

## FRAGMENTS OF NAEVIUS

SPALTENSTEIN (F.) *Commentaire des fragments dramatiques de Naevius*. (Collection Latomus 344.) Pp. 707. Brussels: Éditions Latomus, 2014. Paper, €99. ISBN: 978-2-87031-291-9.  
doi:10.1017/S0009840X14003126

After completing substantial commentaries on Flavian epic poets (Silius Italicus, 2 vols., 1986–1990; Valerius Flaccus, 3 vols., 2002–2005), S. has turned to commenting on the fragmentary texts of the Republican playwrights: he has already produced a commentary on the dramatic fragments of Livius Andronicus (2008; cf. *CR* 61 [2011], 447–9), and he will go on to work on the remains of Caecilius Statius (p. 5). The latest instalment is a commentary on the dramatic fragments of Cn. Naevius (c. 280/60–200 B.C.E.). Since all these fragmentary Republican playwrights have not yet received a proper modern commentary, the material provided by S. is very welcome.

The commentary devoted to Naevius includes the text of and a commentary on the fragments from the comedies, tragedies, praetextae and unidentified dramas. This main section is supplemented by a foreword and a list of abbreviations at the front as well as indexes, concordances and a bibliography at the end of the book. Like S.'s other commentaries in the same series, the volume does not have a general introduction.

For the text and numbering of the fragments, S. follows E.H. Warmington's Loeb edition (*Remains of Old Latin. Newly ed. and trans. Vol. II. Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Pacuvius and Accius* [1936]). Below the text of each fragment he also gives its numbers in the editions by O. Ribbeck (*Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*, 2 vols [3rd ed. 1897/98]) and (for the tragedies) by M. Schauer (*Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta. Vol. I* [2012]). This information is helpful; however, the additional identifications showing which fragments are printed under the respective number in the other editions make the arrangement somewhat confusing and seem redundant, particularly since there are full concordances between the three editions at the end of the volume.

In the preface S. asserts that he is not an editor and only prints the text for the convenience of readers (pp. 5–6). In this respect his decision to base his commentary on Warmington's edition makes sense since it comprises all dramatic fragments of Naevius and is easily available. S. does not include an apparatus and only mentions alternative readings and conjectures in the discursive commentary; he refers to the manuscripts without indicating where the information is coming from. However, in the area of fragments in particular decisions on textual matters and the interpretation of pieces of text are often closely related. Therefore the system of following Warmington also creates problems: on the one hand S. dedicates a good deal of space to commenting on Warmington's text and to explaining or deducing his principles (e.g. pp. 106, 110, 289, 341, 398); on the other hand, this method does not allow him to reflect on different methods of arranging fragments and their implications for interpreting the texts (cf. J. Elliott, *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales* [2013]). In Schauer's edition, for instance, the fragments are presented according to the chronology of the transmitting authors. By contrast, S. presents the fragments within a minimal context from the transmitting authors, but their provenance is not always commented on, and they are organised according to Warmington's views of the dramatic plots. Moreover, only by a careful reading of the discursive commentary can it be inferred which text S. would prefer for the fragments and how this text relates to what can be found in other editions (in addition to those mentioned, cf. also E.V. Marmorale, *Naevius poeta. Introduzione bibliografica, testo dei frammenti e commento* [2nd ed. 1950]; A. Traglia, *Poeti latini arcaici. Volume primo. Livio Andronico, Nevio, Ennio* [1986]).

In S.'s commentary (as in Warmington) the dramas are given in alphabetical order for each dramatic genre and the fragments within each drama according to the assumed plot. The commentary discusses linguistic and metrical issues, textual matters, views expressed in previous scholarship as well as the interpretation of individual fragments and the dramas overall. It presents copious information on linguistic questions and on the prosopography of views of earlier scholars (especially of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries), which are compiled to a great degree of completeness and often discussed in detail. Presumably, when Schauer's edition appeared, S.'s work was too advanced for him to make major structural changes; at least S.'s overview seems largely independent of Schauer's detailed and comprehensive documentation of positions of earlier scholars on the tragedies. S.'s commentary is less exhaustive on the discussion of the meaning of individual fragments beyond reviewing the views of others. A French translation of S.'s preferred text of the fragments would be helpful for clarifying his interpretation, and it would also facilitate access more generally since in the area of Republican fragmentary drama the Budé series so far only includes Accius (J. Dangel, *Accius. Œuvres (fragments)* [1995]) and Togata (A. Daviault, *Comœdia Togata. Fragments. Texte établi, traduit et annoté* [1981]).

It is not always easy to find the relevant information in S.'s commentary because the comments on each drama or fragment are presented as a (sometimes lengthy) mini-essay, even though there are numbered paragraphs to structure the comments and for ease of cross-referencing (cf. p. 5). S.'s system of arrangement leads to some peculiarities, which can be illustrated by the structure of the beginning of the tragedy section: the first tragedy (in alphabetical order) is *Aegisthus* (pp. 309–10), but the paragraphs under this heading comprise, among other things, general information on Naevius' tragedies (since there is no separate introduction) and a discussion of the fact that for a long time no scholar has attributed a couple of lines coming from Livius Andronicus' *Aegisthus* (cf. Schauer, F 2) to Naevius, so that there are no fragments attested for this tragedy. The next two titles do not have any fragments either (p. 311), since one (*Aesiona*) is an alternative title used by some scholars (for *Hesiona*) and the other (*Alcestis*) is no longer attributed to Naevius. Therefore the first fragment is given with the next title, *Andromacha* (pp. 312–18), since S. follows those editors who attribute the fragment to Naevius rather than to Novius (see the documentation in Schauer, F 1).

While it is helpful and methodologically justifiable to include in a complete commentary tragedies that were assumed for Naevius at some stage, it might have been more useful to collate these dubious cases under a special heading. Moreover, such questions of attribution are not always presented in the most convenient way: in the case of *Andromacha*, for instance, the issue is addressed in several paragraphs, including one that raises the question of whether Naevius wrote tragedies at all (§827, p. 312: 'En une démarche plus radicale, on a même pu douter que Naevius ait jamais écrit des tragédies'). This is of course an important question, but again one might expect such a discussion in an introduction rather than within the commentary on a single play. The same applies to the issue of tragic language, suddenly taken up in the commentary on *Iphigenia* (§1098, p. 405: 'C'est l'occasion de parler de la formation de la langue tragique et de ses caractéristiques').

That said, while the information provided in S.'s monumental commentary could have been arranged in a more user-friendly way and presented more concisely, there is no doubt that users who take the time to look for it can discover a wealth of documentation and insightful observations that will advance the study of early Republican literature.

University College London

GESINE MANUWALD  
g.manuwald@ucl.ac.uk