

Damian Pierzak*

SCHOLIA BOBIENSIA ON THE *PRO SESTIO* AS A METATEXT OF ROMAN THEATRE AND DRAMA

Before we turn to the heart of the matter, an overview of the nature of the *Scholia Bobiensia* themselves seems appropriate as not many, apart from the scholars concerned with Cicero, are familiar with them. The scholia belong to a group of several commentaries on Cicero's speeches dating from the Early Empire to the early Middle Ages. They were first edited and printed in 1814 by Angelo Mai, who consulted them in the Ambrosian Library in Milan, but the name derives from the Monastery of Bobbio – the place where they were discovered.¹ Because of their learning and instructive value, Mai believed them to be a work of Q. Asconius Pedianus, until the scholium on the *Pro Milone* was found, considerably different from his own. The scholia we possess include notes on twelve orations, many of which are filled with lacunae, and the author, whose life the scholars variously place sometime between the 4th and the 7th century C.E.² on the whole followed the techniques of Asconius: the commentary proper, consisting of a quotation from the text and a discussion focusing mainly on either historical or rhetorical matters, was usually preceded by a short summary of a given *oratio*.³

* Badacz niezależny, Katowice, e-mail: dobryjanusz@interia.pl.

¹ For more details see: S. Timpanaro, *Angelo Mai*, "Atene e Roma" 1956, no. 1, p. 4–7; P. Hildebrandt (ed.), *Scholia in Ciceronis orationes Bobiensia*, B. G. Teubner, Stuttgartiae 1971 (first edition: 1907), p. V–VI; K. Kumaniecki, *Literatura rzymska. Okres cy-ceroński*, PWN, Warszawa 1977, p. 293–294; G. La Bua, *Sulla Pseudo-ciceroniana "Si eum P. Clodius legibus interrogasset" e sull'ordine delle orazioni negli Scholia Bobiensia*, "Rivista di Filologia" 2001, no. 129 (2), p. 161, n. 1.

² Cf. ibidem; D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Notes on the Bobbio Scholia*, "The American Journal of Philology" 1983, no. 104 (4), p. 390, who sets the commentaries in 4th or 5th century. Establishing more precise dating of the scholia is beyond the scope of the present paper.

³ The modern standard edition is that of Stangl: Th. Stangl (ed.), *Ciceronis orationum scholiastae*, Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim–Zürich–New York 2013, first printed in Vienna in 1912 and reprinted for Georg Olms Verlag in 1964 (abbreviated below as "St."). For the sake of exactitude we have decided to use both his pagination and that of Hildebrandt (above, n. 1), who edited the scholia for the Teubner series (abbreviated below as "Hild.").

The question of why a commentary on the speech *On Behalf of Publius Sestius* should serve as a metatext of theatre and drama requires a brief justification. Any detailed description of the course of the whole trial is, of course, hardly necessary.⁴ For our purposes it suffices to mention two accompanying events, one of which to some degree resulting from the other: in the year 57 B.C., with Cicero still being in exile, the *Ludi Apollinares* were held (6–13 July) on which occasion some actors, the famous Aesopus in particular, made numerous references to his fate during the stage performances of tragic plays.⁵ The speaker, acting in line with common political propaganda, did not hesitate to take advantage thereof while giving an account of who “the best citizens” (*optimates*) are.⁶ One of their responsibilities, we are told, is rallying support for senior statesmen who have been serving their country well (such as himself), and a willingness of expressing it publicly. The sentiments of the people are put to the proof precisely when the Romans take part in the popular entertainment, especially the gladiatorial *munera* and the theatrical shows. One has to distinguish, however, between the applause resulting from bribery and that which is genuine and attests to people’s endorsement.⁷ Several sections of the *Pro Sestio*, therefore, are devoted to theatre and, fortunately, the corresponding part of the commentary of the Bobbio scholiast survives, which makes it possible for us to analyze his methods and to determine the scope and the accurateness of his insights into those issues.

⁴ For which see e.g. E. Ciaceri, *Cicerone e i suoi tempi*, vol. 2, Società Anonima Editrice Dante Alighieri, Genova–Roma–Napoli–Città di Castello 1941, p. 77–81; W. K. Lacey, *Cicero*, “*Pro Sestio*” 96–143, “The Classical Quarterly. New Series” 1962, no. 12 (1), p. 67–71 and especially R. A. Kaster (trans., intr. and comm.), *M. Tullius Cicero. Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius*, Clarendon Press, Oxford–New York 2006, p. 1–40.

⁵ See: D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero and Early Latin Poetry*, “Illinois Classical Studies” 1983, no. 8 (2), p. 242; R. C. Beacham, *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1991, p. 156; idem, *Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome*, Yale University Press, New Haven–London 1999, p. 58; A. Lintott, *Cicero as Evidence. A Historian’s Companion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford–New York 2008, p. 182; G. Manuwald, *Roman Republican Theatre*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011, p. 116. Useful bibliography on Aesopus is listed in: C. Garton, *Roman Republican Actors: A Conspectus*, “Studies in Philology” 1966, no. 63 (4), p. 484.

⁶ Cf. M. Gelzer, *Cicero. Ein biographischer Versuch*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1969, p. 158; E. Fantham, *Roman Literary Culture. From Cicero to Apuleius*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London 1996, p. 22.

⁷ See: Cic. *Sest.* 54 (115): “Comitiorum et contionum significationes sunt interdum verae, sunt non numquam vitatae atque corruptae; theatrales gladiatoriique consessus dicuntur omnino solere levitate non nullorum emptos plausus exiles et raros excitare; ac tamen facile est, cum id fit, quem ad modum et a quibus fiat, et quid integra multitudo faciat, videre”.

First, the scholiast's acquaintance with comedy has to be noted. When Cicero relates how the consul P. Lentulus made his entry into the games which he himself had been giving, he describes the reaction of the crowd by using the words "lacrimantes gaudio" that, according to his own view, was an act showing their goodwill and benevolence towards himself. The commentator identifies the speaker's words as a reference to Terence's *Brothers* (p. 99.18 Hild. = 136.8 St. [ad Sest. § 117]: "Celebratissima Terenti comici haec sententia est ex persona patris de filii sui continentia gratulantis, nisi fallor, iisdem verbis: *Lacrimo gaudio*" [= Ter. Ad. 409]), where Demea addresses one of the slaves expressing himself in a similar fashion (*lacrimo gaudio*), which is quite remarkable especially since it usually escapes the scholars' notice.⁸ Perhaps it would not pass for a quotation by modern standards, as Cicero had replaced the verb with the participle, thus slightly changing the tenor. As a variant of the *celebratissima sententia*, however, it must have brought Terence at least to the minds of some hearers. By saying "if I am correct" (*nisi fallor*), on the other hand, the scholiast admits to his own limitations of knowledge regarding literature, which suggests, by implication, that he is quoting from memory and does not have the text of the comedy before him. Let us also call attention to the fact, whatever we make of it, that such a phrase cannot be found anywhere else in the Bobbio scholia nor in Asconius Pedianus' works.

As has been already mentioned, at the center of the section devoted to the *optimates* there are reminiscences of what the scholiast cautiously specifies as Aesopus' performing of Accius' *Eurysaces* (p. 100.16 Hild. = 136.28 St. [ad Sest. § 120]):

S u m m u s a r t i f e x.

Actor illis temporibus nobilissimus tragicarum fabularum Aesopus egisse videtur Accii fabulam, quae inscribitur Eurysaces ita, ut per omnem actionis cursum tempora rei p. significarentur et quodammodo Cicero-nis fortuna deploraretur. Ex quo illud probare contendit, omnes prorsus homines etiam infimae plebis restitutioni suae promptissime suffragatos.

The question, however, is more complex than it appears at first sight, for after the two fragments of that play (Fr. XIII 357–360 R.³: "quí rem publicam certo ánimo adiúverit, | státuerit, steterit cum Achivis – | ré dubia | haút dubitarit vítam

⁸ Recently overlooked e.g. by R. A. Kaster (trans., intr. and comm.), *M. Tullius Cicero. Speeches...*, ad. loc. (p. 349). D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero and Early Latin Poetry...*, p. 243 notices, however, *hinc illae lacrumae* (Ter. An. 126) in Cic. Cael. 25 (61). On the expression as proverb see also: A. Otto, *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim 1962 (first edition: Leipzig 1890), no. 904 (p. 184) who quotes other relevant references.

offerre nec capiti pepérceŕit”) there follow two improvised lines (“summum amicum summo in bello – | summo ingenio praeditum”), and then two commonly ascribed to the *Andromache* of Ennius (Fr. IX 81, 86 R.³: “O páter – [...] | haec ómnia vidi inflámmari”). One of the possible interpretations, the *communis opinio* since Ribbeck, is that all the verses were spoken during the performance of one play, which would perhaps involve some artistic inconsistency on the part of the actor who seized the occasion to display his political views. According to the second, advocated by Jocelyn,⁹ *nota bene* the editor of Ennius, only the last lines, to which we shall proceed shortly, belong to the Accian drama, and all the rest derive from the restaging of Ennian *Andromache*. If that were the case, Aesopus would perform three roles (including those of Odysseus and Andromache herself) in two plays. As Kaster¹⁰ notes, however: “His [*scil.* Jocelyn’s] solution, positing two separate plays in which Aesopus played three separate roles, is more awkward than the supposed difficulty it aims to remove”. Whatever the right answer, which is not our main concern, it would follow, at least, that the scholiast’s caution was justified and still he remains the only source on which we base the attribution of the tragic fragments in question.¹¹

Next lines Cicero incorporates into his speech as spoken during the *Ludi Apollinares* (Fr. XIII 364–365 R.³: “O íngratífici Argívi, immunes Grái immemores b́enefici! | éxsulare sínitis, sistis pélli, pulsum pátimini!”) primarily refer to a homeless, perhaps exiled person, whose identity is difficult to establish. Here we have a sample of the scholiast’s insight into the semantics and the pragmatics of both the Ciceronian and the tragic text (p. 100.24 Hild. = 137.1 St. [ad *Sest.* § 122]):

⁹ See: H. D. Jocelyn (ed.), *The Tragedies of Ennius*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1967, p. 241 as referred to by R. A. Kaster (trans., intr. and comm.), *M. Tullius Cicero. Speech...*, p. 353.

¹⁰ Ibidem. Cf. H. I. Flower, *Fabulae Praetextae in Context: When Were Plays on Contemporary Subjects Performed in Republican Rome?*, “The Classical Quarterly. New Series” 1995, no. 45 (1), p. 172–173, n. 18; R. C. Beacham, *Spectacle Entertainments...*, loc. cit.; M. Erasmio, *Roman Tragedy. Theatre to Theatricality*, University of Texas Press, Austin 2004, p. 95. For a general overview of the difficulties one faces when it comes to the attribution of the Ciceronian quotations in the *Pro Sestio* see now: G. Manuwald, *Editing Roman (Republican) Tragedy: Challenges and Possible Solutions*, [in:] G. W. M. Harrison (ed.), *Brill’s Companion to Roman Tragedy*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2015, p. 3–23 [at 13–14].

¹¹ See: C. Klodt, *Prozessparteien und politische Gegner als dramatis personae. Charakterstilisierung in Ciceros Reden*, [in:] B.-J. Schröder, J.-P. Schröder (Hrsg.), *Studium declamatorium. Untersuchungen zu Schulübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit*, K. G. Saur, München–Leipzig 2003, p. 35–106 [at 63] who also implies that this is how (i.e. one play comprising the improvised lines and an interpolation from Ennius) *Sest.* 120–122 should be understood.

O i m m u n e s G r a i !

Et haec verba sunt de tragoedia, in qua verbum istud i m m u n e s ingratos significat, quemadmodum ... m u n i f i c o s dicebant eos, qui grati et liberales exstissent. Ergo versus omnes tragici ad ipsum Ciceronem *πλαγίως* convertuntur, ut aliud quidem in opere poetico fuerit, aliud vero in ipsius actoris significationibus.

First he elucidates the meaning of *immunes*, and next he shares with his readers an observation which could easily be applied to ancient Roman drama in general and, for that matter, to any drama whatsoever. The words of the protagonist (?) so emphatically uttered by Aesopus allowed the crowds gathered for the games to partake in his sorrows and thereby to express their political convictions. It is only secondarily, therefore, that all the lines refer to the circumstances of Cicero's exile, which becomes clear if one supplies with Stangl the Greek word *πλαγίως* ("in an oblique manner"), filling in adequately what the scholiast may have wished to convey. From his discussion of both this section and the one we have dealt with previously, moreover, it can be inferred that the person speaking throughout, excluding, of course, the actor's improvisations and the Andromache's interpolated part, is Teucer.¹² It would comply with what Cicero conceived of as appropriate in terms of rhetorical and poetical *decorum*. Ajax's half-brother was, despite his obvious merits in the Trojan war, undeservedly expelled from his homeland. Perhaps even his "lower status" as of the son of Hesione could have reminded the audience of the background of his Roman counterpart (*homo novus*), and in this case been also considered to his advantage.

Alongside his *Eurysaces*, there must have been another play of Accius performed, or at least alluded to at the same games, namely the *Brutus*, a tragedy concerned with the origins of the Roman republic.¹³ When a line intended to portray king Servius Tullius (Acc. *praet.* Fr. IV 40 R.³: "Túllius, qui líbertatem cívibus stabilíverat") was spoken by Aesopus, the audience, according to Cicero, replied it a thousand times. The tradition, indeed, attributed some major social reforms to the Roman ruler second to Tarquin the Proud¹⁴ but, although the orator had once ironically referred to the coincidence of their *nomina gentilia*, he never really

¹² Similarly C. Klodt, *op. cit.*, p. 63, n. 95, does not exclude him as he was, apparently, the exiled person in Ennius' *Telamo* (Fr. V 279–280 R.³). R. C. Beacham, *Roman Theatre...*, *loc. cit.*, seems to be convinced that it indeed was Teucer.

¹³ See: H. I. Flower, *op. cit.*, p. 175–176; R. A. Kaster (trans., intr. and comm.), *M. Tullius Cicero. Speech...*, p. 355.

¹⁴ See e.g. Liv. 1.43.12 with R. M. Ogilvie, *A Commentary on Livy. Books 1–5*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1965, *ad loc.* (p. 174–175); A. Ziółkowski, *Historia Rzymu*, Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, Poznań 2008, p. 77–86.

took it seriously.¹⁵ Here, however, it seems that the crowd deemed it as pertaining to him because, as the scholiast stresses, the actor had used his skills to change, as it were, the signified object (p. 101.10 Hild. = 137.14 St. [ad *Sest.* § 123]):

Nominatim sum appellatus in Bruto.

Haec etiam tragoedia praetextata; Brutus inscribitur. In qua nominatus quidem Tullius videtur, sed non idem ipse Cicero, quantum pertineat ad Accium poetam. Quantum ad actorem tamen, sine dubio per aequalitatem nominis utique significatio passionis eius eluxit.

As Erasmo¹⁶ remarks on the words *nominatim sum appellatus in Bruto*: “Clearly Cicero means that Accius’ Tullius refers to himself in some way, but the most likely explanation is that Aesopus and the audience (re)interpreted Tullius to mean Cicero or understood that he is Accius’ Tullius by metonymy”. It is not entirely anachronistic to say about the ancients in general that they perceived something metonymically, but perhaps it would be too much to expect of a common Roman to do so consciously. One way or another, the Bobbio scholiast, for his part, had recognized the allusion and the intention behind the speaker’s words but, unfortunately, his commentary lacks in any circumstantial information about the performance of the play, which would enable us to determine whether its lines were spontaneously inserted into some other tragedy as well or it was restaged separately as a whole.

The last passage which may serve as a metatext of Roman theatre and drama is concerned with Cicero’s account of how the praetor Appius Claudius Pulcher (Clodius’ elder brother) secretly got his way to the rows of the spectators awaiting gladiatorial show (p. 102.4 ff. Hild. = 138.1 f. St. [ad *Sest.* § 126] ~ Pac. *Iliona*, T. 58 Schierl):

Emergebat subito, cum sub tabellas subrepserat, ut ‘Mater te appello’ dicturus videretur.

Intulerat commemorationem conspiratae cuiusdam multitudinis adversum dignitatem suam instigante videlicet Appio Claudio praetore, quem scimus fratrem P. Clodii fuisse. Deinde post haec intulit versum de fabula Pacuviana, quae sub titulo *Ilione* fertur. In ea est quippe argumentum ita dispositum, ut Polydori umbra secundum consuetudinem scaenicorum ab inferiore aulae [codd., Hildebrandt: aulae Halm, Stangl] parte procedat et utatur

¹⁵ See: Cic. *Tusc.* 1.16.38: [...] “Pherecydes Syrius primus dixit animos esse hominum sempiternos, antiquus sane; fuit enim meo regnante gentili” and cf. on the subject M. Gelzer, *op. cit.*, p. 1, n. 8; S. Koster, *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*, Verlag Anton Hain, Meisenheim am Glan 1980, p. 185.

¹⁶ See: M. Erasmo, *op. cit.*, p. 95.

hac invocatione matris suae, quam sordidatus et lugubri habitu, ut solent qui pro mortuis inducuntur, filius implorabat. Verum sub hoc exemplo intellegi vult Appium Claudium, male sibi conscius et populo graviter offensum, obscure solitum venire ad spectacula, ne iratae multitudinis impetus experiretur. Sic ergo veniebat, inquit, ut solent umbrarum figmenta subrepere.

Because the incident involves a complex mythological allusion and the author of the scholium delves into some details of stage technology while explaining it, we shall devote a little more attention to those issues. The speaker's allusion is arguably to Deïpylus the son of Iliona – the eponymous character of Pacuvius' play – and in the text cited above there is a mention of Polydorus instead. Whose apparition, then, ought to be expected? To answer this question we need to look closer at the myth.

The story goes back to Euripides' *Hekabe*, where in the prologue the ghost of Polydorus discloses how the king Polymestor of Thrace treacherously murdered him. He was sent there by his father Priam, so that the royal line be preserved in case of defeat in the upcoming war. The boy dies after Troy is captured, but Hekabe finds a way to retaliate upon the king. She kills his sons with the help of Agamemnon and blinds him. Such a sequel to the Trojan war was most likely an innovation on the part of Euripides, and this is the version which Ennius must have followed.¹⁷ Pacuvius, on the other hand, had made revisions of what seemed a popular subject among the contemporary Romans. In his tragedy we encounter Iliona, a Trojan princess, for the first time who, having married Polymestor, gave him a son Deïpylus at about the same time that queen Hekabe had borne Polydorus.¹⁸ The latter is then sent by Priam to Thrace for much the same reasons as in the Attic drama. Iliona, motivated by some unexplained suspicions, swaps her brother with her son. The city of Troy falls, and Agamemnon now persuades Polymestor to slay Polydorus, so that the line of Priam be extinguished. As a result, the king of course unwittingly kills his own son, taking him wrongly as his little brother-in-law. Thus, the ghost appearing on the stage to call upon his mother should be that of Deïpylus.¹⁹ Not unlike Porphyrio, who commented on one of

¹⁷ See: Gell. 11.4; H. D. Jocelyn (ed.), *op. cit.*, p. 104, 303–304.

¹⁸ Cf. *inc. trag.* 80–82 R.³ = Cic. *De or.* 3.58.219, *Orat.* 49.164; B. P. Wallach, *Deiphilus or Polydorus? The Ghost in Pacuvius' Iliona*, "Mnemosyne", 4th Series, 1979, no. 32 (1/2), p. 150; C. Klodt, *op. cit.*, p. 64.

¹⁹ See: Hyg. *Fab.* 109.1: "Priamo Polydorus filius ex Hecuba cum esset natus, Ilionae filiae suae dederunt eum educandum, quae Polymnestori regi Thracum erat nupta, quem illa pro filio suo educavit, Dei<p>ylum autem quem ex Polymnestore procreaverat, pro suo fratre educavit, ut si alteri eorum quid foret, parentibus praestaret." On the vague meaning of the last sentence see: B. P. Wallach, *op. cit.*, *passim*. On the story in general cf. T. Gantz, *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sour-*

Horace's *Satires* (2.3.60) where the poet mentions an otherwise unknown actor who, having drunk too much wine, actually fell asleep on the stage while playing the part of Iliona, the scholiast had mistaken Polydorus for Deïpylus, "but this is clearly", as Cowan²⁰ notes, "a confusion arising from Pacuvius' [...] swapping of their names". Wallach²¹ argues that it is caused by his unfamiliarity with the "Deiphilus version" of the myth. She does not, however, explain on what grounds then had he correctly credited the line to Pacuvius' *Iliona*. The verb *fertur*, as we would believe, might point to his indirect knowledge of it. The scholar proceeds to conjecture (p. 149) that the name "Polydorus" was just a *lectio facilior*, known from the "Hecuba plays", thus featuring the queen of Troy and her son. Pseudo-Acro in a scholium on the same line of Horace had avoided the mistake when he wrote (p. 142 Keller):

Iliona, Priami filia, Polimestoris est sortita coniugium; cum in belli desperatione positus Priamus Polidorum tutandum Polimestori commisisset et eum vellet Polimestor occidere, Ilione loco fratris filium mutavit. Ita Polimestor deceptus filium trucidavit [...].

Due to its visual power the scene Cicero is evoking enjoyed a considerable recognition in the 1st century B.C.,²² and this was probably the most recognizable episode of that play altogether.²³ Appius Claudius, who was unpopular then because of organizing rallies of hired mob in order to play off the Roman people against Cicero's recall, had to keep low profile while attending the gladiatorial displays – his favorite entertainment at the time. The speaker juxtaposes him with the shadow of Deïpylus, approaching from the lower part of the scene, perhaps depicting the royal palace of Thrace (see below), which must have somehow resembled the praetor's sudden emergence from beneath the temporary benches (*tabulae*). It must be observed that the scholiast, although he mingled the characters from the Trojan plot, had rightly identified the mythological paradigm as such ("Verum sub hoc exemplo intellegi vult Appium Claudium [...] Sic ergo veniebat, inquit, ut solent umbrarum figmenta subreperere"). The

ces, vol. 2, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London 1996, p. 659–661; R. Cowan, *Haven't I Seen You Before Somewhere? Optical Allusions in Republican Tragedy*, [in:] G. W. M. Harrison, V. Liapis (eds.), *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2013, p. 311–342 [at 333–334].

²⁰ See: *ibidem*, p. 335, n. 74.

²¹ See: B. P. Wallach, *op. cit.*, p. 146 (cf. p. 160).

²² See also: Cic. Ac. 2.88 = Pac. *Iliona*, T. 56 Schierl.

²³ See: M. Cytowska et al., *Literatura rzymska. Okres archaiczny*, PWN, Warszawa 1996, p. 171; P. Schierl (ed.), *Die Tragödien des Pacuvius*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin–New York 2006, p. 318–319; R. Cowan, *op. cit.*, p. 335; B. P. Wallach, *op. cit.*, p. 153.

wording he uses and the way in which he explains the phenomenon is all the more significant because this kind of *exemplum* seldom formed the object of study in the field of ancient rhetoric.

The comment on this passage of Cicero involves a textual difficulty worth mentioning. Here, I would prefer with Hildebrandt to retain the reading of the codices (*aulae*) against Halm's conjecture accepted by Stangl (*aulaei*),²⁴ for I cannot understand how exactly, during the performance, the actor playing the role of the ghost would be able to make his appearance "ab inferiore aulaei parte", given that in the republican Roman theatre there was a drop-curtain in use, raised when the stage was to be concealed, and lowered for the performance to begin.²⁵ Moreover, Cicero's reference to an *aulaeum* in his speech *Pro M. Caelio* (27 [65]), being a *terminus ante quem* for the use of the device, regards a mime, and not a performance of tragedy. Anyway, as the scholium suggests, the speaker had exploited the visual similarity of the praetor's movement to that of the famous tragic ghost.²⁶

The last sentence marked by expanded spacing in the text quoted above provides us with some insight into the scholiast's knowledge of the stage directing in the republican times. He describes in general terms the gloomy outfit a person featuring shadow from the underworld is supposed to wear: "sordidatus et lugubri habitu, ut solent qui pro mortuis inducuntur" ("filthy and dressed in mourning garb, as is the habit of actors playing dead people"²⁷). Since Pacuvius' *Iliona* included 'doubles', that is, as Manuwald²⁸ states, "when two young men of equal

²⁴ P. Schierl, *op. cit.*, p. 318, n. 20, retains Halm's *aulaei*.

²⁵ See: W. Beare, *The Roman Stage Curtain*, "Hermathena" 1941, no. 58, p. 104–115 = *idem*, *The Roman Stage*, Methuen & Co. Ltd., London 1964, p. 267–274; R. G. Austin (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro M. Caelio Oratio*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1977, p. 129; R. C. Beacham, *Spectacle Entertainments...*, p. 171–172; G. Manuwald, *Roman Republican Theatre...*, p. 69–70 and the quotations in *OLD*, s.v. 1. Perhaps the ghost emerged from one of the holes, of which the curtain-slot consisted, as if from the underworld (*cf.* W. Beare, *op. cit.*, p. 269).

²⁶ *Cf.* R. A. Kaster (trans., intr. and comm.), *M. Tullius Cicero. Speech...*, p. 359. Completely misunderstood by R. Gardner (ed.), *Cicero. The Speeches "Pro Sestio" and "In Vatinius"*, Harvard University Press, London–Cambridge 1966, p. 206, who wrote: "From the *Scholiasta Bobiensis* it would appear that Appius made his way under the theatre and emerged through a trap-door through which ghosts appeared on the stage". Gardner must have somehow mistaken the gladiatorial games for the theatre, both of which took place in the same area in the republican times. Cicero, however, intended to compare Appius' making his way to the rows of the spectators with the appearance of the ghost on the stage.

²⁷ Trans. by R. Cowan, *op. cit.*, p. 335.

²⁸ See: G. Manuwald, *Roman Republican Theatre...*, p. 78.

age are exchanged for each other or their respective identity is unclear", it may be argued that the characteristic costume served to inform the audience which one of them currently appears on the stage. Such an understanding does not necessarily result from the text of the Bobbio scholiast, but it becomes more plausible when we take into account the abovementioned scholium on Horace. As this image must have been unforgettable for the spectators, one can assume that it added to the ludicrous picture of Appius Claudius aimed at by Cicero once the hearers of the *Pro Sestio* caught the allusion in its entirety.

Although the research material regarding the scholiast as a source of information about Roman theatre was scarce, we have managed, hopefully, to reveal a few noteworthy features of the text itself and of its role as a metatext. Here are a few closing remarks: the *Scholia Bobiensia* might serve as a guidance for the students of various aspects of the late republican culture, and thanks to the fact that the preserved text includes a commentary on the sections of the speech *On behalf of Publius Sestius* concerning public spectacles, one of them is Roman theatre and drama. The Bobbio scholiast is cautious when it comes to literature and, while apparently quoting Terence's *Brothers* from memory, he allows for a possibility of being wrong. In fact, later he does mistake the tragic Polydorus for Deïpylus. Owing to his discussion of Cicero's words "summus artifex", we are able to ascribe lines from a tragedy to Accius' *Eurysaces* and to identify, with a high degree of probability, the character who speaks them as Teucer. For this reason we owe him a deeper understanding of Cicero's handling of theatrical allusion in practical terms, but equally important are, so to say, his theoretical reflections upon the mythological *exemplum* which rarely occur in the preserved body of classical literature in general.²⁹ Moreover, the scholia are instructive not only with regard to the linguistic and the performative, but they offer certain observations on the interactions between the theatre and the political life, which is best illustrated on the example of the *Brutus* play. Finally, because at one point the speaker made a reference to the famous words (Cic. *Tusc.* 1.44 [106] = Pac. *trag.* Fr. IV 197–198 R.³: "Ma té r, t e a p p e l l o, tú, quae curam sómno suspensám levas, | Neque té mei miseret, súrge et sepeli nátum –"), the scholiast had an opportunity to devote his attention to such issues as scenography and the costumes used during the production, probably restaging, of the *Iliona* by Pacuvius. The present examination had also revealed to us an interesting textual controversy, proving that the Ciceronian scholia are not only worth being studied as a secondary material, but also for its own sake.

²⁹ See my remarks in: D. Pierzak, *The Mythological Exemplum in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and in the Practice of Cicero*, "Eos" 2016, no. 103 (2), p. 245–270.

Bibliography

- Austin R. G. (ed.), *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro M. Caelio Oratio*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1977.
- Beacham R. C., *Spectacle Entertainments of Early Imperial Rome*, Yale University Press, New Haven–London 1999.
- Beacham R. C., *The Roman Theatre and Its Audience*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge 1991.
- Beare W., *The Roman Stage Curtain*, “Hermathena” 1941, no. 58, p. 104–115 = idem, *The Roman Stage*, Methuen & Co. Ltd., London 1964, p. 267–274.
- Ciaceri E., *Cicerone e i suoi tempi*, vol. 2, Società Anonima Editrice Dante Alighieri, Genova–Roma–Napoli–Città di Castello 1941.
- Cowan R., *Haven’t I Seen You Before Somewhere? Optical Allusions in Republican Tragedy*, [in:] G. W. M. Harrison, V. Liapis (eds.), *Performance in Greek and Roman Theatre*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2013, p. 311–342.
- Cytowska M. et al., *Literatura rzymska. Okres archaiczny*, PWN, Warszawa 1996.
- Erasmus M., *Roman Tragedy. Theatre to Theatricality*, University of Texas Press, Austin 2004.
- Fantham E., *Roman Literary Culture. From Cicero to Apuleius*, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London 1996.
- Flower H. I., *Fabulae Praetextae in Context: When Were Plays on Contemporary Subjects Performed in Republican Rome?*, “The Classical Quarterly. New Series” 1995, no. 45 (1), p. 170–190.
- Gantz T., *Early Greek Myth. A Guide to Literary and Artistic Sources*, vol. 2, The Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore–London 1996.
- Gardner R. (ed.), *Cicero. The Speeches “Pro Sestio” and “In Vatinius”*, Harvard University Press, London–Cambridge 1966.
- Garton C., *Roman Republican Actors: A Conspectus*, “Studies in Philology” 1966, no. 63 (4), p. 473–498.
- Gelzer M., *Cicero. Ein biographischer Versuch*, Franz Steiner Verlag, Wiesbaden 1969.
- Hildebrandt P., *Scholia in Ciceronis orationes Bobiensia*, B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart 1971.
- Jocelyn H. D. (ed.), *The Tragedies of Ennius*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 1967.
- Kaster R. A. (trans., intr. and comm.), *M. Tullius Cicero. Speech on Behalf of Publius Sestius*, Clarendon Press, Oxford–New York 2006.
- Klodt C., *Prozessparteien und politische Gegner als dramatis personae. Charakterstilisierung in Ciceros Reden*, [in:] B.-J. Schröder, J.-P. Schröder (Hrsg.), *Studium declamatorium. Untersuchungen zu Schülübungen und Prunkreden von der Antike bis zur Neuzeit*, K. G. Saur, München–Leipzig 2003, p. 35–106.
- Koster S., *Die Invektive in der griechischen und römischen Literatur*, Verlag Anton Hain, Meisenheim am Glan 1980.
- Kumaniecki K., *Literatura rzymska. Okres cyceroński*, PWN, Warszawa 1977.
- La Bua G., *Sulla Pseudo-ciceroniana “Si eum P. Clodius legibus interrogasset” e sull’ordine delle orazioni negli Scholia Bobiensia*, “Rivista di Filologia” 2001, no. 129 (2), p. 161–191.
- Lacey W. K., *Cicero, “Pro Sestio” 96–143*, “The Classical Quarterly. New Series” 1962, no. 12 (1), p. 67–71.

- Lintott A., *Cicero as Evidence. A Historian's Companion*, Oxford University Press, Oxford–New York 2008.
- Manuwald G., *Editing Roman (Republican) Tragedy: Challenges and Possible Solutions*, [in:] G. W. M. Harrison (ed.), *Brill's Companion to Roman Tragedy*, Brill, Leiden–Boston 2015, p. 3–23.
- Manuwald G., *Roman Republican Theatre*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge 2011.
- Ogilvie R. M., *A Commentary on Livy. Books 1–5*, Oxford University Press, Oxford 1965.
- Otto A., *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*, Georg Olms Verlag, Hildesheim 1962.
- Pierzak D., *The Mythological Exemplum in Ancient Rhetorical Theory and in the Practice of Cicero*, "Eos" 2016, no. 103 (2), p. 245–270.
- Schierl P. (ed.), *Die Tragödien des Pacuvius*, Walter de Gruyter, Berlin–New York 2006.
- Shackleton Bailey D. R., *Cicero and Early Latin Poetry*, "Illinois Classical Studies" 1983, no. 8 (2), p. 239–249.
- Shackleton Bailey D. R., *Notes on the Bobbio Scholia*, "The American Journal of Philology" 1983, no. 104 (4), p. 390–394.
- Timpanaro S., *Angelo Mai*, "Atene e Roma" 1956, no. 1, p. 3–34.
- Wallach B. P., *Deiphilus or Polydorus? The Ghost in Pacuvius' Iliona*, "Mnemosyne", 4th Series, 1979, no. 32 (1/2), p. 138–160.
- Ziółkowski A., *Historia Rzymu*, Poznańskie Towarzystwo Przyjaciół Nauk, Poznań 2008.

Damian Pierzak

SCHOLIA BOBIENSIA DO MOWY PRO SESTIO JAKO METATEKST RZYMSKIEGO TEATRU I DRAMATU

Streszczenie. W trakcie procesu P. Sestiusza z lutego 56 r. p.n.e. Ciceron miał sposobność odnieść się do *ludi Apollinares* zorganizowanych ubiegłego roku, stąd jego mowa zawiera liczne aluzje do przedstawień teatralnych. Natomiast dzięki temu, że zachował się komentarz tzw. scholiasty z Bobbio do tych partii tekstu (§ 115–126), mamy okazję zbadać wiadomości, jakie na temat rzymskiego teatru posiadał ten bliżej nam nieznan, późnoantyczny autor. Wiele dowiadujemy się od niego o sposobie cytowania przez mówcę tragiczków republikańskich. Cenne są również wskazówki dotyczące ruchu scenicznego aktorów, zwłaszcza w kontekście ducha występującego w sztuce Pakuwiusza pt. *Iliona*.

Słowa kluczowe: scholiasta z Bobbio, Ciceron, teatr rzymski, *Pro Sestio*, tragedia łacińska.

Key words: the Bobbio scholiast, Cicero, Roman theatre, *Pro Sestio*, Latin tragedy.