
APPENDIX

ROMAN TRAGEDIES LISTED BY DRAMATIST, LATIN AND GREEK PRECURSORS, AND DATE/OCCASION OF PRODUCTION

Placing the tragedies of the Latin dramatists into a dramatic sequence creates an artificial line of development. Due to the silence of ancient sources concerning the dates of production for most plays, there is no way of knowing with any certainty the order of composition of plays by contemporary dramatists. Also, it is difficult to tell at times whether the titles of the plays listed are multiple listings of the same play. Therefore, the plays of each dramatist are listed in alphabetical order.

The word "precursor" here does not imply adaptation of the whole play or a deliberate imitation on the part of the Latin dramatist; rather, it means that Latin and Greek plays of the same title or similar themes were perhaps known to the dramatist and to the audience. Latin precursors are listed first, contrary to the customary practice of citing Greek models before Latin ones, since these were more recently seen on the Roman stage and thus perhaps were more familiar to the audience than the Greek plays of similar titles, which would have been either seen or read only by select members of the audience. For Greek models, I have consulted Brooks 1981, Ribbeck 1875, and Vahlen 1963.

APPENDIX TABLE
The Plays of the Roman Tragedians

Author	Play	Latin Precursor	Greek Precursor	Date/Occasion
Livius Andronicus ^a	<i>Achilles</i>		Aeschylus?	
	<i>Aegisthus</i>			
	<i>Ajax Mastigophorus</i>		Sophocles	
	<i>Andromeda</i>		Euripides	
	<i>Danae</i>	Naevius?	Sophocles?	
	<i>Equos Troianus</i>	Naevius?		
	<i>Hermiona</i>			
	<i>Ino?</i>		Sophocles?	
	<i>Tereus</i>			
	<i>Danae</i>			
	<i>Equos Troianus</i>	Livius?		Restaged Oct. 55 B.C.E., ded. of Pompey's theatre
	<i>Hector proficiscens</i>		Astydamas	
	<i>Hesione</i>			
Ennius (acc. Vahlen/Brooks)	<i>Iphigenia</i>		Euripides	
	<i>Lycurgus</i>			
	<i>Praetextae</i>			
	<i>Clastidium</i>			
	<i>Romulus sive Lupus</i>			
	<i>Achilles</i>	Livius	Aristarchus	Before 184 B.C.E.?
	<i>Ajax</i>	Livius?	Sophocles	Restaged often with Aesopos in title role? (Cic. <i>Off.</i> 1.114)
	<i>Alcmeo</i>		Euripides	c. 190 B.C.E. (Plaut. <i>Rud.</i> 86)
	<i>Alexander</i>		Euripides	Did Cic. see play more than once? <i>De Or.</i> 3.217/
	<i>Andromache</i>		Eur. <i>Troades</i>	<i>Tusc.</i> 1.85; Aesopos in title role before 57 B.C.E.?
	(<i>sive Andromache Aechmalotis</i>) ^a			(Restaged 54 B.C.E. with Antiphon in title role, <i>Att.</i> 4.15.6)
	<i>Andromeda</i>	Livius	Euripides	
	<i>Athamas</i>			
Naevius ^a	<i>Chresphontes</i>		Euripides?	
	<i>Erectheus</i>		Euripides	
	<i>Eumenides</i>		Aeschylus	
	<i>Hectoris Lytra</i>			
	<i>Hecuba</i>			
	<i>Iphigenia in Aulis</i>	Naevius	Euripides/ Aeschylus ^{a/} Sophocles ^a	Restaged with Aesopos as Agamemnon and Cimmer as Menelaos (Cic. <i>Ad Her.</i> 3.34)

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE (continued)
The Plays of the Roman Tragedians

Author	Play	Latin Precursor	Greek Precursor	Date/Occasion
Pacuvius ^a	<i>Medea exul; Medea</i>		Euripides	Play was widely read (Cic. <i>Fin.</i> 1.2.4)
	<i>Melanippa</i>		Euripides	
	<i>Nemea</i>		Euripides	
	<i>Phoenix</i>		Euripides	
	<i>Telephus</i>		Sophocles/Euripides/	169 B.C.E. (E's last play; performed at first <i>ludi</i> <i>Apollinares</i>)
	<i>Thyestes</i>		Apollodorus/ Tarsus/ Carcinus/ Chaeremon/ Cleophon/ Diogenes/ Agathon	
	<i>Praetextae</i>			
	<i>Ambracia</i>			
	<i>Sabinae</i>			
	<i>Antiopa</i>		Euripides	Freq.? acted by Rupilius in Cic.'s youth (<i>Off.</i> 1.114)
Accius ^a	<i>Arctonium iudicium</i>		Aeschylus	Quoted at Caesar's funeral games with Attilius' <i>Electra</i> (Suet. <i>Iul.</i> 84)
	<i>Atalanta</i>			
	<i>Chryses</i>		Sophocles	Produced vs. Accius in 140 B.C.E.? (Cic. <i>Amic.</i> 4; <i>Brut.</i> 64.229; Ribbeck 1875, 260)
	<i>Dulorestes</i>			
	<i>Hermione</i>	Livius	Sophocles	
	<i>Iliona</i>			
	<i>Medus</i>			
	<i>Niptra</i>		Homer/Soph.	
	<i>Pentheus</i>	[Naeivius' <i>Lycurgus</i> ?]		
	<i>Periboea</i>		[Euripides]	
Pacuvius ^a	<i>Teucer</i>		Sophocles	Restaged 51 B.C.E., when Hortensius was hissed? (Cic. <i>Fam.</i> 8.2.1; Ribbeck 1875, 227 n. 9)
	<i>Praetexta</i>			
	<i>Paullus</i>			?160 B.C.E. funeral games of L. Aemilius Paulus
	<i>Achilles/Myrmidones</i>	Livius/Ennius	Aeschylus	
	<i>Agamemnonidae/</i> <i>Erigona</i>			
	<i>Alcmeo/Alphesiboea</i>	Ennius	Euripides	
	<i>Anphitryo</i>			
	<i>Andromeda</i>	Livius/Ennius		

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE (continued)
The Plays of the Roman Tragedians

Author	Play	Latin Precursor	Greek Precursor	Date/Occasion
Antenoridae <i>Antigona</i> <i>Amorum iudicium</i> <i>Astyanax/Troades</i> <i>Athamas</i> <i>Atrous</i>		Pacuvius	Sophocles Sophocles Aesch./[Soph./ Eur.]	
		Ennius [Ennius' <i>Thyestes</i>]	Sophocles	Read to Pacuvius at Tarentum before 130 B.C.E.; restaged with Aesopus in title role (Plut. <i>Cic.</i> 6). Does Seneca refer to a contemporary restaging (<i>Ep.</i> 80)?
	<i>Bacchae</i>	[Pac.'s <i>Pentheus</i> ?] [Naev.'s <i>Lycurgus</i> ?]	Euripides	
	<i>Chrysippus</i> ^b <i>Chyrennestralor</i> <i>Aegisthus</i> ? <i>Deiphobus</i> <i>Diomedes</i> <i>Epigoni/Eriphyle</i> ?	Livius	Euripides Sophocles? Sophocles	Restaged Oct. 55 B.C.E. ded. of Pompey's theatre
Epinausimache <i>Eurysaces</i> <i>Hecuba</i> <i>Hellenes</i> ? <i>Liberi</i> <i>Medea/Argonautae</i> <i>Meleager</i> <i>Minos/Minotaurus</i> <i>Neoptolemus</i> <i>Nyctegressia</i> <i>Oenomaus</i> <i>Pelopidae</i> <i>Philocteta</i> <i>Philocteta Lemnius</i> <i>Phinidae</i> <i>Phoenissae</i> <i>Prometheus</i> ?		Ennius	Apollodorus?	
		Cf. Naevius' <i>Lycurgus</i> Ennius	Sophocles? Euripides Euripides	
			Homer Sophocles?	
			Aesch./Soph./Eur.	
			Euripides Aeschylus	
		[Naev.'s <i>Lycurgus</i> ?]		

Restaged at *Iudi*
Apollinares in
59 B.C.E. with Diphilus?

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE (continued)
The Plays of the Roman Tragedians

Author	Play	Latin Precursor	Greek Precursor	Date/Occasion
	<i>Telephus</i> <i>Tereus</i>	Ennius Livius	Aesch.:?/Eur.? Sophocles	104 B.C.E. (Cic. <i>Phil.</i> 1.36 = 103?) Last known original production. Restaged 44 B.C.E.
	<i>Thebais?</i> <i>Praetextae</i> <i>Brutus</i>			Restaged 57 B.C.E. with Aesopus (Cic. <i>Sest.</i> 58)
	<i>Aeneadae sive Decius</i>			
C. Julius Strabo	<i>Adrastus</i> <i>Tecmessa</i> <i>Teuthras</i>		<i>Late Republican Tragedies</i> ^a	(c. 100–90 B.C.E.)
C. Titius	Titles unknown			Performed
Pompilius	Titles unknown			
Atilius	<i>Electra</i>		Sophocles	Caesar's funeral games
Quintus Cicero	<i>Aeropa?</i> <i>Electra</i> <i>Erigona</i> <i>Sundeipnoi</i> <i>Troilus?</i>		Sophocles Sophocles Sophocles Sophocles	Cicero (<i>Q Fr.</i> 3.6.7) mentions this and 3 other plays Cic. <i>Q Fr.</i> 3.1.13 Cic. <i>Q Fr.</i> 2.15.3
Cornelius Balbus	<i>Praetexta</i> <i>Iter or Journey to</i> <i>Gades</i>			43 B.C.E. at Gades
Cassius Parmensis	<i>Thyestes</i>	Ennius/Accius' <i>Atreus</i>		40's–30's B.C.E.
	<i>Praetexta</i> <i>Brutus</i>			
Santra (not the grammarian)	Titles unknown [<i>Nuptiae Bacchae?</i>]			Cf. Ribbeck 1875, 685
Julius Caesar	<i>Oedipus</i>			
Augustus	<i>Ajax</i>	Livius/Ennius		Mocked and suppressed by Augustus (continued)

APPENDIX TABLE (continued)
The Plays of the Roman Tragedians

Author	Play	Latin Precursor	Greek Precursor	Date/Occasion
Asinius Pollio	Titles unknown			
Varius Rufus	<i>Thyestes</i>	Ennius/Cassius/ cf. Accius' <i>Atreus</i>		Performed at Augustus' Triumph, 29 B.C.E. Little known of his life or work
Sempronius Gracchus	<i>Atalanta</i> <i>Peliades</i> <i>Thyestes</i>	Varius/Ennius/Cassius/ (cf. Accius' <i>Atreus</i>)		
		<i>Early Imperial Tragedies</i>		
Ovid	<i>Medea</i>	Ennius/Accius		Was there a contemporary production?
Mam. Aemilius Scaurus	<i>Atreus</i>	Accius/Pomponius (cf. Ennius/Cassius/ Varius/Gracchus for <i>Thyestes</i>)		Dates to Tiberius' reign
P. Pomponius Secundus	<i>Praetextae</i> <i>Aeneas</i>			Dates to Claudius' reign; seen by Quintilian before 60 C.E. (10.1.98)?
	<i>Atreus</i>	Accius/Pomponius/ Scaurus/ (cf. Ennius/ Cassius/Varius/ Gracchus for <i>Thyestes</i>)		Dates to either Tiberius' or Claudius' reign. Seen by Quintilian before 60 C.E.?
Seneca	<i>Agamemnon</i> <i>Hercules furens</i> <i>Hippolytus</i> <i>Medea</i> <i>Oedipus</i> <i>Phoenissae</i> <i>Thyestes</i>	cf. Accius' <i>Clytemnestra</i> Ennius/Accius/Ovid Julius Caesar Accius Ennius/Gracchus Varius/ Cassius (cf. Accius/ Pomponius/ Scaurus for <i>Atreus</i>)		
	<i>Troades</i>			
Pseudo-Seneca	<i>Hercules oetaeus</i> <i>Praetexta</i> <i>Octavia</i>			

(continued)

APPENDIX TABLE (continued)
The Plays of the Roman Tragedians

Author	Play	Latin Precursor	Greek Precursor	Date/Occasion
Cornelius	Titles unknown			
Lucan	<i>Medea</i>	Ennius/Accius/ Ovid/Seneca		Unfinished at Lucan's death (Vacca <i>Vit.</i> 63–68)
Persius	Titles unknown <i>Praetexta</i>			
M. Curiatius Maternus	Title unknown			Written in his youth Plays date to Vespasian's reign
	<i>Medea</i>	Ennius/Accius/Ovid Seneca/Lucan		
	<i>Thyestes</i>	Ennius/Gracchus Cassius/Varius/Seneca (cf. Accius/Pomponius/ Scaurus for <i>Atreus</i>)		
	<i>Praetextae</i>			
	<i>Cato</i>			
	<i>Domitius</i>			

^a According to Ribbeck.

^b Ribbeck attributed to Pacuvius.

NOTES

INTRODUCTION

1. We find *contaminatio*, the synthesis of Greek models to produce a "new" Latin play. See Gentili 1979, 33–49. Adaptation is also apparent in comedy. Aulus Gellius demonstrates that Caecilius' *Plocium* is no mere imitation of Menander's original, but rather a Roman adaptation (NA 2.23.4–20).

2. Concerning imitation, Quintilian (*Inst.* 10.2.15) makes the following plea: *atque utinam tam bona imitantes dicerent melius quam mala peius dicunt*. For an extended analysis, see Williams 1968, 250–357, and Gentili 1979, 89–105.

3. Changes to the logic of Greek prototypes are common: Ennius, in the opening lines of the *Medea*, adapts Euripides' play by altering the order in which the building of the Argo is described; Accius' *Philoctetes* has Lemnian shepherds who know where to find Philoctetes, rather than Sophocles' chorus of Greek warriors led by Odysseus, who remembers where he left him years earlier. Terence, in his prologues, frequently outlines changes that he made to his Greek and Latin sources.

4. For details of and sources for the process by which the archon eponymous selected three tragedians for the Great Dionysia at Athens, see Pickard-Cambridge 1988, 79; and, more recently, Rehm 1992, ch. 3: "Production as Participation."

5. The practice was, of course, more complex than my brief outline shows. The evidence suggests that a dramatist could sell his play to a stage manager (as Terence admits doing with Ambivius Turpio in his prologue to the *Eunuchus*), but this meant that the play became the buyer's property and he could restage it again whenever he liked; or the dramatist could sell it to an aedile for a specific occasion. If the aedile returned the play to the dramatist after the festival, it seems he was free to sell it again on a later occasion. If the dramatist was no longer alive, one must presume that an aedile was free to stage any of his plays. For a full discussion of this important aspect of Roman drama, see Lebek 1996, 29–48, which outlines the evidence and scholarship surrounding the selling and buying of plays in Republican Rome.

6. See Beacham 1999, 2-44, for an extensive discussion on the occasions of public entertainment in Rome.

7. Plutarch *Rom.* 8.7. See Turner 1982, ch. 4, for observations on acting in "real life" and "onstage" as components of a dynamic system of interdependence between social dramas and cultural performances.

8. Aiming for topicality and contemporary realism, for example, Jean Anouilh set his *Antigone* in German-occupied Paris, and Kenneth Branagh's film version of *Henry V* based the battle scenes on those found in films about the Vietnam War.

9. See Elam 1980, 98-134, for the boundaries and limitations of dramatic illusion. L. Abel's *Metatheatre* (1963) remains important.

10. For characters commonly alluding to themselves as characters in Plautus, see Duckworth 1994, 133-134; Moore 1998, 67-90. Metatheatrical self-references are rarer in the comedies of Terence—Chaerea's comment at *Eunuchus* 386 is among the exceptions: *an potius haec patri aequomst fieri ut a me ludatur dolis?*

11. Tragedy reflects the increased use of rhetoric in oratory in the second century B.C.E. Such a connection is natural, since both genres are constituted of speeches intended to sway the intellectual and emotional responses of the audience. This "rhetoricizing" of tragedy also occurred on the Greek stage, particularly in the case of Euripides. For a discussion on the "rhetorical" and "pathetic" traits of Roman tragedy, see Ribbeck 1875, 643-645 (which cites Horace *Ars poetica* 164-166), and La Penna 1979, 78-92, with references to earlier works.

12. Gentili (1979, 15) distinguishes his definition from that of M. Barchiesi, who defines metatheatre as "plays within plays." See Barchiesi 1969, 113ff.

13. Slater 1985, 14. Slater also elaborates on the relationship between metatheatre and nonillusory drama, in response to J. L. Styan's definition of non-illusory drama (*ibid.*, 14, 15): "Not all non-illusory drama is metatheatrical, but all metatheatre is to some degree non-illusory. In so far as theatre becomes self-conscious and aware of its own processes, it ceases to be strictly illusory." See Styan 1975, 180-181, for Styan's discussion of nonillusory drama.

14. Cicero *Pro Sestio* 56. Earlier in ch. 55, Cicero mentions that the senators were applauded when they resumed their seats. Did the senate meet between various spectacles of the *ludi*? It seems that they met after an earlier event or dramatic performance, but before the tragic plays were to be produced; but nothing can be asserted with absolute certainty.

15. Cicero *Pro Sestio* 120. Quotations that follow also come from this speech, 121ff.

16. Elam 1980, 208-210.

17. See Hinds 1998, 144, for the limitations of allusions: "The creative imagination is an endlessly mobile thing; and not even through the most apparently objectively verifiable allusion . . . can access ultimately be gained to what an alluding poet at any given moment intended by such an allusion."

18. Suetonius *Nero* 21.3. See further chapter 4 below.

19. Suetonius preserves a telling incident in which a spectator rushed onstage

during a dramatic production in order to free "Nero" from chains: *in qua fabula fama est tirunculum militem positum ad custodiam aditus, cum eum ornari ac vinciri catenis, sicut argumentum postulabat, videret, accurrisse ferendae opis gratia* (*Nero* 21.3). See further chapter 4 below.

20. Theatricality as the essence of Nero's reign is reflected in Tacitus, Dio Cassius, and Suetonius. See Rudich 1993, *passim*, and Bartsch 1994, *passim*.

CHAPTER ONE

1. Cicero *Brutus* 72 secures the date of Livius' first production: *atqui hic Livius [qui] primus fabulam C. Claudio Caeci filio et M. Tuditano consulibus docuit anno ipso ante quam natus est Emilius, post Romam conditam autem quartodecimo et quingentesimo, ut hic ait, quem nos sequimur; est enim inter scriptores de numero annorum controversia*. Cicero's source was Varro. Ancient sources refer to the production of a *fabula*, the term normally used to denote a tragedy, rather than a comedy. See Cicero *Brut.* 72, *Sen.* 50, *Tusc.* 1.3; and Gell. 17.21.42. Unfortunately, the title of this play cannot be recovered from the known plays of Livius. Livy (7.2), in his brief sketch of the Etruscan origins of Roman drama, mentions that Livius was the first dramatist to compose a play with a plot, but he omits two important facts: that the dramatist was Greek-born, and that his tragedies were adaptations of Greek originals. See also Val. Max. 2.4.4. On Livy's claim that the first *ludi scaenici* in Rome took place in 364 B.C.E., see Wiseman 1995, 135.

2. In addition to writing the first Latin tragedy, comedy, and epic, Livius also composed the *Partheneion* in 207 B.C.E. In gratitude for his "services" to the state, the Temple of Minerva on the Aventine was dedicated as the seat of a *collegium poetarum*, or writers' guild. This temple provided a meeting place for writers involved in Rome's growing literary movement. On a more significant level, it symbolized the arrival and the importance of a Latin, and not a Greek, literature at Rome.

3. Before 240 B.C.E., less literary forms of scenic entertainment, consisting of Atellane farces and dance productions of the Etruscan *histriones*, appeared in Rome. Beare (1964, 17) points out that both native Italian and Greek actors were already in Rome by this date and that there is a strong possibility that they may have been experienced in the productions of Greek tragedies. Likewise, Jocelyn (1967, 14) suggests the possibility of more literary types of stage productions: "One can, however, leave open the possibility that forerunners and contemporaries of the 240 B.C., Latin-speaking *histriones* performed Etruscan adaptations of the Athenian classics." On the obscurity of ancient sources concerning the origins of Roman drama, see Kenney 1982, 78. Duckworth (1994, 4) argues that there must have been some form of dramatic activity before this date to account for a ready audience and the play's success. See, most recently, Beacham 1999, 2-4, for a discussion of the contexts of early dramatic presentations.

4. See Livy 7.2, where no mention is made of the nonleading roles.

5. Fragments from Caecilius' *Plocium* reveal extensive use of *cantica* to substitute for dialogue parts found in his Greek original, the *Plokion* of Menander. See Aulus Gellius NA 2.23 for his analysis of Caecilius' "translation" of Menander.

6. The orchestra area found in Greek theatres was not needed for Roman tragedies or comedies, and therefore it was diminished to a semi-circular area in the design of later Roman theatres.

7. Cicero *Brutus* 71: *nam et Odyssia Latina est sic tamquam opus aliquod Daedali et Livianae fabulae non satis dignae quae iterum legantur*. For an examination of Livius' dramatic style, see Mariotti 1986.

8. For Cicero's attitude toward the ancient poets and a tabulation of the frequency of citations of these poets in his works, see Zillinger 1911.

9. Suetonius *De poetis*, †Titus† Livius tragoediarum scriptor clarus habetur . . . , in Rostagni 1964.

10. The titles of the known plays by Livius are *Achilles*, *Aegisthus*, *Ajax Mastigophorus*, *Andromeda*, *Danae*, *Equos Troianus*, *Hermiona*, *Ino*(?), and the *Tereus*. The titles of at least six of these plays, first staged by Livius, appear in the works of later dramatists: the *Danae* and *Equos Troianus* of Naevius (throughout this study I assume both wrote a version of the *Equos Troianus*), the *Achilles*, *Ajax*, and *Andromeda* of Ennius, and the *Hermiona* of Pacuvius. By the time Accius was writing, three previous tragedians had presented plays, with the result that many of Accius' plays had received numerous earlier treatments, starting with Livius. Both Livius and Ennius, for example, wrote an *Achilles* and an *Andromeda* before Accius presented plays of the same names. The *Clytemnestra* and *Tereus* of Accius were preceded by Livius' *Aegisthus* and *Tereus*, respectively—plays that were popular in the late Republic.

11. "Carmen-style" refers to the highly alliterative features of archaic Latin verse. Examples from other plays include the description of the flood in the *Andromeda*: *confluges ubi conventu campum totum inumigant* (Ribbeck 1897, 3); and the following passage from the *Equos Troianus*: *da mihi hasce opes, / quas peto, quas precor: / porrige, opitula!* (ibid., 3). For a discussion of the features of this technique, see Lindsay 1968, and, most recently, Goldberg 1995, 58–82.

12. Quoted are the texts and fragment numbers as they appear in Ribbeck 1897, 1–2. The exact placement of the fragments within the play, in this and the other plays discussed in this chapter, must remain conjecture. In many instances, however, one can reconstruct the outlines of the dramatic action without the exact placement of speeches and episodes within the play.

13. For stereotypical traits of a tyrant onstage, see La Penna 1979, 66–68, and Leigh 1996, 171–197. In addition to references to tyrannical traits in Ennius' *Thyestes* and Accius' *Atreus*, which are discussed in chapter 4, we find references in Pacuvius' *Dulorestes*: *amplus, rubicundo colore et spectu protervo ferox* (Ribbeck 1897, frag. 147) and *heu, non tyrannum novi termeritudinem?* (ibid., frag. 149); and Accius' *Diomedes*: *ferre exanclavimus / Tyranni saevom ingenium atque execrabile* (ibid., frag. 269).

14. Alternate spellings of Clytemnestra's name are frequent. Ribbeck (1897, 1–2) spells her name "Clutemestra" in Accius' play of that name. For the sake

of consistency, I use the spelling "Clytemnestra" throughout, but note alternate spellings when found in cited texts.

15. Warmington's note to this fragment (1982, 7) suggests that the order is given to servants. Ribbeck (1875, 30) notes that *hanc* may refer to Cassandra rather than to Electra.

16. Eutropius 3.1–2: *ad ludos spectandos*.

17. Gell. 17.21.45. Was Naevius in the audience of Livius' first tragedy in 240 B.C.E.?

18. The *Andromache* is cited by Servius auctus ad Verg. G. 1.266, but the play may actually belong to Novius, a writer of Atellan farces.

19. As noted above, both Livius and Naevius are credited with the writing of an *Equos Troianus*. If this is correct, the play is the first repetition of a title and may have been written as a literary "challenge" to Livius' version. See chapter 4 for the importance of this play in the late Republic.

20. Terence *Andria* prologue 18 mentions that Naevius "contaminated" two Greek originals in the *Colax*, one of his comedies.

21. Cicero *Sen.* 50.

22. Suetonius *Poet.*, in Rostagni 1964: *Naevius comicus Uticae moritur; / pulsus Roma factione nobilium ac praecipue Metelli*.

23. Terence *Eumuchus* prologue 25 mentions that the characters of the parasite and the braggart soldier had previously appeared in the *Colax* of Naevius and the *Colax* of Plautus.

24. Aulus Gellius (3.3.15) claims that Naevius wrote two plays while in prison, but this may be a fictional response to meager evidence. See La Penna 1979, 50–51, and Goldberg 1995, 33–36.

25. See Cicero *Rep.* 4.11: . . . *sed Periclem . . . violari versibus et eos agi in scaena non plus decuit, quam si Plautus noster voluisset aut Naevius P. et Cn. Scipioni aut Caecilius M. Catoni maledicere*.

26. The title suggests alternative titles to a single play, but Ribbeck (1875, 63–72) and La Penna (1979, 50–51) argue for two separate plays.

27. Chapter 3 explores the historical and dramatic implications of the *prae-textae* for the development of theatricality.

28. The fragments quoted follow the numbering given by Ribbeck 1897, 7–9.

29. Ribbeck (1897, 8) changes *contemplo* (found in all manuscripts) to *contempla*. With *contemplo*, the translation would be, "I examine quietly the shape and beauty of a virgin."

30. See La Penna 1979, 77–78, for an analysis of this line from the perspective of women in Roman tragedy as "ideal types."

31. Naevius himself was proud of his literary accomplishments and his promotion of Italian culture. According to Aulus Gellius (NA 1.24), he advertised this pride when he composed his own epitaph:

*immortales mortales flere si foret fas,
flerent divae Camenae Naeviom poetam:
itaque postquam est Orci traditus thesauro,
oblitei sunt Romai loquier lingua Latina.*

If it were right for gods to mourn for mortals,
the divine Camenae would weep for poet Naevius:
"And when he was surrendered to the vault of Orcus,
no more were Romans mindful to speak their Latin tongue."

See E. Fraenkel, *RE* suppl. 6.622-640, esp. p. 637, for a discussion of Naevius' epitaph, and, most recently, Goldberg 1995, 82.

32. *Brutus* 75-76. Whereas Cicero compares the style of Livius' *Odyssia* to a statue by Daedalus and, in the process, states that the plays were not worth a second reading, he likens the style of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* to the art of Myron, suggesting in the comparison that it is a more polished literary achievement, yet one that falls short of the more sophisticated literary technique of Ennius. On Naevius' poetic style, see Mariotti 1955 and Barchiesi 1962.

33. Suetonius *De poetis*, in Rostagni 1964.

34. Gell. 17.1.17.1.

35. Silus Italicus *Pun.* 12.393ff.

36. Cornelius Nepos *Cato* 1.4; Jerome, anno 1777, 240.

37. See Jocelyn 1967, 44, for the possible connections between Ennius' tragedies and the political views of his patrons: "The political debates of 203-169 sometimes seem to make themselves heard in the scripts of the tragedies he adapted for the festivals managed by his aristocratic patrons." As examples, he offers fragment 84 from the *Hecuba* and fragment 105 from the *Medea*.

38. The titles of Ennius' known plays are *Achilles*, *Ajax*, *Alcmeo*, *Alexander*, *Andromache/Andromache Aechmalotis*, *Andromeda*, *Athamas*, *Chresphontes*, *Erectheus*, *Eumenides*, *Hectoris Lytra*, *Hecuba*, *Iphigenia in Aulis*, *Medea Exull*, *Medea*, *Melanippa*, *Nemea*, *Phoenix*, *Telephus*, *Thyestes*, and the *praetextae Ambracia* and *Sabinae*. Of these plays, five may have been influenced by his contemporaries Livius and Naevius: he followed Livius' lead in writing an *Achilles*, an *Ajax*, and an *Andromeda*, and, like Naevius, he wrote an *Andromache* and an *Iphigenia in Aulis*. This is not to say that he necessarily followed the same part of the myth and plot development as the other two dramatists, but rather that the shared titles are indicative of an interest in the same plays, and furthermore that the audience would have been familiar with mythical details from these rival Latin versions. In his approach to Greek models for his plays, Ennius seems to have been mostly influenced by the plays of Euripides. On the relationship between Ennius' and Euripides' philosophies, see La Penna 1979, 71-78.

39. This passage is found in Jerome *Ep.* 60 and is cited by Warmington 1988, 304-305, but is not listed by Jocelyn (1967) among the fragments of the *Iphigenia*.

40. Elsewhere, Ennius again uses the image of a *plebs* to reflect Roman class distinctions on the stage: *palam muttire plebeio piaculum est* (Telephus); Jocelyn 1967, frag. 142.

41. On the political connotations of the terms *otium* and *negotium*, see André 1966.

42. Jocelyn 1967, frag. 99.

43. There is no evidence that the earliest tragedians at Rome were on per-

sonal terms with each other. Ennius arrived in Rome in 204 B.C.E. Livius was dead by 200 B.C.E., and Naevius was in exile about the time of Ennius' arrival. Ennius' relationship with Naevius, therefore, was strictly literary. Although the comic writer Plautus did live in Rome for at least twenty years after Ennius' arrival, there is no evidence that Ennius ever met him. Yet Plautus was familiar with Ennius' plays and was likely a member of Ennius' audience on more than one occasion. Plautus was also familiar with the events of Naevius' life (if not the dramatist himself), which are alluded to in the *Miles gloriosus* (210-214). For Plautus' familiarity with Ennius' plays, see Plautus *Poen.* prol., 54ff.

44. Cited are fragments from Book 7, **i, **ia, from the text of Skutsch 1986.

45. Cicero *Brutus* 75-76. Elsewhere, Cicero claims that Ennius frequently borrows from Homer (*Fin.* 1.3.7).

46. I quote the text of Jocelyn 1967, frag. 17, lines 32-40. I preserve his fragment order and number system of individual lines but not his arrangement of groups of fragments under one number. Jocelyn discusses the dramatic and linguistic context of these fragments fully in his pp. 202-234. For other texts of the fragments, see Ribbeck 1897, 19-22, and Warmington 1988, 234-245.

47. Jocelyn 1967, frag. 50.

48. *Ibid.*, frag. 59.

49. *Ibid.*, frag. 128.

50. *Ibid.*, frag. 126.

51. Jocelyn (*ibid.*, 343-350) examines fully the question of a second *Medea* set in Athens.

52. This is based on Cicero's quotation of the passage at *Nat. d.* 3.75. See further arguments in Jocelyn 1967, 350.

53. Cited is the text of Jocelyn (1967) with corresponding line numbers (208-216). I have changed the numbers of the fragments but not the order given by Jocelyn.

54. According to Jocelyn (1967, 347), "Similarity with the text of Euripides' *Medea* is a quite treacherous guide. Study of Nonius' quotations of the *Hecuba* shows that Ennius departed radically from the wording of his original even more than he adhered to it."

55. If the emphasis is not on the hill on which the women live, the reference to *arx* may signal the Capitoline Hill and allude to the epithet of Corinth as Akrokorin. Ennius stresses *Medea's* wealth for a Roman audience even in his *Hecuba*. In a speech where Hecuba tries to persuade Ulysses to convince the Greeks not to slaughter Polyxena, Ennius changes his Euripidean model (*Hec.* 293-295) by emphasizing the effect of one's social class, rather than esteem as in Euripides, in obtaining one's wishes: *haec tu etsi perverse dices facile Achivos flexeris, I nam cum opulenti locuntur pariter atque ignobiles, I eadem dicta eademque oratio aequa non aequae valet*, Jocelyn 1967, 172-174.

56. So Duff's view, while somewhat dated and extreme, still stands as typical (1953, 168): "But two facts in the history of tragedy are significant. One is the persistence of the serious drama on the stage despite a popular preference for lighter performances. Beyond question comedy, satire, and epic were more in ac-

cord with the national genius. Yet tragedy lived on, encouraged chiefly by the Roman aristocracy.”

57. Gruen 1992, 209–210: “The vast edifice, exhibiting solidarity and endurance, would enshrine the drama as an unshakeable institution, no longer dependent upon the resolve of magistrates and the verdict of the aristocracy. Resistance was inevitable. The stone theater crumbled under senatorial directive, and none other arose for a century thereafter. The nobility preferred the traditional system, which manifested their own cultural control.”

58. Gorton 1972, 63.

59. See Gratwick 1988b, 60: “Allegory, though not yet literary allusion, was familiar to the public through tragedy.”

60. Brooks 1981, 90: “There was more than a casual connection between Roman tragedy and comedy in the age of Plautus. The points on which his humor depends are sure to be more than vague hearsay to his audience, the plays of Ennius, therefore, seem to have appealed to the same public as the *servus currens* and the *avarus leno*.” See also Anderson 1993, 140: “Plautus was popular because he appealed across the board to Romans of all classes and levels of culture.”

61. Ribbeck (1897, 312) offers the following passages as comic parodies of tragic lines: *Bacch.* 1053; *Stich.* 365; *Men.* 102, 330, 350, 402ff.; *Rud.* 942; *Curc.* 86; *Persa* 3.1. Sedgwick (1927, 89) agrees with the first six.

62. See Sedgwick 1927, 88.

63. Fraenkel 1960, 55–62. Brooks (1981, 81), however, argues that the audience would have been familiar with a play previously produced on the Roman stage, “but if Plautus’ mythological references are examined as a whole, it is clear that he elaborated the myths as for an audience already familiar with them, and that he deliberately chose these familiar myths from those that had already been presented on the tragic stage.”

64. See Brooks 1981, 73: “About $\frac{2}{3}$ and possibly $\frac{3}{4}$ of all these references [sc. heroic myths in Plautus] deal with themes which are found also in the tragedies of Livius, Naevius, and Ennius or in the *Odyssea*.”

CHAPTER TWO

1. The similarities also extend to the comic stage. In the prologue to Terence’s *Hecyra* (1), Ambivius Turpio states, *orator ad vos venio ornatu prologi* . . . , illustrating the actor as orator paradigm, which also extends to the audience: *quare omnis vos oratos volo, / ne plus iniquom possit quam aequam oratio* (prologue to *Heauton Timorumenos*, 26–27). For recent studies on the connections between rhetoric and the theatre, see Goldberg 1997, 166–181; Hughes 1997, 182–197; and Conte 1994, 108. For the effect of *suasoria* on the perpetuation of theatricality under the early Empire, see chapter 4.

2. For the reciprocity of public and theatre spaces as performance and reception venues, see Wiseman 1995, 151–155; and Fantham 1997, 111–128. See Rawson 1985, 97–113, for performance contexts.

3. For the extension of theatre metaphors to the audience, from the reception of public figures in the theatre to self- and imposed identification of audience members with the theatre, see Parker 1999, 163–179. For the role of actors in encouraging allusions between characters onstage and members of the audience, see Beacham 1999, 56–61, discussing Aesopus’ role in urging the recall of Cicero; and Purcell 1999, 181–193, for the social and political contexts of the theatre and for rivalries between actors themselves and their targets.

4. Cicero *Verr.* 5.35.

5. For the connection between drama and oratory, see the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, passim, and Cicero *Brutus* 289ff.

6. For Cicero’s self-identification with Accius’ *Brutus*, see chapter 4 below.

7. Cicero *Mur.* 41.88, and *Att.* 10.12.1: *quo me nunc vertam?* In *Fam.* 12.29.1, Cicero claims that he displayed his friendship for L. Lamia on a world-wide stage (*magno theatro*).

8. For unflattering allusions to actors and the stage, see Corbeill 1996, passim, and 167–168 for the orator Hortensius’ comparison to the mime actress Dionysia.

9. Horace (*Ep.* 2.1.197–198) imagines the Greek philosopher Democritus’ reaction to scenic entertainment both on the stage and in the audience: *spectaret populum ludis attentius ipsis, ut sibi praebentem nimio spectacula plura*, “He would watch the crowd more carefully than the games themselves since the crowd offers far more spectacles.”

10. See Parker 1999, 173–174, for the importance of an “audience” to aristocrats in gauging public opinion, and 175–176 for the “semiotics of failure”; and see Richlin 1997, 99ff., for the dangers to an orator’s reputation of being compared to an actor. See also Graf 1992, 36–58; Dupont 1985, 31–34; and Von Hessberg 1999, 65–75, for the reciprocity of theatricality between the stage and the political sphere of Hellenistic rulers offstage.

11. Boyle 1997, 114.

12. Pliny *HN* 35.19.

13. See the *Vita*, lines 3–4, in Rostagni 1964, 47–48. Beacham (1992, 121) argues from the innovative nature of Pacuvius’ plays that Pacuvius did not depend on the theatre for his livelihood: “That he could afford to take risks may be reflected in his choice of unusual subject matter, dealing with mythic material which was relatively unfamiliar to his audience and therefore might not have readily won its approval. Few of his works handled the stories commonly used by his Roman predecessors, whd, as noted, mutually recycled their subjects.”

14. See the *Vita*, line 1, in Rostagni 1964, 47. Fulgentius’ testimony that Pacuvius also wrote a comedy, the *Seudon*, is unreliable. Did his tragedies inform his paintings and vice versa? The titles of some thirteen plays survive: *Antiopa*, *Armorum iudicium*, *Atalanta*, *Chryses*, *Dulorestes*, *Hermione*, *Iliona*, *Medus*, *Niptra*, *Pentheus*, *Periboea*, *Teucer*, and the *fabula praetexta* *Paullus*.

15. This is arguing against the Aristotelean concept of an effective tragedy, but even in the use of spectacle, Roman tragedians demonstrated independence from Aristotle’s precepts. For the Roman tragedian’s use of spectacle to arouse pity and fear contra Aristotle *Poetics* 1453b1ff., see Boyle 1997, 231 n. 18.

16. Ribbeck 1897, frag. 7, p. 104. I separate the speeches since they may not come from the same passage or be spoken by the same character.

17. Beacham (1992, 121) argues: "The audience presumably was equal to the challenge of Pacuvius' works, despite somewhat obscure subjects and elevated style, because he joined these with a deft understanding of dramaturgical technique. Suspense, pathos, startling revelations, moments of spirited rhetoric; Pacuvius evidently had a particular talent for forming and moulding such elements to create compelling theatre." La Penna (1979, 73) questions the audience's ability to follow a complex philosophical excursus or debate.

18. For Bronislaw Bilinski's argument that Pacuvius sympathized with the plebs, see Bilinski 1957, 8-9. For the influence of the *Dulorestes* and the *Chryses* on the Sicilian slave revolt, see *ibid.*, 26.

19. See La Penna 1979, 72-78, for a discussion of Ennius' influence on Pacuvius and Accius in including and questioning the validity of Greek philosophic passages in their plays; and Conte 1994, 107: "When these poets [Pacuvius and Accius] deal with religious, political, moral, or philosophical themes, they use the tragic myths freely and touch upon themes and problems felt in contemporary society."

20. See Ribbeck 1875, 218, for an Aeschylean model for Pacuvius' play.

21. Teucer expresses his rage in a *canticum*, indicating that this scene was central to the play's action (Ribbeck 1897, 12, p. 136):

TELAMON: *segregare abs te ausu's aut sine illo Salaminem ingredi, neque paternum aspectum es veritus, quom aetate exacta indigem liberum lacerasti orbasti exstincti, neque fratris necis neque eius gnati parui, qui tibi in tutelam est traditus . . . ?*

TELAMON: You dared to separate yourself, even went to Salamis without him,
nor did you fear your father's sight; whom, spent in years, bereft of sons
you have wounded, made childless, and wiped out, nor [did you think]
of a brother's death,
nor of his infant son, who was entrusted to your safe-keeping . . . ?

22. Ribbeck 1897, 17, p. 122.

23. Ribbeck (1897, 44, p. 152) lists this fragment under *Ex Incertis Fabulis* but offers: "*Vix dubium quin ad Teucrum pertineant.*" Pacuvius' line bears some similarity to Livius' *Aegisthus* fragment 2: *tum autem lascivum Nerei simum pecus / ludens ad cantum classem lustratur vias.*

24. Marx 1963, frag. 875 of *Satire* 29.4, p. 59.

25. Cicero *De Or.* 2.46.193.

26. Cicero, who preserves this passage (*Tusc.* 1.44.106 = Ribbeck 1897, 4, p. 114), writes of the sympathy elicited by this speech by Umbra for the dead: *haec cum pressis et flebilis modis, qui totis theatris maestitiam inferant, concinuntur, difficile est non eos qui inhumati sint miseros iudicare. . . .*

27. Cf. Horace *Sat.* 2.3.60.

28. Ribbeck 1897, *Ex Incertis Fabulis*, 14, p. 144.

29. See La Penna 1979, 72-73, for an analysis of the relationship between Pacuvius' and Ennius' philosophical thought, which, like Euripides', is critical of both philosophy and rhetoric.

30. In Propertius' version of the myth (3.15), Antiopa escapes from Dirce and discovers her sons, but finds Amphion the more sympathetic of the two. The later rivalry between the sons during the construction of the walls of Thebes is also described.

31. For a discussion of the relationship between Euripides' and Pacuvius' plays, see Ribbeck 1875, 281-301.

32. Cited is the text of Ribbeck 1897, 86-90.

33. Warmington (1982, 160-161) ascribes this line to Amphion, together with the following line, which Ribbeck ascribes to unassigned fragments: *tu cornifrontes pascere armentas soles.* See Ribbeck 1875, 286, for possible literary meanings of *horrida*.

34. The digression annoyed the author of *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (2.27.43): *item verendum est ne de alia re dicatur cum alia de re controversia sit . . . uti apud Pacuvium Zethus cum Amphione, quorum controversia de musica inducta est, disputationem in sapientiae rationem et virtutis utilitatem consumit.* Ribbeck (1897) cites this notice as fragment 2.

35. Following this fragment, Warmington (1982, 164-165) gives the following line to Zethus: *odi ego homines ignava opera et philosopha sententia.*

36. Or are these lines spoken by Dirce on her stage entrance? Warmington (1982, 166-167) adds the following fragment found in the unassigned fragments of Pacuvius after fragment 10:

*agite ite evolvite rapite, coma
tractate per aspera saxa et humum;
scindite vestem ocius!*

(M. Victorinus, *Grammatici Latini* 7.77.2)

37. Marx 1963, Book 5, 211, p. 16. Other passages ridiculed by Lucilius include Book 26, *Sat.* 3, 665; Book 26, *Sat.* 6, 720-721, 722, 723, 724-725, 726, 727-728, 729-730, and 731; Book 29, *Sat.* 2, 879, 880, 881; and unassigned frag. 1261, Warmington 1982, 413.

38. *itaque licet dicere et Ennium summum epicum poetam et Pacuvium tragicum et Caecilium fortasse comicum,* Cicero *Opt. Gen.* 1. Velleius (1.17), however, accorded the highest place to Accius.

39. Cicero *Tusc.* 2.21.

40. Quintilian *Inst.* 10.1.97; Horace *Epist.* 2.1.53-56:

*Naevius in manibus non est et mentibus haeret
paene recens? adeo sanctum est vetus omne poema.
ambigitur quotiens, uter utro sit prior, aufert
Pacuvius docti famam senis, Accius alti. . . .*

41. Persius *Satirae* 1.77.
42. Lucilius challenged many of Accius' grammatical rules: Book 9, *Sat.* 2.366-367, 368.
43. Bilinski 1957, 49: "Come sappiamo, è appunto in una atellana del poeta comico Novio che comparvero sulla scena Phoenissae e Andromache e nell' atellana di Pomponio Armorum iudicium, tratte entrambe dal repertorio di Accio."
44. One should recall, however, that at *Dial.* 20, Marcus Aper is the speaker, and his opinions should not be taken as those of Tacitus. Tacitus' own potential as a tragic dramatist was remarked upon by Syme (1958, 363): "Roman history gave scope for poetry and for high politics, notably the catastrophe of the Republic. Hence the 'Cato' composed by Curiatius Maternus (senator, orator, and poet) whom the young Tacitus knew and admired. And, if Cato or Brutus were exhausted, did not the tragedy of the Caesars embody a sequence of dramatic themes, with ambition, power, and crime recalling the House of Atreus? The aptitude disclosed in the *Annales* might have found expression and renown with a 'Sejanus' or an 'Agrippina.'" See also Walker 1952; Mellor 1993; Luce and Woodman 1993; and Bartsch 1994, 22-24, 35, 55-56.
45. A large number of fragments from the titles of Accius' tragedies survive. In many instances, however, little more than a few fragments can be assigned to each play. Known titles are *Achilles sive Myrmidones*, *Agamemnonidae sive Eri-gona*, *Alcmeo sive Alpheisboea*, *Amphitryo*, *Andromeda*, *Antenoridae*, *Antigona*, *Armorum iudicium*, *Astyanax sive Troades*, *Athamas*, *Atreus*, *Bacchae*, *Chrysippus*, *Clytemnestra sive Aegisthus* (which may actually be one play), *Deiphobus*, *Epigoni sive Eriphyle*, *Epinausimache*, *Eurysaces*, *Hecuba*, *Hellenes*, *Liberi*, *Medea sive Argonautae*, *Meleager*, *Minos sive Minotaurus*, *Neoptolemus*, *Nyctegressia*, *Oenomaus*, *Pelopidae*, *Philocteta sive Philocteta Lemnius*, *Phinidae*, *Phoenissae*, *Prometheus*, *Stasiastae sive Tropaeum*, *Telephus*, *Tereus*, *Thebais*, and the *fabulae praetextae Brutus* and *Aeneadae sive Decius*.
46. More of Accius' plays are titled after the chorus than any of his predecessors'. See Conte 1994, 107; and Leo 1910, 18: *inter Acci tragoedias magnus numerus est titulorum ipsum chorum significantium: Bacchae Hellenes Myrmidones Phoenissae Stasiastae Troades; cuius generis inter Enni tragoedias esse diximus Eumenides et Sabinas, inter Pacuvianas nulla est.*
47. Bilinski (1957, 38-44) argues that Accius was sympathetic to the aristocracy and hostile to the plebs, and that the social upheavals surrounding Tiberius Gracchus' reforms in 133 B.C.E. are reflected in his *Atreus*. While some themes seem suggestive of this period, we do not know the original production date for this play. La Penna (1979, 49-104) examines passages and recent scholarship on the complex issue of political views expressed in the plays of Pacuvius and Accius. See chapter 4 for various later cultural contexts of Accius' *Atreus*.
48. See La Penna 1979, 63-71.
49. Ribbeck 1897, 4, p. 182.
50. Ibid. 2, p. 163.
51. Ibid. 5, p. 177.
52. See Beacham 1992, 124: "Accius' plays were admired for their flamboyance and energy; they also contained much verbal violence and descriptive gore:

- Thyestes dining upon his sons; Philomela raped by Tereus who cuts out her tongue to avoid detection; Medea's murder of her children. Accius probed mythical material to bring forth its most intense pathos and horror."
53. See Tarrant 1978, 257ff.; and Dangel 1990, 107-122.
54. Only two lines survive from apparently two different points in the play: Medea's *servare potui: perdere an possim, rogas?* and *feror huc illuc, vae, plena deo*. Quoted are the lines from Ribbeck 1897, 267. The rhetorical connections between the *Metamorphoses* and Seneca's tragedies are analyzed in chapter 4.
55. Quintilian *Inst.* 10.1.98: *Ovidii Medea videtur mihi ostendere, quantam ille vir praestare potuerit, si ingenio suo imperare quam indulgere maluisset.*
56. Warmington 1982, 456, following Ribbeck 1875, 528-536, suggests a play by Sophocles as the possible model, but the closest play of Sophocles on the Medea myth is the *Scythians*, in which Apsyrtus appears as a boy. See Hugh Lloyd Jones, *Sophocles*, vol. 3, *Fragments*, Loeb ed. (Cambridge, Mass., 1996), 274-277.
57. Cited is the text of Ribbeck 1897, 216-220.
58. Ribbeck (1875, 533) conjectures Jason speaking to himself, while Warmington (1982, 463) assigns the line to Medea as a threat to Jason. Dangel (1995, 351) assigns the line to Medea to express the hope that he will share the same fate as herself. In my *Archaic Latin Verse* (Erasmus 2001a, 104), I assigned the line to Medea, but I am now less confident about the designation.
59. Ribbeck (1875, 533) conjectures a king or priest of Diana as the speaker of this line. I assigned the line to Apsyrtus (2001a, 57), but the fragment may actually come from another play, in particular, Accius' *Diomedes*.
60. Ribbeck (1875) lists the names of some 36 poets and 150 tragedies after Accius, but much of this information is inconclusive.
61. Paratore (1957, 57) divides the age of the Republican theatre into two eras: 1) Livius to Plautus, and 2) Ennius to the age of Sulla.
62. Pollio, using Pacuvius and Accius as literary models, was accused of having a harsh and dry style by Tacitus (*Dial.* 21.7: *Pacuvium certe Accium non solum tragoediis sed etiam orationibus suis expressit; adeo durus et siccus est*). I list Ovid here, but as stated in the introduction, it is not clear whether the *Medea* appeared on the stage. Cornelius Balbus wrote and produced in Gades a *praetexta* entitled *Iter*, but it was never produced in Rome. For more details concerning this play, see chapter 3. Too little is known of the dramatic activities of other tragedians, such as C. Titius, Pompilius, and Atilius. See the appendix for the known titles of their plays.
63. According to Jory (1986, 149-150 n. 2): "Presentation of complete Roman dramas in the Empire is rarely recorded but may not have been as exceptional as generally assumed, at least in the first century." Further, Jory argues that the increased number of festivals throughout the Republic and Empire points to a robust dramatic tradition that is not reflected in the surviving dramatic notices and ancient sources (144): "It [the number of days on which scenic entertainment was featured] rose from eleven in the time of Plautus through about fifty-five at the death of Julius Caesar to one hundred and one in the mid-fourth century A.D., and the frequency of the *instaurationes* as well as of funeral

and votive games meant that these figures represent only the minimum number of days in each year on which scenic performances were staged. Thus the evidence of literary texts is misleading. The heyday of the Roman theatre was not in the Republic but in the Empire." On the decline of tragic productions under the Empire, see Goldberg 1996, 265-286.

CHAPTER THREE

1. T. P. Wiseman's *Roman Drama and Roman History* (1998) provides valuable analyses of ancient sources for the production contexts of nonliterary forms of drama in the third and second centuries B.C.E. My focus on the semiotic and dramaturgical implications of staging historical plays and the shared theatricality of drama and historiographic sources complements Wiseman's examination of the historic contexts for the production of *praetextae*. Other recent important studies on *praetextae* include Pedroli 1953; Zorzetti 1980; Flower 1995, 170-190; and Manuwald 2001.

2. On the close connection between historiography and drama in the Hellenistic world, in particular the framing of events by historiographic sources in the context of a drama, see Wiseman 1994, 1-22, which is discussed by Flower (1995, 173-174), who disagrees with Wiseman's analysis of *praetextae* as a form of popular drama. In addition to the name *praetextae*, ancient sources also preserve the form *praetextatae*.

3. On the literary connections between tragedy and *praetextae*, see La Penna 1979, 51-56; Flower (1995, 172), however, cautions against defining all *praetextae* as belonging to a subcategory of tragedy.

4. See Manuwald 2001, 29-52, for an extensive analysis of ancient conceptions of *praetextae*.

5. Flower (1995, 178-179, 180-181) weighs the evidence for the production of *praetextae* at various events, favoring votive games as the most likely occasion of performance, as does Nicholas Purcell (1999, 184). See, most recently, the extensive discussion in Manuwald 2001, 110-130.

6. The view of David Raven stands as typical (1969, 290): "A striking indication of the [Republican] tragedians' unoriginality lies in the relative failure of the *fabula praetexta*." Most recently, Flower (1995, 190) argues: "Their meaning and importance was inextricably connected to the spectacle itself in the context of the immediate political climate, and this helps to explain their ephemeral interest and the few fragments quoted by later authors."

7. See La Penna 1979, 63-71, for general remarks on the relation of *praetextae* and tragedy to Roman politics at large.

8. For discussions on the existence of preliterate forms of historical drama, see Zorzetti 1980, 11-52; Horsfall 1994, 50-75, in particular for his analysis of the Varronian origin of our knowledge of preliterate forms of drama; and Wiseman 1998, 1-16.

9. For the Gyges fragments, see TGF adesp. p. 664, with bibliography. The text is reprinted in Diggle 1998, 182. The date of this play may be Hellenistic.

10. La Penna 1979, 51-56. Zorzetti (1980, 53-73) describes *praetextae* as "celebrations of *imperium*." Flower (1995, 171), however, defines a *fabula praetexta* as "a play about Roman aristocrats and their status." Possible additions to the list of known Republican *praetextae* include an anonymous *Claudia*, mentioned by Ovid (*Fasti* 4.326), which was probably performed at the *ludi Magalenses* (but the actual performance date[s] and author cannot be recovered), and a play of unknown title and authorship that celebrated the *Nonae Caprotinae*, a festival with connections to the *ludi Apollinares*. For further details surrounding this play, see Zorzetti 1980, 39-40; Bremmer 1987, 76-88; and Wiseman 1998, 8-11.

11. The title suggests alternative titles for a single play, but Ribbeck (1875, 63-72) and La Penna (1979, 50-51) argue for two separate plays.

12. See chapter 4 for details of the plays of Cassius Parmensis.

13. The didascalia for Terence's *Adelphoe* does not mention this play. Flower (1995, 186-187) argues against the performance of this play at Paullus' funeral games in favor of its performance at earlier votive games.

14. Text from Keil 1857, bk. 3, 487-488: *prima species est togatarum, quae praetextatae dicuntur, in quibus imperatorum negotia aguntur et publica[,] et reges Romani vel duces inducuntur, personarum dignitate et sublimitate tragoediis similes . . . togata praetextata a tragoedia differt, quod in tragoedia heroes inducuntur, ut Pacuvius tragoedias nominibus heroicis inscripsit, Orestem, Chrysen, et his similia, item Accius; in praetextata autem reges Romani vel duces, ut quae inscribitur Brutus vel Decius item Marcellus* (1.487). This notice is somewhat late but, at least in theory, Diomedes had access to many, if not all, of the *praetextae* upon which to base his observations. See Manuwald 2001, 30-36, for a discussion of Diomedes' definition.

15. In relation to the plays of Ennius, Ribbeck (1875, 212) observes: "Kriegerischen Charakter haben die Dramen der Ilias gemeinsam mit den beiden Prätaxten: neben ausführlichen Schlachtberichten mag dem Zuschauer auf der Bühne selbst ein bewegtes Kriegs- und Lagerleben vorgeführt sein." This observation seems more applicable to Ennius' description of Ambracia's fall in his *Annales*, Book 15, than to the extant fragments of the *Ambracia*. It is unclear how any descriptions of battles and camp life relate to Ennius' other *praetexta*, the *Sabinae*.

16. Zorzetti (1980, 93-103) analyzes Imperial *praetextae* from the point of view of aristocratic opposition. For an analysis of the arguments in favor of viewing the *Octavia* in the context of Republican *praetextae*, see Coffey 1957, 113-186.

17. A recent biography of former U.S. president Ronald Reagan, *Dutch: A Memoir of Ronald Reagan* (2000), in which the author, Edmund Morris, inserts himself as a bystander to the historical events recounted, has generated much controversy concerning historical accuracy and objectivity in research: if the narrator is a fictional witness, how accurate are his observations of the biographical subject?

18. Cf. Ribbeck 1875, 207-211, for Ennius' *praetextae*.

19. Ribbeck 1897, frag. 3, p. 325: *nivit sagittis, plumbo et saxis grandinat*.

20. See Skutsch 1985, 104-105, for fragments.

21. See most recently the extensive discussion in Manuwald 2001, 259-339, in particular 305ff. for an analysis of contemporary references in the play.

22. This consistency of historical fact is noted by Herington (1961, 22): "Yet in spite of this highly artificial design, the author has been very successful in building-in the scattered events which he has chosen for his play; there is internal consistency and smooth progression as one reads it, and at the same time little violence has been done to historical fact, apart from the compression of the time-element." In terms of actual historical inconsistencies, one can point to the appearance of Seneca at the court, since he was already in Imperial disfavor at the time of Nero's marriage to Poppaea.

23. This is not to say that the play does not share historical information with Suetonius and Dio. For example, R. Helm (1934, 283-347) has pointed out that there is a reference to Tiridates, who was vassal in Rome in 66 C.E., at lines 627ff. Both Dio (63.5) and Suetonius (*Nero* 13) also mention his coronation in Rome. Coffey (1957) argues that the author of the *Octavia* does not intend a reference to Vindex in the use of the adjective at line 255. In Dio (63.22.1-6) and Suetonius (*Nero* 40-44), however, Vindex plays a narrative role in signaling Nero's imminent fall, and indeed, his name appears as a pun for an "avenger."

24. Nero had Octavia killed in 62 C.E., only months before the birth of Poppaea's child, in January 63 C.E. The *Octavia* mentions the pregnancy twice: at lines 181ff. and 591ff. Tacitus (14.1) only hints at Poppaea's pregnancy. This omission in the literary sources was noted by J.P.V.D. Balsdon, quoted by Herington (1961, 29 n. 3).

25. Vasily Rudich reminded me in conversation that Tigellinus is not mentioned by name, only by position, perhaps signaling that Tigellinus was still alive when the play was written.

26. The monument is confirmed by an inscription. See *CIL* 10.6599.

27. See Pantzerhielm Thomas 1945, 65. Nero's acceptance of the title early in his reign is confirmed by inscriptions.

28. Herington (1961, 28) argues that Seneca later alludes to the *De clementia* in conversation with Nero.

29. See Jocelyn 1971, 87-88. The influence of Greek tragedy is also evident in the *Octavia*. There are stylistic parallels and verbal echoes between the first 262 lines of the *Octavia* and the *Electra* of Sophocles. See Herington 1961, 20: "I have no doubt that the *Octavia* is influenced by the *Electra*. The influence is clearest in the *Octavia*'s prologue: the empress's anapaestic song, which opens the play, and her dialogue with the Nurse (partly in anapaests and partly in iambs) remind one very strongly of *Electra*'s entrance-song and her exchanges with the Chorus. And it is in this part also that the verbal echoes of the *Electra* come thickest."

30. Cited is the text of Denys Page, *Aeschylus Septem Quae Supersunt Tragoedias* (Oxford, 1972, reprinted 1989), 8-10.

31. Cicero *Div.* 1.22.44 preserves both passages. Cited is the text of Diehl

1967, frags. 212-214. A more detailed analysis of this passage in relation to the *Brutus* appears in chapter 4.

32. The parallel is noted by Pedrolí (1953, 219). However, Coffey (1957, 175), in his review of Mickwitz 1928, doubts that the parallels between the two plays are anything more than a similarity of a shared tragic trope.

33. Cited is the text of Zwierlein 1988.

34. See chapter 4, "Staging Brutus," for the cultural contexts surrounding Accius' *Brutus* under the late Republic, and Cassius' version as a vehicle for criticism of Imperial oppression.

35. See Tarrant 1978, 238-239, for an analysis of this parallel and for additional related scenes in Plautus, such as *Merc.* 864, *nescioquoia vox ad auris mi advolavit*, and *Rud.* 233, *certo vox muliebris auris tetigit meas*.

36. Quoted is the Oxford Classical Text of W. M. Lindsay (1989).

37. Although the text of the *Domitius* does not survive, one can assume from Maternus' comments about his *Cato* and *Thyestes* that the play was written not as an encomium but rather as criticism of Imperial power. It is not clear which Domitius is described in the play. The play may have been written about either Lucius or Gnaeus Domitius Ahenobarbus, both of whom were ancestors of Nero. The date of the play, therefore, may be further removed in time from the date of composition than is suggested above. Tenney Frank (1937, 225-229) argues that the play was about Lucius Domitius Ahenobarbus and that it was composed about 67 C.E. to break the power of Nero's courtier Vatinius (cf. Tacitus *Dial.* 11). In the same article (229), Frank speculates that Maternus' *Medea* may have been written as a criticism of Nero for choosing Poppaea over Octavia—a situation analogous to Jason's leaving of Medea for Creusa. See chapter 4 for further discussion of Maternus and *interpretatio prava* (prejudiced interpretation).

38. Pseudo-Seneca *Octavia* 166-173:

*tu quoque extinctus iaces,
deflende nobis semper, infelix puer,
modo sidus orbis, columnen augustae domus,
Britannice, heu me, nunc levis tantum cinis
et tristis umbra; saeva cui lacrimas dedit
etiam noverca, cum rogis artus tuos
dedit cremandos membraque et vultus deo
similes volanti saeviens flamma abstulit.*

Quoted is the Oxford Classical Text of Otto Zwierlein (1988).

39. Although Maternus probably advertised his own *animus nocendi* against Vespasian's court, Tacitus suggests that it was also the way Maternus read his play, that is, his passionate undertaking of the role of Cato, in addition to the sentiments expressed, that made his recitation dangerous: *nam postero die quam Curiatius Maternus Catonem recitaverat, cum offendisse potentium animos diceretur, tanquam in eo tragoediae argumento sui oblitis tantum Catonem cogitasset . . . (Dial. 2).*

40. Was this at the expense of artistic value? The *Octavia* is considered an artistic failure by critics who do not consider its theme in the context of *praetextae*, but who hold it up against the idealized traits of Greek tragedy. David Raven (1969, 292) argues: "It [*Octavia*] is omitted from separate discussion here, owing to its colourlessness and lack of individuality in nearly all respects save that of its theme—Octavia's tragic death at Nero's orders." Herington (1961, 29) praises the "tragic experience" of contemporary events that the play contains rather than the play itself: "And if I have found the *Octavia*, in its own modest way, a moving experience, it is not through any of its rather inept rhetorical and tragical adornments. It is because somehow, in spite of them, the fumbling author does convey something of the tragic experience of that time which we cannot gather from any other quarter."

41. Ronald Syme (1958, 363) suggests that Tacitus would have written good *praetextae*: "Roman history gave scope for poetry and for high politics, notably the catastrophe of the Republic. Hence the *Cato* composed by Curiatius Maternus (senator, orator, and poet) whom the young Tacitus knew and admired. And, if Cato or Brutus were exhausted, did not the tragedy of the Caesars embody a sequence of dramatic themes, with ambition, power, and crime recalling the House of Atreus? The aptitude disclosed in the *Annales* might have found expression and renown with a 'Sejanus' or an 'Agrippina'."

42. I cite the text and fragment numbers of Ribbeck 1897, 326-328.

43. See Pedrolí 1953, 115, on the identification of the *Caleti*.

44. Timpanaro would add the line *Martis manubias Musis consecrare* from Cicero's *Pro Archia* (27) to the fragments of the *Ambracia*. This line was first noticed by W. Zillinger (1911, 145). See Timpanaro 1949, 186-204.

45. I cite the fragments and sequence of Ribbeck 1897, 323-324.

46. Warmington 1988, 358-360.

47. For an extensive analysis of the cultural contexts of Greek historical dramas, see Hall 1989, in particular 64-65 for Themistocles' involvement with the *Sack of Miletus* and the *Phoenissae*.

48. See Zehnacker 1981, 40.

49. Warmington 1988, 359.

50. Flower (1995, 189) includes a chart with possible performance dates and occasions for the production of *praetextae*.

51. For arguments against the appearance of contemporary Romans onstage (besides Cornelius Balbus), see, most recently, Zorzetti 1980, 55; and see the discussion in the text below.

52. *De re publica* 4.10.12: *veteribus displicuisse Romanis vel laudari quemquam in scaena vivum hominem vel vituperari*. For a more detailed discussion of this passage and bibliography, see Flower 1995, 177-179, and Manuwald 2001, 122-123.

53. See Lana 1958-59, 371-376, for an analysis of the historical context of this play and for questions regarding the title, *Iter*.

54. Cicero *Fam.* 10.32.3-5. Cited is the text of Shackelton Bailey 2001, 358. See Manuwald 2001, 54-62, for an analysis of this passage and for a discussion

of recent criticism on Balbus' play and his composition of it. Pollio also informs Cicero that he may obtain a copy of the play from Cornelius Gallus.

55. See Purcell 1999, 184-185, for the displacement of the honorand into the role of dramatic representation: "The *praetexta* seems to me to gain meaning and to acquire extra importance—rather than losing significance—from the apparent fact that its central function was magnifying the hero by abstracting him from the domain of ordinary, unrepresented existence and relocating him in the select company of those who are represented—gods and heroes all."

56. Pollio reports that, in addition to throwing wild animals to beasts, Balbus ordered the soldier to be buried and burned, but he fills his narrative with details that depict Balbus as a tyrant: he was pacing leisurely after a meal while the soldier was being tortured, he was dressed leisurely (barefoot with loosened tunic), and even mocked the soldier by calling out that he should report this illegal punishment: *deinde abstractum defodit in ludo et vivum combussit, cum quidem pransus nudis pedibus, tunica soluta, manibus ad tergum reiectis inambularet et illi misero quiritanti "c.R. natus sum" responderet "abi nunc, populi fidem implora"; bestiis vero civis Romanos . . .* (*Fam.* 10.32.3, text of Shackelton Bailey 2001, 360).

57. Dupont 1985, 219ff.

58. Flower (1995, 177-179) argues that there is no evidence connecting the production of *praetextae* exclusively with funerals. The evidence, however, does not rule it out either.

59. See Flower 1996, 91-127, for a more detailed discussion of all aspects of funerals and the participation of ancestors. I take a semiotic approach in my analysis of the same evidence.

60. Polybius *Histories* 6.53.1-10. Translation from the text of Paton 1972, 388-391.

61. The evidence for *ludi scaenici* in the forum comes from Livy 31.50.4: *et ludi funebres eo anno per quadriduum in foro mortis causa M. Valeri Laevini a Publio et Marco filiis eius facti, et munus gladiatorium datum ab iis; paria quinque et viginti pugnarunt*. In favor of the forum as the site of funeral games, see Saunders 1913, 93-94; Hanson 1959, 17; and Richardson 1992, 380, contra.

62. Hanson (1959, 29-39) discusses the somewhat controversial evidence for the location of early stages and spectator seats at Rome.

63. See Purcell 1999, 182-184, for the role played by an actor *lusor* in the imitation of a deceased emperor during the funeral ceremony, in particular the link between the actor and the divine.

64. The *Amphitryon* contains a pun based on the *imagines* masks and the comic and tragic masks worn by actors. Sosias, looking at Mercury, who is wearing a mask resembling Sosias' own face, exclaims (458-459): *nam hicquidem omnem imaginem meam, quae antehac fuerat, possidet. I vivo fit quod numquam quisquam mortuo faciet mihi* ("This man has got hold of my total image, which used to be my own! / My image is carried around now that I am alive, more than anyone will do so when I'm dead"). Thus in the play, we have an actor imitating a god, who in turn is seen to be imitating a dead actor.

65. Diodorus Siculus *World History (Bibliotheca)* 31.25, from the text and translation of Walton 1968, 376–377.

66. See Flower 1996, 104–106, for an analysis of this passage.

67. A further connection between the theatre audience and the dead is made figuratively by Seneca, who in the *Hercules furens* compares the crowds of the dead in the Underworld to the excited *populus* of Rome at the premiere performance of a play in a new theatre (838–839): *quantus incedit populus per urbes / ad novi ludos avidus theatri* (“As much as the populace hastens through cities / anxious for the plays of a new theatre”).

68. Flower (1995, 179) poses three similar questions: “Would the ancestors watch too? Would the actors on stage wear the same or similar masks in the play? If actors had been hired to impersonate the ancestors or even the dead man himself in the procession, would these same people perform in the play?”

69. The question of whether theatre masks differed from *imagines* is complex. See Wiles 1991, 130, who argues that they were probably not similar so as not to offend a noble family, and see the extensive discussion on the possible similarities between theatre masks and *imagines* in Flower 1996, 91–127, in particular 114–115, where she argues, contra Wiles, that it is possible that both masks were similar. See also the discussion in Slater 1996, 38–39.

CHAPTER FOUR

1. This and subsequent citations from Seneca’s plays come from the text of Zwierlein 1988.

2. Pro-Antony propaganda, for example, associated Octavian with Apollo, and pro-Octavian propaganda associated Antony with Dionysus and Sextus Pompey with Neptune. See Taylor 1931, 102–103, 120–121; and Gowling 1995, 309–310. For audience fondness for tragic texts as allusions to contemporary personalities and events, see Nicolet 1980, 366–373.

3. Bilinski 1957. Bilinski (43) offers a date for Accius’ *Atreus* of sometime between 140 and 130 B.C.E., a little before or a little after 133 B.C.E. D’Antò (1980, 282–283) questions Bilinski’s thesis due to the imprecise dating of Accius’ plays. See also Lana 1958–59, 348–351, for the dating of Accius’ *Atreus*.

4. See Gruen 1992, 183–222, and Richardson 1992, 380, for a discussion of the ancient (Livy *Epit.* 48; Val. Max. 2.4.1–2; Tacitus *Ann.* 14.20) and modern controversy concerning the opposition at Rome to the construction of a permanent theatre; and more recently, see Beacham 1999, 61–71.

5. Pliny records the variety of gladiatorial shows and the animals imported into Rome (*HN* 8.53, 64, 70, 72, 84). In addition to animals, both Plutarch (*Pompey* 52) and Cassius Dio (39.38) list music and gymnastic contests, but Cassius Dio also refers to a horse race in the Circus.

6. Pompey may have also wished to erase from popular memory the successful games given by Sulla—the *ludi Victoriae Sullanae*. The success on this occasion of courting popular favor obscures the fact that Pompey had been jeered at a short while earlier in the theatre; see Cicero *Att.* 2.19.

7. Cicero *Fam.* 7.1.2.

8. For the construction and architectural details of Pompey’s theatre complex, see Platner and Ashby 1965, 428–429 and 515–517; Richardson 1992, 318–319 and 383–385; Gros 1998, 148–149 (“Porticus Pompeii”), and 1999a, 35–38 (“Theatrum Pompeii”); and Beacham 1999, 61–71.

9. For the various reconstructions of the temple and *cavea* suggested to date, see Hill 1944, 360–365; Hanson 1959, 44–52; L. Richardson, Jr., “A Note on the Architecture of the Theatrum Pompeii in Rome,” *AJA* 91 (1987): 123–126; Richardson 1992, 411; Gros 1999b, 120–121.

10. Shrines to Honos, Virtus, Felicitas, and a fourth deity preserved in an inscription only as V[. . .]. See Hanson 1959, 52–53, for a discussion of the inscriptions found on the *Fasti Amiterni* and *Alliteri*.

11. *HN* 36.115. Platner and Ashby (1965, 517), however, put the number at around 10,000, and Richardson (1992, 385) at around 11,000.

12. Cf. Val. Max. 11.6.4.

13. The “Younger” Balbus dedicated his theatre in 13 B.C.E. (Suetonius *Aug.* 29.5; Cass. Dio. 54.25.2) with lavish games and with the *scaena* ornamented with four onyx columns (Pliny *HN* 36.60). The theatre could accommodate 7,700 spectators, making it the smallest of Rome’s three permanent theatres. See Platner and Ashby 1965, 513, and Richardson 1992, 381–382; Manacorda 1999, 30–31 (“Theatrum Balbi”).

14. Cassius Dio associates Julius Caesar with the theatre’s site: “[Caesar] announced his intention to build a theatre after the model of Pompey’s, but he did not fulfill his wish. Augustus, however, did, and after the theatre was built, he named it after Marcellus” (43.49.3). It is not clear, however, whether this theatre would have been connected symbolically to the Temple of Apollo Sosianus in the same configuration and with the same significance as the Temple of Venus Genetrix to Pompey’s theatre.

The still-uncompleted theatre was used during the *ludi Saeculares* in 17 B.C.E. (*CIL* 6.32323.157) but was dedicated in 13 B.C.E. (Cassius Dio 54.26.1). See Platner and Ashby 1965, 513–515; Hanson 1959, 22–23; and Richardson 1992, 382–383.

15. Cassius Dio (39.38.1) claims that the Theatre of Pompey is still a source of pride.

16. For the urban contexts of the theatres, see Anderson 1997, 285–287, and Gros 1987.

17. Tert. *De spect.* 10.

18. Hanson 1959, 55: “Architecturally, despite Pompey’s assertion that he was dedicating principally a temple, the theater was now the dominant element, as it was to be to an even greater extent in the later examples of the same combination.” Livy (30.38.10) mentions that in 202 B.C.E., due to flooding, the *ludi Apollinares* had to be transferred from their usual performance location to the Temple of Venus Erycina. See Hanson 1959, 52, for a Spanish inscription from Castulo (*CIL* 2.3270) connecting Venus to the theatre: *signa Veneris Genetricis et Cupidinis ad theatrum*.

19. Gruen (1992, 183ff.) argues, contra popular scholarly view, that there is

no proof of the relation between *ludi* and future career advancement and political success. The theatre of C. Scribonius Curio, which was built in 53 B.C.E. for his father's funeral games and consisted of two wooden theatres that could revolve on pivots to create an amphitheatre, postdates the construction of Pompey's theatre. See Pliny *HN* 36.117–120. This theatre was still standing in 51 B.C.E. (Cicero *Fam.* 8.2.1).

20. Cf. Pompey 68.2.

21. Suetonius *Aug.* 31: *Pompei quoque statuam contra theatri eius regiam marmoreo Iano superposuit translata e curia, in qua C. Caesar fuerat occisus.*

22. The theatre is not named specifically in the ancient sources, but its use on this occasion may be inferred: Suetonius (*Iul.* 39.1–2) states that Caesar presented plays (*ludos*) in every ward all over the city, and that the actor Decimus Laberius was made a knight following his performance in a farce and that he passed from the stage through the orchestra and took his place in the first fourteen rows. Plutarch (*Caes.* 55.4) only mentions that Caesar gave spectacles (*theai*).

23. Suetonius *Claud.* 21.1.

24. *Res gestae* 20.

25. For Tiberius' restorations, see Tacitus *Ann.* 3.72, and Velleius Paterculus 2.130.1. Suetonius (*Tib.* 47) records that his renovation of the theatre was incomplete. For Caligula's completion of the theatre, see Suetonius *Calig.* 21.

26. For Claudius' rededication and the inscription of names, see Cassius Dio 60.6.8.

27. For Nero's costly renovations, see Pliny *HN* 33.54, and Cassius Dio 62.6.1–2. The *scaena* was burned in the great fire at Rome in 80 C.E. See Richardson 1992, 385, for later renovations of the theatre.

28. Pliny (*HN* 36.108) relates that the theatre built by Libo in 63 B.C.E. was completely covered by a roof. Previously, theatres had been adorned with materials thought to be inappropriate to a temporary structure. Sometime before 100 B.C.E., when L. Licinius Crassus was aedile, for example, the Hymettus marble used to decorate either the *scaena* or the theatre itself caused a scandal, no doubt arising out of the expenditure involved for such a temporary structure. See Richardson 1992, 380, for the growing extravagance and expense of temporary theatres.

29. Pliny *HN* 36.114. The location of this theatre is unknown, but the Campus Martius is the most likely site. See Pollard 1999, 38–39 ("Theatrum Scauri").

30. Pliny *HN* 36.114.

31. *Ibid.* 36.115.

32. *Ibid.* Richardson (1992, 385) puts the actual number at 20,000 based on the seating capacity of Pompey's theatre.

33. Pliny *HN* 36.115.

34. *Ibid.* 36.114.

35. Cf. Richardson 1992, 380.

36. Cf. *Fam.* 7.1.2 (text of Watt 1982, 198). For Pompey's selection of plays, see Beacham 1999, 65. Careful planning, however, was no guarantee for a suc-

cessful opening, as Balbus and Augustus were to learn: the Tiber flooded Balbus' theatre at its opening, causing guests to arrive by boat (Cassius Dio 54.25.2), and at the opening ceremony of the theatre of Marcellus, Augustus' chair collapsed (Suetonius *Aug.* 43.5).

37. Nonius cites two distinct plays by Accius—the *Aegisthus* and the *Clytaemnestra*—but the fragments may actually come from the same play. Ribbeck (1897, 138–141) cites fragments under separate titles (but using the spelling *Clutemestra*), as do Warmington (1982: *Aegisthus* 328–331; *Clytaemnestra* 406–411), Franchella (1968, 239–260), and Dangel (1995, 165–168).

38. Plutarch *Pompey* 45.1–4. Appian (*Mith.* 116–117) provides an account of the triumphal procession to the Capitol, including the detail that Pompey wore, or claimed to be wearing, Alexander the Great's purple cloak.

39. See Suetonius *Nero* 46.1; Pliny *HN* 36. Richardson (1992, 384) suggests that these statues were placed against the piers of the exterior arcade rather than installed as a crown on the *cavea*. A similar portico was later imitated by Augustus. For Augustus' *porticus ad nationes*, see Pliny *HN* 36.39.

40. See Beacham 1992, 158, for a discussion of the theatre as a permanent memorial to Pompey's triumph. See also Coarelli 1971–72, 99–122.

41. See Ribbeck 1875, 460–464, for possible Greek models. Warmington (1982, 406 ff.) argues that Accius followed the story of Agamemnon's return found in Hyginus *Fabulae* 117: upon learning from Oeax that Cassandra was returning to Mycenae as Agamemnon's captive and concubine, Clytemnestra plotted to kill both while Agamemnon was sacrificing. Whatever Clytemnestra's motivation, we have a victorious Agamemnon returning to Mycenae and his subsequent murder with Cassandra by Clytemnestra in either plot scenario.

42. Cited is the text of Ribbeck 1897, 161–163.

43. Plutarch *Pompey* 67.3.

44. *Ibid.* 2.2; see Corbeill 1996, 176–178, for an analysis of the political implications of this allusion.

45. Appian *Mith.* 117, where he questions the credibility of Alexander's connection with the cloak.

46. The sole surviving fragment from Livius' play comes from a speech appealing for help: *da mihi hasce opes, / quas peto, quas precor; / porridge, opitula!* (text from Ribbeck 1897, 3). The speaker of the sole surviving fragment from Livius' play is unknown: *numquam hodie effugies quin mea moriaris manu* (text from Ribbeck 1897, 9).

47. See Slater 1985, 111, for the reception of Plautus' *Bacchides*, in particular his analysis (contra Jocelyn) of the audience's interpretation of seeing Troy being sacked on stage.

48. The number is extraordinary. Plutarch reports that just under 900 towns were captured. In the procession were also captives from numerous nations that had been subdued: Pontus, Armenia, Cappadocia, Paphlagonia, Media, Colchis, Iberia, Albania, Syria, Cilicia, Mesopotamia, Phoenicia, and Palestine. Cf. Plutarch *Pompey* passim.

49. For recent analyses of this play, see Flower 1996, 88–89, and Manuwald 2001, 62ff.

50. In Book 1, Livy's interest in the parallels between Roman history and the tragic stage is apparent when he compares the crimes of the Tarquins to those of the Theban and Mycenaean kings on the Greek stage: *tulit enim et Romana regia sceleris tragici exemplum, ut taedio regum maturior veniret libertas ultimique regnum esset quod scelere partum foret* (1.46.3). On the play of Accius as a historical source for Livy, see Coulton 1940, 465-466.

51. Cicero *Div.* 1.22.44 preserves both passages. Cited is the text of Diehl 1967, frags. 212-214.

52. Warmington 1982, 563, citing the error of a scribe, assigns a speech by Lucretia as the third fragment of Accius' play, but as Varro's passage (*Ling.* 7.42) states, it actually comes from Cassius Parmensis' *Brutus*.

53. Cicero *Sest.* 58, 123.

54. Varro *Ling.* 5.80.

55. The scholiast's gloss of this line casts doubt on Cicero's literal interpretation of the allusion: *haec etiam tragoedia praetextata Brutus inscribitur, in qua nominatus quidem Tullius videtur, sed non idem ipse Cicero, quantum pertineat ad Accium poetam: quantum ad actorem tamen, sine dubio per qualitatem nominis utique significatio passionis eius eluxit* (Schol. Bob. ad 1.1).

56. Cicero (*Att.* 2.19) states that the actor Diphilus attacked Pompey with the lines *nostra miseria tu es magnus—; eandem virtutem istam veniet tempus cum graviter gemes*; and *si neque leges neque mores cogunt—*, but it is not clear whether Diphilus inserted or emphasized these lines. Cicero's remark on the relevance of the lines: *nam et eius modi sunt ii versus, uti in tempus ab inimico Pompei scripti esse videantur. . .*

57. Lana (1958-59, 354-356), however, argues that Cicero was equating his actions with those of Lucius Junius Brutus.

58. For a discussion of the *conditores* of Rome, see Edwards 1996, 44-52.

59. The fact that Marcus Junius Brutus was not related by blood to the legendary Lucius Junius Brutus, who had killed his two sons and heirs, did not bother him since he constructed a family tree of the Junius family anyway, as though his relationship with the legendary Brutus were based on genealogy. Atticus compiled this family tree for Brutus, as Cicero makes clear: *ubi igitur philotechnema illud tuum, quod vidi in Parthenone, Ahalam et Brutum?* (*Att.* 13.40). See also Nepos *Att.* 18.

60. Cicero records that Brutus sought to produce the play in absentia: *Att.* 16.1.11, 16.4.1; and *Phil.* 10.8.

61. According to Plutarch (*Caesar* 61.8), the tribunes Flavius and Marullus removed crowns that had been placed on Caesar's statues after the failed coronation attempt and were called "Brutus" by the populace. Plutarch further records (61.10) that Caesar, unhappy with the allusion, removed Marullus from office and turned the reference against the tribunes and populace by exploiting the pun in Brutus' name, calling them "Brutes" and "Cumaeans." "Cumaeans" refers to the legend that Tarquin had received from Cumae the original Sibylline Books, which stated that only under a king would Rome conquer Parthia. Thus, according to Corbeill (1996, 201), "Marullus and Flavius become stupid regicides who have arrived from Cumae spreading unbelievable prophecies."

62. Suetonius *Julius* 80.3; Plutarch *Brutus* 9.5-7; Appian *B Civ.* 2.112; and Dio 44.12.3. Only if Caesar had been viewed as a king or as aspiring to kingship could such a connection between Caesar and Tarquinius have been sustained. The actual constitutional and religious position of Caesar immediately preceding his death is controversial. See Weinstock 1971 and Fishwick 1987 with their extensive bibliographies.

63. Appian *B Civ.* 3.23-24.

64. Seneca in the *De beneficiis* (2.20.2) condemns Brutus' actions and defends Caesar by claiming that a good king is the best form of government for the Roman state.

65. Perhaps mirroring the report of Brutus' appeal to Cicero, Plutarch claims that Cassius himself appealed to Pompey prior to the assassination by invoking his statue. In the *Life of Caesar* (66.1-2), Plutarch places great symbolic importance on the location of the assassination: "So far, perhaps these things [portents and coincidences] may have happened on their own accord; the place however, which was the scene of that struggle and murder, and in which the senate was then assembled, since it contained a statue of Pompey and had been dedicated by Pompey as an additional ornament to his theatre, made it wholly clear that it was the work of some heavenly power that was calling and guiding the action thither. Indeed, it is also said that Cassius, turning his eyes toward the statue of Pompey before the attack began, invoked it silently, although he was much addicted to the doctrines of Epicurus." Plutarch (66.13), furthermore, places the statue in the role of witness to the murder: "And the pedestal was drenched with his blood, so that one might have thought that Pompey himself was presiding over this vengeance upon his enemy, who now lay prostrate at his feet, quivering from a multitude of wounds." (Translations from Perrin 1968, 594-598.) Though Plutarch's narrative contains theatrical elements, the conspirators themselves did not "frame" the assassination in theatrical terms.

66. For a detailed analysis of events surrounding the attempted restaging of Accius' *Brutus*, see Lana 1958-59, 356-359; and, more recently, Nicolet 1980, 371-373.

67. Cic. *Att.* 16.5.1: *tuas iam litteras Brutus exspectabat. cui quidem ego novum attuleram de Tereo Acci. ille Brutum putabat.* See Lana 1958-59, 356-357 n. 3, for a discussion of tyranny in the Tereus myth and for an analysis of Bilinski 1957, 44, which posits an anti-L. Appuleius Saturninus context to Accius' original production of the *Tereus*. See Parker 1999, 172, for the audience's ability to reinterpret the dramatic text on this occasion.

68. See Warmington 1982, 542ff., for fragments of the *Tereus* and a reconstruction of the plot based on Sophocles. Livius Andronicus had also written a *Tereus*.

69. Cicero *Att.* 16.5.1.

70. Cf. *Att.* 16.2.3; *Phil.* 1.15.36-37, where Cicero downplays the importance of the *Tereus*, stating that the audience passed judgment on Brutus' cause rather than give applause for the play; *Phil.* 2.13.31, for honors granted to Brutus and Cassius following the *ludi Apollinares*. Appian (*B Civ.* 3.24), however, suggests that hired supporters were planted in the audience on this occasion to

foster only the impression of popular support for Brutus and Caesar's assassination. Cicero (*Att.* 16.2.3) also takes the opportunity to chide the audience for cheering actors in support of Republican sentiments but not defending the Republic with deeds in its hour of need. Ribbeck (1875, 669-670) summarizes other references to audiences whose favorable or hostile reception to a play was organized, notably the prologues to Plautus' *Amphitruo* and Terence's *Eunuchus*. See Parker 1999, 172, for Brutus' hiring of supporters before Gaius Antony substituted plays.

71. Suetonius *Iul.* 84: *inter ludos cantata sunt quaedam ad miserationem et invidiam caedis eius accommodata ex Pacuvi Armorum iudicio*. . . . Suetonius also reports that similar sentiments were sung from the *Electra* of Atilius.

72. According to Ribbeck (1875, 218), the model for Pacuvius' play was the play of the same theme by Aeschylus. Earlier Latin versions of the Ajax myth include the *Ajax Mastigophorus* of Livius and the *Ajax* of Ennius. See the appendix for the conjectured models of these plays.

73. Since A. Weichert's *De L. Varii et Cassii Parmensis vita et carminibus* (1836), there have been few studies on Cassius and his composition of a *Brutus*: Nicolas 1851; Ribbeck 1897, 363, which lists Cassius as the probable author of a *praetexta* and includes the play in his list of *praetextae*, p. 365; F. Skutsch 1899, 1743-1744; Pedrolì 1953, 74, which lists the speech by Lucretia among the fragments of Accius' *Brutus*; Helm 1954, 1571 (Helm gives further notice of two anonymous *praetextae*, pp. 1571-1572); Jona 1962-63, 68-104, esp. 95-98; La Penna 1979, 143-151, on the likelihood that Cassius composed a *Brutus*; Flower 1995, 172; and Manuwald 2001, 237-243.

74. Suetonius records that Cassius sneered at Augustus' low birth in political pamphlets, and preserves his actual words: *materna tibi farina est ex crudissimo Ariciae pistrino; hanc finxit manibus collybo decoloratis Nerulonenis mensarius* (*Augustus* 4).

75. Vell. 2.87.3; Val. Max. 1.7 preserves the story that Cassius' execution came soon after being visited by apparitions at night.

76. Varro *Ling.* 6.7. The passage is quoted again at 7.72: *nunc de temporibus dicam. quod est apud Cassium: "nocte intempesta nostram devenit domum." nox intempesta dicta ab tempestate, tempestas ab tempore, nox intempesta quo tempore nihil agitur!* For a discussion of the manuscript tradition that replaces Accii and Accium with Cassii and Cassium, see Kent 1967, 178-179. Ribbeck (1897, frag. 5, p. 331) lists the fragment among those of Accius' *Brutus* but lists Cassius as the probable author. Warmington (1982, 563) assigns this fragment to Accius' *Brutus*, attributing the references to *Casii* and *Cassium* in Varro *Ling.* 6.7 and 7.72 to a scribal error. La Penna (1979, 143-145) argues that Varro may have included a rare contemporary reference due to his friendship with Cassius and their political affinities to the Pompeians.

77. Hyginus *Fabulae* 86-88 conflates many details of the Atreus-Thyestes myth.

78. There seem to have been at least eight plays in Greek with the name *Thyestes*: by Sophocles, Euripides, Apollodorus of Tarsus, Carcinus, Chaeremon, Cleophon, Diogenes of Sinope, and Agathon. See Jocelyn 1967, 418. R. J. Tar-

rant (1985, 40) cites other plays: "Sophocles wrote at least two plays on the subject [House of Tantalus], an *Atreus* and the play usually called *Thyestes in Sicyon*; Euripides wrote a *Thyestes*, a *Plisthenes* (dealing with Thyestes' efforts to avenge the loss of his children), and a third play, *The Cretan Women*, in which both Thyestes and Aerope appeared; plays with the title *Thyestes* or *Aerope* are recorded for several other Greek tragedians (Agathon, Chaeremon, Carcinus, Cleophon, Diogenes, Apollodorus of Tarsus)." This list of Greek plays illustrates that one need not consider the plays of Aeschylus, Sophocles, or Euripides as the sole possible models for dramatists writing centuries later and within the Hellenistic literary tradition in both tragedy and comedy. See Tarrant 1976, 6ff., for a discussion of the relatively small effect fifth-century B.C.E. Athenian tragedy had on Augustan and later Imperial tragedy.

79. Ennius' *Thyestes*, the last play written by Ennius, was performed at the first *ludi Apollinares* in 169 B.C.E. (*Cic. Brut.* 78). Accius read his *Atreus* to Pacuvius in Tarentum before 130 B.C.E. (*Aul. Gell. NA* 13.2.2). The *Thyestes* of Cassius of Parma dates to the 40's/30's B.C.E. Varius Rufus produced his *Thyestes* in 29 B.C.E. for Augustus' triple triumph. The dates of Sempson Gracchus' plays, including his *Thyestes*, are insecure but seem to date to the teens B.C.E. The *Atreus* of Mamercus Aemilius Scaurus dates to before 34 C.E. (the year of his death). Pomponius Secundus' *Atreus* dates to before 60 C.E. (the year of his death). The exact date of Seneca's *Thyestes*, in addition to the dates of his other plays, is unknown. The *Thyestes* of Curvatus Maternus dates to Vespasian's reign. Fulgentius (*Serm. Ant.* 57) ascribes a *Thyestes* to Pacuvius, but his testimony is unreliable. On this attribution, see Valsa 1957, 56.

80. See Lana 1958-59, 326-327: "Si può supporre, nella tragedia variana, un riferimento, più o meno aperto, ad Antonio, presentato come un tiranno," and, most recently, Leigh 1996, 171-197, which equates Antony with Atreus. J. D. Bishop (1985) has sought to apply allusive language to contemporary figures and events. See esp. 16-23, where he attempts to attribute mythological tyrants' names to historical personalities.

81. Scholarship on the significance of this myth at Rome is extensive. In addition to Bilinski 1957, see in particular Ribbeck 1875, 199-204 (Ennius' *Thyestes*), 447-457 (Accius' *Atreus*); La Penna's important study (1979, 127-141), which argues for less emphasis on the inherent theme of tyranny in favor of more analysis of the philosophical implications of the myth, citing in particular Accius' *Atreus* and Seneca's *Thyestes*; Lana 1958-59, 292-358; Jocelyn 1967, 412-419; D'Antò 1980, 277-290; Dangel 1995, 275-283; Lefèvre 1971; Tarrant 1978, 213-263; Calder 1983, 184-198; Tarrant 1985; Cova 1989; and the review of Cova by H. D. Jocelyn (1990, 596-600). Unfortunately, Schiesaro 2003 appeared too late to be included in this study.

82. Varius' dates are approximately 74 to 14 B.C.E. Cova (1989, 15-27) argues for a production date prior to Augustus' triple triumph. See Jocelyn 1980, 399-400, however, for counterarguments.

83. Didasc. in cod. Paris, 7530 S. VIII and Rome, Bibl. Casanatense 1086; see Beare 1964, 233. Ribbeck (1897, 229) cites the scholiast edition of Julius Quiceratus, *Bibliothèque de l'école des chartes* (Paris, 1839), 1:52. A copy of

the manuscript page is also printed in *CLA* 5.569. For a historical analysis of these scholiasts, see Jocelyn 1980, 387-400.

84. The *Res gestae* (22) includes many references to the *ludi* given by Augustus under his own name or the names of others, yet the only specific reference to *ludi scaenici* appears in a summary of other games that he sponsored: *impensa praestita in spectacula scaenica et munera gladiatorum atque athletas et venationes et naumachiam et donata pecunia* . . . (Summary, 19.4). Cited is the text of Diehl 1925, 46. The relative brevity of this reference to scenic entertainment when compared to the details of athletic, gladiatorial, and hunting spectacles found on the inscription seems odd, since Augustus thought it important enough to record his renovation of Pompey's theatre (20) and the construction of the theatre of Marcellus.

85. See Courtney 1993, 272, for analysis of frag. 2 as an allusion to Antony: *incubet ut Tyriis atque ex solido bibat auro*. On unflattering allusions to Antony, see Gordon Williams, "Varius," in *OCD*, 2d ed. (Hammond and Sculard 1970, 1107); and Edward Courtney, "Varius," in *OCD*, 3d ed. (Hornblower and Spawforth 1996, 1581), with recent bibliography.

86. Varius seems to have taken this commission quite seriously, according to the scholiast notice that stresses the care taken in its composition: *tragoediam magna cura absolutam*. Augustus must have been pleased with the result, as the amount of his payment bears witness.

87. As discussed in chapter 3, the *Iter* of Cornelius Balbus was also composed for a triumph, but it was never performed in Rome.

88. Ribbeck (1897, 265), however, lists further passages from unknown plays.

89. Tacitus, in the *Dialogus de oratoribus* (12), praises the play, and Quintilian claims that Varius' *Thyestes* rivaled Greek plays (10.1.98). Since the *Thyestes* of Varius predates Horace's *Ars poetica*, did the play serve as Horace's model? See Boissier 1897.

90. Cited is the text of Ribbeck 1897, 265. Quintilian 3.8.45: *neque enim quisquam est tam malus ut videri velit. sic Catilina apud Sallustium loquitur, ut rem scelestissimam non malitia, sed indignatione videatur audere: sic Atreus apud Varium iam fero, inquit, infandissima, iam facere cogor*.

91. See Tarrant 1985, 41, for the dramatic action of Varius' play and alternative plot reconstructions. With regard to the later dramatic tradition of the play, Tarrant cautions against viewing Varius' play as the model for Seneca's due to a lack of secure evidence. In particular, there is no basis for assuming that the banquet scene in Varius' play was the dénouement, as it is in Seneca's play (and indeed Accius'). See Morford 2000, 173-174, for an analysis of Manilius *Astronomica* 5.458-463 as a possible summary of the banquet scene from Varius' play.

92. I omit Livius Andronicus' *Aegisthus* from this list since the events from this play center on Agamemnon's return from Troy and not the feud between Atreus and Thyestes. See Ribbeck 1875, 28-31. Accius' version was still popular and Ennius' version was current enough to be quoted several times by Cicero in his philosophical and forensic works: *Tusc.* 1.106-107, 3.25; *Orat.* 103;

Brut. 78; and *Pis.* 43. The tragedian Gracchus' plays date to the teens B.C.E.; therefore I do not list his play *Thyestes* as a dramatic precursor to Varius' version. Many references to Atreus and Thyestes appear in the unassigned fragments of tragic plays, but unfortunately these cannot be identified with any one version.

93. Jocelyn 1967, 413: "I propose that the events [Thyestes' adultery with Aerope, wife of Atreus; Thyestes' banishment, subsequent recall, and infamous banquet] took place before the action of the *Thyestes* and that Ennius' tragedy was set at the court of Thesprotus in Epirus." Warmington (1988, 346ff.) divided the action of the play between two scenes, Atreus' court in Mycenae and Thesprotus' in Epirus.

94. See Ribbeck 1897, 161-163; Warmington 1982, 381-393; D'Antò 1980, 280-281; Dangel 1995, 275-276.

95. Accius wrote the *Pelopidae* and the *Chrysippus* about other episodes surrounding this myth. According to Jocelyn (1967, 414), "The *Atreus* quite certainly dealt with the feast while the meagre remains of the *Pelopidae* can be very plausibly interpreted as dealing with the recognition of Aegisthus. If Thyestes had any role in Accius' *Chrysippus* it could only have been a minor one."

96. Cited is the text and fragment order of Ribbeck 1897, 186-192.

97. La Penna (1979, 128) emphasizes the ruthlessness and cruel sarcasm of Atreus.

98. See below for the quotation of this line by certain Julio-Claudian emperors. La Penna (1979, 66-67) notes a similarity between this line and Ennius', *quem metuunt oderunt; quem quisque odit perisse expetit* (Jocelyn 1967, 348), which comes from an unknown play.

99. La Penna (1979, 130-131) discusses the possibility (based on Cicero *Sest.* 102) that these lines belong to Atreus.

100. Leigh (1996, 185) argues that these lines cast Atreus in an ideological tyrannical light: "What is perhaps most characteristic of this quotation and most worthy of note is the manner in which it casts Atreus not just as the villain of the piece but as a representative of an ideological category, the tyrant." However, from a different perspective, it is Thyestes' tyranny (i.e., his usurpation attempt by sleeping with Atreus' wife) that Atreus is punishing. On the difficulty of assessing Thyestes' character in this play, see La Penna 1979, 129-132.

101. See La Penna 1979, 66-71, for an analysis of the philosophical political contexts of generic tyrannical sentiments found in Accius' *Atreus* and Pacuvius' *Dulorestes*.

102. For Cassius' composition of a *Thyestes*, see Nicolas 1851, 42-49; Ribbeck, in his index to 1897, 335, places a question mark next to Cassius' name as the author of a *Thyestes*; F. Skutsch 1899, 1743-1744; La Penna (1979, 148-149), however, argues that the evidence is inconclusive.

103. Pseudo-Acro at Horace *Epist.* 1.4.3. Jona (1962-63, 83-98) analyzes the reliability of ancient sources concerning Cassius and reviews scholarship on the question of Cassius' composition of tragedies. La Penna (1979, 146-147), however, questions the reliability of Acro as a source. The Cruquii scholiasts record the same notice as Acro, which is also found in Porphyryon at Horace

Epist. 1.4.3. In addition, at Horace *Sat.* 1.10.61, Porphyrio glosses: *Cassii fabulam Thyestem sua tempestate exstitisse confitetur*. Even the title of the play is called into question by La Penna (1979, 147–148 n. 2), who discusses the appearance in a manuscript of the title *Orestes* in place of *Thyestes*.

104. In addition to Nicolas 1851, see F. Skutsch 1899, 1743. Helm 1954 only mentions the *Brutus* in connection with Cassius.

105. La Penna (1979, 148) argues that the evidence does not support this conclusion.

106. Cf. Zorzetti 1980, 93–103; Flower 1995, 172.

107. La Penna (1979, 149) argues that Varius' *Thyestes* may be a response to Cassius' *Brutus*, but this argument is based on his rejection of a *Thyestes* by Cassius.

108. Augustus emphasized his victory over Cleopatra by displaying her children Alexander (Helios) and Cleopatra (Selene) as trophies in his triumph, together with an effigy of Cleopatra. See Plutarch *Ant.* 86.2; Dio Cassius 51.21.8.

109. A point emphasized by Lana (1958–59, 326).

110. My reading of the allusion differs from that of Leigh (1996, 171–197), who argues in favor of an identification of Antony with Atreus. The fact that we come to different conclusions about the same evidence illustrates how difficult it is for a dramatist to control audience interpretation. Suetonius (*Aug.* 7.2) and Dio Cassius (53.16.7) report that Augustus considered adopting the name Romulus, which demonstrates that he understood the value of political allusion to a mythological/legendary figure but perhaps not all of its consequences, since this name would have placed Augustus' defeat of Mark Antony (Remus, by analogy) in the context of a civil war. See Wiseman 1995b, 144–150, for the significance of the allusion in Augustan Rome.

111. See Della Corta 1981, 234–235: “Ni la servilité vis-à-vis du pouvoir, compte tenu de ton libertoire du sujet, ni son actualité ne semblent avoir dirigé le choix de Varius. . . . Nous prévient qu'il ne faut pas voir Antoine en Atrée et moins encore Octavien en Thyeste.” Lana (1958–59, 326–327), while recognizing an allusion to Antony in the play, cautions against assigning historical identities to these allusions.

112. Text of Wickham 1959.

113. Michael Dewar (1988, 563–565) argues that in addition to *Georgics* 1.511–514, another metaphor connecting Augustus with Orestes occurs at *Aeneid* 4.471–473, where an allusion to a stage production of a tragedy in which Orestes appears is used, among other mythological figures, to describe Dido in her madness: *aut Agamemnonius scaenis agitat Orestes, / armatam facibus matrem et serpentibus atris, / cum fugit ultricesque sedent in limine Dirae*. *agitat* has the general sense of “aroused” or the technical sense, stemming from the theatre, of “acted.” For visual evidence connecting Augustus with Orestes, see Pausanias 2.17.3, and Cecioni 1993, 506, which reviews the evidence for the renaming of Greek statues with the names of Romans.

114. Dio Cassius 58.24.3–5. The ostensible reason given for Scaurus' prosecution was that he had committed adultery with Livilla. Tiberius seems to have

identified himself not only with Atreus, but also with Agamemnon, since he prosecuted a dramatist for having slandered the mythical king. See Suetonius *Tib.* 61.3. Tiberius' own identification with Agamemnon may have been in response to Agrippina's initial comparison of him with the two kings. See also Tacitus *Ann.* 6.29.3.

115. Suetonius (*Nero* 39) is surprised by Nero's tolerance of criticism and his ignoring of insults and lampoons aimed at his matricide, his singing ability, and his golden house. In fact, when presented with a list of names of detractors, Nero chose to let the offenders off lightly, thereby advertising his clemency. At Tacitus *Ann.* 13.15, however, Nero interprets a song sung by Britannicus as being an attack on him for having usurped the throne.

116. Of Pomponius' two known plays, the *Atreus* and the *Aeneas*, it is not clear in Quintilian *Inst.* 10.1.98 whether Quintilian has seen either play. As a literary connoisseur and a defender of Pomponius' style, it would be difficult to argue that he saw only one of his plays rather than both: *eorum quos viderim longe princeps Pomponius Secundus, quem senes quidem parum tragicum putabant, eruditione ac nitore praestare confitebantur*.

117. Michael Coffey (1986) argues that this play was written after Seneca became a magistrate (praetor in 50 C.E.): “It may therefore be suggested that A.D. 49 is the *terminus post quem* for the composition of Seneca's *Thyestes*, which must have been written either before the accession of Nero in A.D. 54 or in the early years of his reign when Seneca and his master were engaged in writing poetry” (48).

118. Seneca *Ad Lucilium epistulae morales* 80. See also Tarrant 1985, 43: “From this brief survey it appears that the disposition of scenes and some of the elements of character-depiction in Seneca's *Thyestes* follow an outline used at least by Accius (if not by Varius as well), and possibly worked out as early as Sophocles or Euripides.” For similarities between Accius' *Atreus* and Seneca's *Thyestes*, see Ribbeck 1875, 448ff.; Lana 1958–59, 316ff.; La Penna 1979, 135.

119. Tarrant (1985, 10) argues that no such sentiments are present: “The plays do not overtly mention contemporary persons or events; veiled topical allusions have often been suggested, but no dating on them has won general acceptance.” Beare (1964, 236) argues that the presence of absolute rulers depicted in an odious light is sufficient evidence that Seneca's plays were not presented on the Roman stage, but this theory does not account for the role of interpretation in understanding allusions arising from the stage.

120. Text of Zwielerlein 1988, 302.

121. Text of Zwielerlein 1988, 432–433.

122. See *Dialogus* 1–3. The likelihood that Maternus is simply a fictional creation and not a historical personality seems remote. See Barnes 1981, 382–384, which reviews the relevant theories and bibliography, including Syme 1958, 798–799, and Lana 1958–59, 336–340.

123. *Dialogus* 3.2.

124. See Bartsch 1994, 89–90, which translates “misguided interpretation” as the argument of Secundus, but the point is that the audience has been guided

by Maternus as to the gist and force of his allusions. See Rudich 1993, 10-13; 1997, 8-16, for an extensive analysis of Tacitus' use of the expression *prava interpretatio*.

125. Suetonius *Tib.* 59.

126. Ibid. 61.3. Suetonius states that Tiberius took offense at Scaurus' play and at a history glorifying Cassius and Brutus that had not offended Augustus when he heard the work sometime earlier. Did Augustus understand the unflattering allusions to himself but choose not to take offense?

127. Dio Cassius 58.24.4

128. Suetonius *Gaius* 30.1; Dio Cassius 59.13.6.

129. Cicero *De officiis* 2.7.23.

130. Thyestes was among Nero's most frequently acted roles. See Dio Cassius 62.9.4, 63.22.6. Suetonius reports that Nero planned to act the role of Turnus onstage in the games he would hold if he were to survive Galba's revolt (*Nero* 54). Identification with Turnus, rather than with Aeneas, would have signaled further Nero's conflicting "roles" and his own precarious political position.

131. The title *imperator scaenicus* was given to Nero by Pliny in his *Panegyric to Trajan* (46.4), where he contrasts the sober tastes of Trajan and his subjects with the excesses of Nero and his contemporaries.

132. See the extensive analysis of this role-playing in Bartsch 1994, 46-50; Rudich 1993, *passim*; and, most recently, Beacham 1999, 197ff.

133. Suetonius *Nero* 21.3. See Bartsch 1994, 50 and 227 n. 21, for a bibliography for the alternate reading of *Orestes*. Varner (2000, 131-132, and 136 n. 62) discusses the connections between Neronian art and the theatricality of Nero's stage roles.

134. The fact that Poppaea was already deceased further complicates any interpretation of Nero onstage. See Slater 1996, 39, which argues that the appearance of Nero onstage wearing a mask in the likeness of Poppaea would have reminded the audience of his responsibility for her death. Also, it is possible that members of the audience might question her death, since she was embalmed, rather than cremated as was the Roman custom, thus making her "appearance" onstage even more bizarre. Varner (2000, 136 n. 63) discusses two cameo portraits of Poppaea that may give us some idea how Poppaea's features were reproduced on theatre masks.

135. Both anecdotes are preserved in Dio Cassius 63.10.2. Suetonius *Nero* 21.3 gives more details surrounding the story of the soldier rushing to Nero's aid: *in qua fabula fama est tirunculum militem positum ad custodiam aditus, cum eum ornari ac vinciri catenis, sicut argumentum postulabat, videret, accurrisse ferendae opis gratia*. For the undermining of theatrical representation, see the excellent discussions of these passages in Bartsch 1994, 47-49 and Slater 1996, 33-35. Slater raises the important question of whether Nero's mask was more like a portrait or an exaggerated stage mask as a factor in examining the tension between realism and theatricality of this passage.

136. Tacitus (*Ann.* 15.50) attributes this idea to Subrius Flavus. Unfortunately we do not know whether Flavus considered assassinating Nero onstage to

exploit a connection between Nero and the role he would have been singing/acting at the time.

137. Rumors and rhymes (*carmen*) in 59 C.E., after Agrippina's murder, compared Nero to Orestes (Suetonius *Nero* 39.2). Placards were set up in Rome that compared Nero to the matricides Alcmaeon and Orestes (Dio Cassius 62.16.2; Suetonius *Nero* 39). Other indications that the urban mob in Rome thought Nero a matricide include the placement of a leather bag on one of his statues to show that he should be punished as a parricide (Dio Cassius 61.16.1); the exposure of a baby in the forum with a tag that read, "I will not raise you lest you slaughter your mother" (Dio Cassius 16.16.2); and gossip circulated all over the city that Nero had killed Agrippina (Dio Cassius 16.16.3). For Nero's role in the murder of Agrippina, see Tacitus *Ann.* 14.1-10; Suetonius *Nero* 34.

138. For the tragedy-like structure of Tacitus' narrative that contributes to the identification of Nero with Orestes, see Walker 1952; Dawson 1968, 253-267.

139. Suetonius *Nero* 34: *saepe confessus, exagitari se materna specie, verberibus Furiarum, ac taedis ardentibus*. See also Dio Cassius 61.14.4. Pseudo-Seneca, in the *Octavia*, makes several allusions to Agrippina as a Fury (lines 23ff., 161, 263). At lines 593-645, Agrippina's ghost appears as an avenging Fury.

140. See Tarrant 1976, 3ff., for parallels between Seneca's *Agamemnon*, Livius Andronicus' *Aegisthus*, and Accius' *Clytemnestra*.

141. See the extensive discussion on historiographic sources hostile to Nero's reign in Bartsch 1994, *passim*.

142. Tacitus expresses his disapproval in *Ann.* 14.14-16; for *foedum*, see *Ann.* 14.14: *vetus illi cupido erat curriculo quadrigarum insistere nec minus foedum studium cithara ludicrum in modum canere*.

143. *Nero* 20-25.

144. In *Satire* 8.220-221, Juvenal alludes to Nero's killing of his mother by referring to his adoption of the role of Orestes: . . . *in scaena numquam cantavit Orestes, / Troica non scripsit*. Both matricides committed a crime, but Juvenal's implication is that Nero's was worse since, in addition to actually killing his mother, he also enacted the role of matricide upon the stage.

145. Dio creates vituperative speeches for them aimed at the paradox of having an effeminate actor as ruler of the world. For example, Boudicca, in her speech to her troops, emphasizes Nero's effeminacy. Whereas Britons are led by a real woman, she argues, Rome is being ruled by a man who acts and looks like a woman, in the company of the empresses Messalina and Agrippina (62.6.2). At the end of her speech, she actually calls Nero a "queen" (62.6.5). Vindex, however, stresses Nero's stage performances and denies to such an acting emperor any relation to the "real emperors" Augustus and Claudius (63.22.1-6). It is interesting to note that Nero's detractors Boudicca and Vindex came from Britain and Gaul respectively.

146. Dio Cassius 61.19.1 relates that Nero forced members of the noblest families to perform onstage, such as the 80-year-old Aelia Catella, who had to dance in a pantomime; furthermore, he would not allow them to wear masks.

For other instances, see Suetonius *Nero* 11; Tacitus *Ann.* 14.14–15; and Juvenal *Sat.* 8.193. See Rudich 1993, 41: “It was Nero’s ‘artistic tyranny,’ not only in regard to his personal conduct but to his impositions on public taste and behaviour, that was highly offensive to traditional Roman feelings. In addition to their disgust at observing Nero’s own histrionic feats, most senators hated the whole idea since he repeatedly and relentlessly pressured them to participate.”

147. Dio Cassius 63.15.2–3; see Bartsch 1994, 4–6.

148. Burrus was famous for his moral rectitude (Tac. *Ann.* 13.2). See Tacitus *Ann.* 14.15, for Burrus’ reluctant participation in Nero’s stage performance: *maerens Burrus ac laudans*. Dio Cassius (62.20) writes that Burrus and Seneca coached Nero on the stage.

149. Suetonius (*Vesp.* 4.4) writes that Vespasian toured with Nero on his Greek tour and that he angered the emperor by leaving the recital room or by falling asleep. Suetonius also claims that as a result of this, Vespasian was dismissed from Nero’s court and hid in a town until called to be governor. Tacitus (*Ann.* 16.5.3) claims that Vespasian was caught sleeping by Phoebus while Nero was onstage at the continuation of the Second Neronia in 65 C.E., and that only “a higher destiny saved him.” See also Dio Cassius 66.11.2, where Vespasian is caught frowning and not sleeping. Likewise, Thrasea Paetus did not dissimulate his disapproval of Nero, and he did not encourage or participate in Nero’s stage performances. See Dio Cassius 62.20.

150. Dio Cassius (62.26.3–4) gives the following reasons for Thrasea’s death: his irregular attendance at the Senate; his refusal to listen to Nero while he was performing; his lack of public exhibitions; and his having acted in a tragedy in his hometown that was of ancient tradition. But this last reason is certainly no cause for shame, since an appearance on the stage by a noble at this festival was sanctioned by ancient tradition.

151. See Tacitus *Ann.* 16.18–19. Rudich (1993, 153–158) examines the role of Petronius as an “aesthetic dissident.”

152. See Tacitus *Hist.* 1.78.2; Suetonius *Otho* 7.1, *Vit.* 11.2. See Griffin 1985, 160–163, for a discussion of the emperor on the stage. Griffin presents Nero’s theatrical interests in the context of Nero’s manic desire to obtain popularity. See also Manning 1975, 164–175, esp. p. 169: “It is more than plausible to suggest that Nero’s productions and his stage appearances were the result of a certain amount of political calculation. Moreover there is every indication that Nero’s calculations were realistic and that he won the genuine popularity he desired.” Rudich (1993, 40) argues that Nero succeeded where Agrippina failed: “But he proved more successful than his mother; there was a strong ‘populist’ component in his self-image as the ‘artistic tyrant’ craving his audience’s applause. By contrast, Agrippina’s peculiar persona as an arrogant female autocrat was universally detested.” Nero’s popularity on the stage, however, did not prevent the populace from staging several riots over the availability of grain.

153. See Tacitus *Hist.* 1.5.2, 1.8.2, 1.25.2. An important exception is the praetorian Subrius Flavus, who claimed to hate Nero but was nevertheless loyal as a soldier—in Flavus’ opinion, Nero deserved to be hated for killing his

mother and wife and for being a charioteer, actor, and incendiary. See Tacitus *Ann.* 15.67.

154. See Tacitus *Hist.* 2.8.1; and Suetonius *Nero* 57.2.

CHAPTER FIVE

1. Boyle 1997, 114. Since Boyle examines, with numerous examples, passages that define Seneca’s actor-audience, my discussion will complement his by focusing on the effects of this theatricalization of tragedy on audience reception, on and off the stage. Given the scope of this study, it is impossible to analyze examples from every play; therefore, I offer illustrative examples.

2. For the possible influence of Augustan tragedians on Seneca, see Tarrant 1978, 261: “All that is known or that can be plausibly conjectured, however, suggests that the tragedy of the Augustans resembled that of Seneca in several important respects, and that the synthesis of fifth-century subject matter, post-Euripidean form and technique, stylistic and metrical refinement, sporadic archaisms of language, and abstraction from the physical realities of the stage which is generally associated with Seneca was in fact an Augustan achievement”; and Boyle 1997, 85–111, for Seneca’s rewriting of earlier texts, especially those of the Athenian tragedians, Vergil, and Ovid.

3. For the influence of Ovid and contemporary rhetoric, see Coffey and Mayer 1990, 18: “No previous writer had a greater influence on Seneca the tragedian than Ovid both as poet and as dramatist”; and Costa 1973, 5: “The first essential for the appreciation of these tragedies is to come to terms with the rhetoric that informs them through and through. They illustrate all the declamatory elements outlined above, in particular the use of epigram and the ‘sententia’; and because of the static nature of their plots, their unobtrusive characterization, their profusion of set-piece speeches, and their preoccupation with horror and blood, they have long since lost the wide appeal they once enjoyed.” See Conte 1994, 405–407, for *declamatio* and *recitatio* under the early Empire; and Boyle 1997, 15–31, for an analysis of Seneca’s declamatory style, and 116, for the role played by rhetorical training (*declamatio* and *suasoria*) in creating *persona*: “Indeed it is arguable that in early Imperial Rome’s confounding culture personal identity began to be constructed from the performance of a plurality of politically and socially determined roles, thus collapsing the distinction between *persona* and person. Certainly the distinction between ‘reality’ and ‘theatre’ dissolves conspicuously within the theatre-amphitheatre itself, where buildings burn, actors bleed, spectators are thrust into the arena, human and animal bodies dismembered, and pain, suffering, death become objects of the theatrical gaze and of theatrical pleasure.” Goldberg (1996, 283) argues that Seneca’s rhetoric produced successful dramatic results: “The success of this new formula had a profound effect on tragedy because rhetoric had given Seneca not just a technical skill—the choice of ‘colores’ and dexterity in manipulating the language that creates them—but confidence in the power of that manipulation. Action became

secondary when the dramatist could describe effectively what might then, perhaps mercifully, remain unseen."

4. See Rudich 1997, 1-16, for an extensive discussion of the "rhetorized mentality" of Neronian Rome, in particular 10-12, for the events in Seneca's life that contributed to his own rhetorical response to his age.

5. The alternate title of *Hippolytus* is occasionally given to this play.

6. See the discussions and bibliographies found in Herington 1966, 422ff.; Tarrant 1976, which discusses the manuscript tradition of the Senecan plays; and, more recently, Tarrant 1985, 9-11, and Fitch 2002, 10-14.

7. Quintilian recalls this controversy from his youth and states further that Pomponius also published his views on proper tragic diction: *nam meminisse iuvenis admodum inter Pomponium ac Senecam etiam praefationibus esse tractatum, an gradus eliminat in tragoedia dici oportuisset* (Inst. 8.3.31).

8. Seneca's plays cannot be connected with a single emperor, let alone more than one. According to Tarrant (1976, 7): "What should be clear, however, is that the fashionable interpretation of these works as 'Neronian' has no secure basis in fact; they could with equal justification be regarded as Claudian, Gaian, or even Tiberian." On the dating of the plays see Tarrant, 1985, 10-13, and Fitch, 1981, 289-307.

9. Dio Cassius 63.5.

10. See Boyle 1997, 114, for the character as dramaturge in the *Medea* and the *Thyestes*.

11. See Tarrant 1985, 117: "Atreus makes no apology for being a dictator, and appeals several times to the 'rules' of tyrannical behavior, cf. 205-218, 247-48, 312-13."

12. See Lana 1958-59, 316-321, for similarities between the two plays, in particular 317, where he compares Atreus' speech to a similar one spoken by Atreus in Accius' *Atreus*, cited above (Ribbeck 1897, frag. 3): *iterum Thyestes Atreum adtractatum advenit, iterum iam adgreditur me et quietum exsuscitat*. In addition to bibliography, cited above, see Morford 2000, 173-174, on the possible connections between Varius' *Thyestes* and Seneca's *Thyestes*.

13. Tarrant 1985, 161: "The result may be 'untheatrical' by certain standards, but it is undeniably effective, displaying both Atreus' absolute control of the situation and his keen enjoyment of his power over Thyestes. The speech is also a pointed counterpart to Thyestes' opening monologue: while Thyestes' internal conflict withdrew him from his surroundings, Atreus remains intensely aware of every detail in the scene he is manipulating, from the pounding excitement of his own heart to the matted tangle of Thyestes' beard."

14. See Boyle 1997, 90-91, for an allusion in the play to the Julio-Claudian dynasty: "*Troades* thus exploits a myth of immediate contemporary import. The death of a civilisation, the dissolution of a culture, dramatized in *Troades*, has patent ramifications for the palimpsestic, dissolving world of late Julio-Claudian Rome."

15. See Conte 1994, 403-404, for the "spectacularization of literature": "In the face of this [elite's attempt to restore tragic drama] it is not surprising that

contemporary literature, poetry especially, tends, within certain limits and in certain aspects, to become a form of spectacle and to take on theatrical traits"; and Leigh 1997, 234-291, for allusion to the amphitheatre in the *Pharsalia*, and 281ff., for the inclusion of the sadistic voyeurism of the amphitheatre in Seneca's prose works. And see, most recently, Fitch 2002, 17-18, for the descriptive "dark foreboding" in the prologues to set the tone for the rest of the play.

16. Boyle 1997, 114.

17. Tarrant (1976, 343) translates, "He's got it [i.e., the mortal blow], it's all over with him." Tarrant connects the gladiatorial language in this passage with Roman comedy and with the *Hercules oetaeus*, in which the same expression is used by Hyllus to tell Hercules about the death of Deianara.

18. For the connections between the theatricality of the theatre and the arena, see Boyle 1997, 135-136: "By describing violent death verbally and representing it and the reaction to it theatrically Seneca is able to control the perception and evaluation of death in a way that the arena could do. Every *spectator* at the games saw different things. Seneca controls what they see and how they see it in the theatre, and furnishes them with a conceptual framework with which to judge it." On interpreting theatrical allusions outside the theatre, see Bartsch 1994, 1-35.

19. Fitch (2002, 13) conjectures a date during Nero's reign for the *Thyestes* and the *Phoenissae*. See Varner 2000, 119-136, for an analysis of the grotesque in the art of the Neronian period and for correspondences in the plays of Seneca; and Bartsch 1994, 36-40, 46-47, for horror and grotesque elements in Lucan's narrative. See, most recently, Fitch 2002, 18: "True, Seneca sometimes emphasises the grotesque aspect of violence, in part for shock value and in keeping with the taste of his age. But even as the grotesquery thrusts the physicality of violence in our faces, it also underlines its human meaning."

20. See Coleman 1990, 44-73, esp. 63-73, for mythological role-play in the punishment of prisoners under the reigns of Gaius, Claudius, and Nero. On the realism of spectacle, see 68: "From reports of the gullibility of audiences we can conclude that by the time of the early Empire a considerable degree of realism must have been achieved in Roman spectacles of all types (i.e. not simply those involving fatal encounters in the arena)."

21. Once again, I quote Beacham's (1992, 124) term, which I first cited in chapter 2 in connection with Accius' use of gore in his tragic narratives.

22. Euripides' first play, entitled *Hippolytos kalyptomenos*, was considered scandalous for its promiscuous depiction of Phaedra. Sophocles wrote a *Phaedra* that seems to have restored a measure of dignity to Phaedra's character by having her believe that Theseus was dead before turning her amorous attentions to Hippolytus.

23. Self-determination of characters is also evident in the *Troades*, where Astyanax hurls himself from the cliff: *Troades* 792ff. A character taking an active role in his or her own death is also evident as early as Livius Andronicus, who describes Agamemnon's death in the *Aegisthus*: *ipsus se in terram saucius fligit cadens*.

24. On epigrams in general, see Rawson 1987.

25. See Boyle 1997, 133-137, for the presentation of theatricalized death in Seneca against the precepts of Horace *Ars poetica* 179-188 that violent scenes should remain offstage.

26. Cited is the text of Miller 1984.

27. See Seneca *Q Nat.* 3.27.13-15, where he uses the expression *pueriles ineptias*.

28. Goldberg (1996, 283) argues: "This loss of a popular audience could have spelled the end of tragedy as it certainly spelled the end of comedy, but it did not. Tragedy instead took on a new life in a new environment by reclaiming its literary heritage and becoming once again a vehicle for serious literary endeavor."

29. Most recently, Boyle (1997, 15, 104, 134) refers to the play as incomplete, as does Fitch (2002, 278), who argues for a late composition date. Tarrant (1978, 229-230), however, argues that the play is complete: "Because of its length and unique structure, the play has often been considered incomplete. The individual scenes, however, do not give the impression of being unfinished; the opening dialogue in particular has only one near-equal for length in all of the genuine plays, and the closing scene between Jocasta and her sons could hardly be spun out to greater length without losing its effectiveness. Furthermore, the mere insertion of choral interludes and the expansion of the middle scenes, while it might bring the play up to normal Senecan length, would not affect the unconventional structure of its episodes. It seems best to regard *Phoenissae* as an essay in a distinct subgenre of tragedy."

30. Likewise, the *Hercules* ends with a dialogue between Hercules and Theseus, the *Troades* with a dialogue between Hecuba and a messenger, the *Medea* with a dialogue between Jason and Medea, the *Agamemnon* with a dialogue between Clytemnestra and Cassandra, and the *Thyestes* with a dialogue between Thyestes and Atreus. Only two plays contain an extended speech that serves to provide closure to the dramatic events: the *Phaedra* and the *Oedipus*. Zwierlein (1988) ends the play with a dialogue between Eteocles and Jocasta, while Fitch (2002, 328-329), following Grottius, ends the play with a dialogue between Polynices and Eteocles.

31. This is also apparent in the *Troades*, in which Polyxena is onstage at least from lines 872 to 1008 and is addressed by Helen and Andromache, but remains silent.

32. Beare (1964, 234), however, describes pantomime as a performance genre distinct from tragedy: "The modern view that tragedy was decomposed, so to speak, into the dramatic recitations and the pantomimic dances is altogether artificial. The most obvious link of the pantomime with drama was the stage setting; its themes, taken from mythology, might naturally be tragic; at its highest level it may have appealed to that section of the public who would in other circumstances have been interested in tragedy; but our evidence is that the essential attraction of pantomime was the supple, artistic, expressive, passionate, sometimes exquisitely lascivious movements of the dancer—and what has such a performance to do with true tragedy?"

33. Using Medea's murder of her children as an example, Fitch (2002, 21) ar-

rives at a similar conclusion: "The action is not specifically verbalised in the text, so that someone reading or listening to the text alone could not be sure, until some four lines further on (975), that the action had actually occurred. Here, in fact, action is primary, and the words of the text allude to it. While such a scene could presumably have been managed somehow in recitation, the primacy of action leaves little doubt that Seneca is envisaging stage performance as he composes."

34. Seneca reveals his knowledge of mounted stage productions in his prose works, suggesting that even if he did not acquire practical knowledge of dramaturgy as a playwright, which is difficult to imagine, he was at least a seasoned spectator of full stage productions of tragedy and comedy. See in particular *Ep.* 76.31, 80.7-8; *De ira* 2.17.1; *Consol.* 10.1; and *Q Nat.* 7.32.3.

35. On the recitation of Seneca's tragedies, see the extensive treatment in Zwierlein 1966.

36. Beare 1964, 234ff. Beare does not take other aristocratic or independently wealthy dramatists into consideration in his somewhat naive approach to the problem of performance. In fact, he is extremely reluctant to consider Senecan tragedy in the context of performance: "We Anglo-Saxons believe that the plays were written for declamation, not for performance in the theatre. Moreover, we think little of them as plays" (351).

37. *Ibid.*, 235.

38. Costa (1974, 5) also argues in favor of a dramatic recitation, presumably on the basis of Maternus in Tacitus' *Dialogus*, without citing actual evidence: "The old debate on whether the plays were acted or recited need raise little dust nowadays: in view of the known conditions of drama in the Neronian age discussed above and certain characteristics of the plays themselves, it is generally agreed that anything like a full-scale production is most unlikely, though of course the individual declaimer or actor in reciting the play, or extract from it, would have introduced whatever histrionic effects he liked of movement and gesticulation to enliven his own performance."

39. Herington 1966, 444: "Were the tragedies intended for acting on stage? We cannot, in method, be certain."

40. *Ibid.*, 444: "Though I do not know of any evidence which indicates beyond doubt that any first-century play was written for recitation by a single voice, there are certainly indications that some plays were composed for recital rather than full theatrical production." Herington argues that the sight of a single speaker reciting the lines from several characters, especially *stichomythia*, would be ridiculous. His conclusion, then, of a multi-voiced dramatic reading lacks evidence: "That the verse was intended for speaking then, I have no doubt, and if that can be admitted, the conclusion inevitably follows that it was intended for speaking by 'different voices for the different parts'" (444).

41. Fantham 1982, 48: "There is, it seems to me, only one medium in which the action of Senecan tragedy comes through with complete clarity, and that is the written text. I would suggest then, that Seneca composed with the expectation that he would himself recite chosen passages, or would give a dramatized reading in cooperation with others: but ultimately the play would be known

through written copies, and only the readers would experience the plays as complete works." Fantham's suggestion begs the question, why could a dramatized reading not include a complete play? What is the evidence that had Seneca recited from his plays, he would have read only "chosen passages"? Tacitus' *Maternus* gives the impression that the whole play was read. I wonder whether the plays as they have come down to us, with no specific entry and exit notations, etc., are significantly different from those circulating from earlier tragedians in the time of Seneca. Furthermore, there are no other examples (except perhaps in the case of Ovid, but certainty is impossible) of a dramatist writing a tragedy with a view to its publication and not its performance.

42. Tarrant 1978, 218 n. 23: "In discussing Senecan drama, language relating to the theatre (for example, 'on stage' and 'off stage') is employed in a purely figurative sense, and carries no suggestion that Seneca's plays were intended for stage presentation."

43. Tarrant 1976, 7: "In interpreting *Agamemnon* I have assumed that Seneca wrote with recitation, not stage-production, in mind; by 'recitation' I mean public reading either by one person or by several persons dividing the roles among themselves. This is, I think, the most probable view, but its truth cannot be demonstrated."

44. See Tarrant 1978, 247ff. For inconsistent illusion, see Coffey and Mayer 1990, 16: "It must be conceded that Seneca's attempts in *Phaedra* to present the illusion of a staged drama are intermittent."

45. See Boyle 1997, 11, and his recent bibliography on the question of performativity of the plays.

46. Sutton 1986, 62: "There is, in sum, no evidence that any Senecan play was actually produced in antiquity. But there is an equal absence of convincing internal evidence that their author did not write them with the expectation, or at least the hope, that they would be brought to the stage. Quite to the contrary, we have uncovered a number of reasons for thinking that he gave considerable, if not always equally successful, thought to their staging. There is no reason for denying Seneca the title of playwright in the full sense of the word."

47. Sutton 1986, 62 n. 42. The graffito is taken from *Agamemnon* 730.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abbot, F. F. 1907. "The Theater as a Factor in Roman Politics under the Republic." *TAPA*: 49-56.
- Abel, L. 1963. *Metatheatre*. New York.
- Ahl, F.M. 1976. *Lucan*. Ithaca.
- Aly, Wolfgang. 1936. *Livius und Ennius von Römischer Art*. Leipzig.
- Anderson, James C., Jr. 1997. *Roman Architecture and Society*. Baltimore.
- Anderson, William S. 1993. *Barbarian Play: Plautus' Roman Comedy*. Toronto.
- André, J. 1949. *La Vie et l'oeuvre de C. Asinius Pollion*. Paris.
- . 1966. *L'Otium dans la vie morale et intellectuelle romaine*. Paris.
- Archellasi, André. 1990. *Médée dans le théâtre latin d'Ennius à Sénèque*. Col-
lection de l'École Française de Rome 132. Rome.
- Austin, Alan. 1978. *Cato the Censor*. Oxford.
- Austin, R. G. 1963. *Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*. Oxford. (Original ed., 1955.)
- Bailey, C. 1962. *Lucreti De Rerum Natura Libri Sex*. Oxford. (Original ed., 1900.)
- Balsdon, J.P.V.D. 1934. *The Emperor Gaius*. Oxford.
- Barchiesi, M. 1962. *Nevio epico*. Padua.
- . 1969. "Plauto e il 'metateatro' antico." *Il Verri* 31: 113-130.
- Barnes, T. D. 1981. "Curiatius Maternus." *Hermes* 109: 382-384.
- Barret, Anthony A. 1990. *Caligula: The Corruption of Power*. New Haven.
- Barrile, Resta, ed. and trans. 1969. *Accius, Lucius: Frammenti dalle tragedie e dalle preteste*. Bologna.
- Bartsch, Shadi. 1994. *Actors in the Audience*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Beacham, Richard C. 1992. *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience*. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1999. *Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome*. New Haven.
- Beare, W. 1964. *The Roman Stage*. 3d ed. London.
- Bergmann, Bettina, and Christine Kondoleon, eds. 1999. *The Art of Ancient Spectacle*. New Haven.

- Betensky, A. 1978. "Neronian Style, Tacitean Content: The Use of Ambiguous Confrontation in the Annals." *Latomus* 37: 419-435.
- Bettini, Maurizio. 1979. *Studi e note su Ennio*. Pisa.
- Bieber, M. 1961. *The History of the Greek and Roman Theater*. 2d ed. Princeton.
- Bilinski, Bronislaw. 1957. *Accio ed i Gracchi: Contributo alla storia della plebe e della tragedia romana*. Accad. Polacca di Scienze e Lettere Bibliot. di Roma. Rome.
- Bishop, J. D. 1985. *Seneca's Daggered Stylus: Political Code in the Tragedies*. Beitrage zur klassischen Philologie 168. Königstein.
- Boissier, Gaston. 1857. *Le Poète Attius: Étude sur la tragédie latine*. Paris.
- . 1897. "L'Art poétique d'Horace et la tragédie romaine." *Rev. Phil.* 21.
- Bosworth, A. B. 1972. "Asinius Pollio and Augustus." *Historia* 21: 441-473.
- Boyencé, Pierre. 1940. "Sur Cicéron et l'histoire." *REA* 42: 388-392.
- Boyle, A. J. 1983. "Hic Epulis Locus: The Tragic Worlds of Seneca's *Agamemnon* and *Thyestes*." In A. J. Boyle, ed., *Seneca Tragicus: Ramus Essays on Senecan Drama*, 199-228. Berwick, Australia.
- . 1994. *Seneca's Troades*. Trowbridge.
- . 1997. *Tragic Seneca*. London.
- Bremmer, J. N. 1987. "Myth and Ritual in Ancient Rome: The Nonae Caprotinae." In Bremmer and Horsfall 1987, 76-88.
- Bremmer, J. N., and N. M. Horsfall. 1987. *Roman Myth and Mythology*. London.
- Brink, C. O. 1960. "Tragic History and Aristotle's School." *PCPS* 6: 14-18.
- Brooks, Robert Angus. 1981. *Ennius and Roman Tragedy*. New York. (Diss., Harvard University, 1949.)
- Burck, E. 1979. *Das römische Epos*. Darmstadt.
- Burns, Elizabeth. 1972. *Theatricality: A Study of Convention in the Theatre and in Social Life*. London.
- Bury, J. B. 1909. *The Ancient Greek Historians*. New York.
- Calder, W. M., III. 1975. "The Size of the Chorus in Seneca's *Agamemnon*." *CP*: 32-35.
- . 1983. "Secreti Loquimur: An Interpretation of Seneca's *Thyestes*." In Boyle 1983, 184-198.
- Cancik, Hubert. 1978. "Die republikanische Tragödie." In Eckard Lefèvre, *Das Römische Drama*, 308-347. Darmstadt.
- Caratello, Ugo. 1979. *Livio Andronico*. Rome.
- Carey, Earnest. 1961. *Cassius Dio*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1914.)
- Carney, Thomas Francis. 1961. *A Biography of C. Marius*. *Proceedings of the African Classical Associations*, suppl. 1.
- Cecioni, Natale. 1993. "Octavian and Orestes in Pausanias." *CQ* 43: 506.
- Clausen, W. V. 1992. *A. Persi Flacci et D. Iunii Iuvenalis Saturae*. Oxford. (Original ed., 1959.)
- Coarelli, F. 1971-72. "Il complesso pompeiano di Campo Marzio e la sua decorazione scultorea." *Rend. Pont. Acc.* 44: 99-122.
- Coffey, Michael. 1957. "Seneca, Tragedies 1922-1955." *Lustrum*: 113-186.

- . 1986. "Notes on the History of Augustan and Early Imperial Tragedy." In J. H. Betts, J. T. Hooker, and J. R. Green, eds., *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster*, 1: 46-52. Bristol.
- Coffey, Michael, and Roland Mayer. 1990. *Seneca: Phaedra*. Cambridge.
- Cole, Thomas. 1992. "Initium mihi operis Servius Galba iterum T. Vinius consules. . . ." *YCLS* 29: 231-245.
- Coleman, K. M. 1990. "Fatal Charades: Roman Executions Staged as Mythological Enactments." *JRS* 80: 44-73.
- Coleman, R. 1936. "Philosophical Aspects of Early Roman Drama." *CP* 31: 321-337.
- Conte, Gian Biagio. 1994. *Latin Literature: A History*. Trans. Joseph B. Solodow. Baltimore. (Original ed., Florence, 1987.)
- Corbeill, Anthony. 1996. *Controlling Laughter: Political Humor in the Late Roman Republic*. Princeton.
- Costa, C.D.N. 1973. *Seneca: Medea*. Oxford.
- , ed. 1974. *Seneca*. London.
- Coulton, C. C. 1940. "Marcus Junius Brutus and 'the Brutus' of Accius." *CJ* 35: 460-470.
- Courtney, Edward. 1980. *A Commentary on the Satires of Juvenal*. London.
- . 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.
- Cova, Pier Vincenzo. 1989. *Il poeta Varro*. Milan.
- Dangel, Jacqueline. 1989. "Diverbia et cantica chez Accius: Versification et diction dramatique." *REL* 67: 191-212.
- . 1990. "Séneque et Accius: Continuité et rupture." In Jürgen Blänsdorf, ed., *Theater und Gesellschaft im Imperium Romanum*, 107-122. Bonn.
- . 1995. *Accius: Oeuvres (fragments)*. Budé ed. Paris.
- D'Anna, Ioannes, ed. 1967. *M. Pacuvii Fragmenta*. Rome.
- D'Antò, Vincenzo. 1980. *I frammenti delle tragedie di L. Accio*. Lecce.
- Dawson, H. 1968. "Whatever Happened to Lady Agrippina?" *CJ* 64: 253-267.
- Degl'Innocenti Pierini, Rita. 1982. *Studi Su Accio*. Florence.
- Della Corta, Fr. 1981. "La Tragédie au siècle d'Auguste." In H. Zehnacker, ed., *Théâtres et spectacles dans l'antiquité, Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg*, 5-7 November 1981, 227-243. Strasbourg.
- Dewar, M. J. 1988. "Octavian and Orestes in the Finale of the First Georgic." *CQ* 38: 563-565.
- . 1990. "Octavian and Orestes Again." *CQ* 40: 580-582.
- Dewitt, N. J. 1941. "Rome and the 'Road of Hercules.'" *TAPA* 72: 59-69.
- Diehl, E. 1925. *Res Gestae Divi Augusti: Das Monumentum Ancyranum*. Bonn.
- . 1967. *Poetarum Romanorum veterum reliquiae*. Berlin.
- Diggle, J. 1998. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta Selecta*. Oxford.
- Dominik, William J. 1993. "From Greece to Rome: Ennius' *Annales*." In A. J. Boyle, ed., *Roman Epic*, 37-58. London.
- , ed. 1997. *Roman Eloquence: Rhetoric in Society and Literature*. London.
- Douglas, A. E. 1968. *Cicero*. Greece and Rome Survey in the Classics 2. Oxford.
- Duckworth, G. E. 1994. *The Nature of Roman Comedy*. 2d ed. Princeton.

- Duff, J. Wight. 1953. *A Literary History of Rome*. Vol. 1. New York.
- Dupont, Florence. 1985. *L'Acteur-roi ou le théâtre dans la Rome antique*. Paris.
- . 1988. *Le théâtre latin*. Paris.
- Edwards, Catharine. "Beware of Imitations: Theatre and the Subversion of Imperial Identity." In Jas Elsner and Jamie Masters, eds., *Reflections of Nero: Culture, History and Representation*. London.
- . 1996. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. Cambridge.
- Eichholz, D. E. 1962. *Pliny: Natural History*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Elam, Kier. 1980. *The Semiotics of Theatre and Drama*. London and New York.
- Erasmio, Mario. 2001a. *Archaic Latin Verse*. Newburyport, Mass.
- . 2001b. "Staging Brutus." In Elizabeth Tylawski and Charles Weiss, eds., *Essays in Honor of Gordon Williams: Twenty-Five Years at Yale, 191–114*. New Haven.
- Ernout, A. 1957. *Recueil de Textes Latines Archaïques*. Paris.
- Evans, E. C. 1950. "A Stoic Aspect of Senecan Drama, Portraiture." *TAPA* 81: 169–184.
- Fantham, Elaine. 1982. *Seneca's Troades*. Princeton.
- . 1992. *Lucan, "De Bello Civili," Book 2*. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1997. "The Contexts and Occasions of Roman Public Rhetoric." In Dominik 1997, 111–128.
- Feeney, D. C. 1991. *The Gods in Epic*. Oxford.
- Fisher, C. D. 1963. *Cornelii Taciti Annalium ab excessu divi Augusti libri*. Oxford. (Original ed., 1906.)
- Fishwick, Duncan. 1987. *The Imperial Cult in the Latin West*. Leiden.
- Fitch, John G. 2002. *Seneca: Tragedies*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass., and London.
- Flower, Harriet I. 1995. "Fabulae Praetextae in Context: When Were Plays on Contemporary Subjects Performed in Republican Rome?" *CQ* 45: 170–190.
- . 1996. *Ancestor Masks and Aristocratic Power in Roman Culture*. Oxford.
- Fornara, C. W. 1983. *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Berkeley.
- Forsythe, Gary. 1994. "Review of Erich S. Gruen's *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome* (Ithaca, 1992)." *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* 5: 9–14.
- Fraenkel, E. 1932. "Zur Medea des Ennius." *Hermes* 67: 355–356.
- . 1960. *Plautini in Plauto*. Florence. (= *Plautinisches im Plautus* [Berlin, 1922].)
- Franchella, Quirinus. 1968. *Lucii Accii tragoediarum fragmenta*. Bologna.
- Frank, Tenney. 1937. "Curiatius Maternus and His Tragedies." *AJP*: 225–229.
- Frassinetti, P. 1954. *Fabula Atellana, saggio sul teatro popolare latino*. Genoa.
- . 1975. *Gli Annali di Ennio*. Genoa.
- Frézouls, Edmond. 1981. "La construction du 'theatrum lapideum' et son contexte politique." In H. Zehnacker, ed., *Théâtres et spectacles dans l'antiquité, Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg, 5–7 November 1981*, 193–214. Strasbourg.

- Gabba, Emilio. 1969. "Il 'Brutus' di Accio." *Dioniso* 43: 377–383.
- Gardner, R. 1958. *Cicero: The Speeches; Pro Sestio and In Vatinius*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Garton, Charles. 1972. *Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre*. Toronto.
- Geer, Russel Mortimer. 1935. "The Greek Games at Naples." *TAPA* 66: 208–221.
- Gentili, Bruno. 1979. *Theatrical Performances in the Ancient World: Hellenistic and Early Roman Theatre*. Amsterdam.
- Goar, R. J. 1987. *The Legend of Cato Uticensis from the First Century B.C. to the Fifth Century A.D.* Collection Latomus 197. Brussels.
- Goldberg, Sander M. 1980. *The Making of Menander's Comedy*. Berkeley.
- . 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- . 1996. "The Fall and Rise of Roman Tragedy." *TAPA* 126: 265–286.
- . 1997. "Melpomene's Declamation (Rhetoric and Tragedy)." In Dominik 1997, 166–181.
- Gorton, Charles. 1972. *Personal Aspects of the Roman Theatre*. Toronto.
- Gowling, Alan. 1995. *The Triumviral Narratives of Appian and Cassius Dio*. Ann Arbor. (Original ed., 1992.)
- Graf, Fritz. 1992. "Gestures and Conventions: The Gestures of Roman Actors and Orators." In Jan Bremmer and Herman Roodenburg, eds., *A Cultural History of Gesture*, 36–58. Ithaca, N.Y.
- Gratwick, A. S. 1982a. "Drama." In Kenney 1982: 77–137.
- . 1982b. "Ennius' Annales." In Kenney 1982: 60–76.
- Griffin, Miriam T. 1992. *Seneca: A Philosopher in Politics*. Oxford. (Original ed., 1976.)
- . 1985. *Nero: The End of a Dynasty*. New Haven. (Original ed., London, 1984.)
- Grimal, Pierre. 1953. *Le Siècle des Scipions, Rome et l'hellénisme au temps des guerres puniques*. Paris.
- Gros, Pierre. 1987. "La fonction symbolique des édifices théâtraux dans le paysage urbain de la Rome augustéenne." In C. Pietri, ed., *L'Urbs: Espace urbain et histoire*, Collection de L'École Française de Rome, suppl. 98, 319–346. Rome.
- . 1998. "Porticus Pompei." In Steinby 1993–2000, 5: 148–149.
- . 1999a. "Theatrum Pompei." In Steinby 1993–2000, 6: 35–38.
- . 1999b. "Venus Victrix, Aedes." In Steinby 1993–2000, 6: 120–121.
- Gruen, Erich S. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca, N.Y.
- Gummere, Richard M. 1930. *Seneca: Ad Lucilium Epistulae Morales*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1920.)
- Hall, Edith. 1989. *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy*. Oxford.
- Hammond, N.G.L. 1967. *Epirus*. Oxford.
- Hammond, N.G.L., and H. H. Scullard, eds. 1970. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 2d ed. Oxford.
- Hanson, John Arthur. 1959. *Roman Theater Temples*. Princeton.

- Harmon, A. M. 1936. *Lucian: De Saltatione*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Helm, R. 1934. "Die Praetexta Octavia." *SPAW*: 283-347.
- . 1942. "Pacuvius." *RE* 18, pt. 2: 2159-2174.
- . 1954. "Praetexta." *RE* 44: 1569-1575.
- Henry, D., and B. Walker. 1965. "The Futility of Action: A Study of Seneca's *Hercules Furens*." *CP* 60: 11-22.
- Herington, C. J. 1961. "Octavia Praetexta: A Survey." *CQ* 11: 18-30.
- . 1966. "Senecan Tragedy." *Arion* 5: 422-471.
- . 1982. "Senecan Tragedy." In Kenney 1982, 519-532.
- Hill, D. K. 1944. "The Temple above Pompey's Theater." *CJ* 39: 360-365.
- Hinds, Stephen. 1998. *Allusion and Intertext*. Cambridge.
- Hornblower, Simon, and Antony Spawforth. 1996. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 3d ed. Oxford.
- Horsfall, N. H. 1976. "The Collegium Poetarum." *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies of the University of London* 23: 79-95.
- . 1994. "The Prehistory of Latin Poetry: Some Problems of Method." *Revista di filologia* 122: 50-75.
- Hughes, Joseph J. 1997. "Inter tribunal et scaenam: Comedy and Rhetoric in Rome." In Dominik 1997, 182-197.
- Hutchinson, G. O. 1993. *Latin Literature from Seneca to Juvenal: A Critical Study*. Oxford.
- Jacobson, H. 1977. *Ovid's Heroides*. Princeton.
- Jal, Paul. 1963. *La Guerre civile à Rome*. Paris.
- Jocelyn, H. D. 1967. *The Tragedies of Ennius*. Cambridge.
- . 1969. "The Poet Cn. Naevius, P. Cornelius Scipio and Q. Caecilius Metellus." *Antichthon* 3: 32-47.
- . 1971. "Ennius as a Dramatic Poet." In *Ennius, Entretiens* 27, 41-88. Vandoeuvres-Genève.
- . 1972. "The Poems of Quintus Ennius." *ANRW* 1.2: 987-1026.
- . 1980. "The Fate of Varius' Thyestes." *CQ* 30: 387-400.
- . 1990. "Review of Pier Vincenzo Cova, *Il poeta Vario* (Milan, 1989)." *Gnomon* 62: 596-600.
- Johnston, Patricia A. 1993. "Review of Richard C. Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience* (Cambridge, 1992)." *CP* 88: 353-355.
- Jona, Mario. 1962-63. "Cassio Parmense." *Atti dell' Accademia delle Scienze di Torino, Classe di scienze morali, storiche, e filologie* 97: 68-104.
- Jones, Brian W. 1992. *The Emperor Domitian*. London.
- Jory, E. J. 1970. "Associations of Actors in Rome." *Hermes* 98: 224-253.
- . 1986. "Continuity and Change in the Roman Theatre." In J. H. Betts, J. T. Hooker, and J. R. Oren, eds., *Studies in Honour of T.B.L. Webster*, 1: 143-152. Bristol.
- Keil, Heinrich. 1857. *Grammatici Latini*. Vol. 1: *Diomedes, Artis Grammaticae*. Lipsiae.
- Kießling, Adolf. 1914. *Q. Horatius Flaccus: Briefe*. Berlin.
- Kenney, E. J. 1961. *Ovid: Amores*. Oxford.

- , ed. 1982. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. 2: *Latin Literature*. New York.
- Kent, Roland G. 1967. *Varro: De Lingua Latina*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1938.)
- Kerr, C. A. 1919. *Martial, Epigrams*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Klotz, Alfred. 1953. *Scaenicorum Romanorum fragmenta*. Munich.
- Konstan, D. 1983. *Roman Comedy*. Ithaca, N.Y.
- Korfmacher, W. C. 1934. "Philosophical Aspects of Early Roman Tragedy." *TAPA* 65: li-lil.
- Laidlaw, W. A. 1960. "Cicero and the Stage." *Hermathena* 94: 56-66.
- Lanciani, Rodolfo. 1897. *The Ruins and Excavations of Ancient Rome*. Boston.
- Lana, Italo. 1958-59. "L'Atreo di Accio e la leggenda di Atreo e Tieste nel teatro tragico romano." *Atti della Accademia delle Scienze di Torino II. Classe di Scienze Morali, Storiche, e Filologiche* 93: 295-385.
- Lanowski, J. 1961. "Histoire des fragments des tragédies de Livius Andronicus." *Eos* 51: 65-77.
- La Penna, A. 1970-71. "Cassio Parmense nella Storia del Teatro Latino." *Studi classici e orientali* 19-20: 286-292.
- . 1979. *Fra teatro, poesia e politica romana*. Turin.
- Lebek, W. D. 1996. "Moneymaking on the Roman Stage." In Slater 1996, 29-48.
- Lefèvre, E. 1971. "Der Thyestes des Lucius Varius Rufus. Zehn Überlegungen zu seiner Rekonstruktion." *AAWM* 9.
- Leigh, Matthew. 1996. "Varius Rufus, Thyestes, and the Appetites of Antony." *PCPS* 42: 171-197.
- . 1997. *Lucan: Spectacle and Engagement*. Oxford.
- Leo, F. L. 1878. *Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*. Vol. 1: *De Senecae Tragoediis Observationes Criticae*. Berlin.
- . 1910. *De tragoedia romana*. Göttingen.
- . 1913. *Geschichte der Römischen Literatur: Die Archaische Literatur*. Berlin.
- Lindsay, W. M. 1968. *Early Latin Verse*. Oxford.
- . 1989. *T. Macci Plauti Comoediae*. Oxford Classical Text. Oxford. (Original ed., 1905.)
- . 1990. *P. Terenti Afri Comoediae*. Oxford. (Original ed., 1926.)
- Lobel, E. 1949. "A Greek Historical Drama." *Proceedings of the British Academy* 35: 207-217.
- Lowe, N. J. 1993. "Review of R. C. Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience*." *JRS* 88: 195-196.
- Luce, T. J., and A. J. Woodman, eds. 1993. *Tacitus and the Tacitean Tradition*. Princeton.
- Mackail, J. W. 1930. *The Aeneid*. Oxford.
- McKeown, J. C. 1979. "Augustan Elegy and Mime." *CPSP* 25: 711-784.
- MacMullen, Ramsey. 1966. *Enemies of the Roman Order*. Cambridge, Mass.
- Magno, Pietro. 1977. *Marco Pacuvio, i frammenti*. With introduction, translation, and commentary. Milan.

- . 1979. *Quinto Ennio*. Fasano di Puglia.
- Malcovati, Henrica. 1923. "De C. Asinii Pollionis Carminibus." *Athenaeum*, n.s. 1: 131–136.
- Malissard, Alain. 1990. "Tacite et le théâtre ou la mort en scène." In Jürgen Blänsdorf, ed., *Theater und Gesellschaft im Imperium Romanum*, 213–222. Bonn.
- Manacorda, D. 1999. "Theatrum Balbi." In Steinby 1999, 6:30–31.
- Manning, C. E. 1975. "Acting and Nero's Conception of the Principate." *G&R* 22: 164–175.
- Manuwald, Gesine. 2001. *Fabulae praetextae: Spuren einer literarischen Gattung der Römer*. Munich.
- Mariotti, Italo. 1960. *Introduzione a Pacuvio*. Urbino.
- Mariotti, Scevola. 1951. *Lezioni su Ennio*. Pesaro.
- . 1955. *Il Bellum Poenicum e l'arte di Nevio*. Rome.
- . 1986. *Livio Andronico e la traduzione artistica*. Urbino.
- Marshall, P. K. 1968. *A. Gellii Noctes Atticae*. Oxford Classical Text. Oxford.
- Marx, F. C. 1963. *Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*. Amsterdam. (Original ed., Lipsiae, 1904.)
- Mellor, Ronald. 1993. *Tacitus*. New York.
- Mickwitz, G. 1928. "Tragedien 'Octavia' och den tidigare 'fabula praetexta.'" *Eranos* 26: 234–242.
- Millar, Fergus. 1984. "The Political Character of the Classical Roman Republic, 200–151 B.C." *JRS* 74: 1–19.
- . "Politics, Persuasion and the People before the Social War (150–90 B.C.)." *JRS* 76: 1–11.
- Miller, Frank Iustus. 1984. *Ovid: The Metamorphoses*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1916.)
- Moore, Timothy J. 1998. *The Theater of Plautus: Playing to the Audience*. Austin.
- Morford, M.P.O. 1967. *The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic*. Oxford.
- . 2000. "Walking Tall: The Final Entrance of Atreus in Seneca's *Thyestes*." *Syllecta Classica* 11: 162–177.
- Morel, Willy. 1975. *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum. Praeter Ennium et Lucilium*. Stuttgart. (Reprint of 2d ed., 1927.)
- Morris, Edmund. 2000. *Dutch: A Memoir of Ronald Reagan*. New York.
- Morris, Edward P. 1911. *Horace: The Epistles*. New York.
- Mueller, Lucianus. 1854. *Q. Enni Carminum Reliquiae*. Petropolis.
- . 1884. *Quintus Ennius: Eine Einleitung in das Studium der römischen Poesie*. St. Petersburg.
- . 1885. *Livi Andronici et Cn. Naevi Fabularum Reliquiae*. Berlin.
- Mynors, R. A. 1990. *P. Vergili Maronis Opera*. Oxford. (Original ed., 1969.)
- Némethy, Geyza. 1903. *Vita A. Persii Flacci de Commentario Probi Valeri Sublata*. Budapest.
- Nicolas, Alex. 1851. *De Cassio Parmensi Poeta*. Paris.
- Nicolet, C. 1980. *The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome*. Berkeley.

- Nikolaïdis, A. G. 1985. "Some Observations on Ovid's Lost *Medea*." *Latomus* 44: 383–387.
- Otis, Brooks. 1970. *Ovid as an Epic Poet*. 2d ed. Cambridge.
- Owen, S. G. 1963. *Ovid: Tristia*. Oxford. (Original ed., 1915.)
- Pantzerhielm, Thomas S. 1945. "Die Octavia Praetexta." *SO* 24: 48–87.
- Paratore, E. 1957. *Storia del teatro latino*. Milan.
- . 1969. "Indizi di natura sociale nel teatro latino." *Dioniso* 43: 37–58.
- Parker, Holt N. 1999. "The Observed of All Observers: Spectacle, Applause, and Cultural Poetics in the Roman Theater Audience." In Bergmann and Kondoleon 1999: 163–179.
- Paton, W. R. 1972. *Polybius: The Histories*. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1923.)
- Pedroli, Lydia. 1953. *Fabularum Praetextarum Quae Extant*. Genoa.
- Perrin, Bernadotte. 1916. *Plutarch: Sulla*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1919. *Cicero; Cato the Younger*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1920. *Antony; Marius*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- . 1968. *Pompey*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1917.)
- Pickard-Cambridge, Sir Arthur. 1988. *The Dramatic Festivals of Athens*. Reissue of 2d ed. (1968), with supplement and corrections. Oxford. (Original ed., 1953; revised 1968 by John Gould and D. M. Lewis.)
- Platner S., and T. Ashby. 1965. *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Rome. (Original ed., Oxford, 1929.)
- Pollard, N. 1999. "Theatrum Scauri." In Steinby 1999, 6:38–39.
- Purcell, Nicholas. 1999. "Does Caesar Mime?" In Bergmann and Kondoleon 1999, 181–193.
- Raaflaub, Kurt A. 1986. *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome*. Berkeley.
- Radice, Betty. 1969. *Pliny: Letters and Panegyricus*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass.
- Raven, David. 1969. "Tragedy." In John Higginbotham, ed., *Greek and Latin Literature*, 262–299. London.
- Rawson, E. 1985. "Theatrical Life in Republican Rome and Italy." *Proceedings of the British School at Rome* 53: 97–113.
- . 1987. "On Moralizing in Roman Drama and the Roman Audience's Reception of Dramatic Sententiae." In Michael Whitby, Philip Hardie, and Mary Whitby, eds., *Homo Viator: Classical Essays for John Bramble*. Bristol.
- Reggiani, Renato. 1987. "Rileggendo alcuni frammenti tragici di Ennio, Pacuvio e Accio." *Quaderni di cultura e di tradizione classica* 5: 31–92.
- Rehm, Rush. 1992. *Greek Tragic Theatre*. London and New York.
- Ribbeck, Otto. 1875. *Römische Tragödie*. Leipzig.
- . 1897. *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*. Vol. 1: *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. 3d ed. Lipsiae.
- . 1962. *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*. Vol. 2: *Comicorum*

- Romanorum Praeter Plautum et Terentium Fragmenta*. Hildesheim. (Original ed., Leipzig, 1873.)
- Richardson, L., Jr. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.
- Richlin, Amy. 1997. "Gender and Rhetoric: Producing Manhood in the Schools." In Dominik 1997, 90–110.
- Rolfe, J. C. 1924. *Suetonius*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1914.)
- Rosenmeyer, T. 1989. *Senecan Drama and Stoic Cosmology*. Berkeley.
- Rostagni, Augusto. 1964. *Suetonio "De Poetis" e Biografi Minori*. Turin.
- Rudd, Niall. 1989. *Horace Epistles Book II and "Ars Poetica"*. Cambridge.
- . 1992. "Stratagems of Vanity: Cicero *Ad familiares* 5.12 and Pliny's Letters." In Tony Woodman and Jonathan Powell, eds., *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*, 18–32. Cambridge.
- Rudich, Vasily. 1993. *Political Dissidence under Nero: The Price of Dissimulation*. London and New York.
- . 1997. *Dissidence and Literature under Nero: The Price of Rhetorization*. London and New York.
- Santoro, A. 1922. "Di alcune imitazioni greche nell' Octavia." *Riv. Indo-Greco-Italica* 6: 19–22.
- Saunders, C. 1913. "The Site of Dramatic Performances at Rome in the Times of Plautus and Terence." *TAPA* 44: 87–97.
- Schiesaro, A. 2003. *The Passions in Play: Thyestes and the Dynamics of Drama*. Cambridge.
- Scullard, H. H. 1973. *Roman Politics, 220–150 B.C.* Oxford.
- Sedgwick, W. B. 1927. "Parody in Plautus." *CQ* 21: 88–89.
- Segal, C. P. 1984. "Senecan Baroque: The Death of Hippolytus in Seneca, Ovid, and Euripides." *TAPA* 114: 311–325.
- . 1986. *Language and Desire in Seneca's Phaedra*. Princeton.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. 1971. *Cicero*. London.
- . 1983. "Cicero and Early Latin Poetry." *ICS*: 239–249.
- . 1988. *Cicero's Letters to His Friends*. Atlanta. (Original ed., Penguin, 1978.)
- . 2001. *Cicero, Letters to Friends*. Loeb Classical Library. 3 vols. Cambridge, Mass.
- Shipley Duckett, Eleanor. 1915. *Studies in Ennius*. Bryn Mawr College Monographs 18. Bryn Mawr, Pa.
- Sifakis, G. 1967. *Studies in the History of Hellenistic Drama*. London.
- Silk, M. S. 1996. *Tragedy and the Tragic*. Oxford.
- Skutsch, F. 1899. "C. Cassius Parmensis." In *RE* 3: 1743–1744.
- Skutsch, Otto. 1953. *The Annals of Quintus Ennius*. Inaugural lecture delivered at University College London, 29 November 1951. London.
- . 1963. "Enniana V." *CQ* 57: 89–100.
- . 1966. "Notes on Ennian Tragedy." *HSCP* 71: 125–142.
- . 1985. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford.

- Slater, Niall W. 1985. *Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind*. Princeton.
- . 1996. "Nero's Masks." *CW* 90.1: 33–40.
- Slater, William J., ed. 1996. *Roman Theater and Society*. Ann Arbor.
- Snell, Bruno. 1971. *Tragicorum graecorum fragmenta*. Göttingen.
- Steinby, E. M., ed. 1993–2000. *Lexicon topographicum urbis Romae*. Rome.
- Stocker, A. F., and A. H. Travis. 1965. *Servianorum in Vergili Carmina Commentariorum Editionis Harvardianae*. Oxford.
- Strzelecki, W. 1963. "Naevius and Roman Annalists." *RFIC* 91: 440–458.
- Styan, J. L. 1975. *Drama, Stage and Audience*. Cambridge.
- Sullivan, J. P. 1985. *Literature and Politics in the Age of Nero*. Ithaca, N.Y.
- Sutton, Dana F. 1983. *The Dramaturgy of the Octavia*. *Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie*, vol. 149. Königstein.
- . 1986. *Seneca on the Stage*. Leiden.
- Syme, Ronald. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.
- . 1958. *Tacitus*. Oxford.
- Taylor, L. R. 1931. *The Divinity of the Roman Emperor*. Middletown, Conn.
- . 1961. *Party Politics in the Age of Caesar*. Berkeley. (Original ed., 1949.)
- Tarrant, R. J. 1976. *Seneca: Agamemnon*. Cambridge.
- . 1978. "Senecan Drama and Its Antecedents." *HSCP* 82: 213–263.
- . 1985. *Seneca's Thyestes*. Atlanta.
- Timpanaro, S., Jr. 1946. "Per Una Nuova Edizione Critica di Ennio." *SIFC*, n.s. 21: 41–81.
- . 1949. "Note a Livio Andronico, Ennio, Varrone, Virgilio." *ASNP* 2.18–19: 186–204.
- Turner, Victor. 1982. *From Ritual to Theatre*. New York.
- Ullman, B. L. 1942. "History and Tragedy." *APA* 73: 25–53.
- Vahlen, Iohannes. 1963. *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*. Reproduction of 1928 ed. Amsterdam. (Original ed., Lipsiae, 1854; reprinted 1903 and 1928.)
- Valsa, M. 1957. *Marcus Pacuvius, Poète Tragique*. Paris.
- Varner, Eric R. 2000. "Grotesque Vision: Seneca's Tragedies and Neronian Art." In George W. M. Harrison, ed., *Seneca in Performance*, 119–136. London.
- Vergrugge, G. P. 1989. "On the Meaning of Annales, on the Meaning of Annalist." *Philologus* 133: 192–330.
- Versnel, H. S. 1970. *Triumphus*. Leiden.
- Villeneuve, F. 1941. *Horace: Épitres*. Budé ed. Paris.
- Von Hessberg, Henner. 1999. "The King on Stage." In Bergmann and Kondoleon 1999, 65–75.
- Wallace-Hadrill, Andrew. 1983. *Suetonius: The Scholar and His Caesars*. New Haven.
- Walbank, F. W. 1945. "Polybius, Philinus, and the First Punic War." *CQ* 39: 1–18.
- . 1979. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. Vol. 3: *Commentary on Books XIX–XL*. Oxford.

- . 1981. *The Hellenistic World*. Brighton, Sussex.
- . 1985. *Selected Papers*. Cambridge.
- Walker, B. 1952. *The Annals of Tacitus*. Manchester.
- Walton, F. R. 1968. *Diodorus of Sicily*. Loeb Classical Library. London and Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1957.)
- Warde-Fowler, W. 1964. *Social Life at Rome in the Age of Cicero*. London. (Original ed., 1908.)
- Warmington, E. H. 1982. *Remains of Old Latin*. Vol. 2: *Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Pacuvius and Accius*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1936.)
- . 1988. *Remains of Old Latin*. Vol. 1: *Ennius and Caecilius*. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1935.)
- Watt, W. S. 1982. *M. Tulli Ciceronis Epistulae*. Vol. 1: *Epistulae ad familiares*. Oxford.
- Weichert, A. 1836. *De L. Varii et Cassii Parmensis vita et carminibus*. Grimaec.
- Weinstock, S. 1971. *Divus Julius*. Oxford.
- Wickham, E. C. 1959. *Q. Horati Flacci Opera*. Oxford Classical Text. Oxford. (Original ed., 1901.)
- Wiles, D. 1991. *The Masks of Menander*. Cambridge.
- Williams, G. W. 1968. *Tradition and Originality*. Oxford.
- . 1978. *Change and Decline*. Berkeley.
- . 1992. "Poet and Audience in Senecan Tragedy." In T. Woodman and J. Powell, eds., *Author and Audience in Latin Literature*. Cambridge.
- Williams, R. D. 1992. *The Aeneid of Virgil, Books 1–6*. New York. (Original ed., London, 1972.)
- Winniczuk, Lidia. 1961. "Cicero on Actors and the Stage." In *Atti del I Congresso Internazionale di Studi Ciceroniani, Roma, Aprile 1959*, 1:213–222. Rome.
- Winstedt, E. O. 1925. *Cicero: Letters to Atticus*. Vol. 3. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1918.)
- . 1927. *Cicero: Letters to Atticus*. Vol. 1. Loeb Classical Library. Cambridge, Mass. (Original ed., 1912.)
- Wiseman, T. P. 1979. *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*. Leicester.
- . 1988. "Satyrs in Rome? The Background to Horace's *Ars Poetica*." *JRS* 78: 1–13.
- . 1994. "The Origins of Roman Historiography." In *Historiography and Imagination: Eight Essays on Roman Culture*, 1–22. Exeter.
- . 1995a. "Afterword: The Theatre of Civic Life." In Ian M. Barton, ed., *Roman Public Buildings*, 151–155. Exeter. (Original ed., 1989.)
- . 1995b. *Remus: A Roman Myth*. Cambridge.
- . 1998. *Roman Drama and Roman History*. Exeter.
- Woodman, A. J. 1988. *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. London.
- . 1993. "Amateur Dramatics at the Court of Nero." In Luce and Woodman 1993, 104–128.

- Wolf-Hartmut, Friedrich. 1948. "Ennius-Erklärungen." *Philologus* 97: 277–301.
- Wright, F. W. 1931. *Cicero and the Theater*. Smith College Classical Studies 11. Northampton, Mass.
- Wright, John. 1974. *Dancing in Chains: The Stylistic Unity of the "Comoedia Palliata"*. Rome.
- Zehnacker, Hubert. 1981. "Tragédie prétexte et spectacle romain." In idem, ed., *Théâtres et spectacles dans l'antiquité, Actes du Colloque de Strasbourg*, 5–7 November 1981, 31–48. Strasbourg.
- Zillinger, W. 1911. *Cicero und die altrömischen Dichter*. Würzburg.
- Zorzetti, N. 1980. *La pretesta e il teatro latino arcaico*. Naples.
- Zwierlein, Otto. 1966. *Die Rezitationsdramen Senecas*. Meisenheim am Glan.
- . 1988. *L. Annaei Senecae Tragoediae*. Oxford Classical Text. Oxford. (Original ed., 1986.)

ROMAN TRAGEDY

Theatre to Theatricality

MARIO ERASMO



UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS PRESS
AUSTIN