Navarre, O.: Tragoedia, in: Ch. Daremberg / E. Saglio: Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments, Bd. V, Paris 1913, 386–401.
Rabe, H.: Aus Rhetoren-Handschriften, RhM 63, 1908, 127–151.
Radke, G.: Zur Entwicklung der Gottesvorstellung und der Gottesverehrung in Rom, Darmstadt 1987.
Ribbeck, O. (ed.): Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta, I. Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta, Leipzig ²1871, ³1897.
–: Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik, Leipzig 1875 (ND, mit einem Vorwort v. W.-H. Friedrich, Hildesheim 1968).
Sallmann, K.: Censorinus. Betrachtungen zum Tag der Geburt. 'De die natali' mit deutscher Übersetzung und Anmerkungen, Leipzig 1988.
Scheid, J.: Romulus et ses frères. Le collège des Frères Arvales, modèle du culte public dans la Rome des empereurs, Paris / Rom 1990 (BÉFAR 275).
Schilling, R.: La religion romaine de Vénus depuis les origines jusqu'au temps d'Auguste, Paris / Rom ²1982.
Schmidt, P.L.: Varius III, KlPauly V (1975) 1130–1131.
Sihler, E.G.: The collegium poetarum at Rome, AJPh 26, 1905, 1–21.
Taylor, L.R.: The Opportunities for Dramatic Performances in the Time of Plautus and Terence, TAPhA 68, 1937, 284–304.
Toutain, J.: Ludi publici, in: Ch. Daremberg / E. Saglio: Dictionnaire des antiquités grecques et romaines d'après les textes et les monuments, Bd. III, Paris 1904, 1362–1378.
Veyne, P.: Le pain et le cirque. Sociologie historique d'un pluralisme politique, Paris 1976.
Wissowa, G.: Religion und Kultus der Römer, München ²1912.
Zehnacker, H.: Tragédie prétexte et spectacle romain, in: Théâtre et Spectacles dans l'Antiquité. Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg (5–7 Novembre 1981), Leiden o.J. [1983] (Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg. Travaux du Centre de Recherche sur le Proche-Orient et la Grèce Antiques 7), 31–48.
Ziegler, K.: Tragoedia, RE VI A 2 (1937) 1899–2075.
Zimmermann, B.: Dithyrambos. Geschichte einer Gattung, Göttingen 1992 (Hypomnemata 98).

Cicero and the Work of Tragedy

Sander M. Goldberg (Los Angeles)

The Romans, as everyone knows, quickly acquired a taste for plays based on Greek models. In the course of the third century, the *ludi scaenici* featuring such entertainment grew so rapidly in number and popularity that a dramatist like Plautus, even early in his career, had significantly more opportunities to present plays than the dramatists of fifth-century Athens had known.[1] Yet tragedy and comedy, though introduced more or less simultaneously at the *ludi Romani*,[2] were not equal partners in the development of Roman drama. By every available measure, the *comoedia palliata* was immensely popular from the time it was introduced by Livius Andronicus. It rapidly acquired an elaborate set of conventions and traditions, attracted a significant number of playwrights, and made ever-increasing demands on the technical skill of its actors. By the end of the second century, it was the benchmark genre for the scholars and antiquaries who had begun researching the history of Roman theater.[3] Comedy's *flos poetarum*, however, did not endure. The *comoedia palliata* as a stage genre was all but dead by the time its last commercial practitioner passed from the scene. Turpilius died in 103, no successor of note emerged after him, and performances of the old plays themselves grew increasingly rare in the late Republic, doubtless eclipsed by the growing popularity of mime.[4] Thus Cicero, though he

1 The original calculation was by Taylor 1937. See now Gruen 1992, 185–188, Bernstein 1998, 245–251.

2 Cassiod. *chron.*, p. 128 M. s.v. C. Manlius et Q. Valerius (cos. 239 B.C.): *his coss. ludis Romanis primum tragoedia et comoedia a L. Livio ad scaenam data.* Though Gell. 17.21.42 dates this event to 240, his reference to consuls and to the deaths of Sophocles and Euripides and Menander implies a similar belief that Andronicus presented both a tragedy and a comedy on that occasion. Certainty is nevertheless impossible. See Suerbaum 1968, 297–299, Gruen 1990, 80–84.

3 The tendency to privilege comedy when recalling the history of the Roman stage, manifest in Aelius Stilo and Varro, persists through Verg. *georg.* 2.380–396 and Hor. *epist.* 2.1.139–155. See Brink 1963, 189–191. Accius may have dealt with theater history in his *Pragmatica* (less probably in his *Didascalica*), but his approach to the subject is unknown. See Degl'Innocenti Pierini 1980, 58–73. For the conventions and practitioners of the *palliata*, see Wright 1978, and for its diminished appeal after Terence, Goldberg 1985, 203–220.

4 Hier. *chron.* 1914 (103 B.C.): *Turpilius comicus senex admodum Sinuessae moritur.* He could thus easily have been a younger contemporary of Terence (d. 159). See Wright 1974, 153–155. If the Fundanius of Hor. *sat.* 1.10.40–42 was indeed a creator of *palliatae* (the action of *sat.* 2.8 suggests mime), Horace thought him unique (*unus vivorum*), and what he wrote were not *fabulae* but *libelli.* For the developing importance of mime, too easily underestimated, see McKeown 1979, Fantham 1989.

quotes comedy with some frequency and alludes to comic characters and situations, makes strikingly few references to the actual performance of *palliatae* comedies. Roscius, to be sure, occupied a special place in Cicero's regard, but Roscius was hardly typical of his time or his profession, nor was that profession very large.[5]

The situation with tragedy was quite different. The initial experiments of Andronicus and Naevius in the third century did not win a large following.[6] The later tragedians were much more successful, but Rome never supported more than one at a time in the generations from Ennius through Accius. Tragedy in the first century, unlike comedy, nevertheless continued to flourish on the stage as well as in the study, and it left a surprisingly rich and varied record of its presence on the cultural landscape. The most famous accounts of Roman tragic performance are, of course, hardly monuments to artistic integrity. At the *ludi Apollinares* of 59, lines as spoken by the tragic actor Diphilus worked so effectively against Pompey that, says Cicero, they could have been written for the occasion by one of his enemies.[7] Even more notorious were events at the *Floralia* of 57, when the whole cast of Afranius' *Simulans* attacked Clodius from the stage, and the tragic actor Aesopus, starring in Accius' *Eurysaces*, turned the play to Cicero's advantage not only by distorting his delivery to create contemporary echoes at suitable moments but by distorting the text itself with additional lines of his own composition and others probably borrowed for the occasion from Ennius' *Andromacha*.[8] An extraordinary spectacle, to be

5 The register of actors compiled by Garton 1972 lists only five *comoedoi* in first-century Rome, including Roscius and his protégés Panurgus and Eros. For Roscius' acting, see Cic. *Q. Rosc.* 20–21 (Plautus' *Pseudolus*), *fam.* 9.22.1 (Turpilius' *Demiurgus*) and more generally *Arch.* 17, *Brut.* 290, *de orat.* 2.242, and probably *Cato* 48 (Cicero's experience of Roscius projected back onto Ambivius Turpio), and as a teacher of acting *de orat.* 1.129–133. See Garton 1972, 158–188. Not all his roles were necessarily comic: the quotation at *de orat.* 3.102 sounds like tragedy, while 3.221 (performance without a mask) suggests mime (cf. *orat.* 109: *comoedum in tragoediis ... placere vidimus*). Cicero evokes Roscius throughout *de orat.* 1 as the consummate professional (124,129–133,251,254). Cicero owed his first case, the defense of P. Quinctius, to Roscius' patronage and perhaps studied performance with him, debts that may have led him to inflate (and to obscure) Roscius' true standing. See the story at Macr. *Sat.* 3.14.11–13 and Fantham 1984, 304–305.

6 Cicero found Andronicus' plays not worth a second look (*Livianae fabulae non satis dignae quae iterum legantur, Brut.* 71), evidently a common view. No Republican author quotes them. (Varro, *ling.* 7.3 is the one partial exception.) Naevius is quoted, but not with the frequency or enthusiasm of Ennius, Pacuvius, and Accius.

7 Cic. *Att.* 2.19.3 (39 SB): *nam et eius modi sunt ii versus ut in tempus ab inimico Pompei scripti esse videantur.* He quotes two examples. Play and playwright are unknown. Cic. *Sest.* 118 makes a similar observation about the new-found relevance of lines in Afranius' *Simulans.*

8 Cic. *Sest.* 118–123, also reporting similar manipulations in Accius' *Brutus.* On the possible *contaminatio* of Accius and Ennius, contrast Jocelyn 1967, 238–241 and Questa / Raffaelli 1990, 169–172. Afranius' play was a *togata:* no *palliata* comedy is reported. The politicization of these occasions is often discussed. See *inter alios* Nicolet 1980, 363–373, Beacham 1991, 154–163; 1999, 58–61.

sure, but not entirely unique. Brutus, as *praetor urbanus* in 44, apparently hoped to curry popular support in a similar way by scheduling a performance of Accius' *Brutus* at the *ludi Apollinares* but had to settle for the *Tereus* instead when forced to leave Rome before the games could be held (Cic. *Att.* 16.5.1, *Phil.* 1.36, 10.8).

The sheer theatricality of these tragic revivals also attracted notice. At the dedication of Pompey's grand new theater in 55, for example, productions of Accius' *Clytaemestra* and Naevius' *Equus Troianus* featured immense processions and lavish props, an ostentatious display of breathtaking, if not necessarily tasteful proportions.[9] Yet there was always more to the *ludi scaenici* than politics and spectacle. The late Republican stage also delivered the Roman version of a genuinely moving tragic experience.[10] Cicero recalls for readers of his *Tusculans* how the ghost of Deiphilus, calling plaintively to his mother, moved audiences to tears:[11]

> *mater, te appello, tu, quae curam somno suspensam levas,*
> *neque te mei miseret, surge et sepeli natum –*
> *haec cum pressis et flebilibus modis, qui totis theatris maestitiam inferant, concinuntur, difficile est non eos qui inhumati sint, miseros iudicare.*

So too when Pacuvius' Orestes and Pylades each vies for the chance to die for the other, audiences thrilled to their unselfish nobility: *quotiens hoc agitur, ecquandone nisi admirationibus maximis?*[12] Actors like Rupilius, Diphilus, and Aesopus became famous for their performance in particular roles and, in the process, established themselves as cultural icons.[13]

Nevertheless, as so often the case with comedy, Cicero's most vivid tragic references often seem to be drawn not from specific memories of the stage but from his reading. Cassandra's appeal for rescue to the citizens of Troy (*cives ferte opem et restinguite*, 42 Jocelyn = 49 R.[3]), seems to set Ennius' *Alexander* in the city, but Cicero later quotes from the same scene of

9 Cic. *fam.* 7.1. Further examples of this trend toward spectacle in Goldberg 1996, 265–268, Beacham 1991, 67–84; 1999, 32–35, and for the new conditions at Pompey's theater, Beacham 1999, 61–72.

10 Cic. *har. resp.* 22–25 probably exaggerates the religious solemnity of the *ludi* for his own (political) purpose, but the religious feeling on such occasions was always a noteworthy part of the Roman character. Cf. Pol. 6.56.

11 Cic. *Tusc.* 1.106, quoting Pacuvius' *Iliona* (197–198 R.[3]). The other plays he quotes, Ennius' *Andromacha* and *Thyestes* and an unidentified tragedy of Accius, do not so explicitly recall stage performance. Pacuvius' scene was still famous for Hor. *sat.* 2.3.60.

12 Cic. *fin.* 5.63. The play was *Dulorestes* (or possibly *Chryses*). Cf. an analogous appeal to Pacuvius' *Teucer* at *de orat.* 2.193.

13 Cf. the allusion to individual actors, where the references depend on recognition of their particular acting styles, at *Rhet. Her.* 3.34, Cic. *Att.* 2.129.3, *off.* 1.114.

her madness as if it were set in the wilds of Mt. Ida or on the seacoast. The confusion is easier to explain as the imprecision of a book reference than as a poor memory for what he had seen on the stage.[14] The extended string of quotations from *Andromacha* at *Tusculans* 3.44–45 is surely a literary rather than a stage memory: Cicero praises Andromacha's song (*carmen*) for its content, diction, and rhythm – no mention of its choreography or setting, though her anapestic dimeters would have made a memorable scene – and extolls Ennius himself (*poeta egregius*) over Euphorion's claque, thus injecting the old poet into that contemporary battle between old styles of poetry and new, which was essentially a debate over books and reading and education. The ground Cicero shared with the *cantores Euphorionis* was in the library, not on the stage.

Both *Andromacha* and *Medea exul* must have been widely circulated texts, which is why Cicero in particular quotes from them so frequently. They had become part of what Pierrre Bourdieu has so famously called ‹le capital culturel›, that store of knowledge and experience with which educated Romans distinguished themselves from their less privileged countrymen: «De même que la richesse économique ne peut fonctionner comme capital qu'en relation avec un champ économique, de même la compétence culturelle sous toutes ses formes ne se trouve constituée comme capital culturel que dans les relations objectives qui s'établissent entre le système de production économique et le système de production des producteurs» (Bourdieu 1980, 214).

This distinction between the experience of tragedy as something seen and something read matters for a simple but important reason: performance unifies. It creates a shared experience, an experience in and of the theater that transcends boundaries even for an audience segregated by class, as Roman audiences came increasingly to be. Laughter and tears do not know social distinction. References to performance are therefore inclusive, and so Cicero recalls actual performances either to emphasize the extent of a public figure's popular support (e.g. *Sest.* 115–126, *Phil.* 1.36) or to illustrate the universality of human experience (e.g. *fin.* 5.63, *Tusc.* 1.106). Book knowledge is not common and therefore has the potential to divide those privileged few who have it from the many who do not. Cicero's taste in literary quotation therefore runs not to the obscure and learned but to school texts and cultural landmarks. His erudition is calculated less to display a unique

[14] Cic. *div.* 1.114: *multos nemora silvaeque, multos amnes aut maria commovent.* See Jocelyn 1967, 204–206. At *div.* 1.66 *Alexander* is called *poema,* not *fabula.* I would argue with Jocelyn 1967, 359–360 that the reference to *manibus gypsatissimis* at *fam.* 7.6.1, quoting *Medea exul,* suggests the appearance of foreign women rather than actors' make-up, since Cicero is again quoting with a text, not a stage performance in mind.

knowledge, which would put distance between himself as author and even educated readers, or for the pleasure of a purely decorative illustration, but to recall or define a common ground between him and them.[15] An innocent, amusing example of the resulting camaraderie survives in a letter to the jurist C. Trebatius Testa, who had found himself on Caesar's staff in Gaul in 54: Cicero consoles him for his *desideria urbis et urbanitatis* with lines drawn from Ennius' *Medea exul.*[16] The extensive quotations at *De divinatione* 1.66–67 illustrating the process of divine possession with the example of Ennius' Cassandra or the citation of Alcmeo at *Academica* 2.88–89 are similar appeals in a more formal context to a confirming knowledge drawn from the readers' experience. At *Tusculans* 3.45, quoting Andromacha's lament, the stakes are raised. Cicero contrasts the tragedian's ability to comprehend emotion with the Epicureans' limitation in this sphere, thus making the quotation a substantial part of the philosophical argument it advances.

Cicero's striking preference for tragic over comic examples in these situations seems to be the result of conscious choice. Consider, for example, *De officiis* 1.114, which argues for the need to know one's own talents and limitations. Cicero illustrates the point by recalling the self-knowledge of actors:

> *suum quisque igitur noscat ingenium acremque se et bonorum et vitiorum suorum iudicem praebeat, ne scaenici plus quam nos videantur habere prudentiae. illi enim non optumas, sed sibi accomodatissimas fabulas eligunt; qui voce freti sunt, Epigonos Medumque, qui gestu Melanippam, Clytemnestram, semper Rupilius, quem ego memini, Antiopam, non saepe Aesopus Aiacem. ergo histrio hoc videbit in scaena, non videbit sapiens vir in vita?*

Though the issue is a moral one, Cicero's education and training lead him to frame his demonstration in the terms of rhetorical theory: *vox* and *gestus* are primary categories in the rhetoricians' analysis of *actio.*[17] Yet the de-

[15] Quint. *inst.* 1.8.11: *nam praecipue quidem apud Ciceronem, frequenter tamen apud Asinium etiam et ceteros qui sunt proximi, videmus Enni Acci Pacuvi Lucili Terenti Caecili et aliorum inseri versus, summa non eruditionis modo gratia sed etiam iucunditatis, cum poeticis voluptatibus aures a forensi asperitate respirant.* Quintilian's immediate context is oratory, where Cicero is careful to avoid the suggestion of erudition, e.g. *S. Rosc.* 46, *Phil.* 2.65, 13.49, *Sest.* 118. See Zillinger 1911, 70–71. The dramatic base of Quintilian's implied canon is significant.

[16] Cic. *fam.* 7.6. Citations of *Medea exul* by Varro and even the *Rhet. Her.* demonstrate its familiarity to educated Romans. Cicero's urbane, cultured example is thus itself part of the message. Contrast *fam.* 7.7, a similar consolation but without the literary allusion. For the dubious, or at least superficial relevance of the literary example, cf. *fam.* 1.9.19 quoting Ter. *Eun.* 440–445 to Lentulus Spinther (a context hardly flattering to Cicero).

[17] Cicero's development of this idea at *orat.* 54–60 and *de orat.* 3.216–221 also looks to tragedy: all his examples are tragic, although *iracundia, vis,* and *voluptas* could equally (and appropriately) be illustrated by lines from comedy. The Roman examples in *off.* 1.107–121 suggest at least sig-

mands of acting being what they are and the relationship between actors and orators being what it is, there was no particular reason why the practice of comic actors could not equally well have illustrated the matter. Cicero in other contexts recalls Roscius' tendency in old age to adjust his *tempi* to his diminished dexterity.[18] That example would have served equally well here. Indeed, when Quintilian, thinking again of oratory, expands on the idea of knowing one's limitations, he appeals to the example of the comic actors Demetrius and Stratocles.[19] Cicero's sense of *decorum* naturally turns his thoughts to tragedy. Nor is he alone in the recollection of tragic context and tragic devices.

Tragedy, as a fundamental part of the Romans' cultural education and experience, exerted a discernible influence on poetic composition, too, although recognizing tragic references and tragic allusions for what they are can be difficult. Not always, of course. When Lucretius writes: *crudeles gaudent in tristi funere fratris / et consanguineum mensas odere timentque,* it takes no special feat of erudition to spot the general reference to Thyestes' notorious banquet and a specific allusion to the famous words of Accius' Atreus: *oderint dum metuant.*[20] Few tragic allusions, however, are this clear, and the problem for us is not only because knowledge of Republican tragedy has become so fragmentary. Consider, for example, Cicero's famous command to Catiline: *perge quo coepisti; egredere aliquando ex urbe; patent portae; proficiscere ... exire ex urbe iubet consul hostem* (*Cat.* 1.10–13), in which some scholars have heard an echo of another Accian line: *egredere exi ecfer te, elimina urbe!*[21] The problem with this putative allusion is the need to make adequate allowance for the linguistic norms and stylistic conventions that necessarily underlie any Latin utterance. Cicero's alliteration, created here by the emphatic repetition of the *e(x)* prefix, is so typical of dramatic verse, both tragic and comic, and so much a part of the language itself that a direct, allusive link to Accius is difficult to maintain with confidence. We might just as readily think of Plautus' Grumio and Tranio as they open *Mostellaria* with similarly emphatic alliteration created by precisely the same kind of morphological parallelism:

nificant rethinking of Cicero's philosophical source (Panaetius), if not completely original composition. The integration of tragic *exempla* is thus particularly striking. See in general Dyck 1996, 282–287.

18 Cic. *de orat.* 1.254, *leg.* 1.11. In both cases, the context is the making of speeches.

19 Quint. *inst.* 11.3.178–180. See Fantham 1982, 249–251.

20 Lucr. 3.72–73, echoing *Atreus* V, 203–204 R.[3] The fragment of Accius is known precisely because it was so often cited, e.g. Cic. *Sest.* 102, *Phil.* 1.34, *off.* 1.97, Sen. *Ira* 1.20.4, Suet. *Tib.* 59, *Cal.* 30. For this and other possible examples, see Degl'Innocenti Pierini 1980, 11–12.

21 Acc. *Phoen.* VII, 592 R.[3] Thus Beare 1964, 113: "Accius might make us fancy that we see Cicero driving Catiline from Rome", and much more emphatically, Biliński 1958, 43–44.

1 GR.: *exi e culina sis foras, mastigia,*
...
7 TR.: *... apscede ab aedibus.*
abi rus, abi dierecte, apscede ab ianua.

There is of course no question of deliberate echo or tragic allusion here. These authors are simply drawing from a common stock of stylistic mannerisms.[22] And so, I suspect, is Cicero.

The most certain – and surely the best known – example of genuine allusion in late Republican poetry is Catullus' use of tragic language and ideas in poem 64,[23] and his willingness to echo Roman tragedy in a hexameter poem so conspicuously wary of the Roman epic tradition should lead us to suspect similar influences elsewhere in contemporary poetry. Given the fragmentary nature of the record, hints of tragic reference may be all we can hope for, but we should at least remain open to the possibility that behind passages we know well lie works that are now lost to our knowledge. Let me end with one such possibility and the lessons to be drawn from it.

Lucretius' version of Iphigeneia's sacrifice at Aulis (1,82–101) is justly famous and much-discussed.

quod contra saepius illa
religio peperit scelerosa atque impia facta.
Aulide quo pacto Triviai virginis aram
Iphianassai turparunt sanguine foede
ductores Danaum delecti, prima virorum.
cui simul infula virgineos circumdata comptus
ex utraque pari malarum parte profusast,
et maestum simul ante aras adstare parentem
sensit et hunc propter ferrum celare ministros
aspectuque suo lacrimas effundere civis,
muta metu terram genibus summissa petebat.
nec miserae prodesse in tali tempore quibat,
quod patrio princeps donarat nomine regem:
nam sublata virum manibus tremibundaque ad aras
deductast, non ut sollemni more sacrorum
perfecto posset claro comitari Hymenaeo,
sed casta inceste nubendi tempore in ipso,
hostia concideret mactatu maesta parentis,
exitus ut classi felix faustusque daretur.
tantum religio potuit suadere malorum.

22 The same predilection for mannerisms makes tragic parody so easy to recognize, as in the mad-scene of Plaut. *Most.*, e.g. 835–841, readily paralleled even in their fragmentary state by Enn. *Alc.* XV, 28–30 Jocelyn = 29–31 R.[3] and *Alex.* XVII, 32–33 Jocelyn = 39–40 R.[3]

23 Zetzel 1983, 257–265, Thomas 1982.

The style of this account immediately recalls the sound of epic: *Iphianassa* is a Homeric form (Χρυσόθεμις καὶ Λαοδίκη καὶ Ἰφιάνασσα, *Il.* 9.145), and the two genitives in *-ai*, the verbal repetitions, and the marked alliterations throughout the passage all suggest Ennius' *Annales*. But this alignment with epic tradition, which is almost a given of Lucretian style, accounts only for some superficial aspects of the passage. Thinking of Homer or even Ennius does not take us far or deep into its significance.

The problem is two-fold. First, the Homeric echo is oddly, even jarringly unhelpful: Homer's Iphianassa was alive and well in Argos.[24] Why, then, recall a contradicting detail in Greek tradition? Second, neither the ironic tone nor the Greek subject of the passage finds any match in the *Annales*. The epic language that leads only to puzzlement on the Greek side fails to trigger any specific allusion on the Latin one. Cyril Bailey's gloss on the passage therefore took him into the realm of art, in particular to a painting of the sacrifice at Aulis by Parrhasios' rival, Timanthes of Cythnos (fl. ca. 400 B.C.). The painting was famous at Rome by the first century and became something of a rhetorician's *topos*. Its most striking feature was its varied display of grief among all the Achaean leaders except Agamemnon, whose head was instead covered.[25] Lucretius could be thinking of this painting. Timanthes' melodramatic, veiled Agamemnon may well lie behind Lucretius' emphasis on the *maestus ante aras parens* (1,89), but his language also suggests the more direct influence of tragedy.

The memorable phrase *ductores Danaum delecti, prima virorum* (1,86) would live on in epic through Catullus (64.4) and Vergil (*Aen.* 2.14,18; 8.518–519), but its roots are in a phrase of Ennian tragedy describing the crew of the Argo: *Argivi in ea delecti viri* (212 Jocelyn = 209 R.[3]). Even more arresting and to the point is Lucretius' blood-stained altar (1,84–85):

Triviai virginis aram
Iphianassai turparunt sanguine foede,

which recalls the destruction of Troy at *Andromacha* 92–94 Jocelyn (= 86–88 R.[3]):

haec omnia vidi inflammari,
Priamo vi vitam evitari,
Iovis aram sanguine turpari.

This, I suspect, is a conscious and deliberate allusion rather than merely a verbal borrowing: the moral outrage at Aulis that launches the war on Troy finds a verbal echo in the impious destruction that ends it. So too, the poignancy of line 94 *quod patrio princeps donarat nomine regem,* which led Bailey to quote Euripides (πρώτη σ' ἐκάλεσα πατέρα καὶ σὺ παῖδ' ἐμέ, *Iph. A.* 1220), again suggests a tragic source, but this is less likely to be from Euripides directly than from a mediating Latin tragedy on the events at Aulis. Ennius' *Iphigenia,* the only Latin play known on this theme, is of course the obvious candidate.[26] The fact that *Andromacha, Iphigenia,* and *Medea exul* are, as best we can judge, Ennius' most widely attested plays in the first century might add credibility to the idea that Lucretius uses them here, but this kind of argument is potentially circular and therefore demands one last consideration.

Our main sources for these plays are also witnesses to their enduring popularity. Both *Iphigenia* and *Medea exul* are cited by the anonymous *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (at 3.34 and 2.34 respectively), which suggests that by the early first century they had joined the stock of rhetorical *exempla*. All three plays are frequently quoted by Cicero in literary contexts that maintain at least the fiction that his educated readers will recognize them, and they have clearly been culled for their grammatical oddities by Varro (or Varro's teachers). This testimony is thus consistent with our other evidence of tragedy's continuing role in the cultural consciousness of the educated elite in Cicero's time. Our three suggestions of tragedy in these twenty lines of Lucretius are therefore a strong hint of tragedy's continued presence beneath the surface of late Republican verse. There are, I feel sure, more such hints to be found, but we must first recognize the significance of tragedy in the public and the literary life of Republican Rome and the extent of its influence in defining both those who counted in the elite of that culture and in the making of the literature they enjoyed.

[24] Aristonicus *ad loc.* thus concluded ὅτι οὐκ οἶδε τὴν παρὰ τοῖς νεωτέροις σφαγήν, but this does not necessarily follow (so, rightly, Hainsworth 1993, 77). *Cypria,* fr. 15 tries to solve the problem by making Iphianassa and Iphigeneia two separate people. The discrepancy clearly did not trouble Lucretius.

[25] Bailey 1947, 614. According to Plin. *nat.* 35.73–74, Timanthes' painting was *oratorum laudibus celebrata*. There are references to it at Cic. *orat.* 74 and Quint. *inst.* 2.13.13, as well as more general references to the sacrifice at Cic. *off.* 3.95, *Tusc.* 1.116. For art history put at the service of rhetoric, see Douglas 1973, 108–115, Vogt-Spira 1998.

[26] See Jocelyn 1967, 318–324. Of other possible tragic echoes discernible in the passage, the epithet *Trivia,* which Varro, *ling.* 7.16 quotes from Ennian tragedy (363 Jocelyn = 362 R.[3]) is the least unconvincing.

Bibliography

Bailey, C. (ed.): Titi Lucreti Cari, De rerum natura libri sex., 3 vol., Oxford 1947.

Beacham, R.C.: The Roman Theatre and its Audience, London 1991.

–: Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome, New Haven / London 1999.

Beare, W.: The Roman Stage. A Short History of Latin Drama in the Time of the Republic, London ^{3}1964.

Bernstein, F.: *Ludi publici.* Untersuchungen zur Entstehung und Entwicklung der öffentlichen Spiele im republikanischen Rom, Stuttgart 1998 (Historia-Einzelschr. 119).

Biliński, B.: Accio ed i Gracchi. Contributo alla storia della plebe e della tragedia romana, Rome 1958 (Accademia Polacca di Scienze e Lettere, Biblioteca di Roma, Conferenze, Fascicolo 3).

Bourdieu, P.: Le sens pratique, Paris 1957.

Brink, C.O.: Horace and Varro, in: Varron, Vandœuvres-Geneva 1963 (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique. Tome IX), 173–206.

Degl'Innocenti Pierini, R.: Studi su Accio, Florence 1980 (Quaderni dell'Istituto di filologia classica 'Giorgio Pasquali' dell'Università degli Studi di Firenze 1).

Douglas, A.E.: The Intellectual Background of Cicero's Rhetorica, ANRW I.3, Berlin / New York 1973, 95–138.

Dyck, A.R.: A Commentary on Cicero, De Officiis, Ann Arbor 1996.

Fantham, E.: Quintilian on Performance: Traditional and Personal Elements in Institutio 11.3, Phoenix 36, 1982, 243–263.

–: Roman Experience of Menander in the Late Republic and Early Empire, TAPhA 114, 1984, 299–309.

–: Mime: The Missing Link in Roman Literary History, CW 82, 1989, 153–163.

Garton, C.: Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre, Toronto 1972.

Goldberg, S.M.: Understanding Terence, Princeton 1985.

–: The Fall and Rise of Roman Tragedy, TAPhA 126, 1996, 265–286.

Gruen, E.S.: Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy, Leiden / New York / Copenhagen / Cologne 1990 (Cincinnati Classical Studies. New Series. Vol. VII).

–: Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome, Ithaca (N.Y.) 1992.

Hainsworth, B.: The Iliad: A Commentary. Vol. III: Books 9–12, Cambridge 1993.

Jocelyn, H.D. (ed.): The Tragedies of Ennius. The Fragments ed. with an Introd. and Comm., Cambridge 1967 (Cambridge Classical Texts and Commentaries 10) (repr. with corr. 1969).

McKeown, J.: Augustan Elegy and Mime, PCPhS 25, 1979, 71–84.

Nicolet, C.: The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome (1976). Transl. by P.S. Falla, Berkeley / Los Angeles 1980.

Questa, C. / Raffaelli, R.: Dalla rappresentazione alla lettura, in: Lo spazio letterario di Roma antica III, Rome 1990, 139–215.

Suerbaum, W.: Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter. Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius, Hildesheim 1968 (Spudasmata 19).

Taylor, L.R.: The Opportunities for Dramatic Performances in the Time of Plautus and Terence, TAPhA 68, 1937, 284–304.

Thomas, R.: Catullus and the Polemics of Poetic Reference (Poem 64.1–18), AJPh 103, 1982, 144–164.

Vogt-Spira, G.: Der Vergleich von Dichtung und Malerei. Überlegungen zu einem antiken Topos, in: M. Müller (Hg.): multiplicatio et variatio. Beiträge zur Kunst – Festgabe für E. Badstübner zum 65. Geburtstag, Berlin 1998, 283–291.

Wright, J.: Dancing in Chains. The Stylistic Unity of the Comoedia Palliata, Rome 1974.

Zetzel, J.E.G.: Catullus, Ennius, and the Poetics of Allusion, ICS 8, 1983, 251–266.

Zillinger, W.: Cicero und die altrömischen Dichter, Würzburg 1911.

IDENTITÄTEN UND ALTERITÄTEN

Herausgegeben
von

Hans-Joachim Gehrke Monika Fludernik
Hermann Schwengel

BAND 3

ALTERTUMSWISSENSCHAFTLICHE REIHE

BAND 1

ERGON VERLAG

Identität und Alterität in der frührömischen Tragödie

Herausgegeben von

Gesine Manuwald

ERGON VERLAG