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general by a fictitious centurion and concentrating on the deceased's prize collection of crystal glasses!

15) Such as the speeches delivered by Isocrates and Theopompus, among others, in honour of the dead Mausolus of Caria (FGrH 115 T6 = Suda s.v. 'Theodektes', Aul. Gell. X.18).

16) Suas. 6.24: Pollio ... qui ... Ciceros mortem solus ex omnibus maligne narrat, testimonium tamen quamvis invitus plenum ei reddidit.

17) See OLD, s.v. testimonium 3. The Loeb translation, "he gave him full praise", fails to indicate the distinction between customary blame (or praise) and honest assessment. The distinction between testimonium and laudatio seems to have been a topos in its own right—see Jerome, Ep. 108.2 and W. Kierdorf, Die Leichenrede auf Pompeius in Lucans Pharsalia, Würzb. Jahrb. f. Alt. 5 (1979), 157-162.

18) Suas.6.25: ut mihi tunc non laudasse Ciceronem sed certasse cum Cicerone videatur.


20) D. Flach, Tacitus in der Tradition der antiken Geschichtsschreibung (Göttingen 1973), 33-37.


22) Scipio, Hannibal, Philopoemen: XXIII.12-14; Hiero: VII.8; Attalus: XVIII.41; Masinissa: XXXVI.15.

23) Such as the death notice for Servius Tullius which was used by Livy (1.48.8-9) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Antiq. Rom. IV.40).

24) Sall. Cat. 5.

25) On Livy's candor, see Quint. IX.4.74 (cf. II.5.19). Livy offers a final comment on Cicero (Suas. 6.23) which is hardly uncritical, and avoids the problem of Cato (Jerome, ad Pammachium prol. Lib. II in Hoseam 5.6-7). There is no clear evidence for an obituary for Pompey nor for Caesar (H. M. Hine, Livy's Judgement on Marius, LCM (1978), 83-87).

26) Syme, loc. cit. (note 2).

27) Both meanings are possible for effusius: O.L.D. s.v. effusus, quoting Nep. Milt. 6.2: Romani honores quondam fuerunt rari ... nunc autem effusi ('widespread'); and Quint. Inst. II.2.6: in laudandis dictionibus nec malignus nec effusus ('extravagant').

28) Suas. 6.23: Cordi Cremutii non est operae pretium referre redditam Cicero laudationem; nihil enim in ea Cicerone dignum est.

29) As is Seneca's account of the development of declamation at Rome (Contr. 1 Pr. 12)—J. Fairweather, Seneca the Elder (Cambridge 1981), 4 ff.

THE AUTHENTICITY OF SENECA, THYESTES 336-338

Friedrich Leo's text (1879) is:

Tandem regia nobilis
antiqui genus Inachi
fratrum composuit minas.

The grammar, meter and vocabulary of the verses are beyond cavil. Their context appears inconsistent with the action of the preceding episode and the reflection of the chorus immediately following (339-43). As well they anticipate ineptly 546-59. Therefore, Gustav Richter in 1921 rejected them: "At et sequentibus repugnant et posterioris cantici initio

(546 sqq. 558 sq.)”. Deletions based on content alone are daring. Scholars remain uneasy. Otto Zwierlein, Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas. Mit einem kritisch-exegetischen Anhang, Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie 20 (Meisenheim am Glan 1966), 78-79, is delighted with the verses for they confirm Seneca’s ineptness as a dramatist and that the plays were recited and never performed: “Ein Zuschauer, der Zeuge einer solchen Handlungsführung wurde, mußte in der Tat von Zweifeln geplagt werden, ob denn auf seine Augen und Ohren noch Verläß sei.”

R. J. Tarrant, Seneca’s Thyestes. Edited with Introduction and Commentary, American Philological Association Textbook Series 11 (Atlanta 1985), 139, thinks that Seneca is a better dramatist than Zwierlein does (“... he admits more incoherence in Seneca’s technique than I ...”) and so must defend the lines on other grounds than ineptitude. His defense is weak at best “336-38 refer to the latest development, 339-43 to a recurring pattern of behavior.” I doubt that this would ease the puzzlement of Zwierlein’s Zuschauer. His second argument is: “... without 336-38 a listener [not a viewer for Tarrant belongs to the recitatio-wing of modern Seneca-Forschung] could easily assume that 339-43 refer to Atreus’ scheme, and so be surprised by the Chorus’ ready acceptance of the false reconciliation.” Because the chorus are not on stage for the episode, this is a difficulty that ceases to exist in production. Finally Tarrant tacks on “a structural argument for retaining 336-38” but wisely adds “it cannot be pressed very hard.” I agree.

In a recent book that brings a welcome breath of fresh air into Senecan studies Dana Ferrin Sutton simply assumes without endless examination of earlier non-arguments that Seneca’s plays were written for performance and gets on with the business of looking at them in terms of “production criticism.” He treats these verses at Seneca on the Stage, Mnemosyne Supplement 96 (Leiden 1986), 40-41. He immediately sees as Zwierlein did for other reasons, the difficulty of the verses in production. Unlike Zwierlein, because he thinks Seneca is an outstanding dramatist, he concludes: “G. Richter in his Teubner edition may well have been right to delete lines 336-338 from the text.” The question is can one who belongs to the performance-wing of modern Seneca-Forschung keep Seneca an outstanding dramatist, not mystify his audience, and retain the flawless verses.

I think I can. Seneca’s late Hellenistic chorus of three [see my remarks at CP 70 (1975), 32-35] exit into the scaenae frons at 175 and reenter near the end of the preceding episode (perhaps at 330). Atreus and the Satellite prepare to leave the stage. Thyestes 335, which I have elucidated at CJ 72 (1976/77), 8-9, accepted by Joost Daalder, Thyestes (London/New York 1982), xvii-xviii and A. J. Boyle, Seneca Tragicus: Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama (Berwick 1983), 227 n. 33, provides one of the most brilliant exit-lines in Seneca. The actor pauses before fides to show that timor is meant. One does not say what one thinks in the presence of Atreus (or Nero). Just so the chorus. Verses 336-338 are delivered as Atreus, still in hearing