:

Non hominum strepitus audit, non ille rotarum:
Non tamen Euryali, non ille oblitus amorum.

Duris invisio colonis (105) is a variation from *duris agrestibus* (Georg. 1, 160), and there is a similar euphony in *longis invisita colubris* (Georg. 1, 320). The imperatives *caedite messes* and *excidite ferro urite membra* (135 and 177 f.) were suggested by Vergil's *erue silvas interfice molire bipennem* (Georg 4, 329 ff.). A part of the above statement *fumosis focis* (176) is associated with an imperative as *fumosis deripe tectis* (Georg. 2, 243). *Venerunt taedia* followed by a dissyllable *vitae* (159) evidently was written with an eye to *ceperunt taedia laudis*, which also ends the line (Georg. 4, 332). The difficult line with *sed spes inducta rapinae* (139) has the participle as in *pretio inductus* (Aen. 5, 399).

The most noticeable example of transfer from the end to the beginning of the line is *regit omnia Caesar* (143). Vergil has, with reference to Caesar's far distant kinsman, *omnia vincit Amor* (Ecl. 10, 69). There is a similar change in position of *me sata ne laedam* (61) and *te ne frigora laedant* (Ecl. 10, 48). Final *luce palamque* (147) is without a connective in Vergil's *Luce palam* (Aen. 9, 153).

There are also instances of the adaptation of material transferred without reference to position: *Laeso vimine* (48 med.): *numine laeso* (Aen. 1,8 end); *quattuor non amplius* (75): *non amplius unum* (Aen. 1, 683 end). *Figuram gerit* (82 f. both end) occurs only here, but is a suggestion from *os gerens* (Aen. 1, 315). *Finditur Icario cum cane terra* (118) is a variation from Vergil's *ubi findit Canis arva* (Georg. 2, 353). *Foliis haerere* (149 med.) came from *foliisque haerent* (Aen. 6, 284 end), as *candens vacca* (173) is from *candentis vaccae* (Aen. 4, 61 beg.). Compare the change from *sub terra quem* (Aen. 2, 471) to *quem sub humo* (170) in the pentameter. *Falx Saturnia* (63) shortens *curvo Saturni dente* (Georg. 2, 406).

A few individual words also show kinship in literary expression: *Laboranti* in the same position (14: Georg. 3, 193); *viret* (46: Georg. 2, 21); *fossor* (65: Georg. 2, 264). *Pulverulenta* (9) is used once by Propertius (3, 14, 7), four times each by Vergil and Ovid, who has it three times in the pentameter, not at all by Catullus and Tibullus. The declaration *pronas digito petit* (73) presents the conditions under which the puer could reach the apples (Ecl. 8, 41). Vergil does not have *damno* (49), but the equivalent *fraudi* (105: Aen. 6, 609; 11, 708). The condition *si numquam peperissem tutior essem* (25) shortens and reduces to regular form that of *Dido* (Aen. 4, 657 f.):

Felix, heu nimium felix, si litora tantum
Numquam Dardaniae tetigissent nostra carinae.

There are in the Nux some parallels to the words of Manilius. The construction in *iuncta viae* (1) is the same as in *laudi noxia iuncta est* (4, 418), and the adjective in the *publica . . . ira* (4) is the same in *p. . . fata* (1, 883). *Tum cum . . . fuerunt* is parallel to *tum cum . . . verterunt* (1, 501; 5, 668 *iacuerunt*). *Frugiferum* 19: 1, 313), *si modo* with the indicative (19: 4, 520), *destituent* (30: 2, 734) and *ex ordine* (35: 2, 717) are the same. *Hoc aevo* (24) gives the point of time while *omne per aevum* (1, 216) gives the duration. The opposite of *cetera turba viret* (46) is in Ovid (*Met.* 13, 690) *arbor Nuda riget*, as in *riget omnis ager* (3, 641). The words *certo . . . ictu* are equivalent to *ex recto certior ictus* (2, 373). *Forsitan et quaeras* (3, 203) resembles the words of Nux (133), but goes back to Vergil. *Argentum prima de fronte tabernae Tollat* (139 f.) is the opposite of *artus suspendant fronte tabernae* (4, 183), although the association of the nouns goes back to Catullus (37, 10). *Peregrinos . . . lapillos* (141) resembles *perlucentes . . . lapillos* (5, 531), as in *ramo sedit* (151) does *ramove sedentem* (5, 373), although it is a Vergilian touch (*Georg.* 4, 514). The lines addressed to Caesar (1, 8 f.):

Qui regis augustis parentem legibus orbem,
Concessumque patri mundum deus ipse mereris,

state the same fact as does the Nux (146 f.), but in form more closely resemble the lines of Calpurnius (4, 84 f.).

Redundant ipsa with a possessive, as *ipsa meos* (164), freely used by Ovid in the pentameter, occurs in Manilius at the beginning of the hexameter (2, 961; 3, 460), as also with *suus* within the line (5, 337; 360; 554). *Ipse* is also associated with the reflexive, as *seque ipsae* (4, 70; 4, 917; 831 *sese*); cf. *ipse sibi* (5, 55). Ovid also often joins two pronouns, as *te tibi* (165) which only metrically differ from *teque tibi* (5, 241).

Proximitas occurs three times in Ovid, once (*Met.* 10, 339 f.) *ipsaque damno Est mihi proximitas*. The same meaning is differently expressed in the Nux (49) *vicinia damno est*, although it also has *ream nimiae proximitatis* (56). The expression *victoria lucro* (41) is the opposite of *victoria damno est* (*Gratius Cyn.* 336). The last examples seem to associate the Nux with the work of Gratius; the first with the work of Ovid, to whom is assigned the first use of *proximitas*. However, this can not be affirmed with certainty until the date of the Nux is definitely settled.

Some of the Ovidian material has been transferred from

the beginning of the line to the same position in the Nux: Nil ego peccavi (5: Her. 20, 181; Tristia 4, 4, 9); quam miserum est (55: Tristia 4, 1, 69); poma cadunt (71: Met. 7, 586); est quoque qui (104: Am. 3, 9, 46 sunt); sitque tuis (138); sitque suum (Her. 20, 148); optavi quotiens, bis (160-160: Am. 1, 13, 27-29). A larger number retain the position at the end: Ex ordine truncos (35; Met. 8, 747); quare percutiantur habent (36): Met. 14, 663 peteretur haberet); arbor in arvo (88: Met. 10, 647); lapidosus ager (124: Met. 8, 799 abl. with in); tolli . . . securim (173: Met. 8, 397 tollens); coeptum perficiatis iter (182: Fasti 1, 188 peragat c. . . . iter). In two of these, as in the last, there has been a change to a verb similar in form. Venit honos which is initial in Ovid (Ars Am. 2, 279) is final in the Nux (18), and a part of Idque fide careat (51) ends the line (Her. 2, 26; 16, 40; cf. 18, 68). It is the same with iuncta viae (1: Ponto 1, 8, 44). An intermediate position is given to Imus in extremo margine (62) which is adapted from Margine in extremo (Am. 1, 11, 22). The intermediate position is often retained: Palladis arbor (28: Ars Am. 2, 518; Met. 6, 335); in hoc anno (24: Ponto 2, 5, 5); deiecto cortice (38); derepto c. (Am. 1, 14, 12); parca colona (72: Fasti 4, 692); bisve semelve (74: Tristia 4, 10, 59); spatio distante (85: Met. 11, 715); fiat mensura (99: Ars Am. 3, 265 fieri). In these the verse closes with a dissyllable or a trisyllable. The separated intermediate fera . . . vulnera (Ars Am. 3, 572) are placed together (169) the same as the examples just given. Immensas . . . opes, final (112) begins the line in Ovid (Met. 6, 181), but ramo . . . bifurco keeps the same position (151: Met. 12, 442 acc.), as does aptas umbras (117: Met. 1, 681 sing.).

The line (67 f.):

At cum maturas fisso nova cortice rimas
Nux agit,

shows adaptation of Met. 10, 512:

Arbor agit rimas et fissa cortice vivum,

and 14, 630 has a similar ending *fisso modo cortice lignum*. The words *lentam . . . ira moram* (4) change the association of the adjective from that in Ovid (Ars Am. 2, 456):

Ne lenta vires colligat ira mora.

However, Propertius (4, 5, 100) has *lenta moram*, a collocation antedating both the others. The words *Quid tamen hoc prodest . . . si*, are perhaps an adaptation of *Sed mihi prodest . . . si* (Her. 1, 47 and 49).

One line (162) :

Aut valido missi fulminis igne peti,

combines material from two lines of Ovid, *validos . . . ignes*, (*Met.* 7, 9) and *rutilo missi fulminis igne* (*Her.* 3, 64). Other collocations, as that of personal pronouns, *te tibi* (165), and *partes* (68) occur not uncommonly in Ovid. The latter with *venire* has a similar position in *Ars Am.* 2, 546, but not in *Ponto* 4, 2, 27. *Longius absunt* (51) occurs also in Ovid (*Met.* 2, 292; *Tristia* 2, 188; 3, 6, 37), but not in other poets (*Ganz.* p. 44). In contrast with this *quid nisi* (119) occurs thirteen times in Ovid (*Ganz.* p. 61).

A few individual terms are common to the *Nux* and Ovid, as *operosus* with active meaning (57: 3 *Ov.*) ; *divinatas . . . augur* (80) : *Augurium . . . divinavi* (*Tristia* 1, 9, 51 f.) ; *repurgat* (125: 3 *Ov.*), *annumerare* (92: 5 *Ov.*), but the meaning differs in the two authors, while *renovat . . . fossor* occur separately both in Vergil and in Ovid. Some *Nux* collocations, as *mutilatis ramis* (37), *plenis ramis* (69), and *abuncis hamis* (115) are not used by Ovid, although he has the individual words. This also applies to *officium . . . officiosa* (122), for which Ovid has *ingenium . . . ingeniosa* (*Fasti* 3, 840) and the similar *ingenioque . . . ingeniose* (*Ponto* 2, 5, 64). Some other collocations are not found in Ovid, as *caeleste sidus* (81) and *stringi cultros* (174). This is also true of some individual words (*Wartena* p. 13) : *deputare* (63), *dilaminare* (73), *praefestinare* (98), *suffugium* (119), *petulantia* (137), *castor* (166), *manica* (172) and perhaps *candens* (173). To these add *creta* (81) and *inviolatus* (52). *Columella* (4, 6, 5) has the passive *deputari*, and *Calpurnius* (2, 44) the simple form *putare*. *Inviolatus*, not used by either Vergil or Ovid, occurs also in the *Consolatio* (43). From this it would seem that both words belong to a vocabulary current later than Ovid. However, as an author's work does not have mechanical or chemical uniformity, each piece may be expected to have something not found in others. This fact is shown by Professor Fairclough³ for the poems of Vergil, and it must be held that the word-use by Ovid or by any other poet in large masses of poetry does not determine the usage for any particular poem. But some differences in syntax may have some weight. *Non capit . . . moram* (4) does not occur in Ovid, nor *ponor* in (19), in . . . *luxuriare* (20), in *notitiam venire* (29). *Concessum est* (134) is also not Ovidian. Instead of *ferre tributa* (88) Ovid has *pendere . . . tributum* (*Met.* 8, 263),

³ H. Rushton Fairclough, *The Poems of the Appendix Vergiliana*. T.A.P.A. 53, p. 32 f.

and for Clytaemestra only the patronymic. Polydore (109) occurs in Propertius also (3, 13, 56), but the names Eriphyle and Amphiarus (57 f.) are avoided in the Nux:

. . . praeda nefandae
Coniugis Aonium misit in arma virum.

The epithet is probably due to *Veneris . . . nefandae* applied to Pasiphae (Aen. 6, 26; cf. 447). Vergil has Aonius in the same position (Georg. 3, 11), and the writer of the Nux may have taken it as applicable to all that was Grecian. Ovid uses the names separately; one (Ponto 3, 1, 52), the other with an epithet *Talaioniae Eriphylae* (Ars Am. 3, 13). The third illustration in this group, and the one really germane to the subject is

Hesperii regis pomaria tuta fuissent
Una sed immensas arbor habebat opes.

This has a rhetorical touch occurring in Ovid, the use of *sed* in an adversative statement instead of the protasis of a condition.

Wartena commenting on *sed puto* (57) asserts that at is the particle used by Ovid in this connection. This seems a deliberate change from *at* to *sed*, just as in an earlier line (17) the *sed postquam* of Catullus was changed to *at postquam*. The use of *at* is characteristic of the Nux, and in none of the sections 182 lines in length at the beginning of the different works of Ovid is the particle used nearly as freely as in the Nux.

The following dozen words taken from every fifteenth line of the Nux beginning with the second, can be taken as a fair illustration of the futility of ratios in literary comparisons. The numbers are given for Vergil and Ovid: *Obruo* (9: 38), *sterilis* (10: 14), *inanis* (28: 58), *frutices* (1: 9), *fundus* (7: 0), *labi* (52: 92), *fructus* (2: 18), *noceo* (12: 161), *saxa* (96: 122), *intro* (9: 62), *lapis* 8: 24), *animus* (190: 253), *parco* (21: 79). The ratio for the masses is 1 to 2, and the individual ratios range from 7 to 0 for *fundus* to 1 to 15 for *noceo*, only *lapis* approximating to the ratio relative to length, 1:2.7. The calculation and pursuit of these and other ratios is as interesting and profitable as chasing a will-o'-the-wisp in a Serborian bog. Individual items furnishing no basis for comparisons, one may well question the validity, as a criterion, of the use of collocations which differ only in quantity. That the difference between the Vergilian and Ovidian material in the Nux is altogether a matter of quantity and not of quality is indicated by Ganzenmüller who quotes from Ribbeck (p.

37) Anklänge an Vergil wie an Ovid finden sich, aber in mässiger Zahl.

At some points the Ibis closely resembles the Nux, and for that reason will be considered separately. The lines (N. 31 f.: Ib. 27):

Audiat hoc cerasus: bacas exire vetabit;
 Audiat hoc ficus: stipes inanis erit:
 Audiat hoc Pontus, faciet quoque forsitan idem,

occur at about the same point in the two poems, and both have the subjects ending in -us. But Ovid does not use *cerasus*, and *ficus* only three times, all in the *Fasti*. There is the same close connection between two other lines (N. 132: Ib. 468):

Saxa novos fructus grandine plura petunt:
 Saxaque devotum grandine plura petant.

In these the place of *novos fructus* is taken by -que devotum in the other. Both poems have the same elision, *Certe ego* (N. 25: Ib. 129), and the same vocative improbe (N. 136: Ib. 40). *Praefestinato* forms a half line (N. 98), as *indeploratum* (Ib. 164), *insatiabilibus* (172) and *imperturbato* (560). In the second half of the pentameter *iniciente* (156) equals *sufficiente* (Ib. 242) and *deficiente* (524). *Meliora . . . tempora* (N. 7 f.) corresponds to *meliora . . . regna* (Ib. 67 f.), *munus inane* (N. 98) to *corpus inane* (Ib. 152), *contactas . . . manus* (156) to *contacta . . . humo* (Ib. 596). The case of *proterva manu* (116) is the same as that of *lingua proterva* (Ib. 522), but the case is different in *profectura* (N. 158: Ib. 520 -ae). The construction is the same in *damnis accedere nostris* (N. 55) and *carminibusque meis accedant* (Ib. 249), and the transitive use of *Iaculor* is the same (N. 97 me: Ib. 49 te; 587). A few individual words are the same: *destituent* (N. 30: Ib. 56 -ant); *devoveant* (N. 54: Ib. 469 -at); *mutilatis* (N. 37: Ib. 549). *Utve* (N. 173: Ib. 585) occurs also in Ovid (*Met.* 4, 365; 15, 560; *Ponto* 3, 5, 43), but is not used by Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, or Vergil. Both works use *Polydorus* as an illustration (N. 109: Ib. 579) but the passages are unlike each other.

The metrical schemata of the two poems agree in having the first eight begin with a dactyl, in not having SSDD, but in the Nux SSSS ranks with DDDD as the eighth, while in the Ibis it is the fourteenth. The rankings may be taken as norm for the poets of the days of Nero, for the *Eclogues* of Calpurnius also have dactyls beginning the first eight schemata, and Columella 10, seven out of eight, DDDD falling to eleventh place, and SDSS rising to fifth. War-

tena (p. 11 f.), in a table presenting the percentages of pentameter lines beginning with two dactyls, gives for the Nux 17.6 %, for the Ibis 31 %, indicating a clearly differentiated usage. In some respects the elision features are widely different. To Professor Kent's figures showing the percentages for some of the works of Ovid,⁴ we add those for the Nux, Manilius, Calpurnius, and Columella 10.

	Long	Short	—M	—que	est.
Amores 1	12	29	14	16	29
Ars Am. 1	7	30	6	6	31
Fasti 2	3	30	8	25	34
Metamorphoses 1	4	25	11	37	23
Ibis	4	22	4	42	27
Nux	6	14	12	8	60
Maecenas	0	42	25	33	0
Manilius	3.65	28.3	17.3	37.7	13.7
Calpurnius	2.13	19.27	4	44	11
Columella 10	13	37	13	43	7

The limitation in the elision of long vowels is still less noticeable in the Nux than in the Maecenas which has no examples in 182 lines, and also in the ad Pisonem. The youthful auctor of this, *nondum vicesima venerit aetas* (249), almost succeeded in avoiding elision entirely for, in addition to *quare age* (259) he has only the negligible cases *necesse est* (14), *credibile est* (156) and *atque illos* (23) which are of little import except as an indication of the tendencies of the times.

So far as the elision of long vowels is concerned the Nux might have been written by Ovid at any time after the *Amores*. But as the average percentage for the works of Vergil is above 21, and a little less than 10 for the works of Propertius⁵ (hexam. 6.8, pentam. 3) there was an increasing disinclination to elide long vowels, although Columella was affected by the usage of Vergil. In the low percentage for the elision of —m and of —que, and the large percentage for the enclisis of est, the Nux is clearly non-Ovidian. In the case of —m and the long vowels the Nux approximates to the usage of Columella. The elision *certe ego* (25) in the first foot is noticeable, but *ego* following a dissyllable ending in a vowel, especially a pronoun is not uncommon, the frequency depending on the extent to which the personal element is involved, as *ipse ego* in Vergil (*Ecl.* 2, 51) and Horace (*Ep.* 2, 111), *ille ego* in Calpurnius (3, 55), and numerous examples in Ovid; cf. *saepe ego* (*Georg.* 1, 316). Propertius has *ergo ego* (3, 21, 17), and Ovid not infre-

⁴ Roland G. Kent, *Likes and Dislikes in Elision*. T. A. P. A. 54, p. 91.

⁵ Propertius ed. Hosius p. 180, 181 est.

quently in the 62 instances of elision with *ergo* (Ganz. p. 26); cf. Propertius (3, 21, 17) and *credo ego* (2, 24, 41, and 42).

The social and political conditions indicated by the lines (143 ff.):

Sed nec tolluntur nec, dum regit omnia Caesar,
Incolumis tanto praeside raptor erit.
At non ille deus pacem intra moenia finit:
Auxilium toto spargit in orbe suum,

suit conditions in the last years of the reign of Augustus, as is indicated by some of the last epistles of Ovid, e.g. *Tristia* 5, 4, 17 f., *numinis iram . . . dei clementia*; *Ponto* 4, 8, 76:

Iustaque quamvis est sit minor ira dei.

They also express conditions in the days of Nero, as is indicated by the *Eclogues* of Calpurnius, e.g. 1, 58 f.:

Omne procul vitium simulatae cedere pacis
Iussit, et insanos Clementia condidit enses;

and 4, 5 ff. *Carmina* . . .

. . . haec quibus aurea possint
Saecula cantari, quibus et deus ipse canatur,
Qui populus urbemque regit, pacemque togatam;

cf. 4, 127 *ille meis pacem dat montibus*.

They also suit the conditions under Domitian, as is indicated by Martial's adaptation of a line in the *Nux* (6, 60, 2):

Et nomen toto sparget in orbe suum,

and the repeated use of *deus*, as in 7, 8, 2:

Victor ab Odrysio redditur orbe deus.

But the noticeable expression (5, 3, 3, and 6) combines *praeside* and *deus* as does the *Nux*, *viso modo praeside mundi . . . quem colit ille deum*. To this we add (5, 8, 1):

Edictum domini deque nostri,

which carried out the order of Domitian in 89 A.D. in regard to the form in which he should be officially addressed.

The use of *praeside* (144) is also suited to different periods. Not used by Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius, or Vergil with the same application, Ovid has it five times in the ablative as it is in the *Nux*. Seneca applies it to Claudius (*Dial.* 11, 12, 3): *Illo moderante terras . . . illo rebus humanis praeside non est periculum ne quid perdidisse te*

sentias. This indicates the same protective power as does the Nux passage, and so far as form is concerned either one may have influenced the other. The auctor ad Pisonem expresses the same sentiment (232) :

. . . . quo praeside tuti
Non umquam vates inopi timuere senectae.

Martial applies the term to Domition (Spect. 2, 11) :

Reddita Roma sibi est et sunt, te praeside, Caesar,
Deliciae populi, quae fuerunt domini.

A similar thought is expressed (5, 7, 3 f.) :

Taliter exuta est veterem nova Roma senectam,
Et sumpsit vultus praesidis ipsa sui.

Like this is (8, 80, 5) :

Sic praescis servatur honos, te praeside, templis.

See also (9, 18, 1) the wish in regard to Martial's farm. But the conventionality of praeside is shown by its application to Nerva (11, 2, 6), and to Trajan (12, 8, 7).

Taking the use of this term into consideration, we cannot accept a date for publication under Augustus until other possibilities have been disposed of. However, it should be noticed that a somewhat similar statement applying to the future, as does that in the Nux, is found in Vergil (Aen. 8, 470 f.) quo sospite numquam fatebor.

The early works of Seneca, the poem of Columella and that of the Auctor ad Pisonem, and the Eclogues of Calpurnius are like the Nux in the application of terms to ruler, and also, although not to the same extent, in the use of the material of others. Seneca often enlivens his prose with snatches of song. Columella begins and closes with a reference to Vergil, and has an extraneous section (196 ff.) based on the words of Lucretius, and a part of 80 :

Veris et adventum nidis cantari hirundo,

was suggested by Horace (Odes 1, 23, 5 f.) veris adventus. The Auctor extols Vergil, Horace and Maecenas (218 ff.), transforms the words of Lucretius (3, 13) :

Aurea, perpetua semper dignissima vita

to (199) :

Felix, et longa iuvenis dignissima vita.

There is an imitation of the Odes of Horace 4, 7 in 133 ff. with

Non semper fluidis adopertus nubibus aether,

changed from Odes 2, 9, 1 f.:

Non semper nubibus hispidos
Manant in agros.

The object of Calpurnius was to re-present the themes of Vergil, and this is especially noticeable in a part of his fourth eclogue which was based on the fourth eclogue of Vergil and a part of the first (42 ff.) based on Aeneid 1, 291 ff. But in the last he changes Vergil's prophecy surget gens aurea to a realization aurea renascitur aetas. While complimenting the Emperor in this way, there is reason to believe that he sought to compliment Seneca also by drawing material from his early works, and in this we assume that the lesser drew from the greater writer. Some appropriated material will be given in order to fix more firmly the date of Calpurnius within the reign of Nero.

Calpurnius borrows from Vergil the expression for aurea saecula (Ludus 4, 9), but has the equivalent beata pretioso lana metallo (L. 4, 8) which equals perpetuo fila metallo (C. 4, 140). Seneca writes of the pensa (L. 4, 7; 9; 11), and Calpurnius has the word in the singular (4, 130 f.):

. . . . post longa reducite vitae
Tempora, vel potius mortale resolvite pensum.

This was apparently drawn from the Ludus (4, 20 f.):

Ne demite, Parcae,
Phoebus ait: vincat mortalis tempora vitae;

cf. 4, 1:

Abrupit stolidae regalia tempora vitae.

The substance of the statement of Calpurnius (1, 71) legibus omne reductis Ius erit, equals that in the Ludus (4, 24) legumque silentia rumpet; or as it is put in different form (de Clem. 1, 4) legibus quas situ ac tenebris in lucem evocavi. Two lines (L. 4, 9 and 13):

Formoso descendunt saecula filo:
Contorto descendunt stamina fuso

are metrically equal to tenero decurrunt carmina versu, the latter part of C. 4, 152.

Even more interesting is the transformation shown in the two lines (Ludus 2, 6: Calp. 5, 97):

Carpebat raras serus vindemitor uvas:
Et portat lectas securus vinitor uvas.

Taking the words of Seneca as the basis, his verb was changed from a trisyllable to a dissyllable with a connective, the length of the adjective in *-as* was retained, *serus* was lengthened by inserting *-cu-*, and *vindemitor* given a corresponding shortening by striking out *-dem-*.

Some individual items are as follows: *Continuos . . . per annos* (21: Dial. 12, 9, 7 per a. c.). The mature Vergil does not use the adjective, and Ovid not in the plural. The range of concessum with the infinitive is about the same (134: Dial. 12, 16, 1) as it appears in poetry for the first time in Lucan. *Destituent . . . poma* (30) and *vita destituat* (Dial. 10, 1, 1), and *conspicenda coma est* (34) and *conspiciende foro* (Epigram 6, 2) are functionally equal. The last collocation is also in the *Consolatio* (284). *Operosa* has the active meaning (57: Dial. 10, 2, 1), and *officiosa* is used in the same way (122: Dial. 10, 3, 2).

As a compliment to Caesar, Seneca declares (Clem. 1, 1, 6): *Nemo iam divum Augustum nec Tiberii Caesaris prima tempora loquitur; nemo quod te imitari velit, extra te quaerit*, as if the flood gates of flattery were wide open and all that had been said of Augustus might be freely said of Nero. Seneca does not apply *deus* to Nero, but he scarcely avoids it in the soliloquy he assigns to Nero (Clem. 1, 1, 2 ff.) beginning: *Egone ex omnibus mortalibus placui electusque sum qui in terris deorum vice fungerer?* With this introduction he proceeds to discuss *Clementia* which Calpurnius also assigns to Nero, as Ovid to Augustus. The equivalent of what the Nux gives as a fact is a prophecy in Seneca (2, 2, 1): *Tradetur ista animi tui mansuetudo diffundeturque paulatim per omne imperii corpus et cuncta in similitudinem tui formabuntur*. Here the future is used as by Calpurnius in his eclogues.

The next to the last sentence in the *de Clementia* takes trees as an illustration, and uses *rectas* and *rami . . . laborantibus*, both in the Nux (73; 13 f. *ramo . . . laboranti*).

Some features while not peculiar to the two, still indicate a sameness in verse construction. *Dumque*, used by Vergil (Ecl. 5, 77; 8, 34), begins the verse (Nux 125: *Ludus* 4, 18), and in epigram 5 *utque*, *inque* and *deque* occur. Similar endings in Calpurnius *tuque* (4, 81), *utque* (103), *iamque* (121) show that such verse beginnings had become conventional. *Adspice*, not used by Lucretius, occurs frequently in Ovid, is taken up by Seneca (Dial. 10, 2, 4) and Calpurnius (6, 49).

There are some expressional features which, although not derived the one from the other, are at least indicative

of the use of the same current vocabulary. Some of the words of Seneca (Epigram 5, 8 ff.) :

Utque furens totas immittit saxa per urbes
Et repetunt motum saxa remissa caput.
In te nunc stringit nullus non carmina vates,
Inque tuam rabiem publica musa furit,

are distributed in the Nux. Publica musa acts as does publica . . . ira (4), and the first line quoted in substance and structure is like Dumque . . . collectaque saxa remittit (125). The second line is similar, and has motum . . . caput which may be the suggestion for moto . . . trunco (169). The negation of the noun by nullus and of the verb by non is the same as in (17) :

Nullaque non illo tempore mater erat.

Wartena calls attention to the fact that the collocation is not found in Ovid, and quotes as a parallel Juvenal (6, 656). However it occurs occasionally in Seneca: Nulla (imago) non . . . insignis est (Dial. 11, 14, 3) ; nullum non hominum genus concucurrit in urbem (12, 6, 3).

The words of the Nux can be contrasted with those of Seneca (Dial. 12, 16, 3) : Non te maximum seculi malum impudicitia, in numerum plurium adduxit. And further num te fecunditatis tuae . . . puduit; cf. fertilitatis (8). The compliment to Claudius (Dial. 11, 13, 3) solatium est videre misericordiam eius totum orbem pervagantem, is of a piece with (146) :

Auxilium toto spargit in orbe suum.

Although there is not anything to indicate any direct connection between the Nux and the works of Columella, there are some individual items showing that both were taking from the same vocabulary current, as in use of continui anni (Ov., Verg.). Deputo (63) is in the same class and inviolatus (52), as also creta with the exception of three occurrences in Vergil. The Nux declares (63 f.) :

Non mihi falx nimias Saturnia deputat umbras,
Duratam renovat non mihi fossor humum.

The fossor (2 Ov., late, 1 Vergil) is well known to Columella who writes of duritia humi and has duratam also. Figuram . . . gerit is limited to the Nux, but Columella has g. insigne and g. speciem. Spatio distante (85) has equivalents in Columella, distent . . . spatio; spatiis distantia. Sponte mea . . . nascor has in the first person what Columella puts in the third, at the beginning of his chapter

on trees alterum sua sponte gignitur. Tum cum is used in the same way, the opes (fructus) of the tree are as the opes of the farmer, laborans is applied to trees as to the branch (14), and obruere . . . nocentes transfers to persons a verb freely used by Columella in the case of plants.

The equivalent of the story told by Columella (7, 2) about his uncle importing rams from Tarentum and improving the flock is given by Petronius (38, 2) arietes a Tarento emit et eos culavit in gregem. However, a part of the injunction of Calpurnius (5, 70 f.) :

Consimiles include comas; ne longa minutis,
Molia ne duris coeant, ne candida fuscis,

is adapted from Horace (A. P. 12) sed non ut placidis coeant inmitia.

The reference to the swallow, nidis cantarit hirundo (Col. 10, 80) resembles nidosque . . . lutabit hirundo (Calp. 5, 17); and maximus ipse deum posito iam fulmine (10, 204) equals Iuppiter ipse parens . . . posito paullisper fulmine (Calp. 4, 94 f.). It is the same with (Col. 10, 329 f.) :

Saepe ferus duros iaculatur Iuppitur imbres
Grandine dilapidans . . . labores,

and in the ad Pisonem (57 f.) :

. . . pariter cum grandine
Densaue vibrata iaculari fulmina lingua.

The last words quoted from Columella are reduced in power to express the action of the puer in the Nux (73) certo rectas dilaminat ictu.

The youthful Auctor ad Pisonem (248 f.) :

Quamvis non iuvenale decus mihi pingere malas
Coeperit et nondum vicesima venerit aestas

resembles the writer of the Nux in his use of material from others. One line (213) :

Abdita quid prodest generosi vena metalli
Si cultore caret?

re-expresses the thought of Horace (A. P. 409 f.) with vena, but quid prodest is Vergilian (Ecl. 3, 74; Ciris 190; Nux 147), and the line-end has the euphony of Seneca's pretioso lana metallo (Ludus 4, 8). As the youthful poet shows such a marked tendency to adapt the work of others, we should expect to find some evidence of use of the Nux itself, the best example of proficiency in literary mosaic technique. The following are offered as illustrations of such use. Ponis in illis (P. 13) ends the line as does ponor in illis (N. 19),

as do the nouns in *carpit . . . iter* (N. 44) and *carpere cursus* (P. 54). *Qualem* has the same position in the comparison *fit quoque de creta qualem figuram* (N. 81) as in *talis inest habitus qualem* (P. 90). *Iaculor* is transitive (N. 97: P. 58), and a part of the associated words *pariter cum grandine* may have been suggested by *grandine plura* (N. 132). The thought in *arcu Destinat* (P. 130 f.) is from Horace (*Odes* 2, 10, 19 f.) *arcum Tendit*, but it has the verb in *oculis . . . destinat* (N. 168). *Onerare nocentes* (N. 87) has the last word placed as in *obruere . . . nocentes* (N. 3). However the Auctor's contrast of *onerare* and *exonerare* is also to be found in Terence (*Phormio* 842 f.). The parts of *publica cum . . . non capit ira moram* may possibly be adapted and distributed in *cum . . . publica . . . otia* (P. 158) and *capit, quam non habet* (48).

The act (P. 244) *caput exonerare tenebris*, is like that in the *Consolatio* (46) *vitiis exseruisse caput* with a compound verb in *ex-*, but with *caput* and the ablative changing places. Compare with the first *immergentque caput tenebris* (*Calp.* 1, 53). Although the collocation *felix qui* had been long established, its use was continued in the *ad Pisonem* (120) and by Statius (*Silvae* 3, 3, 187; 5, 2, 142; 176), Martial (8, 48, 8; 9, 16, 5) and is in the *Nux* with the antecedent expressed (87):

Felix secreto quae nata est arbor in arvo.

The auctor *ad Pisonem* expresses the conventional attitude toward the emperor (71):

Caesareum grato cecinisti pectore numen.

In other passages he re-expresses the views of Seneca, as if he had been a young friend like Lucilius. The opinion expressed (124 f.):

*Nil nisi submoto novit praecedere vulgo;
Sed virtus numerosa iuvat,*

is in harmony with the views of Seneca in respect to the *turba* (*Ep.* 7 and 8). The declaration (143) *temporibus decet* is an application to personal activities of the injunction of Seneca in regard to rulers (*Ep.* 14, 7) *Itaque sapiens numquam potentium iras provocabit; immo declinabit non aliter quam in navigando procellam*. The description of *Piso* (120) *morem quaeris amando* applies the words of Seneca in translation (*Ep.* 9, 6) *si vis amari, ama*. At *voluisse sat est* (203), although going back to *Propertius* (2, 10, 6), a weakening of the *satis est potuisse videri* of *Vergil* (*Ecl.* 6, 24) is the opposite of Seneca's *satis est noluisse* (*de Benef.* 6, 10, 1).

There are three points at which there is agreement with the *Consolatio*. Both summon a *testis* (P. 80: C. 386) Drusus is represented as saying *vixi maturior annis* (C. 447): the other author says (247):

Est mihi, crede, meis animus constantior annis.

It is said of Livia (11) *percussa es ictu*; of Piso (172) *percutis ictu*. Although the injunction to Piso (33):

Scande super titulos et avitae laudis honores,

does not have a word that is in the command to Livia (Cons. 353) *supraque tuos exsurge dolores*, yet we feel that the statement in one was affected by the other.

The Auctor agrees with Calpurnius in the use of *Caesareum numen* (71: 4, 132), but the latter also has (4, 10) *magnae numina Romae*, and associates Caesar with Apollo (4, 87), and, with an eye to the words of Horace (*Odes* 1, 12, 19), writes (4, 93 f.):

*Iuppiter ipse parens, cui tu iam proximus ipse
Caesar abes.*

There are some passages indicating a connection between Calpurnius and the Nux. *Nos quoque frugiferae* (19) are repeated (Calp. 2, 64) *nos quoque frugiferi*, and the lines (4, 84 f.):

*At mihi qui nostras praesenti numine terras
Perpetuamque regit iuvenili robore pacem,
Laetus et Augusto felix arrideat ore,*

are like the Nux (145 ff.), although the words *iuvenali robore* suggest the same period as do the words of Seneca *non iuvenilis impetus* (*de Clem.* 1, 1, 3). The declaration (Calp. 4, 112 ff.) *ut primum coepit et uberius luxuriare seges*, are noticeably like (18 ff.) *at postquam uberius honor, coepimus luxuriare*.

In describing the days of peace, Calpurnius has *praedator* (1, 40) as the Nux *raptor* (145). The situation in 5, 2 *torrentem vitabant solem* is also in 117 f. *solem vitantibus umbras Finditur cum terra*. There are a few other minor touches, as *improbe* (136: 3, 32; 5, 19, 25, and 29), *viret* (46: 72). However, at is the most noticeable Of the ten occurrences in the Nux three (37, 93, 105) are with *mihi*, one with *cum* (68), and one (131) with *simul*. Calpurnius has the first (2, 32; 4, 84), the second (5, 49), the last (5, 57). Horace has this (*Sat.* 2, 6, 32), but in elegy it is limited to the Nux, and Ovid seven times.

One of the marked features in the poetry of Martial is

the utilization of material from the Priapean poems. This is especially noticeable in the transfer of *pone supercilium* (1, 2) from the reader to the Emperor (1, 4, 2). This is like the transfer and change of *auxilium . . . spargit* to *et nomen . . . sparget*, and this may furnish the basis for an assumption that Martial drew other material from the Nux. As it contained much selected material, it was a fine field from which to select. A few illustrations will suffice: *Iuncta viae* (1: 12, 48, 8), *nil ego* (5: 11, 6, 12), *Palladis arbor* (28: 1, 76, 7 -os), *una tribus* (76: 9, 32, 4; 9, 76, 6), *pulverulenta via* (90: 12, 2, 2). Notice also the reward of the *officiosus* (122: 5, 22, 13).

Commenting on *improbe . . . viator* (136) *Janzenmüller* (p. 35 f.) gives illustrations of similar statements in Ovid. Yet the Nux touch is palpably Vergilian as *improbe* is applied to Aeneas by Dido (*Aen.* 4, 386) and to Amor by Vergil (4, 412), and *viator* is in the earliest effort of Vergil, the lines on *Ballista*.

A few individual words are noticeable: *Dumque* (125) was used by Vergil (*Ecl.* 5, 77; 8, 33 bis) and by Ovid 64 times (*Ganz.* p. 61). As it is initial both in Vergil and in the Nux, the former may be fairly considered the source for the latter. The use of *ergo* (*Ganz.*, p. 26) is a noticeable feature. It begins 86 hexameters in Ovid, 62 with and 24 without elision. However, *Wetmore's Index* gives 54 occurrences for the major works of Vergil. Forty-two of these are the beginning of the line, 37 with elision and 5 without. Six each with and without elision are within the line. This shows a greater relative frequency in Vergil, both for occurrences and percentage of elisions. *Wartena* challenges the assertion of *Janzenmüller*, and asserts that the sum of examples show that the initial position was avoided rather than chosen by Ovid. The position of a few words is worthy of note. *Extremus*, as in (62):

Imus in extremo margine fundus habet,

preceded by a dactyl, occurs twenty times in Vergil, and in addition the metrical equivalent *ad fari extremum* (*Aen.* 9, 484). Similar to these are forms of *quicumque* (142; *Ganz. ad loc.*) preceded by a monosyllable seven times in Vergil.

With these as illustration of non-Ovidian origin we place *fit quoque* (81; *Ganz. sehr oft bei Lucrez*), and *fronte* (139), an adaptation of *frontem tabernae* (*Catullus* 37, 11) transferred to the end of the line.

There are frequent occurrences in Ovid of *sine* in the fourth foot as in *sine crimine vitae* (1), but the instances in Ovid are irrelevant as the phrase is but a modification

of *sine crimine vitam* (Aen. 4, 550). It is the same with *si merui* (177) for it too is Vergilian (Aen. 4, 317). *Ubi* ends the initial dactyl, as in the majority of the occurrences of *ubi temporal* in Vergil, in *haec ubi distincta est* (83) and *sic ubi detracta est* (165). One of these resembles the dozen examples of *haec ubi dicta dedit* in Vergil, and its equivalent with *deflevit* (Aen. 11, 59). The other is in a comparison, instead of which Vergil has *qualis ubi* with elision, e.g., Aen. 2, 471; 9, 563.

Even if Vergil had not used *sine crimine* this position of *sine* could not be considered a specifically Ovidian feature for Vergil has fourteen out of 36 instances of *sine* so placed, extending from *sine viribus ignis* (Georg. 3, 99) to *sine nomine letum* (Aen. 11, 846).

There are two features which may be taken as illustrating the work of a utilizer. These are the use of unusual words and the use of noticeable collocations. Words which are found only in the Nux and the works of Ovid, give to the reader of the former the same impression in regard to originality as they do in the works of Ovid. The second class of utilizations—*purpurei panni*—are such as would most naturally appeal to a writer of lower rank than the original user. Among such we mention *causa tremoris* (Nux 176; Ganz. p. 32) and *cum sim et al.* (1; Ganz. p. 39). The latter phase holds true also in respect to the works of Vergil, for it is a fair assumption that expressions freely used by Vergil were material for the Nux as well as the more obvious examples. Illustrations of this are the figures of alliteration and apostrophe. Ganzenmüller (p. 35) quotes (65) :

Sole licet siccaque siti peritura laborem.

As good an example is from Vergil (Georg. 1, 389) :

Et sola in sicca secum spatiat harena.

Another good example is (Aen. 5, 180) :

Summa petit scopuli siccaque in rupe resedit.

Illustrations are given (p. 35) similar to *cortice contactas* (156), but *cortice crudo* (Aen. 9, 742), and also (Ecl. 6, 61 ff.) *tum canit Hesperidum miratam mala puellam Tum . . . musco circumdat amarae Corticis atque solo proceras erigit alnos*, where *m* occurs six times in one line, and in the passage *c* occurs with five different vowels.

The writer of the Nux freely drew material from the works of others, and in this respect the Ovidian material,

relative to length is not more extensive than is the Vergilian. Word usage is for the most part indecisive in determining authorship, although in the use of it there is a noticeable difference from that in the works of Ovid. There is also considerable difference in the use of two dactyls at the beginning of pentameter lines, and in some forms of elision. In the application of *deus* and *praeside* to the Emperor the poem does not differ from those written in the time of Nero, nor from the poems of Martial. Taking the parallels in the latter as due to borrowing, as are the parallels to the *Priapea*, it is held that the publication of the *Nux* in the time of Domitian is not probable. Cross currents are shown in the works written in the time of Nero, and these may indicate that the writer of the *Nux* borrowed from his contemporaries as he did from his predecessors. In some instances the process may be reversed, and the borrowing may be from the *Nux* because of the writer's notable success in constructing a literary mosaic. But whichever way these elements may be interpreted, the poem reflects the literary and political conditions existing under Nero.

II. THE MAECENAS

The text of the Maecenas as given by Ellis presents only a few difficulties. But in line 62 for the reading

Bacche purpurea candidiora nive

we suggest

Bracchia Hyperborea candidiora nive.

The latter part of the line is from Catullus (80, 2) a comparison utilized also by other writers. *Bacche* and *purpureas* occur in the same positions in preceding lines, and the eye of the scribe may have played him a trick and led him to produce "whiter than the enpurpled snow." Vergil has *Hyperboreas glacies* (Georg. 4, 517) of which the Maecenas line may have been an imitation. According to Ellis line 56 is

Misit ad extremos †exorientis† equos.

In a similar description Vergil has (Aen. 8, 685) *Orientis et ultima*, and were it not for the required dissyllabic ending we might read *ex Oriente equites*. But with *equos* we may read the noun *Exorientis*. Propertius (3, 9, 27) has the participle *exoriens*, and Columella (Arb. 3, 3) *ab exoriente*, and the latter may be taken as justifying the use of *Exorientis* in the Maecenas.

The opening lines of the Maecenas :

*Deferam juvenis tristi modo carmine fata,
Sunt etiam merito carmina danda seni,*

contain *modo* as does the first line of the *Consolatio*, and apparently claim one author for the two poems. The reference (9 f.) :

*Nec mihi, Maecenas, tecum fuit usus amici,
Lollius hoc ergo conciliavit opus,*

places the writer outside of the circle of the friends of Maecenas, but gives no indication of his history. He must be judged entirely by his work, and his claim for authorship of the *Consolatio* decided by a comparison of similar features.

The elision features of the *Consolatio* and the Maecenas are sharply contrasted as is shown by the following table, the figures for the former being taken from Professor Kent's article :

	% per							Percentages				
	100 lines	L	S	M	Q	T	L	S	M	Q	T	
Maecenas	7	0	5	3	4	0	0	42	25	33	0	
Consolatio	27.6	19	42	26	28	16	14.5	31.8	20	21.4	12.2	
Ovid Ars Am. I.	14	8	34	7	29	34	7	30	6	26	31	
Met. I.	27	8	52	24	77	49	4	25	11	37	23	

The percentages for the Maecenas differ from those for the Consolatio and the Ars Am., as those for the latter in the case of L, and T. The Consolatio and Met. I. agree in the number of elisions per 100 lines, but it, as well as the Maecenas, differs from it in all the forms of elisions. Judged by this test the Maecenas and the Consolatio are not by the same author, and neither of them by Ovid. The usage of Martial is similar to that in the Consolatio, excepting in the case of T, which far outnumbers all the others combined.

The following table gives the ranking of the schemata of the two poems, and also for Ars Am. 1, 1-474.

	DD-				DS-			
	-DD	-DS	-SD	-SS;	-DD	-DS	-SD	-SS
Maecenas	11	4	10	1	5	1	5	1
Consolatio	12	6	4	4	6	3	1	2
Ars Am.	14	9	10	11	16	12	14	13

	SD-				SS-			
	-DD	-DS	-SD	-SS;	-DD	-DS	-SD	-SS
Maecenas	11	11	7	8	11	15	15	8
Consolatio	11	10	9	6	16	14	14	12
Ars Am.	14	9	10	11	16	12	14	13

Five of the schemata in the Maecenas are noticeably different from those in the Consolatio, and eight differ from those in Ovid. Only two minor schemata fully agree with those in Ovid, although only four differ by three or more points. Admitting the validity of this criterion, the pieces given seem to indicate the work of three writers. The above comparisons are with a specific part of the work of Ovid, and as wide variations are shown by a comparison with the usage of Ovid as a whole. Professor Radford⁵ gives the ranking of the leading schemata in Ovid, and with them we place the rank in the two poems under consideration.

	DDSS	DSSS	DSSD	DDSD	DSDS	DDDS
Ovid	1	1	3	4	5	6
Maecenas	1	1	5	10	1	4
Consolatio	4	2	1	4	3	6

⁵ "The Metrical Art of the Priapea," pp. 84-94, in *The Priapea and Ovid: A Study of the Language of the Poems*. Richmond Frederick Thomason, George Peabody College for Teachers, Nashville, Tenn., 1931.

Although the per cent of dactyls in the hexameter is useless as a test of authorship, yet it is not without interest as showing difference in cadence in lines of similar import. The Maecenas shows nearly 49 per cent; the *Consolatio* a little over 53, and the section from the *Ars Am.* 54. However, the last, divided into sections of the length of *Catalepton* 9, shows variation of the per cent from 52.23 to 62.38 in the first book; 50 to 66.67 in the second; and 49.33 to 62.88 in the third, so that the per cent for the other two pieces is greater than the least of these, and less than the greatest. The section from Ovid has 37.1 per cent of the lines beginning DD, and 79 beginning with one dactyl. The corresponding figures for the Maecenas are 30.7 and 76; for the *Consolatio* 28.3 and 71.7. This shows that the beginning D is slightly more frequent in Ovid than in the other poems, and DD much more so. In all three poems the endings are either trisyllables or dissyllables. The latter is uniformly the ending for pentameters, with the exception of *Pannonii* (*Cons.* 390). The per cent of combinations of dactyls and spondees in the first part of the pentameter lines is shown in the following table:

	DD	DS	SD	SS
Maecenas	15	40	17	16
Consolatio	25	48	17	10
Ovid	35	47	11	7

The Maecenas and *Consolatio* agree only in the use of SD, the latter and Ovid in DS. Ovid has a marked predominance of DD, and an equally marked infrequency of spondaic beginnings. The figures for DD and D at the beginning of lines is for the Maecenas 17 and 62.5; for the *Consolatio* 28.3 and 73; for the section of Ovid 35 and 82, noticeable differences between the three pieces.

The writer of the Maecenas freely utilized material from his predecessors which he set forth in varying ways. Owing to extended losses of material it is impossible to discover the extent of his borrowing, nor is this material. His method is clearly indicated in what we can trace, although some parallels may be merely incidental. *Fuisse* (18) equalling *mortuum esse* is used by Plautus in the same way (*Capt.* 516) and this may or may not have been in the mind of the writer. His method in general was perhaps suggested by Vergil, who has (*Aen.* 7, 621 f.):

. . . . et cardine verso
 Belli ferratos rumpit Saturnia postes.

Apart from the fact that there are 5,040 possible arrangements of seven words, the statement is interesting as a



rather more flexible group of words than the famous quotation by Horace (Sat. 1, 4, 60 f.) :

. . . . postquam Discordia taetra
Belli ferratos postis portasque refregit.

Belli ferratos is kept at the beginning of the line, but postes has a different position. In the same way both the Maecenas and the Consolatio have transferred collocations occupying the same position, or, if adaptable, sometimes put at some other point in the line. Omnia cum posses (15) is an adapted reversal of non possumus omnes (Ecl. 7, 23) changed from the end of the line, and fitted to the beginning. The references to Bacchus are (57 and 61) :

Bacche, coloratos postquam devicimus Indos,

and . . . sic ducere thyrsos. Vergil has Bacche sumere thyrsos in the same positions (Aen. 7, 389 f.), and coloratis devexus ab Indis (Georg. 4, 293). Serpentes hederæ (64 beg.) equals Pallentesque hederæ (Georg. 4, 124). The statement (65) :

Argentata tuos etiam talaria talos
Vinxerunt certe,

seems to be fashioned after pedibus talaria nectit Aurea (Aen. 4, 239 f.), but the material is different. Multo defuncte labore (69) is like magnis defuncte periclis (6, 83), while cornua fronte (116: Ecl. 6, 41); te propter (75 f., bis; 167: Aen. 4, 320 f.); vivaces cervos (115: Ecl. 7, 30 gen.); and pariter cum (79: Aen. 4, 241) are the same, as is the reference to Aloides (87: Aen. 6, 582). The description of the hirundo (102) :

Verberat egelidos garrula vere lacus,

has a verb used of the eagle (Aen. 11, 756 aethera v.), while garrula hirundo is also Vergilian (Georg. 4, 307). The verb is also associated with water by Vergil annem (Georg. 1, 141), and fluctum (Aen. 10, 207). The line of Vergil (Georg. 1, 447) :

Tithoni croceum linquens Aurora cubile,

furnished the words, with changed constructions, for Auroræ Tithonus (119) and croceo cubili (123). Recubare, used in connection with the last occurs also in Vergil. Integer aevo is transferred from the same position in Aen. 9, 455 with aevo changed to aevi. The mention of the battle of Actium (45-48) seems to give to Maecenas the honor ascribed to Agrippa (Aen. 8. 682 f.). But as it

has *Eoi* for *Orientis*, *Actius*, and mentions the Nile (cf. *Aen.* 6, 800) it seems as if the author were trying to produce a Vergilian effect. The descriptions of night, *Nocte sub obscura* (29) is as in Vergil (*Aen.* 2, 420; 4, 461), and *placida sub nocte* (131) is in the same position with *cum* (*Aen.* 7, 527).

One word *vixi* (157) assigned to Maecenas is also assigned to Dido by Vergil (*Aen.* 4, 653) but the context of the one expresses dependence, of the other independence, as is shown by *te . . . propter* (*bis*).

The description of *Hercules* (72 f.) :

. . . . *Torsisti pollice fusos,*
Lenisti morsu levia fila parum,

is based on the description by Catullus of the spinning of the Fates (64, 312 ff.) containing *deducens fila . . . in pollice torquens . . . fusum . . . (decerpens . . . dens) . . . in levi . . . filo*. A few minor items are the same, although probably independent statements, as *exorientis* (56: 64, 271), *tela in . . . misit* (55): *tela infesta . . . mittere* (116, 4), *tremulo* (120: 68, 142 -i) *magni Caesaris* (150: 11, 10 rev.). The full expression *magnum magni Caesaris* may be compared with that in the *Catalepton* (9, 3) *magnum magni decus . . . triumphi*.

The reference to *Hercules impiger Alcide* (69) and *impiger infans* (81) transfers to his early years the characterization by Horace (*Odes* 4, 8, 3)

Discinctus (21) is applied to Maecenas as also to Laelius and Scipio by Horace (*Sat.* 2, 1, 73), and *praecinctos* is also from Horace (*Sat.* 1, 5, 6). Vergil also has the first (*Aen.* 8, 724) *d. Afros*. *Pete sidera sero* (171) puts into the imperative the wish of Horace (*Odes* 1, 2, 45) *serus in caelum redeas*. *Umbrosam quercum* (33) is equivalent to *u. ripam* (*Odes* 3, 1, 23), *odorata . . . inque rosa* (94) is a variation from *in rosa . . . odoribus* (*Odes* 1, 5, 1), and the beginning of the closing sentence *divis insignis atavis* was suggested by *atavis edite regibus* (*Odes* 1, 1, 1). This gives to the work an ending parallel to the beginning of the *Odes*, while the *et praesidium et . . . decus* of Horace appears as *tu decus et laudes* (18).

There are at least 14 words not used by either Vergil or Ovid and 20 more not used by Vergil but occurring in Ovid. This gives the ratio of 1 to 2.6, and shows that so far as this element is concerned Vergil, who could not have written the work, stands as near to the Maecenas as does Ovid. But the uselessness of ratios in determining literary relationships is clearly shown by the following examples selected

from the mass of occurrences, none of them showing the ratio 1:2.7, that of the length of the work of Vergil to that of Ovid: *Angustus* (16: 12), *candor* (1: 19), *condicio* (1: 10), *defensus* (5: 2), *exemplum* (3: 73), *expleo* (11: 83), *immanis* (56: 15), *manifestus* (7: 23), *monumenta* (10: 19), *sinus* (26: 97), *umbrosus* (5: 15), *ventosus* (7: 9). This is as we should expect for literary productions do not have chemical uniformity, but are illustrations of incalculable variations both in substance and in form.

The simple statement in Ovid (*Fasti* 2, 314) :

Hesperos et fusco roscidus ibat equo,

can be taken as a suggestion for the involved statement (129 ff.) :

*Quaesivere chori iuvenum sic Hesperon illum,
Quem nexum medio in igne Venus
Quem nunc in fuscis placida sub nocte nitentem
Luciferum contra currere cernis equis.*

The salient points of a section in the *ad Pisonem* are represented in the *Maecenas*, possibly by an imitator, possibly by the same writer. Beginning with *tu pronus in omne Pectora ducis opus* (125 f.) the auctor *ad Pisonem* considers changes in human efforts, as well as in nature—winter, spring, summer, and autumn—and then (140 ff.) :

*Quin etiam Superum pater arma recondit,
Et Ganymedeae repetens convivia mensae,
Pocula sumit ea, qua gessit fulmina, dextra.*

The injunction is given *temporibus servire decet* (143) with illustrations of adaptation to this tenet

*. . . . eum si bella vocabunt
Miles erit; si pax, positus toga gestiet armis.*

There is a change to *carmina* (151), and it is stated (154 ff.) :

*Sive chelyn digitis et eburno verbere pulsas,
Dulcis Apollinea sequitur testudine cantus,
Et te credibile est Phoebos didicisse magistro.
Nec pudeat pepulisse lyram, cum pace serena
Publica securis exsultent otia terris;
Nec pudeat chelys, si creditur illis
Pulsari manibus quibus et contenditur arcus.*

Achilles is given as an illustration, and the narrative then returns to *Piso*.

In the other poem the activities of *Maecenas* as miles are presented (40-48), and then follows (49 ff.) :

Pax erat: Haec illos laxarant otia cultus.
 Omnia victores Marte sedente decent.
 Actius ipse lyram plectro percussit eburno,
 Postquam victrices conticuere tubae.

The dominator Olympi (87) is mentioned, and a reference is made to Ganymedes, without mentioning his name. The victor (ter) and victus (bis) precede the general statement (97) :

Tempora dispensant usus et tempora cultus.

Lux est . . . nox est follow and a poetical winter and spring. As the elision features in the works are practically the same, and the schemata not widely divergent, we may hold hypothetically that the auctor ad Pisonem after praising the living turned to answer the criticisms of Seneca and produced the Maecenas.

The approximate solution of the question depends on the determination of the relation of the Maecenas to the works of Seneca. The poem declares (97 f.) :

Tempora dispensant usus et tempora cultus;
 Haec homines, pecudes, haec moderantur avis.

The form of statement is different at the beginning of Ep. 114, quare quibusdam temporibus provenerit corrupti generis oratio, quaeris. This calls out a discussion which Seneca concisely sums up with the words Talis hominibus fuit oratio, qualis vita. Maecenas is taken as an illustration of this, and it is asked, Non oratio eius aequae soluta est, quam ipse discinctus? Non tam insignita illius verba sunt quam cultus, quam comitatus, quam domus, quam uxor? With the first of this we may compare the close of Ep. 92: Diserte Maecenas ait:

Nec tumulum curo; sepelit natura relictos.

Alte cinctum putes dixisse: habuit enim ingenium et grande et virile, nisi illud secum discinxisset. Compare with this (114, 6) etiam cum absentis Caesaris partibus fungeretur, signum a discincto petebatur. The poem evidently refers to this criticism (21) :

Quod discinctus eras, animo quoque, carpitur unum.

The question is then asked (25) :

Livide, quid tandem tunicae nocuere solutae:

There is a similar statement applied to Bacchus (69) :

Et tibi securo tunicae fluxere solutae;

cf. *tunicas . . . fluentis* (77). These *tunicae solutae* are an item mentioned also by Seneca (Ep. 114, 6): *Non statim, cum haec legeris, hoc tibi occurret hunc esse qui solutis tunicis in urbe semper incesserit.*

The statement of Seneca in regard to *comitatus* of Maecenas is not directly answered, but the viewpoint is changed (39 f.):

*Quid faceret? defunctus erat comes impiger idem
Miles et Augusti fortiter usque pius.*

Here *impiger* is applied to Maecenas as to Hercules (81; 69 f.):

*Impiger Alcide, multo defuncte labore,
Sic memorant curas te posuisse tuas,*

as if the surroundings were unimportant, and Augustus was (103 f.):

*Caesar amicus erat; poterat vixisse solute,
Cum iam Caesar idem, quod cupiebat, erat.*

Seneca explains his reference to the wife of Maecenas in the words *uxorem milies duxit cum unam habuerit*. Seneca mentions the same domestic infelicity (Dial. 1, 3, 9) *Feliciorum ergo tu Maecenatem putas, cui amoribus anxio et morosae uxoris cotidiana repudia deflenti somnus per symphoniarum cantum ex longinquo lene resonantium quaeritur?* The poet is kinder, for he gives only the final, imagined, scene (153 f.):

*. . . . moriens quaerebat amatae
Coniugis amplexus, oscula, verba, manus.*

By writing this the poet showed himself as successful a concealer as was Horace when he wrote (Odes 2, 12, 13 fl.):

*Me dulcis dominae Musa Licymniae
Cantus, me voluit dicere lucidum
Fulgentis oculos, et bene mutuis
Fidum pectus amoribus.*

The extent to which the writer sought by means of mythological parallels to palliate or refute the charges of Seneca leaves little doubt that the work of the philosopher was used by the rhetorical poet. One line (15),

Te sensit nemo posse nocere tamen,

has two words from a statement by Seneca (Dial. 11), *nemo potentiam eius iniuria sensit*, which may have been taken from here to the Maecenas. In his criticism Seneca mentions

mores novos (Ep. 114, 7) a possible foundation for the words (6) :

Et tibi consulto verba fuere nova.

In another sphere compare sanguine abstinuit (Ep. 114, 8) and (32) :

Maior res magnis abstinuisse fuit.

If we take the Maecenas as a work later than the works of Seneca we may also hold that the writer may have been influenced by the works of Martial and of Statius. Ovid has (Fasti 3, 192) :

Iugera inculti pauca tenere soli.

In addition to this he has campi iugera pauca (Am. 3, 15, 12; cf. Mart. 3, 31, 1) ; and iugera multa freti (Ponto 4, 9, 86). These show three instances of the genitive in five occurrences of iugera. Vergil has three examples, Georg. 2, 264; Aen. 6, 595; and Georg. 4, 127 f., pauca Iugera ruris, only the last with a genitive. There seems to be a freer use of iugera in Statius, but not with soli, the Lemaire Index giving ten citations, four with the genitive, campi (Theb. 1, 368; 6, 679) ; Dirces (1, 152) ; Dauni (Silvae 5, 3, 163). Iugera soli is noticeable in Martial, and the Maecenas has the same collocation.

The entire passage from the Maecenas (33-38) is as follows :

Maluit umbrosam quercum nymphasque cadentes
 Paucaque pomosi iugera certa soli.
 Pieridas Phoebumque colens in mollibus hortis,
 Sederat argutas garrulus inter avis.
 Marmora Maeonii vincent monumenta libelli,
 Vivitur ingenio, cetera mortis erunt.

This is a good picture of Maecenas sitting humming among the humming birds, but involves the relation of the poem to the works of Martial. He associates iugera with a dissyllable usually soli, at the end of the line in 1, 85, 2; 1, 116, 2; 6, 16, 2; 11, 29, 6; 10, 58, 9 :

Atque suburbani iugera pulchra soli;
 Faenius et culti iugera pulchra soli;
 Iugera sepositi pauca tuere soli;
 Et dabo Setini iugera culta soli;
 Dura suburbani cum iugera pascimus agri.

Four of these have iugera, adjective, soli, as does the Maecenas, but, agri is in the last. The last also has the same adjective with the genitive as does the first, but there

is a new adjective, *dura*, with *iugera*. See also (12, 72, 1) *iugera . . . agelli*. With the last two lines of the quotation may be compared the longer statement of Martial expressing the same thought (10, 2, 9 ff.) :

Marmora Messallae findit caprificus et audax
 Dimidios Crispi mulio ridet equos.
 At chartis nec furta nocent et saecula prosunt
 Solaque non norunt haec monumenta mori.

Marmora and *monumenta* are in the same position in both passages, and as the writer of the *Maecenas* could not refer to *Crispus*, the *Maecenas* statement seems to be an abbreviation of that of *Martial*. He also has a variation of the lines (8, 3, 5 ff.) :

Et cum rupta situ Messallae saxa iacebunt,
 Altaque cum Licini marmora pulvis erunt.
 Me tamen ora legent et secum plurimus hospes
 Ad patrias sedes carmina nostra feret.

In this *Messalla* and *marmora* are retained, but there is a shift to *Martial's* own writings. In the last line of the above quotation from the *Maecenas* the words *vivitur ingenio* are used. These may be fairly taken as a reference to the words of *Seneca* *habuit enim ingenium grande et virile*, already quoted, and as a suggestion that *ingenium* and not *solutae tunicae* is the basis of greatness. The last half of the line, *cetera mortis erunt* has the same cadence and nearly the same euphony, as the half line of *Martial*, *marmora pulvis erunt*, and seems to be a conscious imitation of it.

There are a few passages in which the words of *Stattius* are like those in the *Maecenas*, as in *mollibus hortis* (35 end: *mollibus in pratis* (*Silvae* 2, 1, 107). The references to *Hercules* give his youthful experience (81 f.) :

. . . . premeret cum iam impiger infans
 Hydros ingentes vix capiente manu,

and (*Silvae* 3, 1, 47 f.) :

Parvus adhuc, similisque tui, cum prima novercae
 Monstra premeres atque exanimata doleres.

The *Maecenas* writes of the *argo legit Cyaneosque metus* (107 f.) while *Stattius* has (*Silvae* 1, 2, 40) *si Cyaneos raperere per aestus*, the adjective in each associated with a noun ending in *-us*.

The *Maecenas* and *Consolatio* show a similar use of *dispenso* (140) *si . . . dispensata . . . stamina . . . forent*, and *fortuna . . . tempus dispensat* (371). There is also a

contrast of victor and victus (C. 178) and at greater length (93 ff.) victor . . . victor . . . victor . . . victus . . . victusque.

A writer would be more likely to draw from another using the collocation freely, rather than from one who has only a single example. The same conclusion may be based on the use of Niliacus, N . . . carinae (45) which occurs several times in Martial, although Vergil does not have it at all, and Ovid but once (Ars Am. 3, 318) Niliacis . . . modis. However, the suggestion for its use may have come from Lucan in whose latest books it is used with considerable freedom. A characteristic of Maecenas, simplicitas (O Verg., 11 Ovid), is set forth (12) where criticism is answered:

Diluis hoc nimia simplicitate tua.

This is also one of the traits emphasized by Martial (1, 39, 4) : vera simplicitate bonus; (8, 73, 20) nivea simplicitate; (10, 47, 7) prudens simplicitas; (11, 20, 11) Romana simplicitate loqui. The adjective in annoso . . . avo (4), and Nestoris annosi (139) occurs also in Martial a . . . senecta (1, 105, 3). He also has ire redire (1, 48, 2; 6, 10, 8; 10, 60, 10) along with Statius. With these may be placed candidior nive (1, 115, 3; 4, 42, 5; 7, 33, 2; 12, 82, 7).

Worthy of note are the verse endings vic-tric-es conticuere tubae (52) and one in Martial (7, 80, 2) te-tric-ae conticuere tubae. Neither Vergil nor Ovid has the noun and verb associated, although the former has the verb three times at the beginning of verses, as has the latter (Met. 5, 574) c. undae. It is also followed three times in the pentameter by a final dissyllable, canes (Fasti 4, 490), molae Fasti 6, 348) and mora (Ponto 2, 5, 48). Tetricus, not used by Vergil, and only five times by Ovid in different connections, seems to be a favorite of Martial, as he has it fifteen times according to the Lemairre Index. There is a similar ending in a different meter (6, 70, 8) tetricae tulere febres. From these facts we infer that Martial's ending is original, and was modified by the author of the Maecenas.

The curious statement in the Maecenas (92) of the carefulness of the eagle in carrying away Ganymedes, presso molliter ungue rapit is expressed by Martial (1, 6, 1 f.) :

Aetherias aquila puerum portante per auras
Inlaesum timidis unguibus haesit onus.

If there exists a certain similarity in works produced in

the same generation, as an indication of possible intercommunication, the Maecenas may have been produced at the time of Statius and Martial, or even later if the parallels are taken as signs of the use of these writers. It, *redit* (6) (pent) had perhaps become phraseological by the time of Statius as he has (Theb. 1, 102) *itque reditque* (hexam) both at the beginning of a line; cf. Martial (6, 10, 8; 12, 60, 10). *Ratis obruta* (Theb. 8, 267) may be taken as fixing the reading instead of *ratis oblita* (8). The collocation *nocte sub obscura* (29) is like *obscura dum nocte*, although both writers may have had the words of Vergil in mind. The declaration *haec illos laxarant otia cultus* (49) equals *effreni laxentur in otia mores* (Theb. 7, 30), as *stamina rupta* (76) does *rumpebant stamina* in the same position (8, 13). *Emerito bovi* (100) in the pentameter has the same position as *e iuenco* in the hexameter (Theb. 3, 591), and *Cyaneosque metus* (108) has its equivalent in *c montes* (8, 438).

Iuvenescere (111) which Vergil does not use and Ovid but once (Am. 3, 7, 41), occurs in 3, 584. Similar pieces of phraseology are found in the *Silvae* also. In *mollibus hortis* ends the line (35) as *mollibus in pratis* begins it (2, 1, 107), there is a similar change in *gemmis ornatus et auro* (63), and *Atque auro, gemmisque* (3, 4, 91), and *puer integer aevo* (149) is metrically equal to *decor integer aevi* (5, 2, 63), although both may have drawn from Vergil.

III. THE CONSOLATIO AD LIVIAM

The most noticeable rhetorical feature in the *Consolatio*, as in the *Nux*, is the repetition of elements. All parts of speech are freely repeated without change of form. However, there are some noticeable changes in the case of adjectives and nouns, e.g. *caecis caeca* (374), *laetis, laetus* (?) (374), *ab uno Unius* (151 f.), *principibus . . . principe* (344), *Oceani . . . Oceanus* (438).

Of almost equal rhetorical importance are the instances of variation in form in stating the same or equivalent facts: *Quae . . . numina Quos . . . deos* (131 f.), *sustentabat . . . inhiibat* (229), *rapit . . . sustinet* (372), (298) :

Cur sine me, cur sic incommittatus abis?

Illustrations in successive lines are (405 ff.) :

*Sidera quin etiam caelo fugisse feruntur;
Lucifer et solitas destituisse vias.
Lucifer in toto nulli comparuit orbe,
Et venit stella non praeeunte dies.
Sideris hoc obitus terris instare monebat;
Et mergi Stygia nobile lumen aqua.*

Contrast in terms is illustrated by *solvere vota Iovi . . . solvere vota Deae* (21 f.), and in a single line (414) :

Et vivat nato cum sene mater anus.

Repetition and variation are shown in the following passage (121 ff.) :

*Nate, brevis fructus, duplicis sors altera partus,
Gloria confectae, nate, parentis, ubi es?
Sed neque iam duplicis neque iam sors altera, partus,
Gloria confectae nunc quoque matris, ubi es?
Heu! Modo tantus, ubi es? tumulo portaris et igni.*

Compared with the *Consolationes* of Seneca the *Consolatio ad Liviam* presents much more mythological data. The *atavi . . . proavi* (451) are mentioned, as well as *paternis maioribus . . . maternis* (331), but only in general terms.

Reference is made to *Aurora* bringing the day of vengeance on the Germans (281 f.) :

Quam primum croceis roscida portet equis,

and the *Ledaes . . . fratres* are mentioned. We find (105 f.) :

Talis in umbrosis, mitis nunc denique, si vis
Deflet Threicium Daulias ales Ityn,

an illustration which in form seems to mingle material from Catullus (65, 14), Vergil (Georg. 4, 511), and not certainly from Ovid (Her. 15, 154).

The narrative continues with Oeniden, Clymene and Clymenides. The questions are asked (317) :

Quo raperis, laniata comas, similisque furenti?
Quo ruis? Attonita quid petis ora manu?

and Andromache and Euadne are given as illustrations of similar acts.

The injunction is laid on Livia (427 f.) :

Supprime iam lacrimas; non est revocabilis illis
Quem semel umbrifera navita lintre tulit.

The following four lines mention the mourning for Hector, with the conclusion :

Nullaque per Stygias umbra renavit aquas.

There are eight similar lines given to Thetis and Achilles, with the exaggerated statement concerning Panope, immensas fletibus auxit aquas, and closing

Et Thetis ante omnes: sed nec Thetis ipsa, neque omnes
Mutarunt avidi tristia iura dei. . . . neque omnes

A fine example of lurid rhetoric is (263 f.) :

Spes quoque multorum flammis uruntur in isdem.
Iste rogus miseræ viscera matris habet.

With this may be placed the lines referring to Tiberinus (225 f.) :

Uberibusque oculis lacrimarum flumina misit:
Vix cepit adiectas alveus altus aquas.

This is similar to the statement about Panope, and with it we place the reference to Livia (422), as if she were an alleviated Tantalus:

Aridaque adfusa guttura tinxit aqua.

The author of the *Consolatio* wrote with an eye to Vergil, and freely appropriated his phrases: *Miserabile carmen* (3: Georg. 4, 514); *lumina . . . natantia* (93: Georg. 4, 496 rev.); *frigida lingua* (308: Georg. 4, 525); *liquitur* (101: Georg. 4, 43); *Romana per oppida* (173: Georg. 2, 176);

is honos pietatis (133: Aen. 1, 252); talis . . . sic . . . sic (35: Aen. 3, 490). *Hei mihi* (176: Aen. 2, 272) introduces far different scenes, but both connected with the dead. The picture of the mother (95 ff.) is drawn from the description of the mother of Euryalus (Aen. 9, 483 ff.), and what follows is a transformation of Aen. 4, 684. The rhetorical form for *Nate, brevis fructus . . . nate* (121 f.) is taken from the words of Venus to her son (Aen. 1, 644 f.).

Mars orders Tiberinus to restrain his waters, closing with the words (250):

Vade age et admissis labere pronus aquis,

borrowing *vade, age . . . labere* from Jupiter's command to Mercury (Aen. 4, 223). Like Mercury, Tiberinus obeys:

Paret et in longum spatiosas explicat undas,
Structaque pendenti pumice tecta subit.

The last line changes the order and drops an *a* from one of the words of Vergil (Georg. 4, 374) *pendentia pumice tecta*.

Other illustrations will be given, although not necessary to show that the thought of the author was continually working with the words of Virgil. The opening line has *mater modo dicta* which is changed from the words of Creusa (Aen. 2, 678) *coniunx quondam tua dicta*, giving them a different temporal setting. There is a similar change of *tenuit lumina fixa* (92) from *immota tenebat Lumina* (Aen. 4, 331 f.). *Sustulit . . . caput* (222), applied to Tiberinus, makes him act as does Neptune (Aen. 1, 227) *extulit caput*, although Vergil has of the river god *se attollere* (Aen. 8, 31). However, Vergil's description

. . . eum tenuis glauco velabat amictu
Carbasus et crines umbrosa tegebat harundo,

is not improved in

Tum salice implexum, muscoque et harundine crinem.

The words applied to Drusus (241) *haec (facta) ipsum sublime ferent suggest* that he is another Aeneas (Aen. 1, 259) *sublimemque ferens*. It is possible that *sanctos restinguere ignes* (Aen. 2, 686) may have been in the mind of the author when he wrote *caput contingere sanctum* (253).

Some little pieces are taken over unchanged, as *ventosa per aequora* (107: Aen. 5, 335); or with slight changes, as *incomitatus abis* (298: Aen. 4, 467); *aethera . . . lambit et astra* (256: Aen. 3, 574 *sidera*); *tendens in te sua bracchia* (297): *tibi tendens . . . palmas* (Georg. 4, 498). *Concors*

pietas (84), both from the position of the words and from their application, may be taken as a reflection of *concordes animae* (Aen. 6, 827). The adjective *furibunda* (373) is used twice by Vergil applied to Dido and Amata (4, 646; 7, 348), and the act of *Fortuna ruit totumque per orbem* is like that of Amata *per medias urbes*.

In setting forth the things due from a leader, the *Consolatio* states (64):

Nec, quae nos patimur vulgus, et ipse pati.

In contrast with this expression of personality it has (199 ff.) *Obvia turba ruit . . . Omnibus idem oculi . . .*

Funeris exsequiis adsumus omnis eques,
Omnis adest aetas. . . .

This is based on the scene pictured by Horace (*Odes* 4, 2, 50 f.):

Non semel dicemus, 'Io Triumphe,'
Civitas omnis dabimusque divis
Tura benignis,

and leaves us in doubt in regard to the participation of the author in the exsequies. Universal doom is portrayed (357 ff.):

Fata manent omnes: omnes exspectat avarus
Portitor; et turbae vix satis una ratis.
Tendimus huc omnes: metam properamus ad unam.
Omnia sub leges mors vocat atra suas.
Ecce necem intentam caelo terraeque fretoque,
Casurum triplex vaticinantur opus.
I nunc et, rebus tanta impendente ruina,
In te solam oculos et tua damna refer.

The first three words generalize the words of Horace (*Ep.* 17, 61) *fata te . . . manent*, with the variation *debita iura . . . te maneant ipsum* (*Odes* 1, 28, 31 f.). The beginning of the third line changes *omnes eodem cogimur* (*Odes* 4, 3, 26). The latter part merely changes the figure in the first part. *Mors atra* is a condensation of Horace's *mors atris alis* (*Sat.* 2, 1, 58), and the calling is set forth (*Odes* 2, 8, 40). The *Portitor* is Vergilian (Aen. 6, 326), and the statement in regard to *turba* is an inference drawn from the description of it (Aen. 6, 305 ff.). However, Ovid has (*Met.* 10, 33 f.) *sedem properamus ad unam Tendimus huc omnes*, with the parts in different order. *Ad metam properate* is in an earlier passage (*Ars Am.* 2, 727), but the application is entirely different. The last four lines are an adaptation from Lucretius (5, 95 ff.), the first lines with the order of words reversed:

Principio, maria ac terras caelumque tuere:
 Horum naturam triplicem, tria corpora, Memmi,
 Tres species tam dissimiles, tria talia texta
 Una dies dabit exitio.

The Consolatio puts this indefinitely with vaticinantur, but Ovid (Tristia 2, 425 f.) refers it directly to Lucretius:

Explicat ut causas rapidi Lucretius ignis,
 Casurumque triplex vaticinatur opus.

A part of line 2 *dimidium nominis* was suggested by *animae d.* (Odes 1, 3, 8), and line 317 begins *Quo raperis* as does Odes 3, 25 *Quo . . . rapis. Si quid miri* (314) is also from Horace (Sat. 1, 5, 102). The statement in regard to Remus and Romulus (242):

Effugerent aliqua stagna profunda via,

is a remodeling of the words of Horace (Odes 3, 3, 15 f.):

. . . . hac Quirinus
 Martis equis Acheronta fugit.

The line (220):

At vox adversis collibus icta redit,

puts in different form the fact stated by Horace (Odes 1, 20, 6 ff.):

. . . . simul et iocosa
 Redderet laudes tibi Vaticani
 Montis imago.

In the same way (428):

Quem semel umbrifera navita lintre tulit,

gives in fanciful form the content of Odes 1, 24, 16 ff.:

Quam virga semel horrida,
 Non lenis precibus fata recludere
 Nigro compulerit Mercurius gregi.

Assuming that the Consolatio was written not far from the year 9 B.C., the material parallel to it and the works of Ovid may be divided into two portions. These are material formulated earlier and incorporated in the Consolatio, and material formulated in Consolatio and utilized later. Illustrations will be given taken from the works of Ovid from the earliest to the latest. *Concinuistis aves* (110: Am. 3, 12, 2); *invicta . . . manu* (382: Am. 3, 3, 28); *sidera . . . fugisse* (405: Am. 1, 13, 28 *ne fugerent . . . s.*). *Fovit*

membra (96: Her. 16, 222; 21, 190 rev.); operosaque gloria (265: Her. 2, 63); (165: Her. 14, 67):

Haec et plura refert; lacrimae sua verba sequuntur:
Haec ego, dumque queror lacrimae sua verba sequuntur.

Crinem solvit (435 f.: Ars Am. 3, 783); victrices manus (261: Ars Am. 2, 716); nisi victor (291: Ars Am. 1, 394). Causa. . . . necis (270: Rem. 592).

Protulit imperium (20: Met. 5, 372 rev.); victoria parta est (237: Met. 13, 348); instare monebat (409: Met. 15, 795 f. monet); fletibus auxit aquas (436: Met. 1, 584 auget).

Promissa coma (86: Tristia 4, 2, 34); funeris exsequiis (202 beg.: Tristia 3, 5, 40 end).

De tribus una (243: Ib. 240).

Gloria summa (366: Ponto 4, 8, 70); mergi aqua (410: Ponto 2, 3, 40 mergere); (120: Tristia 1, 3, 42):

Singultu medios impediante sonos:

Caesaris alti (453: Ponto 2, 3, 63).

Facundique principis ora (261: Fasti 5, 698 f. . . . ore deus); (46: Fasti 1, 300):

Altius et vitiis exseruisse caput?
. . . . vitiisque locisque
Altius humanis exseruisse caput.

However, the line of demarcation is not always clearly drawn, and the same expression may be found in works of different dates, e.g., *De tribus una* (243); *de tribus una soror* (Ib. 240); *e tribus una soror* (Met. 10, 314); *curruque superbus eburno* (333): *in curru eburno* (Ponto 3, 4, 35); *currus eburnos* (Tristia 4, 2, 63). *Flammas extinguere* (227: Ars Am. 3, 463; Rem. 53; Met. 15, 778).

The *Consolatio* puts into the future with *adspiciam* (271 ff.) an account of the author watching a triumph over the Germans. This contains one line

Carnifici in maesto carcere dandus erit

which states as a prophecy the fate of Vercingetorix. The lines are an epitome of Ovid's imaginary account of a similar triumph (Tristia 4, 2), and as it has *laetus ero* (v. 72) we take this adjective for the reading in the *Consolatio* (279) *laetusque videbo*. The author's account is apocalyptic, and he elsewhere uses *Germanica signa* (335) not used by Ovid, and twice mentions the Suevi and Sygambri,

not in Ovid's account. These passages are as follows (17 f.; 311 f.) :

Ille genus Suevos acre indomitosque Sygambros
 Contudit inque fugam barbara terga dedit:
 Nec tibi deletos poterit narrare Sygambros,
 Ensibus et Suevos terga dedisse suis.

Indomitos and deletos do not exactly agree, but quis unquam a poeta iuratores exegit? especially from one writing years after the events described.

Seneca with philosophical insight declares (Dial. 11, 3, 3) nihil est enim difficilius quam magno dolori paria verba reperire. In sharp contrast with this the rhetorical poet says (9 f.) :

Hei mihi, quam facile est, quamvis hic contingit omnes
 Alterius luctu fortia verba loqui.

This is apparently a reminiscence of the words of Terence (Andria 309) :

Facile omnes quum valemus recta consilia aegrotis damus.

Although there is this difference in the attitude of the two writers to the theme in general, yet, as is shown by the imperatives used, the attitude of the auctor toward Livia is the same as that of Seneca toward Marcia. The auctor exhorts Livia (354) :

Infragilemque animum, quod potes, usque tene.

This is a part of the passage (343-356) in which is set forth the fitness of certain actions for the imperial position :

Non eadem vulgusque decent et lumina rerum;
 Est quod praecipuum debent ista domus.
 Imposuit te alto Fortuna, locumque tueri
 Iussit honoratum, Livia: perfer onus.

The last words are an adaptation of those of Seneca (Dial. 6, 5, 6) quidquid onerum supra cecidit sustine; and the remainder gives in brief compass the demonstration of Seneca (Dial. 11, 6) containing Liberiora omnia sunt iis quorum adfectus tegi possunt In multa luce Fortuna te posuit Nihil te plebeium decet, nihil humile. The conclusion is Magna servitus est magna Fortuna. The equivalent of this statement begins de Clem. 1, 6, and the penalties are summed up in aberrare a fortuna non potes, and fastigio tuo adfixus es. With the imperatives of the auctor we may compare the imperatives of Seneca te, Marcia, gere (Dial. 6, 25, 3) and I nunc et puta (Dial. 12, 10, 10), the latter similar to I nunc

. . . . refer (363 f.). Adspice (346 bis) and 392 followed by adde quod is used the same way by Seneca, e.g. Dial. 6, 25, 3; 6, 7, 2.

Placed amid these imperatives is (351 ff.) :

Ad te oculos auresque trahis; tua facta notamus
Nec vox missa potest principis ore tegi.
Alte mane; supraque tuos exurge dolores.

The auctor in his thought reverts to the words of Horace (A. P. 390) nescit vox missa reverti, apparently modified in statement by the words of Seneca (Dial. 11, 6, 2) adfectus tegi possunt.

The statement of the auctor is (369 f.) :

Vita data est utenda; data est sine foenere nobis
Mutua, nec certa persoluenda die.

This summarizes and states a little differently the thesis of Lucretius (3, 984) :

Vitaque mancipio nulli datur, omnibus usu.

Cicero's declaration is similar (Tusc. Disp. 1, 39, 93) : At ea (sc. natura) dedit usuram vitae, tamquam pecuniae, nulla praestituta die. Seneca has (Dial. 6, 19, 3) sicut mancipium, and (Dial. 11, 10, 5) Rerum natura . . . non mancipio dedit, sed commodavit. This is abbreviated (Ep. 72, 7) nihil dat fortuna mancipio.

"We live in deeds, not years," says Bailey's Festus, and this is also the philosophy of Seneca and of the Consolatio. The latter says in the person of Drusus (447 ff.) :

Quid numeras annos? Vixi maturior annis.
Acta senem faciunt: haec numeranda tibi;
His aevum fuit implendum, non segnibus annis.
Hostibus eveniat longa senecta meis.

This was anticipated (339) :

Vix credent tantum rerum cepisse tot annos,

and is in harmony with the views of Seneca (Dial. 6, 24, 1) Incipe . . . virtutibus illum non annis aestimare: satis diu vixit.

The completeness of the life of Drusus is indicated: (285 f.) :

Quam parvo numeros implevit principis aevo,
In patriam meritis occubuitque senex.

Compare with this the words of Seneca (6, 21, 4) vixit enim quantum debuit vivere. Nihil illi iam ultra supererat.

The balancing of the ills and blessings of life are briefly set forth by Seneca (Dial. 11, 12, 1). After mentioning *fratres, uxorem, filium*, he writes *ab hac te infamia vindica, ne videatur omnibus plus apud te valere unus dolor quam haec multa solatia*. The same contrast is set forth at length as part of the work of *Fortuna* (377 ff.) :

Quae tamen hoc uno tristis tibi tempore venit
 Saepe eadem rebus favit amica tuis.
 Nata quod en alte es, quod foetibus aucta duobus;
 Quodque etiam magno consociata Iovi.

There follow four *quod*-clauses setting forth the details, and the places in which *Drusus* had operated are summoned as witnesses. The passage closes with

Adspice quot meritis culpa sit una minor.
 Adde quod est absens functus; nec cernere nati
 Semineces oculos sustinere tui.

The statement of the *auctor* (11) *percutsa es fulminis icu* has the verb associated with *fulmen* by Seneca, as Dial. 11, 13, 4, but instead of *absens* he has another participle (Dial. 11, 11, 1) at *inopinanti ereptus est*. The reverse of this is stated in the poem (399 ff.) :

Non ex praecipiti dolor in tua pectora venit,
 Sed per mollitos ante timore gradus.
 Jupiter ante dedit fati mala signa cruenti.

Seneca has the phrase *ante duriores gradus* (Dial 6, 20, 1), the opposite of that in the poem. *Livia* seems to have been violent in her grief (417 ff.) :

Tu tamen ausa potes tanto indulgere dolori,
 Longius ut nolis, heu male fortis, ali.
 Vix etiam fueras paucas vitalis in horas,
 Obtulit invitae quam tibi Caesar opem:
 Admovitque preces et ius immiscuit illis.

Seneca also refers to this (Dial. 6, 4, 2) *illa in primo furore cum maxime impatientes ferocesque sunt miseriae*. Seneca also associates *Livia* and *Octavia* (Dial. 6, 2, 3), and has *Octavia Marcellum*, the reverse of *Marcellum Octavia* (441).

The *auctor* declares (13) :

Occidit exemplum iuvenis venerabile morum,

which is the equivalent of Seneca's characterization of *Marcia* (6, 1, 10) *velut aliquod antiquum exemplar*. *Conditus* is used in similar connections (18: Dial. 6, 12, 6), as *is omne aevum* (42: Dial. 6, 5, 2). *Frustra vota ac studia*

sunt says Seneca (Dial. 6, 12, 6) and this is implied if not expressly stated (21) :

Solvere vota Iovi, fatorum ignara tuorum,
Mater, et armiferae solvere vota deae
Gradivumque patrem donis implere parabas.

Seneca asks the question (11, 3, 5) *Nihil ergo prodest innocentia ad omnem legem exacta, nihil antiqua frugalitas, nihil felicitatis summae potentia, nihil summa conservata abstinentia, nihil sincerus ac purus literarum amor, nihil ab omni labe mens vacans.* At about the same point in his picture (41-5), the auctor has a succession of questions beginning with *Quid tibi nunc mores prosunt?* continuing with *quidque . . . quid, Nec, Nec, Nec,* setting forth *pudicitia*, and with perfect infinitives *Livia's commendable actions.*

"If a man die, shall he live again?" This question is answered conditionally by Seneca (Dial. 11, 5, 2; 11, 9, 2 and 3) *si quis defunctis sensus est*, and also by the auctor in equivalent terms (469) :

Haec sensit Drusus, si quid modo sentit in umbra.

There is a similar expression (329 f.) :

*Ille pio, si non temere creduntur, in arvo
Inter honoratos excipietur avos,*

but this may be interpreted as referring to the passage in the *Aeneid* (6, 824) in which the *Drusi* are mentioned in *Elysium*.

However, it expresses in the future, with a different compound of *facio*, what Seneca puts into the perfect (Dial. 6, 26, 2) *integer ipse se ad maiores recepit suos.* See also Dial. 6, 25, 1 *inter felices currit animas.* The declaration in regard to fate (234) :

Non tibi, non ullis vincere fata datur,

and also that concerning death (443 f.) :

*Sed rigidum ius est et inevitable mortis:
Stant rata, non ulla fila renenda manu,*

are akin to some of Seneca's, as *si fletibus fata vincuntur* (Dial. 12, 6, 1) ; *mutare fata non possumus* (Dial. 11, 4, 1) ; *O dura fata aequa nullis* (11, 3, 5). The Adjective *inexorabile* used with *fata* by Seneca (Dial. 11, 4, 1) is transferred to *ius mortis*. The auctor says (259) *tendimus huc omnes* changing the order of subject and verb and using an adverb for the phrase in Seneca (Dial. 11, 11, 4) *omnes*

in eundem locum tendimus. Seneca also declares (Dial. 6, 6, 2) *nulla planctibus defuncta revocantur* which the auctor also changes (427):

Supprime iam lacrimas: non est revocabilis istis.

Death must come and sorrow follows, and the question is asked (7):

Et quisquam leges audet tibi dicere flendi?

Seneca has some similar expressions in the dialogues, as *sine ullo fine flendi*; *nullum finem flendi* (12, 2, 4); *modestia flendi* (12, 2, 4).

The *Consolatio* sets forth the attitude of Tiberius toward Livia (411):

At tu qui superes maestae solatia matri.

Seneca also urges Polybius to be to his brothers *solatium . . . et consolator* (11, 5, 4). The daughters of Marcia are also *magna solatia* (6, 16, 6), but in the same sphere as the *Consolatio* statement is the injunction *Caesarem cogita* (11, 7, 1), and the characterization *hic itaque princeps qui publicum omnium hominum solatium est*.

A few other instances will be given of the possible utilization of material. Seneca (Dial. 11, 2 f.) begins with the words *Mundo quidam minantur interitum*, and closes with *Quis . . . se unum ac suos seponi velit ruinaeque etiam ipsi mundo imminente aliquam domum subtrahat?* For *minantur* the auctor has *vaticinantur* (362 ff.):

Casurumque triplex vaticinantur opus.
I nunc et rebus tanta impendente ruina,
In te solam oculos et tua damna refer,

with *impendente* for *imminente*, and a rhetorical variation for *se* and *sua damna*. One of the commendations of the dead brother was (Dial. 11, 3, 1) *Dignus fuit ille te fratre, Tu certe eras dignissimus, qui ne ex indigno quidem doleres fratre*. The poem has the same type of commendation (343 f.):

Femina digna illis quos aurea condidit aetas,
Principibus natis, principe viro.

See also *dignissima coniuge Druso* (299). One characteristic of the brother is also that of Livia (Dial. 11, 3, 2) *Nemo potentiam eius iniuria sensit. Numquam te fratrem ulli minatus est. Ad exemplum se modestiae tuae formaverat cogitabatque quantum et ornamentum tuorum esse et onus*. The restraint is indicated (47 f.):

Nec nocuisse ulli et fortunam habuisse nocendi?
Nec quemquam nervos extimuisse tuos?

The auctor also, in considering the position of Livia, gives the command *perfer onus* (351); cf. *onus imperii* (Dial. 6, 2, 3). The character of Marcia *mores tuos velut aliquod antiquum exemplar* (Dial. 6, 1, 1) is transferred to Drusus (13).

The sketch of Drusus and Livia given by Seneca (Dial. 6, 3, 1 f.) has in brief compass some of the points developed by the auctor. The substance of *Iam magnum ducem* is in *titulum belli dux . . . tulit* (17), and in *duce iam victore caremus* (293). "*Intraverat penitus Germaniam*" is put in different form (Dial. 11, 15, 5) *intima Germaniae recludentem et gentes ferocissimas Romano subicentem imperio*. The auctor is specific and names the Suevi and Sygambri (17; 311 f.). "*Ibi signum Romani fixerunt, ubi vix ullos esse Romanos notum erat.*" This fact has its equivalent in (390):

Et modo Germanus Romanis cognitus orbis;

and at greater length (19):

Ignotum tibi meruit, Romane, triumphum;
Protulit in terras imperiumque novas.

The "*ingens civium provinciarumque et totius Italiae desiderium*" is not specifically mentioned, but the account of the actions of men are an important part of the *Consolatio* (181 ff.; 199.; 296 ff.). "*Usque in urbem ductum erat funus triumpho simillimum,*" has its equivalent in (141):

Quos primum vidi fasces, in funere vidi.

The phrase *per omnem Italiam* is restated with a Vergilian phrase (173):

Funera ducuntur Romana per oppida Drusi.

In the poem Livia anticipates giving *oscula* (35); Seneca states that these were denied.

The actions of Livia following the funeral are given, "*Ut primum tamen intulit tumulo, simul et illum et dolorem suum posuit, nec plus doluit quam aut honestum erat Caesari aut aequum matri.*" This later stage lay outside of the range of the poem, yet it may be considered as the outcome of the commands *supprime iam lacrimas* (427), and *iam comprime fletus* (467), and as involved in the last line (474):

Livia, funestam dedecet esse domum.

There is a notable passage (265 ff.) :

Facta ducis vivent, operosaque gloria rerum:
Haec manet; haec avidos effugit una rogos.
Pars erit historiae, totoque legetur in aevo;
Seque opus ingeniisque carminibusque dabit.

The last words transfers from place to time the words of Ovid (Am. 1, 15, 7 f.) :

. . . . mihi fama perennis
Quaeritur, in toto semper ut orbe canar.

Seneca declares, immortalis est ingenii memoria (Dial. 11, 18, 2), and his words melius illum duraturo semper consecrabis ingenio quam irrita dolore lugebis, show that he recognized the dependence of opus on ingenium, as is stated in the last line of the quotation.

The fact is recorded by Seneca (Dial. 11, 15, 5) , "Caesar patruus meus modum lugendi non sibi tantum, sed etiam aliis fecit ac totum exercitum non solum moestum, sed etiam attonitum corpus Drusi sui sibi vindicantem ad morem Romani luctus redegit iudicavitque non militandi tantum disciplinam esse servandam, sed etiam dolendi. This same fact is set forth with poetical embellishments by the auctor (167 ff.) :

Quin etiam corpus, matri vix vixque remissum,
Exsequiis caruit, Livia, paene suis.
Quippe ducem arsuris exercitus omnis in armis,
Inter quae periit, ponere certus erat.
Abstulit invitis corpus venerabile frater
Et Drusum patriae, quod licuitque, dedit.

Were these the only two passages involved in the discussion they would be enough to show that one of the writers was directly dependent on the other.

If we maintain as established the propositions that the auctor drew from Seneca the general outlines of his work; and that noticeable details were from the same source, the relation of the Consolatio to works later than those of Seneca must be considered. The Consolatio of Statius (Silvae 2, 6) deals with a character far different from that in the Consolatio ad Liviam and the works of Seneca, and could not bring in the same historical material, and does not introduce similar myths. Cressa is mentioned (25), and Paris (27), Thetis with Achilles (31), Pylades (54), Eumaeus with Ulysses (57), and the Naides and Proserpina at the close. Grecian games are introduced (45 ff.) and

Italian phenomena, especially the *Vesuvina incendia* (51 ff.). Types of mourners are shown (18 ff.):

. . . . gemit inter bella peremptum
Parthus equum, fidosque canes flevere Molossi
Et volucres habuere rogam, cervusque Maronis.

The words (24 f.):

Optarent multum Graiae, cuperentque Latinae
Sic peperisse nurus,

differ from *ad Liviam* (204):

Aosoniae matres, Ausoniaeque nurus,

and both may be taken as variations of Vergil's statement in regard to *Camilla* (*Aen.* 11, 581 f.) *multae . . . matres Optavere nurum*. All these follow the type set by *Catullus* (62, 53 and 55). The beginning of the poem is not altogether unlike the beginning of the *ad Liviam*:

Saeve nimis, lacrimis quisquis discrimina ponis
Lugendi modos. Miserumque est primaeva parenti
Pignora, surgentesque (nefas) accendere natos.

There are some touches alike in thought, but differently stated, as the injunction *pone . . . questus* (2, 6, 103) for which the *Consolatio* has *supprime iam lacrimas* (427); *iam comprime fletus* (467). The interjection *hei mihi* (2, 6, 14; 5, 2, 160: *C.* 176), although Vergilian, illustrates a similar handling of material in the two works. Both have *fulminis ictus* (11: 3, 3, 157) and the query *quid prosunt* (49: 5, 1, 104). The participle *arsurus* (169: 3, 3, 37; 5, 1, 212) has similar associations, as also *incomitatus* (298 *abis*: 5, 1, 206 *subires*). The Vergilian *portitor* appears in both (339: 2, 1, 229) as well as the phrase *est sitque precor* (393: 1, 1, 14). Statements of the type *est sitque precor* are also in *Stattius*, *dabit . . . detque precor* (4, 4, 56); *est duretque precor* (5, 2, 158). In addition there are a few similar, although not identical statements as if one might have been a suggestion to the other: *Ingenii capax* (262): *audax ingenii* (3, 2, 64). The adjective in (428):

Quem semel umbrifera navita lentre tulit,

not used by Vergil or Ovid, appears in a similar line in *Stattius* (*Theb.* 8, 18):

Umbriferaeque fremit sulcator pallidus undae.

The opening line (1, 4, 1) *nec inexorabile ClothoVolvit opus* has an adjective similar to that in *ius . . . inevitabile*

mortis (443). Ovid has the adjectives once each in the *Metamorphoses*. The phrase *maturior annis* (447) has an equivalent noun in *maturior aevo* (2, 1, 40), and an equivalent adjective in *robustior annis* (5, 2, 13), both phrases in the same position. The suggestion of the correlation of act and penalty is given in *ego scelerata* (135), is questioned (131 f.) :

Nam quid ego admisi? Quae non ego numina cultu,
Quos ego non potui demeruisse deos?

Stattius begins *Silvae* 5, 5, 1 with *Me miserum* used in *Cons.* 287 rev., and continues with a number of lines in the same strain as the *Consolatio*, e.g. :

Numquid inaccesso posui vestigia luco?
Num vetito de fonte bibi? quae culpa? Quis error?
Quem luumus tantis moeroribus?

A few similarities in Martial will be given. Ovid writes (*Tristia* 1, 10, 1) :

Est mihi sitque, precor, flavae tutela Minervae.

This collocation has a parallel in the *Consolatio* (471) :

Est tibi sitque, precor, multorum filius instar,

and also Martial (9, 18, 1 f.) *est sitque, precor, Rus minimum*, and a parallel (2, 11, 7) :

Uterque natus vivit et precor vivat,

with a personal application as in the *Consolatio*.

We shall close this presentation with a few other illustrations of the high points that Martial saw in his backward look: *Faciles dei et tribuere* (1, 103, 4: *Oed.* 203 f.; cf. *Lucan* 1, 510); *requies portusque senectae* (4, 25, 7) : *portus vitae, Lucis requies* (*Her. Fur.* 1077 f.) ; *sit pudor et finis* (8, 3, 3) ; *sit pudor et modus* (8, 64, 15) : *sit modus pudorve* (*Thy.* 26 f.). The mortality of the immortals is indicated by Seneca (*Troades* 252) :

Didicitque Achilles et dea gnatos mori,

and Martial gives this as the lesson from the *Mausolea* (5, 64, 5) :

Cum doceant ipsos posse perire deos.

From Seneca he drew the rhetorical scheme of combining a simple verb with one in *-per, ferre, perferre est grave*

(Thy. 307) : *negare pernegare* (4, 81, 5) ; and (9, 68, 10) :

Nam vigilare leve est, pervigilare grave est.

The preceding examples have illustrated word usage. In addition to these there are indications of kindred rhetorical skill. The repeated rhetorical query *Ubi es?* (122 ff.) is akin to *ubi est* (5, 58, 3), and the tone of despair in the repeated *Quid prosunt?* (41 ff.) is also in (7, 96, 5) :

Quid species, quid lingua mihi, quid aetas profuit?

The departed spirit of Drusus looking backward declares (460 f.) :

*Et sensi exsequias funeris ipse mei;
Decursusque virum notos mihi donaque regum.*

Licinius Sura also with *vita reversa* was aware of the interest of men (7, 47, 9 f.) :

*Scis igitur quantas hominum mors falsa querellas
Moverit et frueris posteritate tua.*

IV. SENECA AND LUCAN

We have reserved for continuous presentation the poetical material related to that of Seneca and of Lucan. This shows a sameness of method in utilization, and an interrelation in substance. We give first some illustrations of Lucan's method in dealing with the work of his predecessors, as well as with that of his uncle Seneca. A few examples from his first book will be sufficient. He sometimes transfers initial material, either unchanged or with modifications, to the same position: Fert animus (67: Ovid Met. 1, 1); pellimur (278: Hor. Odes 2, 18, 26); fit sonus (391: Aen. 2, 209 sonitus); pone sequi (483): pone subit (Aen. 2, 725). Similar collocations are also kept at the end of the verse: Concordia discors (98: Hor. Epp. 1, 12, 19); popularibus auris (132: Odes 3, 2, 20 gen. sing.); pectore curas (132: Aen. 1, 227); moenia fessis (345: Aen. 3, 85); fluctusque ad sidera ducat (416: Aen. 1, 103 tollit). Retention of terms at the beginning and also at the end is illustrated by ipsum . . . tendentem (477: Aen. 2, 211 et ipsum . . . tendentem).

However, there is no rigid rule for transference. Final fata ferebant (Aen. 2, 34) becomes initial fataque ferre (393), and Adsensere omnes (Aen. 2, 130: Lucan 8, 536) is modified and differently placed in cunctae simul adsensere cohortes (386). Final aemula virtus (120) is initial in Horace (Ep. 16, 5), and cinxere corona (321) is for et coetu . . . cinxere (Aen. 1, 398). The words of Vergil (Georg. 4, 350) sedilibus omnes Obstipuere are differently distributed in the imitation (488) Sedibus exiluere patres. It is the same with pendentes rupe (435) and pendere . . . de rupe (Ecl. 1, 76). The final tanta licentia ferri (8: cf. tanta fiducia, 10, 427) is an imitative selection from (Aen. 7, 461):

Saevit amor ferri et scelerata insania belli.

The imitation ruit irrevocabile vulgus (509) takes the place of fugit irreparabile tempus (Georg. 3, 284), and metrical cadence is the same in the imitation (237) as in the original (Aen. 2, 87):

Signa foro, stridor lituum clangorque tubarum:
Insequitur clamorque virum stridorque rudentum.

The line (27):

Rarus et antiquis habitator in urbibus errat,

may be a suggestion from *et raris mapalia tectis* (Georg. 3, 340), or from his uncle's arrangement (Troades 836) :

Olenos tectis habitata raris.

From another part of Lucan (9, 968) *iam lassa radice tenent* there is a shift from the end with a noticeable change in reading from Vergil's *et lenta in radice tenebat* (Aen. 12, 773).

Following the lead of Vergil (Aen. 5, 337) *Emicat Euryalus*, Lucan has *Emicuit* (153) of the thunderbolt as does Seneca (Troades 189) of the shade of Achilles. The declaration ascribed to Thyestes *non capit regnum duos* (Thy. 444) is slightly changed in *non cepit fortuna duos* (111), and *Pax alta per omnes Et tranquilla quies populos* (249 f.) combines two collocations noticeable in Seneca (Her. Fur. 933; Thy. 579; Troades 330; Her. Fur. 161; Troades 1004). Some other collocations are the same: *Livor edax* (288; Phaedra 501 rev.); *recolligit ignes* (157: Oed. 518); *urbibus errat* (27: Her. Fur. 164 -nt).

More important than these isolated examples are the passages showing that Lucan sought, by using material from Seneca's works, to make his characters seem of heroic mold. A few examples will be taken from the first part of the second book. The declaration (23) :

. . . . nec mater soluto crine
Exigit ad saevos famularum bracchia planctus,

and the later injunction (38) *contundite pectora* re-presents Hecuba in the Troades with *solvit crinem* (84; cf. 99); *planctus date* (64) and *pectus tundite* (116). Helpless children *primo in limine vitae* (106) are destroyed as the *umbrae . . . innocuae* (Her. Fur. 1140 f.) :

Quas in primo limine vitae
Scelus oppressit patriusque furor.

The self blinding (184) :

. . . . ille cavis evolvit sedibus orbes
Ultimaque effodit spectatis lumina membris,

is portrayed in terms taken from the Oedipus: *Oculi . . . sedibus pulsus suis* (976); *Evolvit orbes . . . lacerat cavos Alte recessus* (988 ff.). The one who (156 ff.) :

. . . . robora busti
Exstruit ipse sui necdum omni sanguine fuso
Desilit in flammis et, dum licet, occupat ignes,

is another Hercules, but the words describing his two acts are far different from those in the Hercules Oetaeus (1641 f.) :

Aggeritur omnis silva et alternae trabes
In astra tollunt Herculi angustum rogam;

and (1686) incubuit toro. These passages reproduce characters, but one passage (1, 608 ff.) describing the sacrifice by Arruns was written with an eye to that of Tiresias (Oedipus 303 ff.). Passing by some common terms, as Bacchum . . . molas (609 f.) : Bacchi dona (328) and mola (339) ; Diffusum (615) : Effusus (353), there are some pieces which Lucan evidently fashioned after the words of Seneca. The sacrificial beast is brought to the altar in the same way, but is described in different terms sacris tunc admovet aris Electa cervice marem (608 f.) : huc prope admove altum taurus attollens caput (338; 341). When struck (614 f.) :

Nec cruor emicuit solitus, sed vulnere largo
Diffusum rutilo dirum pro sanguine virus;

See also 9, 810. Seneca does not mention the poison, but asks of the blood (349 f.) :

Utrum citatus vulnere angusto micat
An lentus altis inrigat plagas cruor?

Seneca describes the blood in terms of seeing (38) ; Lucan in terms of feeling (319) :

Infecit atras lividus fibras cruor:
Viscera tincta notis gelidoque infecta cruore.

Seneca declares (362) :

Et felle nigro tabidum spumat iecur.

Lucan apparently resolves the adjective into noun and adjective (621) Cernit tabe iecur madidum. Seneca has Cor marcet ac latet (360), pulmo latet (372), and limes oblicus secat (369). Lucan combines these in (622 f.) :

Pulmonis anhel
Fibra latet, parvusque secat vitalia limes.

The negative assertion of Seneca (373 f.) :

non molli ambitu
Omenta pinguis visceri obtundunt sinus,

is put affirmatively by Lucan (625) produntque suas omenta latebras.

The works of Seneca were also utilized by others. The auctor ad Pisonem has the collocation *vitalis auras* (148: Her. Fur. 656 gen. sing.), and *Temporibus servire decet* (143) are a modification of final *tempori aptari decet* (Medea 176). Initial *Hoc solum petimus* (207) differs little from *Hoc omnes petimus* (Troades 399), and the reference to the *chelys* (Troades 330):

Levi canoram verberans plectro chelyn,

is in connection with Achilles, as in 159 following

Sive chelyn digitis et eburno verbere pulsas.

Although verbally different, the boast of Creon (Her. Fur. 341 ff.):

*Nobiles non sunt mihi
Avi nec altis inclytum titulis genus
Sed clara virtus,*

expresses the same as does the auctor (142 f.):

. . . . *Nos humilis domus, et sincera parentum
Sed tenuis fortuna sua caligine celat.*

There is a curious retention of outline with change of phrasing (3, 589 f.):

*Et stetit incertus fueret quo vulnere, sanguis
Donec sparsitque in volnera letum.*

This recalls the falling of the boy (Thy. 723 ff.):

. . . . *educto stetit
Ferro cadaver cumque dubitasset diu
Hac parte an ille caderet, in patrum cadit.*

The reverence in Seneca's *mentimur* (Her. Fur. 450) is altogether lost in Lucan's *mentimur regnare Iovem* (7, 447), but the work of Jocasta (Phoen. 5) *fecit nocentes* is also that of Fortune (7, 488) *facit Fortuna nocentes*.

There is little need for tragic touches in the Nux, and so little room for expressions from Seneca, yet the collocation *nullaque non* (according to Wartena not in Ovid) with *femina* (16) is parallel to *nullaque non dies* (Phaedra 779). The expressions *silva nativas opes* (sc. *dedit*) and *nativas domos* (Phaedra 546 f.) use the adjective as in *nativum decus* (52), and one noun as in *meae opes* (94). *Poma destituunt famem* (Her. Fur. 759) has subject and verb, as in (30):

Destituent silvas utraque poma suas.

Compare with this the words of Seneca or of an imitator (Her. Oet. 845) *Destituit animus membra*. Seneca associates *praeses* with the divine (Thy. 1106 *deos*; Oed. 1064 *deum*; *Phaedra* 114 *deam*), *facilis descensus* to the human *praeside* (144).

The *Maecenas* uses *Hercules* as an illustration (68 ff.) placing his unheroic actions first, and then the heroic, introduced by an account of his slaying the serpents

Hydros ingentes vix capiente manu.

Seneca has *tenera . . . manu* (Her. Fur. 225), and succinctly sets forth his twelve labors. The unheroic acts are given later (472 ff.), as also those of *Bacchus*, the account closing with the general proposition (480):

Post multa virtus opera laxari solet.

His relaxation is again mentioned (*Phaedra* 322 ff.) closing with

*Et manu clavam modo qua gerebat
Fila deduxit properante fuso.*

The *Maecenas* (72 f.) has *pollice* for *manu*, *torsisti pollice fusos*, *Lenisti . . . fila*. The same poem has (36) *garrulus inter aves*, and (101 f.):

. . . *hirundo*
Verberat egelidos garrula vere lacus.

Seneca also has the *garrula . . . avis* (Oed. 460), and *verberat unda* (*Phaedra* 7). Seneca writes (Her. Fur. 561):

Uno tot populi remige transeunt,

and the *Maecenas* sets forth the work of one *ratis* (5 ff.). The latter (51) associates *lyram plectro* with *Apollo*; Seneca (*Troades* 330) *plectro chelyn* with *Achilles*. The order of *bracchia thyrsis* (Oed. 408) is reversed (61 f.). In the query (Her. Fur. 1234 f.) *Quis . . . deflere digne poterit*, may have been found the suggestion for *defendus* (*Maec.* 3) for the verb is not freely used as is indicated by seven occurrences in *Ovid*, five of them in the *Metamorphoses*.

The following collocations are common to Seneca and the *Consolatio*: *Fulminis ictus* (11: *Phaedra* 1142); *solve comas* (40: *Medea* 755; *Phaedra* 379 rev.); *laniata comas*, *similis-que furenti* (317: *Phoen.* 78; *Phoen.* 65); (427):

Supprime iam lacrimas: non est revocabilis istis:

lacrimas . . . reprime (Her. Fur. 655); *colos non revocabiles* (Her. Fur. 563); *mors atra* (360: Oed. 165);

funestam domum (474: *Phaëdra* 1284). Vere tepente (102: *Her. Fur.* 8) is also used by Ovid (*Ars Am.* 3, 185), and may have been drawn from either.

There are in addition to these other passages in which equivalent words have been used, or metrical requirements have brought about slight changes in the wording. The compliment to Livia (343):

Femina digna illis quos aurea condidit aetas,

seems a shortened statement of the words of Seneca (*Phaëdra* 533 ff.):

. . . . hoc equidem reor
Vixisse ritu prima quos mixtos deis
Profudit aetas.

In *Quid ista prosunt?* (*Her. Fur.* 253) the *ista* refers to the twelve labors of Hercules, while a long list of subjects follows *Quid tibi nunc mores prosunt* (41 ff.). Although differently expressed two lines (95: *Medea* 285) set forth like acts:

At miseranda parens suprema neque oscula fixit:
Dum extrema natis mater infigo oscula.

Compare (*Phoen.* 124):

Ferat ut reverso post fugam gnato oscula
Vel prima vel suprema.

There is a like sameness in *Destituitque preces* (196), and *vota destituit deus* (*Troades* 780). With these we place *curru superbus* (333) and *curru sublimis* (*Her. Fur.* 198). The same action is enjoined with *iam comprime fletus* (467), *differte fletus* (*Her. Fur.* 1182), and *omitte fletus* (*Troades* 463). Livia's freedom of action implied in *leges . . . flendi* (7) is also given in *nullus est modus flendi* (*Troades* 822), and the command to her (354) *infragilemque animum . . . tene* (354) in reality bids here have a mind like that of Hippolytus (*Phaëdra* 234; 276; cf. 588), or of Oedipus, *animam . . . inexpugnabilem* (*Oed. Fr.* 163). *Fortuna, furibunda* (373), just as *Furibunda Agave* (*Oed.* 629) and *fata* are prominent in the poetry of Seneca. The resistless sway of the latter has a different but an equivalent expression (234: *Oed.* 1002):

Non tibi, non ullis vincere fata datur:
Fatis agimur: cedit fatis:
Non sollicitae possunt curae
Mutare rati stamina fusi.

Submission then is the better part of action, and this is enjoined in different terms (375 f.: *Medea* 432 f.):

Regna Deae immitis parce irritare querendo:
 Sollicitare animos parce potentis herae:
 Quam multa sint timenda si perstas vide;
 Nemo potentes aggredi tutus potest.

It cannot now be determined whether it was the auctor ad Liviam (106) or the auctor ad Sappho (154) who first framed one of the two equivalent lines:

Deflet Threicium Daulias ales Ityn:
 Concinit Ismarium Daulias ales Ityn,

or whether it was the writer of the Hercules Oetaeus who has in three lines (192 ff.) a simile developed in like manner:

Vel in Edonas tollite silvas
 Qualis natum Daulias ales
 Solet Ismaria flere sub umbra,

yet Daulias parens (Thy. 275) may have been a suggestion for all the non-Senecan passages.

The Hercules Oetaeus surcharged with Senecan material reflects also the sentiments of the works under consideration. The experience of Hercules with Omphale as narrated in the Maecenas (68-80) is set forth also in the tragedy (374-379). *Flectam merendo* (578) is the opposite of *parce irritare querendo* (C. 375), but *questus comprime* (279) equals *iam comprime fletus* (C. 468), as *lacrimas comprime*, in different sentences does *supprime iam lacrimas* (C. 427). However, the tragedy usually has *compesce* in similar statements (1377; 1431; 1460, 1678 et al.).

The parallels to the work of Lucan have the same place in the presentation as do those to the works of Seneca. The opening declaration of the Nux:

Obruere ista solet manifestos poena nocentes
 Publica cum lentam non capit ira moram,

has an equivalent in the words of Lucan (2, 143 ff.):

Periere nocentes,
 Tunc data libertas odiis, resolutaque legum
 Sed cum iam soli possent superesse nocentes.
 Frenis ira ruit.

Some other collocations, even if they do not mean borrowing one from the other, yet indicate use of the same vocabulary strata: *Tum cum* (7: 1, 275; 2, 136); *nulla non* (16: 10, 270); *inviolatus* (52: 9, 342); *felix qui* (87: 4, 393); *concessum est* with *inf.* (134: 10, 301); *hoc iuris* (134: 5, 496; 596); *praeside* (144: 2, 538 applied to Pompey).

Lucan had learned, perhaps through his uncle Seneca,

the sentiment of Maecenas in regard to burial, and re-expressed it at greater length (7, 809 ff.) :

. . . . tabesne cadavera solvat
An rogus, haud refert; placido natura recepta
Cuncta sinu finemque sui sibi corpora debent;

and further *capit omnia tellus*. But there is little to connect his work and the Maecenas. This has *postquam* four times with the perfect indicative and in this free use of the word is in strong contrast with the *Consolatio*, and the *Ars Amatoria* of Ovid. However, Lucan uses it with considerable freedom, and also has at *postquam* as in the *Nux*. One may also compare *verberare* with *lacus* (102), and with *undas* (4, 426).

Even more interesting are two equivalent pieces in Lucan and the *Consolatio*. A mother (2, 39) commands

Nunc laniate comas neve nunc differte dolorem.

The first part of this is in the description of Livia (C. 317), and the imperative ending is not unlike those applied to her (427; 467). On the same occasion men implored (2, 51 f.) :

Fundat ab extrmo flavos aquilone Suebos
Albis et indomitum Rheni caput.

The *Consolatio* is more specific in regard to the tribes conquered by Drusus (C. 17) :

Ille genus Suevos acre indomitosque Sygambros
Contudit inque fugam barbara terga dedit.

Although it may be uncertain when a reference to these tribes would be most fitting, yet one of Martial's lines (*Spect.* 3, 9) shows that the *Gygambri* were a noticeable part of the population at Rome in the reign of Domitian :

Crinibus in nodum tortis venere Sygambri.

The two tribes are mentioned again (C. 311 f.), but the use of the adjective *indomitum*: *indomitos* clearly indicates that one writer was reworking the material of the other. Lucan has the plural, as does the *Consolatio*, *populos* (4, 146), and *viros* (9, 95). The experience at night of the wife of Drusus (325-8) with *in vacui parte priore tori*, gives an apparent abbreviation of the experience of Cornelia (5, 805-13) with

Non iuvat in toto corpus iactare cubili:
Servatur pars illa tori.

Non-performance of the act is similarly expressed in *At*

miseranda parens suprema neque oscula fixit; and (3, 744 f.) veniam misero concede parenti . . . extrema quod oscula fugi. There is the same cadence in vincere fata (234) as in rumpere fata (2, 107) but the construction is different in fatis mutare (2, 652). Maturior annis (447) ends the verse as does modestior (8, 476); parce is construed with the present infinitive (375 f.: 10 395); and prodest with the perfect (41 ff.: 4, 761). Adspice (346: 10, 378; 381) and adde quod are found in both works (393: 3, 321; 5, 291; 5, 776; 10, 223). Venerabilis (13; 171) has similar application in Lucan (8, 664; 9, 202).

The manifest similarities between the Maecenas and Consolatio and the works of Seneca fix the date of their publication within or later than the reign of Nero. The many resemblances between the latter work and the *Silvae* of Statius render it possible that it may be coeval with or later than his works. The *Nux* is in form and substance like works published under Nero. All three works indicate the same judgment in the free selection of material from predecessors, especially Vergil. Judged by the restriction in elision, the *Nux*, the Maecenas, and the ad Pisonem show a like usage, while the Consolatio is different.

Conclusions based on these metrical data may be considered fairly definite, and still more so those based on the use of historical material from Seneca. But there is no such certainty attaching to poetical material found in Lucan or Martial and any of the authors under consideration. A final illustration from each of the greater poets will be given. Lucan declares (4, 704) *variam semper dant otia mentem*. This is a specific application of the general principle announced in the Maecenas (49):

Pax erat: illos lavarant otia cultus;

but it cannot be determined which of the metrical equivalents *otia mentem* and *otia cultus* was formulated first. *Laedere* expresses a common activity, but was the repetition in the same line of the *Nux* (22; 61) *laedam . . . laedere* a suggestion to, or suggested by Martial (3, 97, 2) *laesa est, laedere*? Such problems are insoluble, and whether forward to or backward from Martial must remain undetermined.

VANDERBILT UNIVERSITY,
NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE.



