



Universiteit
Leiden
The Netherlands

On the text and interpretation of Accius 306-307 Dangel

Nelis, B.L.P.

Citation

Nelis, B. L. P. (2024). On the text and interpretation of Accius 306-307 Dangel. *Mnemosyne*, 77(6), 1012-1024.
doi:10.1163/1568525x-bja10235

Version: Publisher's Version

License: [Creative Commons CC BY 4.0 license](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

Downloaded from: <https://hdl.handle.net/1887/4304041>

Note: To cite this publication please use the final published version (if applicable).

On the Text and Interpretation of Accius 306-307 Dangel

Basil L.P. Nelis

LUCAS/University of Leiden, Leiden, The Netherlands

b.l.p.nelis@hum.leidenuniv.nl

Received 20 December 2022 | Accepted 3 April 2023 |

Published online 20 March 2024

Abstract

This article argues that the text of Accius 306-307 Dangel, as transmitted, cannot stand on grammatical grounds. It aims to clarify the use of the word *cuiatis*, propose an emendation of the text, and suggest a new explanation of the metre of the fragment.

Keywords

Accius – fragment – tragedy – textual criticism

Accius 306-307 Dangel,¹ hereafter D (Non. p. 110.32-33 Mercier = 158.37 Lindsay = 22 Ribbeck³ = 4-5 Warmington), a fragment transmitted as belonging to the *Aegisthus*, reads as follows:

heu!
cuiatis stirpem funditus fligi studet?

heu] eheu *Bothe* || cuiatis] ciuitatis [*in aliquibus* [sc. *libris*]]' *Vossius*: cuiam *Iunius*: quia tis
Palmer || funditus] penitus *Delrius*

1 I use Dangel's edition because, at the time at which this article was written, it was the most recent edition of the fragments of Accius. I have been unable to take into account Jochen

Translating this fragment and attempting to decide where it fitted into the plot of the play are not easy tasks. The following issues in particular have been debated: the identity of the speaker, the identities of the perpetrator and of the victim of the murder plot, and the grammatical function of *cuiat*². The speaker has variously been identified as Cassandra (Ribbeck 1875, Argenio 1966, Franchella 1968), an unspecified speaker (Warmington 1935-1940, Pociña 1984), Strophius (Venini 1954), the chorus (Argenio 1966, Dangel 1995), an unknown Argive citizen (D'Antò 1980), and Aegisthus (Gottfried Hermann *apud* Ribbeck 1852, Dangel 1995). On the basis of the supposed identity of the speaker, several different dramatic scenarios have been imagined:

- (i) Cassandra foreseeing Aegisthus' murder of Orestes (Ribbeck, Franchella).
- (ii) Cassandra foreseeing Orestes' murder of Clytemnestra (Argenio).
- (iii) An unspecified speaker lamenting the plot of Orestes to kill his mother (Warmington).
- (iv) An unspecified speaker lamenting the plot of Aegisthus to kill Orestes (Pociña).
- (v) Strophius expressing his astonishment to Electra that Aegisthus, having murdered Agamemnon, now plans to kill his son Orestes (Venini).
- (vi) The chorus commenting on Aegisthus' plan to extinguish the house of Atreus (Argenio).
- (vii) The chorus lamenting the supposed death of Orestes in the chariot race at the Pythian Games in Delphi (Dangel).
- (viii) An unknown Argive citizen reacting with shock to the news that Aegisthus has ordered the execution of Orestes (D'Antò).
- (ix) Aegisthus after discovering Clytemnestra's corpse (Hermann).
- (x) Same as (ix), except that Aegisthus, addressing Orestes without recognising him, expresses his fear that he will be the murderer's next victim (Dangel).

In particular, much debate has turned on the issue of determining whether *cuiat* should be construed as a genitive or as a nominative.² Those scholars who supply a translation of their text of the fragment do so as follows:

Schultheiß's new edition of Accius, published in the *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* series (Volume 4, Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2023).

2 Scholars who understand *cuiat* as a genitive are Ribbeck 1875, 467; Argenio 1966, 26; Franchella 1968, 260 n. 1 (though in his translation he renders it as a nominative); D'Antò 1980, 195 and 510; Pociña 1984, 122-123. Those who understand it as a nominative are Warmington 1935-1940, vol. 2, 328-329; Venini 1954, 327; Dangel 1995, 324.

- (i) 'Alas! Of what land is the man who plans to strike our stock down to its base?' (Warmington).
- (ii) 'Ahi quanta e quale stirpe abbatter vuole | Dai fondamenti!' (Argenio [1]).
- (iii) 'Oh, di che paese è l'uomo che medita di abbattere dalle fondamenta la nostra stirpe?' (Argenio [2]).
- (iv) 'Ohimé, di quale razza di gente è colui che progetta di distruggere alla base la stirpe?' (Franchella).
- (v) 'Ahimé! Il figlio di chi vuole del tutto rovinare?' (D'Antò).
- (vi) 'Las! d'ouè est celui qui s'acharne à abattre la souche à sa base?' (Dangel).

The translations of Warmington, Argenio (2), Franchella, and Dangel show that they take *cuiatis* as an interrogative pronoun in the nominative. Argenio and D'Antò both write in their commentaries that they take *cuiatis* as a genitive. In the translation of Argenio (1), which reflects his interpretation of the fragment in so far as it corresponds to the text he prints, *cuiatis* is rendered with two adjectives ('quanta e quale') agreeing with 'stirpe' and the sentence is turned into an exclamation. As for D'Antò, his translation suggests that he understands *cuiatis* as a pronoun in the genitive ('di chi') depending on *stirpem*. While editors agree that the issue of determining the grammatical function of *cuiatis* is crucial to the correct understanding of the fragment, both interpretations that have been put forward are problematic. In what follows, I begin by clarifying the use of the word *cuiatis* in pre-classical Latin and giving an account of its later development, before proposing a solution to its problematic usage in Acc. 306-307 D. This proposed solution will address the issue of what seems to be an occurrence of the monosyllabic interjection *heu* in final position. Though not strictly untenable, the presence of the final heavy syllable *heu* in this position in iambo-trochaic verse is nonetheless suspicious for several reasons which will be explained below. I shall suggest that the line was in fact originally written as a trochaic septenarius and that two syllables were lost at some stage of the transmission.

A survey of the occurrences of *cuiatis*, also spelled *quoiat*, in extant Latin literature is in order. Here is, to the best of my knowledge, a full list of its occurrences: Enn. *Ann.* 235 Skutsch (= Cic. *Balb.* 51), Pl. *Bacch.* fr. xi.20 de Melo (quoted at Prisc. *Inst.* 11.9.39, p. II.575 GLK, see below), *Cur.* 407, *Men.* 341 (quoted at Prisc. *Inst.* 17.3.23, p. III.122.20 GLK), *Poen.* 109, 993-994 (quoted at Prisc. *Inst.* 17.3.23, p. III.122.17-18 GLK), Acc. 81 D (= Non. p. 426.24-26 M = 689.23-24 L), 307 D (our fragment), Cic. *Tusc.* 5.108 (quoted at Non. p. 93.9-10 M = 132.7-8 L), Liv. 27.19.9, Val. Max. 8.5.6, Apul. *Met.* 1.5.3, 1.21.4, 5.19.2, 8.24.3, Gell. *NA* 15.30 Λ,

15.30.3. On the basis of these occurrences, the following principles concerning the usage of *cuiatis* can be established. *Cuiatis* is almost always used as an interrogative pronoun.³ It always appears with the verb *esse*. It typically occurs in contexts where information is sought about a person's identity and provenance, and is sometimes found alongside the interrogative pronoun *quis* or *qui*. The form *cuiatis* is used both in direct questions, such as *cuiati's?* (Pl. *Curc.* 407), or in indirect questions (*qui neque cuiatis esset umquam potuimus | multa erogitantes sciscere*, Acc. 625-626 Ribbeck³ = 81-82 D). It is noteworthy that the example from Accius just quoted follows the standard Latin construction with *esse*. Therefore, Acc. 306-307 D, our fragment, deviates not only from standard Latin usage of *cuiatis*, but also, we might infer, from Accius' practice elsewhere. Let us now take a closer look at some of the passages just listed.

At Cic. *Tusc.* 5.108, we find the form *cuiatem* used in an accusative and infinitive construction within an indirect statement (*Socrates quidem cum rogaretur, cuiatem se esse diceret, 'mundanum' inquit*). The accusative *cuiatem* plausibly implies a nominative *cuias*, but it could also have *cuiatis* as its nominative. The form *cuias* itself is securely attested for the first time in Livy (*quem cum percontaretur Scipio quis et cuias et cur id aetatis in castris fuisset, Numidam esse ait ...*, 27.19.9), and is then found in Valerius Maximus (*hunc ego, iudices, qui causam dicit, cuias sit ... ignoro*, 8.5.6). It therefore seems that the form *cuias* appears for the first time in classical Latin. Although Servius reports (*Commentarius in Artem Donati*, p. IV.435.31-436.2 GLK) that Plautus used both *cuias* and *cuiatis* as nominatives, he does not substantiate this claim with any textual evidence, leaving us with no extant example of the form *cuias* in pre-classical Latin. Four further occurrences of *cuiatis* are found in Apuleius' second-century CE work, *Metamorphoses*. In keeping with his archaising style,⁴ Apuleius uses the form *cuiatis* rather than the classical *cuias* (e.g. *sed ut prius noritis cuiatis sim, qui sim: <Aristomenes sum> Aegiensis*, Apul. *Met.* 1.5).

In another second-century CE writer, Aulus Gellius, we find, for the first time in extant Latin, *cuiatis* used as an interrogative adjective modifying a substantive: *uehiculum, quod 'petorritum' appellatur, cuiatis linguae uocabulum sit, Graecae an Gallicae* (Gell. *NA* 15.30 Λ).⁵ There seem to be two possible explanations for Gellius' use of *cuiatis*: it could be a genitive which has the same form as the pre-classical nominative *cuiatis* or a genitive formed on the basis of the classical nominative *cuias*. If it is the former, then, in light of Gellius' taste

3 So Pinkster 2015-2021, vol. 1, 336, though it is listed in the *OLD* as an interrogative adjective.

4 See e.g. Callebat 1993, 1642-1662; Pasetti 2007.

5 The phrase appears both in the lemma and in the main body of the text (15.30.3).

for archaism,⁶ his use of the form *cuiatis* could possibly imply the existence of that form as a genitive in pre-classical Latin. Regardless of the origin of the form Gellius uses, *cuiatis* is here used attributively in agreement with a clearly expressed substantive, *linguae*. As such, this use of the word *cuiatis* is unparalleled in extant Latin.

The forms *cuias* and *cuiatis* are discussed by later grammarians in the context of pronouns. They are often mentioned alongside *nostras* and *nostratis* as pronouns that provide information about a person's origin (e.g. Donatus, *Ars grammatica*, p. IV.379.30-380.1 GLK; Serv. *Commentarius in Artem Donati*, p. IV.435.31-436.2 GLK; Prisc. *Inst.* 11.9.39, p. II.575 GLK, 17.3.23, p. III.122.9-16 GLK). A remark from Priscian may help to clarify the apparent difference between the pre-classical nominative *cuiatis* and the classical nominative *cuias* (*Inst.* 17.3.23, p. III.122.9-16 GLK):

cum qualitatem quaerentes dicimus 'qualis', quantitatem uero 'quantus', numerum uero 'quot' et 'quotus' et 'quotenus', et per deriuationem, quae apud Graecos non est, possessiuium 'cuius, cuius, cuium' et gentile 'cuias', cuius nominatiuium etiam 'cuiatis' communi genere antiqui proferebant.

According to Priscian, the form *cuiatis* was also (*etiam*) an archaic⁷ nominative. In order to justify this claim, he provides two examples from Plautus (mentioned above):

AGORASTOCLES. adi atque appella quid uelit, quid uenerit,
qui sit, cuiatis, unde sit: ne parseris.

MILPHIO. auo. cuiates estis aut quo ex oppido?⁸

993 qui *Pal.*: quid *Priscianus*

994 auo *Pal.*: quid est *Priscianus*

MESSENIO. rogitant cuiatis sit.⁹

In these two citations of Plautus, *cuiates* and *cuiatis* are clearly nominatives. Priscian's remark is echoed in the later grammatical tradition, where both *cuias* and *cuiatis* are explicitly stated to be nominative forms (Cledonius,

6 On Gellius' archaism, see Holford-Strevens 2005, 354-363.

7 On this sense of *antiqui* in grammatical sources, see De Nonno 2017, 216-219.

8 Pl. *Poen.* 992-994. I quote the text as it is printed in modern editions of Plautus, that is with the readings of the Palatine branch of manuscripts of Plautus, *qui* and *auo*, rather than Priscian's *quid* and *quid sit*, in lines 993 and 994 respectively.

9 Pl. *Men.* 341. Priscian actually quotes only *Poen.* 993-994. The text of Plautus is from De Melo's Loeb. De Melo alters the orthography of any transmitted form of *cuias* to *quoias*. For the sake of clarity, I have undone this orthographical change.

Ars grammatica p. V.20.21-4 GLK; Pompeius, *Commentum in Artem Donati*, p. V.204.36-205.6 GLK). It is also noteworthy that, in spite of what Priscian says here about *cuiatis* having no equivalent in Greek, Lewis and Short note (s.v. *cūjas*) that it is equivalent to ποδαπός ('from what country? whence? where born; of what sort?' after LSJ s.v.).

Elsewhere, Priscian notes that Plautus declined the word as *cuias* in the nominative and *cuiatis* in the genitive, citing as evidence a passage of *Bacchides* that has not been preserved in the manuscript transmission:

Plautus 'hic cuias, huius cuiatis' declinavit in Bacchidibus:
 Scio spiritum eius maiorem esse multo
 Quam folles taurini †habeant. ...
 Praenestinum opino esse, ita erat gloriosus.¹⁰

Unfortunately, the text of Priscian is corrupt, and the passage of Plautus' *Bacchides* that allegedly contained evidence of the declension *cuias* in the nominative and *cuiatis* in the genitive is now lost. An additional portion of this fragment of *Bacchides* is preserved by Servius (*ad Verg. A.* 4.171: *quam folles taurini habent, cum liquescunt petrae, ferrum ubi fit*).¹¹ In an attempt to restore the text between *fit* and *Praenestinum*, Ritschl suggested supplying <quoiatis tibi uisust?>.¹² Since no nominative form *cuias* nor genitive *cuiatis* actually appears in the passage of Plautus transmitted in Priscian's citation, however, we have no way of evaluating what Priscian means, or even whether he is correct in his understanding of the Plautine passage. Assuming Ritschl's conjecture is correct, then the use of *cuiatis* here is no different to any of the other instances of the form examined above: it is an interrogative pronoun in the nominative case marking provenance and constructed with *esse*.

The ancient grammarians' accounts of the forms *cuias* and particularly *cuiatis*, which they explain can both be a genitive and an archaic nominative form, seem to have given rise to different accounts of the etymology and morphology of *cuiatis* in modern grammars. *Cuiatis* is generally agreed to be derived from the adjective *cuius*, -a, -um, itself built on the genitive form *cuius* of the pronoun *qui* (de Vaan 2004 s.v. *cūius*). But while some modern grammars explain *cuiatis* as the old, uncontracted form of *cuias* (Neue and Wegener, vol. 2, 27-28; Leumann, Hofmann and Szantyr, vol. 2, §309; Weiss 2009, 316-317),

10 Prisc. *Inst.* 11.9.39, p. 11.575 GLK, quotation: Pl. *Bacch.* fr. viii.9-12 Lindsay = xi.18-21 de Melo.

11 The following line, *Praenestinum ... gloriosus*, is also preserved by Nonius (p. 474.32-33 M = 761.36 L).

12 Ritschl 1845, 579-580.

the *Oxford Latin Dictionary* explains the form *cuias* as the adjective *cuius* with the adjectival suffix *-ās*, *-ātis*,¹³ while also stating that *cuiatis* is attested as a nominative form in pre-classical Latin. Therefore, according to the *OLD*, the form *cuiatis* is a genitive formed regularly on the basis of the adjective *cuius* and suffix *-as*, *-atis*. This explanation, however, is misleading in so far as it does not account for the existence of the archaic nominative form *cuiatis* and rules out the hypothesis of a contraction from *cuiatis* to *cuias*, which, given that *cuias* is unattested before the classical period, seems plausible. Moreover, it gives no indication as to why *cuiatis* is not attested as a genitive form in extant Latin before the second century CE.

The whole theory of a genitive form *cuiatis* at Acc. 306-307 D does not rest on any actually preserved attestations of *cuiatis* used as a genitive in pre-classical Latin, but solely on post-classical usage of *cuiatis* as a genitive at Gell. *NA* 15.30, where, unlike in our fragment, *cuiatis* is used attributively in agreement with a substantive. In arguing that *cuiatis* at Acc. 306-307 D could be either nominative or genitive, scholars seem implicitly to be following the testimony of the ancient grammarian Priscian, which, in fact, is problematic, because it does not contain an explicit attestation of the existence of *cuiatis* as a genitive form in pre-classical Latin. Although editors consider understanding *cuiatis* as a genitive to be a viable explanation, they are unable to adduce a parallel for this use of the form in pre-classical Latin. Therefore, on the one hand, the explanation of *cuiatis* as a genitive cannot stand. On the other hand, taking *cuiatis* as a nominative involves positing that this fragment contains a unique usage of *cuiatis* without the verb *esse*, which, while not totally impossible, is at least rather implausible.

So far, we have established (i) that there is no actual attested genitive usage of *cuiatis* in pre-classical Latin and (ii) that, apart from Acc. 306-307 D, there is no other instance of *cuias*/*cuiatis* used without *esse*. I now wish to consider in further detail the other problem with this fragment that was identified above, namely the unsatisfactory position of the monosyllabic interjection *heu* as a heavy syllable at the end of a line. *Heu* itself occurs at line-end nowhere else in Accius, nor indeed in extant pre-classical Latin poetry,¹⁴ though other monosyllabic interjections are found in that position in Republican verse (for

13 *OLD* s.v. *-ās*, *-ātis*!: “Originally used in ethnic adjs. from the names of Italian towns (*Arpinas*, *Genuas*), but extended to a few other stems (*cuias*, *nostras*, *optimas*, *primas*; *Penates*)”; cf. Weiss 2009, 316-317 on the suffix **-āti*.

14 The only instances of *heu* occurring at line-end in the literature of the late Republican and Augustan periods are in Horace (*Epod.* 11.21; *Carm.* 4.6.17). In both cases, *heu* already appears earlier in the line.

example, *ah*: e.g. Pl. *Merc.* 156, Ter. *Andr.* 252;¹⁵ *hem*: e.g. Pl. *Most.* 1000, Ter. *Eun.* 962; *em*: e.g. Pl. *Asin.* 537, Ter. *Ad.* 371). For such words to appear in this position in iambo-trochaic verse, however, they must normally be preceded by an elision.¹⁶ Unelided, non-enclitic, monosyllabic interjections at line-end are almost always avoided in iambo-trochaic verse, and so, for *heu* to stand in that position, it would need to be posited that what preceded was a word ending with an elision. Editors have responded in different ways to the problem posed by *heu*. Having realised that *heu* in this position is objectionable, Bothe changed it to *eheu*,¹⁷ which, while not untenable (it is found at Pl. *Pseud.* 81, 82; Ter. *Haut.* 83), is unappealing for other reasons (see below). Ribbeck, apparently following a suggestion made by Hermann which is recorded in the prolegomena to the first edition,¹⁸ seems to have considered *heu* to be an *extra metrum* interjection. There is however some degree of confusion throughout Ribbeck's three editions, and indeed among later editors, as to whether he considered the fragment to consist of one or two complete iambic senarii, but in any case it seems clear that Ribbeck did not consider *heu* to be the final heavy syllable of a line.¹⁹

A further reason to treat with suspicion the position of *heu* as it appears in modern editions of the fragment is that for a monosyllabic word from the end of the previous line to be appended to what would otherwise be a one-line citation would constitute a deviation from the standard practice of

15 It should be noted that the occurrence of *ah!* at Pacuvius fr. 291 Schierl is introduced by conjecture by Ribbeck (Pacuvius 353-354 Ribbeck²⁻³).

16 Questa 2007, 311-325 (with examples), although see Ter. *Ad.* 709 and Turpilius 177 Ribbeck³ (both with *hem*).

17 Bothe 1834, 160.

18 Ribbeck 1852-1855, xii.

19 Ribbeck's numbering of the fragments is not always consistent and clear across all three editions. Insight can be gleaned in this case from consulting the apparatus criticus and the 'Conspectus metrorum' in his second edition (1871-1873, vol. 1, 366-368). It appears that, in his first edition, Ribbeck attributes the line number 22 to the entire text of the fragment printed over two lines, which suggests that *heu* is to be understood as *extra metrum*. Although in his second and third editions, in which *heu* is now printed at the end rather than at the beginning of the line as in the first edition, Ribbeck seems to attribute to the two lines the numbers 21 and 22 respectively, both lines 21 and 22 are listed as complete iambic senarii in the second edition's 'Conspectus metrorum'. The numbers in the third edition are the same as in the second. It therefore appears that Ribbeck considered *heu* to be an *extra metrum* interjection across all three editions, though the inconsistency in the ways he reported this generated evident confusion among later editors, some of whom attribute to the fragment a single line-number (22 Klotz, 22 D'Antò), others two (4-5 Warmington, 401-402 Franchella, 306-307 D). My thanks to an anonymous reviewer for helping me to formulate this point.

Nonius' source. The source in question, usually referred to as source no. 27 or as 'Alph. Verb.,'²⁰ is an anonymous glossarial source whose normal practice when quoting fragments of Republican drama is to quote a single metrical unit. Nonius' anonymous source will occasionally deviate from this norm and supply part of another line if it is required to achieve a full syntactical unit. For example, in another fragment of Accius' *Aegisthus* preserved by the very same source (*neque fera hominum pectora | fragescunt, donec uim persensere imperi*, 302-303 D), the author of the glosses overruns the metrical unit of a single senarius to include an additional half-line which completes the sense.²¹ But our fragment does not meet the criteria for such deviation: in it, the additional content, *heu*, is superfluous in so far as it does not modify the sense of the following line, which is perfectly intelligible without it. There is therefore no reason for the author of the glosses to have deviated from his usual practice and disrupted the metrical unity of the line. Accordingly, there is good reason to want to fit the entire fragment within a single metrical and syntactic unit.

Let us now consider modifications to the text of the fragment that have been made in lexicographical works, in editions of the fragment, and in the secondary literature. As we shall see, modifications of the paradosis have often involved the removal of *cuiatis*. In some fifteenth-century versions of the text, the reading *ciuitatis* is found instead of *cuiatis*. This is the case in a lexicon composed by Antonius Calcilius which remained unprinted but survives in manuscript form, a copy of which is held in the Bodleian Library in Oxford (MS. Bodl. 171). In this manuscript, our fragment is quoted as follows in the entry for *fligi* (f. 162r), the contents of which is an almost exact reproduction of Nonius' lemma for the same word (p. 110.29-33 M = 158.32-38 L): *heu ciuitatis stirpem funditus fligi studet*. The reading *ciuitatis* is also found in the *De priscorum proprietate uerborum* (1475) of Iunianus Maius, who was likely Calcilius' student,²² although in Maius' text *hem* is printed instead of *heu*.²³ It is unclear how the reading *heu/hem ciuitatis* made its way into these texts: perhaps it is an attempt by Calcilius to make sense of the unfamiliar word *cuiatis*, or simply a copying mistake. In any case, the line would then mean: 'alas, he [or she] is

20 Lindsay 1901, 9, 45, and 100-101.

21 On the quotation practices of the author of the glosses in general, and on his method of quoting Republican verse in particular, see Welsh 2012, 829-834.

22 Ricciardi 1968, 284; 292-293.

23 Vossius (*apud* Scriverius 1620, vol. 2, 123), followed by Bothe 1834, 160, reports that *ciuitatis* is found 'in some texts' (*in aliquibus* [sc. *libris*]). I quote Vossius' formulation in the critical apparatus provided for the fragment (p. 1) even though I have found this variant only in the texts of Calcilius and of Maius. I am grateful to an anonymous reviewer for helping me to clarify this point and for bringing Antonius Calcilius' lexicon to my attention.

seeking utterly to destroy the city's lineage'. Although this produces good sense, it is unclear whether this text of the fragment is meant to form a single metrical unit. If it is, then the line, though it would seem, as Vossius suggested, to have an iambic base, would scan neither as an iambic senarius, septenarius, nor octonarius (*hēm cūitātis stīrpēm fūndītūs fligī stūddēt*).²⁴ The sixteenth-century editor of Nonius, Hadrianus Iunius, tentatively suggests, in a note printed in the margin of the text, emending *cuiatis* to *cuiam* so as to produce a unitary iambic senarius (i.e. *heu, cuiam stīrpēm funditus fligi studet*). Palmer proposes emending *cuiatis* to *quia tis*, which is attested at Pl. *Mil.* 1033, *tis* being an alternative form of *tui* (*OLD* s.v. *tū*).²⁵ This would produce the following: *heu! quia tis stīrpēm funditus fligi studet* ('Alas! it is because he wishes thy progeny to be extirpated'). While this conjecture does indeed produce a metrically sound iambic senarius, the use of the conjunction *quia* to explain the reason for the lamentation expressed by *heu*, as is implied by Palmer's punctuation, is unappealing. In order to introduce a reason for lamentation, *quia* would normally require a verb of grieving or similar to be expressed (cf. *OLD* s.v. *quia* 2c, 5b; e.g. Pl. *Capt.* 994 *eo miser sum quia male illi feci ...*). Printing *heu* between commas and positing that *quia* introduces a clause that is subordinate to a main clause which is now lost but which originally contained an expression of the speaker's grief (e.g. *queror*;) | *heu, quia tis* etc.) would be a more plausible solution.

All of these suggestions involve the removal of *cuiatis* in favour of an easier reading. This runs counter to usual editorial practice, according to which the more difficult reading is often privileged. The suggestion made in this article is that the fragment was originally written in a different metre, the trochaic septenarius,²⁶ and that two syllables were lost at a stage of the transmission likely to be later than Nonius' source. The line can be reconstructed and translated as follows so as to conform to the construction of *cuiatis* with the verb *esse* that has been established as regular:

24 On these metres, see Moore 2012, 172-189. Maius' reading is rejected by Hermann, who makes no mention of Calciolus (*apud* Ribbeck 1852, xii).

25 Palmer 1889, 54.

26 The idea that the fragment might originally have been a trochaic septenarius appears to go back to Vossius (*apud* Scriverius 1620, Vol. 2, 123), who suggested that the missing foot is at beginning of the line. The fragment appears to be presented as a trochaic septenarius by Welcker (1839-1841, vol. 3, 1157: [*Heu*], *eheu cuiatis stīrpēm funditus fligi studet*). It can be assumed that *heu* is intended to stand in the text because Welcker elsewhere prints additions to the text between square brackets (cf. e.g. Bothe's conjecture *mihi* in the fragment of Pacuvius' *Niptra* [fr. 190 Schierl] quoted at vol. 1, 214). For the line to scan as a trochaic septenarius, a hiatus would need to be posited between *heu* and *eheu*, which is unappealing. Furthermore, *heu eheu* is not found in Republican verse.

heu! cuiatis (est, qui) stirpem funditus fligi studet?²⁷

Alas! From what land is the person who is trying utterly to destroy the family?

The use of *est qui* is well paralleled in Republican drama (Enn. *palliatae* 2 Ribbeck³, *trag.* 256 Jocelyn [same *sedes*], Pacuvius 24 Schierl, Acc. 249 D) and there are over a dozen instances of *heu* at the beginning of a line in Republican drama up to the time of Accius (e.g. Pl. *Aul.* 721, Enn. *trag.* 180 Jocelyn, Pacuvius 115 Schierl, Ter. *Andr.* 647, Turpilius 117 Ribbeck³, Afranius 409 Ribbeck³), including three within the Accian corpus itself (237, 349, 517 D). Furthermore, it is noteworthy that in their translations of Acc. 306-307 D (see above), Warmington, Argenio [2], Franchella, and Dangel all supply *esse* followed by a relative pronoun, as if the text they are translating were in fact *cuiatis est, qui ...*? As for the error, which was probably introduced either by Nonius himself while copying out his source or at a later stage of transmission, it is not difficult to explain how it might have arisen. One could imagine that *est qui* was misinterpreted by a scribe as a gloss on *cuiatis*, such as for instance *id est qui*, and therefore erroneously deleted,²⁸ or that the words *est* and *qui* were abbreviated, as is frequently the case,²⁹ and were then omitted by mistake, perhaps on account of their position between a series of similar letters (i.e. *cuiatis est, qui stirpem funditus fligi studet*).

As for the issue, raised at the beginning of this article, of imagining the dramatic scenario to which this fragment might have belonged, all of the possibilities that scholars have proposed, listed above, are theoretically conceivable. The purpose of this article has not been to make a new suggestion about how it might have fitted into the wider context of Accius' plot. It has been rather to draw attention to a problem with Acc. 306-307 D, to clarify the use of the interrogative pronoun *cuiatis*, and to propose a modification of the text and metre of the fragment.

27 I am grateful to Matthew Payne and to Francesco Busti for their help in conceiving and formulating this conjecture, which is the result of a collaborative effort.

28 My thanks to an anonymous reviewer to whom I owe this suggestion.

29 *Est* and *qui* are among the most commonly abbreviated words and indeed are often reduced to a single letter or symbol (see Pluta 2020, 10-15).

Acknowledgements

This publication is part of the project Experiencing Fragments (with project number 406.21.CTW.011) in the research programme SGW Open Competitie which is financed by the Dutch Research Council (NWO).

I wish to thank Matthew Payne for providing invaluable advice at several stages during the preparation of this article and much-needed support throughout. I am also grateful to Francesco Busti as well as to the journal's two anonymous reviewers, whose generous comments improved this article significantly. Finally, thanks to Tristan Franklinos for consulting the manuscript of Antonius Calcilius in Oxford.

Bibliography

- Argenio, R. (1966). Tragedie acciane. *Rivista di studi classici* 14, pp. 5-53.
- Bothe, F. (1834). *Poetarum Latii scenicarum fragmenta*. (2 vols). Leipzig.
- Callebat, L. (1993). Formes et modes d'expression dans les œuvres d'Apulée. *ANRW* 34.2, pp. 1600-1664.
- D'Antò, V., ed. (1980). *Accius, I frammenti delle tragedie*. Lecce.
- Dangel, J., ed. (1995). *Accius, Œuvres. Fragments*. Paris.
- Delrius, M.A. (1593). *Syntagma tragoediae Latinae*. (3 vols). Antwerp.
- De Melo, W., ed. (2011-2013). *Plautus*. (5 vols). Cambridge, MA/London.
- De Nonno, M. (2017). *Vetustas e antiquitas, veteres e antiqui nei grammatici latini*. In: S. Rocchi and C. Mussini, eds., *Imagines antiquitatis. Representations, Concepts, Receptions of the Past in Roman Antiquity and the Early Italian Renaissance*, Berlin/Boston, pp. 213-247.
- Franchella, Q. (1968). *Lucii Accii tragoediarum fragmenta*. Bologna.
- Holford-Strevens, L. (2005²). *Aulus Gellius. An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*. Oxford.
- Iunius, H., ed. (1565). *Nonius Marcellus de proprietate sermonum*. Antwerp.
- Keil, H., ed. (1855-1870). *Grammatici Latini*. (8 vols). Leipzig.
- Klotz, A., ed. (1953). *Tragicorum fragmenta*. Munich.
- Leumann, M., Hofmann, J.B., and Szantyr, A. (1972-1979). *Lateinische Grammatik*. Munich.
- Lindsay, W.M. (1901). *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin*. Oxford.
- Lindsay, W.M., ed. (2003). *Nonius Marcellus, De compendiosa doctrina*. 2nd ed. Munich/Leipzig.
- Maius, I. (1477). *De priscorum proprietate sermonum*. Treviso.
- Mercier, J. (1826²). *Nonius Marcellus de proprietate sermonis*. Leipzig.

- Moore, T.J. (2012). *Music in Roman Comedy*. Cambridge.
- Neue, F., and Wagener, C. (1892-1905). *Formenlehre der lateinischen Sprache*. 3rd ed. Leipzig/Berlin.
- Palmer, A. (1889). Observations on the Fragments of the Scenic Latin Poets. *Hermathena* 15, pp. 46-63.
- Pasetti, L. (2007). *Plauto in Apuleio*. Bologna.
- Pinkster, H. (2015-2021). *The Oxford Latin Syntax*. (2 vols). Oxford.
- Pluta, O. (2020). Abbreviations. In: F.T. Coulson and R.G. Babcock, eds., *The Oxford Handbook of Latin Palaeography*, Oxford, pp. 9-24.
- Pociña, A. (1984). *El tratediografo Latino Lucio Acio*. Granada.
- Questa, C. (2007). *La metrica di Plauto e di Terenzio*. Urbino.
- Ribbeck, O., ed. (1852-1855). *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*. (2 vols). Leipzig.
- Ribbeck, O., ed. (1871-1873). *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*. 2nd ed. (2 vols). Leipzig.
- Ribbeck, O. (1875). *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik*. Leipzig.
- Ribbeck, O., ed. (1897-1898). *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*. 3rd ed. (2 vols). Leipzig.
- Ricciardi, R. (1968). Angelo Poliziano, Giuniano Maio, Antonio Calcillo. *Rinascimento* 8, pp. 277-309.
- Ritschl, F. (1845). Die ursprüngliche Gestalt der Plautischen *Bacchides*. *RhM* 4, pp. 354-376 and 567-610.
- Scriverius, P. ed. (1620). *Collectanea Veterum Tragicorum, L. Livii Andronici, Q. Ennii, Cn. Naevii, M. Pacuvii, L. Attii, aliorumque fragmenta; et circa ipsa notae breues. Quibus accedunt singulari libello Castigationes et Notae uberiores Gerardi Ioannis Vossii*. (2 vols). Leiden.
- de Vaan, M. (2004). *Etymological Dictionary of Latin and Other Italic Languages*. Leiden/Boston.
- Venini, P. (1954). La *Clytemnestra* di Accio. *RIL* 87, pp. 321-328.
- Weiss, M. (2009). *Outline of the Historical and Comparative Grammar of Latin*. Ann Arbor/New York.
- Welcker, F.G. (1839-1841). *Die griechischen Tragödien mit Rücksicht auf den epischen Cyclus*. (3 vols). Bonn.
- Welsh, J.T. (2012). The Methods of Nonius Marcellus' Sources 26, 27 and 28. *CQ* 62, pp. 827-845.
- Warmington, E.H., ed. (1935-1940). *Remains of Old Latin*. 4 Vols. Cambridge, MA.