The difference in pronunciation between the two is minimal, of course, but surely a word break between *animam* and *agens*—especially following, as it does, on the heels of another participial form that begins with an *a*-, two words in *ua*-, and a general emphasis on the vowel *a*—stresses the verse's inherent out-of-breathness.

There is a burgeoning literature on classical compounds, and L. is the rare scholar who is at home with both linguistic and philological minutiae. Anyone whose eyes do not automatically glaze over at the sight of lists of Latin words preceded by such infelicitous symbols as '~ ~' (attested from Late Latin times) and '~ ~ ~' (attested first in Middle or Neo-Latin) will find in these pages an exemplary sesquipedalian account.

Princeton University JOSHUA T. KATZ
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni062

ACCIUS THE TRAGEDIAN

S. Faller, G. Manuwald (edd.): *Accius und seine Zeit.* (Identitäten und Alteritäten 13: Altertumswissenschaftliche Reihe 3.) Pp. 354. Wurzburg: Ergon Verlag, 2002. Paper, €41. ISBN: 3-89913-257-2.

Accius und seine Zeit is the immediate sequel to *Identität und Alterität in der Frührömischen Tragödie* (ed. Manuwald, 2000). Both are products of international conferences sponsored by the Freiburg Seminar für Klassische Philologie, and both have added substantially to the scholarship on early Roman drama. The earlier volume contained only one contribution on Accius, the masterly study of his praetexta(ta) *Aeneadae aut Decius* by the late lamented Henry Jocelyn (pp. 325–59). It is not only from *pietas* that I urge reading Jocelyn's paper as an introduction to this volume, and to the study of Roman dramatic *ludi* and the literary origins and political motivation of both adapted Greek tragedies and Roman historical plays. Jocelyn's paper combines study of the major questions with clarity in the main text and predictably erudite footnotes.

Baier (p. 51) reports the aim of this volume as exploring Leo's perception that in Accius' time playwright and public thought of themselves as Romans experiencing Greek culture while actually benefiting from the synthesis of both cultures. Yet these studies go further; besides reconstituting and appraising individual dramas as far as possible, they examine the relationships implied by these dramas between Rome and other communities of Italy (Greek, Italic, and barbarian), and their possible reflection of internal politics. Nine contributors also wrote for the previous volume; besides the papers focused on individual dramas, there are studies of this very self-conscious poet's self-image (Hartmann), his creation of calques from Greek (*Dichtung und Philologie:* Bagordo), Lucilius' criticisms of Accius (Faller), and aspects of religion in the dramas (Rüpke and Lehmann; the disappointing harvest is not the fault of these scholars.) Dangel, editor of the idiosyncratic *Accius: Oeuvres* (1995; see Pierini, *Boll. Stud.* [1996], 270–5 and Timpanaro's review article in *Paideia* 51 [1996], 194–218), offers a resumptive synthesis of her main conclusions, that Accius was constructing a comprehensive epic anthropogony from genealogically determined cycles (106–10) while adapting the crimes of Greek myth in light of Roman legislation and morality. Two of the dramaturgic studies (Manuwald's 'Der Streit um die Waffen Achills' and Schierl's 'Rezeption des Medea-mythos bei Pacuvius und Accius') helpfully relate

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

tragedies by Accius to Pacuvius' treatment of the same myths, and four (see below) consider mythic protagonists as supposed *ktistai* of Italian and foreign communities.

Accius is not to everyone's taste, as is reflected by the comparative representation of the main language communities in this volume (eleven German, eight Italian, two francophone, and one anglophone), with the 114 items from 1969–2001 listed under Accius by *Année Philologique* online. More than three-quarters are Italian (about half of these linguistic/textual notes on individual lines); this includes the editions of Resta Barrile (1969) and D'Antò (1980), and Pierini's *Studi su Accio* (1980), but omits La Penna's *Fra Teatro, Poesia e Politica Romana* (1979). Fifteen are francophone (including the edition and ten articles of Dangel) five are German, and five anglophone. (While four of these contributed to the earlier volume, only one was able to accept an invitation for the second.)

Why do so few of us work on Accius? Study of early Roman tragedy faces several obstacles: often the Greek original is fragmentary or unidentifiable; Roman poets seem to have obeyed the rule against readapting previously presented tragedies, but, given a public hungry for action, intrigue, and violence, have cheerfully inserted additional episodes and changes of scene (Ennius' *Medea*, based on Euripides' play, brings her to Athens) and extension of time beyond the canonical twenty-four hours. They might also change the title: without known Greek hypotexts, scholars resorting to the *fabulae* of Hyginus may have grounds to believe a named intrigue featured in Republican drama, but have difficulty in arguing which (hence Arico's judicious article on *Clytemestra* and *Aegisthus* acknowledges that *Fabulae CXVII* and *CXIX* are little help). Study of Accius is also more unrewarding than of his predecessors because 95% of the fragments depend on Nonius, quoting at second hand without access to the scripts: the reason that *Atreus*, *Medea/Argonautae*, and *Eurysaces* (also *Brutus*) seem so much more vivid is that they are cited (often with context) by Cicero.

I can offer only cursory discussion of a few papers. Among the founding heroes Lefèvre (pp. 187–98) fairly appraises Diomedes as the great Greek champion who recognized the value of Aeneas, yet it is difficult to see how Accius could have stressed this in adapting a tragedy based on Diomedes' rescue of his imprisoned grandfather in Boeotia; similarly the *Antenoridae* (based on Sophocles) must surely have celebrated Antenor's justice and prudence over the return of Helen by Troy, limiting reference to his Illyrian adventures to a *deus ex machina* (see, however, Leigh, *JHS* 118 [1998], 182–200). Would this be enough to remind Romans of the successful Illyrian campaigns of Tuditanus (implied by Auhagen, pp. 27–30)? The more historically oriented paper of Petaccia (pp. 229–44) usefully discusses Tuditanus' Saturnian inscription, reviving Dessau's hypothesis that (like the Saturnians on the temple of Accius' patron Callaicus) it was composed by Accius. Stockert similarly offers arguments for Roman interest in Mysian Telephus as Ur-Founder of Pergamum, allied with Rome since the third century. But even before Attalus bequeathed his kingdom to Rome (to become the province of Asia), Telephus was already hero of tragedies by Ennius and Pacuvius (*Atalanta*). Contributors link several of these plays to the political crises around the Gracchi, and Auhagen even argues laudatory allusion to Scipio Nasica (the élite murderer of Tiberius) in Accius' *Atreus* (as a comment on the supposed tyrannical aims of Tiberius), *Eurysaces* (deploring the exile of a patriot, Cic. *Sest.*120–2), and *Astyanax*. But we must remember that apart from the early *Atreus* there is neither absolute nor relative dating for any of the tragedies, which could have preceded Tiberius' tribunate by a decade or followed Gaius' death by more than thirty years.

Among discussions of individual plays let me single out the *Armorum Iudicium* and

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni063 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Atreus. Manuwald, author of *Pacuvius: summus tragicus poeta* (2003), usefully distinguishes both action and characterization of Accius' Sophocles-based *Armorum iudicium* from Pacuvius' adaptation of Aeschylus' *Hoplon Krisis.* As the first play of Aeschylus' trilogy, this cannot also have included the suicide; conversely, while Sophocles' drama began after Ajax's humiliation, Accius covers the actual *agon* with Ulixes as well as Teucer's loyal defence of his brother's right to burial against Agamemnon. Distinguishing the Accian hero's proud insistence on his *virtus* from the humiliated figure of Pacuvius' tragedy, she notes his stress on Roman values, going beyond the heroic Ajax of Sophocles. Sixteen fragments (about twenty lines) are specifically attributed to each of these plays, but the fondness of Roman rhetoric for this agon has preserved another twenty lines (47–66 or 68R); surely the brilliant sarcasm of XXXII (61–3), 'vidi te, Ulixes saxo sternentem Hectora,/ vidi tegentem clipeo classem Doricam:/ ego tunc pudendam trepidus hortabar fugam', has claims to be Accian?

Romans obviously loved Accius' tyrants, and we feel so much more at ease in judging Accius' *Atreus* because of the abundant citations (thirteen from Cicero alone). These inform the studies of Petrone and Pierini. In *Il barbaro Tereo* Pierini cautiously notes the affinities between the overwhelming lust of theThracian tyrant and the lust of Sextus Tarquinius (did Accius show Etruscans as 'other'?) in which Accius may foreshadow Ovid (*Fasti* 2 and *Met.* 6). We now believe that Accius' Lucretia reported her own rape (Varro *L.L.* 6.7 = Dangel *Brutus* v: *nocte intempesta nostram devenit domum*), which raises the question of how Accius staged the report to Procne of Philomela's rape and mutilation. Petrone's study of the *Atreus* (pp. 245–53) notes Cicero's evidence for the anger and violence of Atreus' persona (*iracundia, vis, De or.* 3.217), and Thyestes' unprovoked return (ibid. 218), in contrast with Seneca's version. Like Dangel, she adopts La Penna's explanation for the apparent shift of Atreus' character in *Planc.* 59 'vigilandum est semper: multae insidiae sunt bonis' and 'id quod multi invideant', etc. (214–16R), followed by 'nolo idem alio loco dixisset . . . "oderint dum metuant" ', understanding *idem* as the playwright, not the speaker, but assigns the former lines to Atreus, in a scene warning his own sons of treachery, whereas Ribbeck and others gave both excerpts to Thyestes.

Recognizing Cicero's own political slant on Accius' depiction of the tyrant in *Sest.* 102, she is rightly shy of seeing any anti-Gracchan reference in Accius' text. This straining for political allusion, rather than any failure of dramatic interpretation, is the only weakness of several papers in this valuable addition to the scanty literature on Accius. I hope it will stimulate further detailed study of the republic's last significant tragic poet.

Princeton University ELAINE FANTHAM
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni063

MANUSCRIPTS OF THE *SOMNIUM SCIPIONIS*

R. Caldini Montanari: *Tradizione medievale ed edizione critica del* Somnium Scipionis. (Millennio Medievale 33: Testi 10.) Pp. xiii + 577. Florence: SISMEL—Edizioni del Galluzzo, 2002. Cased, €89. ISBN: 88-8450-032-X.

The generous scale of this study of the manuscripts and text of the *Somnium*

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni063 Published online by Cambridge University Press