

P. SCHIERL, *Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta. Vol. III: Pacuvius*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2023, xlii+520 pp., ISBN 978-3-525-25030-3.

J. SCHULTHEISS, *Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta. Vol. IV: Accius*, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck and Ruprecht, 2023, xli+858 pp., ISBN 978-3-525-25031-0.^{1*}

The end of 2023 saw the publication for the first time of Volumes 3 and 4 of the *Tragicorum Romanorum fragmenta* series (henceforth *TrRF*), devoted respectively to Accius and to Pacuvius, as well as updated editions of Volumes 1 (Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Tragicci minores, Adespota; edited by Markus Schauer) and 2 (Ennius; edited by Gesine Manuwald), first published in 2012 and now both revised by Manuwald (with the assistance, where Volume 1 is concerned, of Jochen Schultheiß and a team of student helpers and research assistants).² Volume 3 on Pacuvius is edited by Petra Schierl, who returns to that poet after her 2006 edition of his work which stemmed from a Munich PhD dissertation, while Jochen Schultheiß takes charge of Volume 4 on the tragedies of Accius. For reasons that will be detailed below, readers will still find it profitable to consult Schierl's earlier edition on Pacuvius alongside her new *TrRF* contribution. But regarding Schultheiß's Accius volume, it will now replace the 1995 Budé edition by Jacqueline Dangel and become the standard critical edition. Before examining these volumes in greater detail, it should be stated from the outset that both editors abide by certain editorial principles which have been decided on in collaboration with the series editors, Wolfgang-Widu Ehlers, Gesine Manuwald, Markus Schauer, and Bernd Seidensticker. Accordingly, Schierl and Schultheiß should not be made to bear full responsibility for the difficulties that stem from some of these editorial principles. Although some will disagree with some aspects of the methodology and quibble about the text of certain fragments, it was a momentous undertaking, and the results are highly impressive. Both editors have performed a truly tremendous service to all scholars who take a serious interest not only in Roman Republican tragedy, but also in Early Latin literature and indeed in ancient drama more broadly.³

The two volumes under review both have a similar layout. Most of the prefatory material will be familiar to users of the first editions of Volumes 1 and

¹ * I wish to thank all the members of the 'Experiencing Fragments' project at Leiden University for many stimulating discussions, from which this review has benefited greatly.

² The second edition of Volume 1 (to be referred to as *TrRF*² I) bears a new sub-title which reflects the addition of the fragments of *fabulae praetextae* not written by Ennius or Accius (a list of *testimonia* had been included in the first edition, but this was not mentioned in the title): 'Testimonia tragoediae Romanae, Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Poetae tragici minores, Fragmenta tragica adespota, Fabula praetexta'.

³ Some desiderata still remain because Dangel's edition is still the most recent edition of Accius' non-dramatic works, and while users of these two editions will benefit from the introduction to both Pacuvius' and Accius' lives and careers in Manuwald's 2011 monograph *Roman Republican Theatre* (Cambridge, pp. 209-15 and 216-25 respectively), we still lack, as Timpanaro pointed out in his 1996 review of Dangel (*Paideia* 51, 218), a full, recent commentary on Accius.

2, including the important explanation of how a fragment is presented according to *TrRF* norms ('Specimen fragmenti et partes apparatus'). New to Volumes 3 and 4 are an addition to the prologue of the first editions, written by Ehlers and Seidensticker, and a preface pertaining specifically to each of these two volumes, written by its respective editor. Both volumes contain a lengthy 'Subsidia' section which contains useful material such as a rich, and in fact so far as I can see almost comprehensive, bibliography; a 'Conspectus metrorum'; concordances relating to major editions of each author; and indices. One detail worth noting is the presence of a section in Volume 3 containing dubious fragments which are perhaps to be attributed to the tragedies of Pacuvius ('Fragmenta dubia tragoediis Pacuvi fortasse tribuenda', 3.316-21), and of one in Volume 4 containing fragments of uncertain works which are perhaps to be attributed to Accius' tragedies ('Operum incertorum fragmenta tragoediis fortasse tribuenda', 4.592-602). Schultheiß has made the significant contribution of compiling a total of fifty-nine *testimonia* to Accius' life and oeuvre, which is a significantly higher number than those collected by Stärk in 2002 (twenty-two: '§122 L. Accius' in Volume 1 of Suerbaum's *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike*) and before that by Funaioli in 1907 (nineteen: *GRF*, p. 22-5). The fragments themselves are arranged according to the alphabetical order of the title of each play, as in Ribbeck's editions. Dangel's arrangement of the Accian fragments according to the mythical 'cycle' to which each play is assumed to have belonged (e.g. 'Cycle des Pélopidés' or 'Cycle de la guerre de Troie') has thus not been replicated. But *TrRF* employs a different numbering system to Ribbeck's, whose system was adopted by most later editors. Ribbeck used two different numbering systems: one in Roman numerals representing the putative order in which the fragments appeared within any given play, and another in Arabic numerals counting in sequence each surviving line of a poet's tragic output. *TrRF*, however, attributes an Arabic numeral to each fragment of a poet's dramatic works from the first to the last, and if a fragment consists of more than one line, each line receives a separate Arabic numeral. To give an example, the line *sermone indecorans turpi fama differet*, which is the second line of a two-line fragment, technically should be referred to, in Ribbeck's system, as Accius *Meleager* F XV, v. 459 (though in practice the numeration by Roman numeral is often omitted), but according to *TrRF*'s system as Accius *Meleager* F 269.2.

In keeping with the usual practice of the *TrRF* series, the editors aim, to the extent that it is possible, for exhaustiveness and neutrality in presenting the fragments. Literal exhaustiveness is of course unattainable, but the term is rather to be understood in the sense that each fragment is given a complex, four-part critical apparatus designed to provide a full list of variant manuscript readings, conjectural emendations, and parallels.⁴ In the words of Sander Goldberg in

⁴ The lists of parallels are useful, though occasionally the definition of what constitutes a 'parallel' is stretched: does the twelfth-century John of Salisbury's misattribution to Ennius of a

his BMCR review of Volume 1 (2013.02.12), the series ‘strives to put between hard covers as complete as possible a record of evidence and analysis’. As for the matter of how *TrRF* strives for neutrality, the preface, as in the previous volumes, states that ‘a characteristic feature of this new edition (in contrast to most preceding ones) is the arrangement of the fragments, which follows the chronological sequence of the transmitting authors for each tragedy as well as for the fragments that cannot be ascribed to individual plays; such a structure does not imply specific interpretations or suggest particular reconstructions for the dramas’ (*TrRF* III and IV, xxv). This feature of the edition will be discussed in greater detail below, but first I shall demonstrate how these principles of exhaustiveness and neutrality can be witnessed in the way in which *TrRF* handles the fragments at the level of establishing the text.

Of the 295 fragments of Pacuvius in the *TrRF* edition, I have counted twenty-five fragments in which the text printed differs from Schierl’s previous edition, and of the 461 *TrRF* fragments of Accius, eighty-nine that differ from Dangel’s 1995 edition.⁵ On some further occasions, a change of punctuation results in a change of meaning: this is the case, for example, in Pacuvius *F inc.* 225.10-11 *TrRF* and in Accius *Medea siue Argonautae* F 248 *TrRF*. Here I shall point out some general trends and discuss only a few examples in detail, but for readers interested in seeing how these new editions relate to the existing standard editions of Schierl and Dangel, I have included at the end of this review a full list, with brief commentary, of all these changes. The concordance offered by Schierl relating to her own earlier edition (3.484-929) helpfully sets out most of the differences that arise owing to the differences in policy. For example, Schierl in this edition prints as two different fragments (*Antiopa* F 2; *F inc.* 234 *TrRF*) lines which in her earlier edition she had combined within one single fragment (F 7 Schierl 2006): this is because F 234 *TrRF* is technically an *incertum* which she had combined with a fragment which is securely attributed to the *Antiopa*. A similar case is *Teucer* F 202 *TrRF* (= 241.2 Schierl), where she does not, as she had done in her first edition, accept the combination, originally proposed by G. Hermann (‘De Aeschlyli tragoediis fata Aiacis et Teucris complexis’ in *Opuscula*, 7.386), of this fragment with another Pacuvian fragment preserved by Servius Auctus (*Aen.* 9.667, p. 96.7 Murgia-Kaster = Pacuvius F 220 *TrRF*) and an *adespoton* preserved by Marcus Caelius Rufus (*apud Cic. Fam.* 8.2.1 = Pacuvius F 288 [*dub.*] *TrRF*). Some of the changes that Schierl makes are improvements which are due to advances in research which have been published since 2006, for instance Gaertner (2015, ‘Pacuvius poeta comicus’, *Hermes* 143, 24-56 and 426-46) on the reliability of Fulgentius (see below); Welsh 2015 (‘Verse Quotations from

fragment of Accius found in Cicero (*Off.* 3.104) at *Policraticus* 6.18 really count as a ‘parallel’ to Accius *Atreus* F 106 *TrRF* (IV.179)?

⁵ Of the thirty or so conjectures made by Dangel, Schultheiß endorses only one, her addition of *si* at F 134 *TrRF* (= v. 26 D), *qui <si> hinc superescit, Spartam atque Amyclas trado*, ‘if he survives then(?), I surrender Sparta and Amyclae’.

Festus', *HSCP* 108, 403-65) on the parameters according to which Republican Latin is quoted in Festus (cf. Pacuvius *Armorum iudicium* F 14 *TrRF* and *Teucer* F 207 *TrRF*); and Calboli's 2020 De Gruyter edition of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (cf. Pacuvius F *inc.* 225).

It is noteworthy that the Pacuvius edition includes a new fragment which was identified by Deufert in 2023, though Deufert's article, which appeared in *Hermes* 151, 298-316, seems not to be listed in the bibliography. This fragment, which seems to have been known to Remigius of Auxerre, is transmitted in a Bamberg manuscript (Staatsbibliothek, Msc. Class. 18) which contains a syncretism of Plato and Plautus by an anonymous author, and it now becomes 'Pacuvius F 286 *TrRF*', featuring among the fragments from uncertain plays. Another noteworthy novelty is that in the *TrRF* edition, Schierl includes among the list of plays of Pacuvius an *Orestes*, a *Protesilaus*, and a *Thyestes*, three plays of which the existence and/or attribution to Pacuvius is of uncertain attestation (in her previous edition she had discussed them only in the introduction, pp. 6-10). Only for the *Thyestes* is a fragment actually transmitted, and it is preserved by Fulgentius (*Serm. ant.* 57, p. 125 Helm). Citing the argument in its most recent formulation by Gaertner (2015, 29-37) that Fulgentius is a reliable source regarding Pacuvius, Schierl considers the fragment genuine (Pacuvius *Thyestes* F 223, pp. 253-4: *Thyeste* having been proposed for the manuscripts' *Tietis* by Hadrianus Iunius in his 1565 edition of Nonius, p. 591). Some, most influentially Jocelyn in his edition of Ennius' tragedies (1969², 412), had suggested that what would be the solitary witness to the existence of a *Thyestes* by Pacuvius, which does not feature in Ribbeck's or Warmington's editions, might be a mistake and in fact refer to the play of the same name by Ennius, though Jocelyn did not go so far as to include it among the fragments of that poet. D'Anna had, perhaps more prudently, considered the fragment as being of uncertain authorship, and Schierl herself previously listed it as a *testimonium*. One might of course disagree with Schierl's decision, but her outline of the problem is commendably succinct and informative.

The changes that have been made often, but not always, make the *TrRF* text more conservative than the previous reference edition, with a tendency, especially in Schultheiß's Accius edition, to obelise rather than to adopt conjectural emendations. In the Accius volume I have counted seventeen occasions on which Schultheiß obelises a part of the text that Dangel had sought to mend by adopting a conjecture. Occasionally, the changes made might be considered too conservative. Consider, for example, Accius *Chrysippus* F 135 *TrRF*, *melius pigrasse quam properasse est nefas*, 'it is better to hang back than to hasten towards crime'. In Schultheiß's text, for the line to scan as an iambic senarius, a hiatus must be posited between *properasse* and *est*, whereas accepting Lucian Müller's suggestion of *quoniam* or *quando* for *quam* would solve this problem.⁶ Another example is Accius F *inc.* 437 (= Schol. Bern. Verg. *Georg.* 1.502, pp. 883-

⁶ Müller 1888, I.224: see the discussion in Timpanaro, *Paideia* 51, 1996, 208-9.

4 Hagen), where the text as printed is difficult to construe, particularly if Accius' account of Trojan genealogy is thought to correspond to that at Hom. *Il.* 20.236-9: on another note, if we suppose that what lies behind the Bern scholion's prose are not iambs but hexameters, might we not entertain the possibility that the fragment belongs to Accius' *Annales*? Schierl, however, does not share this tendency to the same extent, and to cite some examples: in Pacuvius *Armorum iudicium* F 19.1 *TrRF*, *qui sese adfines esse ad causandum uolunt...* ('those who want to be involved in pleading a cause...' = F 22.1 Schierl 2006, *qui sese †adfinem† esse ad causandum uolunt*), Schierl goes back on her earlier decision to obelise the paradosis *adfinem* and now prints instead Iunius' *adfines* (1565, 290), which she previously had relegated to the critical apparatus. And at *Dulorestes* F 83 *TrRF*, *oro min<im>e flectas fandi me prolixitudine* ('I implore you to influence me as little as possible with your prolixity' = F 93 Schierl 2006, *oro †mi† ne flectas fandi me prolixitudine*), instead of obelising the paradosis, she prints a conjecture made by Ribbeck in the *corollarium* of his second edition of the comic fragments (1871-1873², II.cxx).

As to the critical apparatus, the nature of the project makes it impractical for the editors to consult manuscripts consistently, and so *TrRF* compensates by listing manuscript readings which they have not verified by autopsy according to how these readings are reported by earlier editors. In citing manuscript readings according to previous editors, *TrRF* makes large-scale use of a technique which seemingly derives from that employed by Lindsay in his 1913 edition of Festus and which consists of using superscript abbreviations to refer to manuscript readings as they have been reported by earlier editors.⁷ *TrRF* puts these superscript abbreviations between square brackets, so for example at Accius *Aegisthus* F 7 *TrRF* (*cui manus materno sordet sparso sanguine*, 'whose hand is soiled by his/her mother's spattered blood'), a fragment preserved by Nonius, the notation 'cum (manus) L^[Ri.1-2,Mu,On, Ri.3,Da]' means that the reading of the L manuscript of Nonius (= Leiden, Universiteitsbibliotheek, VLF 73) is reported as *cum* by Ribbeck in his first and second editions, Lucian Müller, Onions, Ribbeck in his third edition, and Dangel. While the decision not to consult manuscripts systematically is justifiable, it results in making the editor's claim to 'collate, document and *verify* the information found in editions and scholarly works that concerns the text of the tragic fragments' a questionable one (*TrRF* III and IV, xxiv, emphasis added): *TrRF*'s report of the manuscript readings in the 'Conspectus codicum' is only as accurate and as thorough as the recension of the editions on which they base their text.

If judged according to traditional norms, the critical apparatus of the *TrRF* edition is certainly unusual. Cluttered critical apparatuses are customarily singled

⁷ Lindsay uses this technique to report readings of the badly damaged F manuscript of Festus (Farnesianus, Naples IV.A.3) made by various other editors (e.g. F^u indicates the reading of the F manuscript as reported by Ursinus): see Lindsay 1913, xxvii.

out for criticism (R.J. Tarrant, *Texts, Editors, and Readers*, Cambridge 2016, 124-44'), and, despite the helpful list of the manuscripts that preserve the fragments (3.342-418; 4.641-718), a user interested in finding out about the relations between these manuscripts will likely want to consult the relevant critical edition anyway. In one extreme case, the critical apparatus extends to five pages' worth of variants (Accius *Philoctetes* F 334 *TrRF*), which some users might well consider excessive (compare the similarly lengthy apparatus of Ennius *Iphigenia* F 84 *TrRF* in Volume 1, pp. 177-82). But what the *TrRF* editors have given us is not a critical apparatus in the traditional sense. It could rather be described as the aggregate of the critical apparatuses of earlier editions, followed by what essentially amounts to a repertory of conjectures (one might compare the work of Billerbeck and Somazzi in their *Repertorium der Konjekturen in den Seneca-Tragödien*, Brill 2009). When viewed from this perspective, the momentous service that the editors have performed can be appreciated properly. A particularly positive aspect of the critical material appended to each fragment are the doxographical notes that summarise questions of interpretation and/or attribution relating to each individual fragment. These notes are to be found in the so-called 'CS' ('Conspectus studiorum'): concise yet thorough, they arguably constitute one of the most valuable contributions made by these editions. It must be nevertheless said, for the reasons outlined above as well as because it is written in Latin, the apparatus makes the user do a lot of work (I say more on this below).

I now turn to *TrRF*'s practice of presenting fragments according to 'the chronological sequence of the transmitting authors for each tragedy'. In abandoning any pretences of reconstructing plots and instead ordering the fragments by chronological order of the fragment's source, *TrRF* editors follow a practice which was invented, so far as I have been able to find, by Jocelyn. This method of presenting the fragments, which Jocelyn explains succinctly ('testes cuiusque tragoediae ratione fere temporum ordinaui', 1969², 66), represents a fundamental difference in approach to that canonized in the nineteenth century by Ribbeck, and was not adopted by editors of the Roman tragic fragments subsequent to Jocelyn (cf. e.g. Schierl 2006, 73-4). It has the significant advantage of curtailing the bias, inherent in attempting to reconstruct the plot of a lost Roman Republican tragedy, of making certain assumptions, for example about the degree of correspondence between these Roman plays and Greek tragedies, and, more generally, about the parameters of a genre of which not a single play survives in its entirety. In general, *TrRF*'s aim is, as Schierl formulates it, to 'refrain as far as possible from interpreting the fragments' (*TrRF* III.xli). Yet the approach of Jocelyn and *TrRF* is not without some problems of its own. One problem concerns fragments preserved by Cicero, and arises when lines by the same poet are quoted in close proximity on two or more occasions. One example of this is Accius *Atreus* F 103 and 104 *TrRF* (others are *Medea siue Argonautae* F 236 and *Philoctetes* F 331 and 334 *TrRF*). Each of these two fragments, which combined contain twenty lines of text, is subdivided into several parts numbered with Roman numerals (103.I, II, and III; 104.I and

II), the order of which corresponds to the chronological order of Cicero's works. For instance, lines which are quoted in the *Pro Sestio* (102), written in 56 BC, are presented before lines quoted in the *De officiis* (1.97), written in 44 BC. In the case of Atreus' famous statement *oderint, dum metuant*, which is quoted in both texts, the testimony of *Pro Sestio* trumps that of *De officiis*.

It must be said that this method of grouping fragments avoids having to reproduce in full the same passages of Cicero several times in a volume which, at 858 pages, is already large enough. But whether or not the quotation by Cicero of the same Accian lines within a single passage on more than one occasion warrants grouping those lines together within one and the same fragment is debatable. This method perhaps involves lending more weight to the testimony of Cicero than strictly necessary. Cicero may have had various purposes for quoting certain passages from tragedy together and we cannot assume that he had any regard for reflecting the order of lines in a dramatic script when doing so. Moreover, as Timpanaro already observed in his review of Jocelyn's Ennius, this method has the disadvantage of not taking into account information about the plot of Accius' *Atreus* which can be ascertained with a high degree of plausibility.⁸ For example, Schultheiß presents, within F 104 *TrRF*, first lines which must surely be spoken or sung by Thyestes after he has devoured his children (*ipsus hortatur me frater, ut meos malis miser | manderem natos*, 'My brother himself incites me, miserable, to chew my own sons with my jaws', F 104.I), and then what is clearly a speech by Atreus in which he is formulating a revenge plan, and which thus surely occurred earlier in the play (F 104.II). This way of presenting the evidence differs radically from earlier editions, in which the text had been printed as separate fragments (e.g. fr. II-V, v. 29-41 and fr. XVI, v. 57-8 Dangel), is potentially confusing for the reader, and problematic in so far as it does not reflect information about the plot which the editor himself endorses as plausible ('Hi versus e locis fabulae diversis hausti esse debent. Cum I verba Thyestis de cena contineat, II sunt versus Atrei de fratre', 4.174). Although this way of presenting the fragment conforms to *TrRF*'s policy, a middle ground between the excesses of plot reconstruction and such scepticism as that practised by *TrRF*, while difficult to achieve in practice, nevertheless appears desirable.

Overall, these new *TrRF* volumes highlight the challenges of presenting the fragments of Roman Republican tragedy (and to an extent those of any corpus of fragmentary ancient literature) in book format, and of doing so in a way which is accessible to a wider audience and not only to the experienced scholar. The creation of a critical apparatus which is as exhaustive as possible seems designed to counterbalance the conservative nature of the text, and to encourage users to think critically based on the fullest possible collection of evidence. But what

⁸ Timpanaro, *Gnomon* 40, 1968, 670 uses the expression 'indirizzo antiricostruttivistico' to describe Jocelyn's method, which G. D'Anna also comments on in his review of Jocelyn's edition (*Athenaeum* 47, 1969, 364-5).

exactly is the profile of the user *TrRF* has in mind? Even scholars who have experience in working with fragmentary Early Latin literature will struggle to use these editions, and furthermore their steep price will discourage many potential users. And yet despite these drawbacks, the thoroughness and quality of these editions spell a bright future for the study of Roman Republican tragedy. Since the editorial principles adopted by the *TrRF* series were conceived in 2012, the idea of producing digital editions of Classical texts has sparked the interest of many scholars. Much thought and constructive discussion has gone into identifying how exactly digital editions can enrich and make more accessible the study of Classical literature (Keeline, *CJ* 112, 2016, 342-63; Olson, *CJ* 114, 2019, 330-44; and Huskey and Cayless, *CJ* 117, 2022, 337-55), and, when it comes to the study of fragmentary literature, the value that a digital edition can add has been highlighted as particularly significant (Keeline 2016, 354-6). Presenting the fragments of Roman Republican tragedy in a digital format would enable a more digestible handling of the critical apparatus, and unlock its interactive potential by allowing users to visualise easily and quickly what the fragment would look like with a given conjectural emendation. The wealth of material that has been assembled supplies readers with, to borrow a phrase from E.J. Kenney, a ‘do-it-yourself kit’ to put together just about any version of the text (*CR* 19, 1969, 184). But beyond that, it could potentially have much greater benefits and contribute to enriching our understanding of some aspects of this almost entirely lost genre. For example, it could, depending on the level of flexibility built into the technology, enable users to bring together with the fragments of certain attribution those which are of uncertain play or even of uncertain authorship, giving them the liberty to arrange, modify, and compare fragments as they see fit. Fragments that have traditionally been assigned to other genres, such as comedy, could also be included, with the aim of fulfilling the objective, outlined recently by Deufert (*MD* 91, 2023, at 41-63) of achieving a more nuanced appreciation of the frontiers between different genres of Republican literature. These *TrRF* editions have laid crucial foundations by providing a remarkably reliable basis on which those who might wish to take an innovative approach to these fragments can rely.

Both volumes are well produced. I noticed only a couple of small mistakes: at 4.160, ‘F 435’ should presumably read ‘F 437’; and at 4.165, the list of witnesses to Accius *Atreus* F 103.I.1 should read ‘a, b’ and not ‘a, b, c’. As indicated above, I include here, for the benefit of those readers who are interested, a list of differences between these two new *TrRF* editions and the previous standard editions of Pacuvius and Accius by Schierl (2006) and Dangel (1995) respectively. When referencing conjectural emendations I cite by name, year of publication, and page number: full references can be found in the various bibliographies of the volumes themselves.

Pacuvius: *contulit* L F 1.6 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 170 M = 250: *contuit* F 3.6 Schierl, a conjecture by Vossius (*apud* Scriverius 1620, 5-6); *frendo* F 10 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 447 M = 717 L: *frendendo* F 11 Schierl,

a conjecture by D'Anna (1967, 52); *sin* F 14 *TrRF*, with Welsh's (2015, 441) conjecture: *si non* F 30 Schierl; *ad fines* F 19.1 *TrRF*: †*adfinem*† F 22.1 Schierl, here Schierl has gone back on her decision to obelise and accepted Iunius' (1565, 290) conjecture; at F 56.1 *TrRF*, Schierl decides to include at the beginning of the text of the fragment the words †*proaerenda*† *gratia*, which in her previous edition (F 72 Schierl) she had considered as belonging to Festus; *propteruo* F 71 *TrRF*: *proteruo* F 101 Schierl; *minime* F 83 *TrRF*, adopting a conjecture made by Ribbeck in the *corollarium* of his second edition of the comic fragments, 1871-1873, II.cxx: †*mi*† *ne* F 93 Schierl; at F 106 *TrRF* (= 142 Schierl), she decides against printing *refutant* as she had done in her earlier edition on the basis of Festus' testimony (p. 346 L) that Pacuvius used that verb in this fragment; at F 117 *TrRF* (= 120 Schierl) she removes the obeli from *subaxet* (in spite of her explanation at 2006, 291 that the expected form would be *subaxit*, by analogy with *axim* = *egerim*, used by Pacuvius at F 184 *TrRF* = Nonius p. 812 L = 505 M); at F 130 *TrRF* (= 143 Schierl), she does not print *ab eo* <...> at the beginning of the text of the fragment as she had done previously and instead now considers these to be the words of Festus; at F 163 *TrRF* (= 180 Schierl) she removes the obeli from *exa*<...>; *inde aduenio montem Aetnam* F 172 *TrRF*, reflecting the word order in the manuscripts of Nonius, p. 329 L = 223 M, despite, as Schierl notes, the fact that it violates Meyer's law: *inde Aetnam montem aduenio* F 194 Schierl (the text of Ribbeck²⁻³); at F 207 *TrRF* (= 246 Schierl), though she had previously printed the fragment over two lines, she now she prints the fragment as one single iambic octonarius, accepting the argument of Welsh (2015, 440-1) regarding Festus' tendency to quote metrically complete verses; at F 208.1 *TrRF* (= 240.1 Schierl), another fragment preserved by Festus, she chooses to print, and to obelise, the paradosis, whereas in her earlier edition she had accepted the solution proposed by Bücheler–Ribbeck (*apud* Ribbeck², I.119); *perrogitando* F 222 *TrRF*: *perrogitando* <est> F 231 Schierl; at F 225 *TrRF* (= 262 Schierl), she prints the order of lines 4-5 found in the manuscripts of *Rhet. Her.*, whereas in her earlier edition she had adopted the transposition proposed by Ribbeck¹, 105; at F 225.8 *TrRF* she prints the paradosis *sed temeritate omnia regi*, whereas in her earlier edition she herself had decided to remove *sed*; at F 225.11 *TrRF* (= 262.11 Schierl), whereas in her first edition she had obelised †*nempe re ergo id fructu*† *Forte*..., she now removes the obeli, deletes *rem* (the reading of the best manuscripts at *Rhet. Her.* 2.23.36, 1.219.5 Calboli according to Calboli's 2020 recension), and, following Calboli, adds Marx's (1923², 56) conjecture *hau* before *Forte*; *atque* F 233 *TrRF*: *ad* (a conjecture by Ribbeck², 123) F 267 Schierl; at F 240 *TrRF* (= 272 Schierl), she prints the manuscript reading *neque* rather than Lachmann's conjecture *nec*, and removes the obeli from the unmetrical *reficere* (printing an interrogation mark next to the identification of the metre as *tr*⁷); at F 253 *TrRF* (= 278 Schierl), she prints the fragment in one line rather than in two; *plures* F 266 *TrRF*: <com>*plures* (a conjecture by Bergk 1874, 273) F 175 Schierl; at F 269 *TrRF* she does not print D'Anna's *Cepheo* but instead obelises

the paradosis †*Calefo*†; she prints F 281 *TrRF* (= 297 Schierl) within one line and marks the metre as uncertain rather than printing it over two lines as an anapaestic quaternarius. I have also observed a punctuation change which impacts meaning at F 225.10-11 (...*modo* | *naufragio*.) = 262.4-7 Schierl (...*modo*. | *naufragio*...).

Accius: at F 10 *TrRF* (= v. 314-16 D), Schultheiß prints the monosyllabic *sic* at line end, which had been bracketed by D (after Vossius *apud* Scriverius 1620, 127), as the first word of the fragment; <*m*>*eorum nulla est liberum* F 22 *TrRF*, with Bothe's (1837, 252) *simitu* and Vossius' <*m*>*eorum* for the manuscripts' *simeta* and *eorum* respectively: *horum* <*me*> *ulta est liberum* v. 632 D, *horum* and *ulta* are Dangel's conjectures: she translates 'quand, conjointement, la pitié même, éprouvée pour ces enfants, m'a vengée', whereas Schultheiß's text would translate to 'when at the same time there is no pity for my children'; *tuo* F 29 *TrRF*, the manuscript reading at Festus p. 208 L): *suo* v. 634 D, a conjecture by Agustin; *cedo*, | *ecquid hic redhostit* †*uiam, quo metem*† *obiectet facilius* F 30 *TrRF*: *cedo! ecquid hic redhostit* <*in*> *uicem? comitem obliget* | *facilius*, v. 649-50 D, Schultheiß, sceptical as to both text and metre, prefers to obelise what cannot be reconstructed with a high degree of plausibility from the testimonies of Nonius and Festus combined; *circos* F 42 *TrRF*: *circlos* v. 380 D, Schultheiß sides with Mercier's *circos* (at Nonius p. 20 M = 30 L) rather than with *circlos*, a conjecture attributed by Ribbeck² (148-9) to Bücheler, for transmitted *circulos*; *ad*<*ductum*> *dubitare* F 47 *TrRF*: *ad*<*ire*> *dubitare* v. 392 D, Dangel had accepted Bücheler's *ad*<*ire*> (*apud* Ribbeck², 150), but Schultheiß prefers Onions' (1895, 214) *ad*<*ductum*> *dubitare*: the manuscripts of Nonius (p. 175 M = 256 L) are split between *aut dubitare* and *addubitare*, but two more syllables are needed if the line beginning with *aut* is thought to be an iambic senarius; †*immanitate habet*† F 49 *TrRF*: *immane te* v. 384 D, Dangel accepts the reading *immane te* found in the Aldine edition of Nonius, but Schultheiß prefers to obelise the paradosis; *piget* F 52.2 *TrRF*: *pudet pigetque* v. 390 D, Dangel prints *pudet pigetque* which she claims to have found in the *P* manuscript of Nonius, Parisinus lat. 7667 (but, having checked a digitised version of that manuscript, its reading is in fact clearly only *pudet*, f. 89v, so Dangel appears to have inserted *pigetque* on the basis of an incorrect MS reading), while Schultheiß prints *piget*, a reading found in the 1513 Aldine edition of Perotti's *Cornucopia* (col. 1385), for *pudet*, apparently on the grounds that otherwise the text of the fragment does not contain the word *piget*, which features in the lemma; at F 55 *TrRF* (= v. 393 D), Schultheiß chooses not to print, as Dangel does, *peream* as the last word of the line, an addition by Ribbeck² (149); *huc id uenio* F 57 *TrRF*: *hucin uenio* v. 250 D, Schultheiß prints Vossius' conjecture (*apud* Scriverius 1620, 134) instead of transmitted *huc inuenio*, which cannot stand as a verb of motion is needed, and thus rejects Dangel's proposition *hucin uenio*, which would turn the sentence into an interrogation; *deum summus rex hominibus curat* F 66.2 *TrRF*: *deum supremus rex* <*res*> *curat hominibus* v. 582 D, Schultheiß follows Kaster's edition of Macrobius in printing *deum supremus*, the reading of the N manuscript (Naples,

V. B. 10), rather than *deum summus* with the rest of the manuscripts, as Dangel does; Schultheiß prefers Bücheler's conjecture (*apud Ribbeck*², 154) *hominibus* to the transmitted *omnibus*, which is accepted by Kaster; and whereas Dangel had accepted Ribbeck²'s (154) addition of *res* and inversion of *curat* and *hominibus* so as to turn the line into a complete trochaic septenarius, Schultheiß prefers to keep the transmitted word order and the line as metrically incomplete; the text and metre of F 68 *TrRF* are different to that of v. 179-80 Dangel: whereas Dangel considers the fragment a trochaic septenarius, Schultheiß prints it as a trochaic octonarius, and whereas Dangel accepts Quicherat's *ubi...ubi...* (1872, 73), Schultheiß prefers the paradosis *ubi...ibi...*; Dangel had printed *acerbast* <*incerto*> *tibi*, adopting Bücheler's *acerbast* (*apud Ribbeck*², 156) and Soubiran's addition of *incerto* (*apud Dangel* 145), but Schultheiß prints *acerba*, [t]ibi, following the removal of *t* in the 1513 Aldine edition of Perotti's *Cornucopia*, col. 609; and finally whereas prints *fortuna sit* which has manuscript authority, Schultheiß accepts Lindsay's conjecture *fortuna* <*hae*>*sit*; at F 71.1 *TrRF* (= v. 177 D), Schultheiß obelises the paradosis †*ocule*†, whereas Dangel prints Hermann's ([1838] 1839, 372) conjecture *occulta*, and whereas Dangel considered the first line of the fragment as a trochaic septenarius and the second as a trochaic octonarius, Schultheiß lists both as trochaic octonarii; the text of F 77 *TrRF* (*sed it*<*a*> *Achilli inclutis armis uesci studet*, | *ut ea cuncta optima [achilli inclyto] leuia prae illis putet*) and v. 161-2 D (<*Dicto*> *sedit* <*ita*> *Achilli; armis incletis uesci studet* | *ut [ea] cuncta optima atque illata leuia* <*iam*> *prae illis putet*, 'Il s'en est tenu ainsi à la décision d'Achille ; il brûle de manier les célèbres armes, au point de considérer toutes les autres, qui sont excellentes et qu'on lui a proposées, désormais sans valeur, comparées à celles-là !') differ quite substantially: Dangel, for example, prints her own suppletions *dicto* and *ita*, as well as her own conjectural emendation *illata leuia* for the paradosis *achilli inclyto* (obelised by Schultheiß); and whereas Dangel had innovatively turned both lines into trochaic septenarii, Schultheiß tentatively endorses the more traditional interpretation of the metre as *cr⁴*; *inbutos* F 80 *TrRF*: *inbutus* v. 168 D, with Bothe's conjecture (1823, 178) on the basis of a perceived reference to Ajax; at F 81 *TrRF* (= v. 166 D), Dangel had accepted Hermann's ([1838] 1839, 369) addition *nullum* <*mi*> *est probrum; ab domu*<*m*> *itione arce tu*<*o*> *obscene omine* F 87 *TrRF*, where *domum itione* is Ribbeck²'s conjecture (158): *ab domuitione arce ex tuo obscene omine*, where *domuitione* the reading of the 1513 Aldine edition of Perotti's *Cornucopia* (col. 1360); and *arce ex* is Dangel's own conjecture; *repertus* F 89.4 *TrRF*, Mercier's conjecture (1614, II.195) for manuscripts' *repertur*: *refertur* v. 276 D, Dangel's own conjecture; *prorepens* F 95.1 *TrRF*, Bothe's conjecture (1823, 181) for the corrupt paradosis *properantem* copied by mistake from the following line: *prope euntem* v. 279 D, Dangel's own conjecture, endorsed as plausible by Timpanaro 1996, 206; at F 97 *TrRF*, Schultheiß prefers to obelise the paradosis †*grauem hostium*† than to accept Dangel's conjecture *granum tostum*, 'un grain torréfié' (note that Lindsay had

obelised the whole line, at Nonius p. 315 M = 493 L); *an dubito, ha* F 102 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 524 M = 843 L: *ah! dubito; ah!* v. 432 D, the text at *Cornucopia*, 1513 Aldine edition, col. 1423; *fregisti* F 106.1 *TrRF*, the reading of the ξ branch of Cicero's *De officiis* in Winterbottom's recension: *fregistin* v. 60 D, the reading of the 'Bern.d' manuscript according to Ribbeck, and although Dangel attributes the reading to Graevius, but Graevius in his 1710 edition of Cicero's *De officiis* prints *fregisti* (p. 368), the reading *fregistin* having seemingly first been adopted in a critical edition by Heusinger (1783, 772); *in focos* F 108.2 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 210 M = 310 L: *in foco* v. 52 D, the conjecture of Bergk (1835, 82), misattributed since Ribbeck¹, 139 to Vossius; †*irrideris nobis* [...] *stipe*† F 114.1 *TrRF*, the corrupt paradosis of Festus p. 214 L, metre undefined: *irridens <leniter> | nobis stupe<factis sese>* v. 418-19 D, the text of Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 169), who identified the metre as an iambic senarius; *ec* [...] *egum aut al* [...] *nus* F 115 *TrRF*, the corrupt paradosis of Festus p. 412 L: *ec<quem stipitem abi>egnum aut al<neum>* v. 429 D, the text of Ursinus in his 1581 edition of Festus, p. 123; †*tumultu*† F 125.2 *TrRF*, a word introduced by error which was corrected in the margin of the archetype according to Lindsay, at Nonius p. 467 M = 749 L: *turbida | insania*, Dangel's conjecture, following scholars since the 1513 Aldine edition of Perotti's *Cornucopia*, col. 1402 which attributed to Accius the word *insania* in the following quotation of Turpilium; the text of F 133 *TrRF* (v. 23-4 D), preserved by Festus (p. 320 L), is radically different in each edition. Schultheiß prints the same text as Klotz, in iambic senarii: *neque quisquam a telis uacuus, sed ut cuique obuam | fuerat, ferrum, alius saxi r<a>udu<s> m<iserat>*, with Ribbeck²'s (196) *ut* for *uti*, which is misattributed to Klotz by both Dangel and *TrRF*, Müller's (1880², 264) *saxi* (or *saxeum*) *raudus*, and Ribbeck²'s (170) *miserat*: whereas Dangel prints the text as trochaic septenarii: *neque <erat> quisquam a telis uacuus, sed uti cui quicque obuam | fuerat, ferrum, uallus, saxi <rodus>, rudus <sumpserat>* ('et personne n'était à court de projectiles ; mais tout ce qui tombait sous la main, soc, van, bloc rocheux, plâtras, était de mise'), with Ribbeck¹'s (143) addition of *<erat>* and his *cui quicque* for the manuscript's *cuique*, her own conjectures *ferrum uallus* for the manuscript's *ferrum alius* and *saxi <rodus> rudus <sumpserat>* for the manuscript's †*saxio rudem*† (*alius saxi raudus sumpserat* had already been proposed by Müller 1880², 264); at F 135 *TrRF* (= v. 27 D) Schultheiß rejects Bothe's (1823, 193) *quamde* for *quam*, which had been accepted by Dangel; at F 136 *TrRF* (= v. 25 D), Schultheiß attributes *certe* to speaker 1 (following Bothe [1823, 193] who first suggested that there were two different speakers), Dangel to speaker 2 (following Ribbeck¹, 144): and Schultheiß accepts Onions's (*apud* Lindsay 398) *id quidem*, whereas Dangel prints *certe idem*; at F 153.1 *TrRF* (= v. 550 D), Schultheiß prints the manuscripts' (of both Festus and Nonius) *me*, whereas Dangel prints Müller's (1861, 442) *med*; *me* †*cumago*† F 165.2 *TrRF*, the corrupt manuscript reading according to Keil at Charisius, *Gramm.* I.288 *GLK*: *mecum agere* v. 599 D, Bücheler *apud* Ribbeck², 175; *eloquere propere* F 167 *TrRF*, with Stephanus'

(1564, 21) *propere* for *proprie*, the reading of the L manuscript after correction at Nonius p. 16 M = 23 L): *loquere proprie* v. 600 D, with Bücheler's (*apud* Ribbeck², 176) *loquere* for the manuscripts' *eloquere*; at F 171.1 *TrRF* (= v. 586 D) Schultheiß rejects Dangel's addition of the interjection *o* at the beginning of the line (after Rosellini 1996, 116-17); at F 174 *TrRF* (= v. 601 D) Schultheiß rejects Dangel's addition of the interjection *o* at the beginning of the line (which Dangel seems wrongly to attribute to D'Antò, who had proposed to add an *o* later in the line), and Schultheiß also prints †*camo*† *collum grauem* whereas Dangel prints *camo* <*uide*> *collum grauem* ('Vois ! ce carcan qui pèse à son cou !') with the addition of Ribbeck², 176; *Martes* F 182 *TrRF*, the reading of the *N* manuscript of Charisius at p. 160 Barwick = 1.126 *GLK*: *Mauortes* v. 157 D, the conjecture of Ribbeck², 178; at F 187.1 *TrRF* (= v. 153 D) Schultheiß considers plausible, but does not print, Quicherat's addition of *cum* at the beginning of the line, which had been accepted by Dangel; †*studitos*† F 195 *TrRF*, the corrupt paradosis at Nonius p. 499 M = 802 L: *studiosos* v. 139 D, the conjecture of Soubiran (*apud* Dangel 1995, 136); F 197 *TrRF* (= v. 152 D) is different in both text and metre, with Schultheiß printing *lucifera lampade exurat Iouis | abietem*, with Hermann's ([1833a] 1834, 154) *abietem* for *arietem*, and listing the fragment as of uncertain metre, and Dangel printing a single iambic senarius *lucifera lampade abietem exurat Iouis*, changing the word order following Bothe (1823, 202) and Ribbeck², 179; *si me [esse]* F 198 *TrRF*, with *esse* bracketed by Del Río 1593, I.136: *si inceste* v. 320 D, Dangel's own conjecture, translating 'mais alors si Égisthe avait commis un inceste dans le même lit que son père', cf. Warmington's translation 'But if in such a case Aegisthus had companioned me in the same bed as the father'; *exanguie est...mihi* F 199 *TrRF*, the text and word order in the manuscripts of Nonius at p. 159 M = 235 L: *est exanguie...mi* v. 319 D, the text and word order proposed by Bothe (1823, 204); *adstituere* F 201.2 *TrRF*, the reading of most manuscripts at Nonius p. 315 M = 492 L: *adstituerat* v. 322 D, the conjecture of Ribbeck¹, 120; the text and metre of F 203 *TrRF* is different to that of v. 318 D: Schultheiß lists the metre as uncertain and prints *adsentio: age nunc tu tuam progeniem ex ordine*, with *ex* the reading of Agustin for manuscripts' *et*, whereas Dangel prints <*Egone*>? *adsentio: nunc age tu tuam progeniem ede ordine*, with *egone* being her own conjecture, the inversion of the words *age* and *nunc* also her own intervention, and *ede* the conjecture of Mercier (1614, 2.202); *locorum* F 204 *TrRF*, Bothe's suggestion (1823, 204) for most manuscripts' *locronum* at Nonius p. 497 M = 799 L: *lucorum* v. 317 D, the conjecture of Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 142); at F 206.5 *TrRF* (= v. 364 D), Schultheiß rejects the attribution to Accius, initially suggested by Nieberding (1838, 25) and adopted by Warmington, Klotz, and Dangel, of the words *summo ingenio praeditum* (Cic. *Sest.* 121); the text at F 213 *TrRF* (= v. 325-6 D) changes in two places, *sciat* F 213.1 *TrRF*, the manuscript reading at Nonius p. 111 M = 158 L: *sciet* v. 325 D, a conjecture by Stephanus (1564, 24), and *quin* F 213.2 *TrRF*, a conjecture by Stephanus (1564, 24): *qui* v. 326 D, the reading of some manuscripts, others have *quiqui; inu<i>sita | tam* F

216.1-2 *TrRF*, a conjecture by Müller 1868, 430 (*sic*: 1888, 340) for manuscripts' *inuitatam* or *inuitatem*: *inuisito* | *tam* v. 329 D, the proposition of Bothe (1823, 208); †*diffidamantem necidere*† F 217.1 *TrRF*, the corrupt paradosis of Nonius p. 230 M = 341-2 L according to Lindsay: *discidia amantem nectier* v. 367 D, with *discidia amantem* the proposition of Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 181) and *nectier*, Dangel's own conjecture; F 220 *TrRF* contains two differences from v. 350-1 D: *nam ea* F 220.1 *TrRF*, the manuscript reading at Nonius p. 267 M = 408 L: *nam uana* v. 350 D, Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 180) and *dum id* F 220.2 *mTrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 267 M = 408 L: *dum illud* v. 351 D, Ritschl *apud* Lange 1851, 5; at F 222 *TrRF* (v. 333 D), Schultheiß does not accept Dangel's addition of another *atque* at the beginning of the line, and he lists the line as '*ia/tr*' whereas Dangel lists it as an incomplete trochaic septenarius; *adstas* F 229 *TrRF*, with Mercier's proposal for transmitted *adistas*: *adsistas* v. 334 D, with Gerlach's conjecture (Gerlach–Roth 1842, 358); <*ex*>*ortum* F 235 *TrRF*, following Ribbeck²'s (186) proposal of adding *ex*-. <*int*>*ortum* v. 379 D, Dangel's own conjecture, translating 'en quelles contrées donc disaient-ils que tu as été enchaîné?'; *sicut inciti* F 236.13 *TrRF*, the manuscript reading at Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.89, though it is obelised by Ax–Plasberg: Schultheiß 345 cites D'Antò's point (1980, 363) that *inciti* can stand as long as one posits hiatus with *atque*: *sicut citati* v. 479 D, the conjecture of Warmington 2.458; *qui nos* F 241.2 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 159 M = 234 L, Schultheiß preferring the reading *qui* of *GH²* to *quis* of *H¹LFE*: *quis oues* v. 485 D, *oues* is Dangel's own conjecture, *quis oues pascet postea?*, translating 'Qui, après cela, fera paître les brebis?', cf. Warmington's 'who will pasture you ([reading *uos*] thereafter?'; *in stabuleis* F 244 *TrRF*, the reading at Nonius p. 307 M = 478 L of MS *Urb.307* adopted by Lindsay: *in stabulo* v. 489 D, a reading attributed by Dangel to MS *G* (= Gudianus, Wolfenbüttel 96), by Lindsay/Schultheiß to Grotemeyer (1851, 43); *horret* F 247.2 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 422 M = 638 L: *horreret* v. 487 D, Bothe's (1823, 213) conjecture; at F 255 *TrRF* (= v. 527 D), Dangel accepts Vossius' addition (*apud* Scriverius 1620, 164) of <*ea*>, but Schultheiß rejects it (this does not affect the metre); *cum hic* F 256 *TrRF*, the order in MSS at Nonius p. 15 M = 22 L: *hic cum* v. 537 D, Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck³, 223); *pop*<*u*>*lit*<*um*> *cursum* F 271 *TrRF*, where *populitum* is Lindsay's conjecture on the basis of the *editio princeps*' *poplitum*: *poplitum* <*tuum*> *cursum* v. 521 D, with Ribbeck¹'s (165) addition; at F 272.I (= v. 503 D), Schultheiß, after Klotz, obelises the paradosis †*acuuum*†, whereas Dangel does not, translating *corpus acuuum* 'les piquants de son corps'; *ortum* F 280 *TrRF*: *ortam* v. 398 D, Schultheiß sides with the reading of the MSS of Macrobius, Dangel with that of those of Priscian; *Atr*<*ida*>*e* F 283.2 *TrRF*, the conjecture of Hermann ([1833a] 1834, 141) for the corrupt MS reading *atre* or *etre* at Nonius p. 137 M = 200 L: *taetre* v. 120 D, the conjecture of Bothe (1823, 221); at F 292 *TrRF* (= v. 193 D), Schultheiß prints the line as an iambic senarius and rejects Dangel's addition of <*te limo*> ('mieux vaudrait te parer <de la bande de pourpre>...') at the beginning of the line to turn it into a trochaic septenarius;

the text of F 297 *TrRF* and v. 192 D are quite different in each edition: Schultheiß prints *ita ut dixi, macte his armis, macte uirtutei patris*, with Mercier's *ita ut dixi* (for a corrupt paradosis in which the beginning of the line is mixed up with the title of the play) and Ribbeck²'s (*Coroll.* 1871-1873, I.lx) *virtutei*, and Dangel *tu, ut dixi, macte his armisque macta uirtutem patris!* 'Toi, comme je l'ai dit, magnifie magnifiquement l'excellence de ton père, avec eux et avec ses armes !', with Ribbeck¹'s (167) *tu, his armisque* with Lindsay's *B⁴* branch of Nonian MSS, Bothe's (1823, 223) *macta*, and *uirtutem*, the reading of the *D⁴* branch of Nonian MSS in Lindsay's recension; *ascendit †hora†* F 304 *TrRF*, printing *ascendit* from a paradosis which is difficult to parse because *scindit* or *scandit* are also possible readings, and following Klotz and earlier Onions who had obelised *hora*: <etsi a>*scendit aura* v. 129 D, with her own addition *etsi* and Palmer's *aura* (*apud* Gruter 1602-1634, IV.778); the text of F 311 *TrRF* = v. 127-8 D is different: Schultheiß prints the fragment over one line and marks the metre as uncertain, *classis †aditcladitur†, feruit*, with the obelised reading of MS L of Nonius, whereas Dangel prints, over two lines marked as 'ia⁶/tr⁷', *classis adit <clam>; clauditur; | feruit* ('La flotte approche dans l'ombre ; elle est bloquée ; c'est le branle-bas') with her own addition of *clam* and the reading *clauditur* which she attributes to MS F (= Florence, Biblioteca Medicea Laurenziana, Plut. 48.1); *ferre* F 319.1 *TrRF*: *fer te* v. 9 D, *fer te* is reported by Ribbeck as a manuscript reading, it is attributed by Dangel to Gerlach (Gerlach–Roth 1842, 268), but it is printed already by Bothe (1823, 226); at F 332 *TrRF*, Schultheiß does not consider as part of the fragment a passage of Cicero (*Fin.* 5.32) which Hermann ([1824] 1828, 121) first tried to turn into verse (*uitam sagittarum aucupio propaginat*) and which Madvig in his 1876 revised third edition of Cicero's *De finibus* (p. 663) attributed to Accius. Ribbeck³ and Warmington did not include this line as part of the fragment, but Dangel does include it, as the first line of the fragment and in the following form: *propagat uitam suam sagittis aucupans* (*suam sagittis aucupans* is Dangel's conjecture); *esse, †sam† inmani* F 343 *TrRF*: *esse usam inmani* v. 241 D, Dangel's own conjecture; *†ledo†* F 349 *TrRF*, the paradosis at Festus p. 488 L: *lecto* v. 460 D, K.O. Müller's (1880², 356) conjecture; *magna sonantibus* F 354.1 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 463 M = 742 L: *stagna tonantibus* v. 457 D, *stagna* is Bentley's conjecture (1733, 475), *tonantibus* is Bergk's (*apud* Ribbeck¹, 179)); *subit* F 367.1 *TrRF*, Ribbeck¹'s (182) conjecture for paradosis *ubi: obit* v. 571 D, Mercier's (1614, 398) conjecture, with which Dangel translates 'elle parcourt en ce moment vos remparts'; *†subidae de loide lore†* F 374 *TrRF*, the obelised paradosis (see Lindsay's apparatus): *cum subito e deliro dolore* v. 402 D, with Iunius' (1565, 364) *subito, e deliro* attributed, seemingly wrongly, by Dangel to Vossius, and Dangel's own *dolore; tu[a]* F 382 *TrRF*, the *a* deleted after Müller (1888, 343): *tua* v. 98 D; *mihi* F 387 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 503 M = 808 L: *Mysii* v. 93 D, Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 218); *nouus †nouo dabunt†* F 399.1 *TrRF*, obelised by Schultheiß after the Gatti–Mazzacane–Salvadori edition of Nonius, deleted by Lindsay: *nouus <non> notus Daulide* v. 452 D, Dangel's

own conjecture; *famam, nam* F 400 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 467 M = 749 L: *famae enim* v. 454 D, with *famae* a conjecture by Grotius (no reference given), and Ribbeck²'s (219) conjecture); †*quini Dircaeo fontei aduenient, mundule*† F 401.1 *TrRF*, Schultheiß follows Lindsay in obelising the first line, Lindsay even obelises *nitidantur* the first word of the next line: *quin e Dircaeo fonte aduenient; mundule* v. 399 D, with Dangel's own conjecture *quin e* and Del Río's (1593, I.185) *Dircaeo; nocturna[m]* F 402 *TrRF*, with Scriverius' (1620, 149) deletion of the *m*: *nunc tornans* v. 288 D, Dangel's own conjecture; *bigis... | †cepit† signis* F 414.2-3 *TrRF*, where *bigis* is the MS reading at Varro, *Ling.* 7.14 (for a defence of which see Timpanaro 1996, 216-17) and *signis* is Scaliger's conjecture (1565, 129): *bis qui... | sepit spatiis* v. 712-13 D, where *bis qui* and *sepit* are Nosarti's conjectures (1976, 69-70) and *spatiis* Dangel's own; *patefit* F 416 *TrRF*, the reading of MS F at Varro, *Ling.* 7.50: *patescit* v. 714 D, the reading of MS H; *rite ad patri [...] set* F 423 *TrRF*: <si> *rite ad patri*<am sospes rediis>*set <suam>* v. 725 D, Bothe's suppletion (1823, 250), with *suam* added by Ribbeck¹ (192); *praeferuido<que> fulgore | ... dextra* F 428.1-2 *TrRF*, with Klotz's *praeferuido<que> fulgore*, following Bücheler (*apud* Ribbeck², 220) who proposed *fulgure*, and the manuscripts' *dextra: fulguri praeferuido | ... dextera* v. 702-3 D, with Ribbeck²'s (220) *fulguri praeferuido* and Scriverius' (1620, 152) *dextera*, attributed by Ribbeck² to Bücheler); *ariuga* F 434 *TrRF*: *aruiga* F inc. XXXVII D; at F 437 *TrRF*, Schultheiß rejects Ritschl's (1857, 495-6) attempt to fit in Capys as the father of Anchises, which is accepted by Dangel; †*tesauri*† F 443 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 206 M = 303 L: *tensae <atque> ori* v. 723 D, which is Ribbeck¹'s (191) text; *essis* F praet. 8 *TrRF*, the MS reading at Nonius p. 200 M = 295 L: *est is* v. 691 D, Vossius' conjecture (*apud* Scriverius 1620, 125); *ni[hi]il* F praet. 11 *TrRF*, *-hi-* is deleted by Agustín: *nihil* v. 682 D; *in re tanta...improuisa* F praet. 14.15 *TrRF*, where *in re tanta* is the paradosis at Cic. *Div.* 1.46, *improuisa* Bothe's conjecture (1823, 191) for *improuiso: rem tantam... improuiso* v. 665 D, where *rem tantam* is Neukirch's conjecture (1833, 86); *quod ad dexteram* F praet. 14.20 *TrRF*: *quod [ad] dexterum* v. 670 D, *dexterum* is Vossius' conjecture (*apud* Scriverius 1620, 144), but there is nothing in the apparatus regarding the deletion of *ad*; *fiat* F praet. 15 *TrRF*, the conjecture of Pomponius Laetus in his 1471 edition of Varro, f. 10r: *chuat* v. 673 D, a conjecture by Scaliger (1575, xlvii).

A few other noteworthy details: F 167 *TrRF* (= v. 600 D) is marked by Schultheiß as an incomplete cretic quaternarius (*cr^d*), a trochee missing at the beginning of the line, whereas it is marked by Dangel as a complete *cr^d*; F 174 *TrRF* (= v. 601 D) is turned by Dangel into a trochaic septenarius, but the metre is marked as uncertain by Schultheiß; F 211 *TrRF* is marked as a complete iambic senarius by Schultheiß, but as a trochaic septenarius missing its initial trochee by Dangel; F 235 *TrRF* (= v. 329 D) is marked as '*ia/tr*' by Schultheiß but as an iambic senarius with an iamb missing in the first foot by Dangel; the change of punctuation at F 248 *TrRF* = v. 483 D somewhat changes the sense, too: Schultheiß prints *ego me*

extollo in abietem, alte ex tuto prospectum aucupo (cf. Warmington's translation, 'Myself into a fir-tree I uplift | And from safe vantage-point I catch an outlook', while Dangel prints *ego me extollo in abietem alte, ex tuto prospectum aucupo*, thus taking *alte* with *extollo*: 'Moi, je me hisse sur un sapin, à son faite ; en toute sécurité, je scrute l'horizon'); F 336 *TrRF* was not included as a fragment by Dangel (= v. 561 Ribbeck³ = 569 Warmington); the same goes for F 435, a 'new' one-line fragment of Accius preserved at Varro, *Ling.* 6.80 where Kent (1938, 1.246) restored the name *Acci* based on the transmitted *atti*: this fragment is not found in Ribbeck's, Warmington's, or Dangel's editions, but Schultheiß it includes on the basis of De Melo's (2019, 880) scansion of the line as an iambic senarius; similarly, F 440 and 441 *TrRF* are in Ribbeck but not in Dangel.

BASIL L. P. NELIS
 Universiteit Leiden
 b.l.p.nelis@hum.leidenuniv.nl

CRISTIAN TOLSA, *The Orphic astrologer Critodemus. Fragments with annotated translation and commentary*, Untersuchungen zur antiken Literatur und Geschichte 155, Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, 2023, xviii+252, pp., 99,95€, ISBN 978-3-22-132876-8.

El libro rescata de un largo olvido la obra y las aportaciones de un autor, el astrólogo Critodemo, de cuyos fragmentos no existía una edición independiente, sino que solo era accesible a través de sus fuentes, en especial Vecio Valente y el *Catalogus Codicum Astrologorum Graecorum*.

Cristian Tolsa (a partir de ahora T.) se ha ocupado de recopilar, editar, traducir y comentar los vestigios de Critodemo y recompone con ellos la figura de un autor órfico que consideraba la astrología como una revelación divina.

En el "Preface" (pp. xi-xiv) T. hace una primera presentación del autor, su relación con el ámbito órfico y el tipo de transmisión de los textos astrológicos, en especial el papel que desempeña en ella Vecio Valente; asimismo esboza la configuración del libro y las características de su edición, en particular, señalando la escasa adecuación a un autor como este de la tradicional distribución testimonios – fragmentos.

En la "Introduction" (pp. 1-16), concisa y bien documentada, T. sitúa a Critodemo en la tradición de textos astrológicos que se inicia en Mesopotamia (donde se producen innovaciones metodológicas cruciales, como el zodiaco y los esquemas matemáticos sofisticados para la predicción de las posiciones del sol, la luna y los planetas) y se desarrolla en el Egipto helenístico a partir de 150 a.C. T. data a Critodemo con la ayuda del *terminus ante quem* de Marco Terencio Varrón y el *terminus post quem* del poema de Necepsos/Petosiris, lo que lo sitúa entre