Il volume è senza dubbio un utile strumento e testimonio della vitalità degli studi sulla poesia ellenistica mostrando quanto ancora ci sia da imparare e da indagarne in questo campo.1
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1 Numerosi sono i refusi: p. XIII, per «Istruzione Publica» I. 'Istruzione Classica', per 'Rendiconti' I. 'Rendiconti'; SSH 21, per «ettetino[li]» I. 'eptetino[li]'; SSH 79A, per «d]«etetino[li]» l. 'd]«etetino[li]'; p. 11 fr. 10 CA, per «Nillies» I. 'Millis'; p. 11, nella bibliografia di Archestrato in luogo di «D. Scina, I Frammenti della Gastronomia (1823)» l. 'D. Scina, I Frammenti della Gastronomia (1823)'; SSH 257–8, 3 per [... l. '...'; per 8 «t]«etono[pi]» l. 'C]«etono[pi]'; 29 per «t]«etono[vo]» l. 't]«etono[vo]'; SSH 270A, i fr. i–8 sono incolonnati male, r. 10 per «tuti」 l. 'tuti」; r. 11 per «a[a]» l. 'a[a] e per «E[λ]νηρεύ» l. 'E[λ]νηρεύ', r. 16 per «Αρχαίον» l. 'Αρχαίον', r. 19 per «[η]γονοί» l. 'ηγονοί' e per «Γού» l. 'Γού', r. 24 per «[ο]το» l. 'οτο'; SSH 287, per «πανούσσα» l. 'πανούσσα'; SSH 39A, per «πα[']'Ερτωκθέν» l. 'πα[']'Ερτωκθέν'; SSH 44C, r. 3, per «v:]» l. 'v:]', r. 5, per «[ε]τρατάς» l. 'δετρατάς', SSH 418, 37, per «ετελέ» l. 'ετελέ', SSH 427, per «δοδοίνου» l. 'δοδοίνου', SSH 44A, per «[η]σ[η]ν] [Ευσφρί[ου]» l. 'ησ[η]ν] [Ευσφρί[ου]', p. 63, fr. 7 CA, 62–8 per «Gians» l. 'Gians' e per «Mélanges» l. 'Mélanges'; SSH 494, per «RIPC I: Studi di Letteratura Greca». 'Ricerche di Filologia Classica I: Studi di Letteratura Greca'; p. 69, nella bibliografia di Numen per «a Nicsandre» l. 'a Nicsandre', SSH 604A, per «Αθηνάιος» l. 'Αθηνάιος', SSH 724, per «Plutarcho» l. 'Plutarcho', SSH 906, 5, per «Sirenas» l. 'Sirenas' e per «G.» l. 'Gigante'; SSH 985, r. 1, per «αδραμί[ατα]» l. 'αδραμί[ατα]', r. 4, «[...] ον» l. '[...] ον', r. 35, per «ετ» l. 'ετ', r. 36, per «v. χαίο» l. 'v. χαίο', per «διάλεξατον» l. 'διάλεξατον', r. 41, per «ε» l. 'ε ... ', r. 42, per «γραμμάτα» l. 'γραμμάτα'. ...'; SSH 1146, per «[και]» l. '[και]', SSH 1187, i primi 11 versi sono incolonnati male; r. 1, per «[κ]άκε» l. 'κάκε', SSH 1188, i primi due versi sono incolonnati male, v. 2 per «πο» l. 'πο', v. 3 per «κα» l. 'κα', v. 6 per «κα[']» l. 'κα[']', SSH 1192, per «35 s.» l. '35'; SSH 1193, per «328 s.» l. '328'.
Schierl’s own good judgment has been reinforced by consultation with these scholars, and has produced an edition whose extended introduction, tables and indexes, give every possible support to the reader. Thirty pages on Pacuvius’ life and works, the tragedies and the aids available to elucidating the fragments (including discussion of Cicero and ‘Hyginus’ as sources) are followed by an account of the history of his text(s) and their reception in antiquity (34–65), and a judicious, compressed, report on recent scholarship (64–71). Schierl takes pains to explain her method and organization (#7, #8): plays listed alphabetically as in Ribbeck, fragments (not verses) numbered consecutively, grouped within each play by theme or setting, and distinguished by a system of asterisks where only author, or title (particularly problematic in the case of Armorum Iudicium, since Accius also wrote a play of this name) is cited by sources: she marks with triple asterisks unidentified excerpts assigned with high probability to each play. This prevents fragments of undoubted poetic merit (such as 262 Sch. on Fortuna) being orphaned because they cannot be assigned to a given play (a consequence of Jocelyn’s scruples in handling Ennian tragedy). Schierl does not profess to offer a new text and rarely diverges from D’Anna (taking together the 90 fragments in the three Orestes plays I found only 6 divergences, four – fr. 69, 92, 121, 127 line 2 on metrical grounds, two – fr. 76 horriferum, and 114 fetum for assonance and/or sense.) Wisely she attempts translation of every fragment, and gives primacy in the commentary to interpretation and context, parallels from other authors, morphology, style and metre.

She gives testimonia in full (general testimonia 85–90, with separate sections for specific plays). Endorsing her respect for Cicero as the most appreciative and helpful source, I would have liked more discussion of Brutus (T 22) and Cicero’s implication that Pacuvius though a great stylist and master of grand language was male locutus, like Caecilius. In what sense? Not in his register, despite some use of colloquial phrasing, nor surely his aberrant morphology and heteroclite inflexions, but as has been suggested, in arbitrary use or avoidance of -um genitive plurals (Orator 155).

Schierl’s after-matter includes abbreviations, bibliographical entries and indexes of all references in the sources for Pacuvius, followed by all references from both early and subsequent authors cited as parallels in the commentary. There is a concordance with Ribbeck TRF, Klotz and D’Anna and (most courageously) a conspectus metrorum, as well as an index of Pacuvius’ vocabulary, and indexes for features of language and metre, and of proper names. But although these ninety invaluable pages must have cost her immense and meticulous toil, I do not want to praise Schierl for the minor (womanly) virtues of care and diligence. She deserves the highest praise for her determination to go back beyond traditional and preferred interpretations, such as Ribbeck’s powerfully persuasive reconstructions of the lost plays, and to consider all alternatives – vital when the fragments come to us from Nonius or Festus without speaker or context.

The introduction to each play sets out what is known of its mythical basis in ancient literature, discusses in detail what is known about lost tragedies of Sophocles or Euripides with the same title or theme under a different title, possible variations in the action, incidental issues in each play and possible evidence for its dating (she is rightly sceptical). Two important components in her intro-
ductions are the evidence of ‘Hyginus’ (see below) and of Hellenistic or Roman works of art. To provide a focus for comment I will limit my discussion to the Orestes plays as they are presented by Schierl.

We are certain of three, in chronological order Doulorestes, focused on his murder of Aegisthus and Clytemnestra, Chryses, a dramatic sequel to his voyage to recover Iphigenia and the statue of Artemis from the Taurians, and Hermione, in which the purified and sane Orestes reclains his cousin and bride. (D’Anna has argued persuasively that a fourth play, entitled Orestes, included scenes of his madness: Servius Auctus’ evidence for this is as good as for the otherwise unattested Pentheus.) The Doulorestes assumes that Orestes comes to Argos from Delphi disguised as a slave cowherd (fr. 87) on the day designated for the wedding of Oeax son of Nauplius and enemy of Agamemnon (to Electra? or perhaps Aegisthus’ child by Clytemnestra, Ergone). (Two plot elements reflecting the influence of comedy). Schierl provides the scanty ancient evidence for Oeax (from Hyginus Fab. 117, hints in Eur. Orestes and an Athenian painting described by Pausanias) who acts as a warner (fr. 105), though it is not clear how this relates to the oracle (fr. 111, cf. 113, 114). There is ambiguity in ne matris fui! cognoscendi unquam aut contuendi copia, which may only warn Orestes against meeting his mother before he has killed Aegisthus. Fragments reflect threats by Aegisthus (against Electra, fr. 94) and self-exhortation by Orestes (fr. 96, 97) but apart from Aegisthus, Clytemnestra, Orestes (and Pylades?), it is not clear that Oeax, however necessary to the plot, takes part in the on-stage action. The allusions to men inciting the people of Argos (Aegisti fidem nuncupantes concievit populum, fr. 100) may imply a chorus of Argive elders, but as Fraenkel noted, Aegisti fidem could as well be an appeal to Aegisthus’ protection as on his behalf. No fragments reflect the actual killings, (unless the creaking doors of fr. 117 herald Orestes’ entry after his first killing? 278), and we cannot assume that Aegisthus was killed first. Yet fr. 109 suggests he has cooperation in acting against the tyrant.

Although the few fragments of Sophocles’ Chryses offer no help in determining its content, the main action of Pacuvius’ play is now generally agreed, thanks to Hyginus (120–121, see 194, 196): Initially hostile, Chryses, son of Agamemnon and the priestess of Artemis, becomes well disposed to Orestes and Iphigenia when he discovers his own descendant (more likely from his mother than grandfather) and rejects the angry demands of their pursuer Thoas. Again the people are involved, (as chorus?) in Chryses’ appeal based on prodigies and some of the fullest fragments are concerned not with the human conflict but interpretation of divine will (fr. 77) and speculations about the sacred marriage of heaven and earth (fr. 79–81) by a natural philosopher (physicus Cic. Div. 1.131). This used to be taken as evidence for contaminatio from a chorus of Euripides Chrysis, but Schierl shows (284–9) that these ideas found in Lucretius, perhaps in reminiscence of Pacuvius, are more commonplace than echoes of a specific text. Scholars now accept that the competition between Orestes and Pylades in friendly self-sacrifice belongs to the Chryses rather than another Orestes play. And Schierl has also warned readers against ascribing the long meditation on Fortuna to this or another Orestes play because of the general and distanced allusion to his shipwreck and reduction to beggary (fr. 126, 10/11, 133–6). Perhaps it was this kind of doctrina (elaborating a philosophical distinction between Fortuna and remetias) which earned Pacuvius his sobriquet of doctus. The Hermione is perhaps the most complex of these Orestes actions. Sophocles’ Hermione does not survive but Schierl cites its action from Eustathius (281); in contrast Euripides Andromache survives in full, situated in Phthia and contrasting the honorable Andromache and Pæleus with the pampered Hermione, her oath-breaking father Menelaus and the violent Orestes. There are mixed versions of the myth – that Neoptolemus had a child Anchialos by Hermione, (281); that Neoptolemus went to Delphi in anger against Apollo for his father’s death (287–8). In Euripides’ partisan play he goes to make atonement, and is thuggishly killed by Orestes, who makes off with Hermione. Pacuvius’ Neoptolemus seems rather to consult Delphi over his childlessness. The play includes a report of his attempt to defend himself unarmed against attack (fr. 134) as well as scenes of congratulation (frr. 135–6) to...
his killer. The issue is Hermione’s marriage: promised to Neoptolemus at Troy, but betrothed to her cousin Orestes by her grandfather during her father’s prolonged absence (fr. 126; as would indeed be necessary for any growing girl, let alone one disgraced by an adulterous mother). But the overall tone of the fragments seem sympathetic to the Atridae and their children. Several voice Hermione’s unhappy memories of a shameful childhood, and disputes between Menelaus and both Orestes and Neoptolemus. As Schierl notes there was a long tradition from the Iliad onwards of conflict between Agamemnon and Achilles, echoed in this play by conflict between their sons Orestes and Neoptolemus, (compare the quarrel of Agamemnon and Pyrrhus in Seneca’s Troades). But where were these quarrels set? Not in Phthia: perhaps in Sparta? Or even Delphi? (Is this a case for a split setting as in Eumenides?) Despite allusions to old age (frrs. 120, 127) and Pacuvius partiality to pathetic old men, Schierl is surely right to question whether Tyndareus (or less likely still Peleus) takes part in the action. But if the discorditas mentioned by Hermione in fr. 131 is really bringing disaster on her family (quantam … cladem importem familiae) it has to be more than the conflict of rival suitors: in ‘Hyginus’ Hermione is already the bride of Orestes when Menelaus responds to Neoptolemus’ demands by taking her from her cousin. If this is Pacuvius’ dramatic intrigue, as Schierl assumes, this is a remarkable fusion by Pacuvius of elements from the Euripidean and Sophoclean versions of the myth.

But even the study of these three fragmentary plays, not to mention closer exploration of any Pacuvian drama, seems to suggest a greater degree of creative independence than many scholars are willing to credit to him. Could not this independence, even the conscious intention of creating actions not previously dramatized in Greek or Latin, help to explain why Pacuvius composed only twelve tragedies (plus his praetexta Paullus) in over fifty years of writing? Some, like Periboea, may defy even Schierl’s patient attempts at a reconstruction, but there is no play of Pacuvius whose scanty fragments do not contain something unpredictable.

Dangel has constructed for Accius an extraordinarily ambitious program of synthesizing all Greek mythology into groups of sequential dramas. Such is the quantity of his titles that it would defy most of us to dismantle his arguments. But if Accius was prolific, he also seems to have been more prosaic, more rhetorical, than his romantic and poetic predecessor Pacuvius. Lucilius and Persius treated Pacuvius as uncouth, but how does the diction of his fragments differ from what we find in the plays and fragments of Aeschylus, or for that matter, the neoterizing diction of Callimachus? Until recently the comparatively small remains of Pacuvius (just over three hundred fragments, or four hundred lines) combined with lack of a detailed edition to divert students of tragedy to the more fertile Accius. Now we have been given a major incentive to devote attention to the better poet.