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Although the predominantly fragmentary nature of Roman Republican drama may be somewhat off-putting, interest has revived in recent decades, building on the fundamental work of nineteenth and early twentieth century scholars on basic philological questions. This renewed interest is complemented by currently flourishing research on historical, social and cultural issues of the Republican period, concerned with understanding crucial basics of Roman literature and society. As a result, we have recently seen various surveys, some studies of individual dramatists and even a few new editions and commentaries on particular poets. What is still lacking as a basis for further research is a comprehensive modern edition of all the tragic and comic fragments, replacing Otto Ribbeck’s nineteenth-century editions and building on the progress that has since been made in understanding these texts. Detailed studies of those individual plays that provide a sufficient basis for in-depth discussion are further desiderata.

Hence any work on the tedious but rewarding field of Republican dramatic fragments is more than welcome. The books under review help to remedy the two kinds of deficiency described above: one treats a selection of comedies by Cn. Naevius, focussing on editorial, textual and metrical questions; the other studies a single tragedy by L. Accius, providing both an edition with commentary and an appreciation of the history and relevance of the dramatised myth.

Silvia Paponi’s study begins (pp. 9–20) with an informative overview of previous editions of Naevius’ comic fragments from the nineteenth and twentieth centuries (covering editions of Roman comic fragments and of Naevius as well as anthologies). She rightly concludes that, although more recent editions have their advantages, the
second and third editions of Ribbeck’s collection of the dramatic fragments are still the standard works that form a natural starting point: as critical editions they have not been superseded, even though they obviously do not include suggestions made later and may use editions of source authors that are now out of date (cf. p. 20). Ultimately, what she demands for a complete modern analysis of fragments goes beyond a mere critical edition (p. 20):

Volendo poi condurre un’analisi completa sui frammenti, occorre integrare una serie di elementi che non si trovano in un’edizione propriamente critica, come una traduzione soddisfacente (che pare necessaria perché indica più chiaramente l’interpretazione data al frammento e spiega le scelte testuali operate; Ribbeck non la affianca al suo testo, per cui occorre rifarsi ad edizioni più recenti), e note al testo non solo di carattere filologico ma anche letterario, linguistico e stilistico, anch’esse ricavabili dalle edizioni successive.

In the body of the book (pp. 21–138), P. discusses points of detail in the first nine comedies in most editions of Naevius according to the common alphabetic arrangement (Acontizomenos, Agitatoria, Agrypnuntes, Appella, Ariolus, Astiologa, Carbonaria, Clamidaria, Colax). For each of these P. analyses some of the surviving fragments with regard to textual, linguistic and metrical issues and finally offers ‘Conclusioni’ dealing with more general questions, such as the titles, the possible structure of the dramas and the order of fragments. This major section is followed by an appendix on writing conventions (pp. 139–47), a bibliography (pp. 149–55) and indexes (pp. 157–70).

The discussions of various specific items and the repertory of previous comments on the passages selected will prove immensely useful to any future editor of Naevius’ comic fragments: focussing on metrical, textual and linguistic issues, it provides important material for a prospective new edition. However, because of the rather schematic limitation to the first nine comedies instead of, for instance, a study of paradigmatic cases, the book will leave readers wishing for a sequel.

Although the volume provides meticulous and philologically well-informed analyses of individual fragments, it is not too helpful in other respects. For instance, there is no methodological discussion of how to approach fragmentary plays, and the treatment of the individual comedies is selective. Hence the ‘Conclusioni’ do not provide a great deal of original interpretation. Additionally, it seems odd that in a detailed study of Naevius’ fragments some modern scholarship is not mentioned: the bibliography lists editions of Naevius and of his source authors, but few studies on Naevius himself. A particularly surprising omission is A. Cavazza, A. Resta Barrile, Lexicon Livianum et Naevianum (Hildesheim & New York, 1981: Alpha – Omega, Reihe A XIII). There is no indication that recent helpful bibliographical surveys have been used, as for instance W. Suerbaum, ‘Naevius comicus. Der Komödiendichter Naevius in der neueren Forschung’, in E. Stärk, G. Vogt-Spira (edd.), Dramatische Wäldchen. Festschrift für Eckard Lefèvre zum 65. Geburtstag [Hildesheim, Zurich and New York, 2000: Spudasmata 80], pp. 301–20).

In comparison with P.’s attempt to provide a fresh look at nine comedies, Giampiero Scafoglio’s focus on one tragedy allows him to study his subject more thoroughly from a variety of aspects. His chosen topic is Accius’ Astyanax, selected because of its mythological, historical and literary importance. Aside from an introduction (pp. 7–11), conclusions (pp. 123–7), an index of passages (pp. 129–44) and a bibliography (pp. 145–56), the book consists of two major parts: ‘Parte prima – Saggio sul background mitografico’ (pp. 13–75) and ‘Parte seconda – Testo e
commento dei frammenti’ (pp. 77–122). These two parts realise the different aspects suggested by the title and almost function as two independent studies.

The first section looks at Accius’ predecessors and reviews the development of the Astyanax myth among ancient writers from Homer to Accius; on the basis of this framework traditional and original elements in Accius may be distinguished tentatively. The second section is essentially an edition of the fragments with commentary; those transmitted under the title Troades have been added, since S. (like other scholars, but in contrast to the most recent editor, J. Dangel) believes that these titles refer to the same play (cf. pp. 73–5, 126). The fragments are presented in his own order and have been assigned a new numbering; references to the numberings of O. Ribbeck, E.H. Warmington and J. Dangel are provided. Each fragment is given in the context of its source and followed by an apparatus criticus and running commentary. S. is a reliable guide to the fragments and presents some interesting suggestions on the text and structure of the play.

In some ways, this book is similar to a recent study by another Italian scholar, which looks at those plays of Accius connected with the early stages of the Pelopid saga (B. Baldarelli, Accius und die vortrojanische Pelopidensage [Paderborn, München, Wien & Zurich, 2004: Studien zur Kultur und Geschichte des Altertums 24]). S’s method of analysing a fragmentary tragedy with respect to its mythical and ideological backgrounds is therefore not entirely new, but it is worthwhile and rewarding for each individual drama, since it allows further thoughts about the appeal of Greek myth to the contemporary audience in Republican Rome. However, as S’s approach is predominantly philological, he limits himself to brief suggestions on the relevance of the myth and Accius’ elaboration of it in its historical context (cf. p. 127). Nevertheless, the material gathered in his study offers a starting point for integrating the play into a larger context.

Even though both books might fail to satisfy some readers, both certainly offer a wealth of useful and intriguing information and suggestions; and both are well produced. These two different studies cannot (and do not intend to) function as definitive new editions, but they are a major step forward. The results achieved by new approaches combined with traditional philological criticism of Latin dramatic texts will eventually provide the basis for a comprehensive assessment of early Roman drama.
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