

Enrico Medda

Cassandra in a Shard from Post-Classical Tragedy
(TrGF adesp. 649)*

Abstract

The purpose of this article is to discuss and reevaluate the nature of the fragment of a dramatic dialogue preserved by *P. Oxy. XXVI 2746 (TrGF adesp. 649)*, in which Cassandra describes to Priam, Deiphobus and a chorus the duel between Hektor and Achilles. It aims to call attention to some features of the text which may be considered firm evidence that this is a fragment of a play specially designed for theatrical performance. It also discusses again the thorny problems that have arisen on account of the unusual layout of the manuscript.

L'articolo si propone di ridiscutere la natura del dialogo drammatico conservato da *P. Oxy. XXVI 2746 (TrGF adesp. 649)*, nel quale Cassandra descrive a Priamo, Deifobo e un coro il duello fra Ettore e Achille. Lo scopo è quello di mettere in evidenza una serie di caratteristiche del testo che possono provare che si tratta di un frammento appartenente a un dramma specificamente pensato per la rappresentazione in teatro. Vengono inoltre discussi i complessi problemi sollevati dal *layout* assolutamente inusuale del manoscritto.

Since its publication in 1968, the fragment of a dramatic dialogue preserved by *P. Oxy. XXVI 2746 (= TrGF adesp. 649)*¹ has attracted a fair amount of discussion. It is indeed a particularly good example of the thorny problems facing scholars attempting to shed light on tragic pieces written after the end of the fifth century BCE. The almost complete loss of the rich post-classical production prevents us from gaining a satisfactory knowledge of its language, style and meter, and the evidence is so scanty and fragmentary that sometimes it is even difficult to understand whether a manuscript preserves a remnant of a complete play, a selected passage chosen for an anthological performance, or simply a school text or a literary exercise not intended for performance.

In the following pages I would like to explore this somewhat enigmatic fragment again, in order to draw attention to some features which may help us in assessing its place in the history of post-classical tragedy. In the final part of the paper I shall discuss the problematic issues concerning the uncommon layout of the manuscript.

Here is the text of the fragment²:

* An Italian version of the first section of this paper was presented at the “Jornades Internacionals sobre el Món Clàssic en Honor de Carles Miralles” (Barcelona, Institut d’Estudis Catalans, January 18-19, 2018) and is currently in press in the proceedings of the meeting.

¹ The literary text is written on the transfibral side of the manuscript; the documentary texts written on the opposite side may be assigned, on palaeographical grounds, to the first century A.D. The papyrus was first published by COLES (1968); see also COLES (1970) and KANNICHT – SNELL (2007², 221-23). For a detailed analysis of the script, besides COLES (1968, 110), see GAMMACURTA (2006, 122-23).

² I have checked the readings of *P. Oxy. XXVI 2746* on the photography available online (<http://www.papyrology.ox.ac.uk/POxy/>); for the interpretation of the most difficult traces I rely on

Πρί]αμο(ς)	θάρρησον, ὦ παῖ· μὴ κάμη· στήσον πόδα, καὶ καῖσι β[ο]υλαῖς προσδέχου τὰ κρείσσ[ονα· ὦδὴ		
Κακ]ς(άνδρα)	βέβληκε δεινὸν κάμακα		
Πρί]αμο(ς)	<u>τίς</u> , τέκνον; φράσον·	Χο(ρός) ὁ Πηλιώτης [5
Κα]ς(άνδρα)	ἀλλ' ἠστόχησε<ν>·	Χο(ρός) εἶπας ὡς ἔχει[
Κα]ς(άνδρα)	Ἔκτωρ †δεδεμλει†	Χο(ρός) δυστυχῆς ἀγῶ[ν	
Κακ]ς(άνδρα)	<u>ἴσως</u> ἐδυστύχησεν·	[
	ὦδὴ		
	κοινὰ μέχρι νῦν νικῶμεν.	.[10
Δηί]φοβ(ος)	τίς ἦχ[ο]ς ἡμᾶς ἐκ δόμων ἀνέκλαγε;		
	ὦδὴ		
[Κακ]ς(άνδρα)]	ἔα ἔα· τί λεύς<σ>ω;	.[
Δηί]φο(βος)	<u>αἰνίχ</u> [ματό]ς μοι μείζον' ἐφθέγγω λόγῳ[ν.		
	ὦδὴ		15
[Κακ]ς(άνδρα)]	ο[ὕ]κ εἶ πρὸ πύργων;	οὐ[.]σε.[
Δηί]φο(βος)	μέμνηα[ς] αὐτὴ καὶ παρεπλάγχθησ φρένα.		
	ὦδὴ		
[Κακ]ς(άνδρα)]	οὐ παρεξέ[λ]ευσ;	.[
	πατ . . . τ ατο[].[20
	ὄς νῦ[ν] .ερο.ιο[ς[].[
	ὦδὴ		
Κακ]ς(άνδρα)?	νε[ώ]τερόν μοι τ[
] ἀκού[ς]α[τ'] ἄ[κ]ραν γῆρυν [
] ἀκού[ς]αθ'· Ἔκτωρ ἐξόλωλ[.].[25
	ὦδὴ		
[Κακ]ς(άνδρα)?]	[.] ἄχλυς πόθεν με[
] ὄλωλ[.]. . .αι καὶ φάος τιτα[
] . . .[.] . .[.]δ . . νῦν τὸ κλεινὸ[ν] Ἴλιον		
] τῆς σῆς ἔρη[μ]ον χειρὸς Ἑλλή[νων]	30	
	<u>βαλεῖ</u> πρὸς οὐδας	[
	ν]ῦν δ[έ] δ[υ]τυχῆς ἐγώ·	[
	.]λλ[.]. . .αγρ[.ς]κῆπτρ[
	[ὦδὴ ?]		
ΚΑ.] []τυ[35

Cola περιγραφῆ 'ὦδὴ' instructa omnia Cassandrae tribuenda esse vidit Coles 6
ἠστόχησε Π : corr. Coles | ἔχει[ν θέλω Barrett apud Coles, ἔχει [καλῶς Snell, ἔχει [τάδε

COLES (1970, 8-10).

Ferrari 7 δὲ βάλλει vel δὲ πέμπει Coles (qui etiam de δὲ μέλλει vel δ' ἄθυμει cogitat) :
possis δ' ἰάλλει | ἀγῶν ὄδε vel ἀγῶ[νιῶ Coles, ἀγῶ[νιᾶ Kannicht et al., ἀγῶ[νία
Stephanopoulos, ἀγῶ[ν δοκεῖ Ferrari 8 ἔδυστύχησε Ferrari 10 νεικωμεν Π | Χ[ο(ρός)
Kannicht 11 ἀνέκλαγε<v> Coles 13 prius ἔα del. Coles | fin. π[vel τι[Kannicht: e. g.
π[ῶς ἀπὼν πάρει, κάσι; vel π[ῶς ἄπει πάρει θ' ἄμα; Ferrari 16 ο[ύ]κ ἔϊ Kannicht et Snell
| fin. ο[ύ]κ [ἔ]κει [κοφός υ - Snell : ο[ύ]κ [ἔ]κει [κόφρον μανείς; Ferrari (μανείς iam Kannicht)
17 φρένα[ς Coles 23 suppl. Kannicht 24 suppl. Snell 27 μέ[λαινα? Ferrari, cl.
Aesch. Sept. 494, Eur. HF 46 28 Τιτά[νιον Kannicht et Snell : τειτ[Π 29 fort.
λόγ[χ]αι[ς] [iv] ἦδη γῆν Ferrari 30 fin. e. g. Ἑλλή[νων] στόλος Ferrari : Ἑλλή[νων] βία
Kannicht 31 fort. βάλλει Π (λ supra scripto) 32 Πρ. v]ῦν δ[έ] Ferrari | δ[uc]τυχήc
Coles 34 ὠδή suppl. Coles

At least three characters (Priam, Cassandra and Deiphobus) take part in the dialogue, together with a chorus. The form is apparently epirrhematic, with iambic trimeters mixed with lyric verses³. In the 35 surviving lines Cassandra describes to Priam and the chorus the single combat between Hector and Achilles taking place outside the walls of Troy. The description culminates in the announcement of the death of Hector (l. 25); then, in the last poorly preserved lines, Cassandra and at least one other unidentifiable character lament his death, which for Troy foreshadows a grim future of destruction.

The fragment offers one of the very few surviving dramatic treatments of the celebrated Homeric episode of the duel (*Il.* XXII 260-365), closely following the narrative sequence of the model. The duel takes place outside the walls of the city and at the beginning both the heroes throw their spears without success (cf. *Il.* XXII 274-93); the text also alludes probably to the deceptive presence of Deiphobus on the battlefield (see below, pp. 60f.). A particular innovation is that the task of describing the combat is assigned to Cassandra.

There is a great deal of uncertainty surrounding the nature, chronology and authorship of these verses. I offer here a brief survey of the suggested interpretations.

a) A remnant of a fourth-century tragedy. Coles (1968, 111f.) considered, though only to reject it, the attribution to Astydamos the Younger's *Hector*, one of the very few known plays dealing with the death of the hero. His scepticism has been widely shared by later interpreters; nonetheless, the attribution to *Hector* has been recently revived by Taplin (2009, 259-63)⁴.

b) A fragment of a third-century (or later) tragedy (Coles, Gentili and others)⁵. Fernández-Galiano (1978), observing that a certain amount of words recur in

³ See however section II of this paper for different reconstructions of the original form of the dialogue.

⁴ See however below, section III.

⁵ Cf. COLES (1968, 111), GENTILI (2006², 75), XANTHAKIS-KARAMANOS (1997, 1045), CATENACCI (2002, 98 n. 6), FERRARI (2009, 26 n. 21), KOTLIŃSKA-TOMA (2015, 195-98), LIAPIS (2016, 77-84).

Lycophron's *Alexandra*, suggests that it could belong to a lost play by this author dedicated to Cassandra.

c) An adaptation of a pre-existing tragic scene of unknown date, originally composed in spoken iambic trimeters, for a musical performance by a Hellenistic τραγωδός (Ferrari 2009, 21-27). According to Easterling (2005, 32f.) «we should not automatically think *whole tragedy* when we find fragments like these» and we may imagine «a singer drawing on his personal repertoire to create Cassandra in musical terms that would suit this dramatic situation».

d) A Hellenistic *Singspiel* («drama musicum stilo severiore conscriptum», Kannicht – Snell 2007², 222)⁶.

e) A literary exercise written by an educated amateur (Taplin 1977, 126f.)⁷.

My primary aim is to narrow down this excessively wide range of possibilities. To achieve this goal I shall analyse the fragment in search of elements which may be considered firm evidence that this is a fragment of a play specially designed for theatrical performance.

I begin by drawing attention to the treatment of space. A close examination of this aspect brings to light the intention of the author to create tension between the place in which the characters are speaking and other unseen spaces mentioned in the text. This is a typically theatrical way to approach the situation, and the anonymous dramatist proves to be well acquainted with the conventional means used by fifth-century authors to evoke in the minds of the spectators extra- and retro-scenic spaces which are relevant to dramatic action⁸.

Let's consider first of all the entrance of Deiphobus. His words at l. 11 τίς ἤχ[ο]ς ἤμαρ ἐκ δόμων ἀνέκλαγε; imply that he is emerging from a house where the loud voices of the characters who are talking had impinged. Taplin (2009, 259) is surely right in calling this line «an 'implicit stage-direction'», since it gives a decisive indication about the setting of the scene. In view of the presence of Priam and Deiphobus, the dialogue is likely to take place in front of the royal palace of Troy, which, according to *Il.* VI 314-17, was located ἐν πόλει ἄκρη, near the houses of Priam's sons. The κλαγγή of Cassandra is therefore imagined as capable of reaching the ears of someone who is inside the palace. This situation exactly matches the tragic convention allowing characters placed in the *skēnē* to hear the words of someone speaking outside it, in the scenic space. For a character emerging from the *skēnē* and saying that she/he has heard a voice or a cry uttered in the scenic space we may aptly compare the entrances of

⁶ Kannicht notes however that so far no other example of this kind of composition has been discovered. See also FANTUZZI – HUNTER (2002, 514f. [= 2004, 433]).

⁷ Taplin's suggestion is considered possible also by KANNICHT – SNELL (2007², 222) and FANTUZZI – HUNTER (2002, 514f. [= 2004, p. 433]).

⁸ For a survey of these conventions see DI BENEDETTO – MEDDA (2002², 34-78).

Eurydike at Soph. *Ant.* 1183-88, Macaria at Eur. *Hclid.* 478f., and Clytemnestra at Eur. *IA* 819f. The same convention is active at Soph. *OR* 634-38, where Iocasta's first utterance after her entrance reacts directly to the words pronounced by Creon and Oedipus who are arguing in front of the house. It is also useful to compare two entrances from the extra-scenic space which are caused by a cry (cf. ἀνέκλαγε at *TrGF adesp.* 649.11). At Eur. *Hec.* 1109-11 the first words of Agamemnon, who enters from one *eisodos*, are κραυγῆς ἀκούσας ἦλθον· οὐ γὰρ ἦκυχος | πέτρας ὀρείας παῖς λέλακ' ἀνὰ στρατὸν | Ἥχώ διδοῦσα θόρυβον. At Eur. *Hipp.* 790f. Theseus mentions the echo of the cries of the Servants from the house as the cause of his arrival from the extra-scenic space (though the passage is corrupt, the presence of the terms βοή and ἠχώ is certain).

A relevant common feature of these passages is that the character emerging from the *skēnē* has been able to understand the content or at least the general tone of the words uttered outside. We wonder if the same may also be said of Deiphobus. The answer depends on the evaluation of the particular word chosen by the anonymous author to qualify the sound which has caused his exit from the house. The word is ἀνέκλαγε, a rare compound of κλάζω (in tragedy it occurs only at Eur. *IA* 1062), constructed here in a previously unattested way, with the accusative indicating the person who has been 'called out by a noisy voice'. Κλάζω is normally reserved for loud noises (for example the thunder, or the trumpets at Aesch. *Sept.* 386) or animal sounds (Soph. *Ant.* 112, 1002, *OR* 966, fr. 767.1 R.², Eur. *Ion* 1204, Xen. *Cyr.* 1.4.15.4), and is only seldom used for the human voice (*Il.* II 222 ὄξεα κεκλήγων λέγ' ὀνειδέα, Aesch. *Ag.* 174 ἐπινίκια κλάζων, Eur. *Phoe.* 1144 ἔκλαγξε Τυδεῦς καὶ τὸς ἐξάϊφνης γόνος). It is particularly noteworthy that in three of these rare occurrences the verb is associated with prophetic utterances, which must be imagined being made with a loud voice. Two of them are from Aeschylus' *Agamemnon* 156 τοιάδε Κάλχας ξὺν μεγάλοις ἀγαθοῖς ἀπέκλαγξεν and 201 μάντις ἔκλαγξεν (in both passages the subject is Kalchas)⁹; one from Pindar, *Pae.* 8a, fr. 52i(A).10 M., (= B3, 16 Rutherford), where ἔκλαγξε[v] refers to Cassandra.

These passages suggest that the anonymous author has intentionally chosen a word which he felt was associated with prophetic utterances. In other words, Deiphobus has heard something more than a confused sound of voices: he has probably recognized the disquieting prophetic nature of one of them, and this has made him most eager to come out of the house and ask information. If this reading of ἀνέκλαγε is correct, we should regard the verb as an argument in favour of the interpretation of the scene as a manifestation of Cassandra's visionary powers (see below pp. 60f.). Moreover, the verb

⁹ Moreover, at Aesch. *Ag.* 1152f. the chorus describes Cassandra's singing as a δυσφάτω κλαγγῆ. It may also be observed that at Eur. *IA* 1062 the words μέγα δ' ἀνέκλαγον introduce a speech of the Centaurs, who, though not being prophets, report to Thetis a prophecy by Cheiron.

contributes to creating a complex intertwining of the visionary context and the staging of the scene, in which the appearance of Deiphobus causes a reaction of surprise and desperation in Cassandra, who has just ‘seen’ him on the battlefield at a considerable distance from the house¹⁰. The very emphasis on this relationship between Cassandra’s visions and the scenic movement of Deiphobus could therefore be regarded as the reason for the introduction of the innovative construction of ἀνακλάζω.

A second, pivotal instance of tension is created by the author between the place in front of the palace where the characters are talking and the battlefield, outside the walls of Troy. In order to evoke the duel which is happening in this distant space, he resorts to two forms of conventional perception.

The first one involves sight and represents the most striking feature of the fragment. Cassandra offers a detailed description of the duel, which surely takes place outside the walls of Troy, at a considerable distance from the place where she is talking. How can she perceive this event? Three possible interpretations have been envisaged by Coles (1968, 110f.).

(1) Cassandra is prophesizing about a future event.

(2) Cassandra is giving an eye-witness account of the duel. This requires her to be located high up, on the walls of Troy or at another vantage point from where she can see what is happening in the Trojan plain. The situation would be similar to the *Teikhoskopia* of Euripides’ *Phoenissae* (103-92), where Antigone climbs a ladder to reach the roof of her house and asks the Old Servant about the names of the warriors who are visible at some distance in the Theban plain.

(3) The description of the duel is a form of ‘telesthetic’ perception or, in Taplin’s words, «a ‘televisionary’ narration»¹¹. Despite being in front of the royal palace inside the city, Cassandra ‘sees’ the duel in her mind as it is actually happening outside the walls.

The first interpretation can be confidently discarded. If Cassandra’s words were a prophecy about a future event, she would not have any reason to be surprised when she sees Deiphobus emerging from the house, and her questions at l. 13, ἔα ἔα· τί λεύκ<C>ω; l. 16 ο[ὐ]κ εἶ πρὸ πύργων; and l. 19 οὐ παρεκέ[λ]ευες; would hardly be understandable. The question οὐ παρεκέ[λ]ευες, (‘were you not exhorting (him)?’), in particular, underscoring the discrepancy between Deiphobus’ appearance on scene and Cassandra’s perception of his role at the side of Hector on the battlefield, would have no meaning¹².

¹⁰ LIAPIS (2016, 81) is sceptical about the idea of an allusion to Deiphobus’ presence on the battlefield: «the legible remains are too scanty to bear out this interpretation in full». Yet, this is the most likely interpretation of the situation: see below, pp. 60f.

¹¹ TAPLIN (2009, 260).

¹² This point has been rightly stressed by MAZZOLDI (2001, 271) and CATENACCI (2002, 98).

A strongly argued case in favour of solution (2) (an eye-witness account from the walls of Troy) has recently been put forward by Ferrari (2009, 27-35). He interprets the situation as a combination of the narration of the duel at *Il.* XXII 273ff. with the episode of *Il.* XXIV 697-706, where Cassandra, having gone up to the citadel (Πέργαμον εἰκαναβᾶα), is the first among the Trojans to know of her father's return from the Greek camp with the body of Hector. In Ferrari's opinion, the anonymous author chose to represent Cassandra not as a clairvoyant woman, but as the Homeric princess who was not yet known as a seeress (see *schol.* *Il.* XXIV 699 οὐ γὰρ οἶδεν αὐτὴν μάντιν ὀ ποιητήε)¹³. This entails situating the dialogue on the walls of Troy (Ferrari suggests the tower near the Scaean Gates), and the possibility for Priam and the chorus to see the battlefield.

It is not easy, however, to reconcile this collocation of the scene with the presence of the facade of a house, from which Deiphobus emerges at l. 11 (ἐκ δόμων). If a *skēnē* was present and had an active role as the royal palace, how could the scenic space be meant to represent a place on the walls of Troy? And where would Deiphobus come from? One could perhaps imagine the palace being situated in the extra-scenic space, with Deiphobus arriving from one of the *eisodoi*. But Deiphobus says that he has heard the characters' voices talking in the scenic space, and, as I argued above, his perception was sufficiently clear to allow him to understand the nature of Cassandra's utterances. The idea of an extremely extended conventional perception, allowing a character to hear what has been said on scene while being inside a house situated at a certain distance in the extra-scenic space is far from convincing, and would find no parallel in fifth-century tragedy. At best, we might look at some Euripidean examples of an acoustic contact between the extra-scenic and the retro-scenic spaces. At *Med.* 131-38 Medea cries in the house, and when the chorus enters the Corinthian women say that they have heard her voice; at *Hipp.* 790f. arriving from one *eisodos*, Theseus asks the chorus what the meaning is of some servant's cries that he has heard in the house. This convention is more boldly exploited in the fourth episode of *Orestes*, when Hermione, who is coming back from the tomb of Clytemnestra, is anxious about the cries she has heard from the house before entering the scene, τηλουργὸς οὐ̄κα (*Or.* 1324f.). In all these passages, however, the sound comes from the *skēnē*, and is heard by someone situated in an open space not too far from it. None of them offers any support for the idea of a conventional acoustic contact between a character talking in the scenic space and another placed inside a house at a considerable distance.

¹³ The scholiast's statement, however, is not necessarily true. It is possible that at *Il.* XXIV 699 the poet had in mind the prophetic gifts of Cassandra, but for some reason avoided an explicit mention of them. See RICHARDSON (1993, 348): «As often [...] one is inclined to think that the poet knows more than he tells us».

Yet, the presence of a house visible on scene would not be sufficient in itself to dismiss the interpretation of Cassandra's words as an eye-witness account. Cassandra could speak from the roof of the *skēnē* or from another elevated point near the house. The most serious problem lies with the fact that in this case Priam and the chorus would probably not be able to see the battlefield, since they would be situated at a lower level than Cassandra. A whole chorus placed high up is out of question, as it is trying to imagine the old king Priam on the rooftop (we may recall the trouble of the Old Preceptor in Euripides' *Phoenissae*, who climbs a steep ladder to reach the roof of the palace). We should therefore envisage a dialogue between an actor on high and the other characters at the level of the orchestra or of the *logeion* (something like the final scene of Euripides' *Orestes*). This reconstruction, though not impossible, does not adequately explain some decisive features of Cassandra's description of the duel, such as the omission of the subjects in the sentences of ll. 4 and 6, which is far more understandable in the case of a seer absorbed in her vision, nor does it take adequately into account the motive of madness in the words of Deiphobus at l. 17 (see below, p. 61).

The 'telesthetic' perception of the duel (3) is by far the most attractive interpretation¹⁴. Gentili, in particular, interpreted the situation as a refinement of the masterly treatment of Cassandra's visions proposed by Aeschylus in the *Agamemnon*. A close connection between the two scenes is indeed suggested by many points of affinity in content and form (for the structure and metre of the dialogue see section III).

Compared to this model, *TrGF adesp.* 649 introduces two relevant novelties. Firstly, while in Aeschylus Cassandra's prophecies concern the retro-scenic space (she sees both the past and the immediate future of the inhabitants of the house), in the fragment her perceptions are about an extra-scenic event. Secondly, she is not foreseeing a future action: the duel is happening on the battlefield at the same time as she is speaking. In fifth-century tragedy an extra-scenic death would have normally been reported by a Messenger, or by someone who has directly witnessed it. Our author offers instead a refined and innovative variation of this convention, by merging in an emotionally powerful combination the moment of witnessing and that of communicating to the characters on scene the events she sees in her mind.

Moreover, the tension between the scenic and the extra-scenic space is further increased by the author's choice to exploit the discrepancy between the 'televisionary' report and the scenic reality. Cassandra is amazed when she sees before her, inside the city, a person who, according to her vision, should be on the battlefield. This upsetting contradiction is emphasized by the question ο[ὐ]κ εἶ πρὸ πύργων; at l. 16. One would search in vain for a precise parallel in the extant fifth-century tragedies. We could

¹⁴ It has rightly been preferred by GENTILI (2006², 76-78, 82f.), MAZZOLDI (2001, 271-76), CATENACCI (2002, 97f.), TAPLIN (2009, 260f.).

perhaps recall some Euripidean passages where the dramatist plays with his spectators' expectations, for example in the case of the discrepancy between the death screams of Helen from the house at *Or.* 1296 and 1301 and the subsequent narration of the Phrygian servant, who reveals that she is not dead. Nothing however is really comparable to this woman seeing in her mind something which contradicts what she sees with her eyes on scene. It has been noted that the question ἔα ἔα, τί λεύκω (l. 13), has only one parallel in classical tragedy, Eur. *Bacch.* 1280 ἔα, τί λεύκω; τί φέρομαι τόδ' ἐν χεροῖν, and it may be significant that there too the question emphasizes the contrast between what Agaue believed she had seen when her mind was deluded by Dionysus (a lion's head) and the vision of Pentheus' severed head when she comes to her senses¹⁵. In Euripides the two perceptions correspond to different moments; the anonymous author goes a step further step by making the mental perception and the real one simultaneous, so that the contradiction is exasperated.

The 'telesthetic' interpretation also facilitates a better explanation of Deiphobus' utterances at l. 14 αἰνίγ[ματό]ς μοι μείζον' ἐφθέγγω λόγῳ[ν and l. 17 μέμηνα[ς] αὐτή καὶ παρεπλάγχθη φρένα. To him Cassandra's words seem enigmatic and her surprise inexplicable, since he is not aware of what she is inwardly seeing. Hence he concludes that she must be insane. It is worth noting that the description of Cassandra's utterances as αἰνίγματα recalls Aesch. *Ag.* 1112f., where the chorus reacts thus to the obscure words of the Trojan prisoner: οὐπω ξυνηκα· νῦν γὰρ ἐξ αἰνιγμάτων / ἐπαργέμοις θεοφάτοις ἀμηχανῶ. Aeschylus also offers a precise parallel for the accusation of being mad (μέμηνα[ς], l. 17). At *Ag.* 1140 the Argive Elders describe her as φρενομανής and θεοφόρητος. Later, at l. 1174, they explain her condition as the consequence of the action of a 'heavy daimon' who fills her mind with bad thoughts and makes her sing of woeful sufferings: καὶ τίς σε κακοφρονεῖν τίθη-/σι δαίμων ὑπερβαρῆς ἐπίτνων / μελίξειν πάθη γοερά θανατοφόρα¹⁶. Yet, we must account for the presence of αὐτή in Deiphobus' response at l. 17, which characterizes the sentence as a retaliation. This has been explained by suggesting that Cassandra herself might have introduced the theme of madness in the lost part of l. 16, perhaps reproaching her brother for what she considers to be insane behaviour. Kannicht and Ferrari accordingly supply a form of μανεῖν at the end of l. 16. In any case, even if Cassandra is the first to speak of μανία, this is not enough to deny, as does Ferrari, the association of this motive with her state of prophetic trance. The hendiadys μέμηνας ... καὶ παρεπλάγχθη φρένα alludes clearly to the traditional description of the poor fool prophetess whom no one believes (cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 1273f., Eur. *Tro.* 417).

¹⁵ On this point see particularly MAZZOLDI (2001, 275).

¹⁶ On the text of these verses see MEDDA (2017, III 203f.).

A second conventional means for evoking the extra-scenic space of the battlefield, probably present at ll. 24f., involves the perception of a sound. An unidentified speaker¹⁷ invites the other characters to listen to a cry, interpreted as a clear signal of Hector's death. The repetition of the imperative ἀκούσατε (l. 24 ἀκού[σ]α[τ'] ἄ[κ]ρανον γῆρυν and l. 25 ἀκού[σ]αθ'· Ἐκτῶρ ἐξόλωλε) is clearly intended to emphasize the emotional impact of this perception; unfortunately, it is not possible to say whether the two utterances are pronounced by the same speaker or by two different voices.

The most delicate point here is represented by the meaning of the expression ἄ[κ]ρανον γῆρυν. Some scholars identify it as Cassandra's words: the sentence is accordingly interpreted as an order to pay attention to them¹⁸. Yet, Cassandra has already been talking for some time, and the emphatic repetition of the imperative at this point would not be justified. The repetition seems more apt to mark the beginning of a new relevant perception, which is introduced at l. 23, very probably by Cassandra herself, with the words νε[ώ]τερόν μοι τ[ι] (a plausible supplement by Kannicht, cf. Eur. *Phoe.* 709, *Or.* 1327, *Bacch.* 214). It is therefore much more likely that ἄ[κ]ρανον γῆρυν refers to the death cry of Hector, uttered offstage¹⁹. A good parallel for the perception of a death cry coming from the extra-scenic space is offered by Eur. *El.* 747f. Χο. ἔα ἔα· φίλαι, βοῆς ἠκούσατ', ἢ δοκῶ κενὴ / ὑπῆλθέ μ' ...; and 752f. φοίνιον οἰμωγὴν κλύω. The affinity between the two passages is all the more striking if we observe that in Euripides too the offstage cry is called γῆρυς (*El.* 754 μακρὰν γὰρ ἔρπει γῆρυς, ἐμφανὴς γε μὴν). A particular difficulty concerns the meaning of the adjective ἄκρανον in this unusual expression. Ferrari interprets it as 'high-pitched', 'acute'²⁰; as an alternative, I would suggest 'final', 'ultimate cry', although I have not been able to find a certain parallel for this meaning.

The impossibility of attributing the utterances of ll. 23-25 with any certainty does not allow us to understand whether the cry is heard only by Cassandra (as a part of her individual perceptions) or by all the characters on scene. Two possible situations may be envisaged.

(a) She has a premonition of a new disaster, and invites the other characters to hear the γῆρυν, whose meaning she explains at l. 25.

¹⁷ Perhaps Deiphobus, or the chorus? The speaker's indication has been swallowed by the lacuna on the left side of the papyrus.

¹⁸ MAZZOLDI (2001, 278) observes that at Lycoph. 7 γῆρυς is used for the voice of the Sphynx, imitated by Alexandra; see also FERNÁNDEZ GALIANO (1978, 140) and the translations of KANNICHT ET AL. (1991, 255), «hört den Gipfel der Kunde», and LIAPIS (2016, 79) «listen to my ultimate (?) utterance». Coles and Gentili do not give a translation of this part of the fragment.

¹⁹ Or, alternatively, to the cries of people offstage who have witnessed the duel. However, I find this solution far less attractive than the other.

²⁰ FERRARI (2009, 34): «ascoltate il grido alto».

(b) She has a premonition of a new disaster, which is immediately confirmed by the cry, echoing between l. 23 and l. 24²¹. Then, somebody (maybe Deiphobus, or the chorus, or both if we assign ll. 24 and 25 to different speakers) explains the meaning of the cry by connecting it to Hector's death.

In the light of what has been discussed so far, we may conclude that the anonymous author has represented Cassandra as 'seeing' in her mind the extra-scenic duel. A relevant consequence of this interpretation of the scene is that the other characters cannot have a direct perception of the event. There are, however, some problematic issues which still require discussion.

Let's consider Priam first. When Cassandra begins to speak at l. 4, she has no need to clarify who the subject is of the phrase βέβληκε δεινὸν κάμακα, since the scene of the duel is perfectly clear in her mind. The king replies by asking τίς, τέκνον; φράσον (l. 5), and it seems reasonable to infer from the question that he has not seen the action described by his daughter. As a consequence, his first utterance θάρσενον, ὦ παῖ (l. 1) cannot but be directed at Cassandra, and in order to explain the exhortation «Take courage, child! Do not exhaust yourself! Steady your feet» we may have to assume that in the lost verses preceding l. 1 there was a scene of frenzied agitation prelude to Cassandra's prophetic impulse. This suggestion finds support in the Euripidean description of Cassandra μαινάς (see *Tr.* 298-307, and in particular ll. 306f. παῖς ἐμὴ | μαινάς θοάζει δεῦρο Κασσάνδρα δρόμῳ) and in the Cassandra *furens* of Ennius' *Alexander* fr. XVIII Jocelyn (= Cic. *div.* I 66)²².

Nonetheless, a serious problem lies with the obscure expression καὶ καῖσι β[ο]υλαῖς προδέχου τὰ κρείσσ[ονα] at l. 2²³. When applied to the psychological dimension, in fact, the verb προδέχεσθαι means 'accept', 'receive', cf. Eur. *Alc.* 130 νῦν δὲ βίου τίν' ἐλπίδα προδέχωμαι and Plat. *Resp.* 485c τὴν ἀψεύδειαν καὶ τὸ ἐκόντας εἶναι μηδαμῆ προδέχεσθαι τὸ ψεῦδος. But what is meant by βουλαῖς? One would rather expect here an exhortation like 'accept in your mind τὰ κρείσσονα', i.e. the superior force of the divinity (cf. Eur. *Ion* 973 καὶ πῶς τὰ κρείσσω θνητὸς ὢν ὑπερδράμω;). Βουλή, however, always means 'will', 'design', 'project', and cannot be simply equated to 'mind' (the difference is made clear by Pindar *N.* 1.27 πράσσει γὰρ ἔργῳ μὲν cθένος, βουλαῖσι δὲ φρήν). Gentili suggests that βουλαῖς should be interpreted as 'resources of the mind': «with the power of your reason face what is

²¹ It is obviously impossible to say whether a cry was really uttered offstage or if it was only mentioned by the characters. This would not have made any difference in view of the conventional treatment of the situation.

²² The comparison with Euripides and Ennius is proposed by MAZZOLDI (2001, 272 with n. 518) and CATENACCI (2002, 100 with n. 11).

²³ COLES (1968, 115), in acknowledging the problems of this line, puts forward a deliberately generic translation: «accept the better course in your designs».

overwhelming»²⁴. Yet, *προσδέχου* can hardly mean ‘face’, nor have I found any example of *βουλή* meaning ‘resource’²⁵.

On the other hand, it has been observed that a phrase like «accept the better course in your designs» would be more understandable if it referred to Hector’s situation on the battlefield. Uebel (1974, 324) accordingly argued that Priam’s question is directed at Hector. His exhortation to stay and resist Achilles, however, would be the exact opposite of that given by the king to his son at *Il.* XXII 38-76, where Hector is asked to leave the battlefield and come back into the city. Ferrari (2009, 29) suggests that this may represent an intentional inversion of the Homeric exhortation, motivated by the fact that at this point the fight is inevitable, since Hector has already decided to stay outside the Scaean Gates. In his opinion, the anonymous author transfers to Priam the counsel given to Achilles by Athena at *Il.* XXII 222 *ἀλλὰ cὺ μὲν νῦν cτηῆθι καὶ ἄμπνυε*. A first objection to this reconstruction is that, if Priam sees Hector clearly enough to address him at l. 1, it would be strange that two lines later he is not be able to perceive who the warrior is that has thrown his spear. Ferrari tries to explain the contradiction as «a touch of realism», by which the poet alludes to the difficulty in perceiving what exactly is happening on the battlefield from the walls of the city. Cassandra would then be the first to see a detail that is still out of focus for the other characters²⁶. But the fatal flaw of Uebel’s proposal is the collocation of all the participants in the dialogue on the wall of Troy, the weaknesses of which I have already discussed above (see pp. 59f.). In spite of the difficulties regarding the meaning of l. 2, it seems necessary to read ll. 1f. as being directed at Cassandra. As for the problematic *καὶ καῖσι β[ο]υλαῖς προσδέχου τὰ κρείc[ονα]*, we can either accept Gentili’s translation or resort to a highly hypothetical suggestion. The presence of *β[ο]υλαῖς* could be justified by some words which have been lost before l. 1. Maybe Cassandra has manifested the intention to perform some self-harming action, and Priam reacts by exhorting her to calm down and take the better course in her decisions.

As for the chorus, the content of their comments is partially obscured by the lacunae in the right part of the column. At l. 5 they indicate the warrior who has thrown his spear as *ὁ Πηλιώτης*. This seems to be an ethnonym from *Πήλιον* (cf. Eur. *Med.* 581 *τὴν Πηλιῶτιν Ἴωλκόν*); the nominative provides a subject for l. 4 *βέβληκε*, and the most natural candidate is Achilles, who seems to be designated, in an unusual way, as ‘the

²⁴ See GENTILI (2006², 74) «affronta con le risorse del tuo senno la forza superiore»; at p. 77 n. 9 he observes that «l’uso del plurale *καῖσι βουλαῖς* in luogo del singolare sottolinea enfaticamente, in rapporto alle non comuni qualità e capacità del personaggio, tutte le risorse del calcolo intelligente e della riflessione».

²⁵ Gentili refers to the discussion of *βούλομαι/βουλή* by VERNANT – VIDAL-NAQUET (1972, 45f.), which however is not helpful in this respect.

²⁶ Ferrari recalls the situation of Eur. *Ph.* 159-62, where the Old Servant indicates Polyneices to Antigone who fails to recognize him among the other warriors.

man from Pelion', presumably because he was fostered on that mountain by Cheiron. But are we dealing with an assertion (which would entail the visibility of the battlefield for the chorus) or with a question? The former solution would be possible only with the chorus placed on the walls of Troy, and for the reasons stated above I think that we should prefer the latter. The other choral comments at l. 6 εἶπας ὡς ἔχει and l. 7 δυστυχῆς ἀγών are vague and cannot be considered as proof that the chorus sees the fighters²⁷. Moreover, something may be missing at the end of the two utterances: see at l. 6 the supplements proposed by Ferrari (εἶπας ὡς ἔχει [τάδε]), Snell (εἶπας ὡς ἔχει [καλῶς]), Barrett (εἶπας ὡς ἔχει[ν θέλω: perhaps the best supplement) and at l. 7 Coles' plausible δυστυχῆς ἀγῶ[ν ὄδε.

Let us proceed to pull the threads together. The analysis of the treatment of space in the fragment leads to the conclusion that the work to which it belonged was the product of a theatrical mind, namely someone who worked by bearing in mind the space of a theater and the means through which it could be transformed in the dramatic space of a play. The anonymous author not only displays an excellent control of the conventions known to us from fifth-century tragedy, but is also capable of building on them in a clever and innovative way. Moreover, we have here a still active chorus participating in a lyric dialogue. Taplin, albeit rightly observing that we have «firmer evidence than it is usually acknowledged that this is a passage from a play for performance», hesitates to abandon his former view of 1977 and tones down his judgement by adding «if it is not, then it is in a sense masquerading as one»²⁸. However, should we credit an amateur without any direct experience of theatre with such a refined treatment of the tension between visible and unseen spaces?

Another relevant argument which must be taken into account is the fact that the most striking 'theatrical' invention of this anonymous author, *i.e.* the 'televisionary' perception of Cassandra, is associated with other features which reveal his literary and theatrical taste.

First of all, he chooses to dramatize the Homeric episode of the duel (a subject not very common in Greek tragedy) not in the predictable form of a messenger's speech, but by constructing a lively scene in which the extra-scenic space, as Catenacci (2002, 99) has perceptively observed, coincides with the space of literary memory. Secondly, he reworks the Aeschylean scene from the *Agamemnon* with innovative solutions at the level both of content and form²⁹. Thirdly, he adds a decisive touch, finely highlighted by Taplin: Cassandra's vision includes the supernatural trick played against Hector by Athena taking on the form of Deiphobus. This means that the seer, though divinely

²⁷ This is for example the opinion of MAZZOLDI (2001, 273) who considers the sentence εἶπας ὡς ἔχει complete and translates «tu hai detto come sta la cosa».

²⁸ TAPLIN (2009, 259). He accordingly labels the fragment as «dramatic or quasi-dramatic».

²⁹ See Section III for the metrical affinities between the two scenes.

inspired, is not immune from delusion. She sees in her mind exactly what anyone present on the battlefield would have seen: a scene that is the result of divine trickery. Around this detail the author construes the scenic play discussed above. One cannot but agree with Taplin (2009, 261) when he writes that we have here «a kind of self-consciousness which goes beyond anything readily comparable from fifth-century tragedy».

II

It's time now to turn to the puzzling issues that have arisen on account of the unusual layout of the manuscript.

Among regular iambic trimeters we find seven short verses (4, 10, 13, 16, 19, 23, 27) written ἐν εἰσθέσει and preceded by a *παρεπιγραφή*, the isolated word ᾠδή, placed in a separate line³⁰. These utterances are mainly iambic: *ia cr* (4, with solution of the last long element), 2 *ia*_λ (10 and 13), *ia penth* vel *reiz* (16 and 19)³¹. Between l. 4 and l. 9 there are four lines divided between Priam (5a), Cassandra (6a, 7a, 8a) and the chorus (5b, 6b, 7b). These short utterances may also be analysed as lyric verses: *ia penth* vel *reiz* (5b, 6a, 7a), hypodochmiacs (5a, 6b, 7b), 2 *ia*_λ (8). Two *paragraphoi*, placed under the first words of l. 5 and l. 10 very probably mark the section 5-8 as a unit³².

The inset verses 10, 13 and 16 are followed by iambic trimeters. In the lower half of the column, although the lines are poorly preserved, iambic trimeters can be identified at ll. 24, 25 and 28-30; another *ia penth* (vel *reiz*) is probably present at l. 31. The most problematic feature of the manuscript is that, while the exchange of ll. 5-8 occupies the whole column, with a little blank space in the middle of the line to mark the changes of speaker, Cassandra's lines preceded by ᾠδή are written in the central part of the column, preceded and followed by large blank spaces.

Many questions arise from this complex and somewhat perplexing *mise es page*. What is the meaning of the *parepigraphē*? And how should we interpret its association with inset lines? Εἰσθετικ is often used in dramatic papyri to mark the difference

³⁰ It is possible that another ᾠδή was present at l. 34, as Coles plausibly suggests. Yet, no significant trace of ink is visible in that spot.

³¹ For this metrical analysis see GENTILI (2006², 79). As for the badly damaged ll. 23 and 27, it can only be said that what survives seems to be compatible with iambic sequences.

³² Since the identity of the speakers is always indicated by sigla, it is very probable that in this papyrus the *paragraphoi* are used to mark the sub-units of the text (here the *amoibaion* between Cassandra, Priam and the chorus). Another *paragraphos* is placed at l. 31, probably in order to mark off the epirrhematic dialogue between Cassandra and Deiphobus. On the other hand, the small horizontal trace visible under the beginning of l. 14 is not a *paragraphos*: it is rather connected with the letter B placed immediately under it, whose function has not been hitherto explained: see GAMMACURTA (2006, 127 and 129).

between sung and spoken verses³³; yet, we also find here a group of lines (4-8) which, though apparently lyric, are not placed ἐν εἰσθέσει.

Since many of the utterances in ll. 4-10 metrically coincide with parts of a iambic trimeter, Coles (1968, 116) suggested that the text should be reconstituted in iambic trimeters, wrongly divided by the scribe³⁴. He admits however that, if this was the original nature of the passage, «something must have gone wrong», since some of the sequences cannot be segments of a iambic trimeter, such as l. 4a τίς, τέκνον; φράσων, l. 8 ἴσως ἐδυτύχησεν and l. 13 ἔα ἔα· τί λεύκ<σ>ω. Moreover, at l. 6 there is a hiatus between l. 6a ἀλλ' ἠστόχησε and l. 6b εἶπας ὡς ἔχει.

Cole's suggestion was rejected by Gentili, who analyses the whole section of ll. 4-8 as a lyric dialogue containing metrical sequences (2 *ia*, *ia penth*, *hypod*) documented both in classical tragedy (mainly in *amoibaia*) and in Hellenistic poetry³⁵. Moreover, he adds a relevant argument, by observing that the same mixture of iambic and dochmiac cola can be found in the dialogue between Cassandra and the chorus in Aeschylus's *Ag.* 1072-77, which was very probably echoed in this scene (see above, p. 60).

In a recent discussion of the fragment, Franco Ferrari has challenged Gentili's reconstruction, by pointing out the following arguments in favour of a text originally composed in iambic trimeters.

1. L. 6 can easily be transformed into a iambic trimeter by writing ἠστόχησε<ν> (Coles) and by supplying two syllables after ἔχει at the end of the line.

2. L. 7 (in spite of the corrupted †δεδεμλει†³⁶) could be a iambic trimeter which has lost two syllables at the end.

3. At l. 13 one of the two ἔα may be deleted, with Coles, thus restoring the first part of a iambic trimeter.

4. Gentili's theory does not adequately explain the distinction between lines ἐν εἰσθέσει and lines beginning from the left margin of the column. For example, l. 5a, a

³³ See GENTILI (2006², 79 with n. 13), who gives a list of papyri showing a metrical use of εἰσθεσις; for a detailed treatment of this topic see SAVIGNAGO (2003 and 2008).

³⁴ Kannicht (in KANNICHT – SNELL 2007², 222) added the suggestion that only the first part of the trimeters («usque ad caesuras») was sung, while the rest was spoken.

³⁵ GENTILI (2006², 80-85). In particular, he compares the so-called *Fragmentum Grenfellianum* (or *The Lament of the Abandoned Woman*: on the metre of this poem see ESPOSITO 2006, 27-33). CATENACCI (2002, 102-104) adheres to Gentili's reconstruction.

³⁶ A satisfactory emendation for this corruption has not yet been found. If we assume that the sense must be that Hector in turn is casting his spear, we might think of something like δὲ βάλλει or δὲ πέμπει (COLES 1968, 116); I would add δ' ἰάλλει, a Homeric and tragic verb (cf. Aesch. *Ch.* 45, 497), which at *Il.* VIII 300 and 309 is used for the act of throwing an arrow. Other possibilities suggested by Coles are δὲ μέλλει (closer to the transmitted letters) or δ' ἄθυμῃ. I have also considered δὲ πάλλει ('sways', *scil.* his spear), though in Homer this verb is usually accompanied by an expressed object. After a presentation of this paper to the members of the Association des Études Grecques (Paris, May 2, 2016), M. André Bouvet suggested to me the emendation ἔτ' ἐμπνεῖ; ('is Hector still alive?'), which is paleographically interesting; however, it would be difficult to reconcile a question like this with Cassandra's assertion that Achilles has missed his target (l. 6).

hypod which should be sung by Priam, begins at the left margin; ll. 5b, 6b e 7b, sung by the chorus, begin in the middle of the line; ll. 6a, 7a and 8, which should be sung by Cassandra are not placed ἐν εἰσθέσει, unlike l. 4. If all of these are lyric verses, how can their different collocation be justified?

Ferrari concludes that we should regard the fragment as an example of the practice, widespread in the Hellenistic age, of adapting spoken or recitative passages to the sung performance by a τραγωδός³⁷. He accordingly restores iambic trimeters at ll. 6 and 7 as indicated above, and suggests that in the case of ll. 10, 13 and 16, which are written ἐν εἰσθέσει, the trimeters were completed, after a large blank space, in the right part of the column, where some traces are visible. This is impossible, however, at l. 4, where certainly nothing was written near the right edge of the manuscript. Ferrari suggests that in this case the iambic trimeter was divided between two lines, so that it should be reconstructed by merging l. 4 βέβληκε δεινὸν κάμακα with l. 5a τίς, τέκνον; φράσον, and that l. 5b ὁ Πηλιώτης [should be completed by supplying the missing part of the trimeter in the lacuna at the end of l. 5. The same happens at l. 31, where βαλεῖ πρὸς οὐδας can be completed by 32 ν]ῦν δ[ἐ] δ[υ]τυχήε ἐγώ (supplements by Ferrari and Coles).

The most delicate point of Ferrari's reconstruction is represented by ll. 8-10. At l. 8 he emends the sequence ἴσως ἐδυτύχηεν, incompatible with the beginning of 3 *ia*, by deleting the ν ἐφελκυστικόν and obtains a trimeter by combining these two words with l. 10 κοινὰ μέχρι νῦν. As for the rest of l. 10, the single word νικῶμεν is interpreted as the beginning of a new iambic trimeter, with change of speaker at the trithemimeral caesura, whose continuation was contained in the lacuna at the right of the column. Only a χ is perhaps visible there, interpreted by Ferrari as the siglum χ[ο.(ρός)].

This complex arrangement of the text, though not devoid of merits, has undeniably feeble points. The two small emendations involving a ν ἐφελκυστικόν (l. 6 ἡτόχηε<ν>, l. 8 ἐδυτύχηε{ν}) could be easily accepted, but the deletion of ἔα at l. 13 is less palatable, prompted as it is only by the need to adapt the text to the alleged original form. Moreover, it is far from certain that the traces at the right edge of the papyrus belong to the same column, and, even if they did, that there was enough space for the letters required to transform ll. 10, 13 and 16 into iambic trimeters. At l. 10, in particular, at least nine syllables need to be supplied after χο. to complete the iambic trimeter beginning with νικῶμεν, even more than the seven necessary at l. 7 after ὁ Πηλιώτης. And what could be the reason for the large blank spaces left between the two parts of the iambic trimeter at ll. 10, 13 and 16? No parallel can be found for such a

³⁷ For this form of performance, in which a single actor could sing lyric sections originally performed by a chorus, see above all HALL (2002) and PRAUSCELLO (2006, 85-121). An up-to-date list of papyri that can be associated with this practice is offered by TEDESCHI (2017, 47-50).

disposition in other ancient papyri, nor is it easy to explain why the second part of the iambic trimeter would have been written on the right side of the column at ll. 10, 13 and 16, but not at l. 4.

I come now to the most difficult issue, the interpretation of the *parepigraphē*. Coles (1968, 115) registered the only one other known instance at the time, $\omega\delta\eta$ $\epsilon\nu\delta\omicron\theta\epsilon\nu$ at Eur. *Cycl.* 487, indicating the song which the Cyclops is singing within the cave before coming out. Another uncertain occurrence has recently come to light in *P. Oxy.* LXXIX 5188 (2nd century AD), a fragment of a dramatic dialogue published by P.J. Parsons in 2014 (the composition is set out as prose, but consists of trochaic tetrameters catalectic). At fr 1. col. I, 5. a suprascript δ might combine with ω in the line as an abbreviation of $\omega\delta(\eta)$, perhaps a stage direction for a sung interlude whose words have not been recorded. Yet, as Parsons rightly observes, in this case we might expect to find it set off from the text by spacing or lineation. Maybe the δ is only an addition or correction of the text³⁸.

The context makes clear that a song coming from outside is out of question in the Cassandra fragment. In looking for a different meaning, it is also necessary to take into account the unparalleled repetition of the *parepigraphē*. Coles tentatively suggests that $\omega\delta\eta$ points to a musical accompaniment (either simultaneous with Cassandra's outcries or in the form of short musical interludes)³⁹. $\omega\delta\eta$, however, seems to involve singing, and Gentili prefers to explain it as an instruction for the actor playing Cassandra, who should improvise a sung prelude before uttering the verses: «un'intonazione di canto, accompagnata da esclamazioni (fuori metro) di angoscia o di smarrimento [...] che costituiscono il preludio dell'accesso profetico. Un preludio affidato all'improvvisazione dell'attore, come nel caso del canto corale della commedia di Menandro e in alcuni testi rinvenuti in papiri»⁴⁰. This is possible, but Gentili's reference to the use of $\chi\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon$ in Menander is misleading. $\chi\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon$ $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omicron\varsigma$ or $\chi\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon$, as far as we can see, is regularly used with reference to sung choral sections whose text, no longer considered part of the action of the drama, had not been preserved, and, at least in one case, for the omission of a lyric section which can still be found in other manuscripts.⁴¹

³⁸ See PARSONS (2014, 24). TEDESCHI (2017, 57s.) mentions also *P. Oxy.* LXXIX 5203 (1st-2nd century AD), published for the first time by COCKLE (1975) and included by Kannicht in *TrGF* V.2 as Did B 15a (p. 1103: see now HENRY 2014). In this manuscript the word $\omega\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}$ (repeated seven times) is used as a label for a list of songs of two $\chi\omicron\rho\omicron\alpha\upsilon\lambda\alpha\iota$ (Epagathon and Pamphylus) and of some $\tau\rho\alpha\gamma\omega\delta\omicron\acute{\iota}$ (among them Kanopos). The $\omega\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}$ attributed to Epagathon include monodies from ancient tragedies entitled *Hypsipyle*, *Deidamia*, *Medeia*, *Antiope* etc. Albeit the document is relevant for the history of tragic performances in Roman times, $\omega\delta\alpha\acute{\iota}$ here is not a *parepigraphē* with performative meaning.

³⁹ COLES (1968, 115). He adds however that both the ideas offer difficulties, «the first, as to why her outcries in ll. 6 ff. should apparently not have been so accompanied; the second, that even a short interlude might seem out of place at ll. 12, 15 and 18».

⁴⁰ GENTILI (2006², 80). Gentili's view is shared by HALL (2002, 18) and CATENACCI (2002, 103 with n. 25).

⁴¹ For $\chi\omicron\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon$ or $\chi\omicron\omicron\rho\omicron\upsilon$ $\mu\epsilon\lambda\omicron\omicron\varsigma$ in manuscripts of tragedy see *P. Hib.* II 174, fr. 1, col. I, l. 5 (3rd

In *P. Oxy.* XXVI 2746, on the contrary, ᾠδή occurs at points where an interval of any length would be disrupting, and for seven times in just a few verses. Moreover, at l. 13 the two interjections contained in the text would inopportunately duplicate the alleged improvised ones implied by ᾠδή.

It seems safer to follow Taplin (1977) in interpreting ᾠδή as a simple signal that the following verse or verses were sung⁴². In any case, this use would also be unique, since all the other known *parepigraphai* indicate extra noises, not the manner of execution of what follows⁴³. Following Taplin, Ferrari (2009, 24) suggests that after the rearrangement the lyric sections were identified both by the collocation ἐν εἰσθέσει and by the addition of the *parepigraphē*: in the case of the dialogue 4-9, then, only l. 4 was sung. It is also possible, however, that ᾠδή + inset verse could be the signal of the *beginning* of a sung section, also including the verses written starting from the left margin. The first ᾠδή, in other words, might cover the whole lyric section 4-9, while in the following instances, each time the *parepigraphē* introduces a single lyric verse followed by a iambic trimeter.

Certainty is not attainable in so complex a matter, and I cannot go beyond the expression of a preference for the lyric interpretation of the passage 4-10. With all the difficulties discussed above in view, I shall now turn to the last question: are the *parepigraphai* contemporary with the composition of the play, or are they a later insertion, documenting the work of a Hellenistic τραγωδός? Ferrari, who favours the latter possibility, indicates as a possible parallel the Louvre papyrus containing a fragment of the *Medea* by Carcinus the Younger (*P. Louvre* E 10534)⁴⁴. This manuscript is clearly an excerpt prepared for performance, containing eight iambic

century BCE = TrGF 60 F **1h, 10, probably from Astydamas the Younger's *Hektor*, *P. Lit. Lond.* 80 (= *P. Grenf.* 2.1 + *P. Hib.* 4, 3rd century) fr. a+d+c, 9 (= TrGF adesp. 625, Euripides' *Oineus* or *Meleager*?), *P. Köln* VI 241 (2nd-1st century BCE = TrGF adesp. 640 K., see TrGF V.2 p. 1131, from a tragedy on Achilles), *P. Oxy.* LXXVI 5075 (1st-2nd century AD, fragment of a lyric dialogue, probably from a postclassical tragedy). The words XOPOY MEΛOC must very probably be integrated also in *P. Sorb.* 2252 (c. 250 BCE), where the choral section Eur. *Hipp.* 58-72 is omitted, with a blank space of two lines, partially affected by a lacuna: see BARRETT 1964, 438f. n. 2. For a thorough discussion of this practice see PÖHLMANN (1977).

⁴² TAPLIN (1977, 126f.). In his more recent contribution (TAPLIN 2009, 260), Taplin takes a different position, by suggesting that, like χοροῦ μέλος, ᾠδή could correspond to a segment of text originally written by the dramatist, but substituted in this version by words improvised by the performer. The papyrus, however, preserves lyric utterances, and it would not be clear why only some of them should have been omitted (moreover, the seven consecutive omissions would find no parallel elsewhere).

⁴³ Cf. Aesch. *Eum.* 117, 120 μυγμός, 123, 126 ὠγμός, 129 μυγμός διπλοῦς ὄξύς, Aesch. *Diktyoulkoi* fr. 47a R.², post 802 ποπυςμός, Soph. *Ichn.* fr. 314 R.², 113f. ροῖβδος (which could however simply be a gloss for 113 ροῖβδημα). According to *schol.*^{BC} in Eur. *Or.* 1384 (I 220, 21-23 Schwartz), an ancient grammarian, Apollodorus of Cyrene, interpreted the words ἀρμάτειον ἀρμάτειον μέλος in that passage as a musical instruction indicating the use of the ἀρμάτειον νόμος. But the same scholiast correctly refutes Apollodorus' assertion by noting that εἰ δὲ ἦν παρεπιγραφή, ἅπαξ ἂν ἐπεγράφετο. On the whole topic of dramatic *parepigraphai* see TAPLIN (1977).

⁴⁴ Edited by BÉLIS (2004); see also WEST (2007) and, for an accurate edition, MARTINELLI (2010).

trimeters (ll. 1f., 6-11) written *κατὰ τρίχρον* in the usual manner, and seven lines (3-5, 12-15) in *scriptio continua* with musical notation: this section of the text is also made up of iambic trimeters, but they are adapted by a singer to musical execution. *P. Louvre* E 10534 is certainly a document of the «late practice by professional singers of taking emotional passages of speech or dialogue from old tragedies and setting them to music, with a view to performing them as recital items» (West 2007, 8). However, the affinity with *P. Oxy.* XXVI 2746 is rather limited. This latter has no musical notation, nor do we find the use of *scriptio continua* for the allegedly reworked iambic trimeters, which is documented instead for other musical papyri. Moreover, in *P. Louvre* E 10534 εἰςθετικ is reserved for spoken verses, while the musical text occupies the whole space of the column. And, on a more general level, it would not be clear what help the annotation ᾠδῆ could offer to the τραγῳδός for his performance (unless it was an indication of free improvisation, as suggested by Gentili).

After all, we should not exclude the possibility that *P. Oxy.* XXVI 2746 is a manuscript preserving a fragment of a post-classical tragedy in its original form. In any case, it must be regarded as one of the few documents with an active choral presence in Hellenistic tragedy. We know that choruses were still part of theatrical companies in the third century BCE⁴⁵, and even if already in the previous century their songs had progressively been eliminated from the dramatic action, we have no reason to deny that a chorus could still participate in a lyric or epirrhematic dialogue. The presence of a choral group is particularly relevant in a scene which, as we have seen above (p. 60), is indebted to the celebrated Cassandra scene in Aeschylus' *Agamemnon*. If this assumption is correct, the idea of a later musical re-arrangement of a dialogue originally composed in spoken iambic trimeters would probably entail too complex a history. Initially, a Hellenistic dramatist revisited the Aeschylean passage by transforming the iambo-dochmiacs of the original epirrhematic dialogue into spoken iambic trimeters; then a later τραγῳδός again set the passage to music, dividing the trimeters into metrical sequences which, by a curious coincidence, turn out to be similar to those of Aeschylus. Though not impossible in itself, this reconstruction gives rise to legitimate doubts⁴⁶.

The fragment is also a relevant document of the fortune of Aeschylus⁴⁷, and we might ask ourselves in what form the author had access to the *Agamemnon*. In order to conceive of his musical imitation, in fact, he must have had some notion of the metrical and musical structure of the original. Was he still able to understand Aeschylean meters from manuscripts that very probably no longer preserved the original music? Or did he

⁴⁵ For a recent survey of the evidence about the chorus in Hellenistic drama see TEDESCHI (2017, 56f.).

⁴⁶ FERRARI (2009) gets rid of this problem by denying any connection between the fragment and Aeschylus: see above, p. 59.

⁴⁷ See in particular EASTERLING (2005, 32f.).

happen to see a performance of the old tragedy, or at least of one scene from it? It is wise not to proceed too far into this highly hypothetical field.

III

Finally, I shall add a few considerations about chronology. Coles, Gentili and Kannicht detected in the fragment words and usages which cannot belong to fifth-century tragedy; some of them recur only in much later authors (Fernández Galiano lists at least fourteen words that recur in Lycophron's *Alexandra*)⁴⁸, so that a third-century or even later date seems the most probable for this drama. They also unanimously rejected the attribution of the fragment to the *Hector* by Astydamas the Younger, who was active in the first half of the fourth century BCE⁴⁹. Taplin (2009, 259-63) has nonetheless revived this proposal⁵⁰, and, in order to overcome the chronological difficulties, reminds us that so little is known of language and metre of fourth-century tragedy that we should not rely too confidently on these kinds of arguments. At least some of the linguistic peculiarities of the fragment could be innovations adapted to the unconventionality of the scene.

The two questions must be kept separate. As for the attribution to Astydamas' *Hector*, after Vayos Liapis' persuasive refutation on the grounds of dramatic structure⁵¹, there is no need for further discussion. On the other hand, Taplin's cautious attitude in matters of language and metre deserves at least some reflection. I offer a few observations, not aiming to suggest an early fourth-century date, but only to show that some of the linguistic arguments should not be pressed too far.

(1) ἵκω = ὁμοίω (l. 8) is not documented with certainty in tragedy⁵². However, it belongs to poetic language as early as Sapph. 96.11f. V. φάος δ' ἐπίχρει θάλασσαν ἐπ'

⁴⁸ FERNÁNDEZ GALIANO (1978, 139-41). These correspondences, though relevant, do not justify the attribution to a putative Cassandra tragedy by Lycophron suggested by Fernández Galiano.

⁴⁹ Cf. COLES (1968, 111f.), GENTILI (2006², 87), SNELL (1986², 201), KANNICHT – SNELL (2007², 222). Their opinion is shared by XANTHAKIS-KARAMANOS (1997, 1045), CATENACCI (2002, 98 n. 6), FERRARI (2009, 26 n. 21), KOTLIŃSKA-TOMA (2015, 195-98).

⁵⁰ His proposal is based on the presence of Cassandra, depicted in a mantic attitude, in the upper register of a monumental Apulian volute-crater (Berlin, Antiken Museum, Staatliche Museen zu Berlin, inv. 1984.45, c. 330 BCE), whose lower register shows Hector's departure to battle (for the connection of this vase with Astydamas' *Hector* see TAPLIN 2007, 252-55). Since, as far as we can see from the sources and the surviving fragments, Cassandra seems to have had no role in *Hector*, the space dedicated to her on the vase could be explained only by attributing *TrGF adesp.* 649 to that play (Taplin is aware anyway of the consequences this creates for the reconstruction of the plot).

⁵¹ See LIAPIS (2016, 79-83). A papyrus fragment, very probably belonging to Astydamas' play (*TrGF* 60 F 2a), shows that the hero's death was narrated by a messenger. Liapis convincingly argues that, if the Messenger's *rhēsis* preceded Cassandra's vision, the shocking effect of the scene would have been undercut; if, on the contrary, it followed the much more powerful visionary scene, the effect would have been anticlimactic.

⁵² KANNICHT – SNELL (2007², 222) quote Soph. *Ai.* 1009 and Soph. *Phil.* 758f. In the former passage,

ἀλμύραν / ἴσως καὶ πολυανθέμοις ἀρούραις, Theogn. 224-26 ἴσως γὰρ πάντες ποικίλ' ἐπιστάμεθα and 271f. ἴσως τοι τὰ μὲν ἄλλα θεοὶ θνητοῖς' ἀνθρώποις / γῆρας τ' οὐλόμενον καὶ νεότητ' ἔδοσαν, and perhaps occurred in late fourth century at Men. *Georgos* 79 Arn. δεῖ γὰρ πλουτεῖν ἴσως⁵³.

(2) ἦχος (l. 11) does not recur in classical tragedy (where the normal forms are ἦχη and ἦχώ), while it is common in the Hellenistic age. It is present however at Men. *Syc.* 199.

(3) ἡστόχησε (l. 6) is documented only in *Lyr. Alex. adesp.* 4b.21 Powell and in late prose, but Sophocles, fr. 442.5 R.², has perhaps the form ἀστοχίζη⁵⁴. Moreover, considering the widespread diffusion of ἄστοχος / ἀστόχως in fourth-century authors, ἀστοχέω would not be a particularly surprising innovation.

(4) μέχρι νῦν is labelled as «very much a prose expression» by Coles (1968, 117). See however at least Ar. *Ran.* 1256, where Meineke's τῶν μέχρι νυνί (τῶν ἔτι νῦν ὄντων codd., suspect for both metre and sense) is considered by Dover *ad l.* the best emendation.

(5) For the reasons which could explain the introduction of the unique transitive form ἀνέκλαγε (11) see above, pp. 57f.

(6) The expression φάος Τιτά[νιον for the Sun (*suppl.* Kannicht, cl. Exech. *Exag.* 217 Τιτάν ἥλιος) points to a Hellenistic author⁵⁵. However, we must at least take into account Emped. *VS* 31 B 38 (= D 122 Laks-Most), 1-4 εἰ δ' ἄγε τοι λέξω πρώθ' † ἥλιον ἀρχὴν †, / ἐξ ὧν δῆλ' ἐγένοντο τὰ νῦν ἐκορῶμεν ἅπαντα, / γαῖά τε καὶ πόντος πολυκύμων ἡδ' ὑγρὸς αἴηρ, / Τιτάν ἡδ' αἰθὴρ σφίγγων περὶ κύκλον ἅπαντα, where Τιτάν is possibly the Sun, as suggested by ἥλιον at l. 1 (see the translation of Laks – Most 2016, 475 «The Titan and the Aether, gripping all things in a circle»)⁵⁶.

We are left then with only two words which point more clearly to a later date:

however, ἴσως means 'perhaps', see Finglass *ad l.*; the latter is recorded by ELLENDT – GENTHE (1872, 343f.) as the only Sophoclean example of 'pariter', but many editors emend the text (πλάνοις ἴσοις Bothe, *alia alii*). Anyway, the meaning 'perhaps' could also work in the context (see Jebb *ad l.*).

⁵³ In the context of a reflection on poverty, which is more difficult to conceive when living in the city, the translation "one should be / rich, perhaps, or live without a crowd / of witnesses to notice one's bad luck" (Arnott) seems in fact less satisfying than "one should be equally rich (i.e. as other people living in the city) or live etc."

⁵⁴ This is however only a possibility, since the manuscript is lacunose, and different supplements have been proposed: [οὐδ'] ἀστοχίζη Blass, [κατ]αστοχίζη Pearson, Barrett.

⁵⁵ Cf. also *Orph. hymn.* 8.2 Ricciardelli Τιτάν χρυσαυγής, Ὑπερίων, οὐράνιον φῶς, 78.2f. Ricciardelli Ἡὼς λαμπροφαῖς ... / ἀγγέλτετρα θεοῦ μεγάλου Τιτάνος ἀγαυοῦ, *Orph. Arg.* 512 Ἄλλ' ὅτε γ' Ὁκεανοῖο ρόον βαπτίζετο Τιτάν.

⁵⁶ With the commentary at n. 2 «The Sun ('Titan') and the aether are the two aspects of one and the same reality, the former being only the concentrated reflection of the latter». See also GALLAVOTTI (1975, 47 and 229).

(a) the aorist imperative θάρσῃσιν (l. 1), not attested before Exechiel's *Exagoge* (TrGF 128) v. 100 θάρσῃσιν, ὦ παῖ; fifth-century tragedy always has always the form θάρσει);

(b) the active παρεκέλευε (l. 19), attested in only in late prose (the occurrence in the pseudo-Hippocratic treatise περὶ εὐσχημοσύνης, c. 16 = IX 342 Littré is probably not earlier than the first or second century AD).

As for metre, the fragment presents three occurrences of mute + liquid 'making position' (l. 11 ἀνέκλαγε, l. 17 παρεπλάγχθησιν, l. 24 ἄ[κ]ραν)⁵⁷. Among them, the lengthening before the group -κρ- in l. 24 ἄκρην, widespread in fifth-century tragedy, is not significant⁵⁸. The other two instances present the lengthening of a syllabic augment placed between the prepositional prefix and a verbal root beginning with *muta cum liquida*, sporadically attested in the tragic poets of the fifth century BCE: cf. Aesch. *Pe.* 395 ἐπέφλεγεν, *Suppl.* 624 ἐπέκρανεν, Eur. *Or.* 12 ἐπέκλωσεν and 128 ἀπέθρισεν, *Hel.* 1188 ἀπέθρισας. Moreover, the initial augment of a simple verb is lengthened at Aesch. *Ag.* 536 ἔθρισεν, Eur. *Hclid.* 646 ἐπλήθησιν, *HF* 150 ἐκλήθησιν⁵⁹. Since the absence of *correptio attica* is common in Hellenistic authors such as Lycophron, Moschion and Sositheus, three occurrences in thirty-five lines may perhaps be regarded as an argument in favour of a rather late author. However, at l. 11 μέχρι and l. 29 ἄχλυς there is no lengthening, so that the situation seems to be rather fluid.

⁵⁷ Cf. COLES (1968, 117), Kannicht in KANNICHT – SNELL (2007², 222).

⁵⁸ Twenty-three parallels may be found according to TUCKER (1897, 342): see for example Aesch. *Ch.* 691, Soph. *Tr.* 436, Eur. *Bacch.* 1141.

⁵⁹ See DENNISTON – PAGE (1957, 121) and DIGGLE (1994, 15, 149 with n. 6, 215). Equally rare is the lengthening of the final vowel of a praeposition within a compound word, cf. Eur. *Phoe.* 586 ἀπότροποι with the note of MASTRONARDE (1994, *ad l.*).

bibliography

BARRETT 1964

W.S. Barrett, *Euripides. Hippolytus*, Oxford.

BÉLIS 2004

A. Bélis, *Un papyrus musical inédit du Louvre: identification, transcription et interprétation musicale*, «CRAI» CXLVIII/3 1305-29.

CATENACCI 2002

C. Catenacci, *Un frammento di tragedia ellenistica (P.Oxy. 2746 = TrGF adesp. 649)*, «QUCC» n.s. LXX 95-104.

COCKLE 1975

W.B.H. Cockle, *The Odes of Epagathus the Choral Flautist: Some Documentary Evidence for Dramatic Representation in Roman Egypt*, in *Proceedings of the XIV International Congress of Papyrologists*, Oxford, 24-31 July 1974, London, 59-65.

COLES 1968

R.A. Coles, *A New Fragment of Post-Classical Tragedy from Oxyrhynchus*, «BICS» XV 110-18.

COLES 1970

R.A. Coles, *P. Oxy. 2746*, in R.A. Coles et al., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. XXXVI, London, 7-11.

DENNISTON – PAGE 1957

J.D. Denniston – D.L. Page, *Aeschylus. Agamemnon*, Oxford.

DI BENEDETTO – MEDDA 2002²

V. Di Benedetto – E. Medda, *La tragedia sulla scena. la tragedia greca in quanto spettacolo teatrale* (1997), Torino.

DIGGLE 1994

J. Diggle, *Euripidea*, Oxford.

EASTERLING 1993

P. Easterling, *The End of an Era? Tragedy in the Early Fourth Century*, in A.H. Sommerstein – S. Halliwell – J. Henderson – B. Zimmermann (eds.), *Tragedy, Comedy and the Polis, Papers from the Greek Drama Conference, Nottingham, 18-20 July 1990*, Bari, 559-69.

EASTERLING 2005

P. Easterling, *Agamemnon for the Ancients*, in F. Macintosh – P. Michelakis – E. Hall – O. Taplin (eds.), *Agamemnon in Performance. 485 B.C. to AD 2004*, Oxford, 23-36.

ELLENDT – GENTHE 1872

F. Ellendt, *Lexicon saphocleum*, ed. altera emendata curavit H. Genthe, Berolini.

ESPOSITO 2006

E. Esposito, *Il Fragmentum Grenfellianum (P. Dryton 50)*, Introduzione, testo critico, traduzione e commento, Bologna.

FANTUZZI – HUNTER 2002

M. Fantuzzi – R. Hunter, *Muse e modelli. La poesia ellenistica da Alessandro ad Augusto*, Bari (= *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry*, Cambridge 2004).

FERRARI 2009

F. Ferrari, *L'altra Cassandra: adesp. trag. fr. 649 TrGF*, «SemRom» XII/1 21-35.

FERNÁNDEZ GALIANO 1978

M. Fernández Galiano, *Sobre el fragmento trágico del P.Oxy. 2746*, «MPHL» III 139-41.

GALLAVOTTI 1975

C. Gallavotti, *Empedocle. Poema fisico e lustrale*, Milano.

GAMMACURTA 2006

T. Gammacurta, *Papyrologica scaenica. I copioni teatrali nella tradizione papiracea*, Alessandria.

GENTILI 2006²

B. Gentili, *Lingua e metro in un testo tragico di età ellenistica* (1977), in Id., *Lo spettacolo nel mondo antico. Teatro ellenistico e teatro romano arcaico*, Roma.

HALL 2002

E. Hall, *The Singing Actors of Antiquity*, in P. Easterling – E. Hall (eds.), *Greek and Roman Actors. Aspects of an Ancient Profession*, Cambridge, 3-38.

HENRY 2014

W.B. Henry, *Edition of P. Oxy 2503*, in W.B. Henry – P.J. Parsons et al., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. LXXIX, London, 139-43.

KANNICHT ET AL. 1991

R. Kannicht et al., *Musa Tragica. Die griechische Tragödie von Thespis bis Ezechiel*, Göttingen.

KANNICHT – SNELL 2007²

R. Kannicht – B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*, II, *Fragmenta adespota* (1981), Göttingen.

KOTLIŃSKA-TOMA 2015

A. Kotlińska-Toma, *Hellenistic Tragedy. Texts, Translations and a Critical Survey*, London-New York.

LAKS – MOST 2016

A. Laks – G.W. Most, *Early Greek Philosophy*, Vol. V.2, *Western Greek Thinkers*, Cambridge MA.

LIAPIS 2016

V. Liapis, *On the Hector of Astydamos*, «AJPh» CXXXVII 61-89.

MARTINELLI 2010

M.C. Martinelli, *Una nuova Medea in musica: P.Louvre inv. E 10534 e la Medea di Carcino*, in M.S. Celentano (ed.), *Ricerche di metrica e musica greca per Roberto Pretagostini*, Alessandria, 61-76.

MASTRONARDE 1994

D.J. Mastronarde, *Euripides, Phoenissae*. Cambridge.

MAZZOLDI 2001

S. Mazzoldi, *Cassandra, la vergine e l'indovina. Identità di un personaggio da Omero all'Ellenismo*, Pisa-Roma.

MEDDA 2017

E. Medda, *Eschilo. Agamennone. Edizione critica, traduzione e commento* (Suppl. n. 31 al «Bollettino dei Classici» dell'Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei), Roma.

PARSONS 2014

P.J. Parsons, *Edition of P. Oxy. 5188*, in W.B. Henry – P.J. Parsons et al., *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, vol. LXXIX, London, 20-26.

PÖHLMANN 1977

E. Pöhlmann, *Der Überlieferungswert der χοροῦ-Vermerke in Papyri und Handschriften*, «WJ» III 69-81.

PÖHLMANN 1988

E. Pöhlmann, *Sulla preistoria della tradizione di testi e musica per il teatro*, in B. Gentili – R. Pretagostini (a cura di), *La musica in Grecia*, Roma-Bari, 133-44.

PRAUSCELLO 2006

L. Prauscello, *Singing Alexandria. Music between Practice and Textual Transmission*, Leiden-Boston.

RICHARDSON 1993

N. Richardson, *The Iliad. A Commentary*, vol. VI: books 21-24, Cambridge.

SAVIGNAGO 2003

L. Savignago, *Il sistema dei margini nei papiri di Euripide*, in L. Battezzato (ed.), *Tradizione testuale e ricezione letteraria antica della tragedia greca*, Amsterdam, 77-96.

SAVIGNAGO 2008

L. Savignago, *Eisthesis. Il sistema dei margini nei papiri dei poeti tragici*, Alessandria.

SNELL 1971

B. Snell, *Szenen aus griechischen Dramen*, Berlin.

SNELL 1986²

B. Snell, *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta, I, Didascaliae tragicae, Catalogi tragicorum et tragoediarum, testimonia et fragmenta tragicorum minorum* (1971), editio correctior et addendis aucta curavit R. Kannicht, Göttingen.

STEPHANOPOULOS 1988

T.K. Stephanopoulos, *Tragica I*, «ZPE» LXXIII 207-47.

STEPHANOPOULOS 1990

T.K. Stephanopoulos, *Tragica II*, «ZPE» LXXXII 37.

TAPLIN 1977

O. Taplin, *Did Greek Dramatists Write Stage Instructions?*, «PCPhS» CCIII 121-32.

TAPLIN 2009

O. Taplin, *Hector's Helmet Glinting in a Fourth-century Tragedy*, in S. Goldhill – E. Hall (eds.), *Sophocles and the Greek Tragic Tradition*, Cambridge, 251-63.

TAPLIN 2014

O. Taplin, *How Pots and Papyri Might Prompt a Re-evaluation of Fourth-Century Tragedy*, in E. Csapo – H.R. Goette – J.R. Green – P. Wilson (eds.), *Greek Theatre in the Fourth Century B.C.*, Berlin-Boston, 141-55.

TEDESCHI 2017

G. Tedeschi, *Spettacoli e trattenimenti dal IV secolo a.C. all'età tardo antica secondo i documenti epigrafici e papiracei*, Trieste.

TUCKER 1897

T.G. Tucker, *On a Point of Metre in Greek Tragedy*, «CR» XI 341-44.

UEBEL 1974

F. Uebel, *Literarische texte unter Auschluss der Christlichen*, «APF» XXII-XXIII 324.

VERNANT – VIDAL-NAQUET 1972

J.P. Vernant – P. Vidal-Naquet, *Mythe et tragédie en Grèce ancienne*, Paris (trad. it. *Mito e tragedia nell'antica Grecia*, Torino 1976).

WEST 2007

M.L. West, *A New Musical Papyrus: Carcinus, Medea*, «ZPE» CLXI 1-10.

XANTHAKIS-KARAMANOS 1997

G. Xanthakis-Karamanos, *A Survey of the Main Papyrus Texts of Post-classical Tragedy*, in *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin 1995*, «APF» Beiheft III 1034-48.