I

OTTO SKUTSCH

Readings and Interpretations in the Annals

READINGS AND INTERPRETATIONS
IN THE ANNALS

We need not perhaps reflect at length on the reasons why we are having these *Entretiens sur Ennius*. The title of " Father of Roman Poetry " was not given to Ennius for nothing : it states the facts succinctly but correctly. I am not sure who first applied that title to him. Horace's reference to " Father Ennius ", half reverent, half mocking, does not seem to contain any notion of his being the 'begetter' of Latin Poetry ; and yet who, reading Horace today, can banish that idea from his mind, especially as Ennius himself is not far from claiming paternity? Nevertheless, as far as a hasty search enables me to judge, it was a scholar of the late sixteenth century, Bonaventura Vulcanius, who first came rather close to calling Ennius the Father of Roman Poetry. In a Greek epigram in the introduction to Merula's commentary on the *Annals* he calls him ἀρχὸς ἀοιδοπόλων, and in the Latin version the corresponding phrase is *vatum pater Ennius*. But whoever may have been the first, he was thinking of Ennius' linguistic achievement, linked indissolubly with his metrical innovation, the introduction of the hexameter. He was certainly not thinking of another aspect of Ennius' art, which to us seems to loom larger and larger : his attitude to Hellenistic poetry, and the conscious stance he took and passed on to later generations of poets. Ennius' linguistic achievement, then, and " Ennius as a Hellenistic Poet " are the topics which Prof. Untermann and Dr. Wülfing have chosen for their contributions. Prof. Badian will deal with historical problems, the nature of which I am not in a position to reveal ; and Prof. Suerbaum will tell us of the influence which Ennius had on later poetry and in particular of the image of Ennius as it was conceived by later centuries down to the Renaissance. I feel almost

certain that he will incidentally give us the answer to the
question which I raised a minute ago : who was it who first
called Ennius the Father of Roman Poetry?

These four contributions and the discussions following
them will constitute the more general part of the *Entretiens*.
They will be preceded, as it is right and proper in the study
of a particular author, by contributions concerned with the
actual text of his works. I shall speak of the *Annals*,
Prof. Jocelyn of the Tragedies, and Prof. Waszink of the
Satires. And if a study of the text is a necessary condition
for the assessment of any writer, this is particularly so with
a writer who has come down only in fragments. It would
be difficult enough to place the fragments in their putative
context and thus to build up a picture of the whole if the
fragments themselves were clearly understood. But the
interpretation of fragments is often uncertain, and the sources
which transmit them are frequently either not sufficiently
explicit or even actually mistaken. The patient work of
scholars over the centuries, beginning with Columna's text
and commentary published nearly 400 years ago, and culmi-
nating in Vahlen's second edition of 1903, has pieced together
a large part of the story. We know, for instance, that the
first three books of the *Annals* dealt with the regal period,
books IV and V with the early republic, and book VI with
the war against King Pyrrhus ; that book VII, after an
important proem, and (probably) a very brief summary of
the First Punic War, began a story of the events of which
Ennius himself was an eye witness : the Second Punic War,
the description of which came to an end with book IX.
Book X, beginning with another proem, was devoted to the
war against Philip of Macedon, XI and XII to the activities
of Flamininus in Greece, XIII and XIV to the conquest of
Antiochus, and XV largely to the achievements of Ennius'
patron Fulvius. At this point matters become a little un-
certain, and the subject matter of the last triad, XVI to XVIII,

which was apparently added by Ennius some time after the completion of I-XV, remains rather obscure. But it is not questions of the arrangement of the subject matter with which I want to deal, nor the old and notorious problems of the proems, which we shall discuss on another occasion. Nor shall I look into the question of how Ennius solved the problem which faced every writer of an historical epic, and especially any Roman epic poet: how was he to use the Homeric backcloth of the Olympic gods in his story? This is the problem which Virgil brilliantly solved by placing his national epic in the mythical past, which Lucan solved by omitting the divine apparatus, which Statius and Valerius avoided by writing purely Greek mythological epics, and which Silius Italicus egregiously failed to solve, with the most ludicrous results. I have made it my task rather to discuss a number of passages, the reading and interpretation of which can in my opinion be advanced. It would seem that even today, nearly seventy years after Vahlen's second edition, some comparatively simple reflexions may achieve some progress. And I have selected passages which can throw a certain amount of light either on Ennius' style and poetic manner or on the method with which such enquiries are to be conducted, or, preferably, on both.

I should like to begin with a very minor linguistic matter, which has perhaps a certain topicality because it was recently mentioned by one of the finest critics of Ennius, whom we have tried in vain, like his friend Scevola Mariotti, to persuade to take part in our deliberations. I am referring, of course, to Sebastiano Timpanaro. In a recent paper [1] he discussed a phenomenon of colloquial language which essentially disappears after Plautus and reappears in late Latin, but is occasionally found as an archaism in the inter-

---

[1] *Studia Florentina Alexandro Ronconi sexagenario oblata*, Roma 1970, 455 ff., esp. 461.

vening period, especially in the historians. The paper is
entitled *Positivus pro comparativo*, and the line of the *Annals*
which he adduces as an example is 134 *ferro se caedi quam
dictis his toleraret*. He imagines that Ennius took this feature,
the omission of *magis* or *potius*, from contemporary language,
not observing that it did not suit the epic style. The
fragment is, by the source which quotes it as an example
of *tolerare* meaning *patienter ferre*, attributed to Book II, and
all editors connect it with the story of the surviving Horatius
who killed his sister because she wept for her bridegroom,
or, in the fertile imagination of Dionysius and of Ennius'
commentators, because she insulted him. But it would be
most extraordinary, not to say ludicrous, for a man to say
that he would rather let himself be killed than so insulted,
and immediately to proceed to butcher a woman instead.
Moreover, if this were a speech of Horatius, the verb would
either have to be in the first person or, as indirect speech,
in the infinitive. Timpanaro, a long time ago [1], took the
passage to be narrative : " He, Horatius, would more readily
have allowed himself " etc. But, unless I am greatly
mistaken, that is the style of the *Chanson de Roland*, not of any
Greek or Latin epic. Nor is the absurdity of such a state-
ment just before that impatient hero saves his honour by
murdering the woman in any way lessened by attributing
it to the poet rather than to Horatius. Vahlen correctly
saw that the fragment was part of a question, and he sug-
gested : *quis non magis ferro*. ... It is not quite clear to me
why Timpanaro rejected this. We all know that Festus,
who transmits the fragment, regularly quotes whole lines,
ruthlessly cutting off any part of the sentence not contained
in that one metrical unit. There simply is no question at
all but that the sentence ran : *quis non potius cui uiuida uirtus
ferro se caedi quam dictis his toleraret*. I believe that the

---

[1] *SIFC* 22 (1947), 38.

context must have been an occasion (which we cannot identify) when somebody is by taunts goaded into fighting. But I was not really concerned with the context. My main concern was to show that in looking at fragments we must not be too willing to accept irregularities. The language of Ennius does in fact seem to have been far more normal than the collection of its oddities by modern as well as by ancient grammarians would make it appear.

* * *

A very similar case may continue our story. Festus quotes from book VIII, as an example of *occasus* for *occasio*, line 294 *aut occasus ubi tempusue audere repressit*. This line again has exercised scholars more than just a little. All commentaries note that the infinitive *audere* is here, somewhat boldly perhaps, but not impossibly, used as the object of *repressit*, and our syntacticians follow suit. Here is Wackernagel, *Vorles. über Syntax* I, 273 : " den Wagemut zurückdrängte ", and Schmalz-Hofmann 577 describes the construction as ' rather bold '. Personally, when I look at the line, I am not so much impressed by the boldness of the syntax as by the fact that the statement made here is absolutely nonsensical. In what conceivable circumstances can ' time and opportunity ' be said to *stifle* daring ? Don't they usually do the opposite ? Let us recall, then, that again our source is Festus, and that Festus quotes whole lines, chopping off parts of the sentence however much they may be required by the sense. So we can, without much ado, supplement : *monuit res aut occasus ubi tempusue audere, repressit* : " when circumstance and time and opportunity called for daring, he repressed it ". An object of *repressit*, such as *cupidos pugnandi animos*, may have preceded, or the general sense of the *ubi* clause was understood to be the object, which is by no means improbable, especially if the next line ran : *et*

pugnae cupidos hosti dare terga coegit. What makes me so
confident that the phrase cut off by Festus was *monuit res* is
the Virgilian line, *Aen.* IX 320 *Euryale, audendum dextra :
nunc ipsa uocat res.* We have all learned from Eduard Norden
that very often these slightly irregular verse endings in Vergil
go back to Ennius ; and in fact of the 500 odd hexameters
of the *Annals* no less than six end in *res.* And for the use of
res we may compare *Ann.* 166 *iuuat res* [1], or 430 *quo res
sapsa loco sese ostentatque iubetque* " where circumstance itself
beckons and bids ", namely " to do and dare "; or Plautus,
Asinaria 512 *animus hortat, res monet.*

But perhaps Festus was mistaken and *occasus* does not
mean " opportunity " here but something like *interitus?*
This is indeed how Wackernagel translates : " oder wo der
Untergang oder gefahrvolle Umstände den Wagemut
zurückdrängte ". There are three considerations, each of
them strong enough in itself, to rule out this idea :

1. I shall have to say later that the ancient grammarians
   were rather stupid ; our judgement is incomparably better
   than theirs, and we must not hesitate to reject their
   opinion—except where the context which they had before
   their eyes and which is unknown to us gave them the
   advantage. And they clearly had the advantage here :
   Festus or rather his source Verrius Flaccus knew what
   it was all about, and we do not, and so he must be trusted
   when he says that *occasus* here means *occasio.*

2. Not only is *occasus* for *mortis periculum* and *tempus* for
   tempus aduersum rather strained, we also know, and every-
   body who has read Terence's prologues knows, that
   tempus atque occasio is a fixed phrase and bears a positive,
   not a negative sense. And, lastly,

---

[1] I would not rule out that in that much-vexed line *monet occasus, iubet res* has
to be restored for *tenet occasus, iuuat res.*

3. Our fragment comes from Book VIII. Book VII ended with the battle of Lake Trasumene, and Book VIII began with the gathering of Roman strength, *Marsa manus, Paeligna cohors, Vestina uirum uis*, and continued with the *uictrices morae* of Fabius, the first part of them, later to be followed by the reversal of policy and the battle of Cannae. And what happened during the first part of the *uictrices morae*? We know, of course, that the dictator was criticised and attacked; but read the speech of Minucius in Livy XXII 14, 4-14, accusing the dictator of cowardice, and the speech of M. Metilius XXII 25 : *exercitum cupientem pugnare et magistrum equitum clausos prope intra uallum retentos*, and it becomes impossible to deny that this is the ideal context for our *monuit res aut occasus ubi tempusue audere, repressit et pugnae cupidos hosti dare terga coegit.*

It is very pleasant when the slight linguistic correction which one has to make helps to settle the fragment in a definite context. But the essential point which I want to make is that fragments are no happy hunting ground for syntactical peculiarities. It is sometimes said, and with reason, that we must be extremely restrained in correcting fragmentary texts. But with just as much, and perhaps even better reason can it be said that a linguistic irregularity in a fragment can be accepted only with the greatest reserve, and the suspicion that something may have gone wrong, or that the linguistic character of the passage may be affected by the context must be ever present in the mind of those interpreting fragments.

* * *

And the error is not necessarily modern, as it was in the two cases discussed so far. I believe that we have in a number of instances acquiesced too readily in the ancient

grammarians' judgement. As I have already pointed out, we
have to defer to it where the knowledge of the context
assisted their linguistic analysis, but we must set it aside
where it did not, and where our own vastly superior linguistic
judgement tells us that they may have been, or *must* have been
wrong. We have all the context we need for *Annals* 367

> *omnes mortales uictores, cordibus uiuis*
> *laetantes, uino curatos, somnus repente*
> *in campo passim mollissimus perculit acris.*

Here Priscian tells us that *acris* is a masculine nominative
singular, taking the place of the classical *acer*, and nobody
has ever questioned this (except that I did so myself at Bonn
two years ago, and I hope those who were there will forgive
me if I bring the matter up again).   Now I wonder whether,
if the passage had been cited not for *acris* but for some
other reason, we would have taken the view that *acris* was
masculine singular. With regard to the adjectives ending
in *-er* the position of course is that, whereas in the case of
the *-ro* adjectives such as *sacer* and *creber* the unsyncopated
form has survived only in *sacros* on the Forum cippus, the
adjectives formed with *-ri* retained the unsyncopated form
much longer, side by side with the syncopated one, and the
variant was eventually, by a deliberate decision, utilised to
distinguish between the masculine, syncopated, *acer*, and the
feminine, unsyncopated, *acris*. This distinction became an
absolute rule only with disyllables such as *acris*. Tri-
syllables such as *illustris, salubris, terrestris,* and occasionally
equestris, defy it at all times. As far as *alacris* is concerned
it is not quite clear whether it should be classed with the
polysyllables, or with the disyllables, since rhythmically it
is the equivalent of a trochee. At any rate in the *Athamas*
of Ennius we have a masculine nominative singular *alacris*,
where this, the old form, is used without any special reason.
When Terence later says, *Eun.* 304, *quid tu es tristis quidue es*

alacris one seems to hear an intended rhyme with *tristis*, and when Virgil *Aen.* 5, 380 has *ergo alacris*, one may suspect that he avoids **er**go *alac*er. As for *acer*, this, the more modern phonetic variant is used even for the feminine by Naevius, *fames acer augescit* and by Ennius himself in *Annals* 424 *post acer hiems it*. So, although the technical writers Celsus and Columella used *acris* masculine singular once each, we should perhaps ascribe that form to Ennius only if we have definite reason to do so. But what reason have we? How did Priscian or his source know that *acris* was nominative here? The context beyond what we have could certainly not have helped him to decide.

So much *a priori*. Now let us look at the text itself. If *acris* is taken as nominative singular, it would have to be used predicative-adverbially to qualify *perculit*, since as an attribute of sleep *acer* is unintelligible. Not even as a translation of a Greek compound such as γλυκύπικρος would it seem to make sense, and we should also have to ask why one part of the compound should be rendered in the superlative and the other in the positive. So *acris* as a s i n g u l a r n o m i n a t i v e is difficult : why not take it as a c c u s a t i v e p l u r a l ? This seems to me a b s o l u t e l y required by what precedes. These men are shown in the elation of victory. The conjecture *imis* for *uiuis* is best forgotten : it destroys the alliteration *uictores ... cordibus uiuis ... uino curatos*, and destroys the sense : the *uiuida uis animi* is vigorously alive in them, they are *acres* or *alacres*. It is then, in that condition, that they are struck by gentle sleep. That is to say we have to do with an oxymoron of the same type as Homer's κιχάνει τοι βραδὺς ὠκύν, 'the slow captures the swift', lame Hephaestus capturing Ares. A similar example is found in the *Philoctetes* of Accius, Philoctetes shooting birds : *occidit tardus celeres, stans uolantes*.

* * *

How misleading in fact the statements of the grammarians can be is amusingly illustrated by *Annals* 149 *postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliquit*.   R. Frobenius, a man of limited knowledge and intelligence, in his Syntax of Ennius, commenting on this line, followed Vahlen's text without troubling to look at the attestation, and he thus correctly took *sis oculis* to be an ablative (though he classified it wrongly).   There can be no doubt at all that it is an ablative, since in *Annals* 532 Ennius quite similarly says *corde relinquite somnum*.   But great scholars such as Heinze and Norden *did* look into the attestation, and finding there that Festus speaks of *sis* as a dative they went to great lengths explaining *sis oculis* as a dative of disadvantage: " to the detriment of his eyes King Ancus left the light ".   That is the sort of damage which can result from taking these grammarians too seriously. Obviously no context could help Verrius Flaccus to decide whether it was a dative or an ablative, and therefore his opinion is worth nothing.   Nor did he really care which it was : he was concerned merely with the attestation of the old pronoun, and was not interested in the syntax at all.

I should like to digress here a little from my present line of argument because two problems arise in connection with this fragment.   One, that of placing ; and to that I think I know the answer.   The second is an historical one, and to this I should very much like to elicit an answer from Professor Badian.   First of all, the place of the fragment.   It is attested by Festus as belonging to Book III, and there of course editors print it, but in different positions.   In Vahlen, for instance, and in Valmaggi it is the third fragment of that book, in Warmington the fourth.   And yet there can be no question but that the much maligned Baehrens was correct in giving it the first place, right at the beginning of the book.   That is its natural position.   The reign of Ancus was described in Book II.   On the other hand, the omens which forecast the future rule of Tarquin were reported by

Ennius in Book III, line 146 and 147-8 in Vahlen.   This means that at the beginning of Book III Ennius must have gone back a little in time and have related how under the rule of King Ancus Tarquin immigrated.   And how would, how could this narrative have started?   " When Ancus was dead" (our line 149) 'the Roman people gave the kingdom to Tarquin' (line 150).   And then Ennius began to explain who this Tarquin was, and told of the immigration, the story of Tanaquil, and the eagle portent.   This, incidentally, is the order in which Dionysius tells the story, whereas Livy slips it in just before the final note on Ancus.

This accounts for a fact which has not perhaps hitherto been given its due weight.   Our line is of course repeated with a slight variation by Lucretius in Book III *lumina sis oculis etiam bonus Ancus reliquit*, where it illustrates the fact that we all must die.   But why did Lucretius use the line— unless it was well known, prominent, and almost proverbial? Surely it had all these qualities because it was the first line of a book.   And if in Horace King Ancus twice illustrates the fact that all must die, once in company with Numa : *Epist.* I 6, 27 *Numa quo deuenit et Ancus*, and once in the *Odes*, IV 7, 14, in company with Aeneas et Tullus, *nos ubi decidimus, quo pius Aeneas, quo diues Tullus et Ancus*, the reason is not that Ancus had some mysterious connection with the underworld but that his death had been made prominent first by Ennius and then by Lucretius.   Let me confirm this by a last observation.   Virgil has one book which begins with *postquam*.   Which is it?   Book III, as in Ennius. Accident, you will say.   Perhaps.   But let me tell you another fact.   Silius Italicus has seventeen books on the Punic War.   One of them begins with *postquam*.   Which is it?   Book III.   Just as Silius followed Virgil in this peculiar little detail, so Virgil followed Ennius.

Let me now turn to my other problem, the historical one, although I admit that it has little bearing on Ennius himself.

The question has sometimes been asked why Ancus is called *bonus*, and his concern for the *plebs*, whose common law he is said to have established, has been held to be responsible e.g. by Niebuhr. This may well be so, but in that case it would not be Ennius whose opinion is expressed in that attribute. Ennius may have been an Aufklärer, but we have absolutely no reason to believe that he was a partisan of the *plebs*. His personal friendship with great aristocrats of Rome seems to suggest the opposite. If *bonus* has anything to do with Ancus' pro-plebeian attitudes, Ennius would rather seem to have taken from popular transmission the idea that Ancus was good, without concerning himself with the reasons for that judgement. But of course *bonus* need really mean no more than that Ancus was a just, pious and peaceful ruler, like Numa, whose grandson he is reported to be, and like Servius Tullius, and unlike in some respects at any rate to Romulus, Tullus and the Tarquins.

Bonus need not therefore indicate that Ancus was the patron of the *plebs*, and was certainly not meant by Ennius to do so. We do, however possess certain information proving that Ancus was criticised for currying favour with the people. I am referring, of course, to Virgil's (*Aen.* VI 815) *iactantior Ancus, nunc quoque iam nimium gaudens popularibus auris*. Norden's commentary can make nothing of this, beyond suggesting a confusion with Servius Tullius, although Niebuhr long ago had mentioned the line in connection with his explanation of *bonus*. Here we quite clearly have the aristocratic view of Ancus' attitude to the *plebs*. And how did this tradition of his being the patron of the *plebs* arise? Apart from the transmission that he settled the regions of the Circus valley and the Aventine, definitely plebeian quarters, we may recall the fact that the *gens Marcia* was plebeian and that it was always prominently associated with the *populares*.

But there is another, and perhaps a more interesting explanation. We know that many events in Roman history,

if they were not flattering to Roman pride, tended to be eliminated in the transmission, or to be explained away, and in such cases we get only here and there a glimpse of what really happened.   The surrender of the city to Porsenna, the fall of the Capitol, the failure of the *deuotio* of Decius Mus at Ausculum are examples of this.   Now in the last chapter devoted to Tullus' reign Dionysius of Halicarnassus, III 34, 3, tells us that in the war against Rome the thirty Latin cities appointed two supreme commanders, Spusius Vecilius from Lavinium, and Ancus Poplicius from Cora.   These two men are not mentioned anywhere else.   It has therefore been suggested that they were invented by Dionysius.   Dionysius does invent things, such as the abuse heaped on Horatius by his sister.   But this is to adorn a tale.   Why should he invent two Latin commanders of whom nobody had ever heard?   In the next chapter Tullus is dead and is succeeded by Marcius.   We are of course on treacherous ground in the whole story of both Tullus and Ancus.   Few of us will believe that Tullus was killed by lightning in his home because he had offended Iuppiter Elicius.   I would certainly consider it possible that he was despatched by the Latins and was succeeded by their commander Ancus, whose *gentile*, as given by Dionysius, seems to have given rise to the story that he was a man of the people, seeking *populares auras*. We think of the *Publicii* Malleoli, through whom, according to Ovid, *Fast.* V 289 *rem populus recipit* (they were *aediles plebei* according to Varro, *LL* V 158 and Ovid, but curule aediles according to Fest. 238[B]), and we think of course of Valerius *Poplicola*, whose surname " little poplar " was misunderstood and coloured the picture of his activities.   And why should Ancus Poplicius have become Ancus Marcius? One has of course questioned the historicity of King Ancus Marcius because the Marcii are plebeians and do not appear in the *Fasti* before 357.   However, the first plebeian *rex sacrorum* was a Marcius, whence that branch of the Marcii

proudly called themselves Marcii Reges, and claimed to be descended from a King. But that Marcius *Rex* (*sacrorum*) died in 210 B.C. and it seems hardly credible that Ancus after that date acquired the surname Marcius, unless indeed that surname is an invention of Ennius himself. There are other possibilities : a Publicius and a Marcius are mentioned together as early *uates* by Cicero *De diu.* I 115. There could be confusion here. But it is idle to speculate. The salient facts are these : an Ancus Publicius, otherwise entirely unknown, is mentioned as a leader of the Latins in the wars conducted against them by Tullus immediately before his end. Tullus is succeeded by an Ancus surnamed Marcius, who, though otherwise as pious as his grandfather Numa, was yet in part of the transmission suspected (Dion. III 35, 3) of having killed Tullus. And the *gentile* of Ancus in his earlier role, Publicius, may well have given rise to the story of *iactantior Ancus, ... nimium gaudens popularibus auris.* We must not underestimate the force of etymology in the creation of legend : the same Ancus is said to have fetched laws from the *Aequicoli*, obviously because they *aequom colunt.*

Let me add one more point, and I believe a decisive one. The name Ancus is very rare indeed. King Ancus and Ancus Poplicius are the only known bearers of it [1]. Can we really believe that two separate Anci lived at precisely the same time, one a leading enemy of King Tullus, the other his successor suspected of having murdered him? No, I am convinced that these, the only two Anci known to history, were in fact identical. However, let us now return to Ennius.

* * *

[1] A diminutive *Anculus* must have existed but survives only in the gentile *Ancilius*, found once at Corfinium, once at Tarquinii and once at Praeneste. This distribution alone would be sufficient to discredit Varro's statement (*De praen.*, 4, accepted by Ogilvie on Livy I 32) that the name is Sabine. It is quite likely to be Etruscan ; see W. SCHULZE, *ZGLE* 165,7 ; WALDE-HOFMANN, *s.v.*

Sometimes the grammarians working on the text of
Ennius deserve some credit for having spotted a problem
although they failed to spot the solution.   Aulus Gellius,
XVIII 5, tells us that he heard an Ennianista read the line
which is 232 in Vahlen's edition as *denique ui magna quadrupes
equus atque elephanti proiciunt sese*, and that a certain Julianus
said this was quite wrong and that the reader should have
said *eques* instead of *equus*.   Julianus claimed he had consulted
an age-old MS of Ennius which Lampadio himself was said
to have emended, and found there *eques* and not *equos*.
From the concluding words of Gellius it follows that this
was an old conundrum of Roman grammarians.   And it has
remained a conundrum with modern grammarians as well.
If the text is correct, it would seem that *eques* is here used
in the sense of " horse ".   Now we are all nowadays, I
think, agreed that when Virgil, *Georg.* III 116, says that the
Lapithae *equitem docuere sub armis insultare solo et gressus
glomerare superbos* he simply makes the horseman do what in
fact is done by the horse.   But nevertheless there are those who
believe that Ennius used *eques* for " horse ".   It seems the
straightforward sense of our passage, and there is no denying
the fact that in late Latin, in the Vulgate, *uidit currum duorum
equitum*, and in Gregory of Tours, *ascenso equite*, *eques* stands
for *equus*.   But that is a very different matter, for in late
Latin *equus* caused phonetic difficulties and tended to be
replaced by longer words, such as *caballus*, French *cheval*,
and *paraueredus*, German *Pferd*, and apparently also by
equitem.   Note also that in that period there was little
phonetic difference between *eques* and *equus*.   Now there
were obviously no phonetic difficulties in early Latin or in
classical Latin ; so why should Ennius feel the need to
replace *equus*?   Bonnet remarks, rightly, that *quadrupes* as
an attribute of horse would seem to be a little redundant,
and that *eques* should therefore here be the horseman.   But
we must go a little farther than that.   Both as an attribute of

equus and as an attribute of *eques* "four-footed" is just utterly senseless, and from no poetry known to me in any language can such nonsense be parallelled. Professor Warmington here adopts an interesting idea, which I am unable to trace to its source but which is given in some of our dictionaries. It is that *quadrupes* means "at the gallop". Now, *quadrupedi cursu*, which we find in Apuleius, is perfectly alright, but that is a somewhat different matter. As an attribute of horse *quadrupes* would have to be understood as a back-formation, a hypostasis, of the verb *quadrupedari*, a substitute for its participle *quadrupedans*, which is used as "galloping" both by Virgil and Ennius. But the back-formation would be rather bold and one might also ask why the attribute should attach to *eques* only and not to *elephanti*. I have thought of a different solution: military formations are often referred to in the singular: so *eques* apparently here, and elsewhere, so *miles*, *pedes*, *ueles*, etc. Why then should *quadrupes* be either an attribute or the equivalent of a participle? Why should it not be a noun and mean "the four-footed formations", i.e. τὰ τετράποδα, the cavalry and the elephants? A comma after *quadrupes* puts the whole thing right. *quadrupes* is not attested for the quadrupeds in a military sense, but why should it? It's perfectly possible, and the Romans who did not use elephants had little occasion to employ it. This explanation seems to me far more probable than *quadrupes* in the sense of a participle, especially as the verb is qualified already by *ui magna*. But whichever solution is right, it appears that, when looked at critically, the language of Ennius is far less quaint than it appears at first sight.

* * *

And it is not only word-usage and syntax that loses much of its strangeness on closer inspection. The style, too, is more normal than the state of the text may suggest.

One of the longest fragments of the *Annals* is the one con-
cerned with the familiar friend, lines 234-251 in Vahlen.   I
have discussed this fragment before now, but want to add
a note on it here which nicely, I think, illustrates my point.
We have here a detailed description of the friend's character :
*ingenium cui nulla malum sententia suadet ut faceret facinus leuis
aut mala* : a man who would not be driven by any lighthearted
or wicked thought into doing evil : *doctus, fidelis, suauis homo,
facundus, suo contentus, beatus, scitus, secunda loquens in tempore,
commodus, uerbum paucum, multa tenens antiqua, sepulta uetustas
quae facit* ; knowing many ancient things, which the lapse
of time has buried (so, of course.   Not : keeping many old-
time ways of which a by-gone age long buried is the maker,
as the Loeb translator has it).   Now this whole piece is in
pretty bad shape.   I have removed certain difficulties by
emendation, and I have simply adopted these corrections
here.   Others remain, and I do not know how to cope with
them : especially the odd transition from *tenens* in one line
to *tenentem* in the next one.   But there is one which hitherto
does not seem to have been noticed, and which I consider
not unimportant in its implications.   In the piece which I
quoted without translating it we had the line 245 *suauis
homo facundus suo contentus beatus*.   Now is not this really
rather peculiar ?   The whole line is concerned with the
sweet nature of the man : agreeable, not in any way jealous,
and of a happy disposition.   That he is *eloquent* is a statement
which does not fit in too well at this point, and though it
might be held to be consistent with *secunda loquens in tempore*,
it certainly does not consist too well with *uerbum paucum*,
because *facundus* always implies a free flow of speech.   With
these considerations in mind, we realize at once that the
word required here is not *facundus*.   Quite certainly we must
read *iucundus*.   Nor is it difficult to see why *iucundus* became
facundus : *facinus* stood right above it, and the scribe's eye
just slipped.   Perhaps we can find a little confirmation else-

where. A. Gellius tells us that Aelius Stilo saw in this piece a self-description of Ennius. The piece was famous and left a good many traces in Latin literature. In Virgil, when the dying Camilla calls a friend to give her a last message, we have verbal echoes, and from there they go to Statius. More importantly, Horace, when he discusses his relationship to Maecenas, can never forget about this passage. And no wonder : Orbilius had seen to it that he knew it by heart, and that he knew what Aelius Stilo had said about it. Now, our piece begins : *quocum bene saepe libenter*. Hor. *Sat.* I 3, 63 says : *qualem me saepe libenter obtulerim tibi Maecenas*. What is remarkable here is not so much the collocation of the two words at the end of the line ; anybody who still composes verse knows that *libenter* more or less has to go to the end of the line, and that *saepe* is liable to settle down next to it. What is remarkable is the application of the phrase to this amicable association, seen in one instance, Ennius, from the point of view of the patron, and in the other, Horace, from the point of view of the client. And connected with this is the fact that *libenter* in both instances has not its normal meaning of " gladly " but the very rare one of " as I (or he) pleased, at will ". So Horace seems to have had the passage of Ennius in mind. A little later in the same satire he says, 93 : *minus hoc iucundus amicus sit mihi*, and in I 5, 44 *nil ego contulerim iucundo sanus amico*. There are a good many passages in Latin literature to show that *iucundus* is just what one does say of a friend. Horace perhaps shows a little more : namely that Ennius did so.

In restoring *iucundus* for *facundus* we have, I think, disposed of a criticism which could have been levelled against Ennius' style : namely that he put his attributes together without any thought other than that of metrical convenience. It is true that there is still no pedantic arrangement : neither is there, for that matter, in the Hellenistic piece about the king's confidant with which I once compared this frag-

ment[1]. But there is certainly no flagrant muddle. In 246 it might be argued that *commodus* was out of place between *scitus, secunda loquens in tempore* and *uerbum paucorum*, but actually this arrangement seems rather logical: it is his good sense (*scitus*) which makes him say the right things at the right time, and his adaptability and tact (*commodus*) which makes him say little although he could say much because he knows much.

Further on in the fragment there are serious difficulties: the worst of them that *tenens* in 247 is continued in 248 by *et ... tenentem*. This almost looks as if the poet had chosen the participle of the same verb, *tenere*, and the connection with *et* for the express purpose of drawing attention to the absence of any construction. This I cannot believe, and I am quite certain that there is textual corruption here. However that may be, by restoring *iucundus* we have removed a grave stylistic offence.

* * *

Altogether, I believe, Ennius is much nearer to Greek predecessors and to later Latin poets than might appear from the fragmentary state of the text and the bad transmission of this piece. I would not deny that Ennius often arranges words in ways which are avoided in later poetry: the direct collocation of adjective and noun, and the frequency with which an attribute follows, rather than precedes, its noun. I would not deny that compared to later poetry he can have an archaic stateliness which later poets have given up: as when in the famous scene of the cutting of trees for the cremation of the fallen at Heraclea, 187 ff., three short cola with active verbs, *incedunt, caedunt, percellunt*, are followed by three short cola with passive verbs, *exciditur, frangitur, consternitur*, the whole then, after a single return to an active

[1] *Studia Enniana*, 92 ff.

verb, being rounded off by a major colon of long-and-far sounding vowels : *fremitu silvai frondosai*.   If one compares Virgil and others in the corresponding scenes, one sees that they aim at variety rather than that archaic stateliness.   In this matter we simply have to recognise a different artistic attitude.   In the matter of the order of words, it would probably be more correct to say that Ennius marks a stage intermediate between Greek and Latin manner.   But what I would deny is that there is lack of artistry, as in the insensate position of *facundus*, or a lack of feeling for what is germane to poetry. Let me give an example of the latter, where editors, guided by their reading of poetry generally, have unhesitatingly corrected a text, until modern ingenuity and modern hyper-conservatism began to defend it.

In a fragment possibly describing the region of the Plutonium through which Discordia, having done her work, plunges back into hell, we read, *Ann.* 262 :

> *longique cupressi*
> *stant sectis foliis et amaro corpore buxum.*

Every editor here, following Fulvio Orsini, corrected *sectis* to *rectis*, especially as Ennius elsewhere (490) says *rectosque cupressos*.   But then along comes an excellent naturalist, Professor E. H. Warmington, and says : " Why, *sectis* is right.   Just look at a cypress and you'll find that cypress leaves appear to be divided up into small parts, being scale-like and imbricated ".   And some would even add that the alliteration supports *sectis:* s*tant* s*ectis*.   Let us take the alliteration first : it proves nothing at all.   The function of alliteration in poetry is to heighten the emotional appeal. What emotional appeal is heightened by *stant sectis* " they stand with incisions in their leaves ? "   And in any case, if the poet had wanted alliteration here he would have said *celsique cupressi*, not *longique cupressi*.   And now to *sectis* itself : Ennius would be quite an extraordinary poet if he were

speaking here of those minute incisions in the leaves, so tiny that they are best looked at through a magnifying glass. Surely that is not poetry : that is botany. And what does a poet see in a cypress? We know, from Ovid, *Met.* X 138, where the transformation of Cyparissus into the tree is described. There the poet says of Cyparissus' hair :

et modo quae niuea pendebant fronte capilli

(and the hair that was but now hanging down over his fair brow)

horrida caesaries fieri sumptoque rigore
sidereum gracili spectare cacumine caelum

(grew stiff and rigid and pointed up to heaven).

sumptoque rigore : that is what Ennius means by *rectis foliis*. Let us not cut the father of Latin poetry off from the comity of poets for the sake of preserving an S. He knew as well as Ovid did what was germane to poetry and what was not.

* * *

I should like to attach here an observation which, whether or not my critical decision is correct, shows that Ennius anticipated a stylistic attitude of later poetry : an attitude all the more remarkable in him because it applies to the *Annals* in contradistinction to his scenic poetry.

Donatus, in the *Ars grammatica* IV 394, 6 K. and Pompeius, in his commentary on it, V 291, 25 K., cite as an example of solecism, without naming the author, the line

spoliantur eos et corpora nuda relinquunt.

As Ennius is a likely candidate for the authorship of hexametrical fragments in grammatical tradition, taking into account further that Donatus five lines earlier cites a line, again without naming the author, which we know to belong

to Ennius, Columna assigned our fragment to the *Annals*,
and editors generally have accepted this. It is line 619 in
Vahlen. Quite recently Hubert Cancik, *RhM* 112 (1969),
94, pointed out that we can restore the syllable missing at
the beginning from another branch of grammatical trans-
mission : Priscian, II 390, 26 K., apparently following Flavius
Caper, testifies that *auctores antiquissimi* used forms such as
careor for *careo* and *despoliantur* for *despoliant*. It stands to
reason that if Flavius uses the third person plural *despoliantur*,
he does so because that was the form used in the text to
which he refers, and all the chances therefore are that the
text was the line which Donatus adduces for *spoliantur*. Now,
neither *spolio* nor *despolio* is attested elsewhere to have a
deponent variant, and though there are numerous active
forms for deponents in Ennius, he has no other deponent
form instead of an active form. Both these facts carry com-
paratively little weight but there is also a very serious
objection to the line as it stands. It is well known that most
of the forms of the anaphoric pronoun, apart from *is* and *id*,
are very rare in poetry. *eos* appears once in the *Georgics*,
once in the *Aeneid*, and once in Ovid's ca. 36,000 lines ;
eas appears never in Virgil, and once in Ovid (*Met.* XIV 558,
bracketed by Merkel). As to Ennius himself, he uses *is*
four times in the *Annals*, and a few times in his other works ;
forms such as *ei* (dative), *eum, eam, ea, eos, eis* he has fifteen
times, but in the plays, of course, not in the *Annals*. You
may say that this evidence is not strong enough to show
conclusively that Ennius in the *Annals*, in contradistinction
to the plays, avoided the oblique forms of *is*. My reply
would be that the evidence is indeed conclusive if combined
with the fact that, instead of *eum, eam, eos, eas* Ennius uses
the highly archaic forms *sum, sam, sos* and *sas*. It seems quite
clear to me that his reason for employing this archaism is
his refusal to admit the trite unpoetic forms of the anaphoric
pronoun.

What then are we to make of *despoliantur eos*?   We could refuse to accept the line as Ennian, although, attested as it now is by both Donatus and Caper, the chances of genuineness are even better than before.   Or we can make the bold assumption that the text was corrupt before it was excerpted by our grammarian, say at the end of the republican period. What I would expect Ennius to have written is not *despoliantur eos*, but *despoliant umeros et corpora nuda relinquunt*. The Homeric parallels spring to mind : τεύχε' ἀπ' ὤμων αἴνυσθαι, ἀφαιρεῖσθαι, συλᾶν. It is not easy to see why *umeros* should have become *ureos*, but the possibility certainly exists. Whatever the correct solution here, it is abundantly clear that the peculiar poetic prejudice against the oblique forms of *is* did not arise in the first century B.C.: it was not only foreshadowed but fully developed in the father of Roman poetry.

<p style="text-align:center">* * *</p>

In all or almost all the passages we have discussed it was a linguistic feature from which we started, and I do indeed believe that such progress as is still possible will be mainly on these lines.   It is true that even in the last few decades occasionally a passage has received a more satisfactory explanation from the comparison of historical narrative concerned with the incidents which the poet must have described ; and especially it has been seen that speeches in Livy were strongly influenced by the speeches of historical characters in the *Annals*, speeches which Livy must have learned by heart at school and was never able to forget. Unless, however, I am very much mistaken, the relevant sources have now been so carefully studied that not much progress is to be expected here.   But I do not wish to be discouraging, and in order to avoid giving this impression I should like to conclude with one example of how close comparison with Livy can still help to settle both the

reading and the precise reference of a fragment. Again
I must apologize to those who heard me at Bonn. But I do
see some of the detail differently now from the way I saw it
then, and so I will venture to repeat the matter.

Festus p. 258[b] cites, without giving the number of the
book, a fragment of the *Annals* illustrating the use of *Roma
quadrata* :

> *et quis est erat Romae regnare quadratae*

In Vahlen's edition it is line 157. *Quis est erat* is obviously
wrong, and Vahlen accepts Hertz's *qui sextus erat* instead.
The sixth King of Rome being Servius Tullius, the fragment
therefore appears in the third book. More than twenty
years ago, however, Timpanaro showed that *qui sextus erat*
must be wrong [1]. An infinitive following on *primus* is first
found in Silius Italicus, infinitives following other numerals
are found nowhere, and since the use, common in the
Augustan period, of an infinitive with an ordinary adjective
is not found in early Latin at all, *sextus erat* with an infinitive
is wholly impossible there. Much better is the version of
Salmasius : *et qui se sperat*. It alters only one letter, *p* for *t*,
and the construction of *spero* with a present infinitive is quite
common in early Latin [2].

Those who follow Salmasius generally put the fragment
in the second book and refer it to the deliberations which
led to the installation of King Numa. So Lucian Mueller
and Valmaggi, and Warmington even maintains that this is
the only place possible for it since at a later period Rome
was no longer *quadrata*. I do not believe this argument is
valid ; for, in the first place, Ennius may not have been as
accurate in his antiquarian studies as Professor Warmington ;

---

[1] *Maia* 3 (1950), 26 ff.

[2] HOFMANN-SZANTYR 357, 4. It is therefore unnecessary to assume that the
sentence continued with *posse*.

and secondly, *Roma quadrata* probably does not mean the
" square Rome " about the Palatine, but " Rome divided
into four parts ", i.e. the four region city of Servius Tullius :
urbe quadrifariam diuisa regionibus, as Livy I 43, 13 has it.
If one refers the fragment to the succession of Romulus,
it does not matter greatly whether in the beginning you
read *et qui* " and who hopes ? " or *ecqui* (which in the ductus
is identical) " does anyone hope ? " But of course *ecqui*
could also be an adverb " does he somehow hope ? " This
is how Louis Havet took it, and since in that case the subject
must be a definite person, much is to be said for Timpanaro's
proposal [1] that the subject is one of the three men who
during the early republic incurred the suspicion of trying
to become king : Spurius Cassius in 485, Spurius Maelius
in 439, and M. Manlius Capitolinus in 384. Is it possible
to get a little further still, to prove that Timpanaro was
right and to determine which of his three candidates is
meant? After what I said about the speeches in Ennius
and their influence on Livy, let us look at what Livy says
about these three men. Spurius Cassius is dealt with by
him very summarily, and the account of Manlius Capitolinus
centres on the dramatic gesture with which the accused man
turns to the Capitol, the Capitol which he has saved. Matters
are different with Spurius Maelius. There in Livy the dic-
tator Cincinnatus delivers a long oration mainly couched in
indirect speech, and in its third part, book IV, chapter 15,
he says : *nec cum eo tamquam cum ciue agendum fuisse qui natus
in libero populo ex qua urbe reges exactos sciret ... in ea Sp. Maelius
spem regni conceperit*: " nor had they to treat as a citizen a man
who, born in a free state, in a city from which he knew
the kings to have been expelled, had yet, he Spurius Maelius,
hoped to become king ! " And he continues : *et quis homo?*
Not a member of the great aristocratic families who had

---

[1] *Maia* 3 (1950), 26 ff.

served the state with distinction, but a grain merchant who could hardly be borne as a senator, let alone as king. *et quis homo?* That is obviously the same as Ennius' *et qui se sperat*, "and, being what kind of a man, does he hope ...?" That is to say we retain the *et qui* as it stands. The matter is so manifest that proof is not really required. But I will point out one detail : why, in Livy, in the midst of indirect speech, do we suddenly have a nominative *et quis homo*, when after all we should expect *et quem hominem?* Ogilvie does not comment. Weissenborn-Mueller say the nominative attaches itself to Spurius Maelius in the preceding sentence—which is of course in the nominative as belonging to a relative clause. That may be a sort of syntactical justification, but the cause is different : the cause is the direct question in Ennius : *et qui se sperat*.

Quite a simple argument, and yet not without interest. Not only can we put the fragment in its historical context and thus into a definite book of the Annals, Book IV ; but we can also make a statement about historiography in Rome. Our historians believe, and I think correctly, that the great Cincinnatus had nothing to do with this episode. His ditatorship was, to begin with, connected exclusively with the rescue of Minucius near Mt. Algidus in 458. But the extension of the role of Cincinnatus which has certainly occurred in the annalistic transmission is now shown to be very old and to have been accepted a whole century and a half before Livy. Perhaps you will say: a speech, yes, and also the same speech as in Livy; but how do we know that in Ennius too the speaker was Cincinnatus? Well, perhaps we cannot be absolutely certain. But the chances are that, together with the words, Livy took the person of the speaker from Ennius. Moreover, it is the attitude of Ennius to give great speeches to great men. Münzer once tried to prove that the great speech of Camillus, stopping the Romans from transferring the city to Veji, was an invention

of Livy's.   No, it belongs to Ennius, and Livy took it over from him, although it clashes with another story which Livy has borrowed from annalistic transmission[1].   Ennius, as a Greek of the Hellenistic period, and as a poet, sees history, as I once tried to put it, as a process shaped by the words and the deeds of great men.   If in Livy the speech belongs to the great Cincinnatus, it certainly did so in Ennius.

---

[1] *Studia Enniana* 12 f.

DISCUSSION

M. Badian : We should perhaps remember, when we look at Horace's *pater Ennius,* that *pater* does not normally mean *genitor* (i.e. begetter). It is a term denoting legal and social status (head of a *familia*), and as such comes to be a title of honour. But no descent is claimed—any more than, when Jupiter is called *pater diuomque hominumque,* it is claimed that he begot them all. It could be, however, that a phrase like *pater Ennius* suggested to a Renaissance scholar (accustomed to the word " father " in a more modern sense) the idea of Ennius as the " father of Roman poetry ".

M. Suerbaum : Der *pater*-Titel für Ennius braucht nicht mehr zu bedeuten, als wenn Aeneas bei Vergil *pater* genannt wird (etwa im Sinne von *uenerabilis*). Ferner ist zu bedenken, dass Ennius als erster wirklicher römischer Dichter gilt (spätestens seit Lucr. I 117 sq.: *Ennius ... qui primus amoeno | detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam*) — eine der Konstanten im Ennius-Bild, über die ich noch sprechen möchte. Wenn er gelegentlich korrekt als *qui primus digne epos Latinum scripsit* oder generalisierend als *Romani carminis primus auctor* bezeichnet wird, entspricht das letzten Endes der Selbsteinschätzung des Ennius, die aus dem Proömium zum VII. *Annalen*-Buch mit der Abwertung der Vorgänger spricht.

M. Jocelyn : *Ennius ipse pater* may parody a formula of the *Annals,* something like Virgil's *pater Aeneas.* In any case Horace's phrase would simply indicate the present status of Ennius in the family of Roman poets. It has nothing to do with paternity, physical or metaphorical.

Concerning line 294, I am unhappy about the long postponement of *ubi* which results from Mr. Skutsch's supplement

as well as about the fact that Ennius' phraseology remains so far from the stock *tempus est | datur*—infinitive / gerundive, *occasio est* + infinitive / gerundive, *occasio est et tempus* + infinitive / gerundive (cf. Plautus, *Men.* 552-3, *Pseud.* 958, *Trin.* 998-9). Is it possible that Verrius Flaccus misinterpreted *occasus*? That Ennius was not basing his phraseology on *tempus est et occasio*? Could one interpret *occasus* as " what has just happened " and *tempus* as " general circumstances "? Mr. Skutsch's objections to *occasus ... audere repressit* are certainly valid if *occasus* is just a variant of *occasio*.

M. Waszink : I, too, would prefer not to add anything but rather to supply *fuit* : " When there was either an occasion or the moment to show courage, he suppressed it."

M. Skutsch : It seems to me very difficult to assume that an insubstantial and purely formal alternative such as *occasio* and *tempus* should have been introduced by an emphatic *aut*. If, however, to avoid this an addition must be made before *aut*, the chances are that it contained a verb : *monuit res*.

M. Waszink : In my opinion, there is a clear difference between *occasus* (" occasion ", " possibility ") and *tempus* (" urgency ", " necessity ") ; one could paraphrase : " when one could or should be courageous." I do not see any reason to call the use of *aut* in this passage emphatic. But in any case, the comma after *audere* as proposed by Mr. Skutsch seems right.

M. Badian : I am convinced by Professor Waszink's suggestion that *audere* should be taken in an epexegetic sense, governed by *occasus tempusue*, and that (to put it crudely) *fuit* may be understood—i.e. " or when there was an opportunity or time for daring ". This seems much the most straightforward reading of it. However, I do not think that *repressit* can have " opportunity or time " as its object—that does not make sense. We still need a comma after *audere*, with *repressit* referring (just as Professor Skutsch suggested) to the soldiers' eagerness to fight. Hence

I would say that Professor Skutsch's suggested context—
a speech attacking Fabius Maximus—still seems to me to be
excellent.

If the construction starts with *aut* at the beginning of the line,
we agree we need another statement to give the first alternative.
This poses no problem.   I do not want to invent *pseudo-Enniana*.
But one can easily imagine a statement like " When we held a
position of advantage " preceding, in some form, the line we
have. This reconstruction also answers Professor Jocelyn's
justified objection to the excessively postponed *ubi*: it need and
should not have anything to do with the preceding line, and in
its own clause is only—quite unexceptionally—the second instead
of the first word.

<p align="center">*   *
*</p>

M. Jocelyn : In Mr. Skutsch's interpretation of line 367 it
worries me that the victorious soldiers should be described as
exulting in their victory (*laetantes*), having their bellies full of
wine (*uino curatos*) and then, within the structure of the same
sentence, keen in spirit (*acres*). This adjective and its adverb
acriter, where soldiers are concerned, usually apply to actual
fighting (Ennius, *Sc.* 172 : *ubi fortuna Hectoris nostram acrem aciem
inclinatam dedit*; Livy III 5, 7: *acriter dimicans cecidit*).

M. Untermann : *Acer* pflegt, wie Herr Jocelyn bemerkt hat,
im Zusammenhang mit Kampfszenen die Qualität der Handlung
und nicht die der beteiligten Personen zu bezeichnen, und hier
bringt *perculit* unmissverständlich das Bild eines Kampfes mit
sich. Deshalb sollte man doch versuchen, *acris* nicht auf die
uictores, die ja soeben gerade nicht *acres*, sondern *laetantes*, *uino
curati* sind, sondern auf *somnus* zu beziehen, und es als *adjectivum
pro adverbio* zu verstehen : der sanfte Schlaf erschlägt hart, wie ein
plötzlich neu hereinbrechender Feind, das siegestrunkene Heer ;
das ὀξύμωρον *mollissimus . . . acris* ist nicht weniger wirksam, wenn
es aus zwei auf das gleiche Substantiv bezogenen Adjektiven
besteht.

M. Suerbaum : Eine Auffassung von *acris* als acc. plur. passt besser zur Situation *in campo*. — Eine wirkliche Entscheidung ist nur möglich, wenn man Sinnparallelen zur Auffassung eines *somnus* als *acer* bzw. für die von Mr. Skutsch vertretene Interpretation, dass auch Soldaten, wenn sie einschlafen, noch als *acres* gelten können, vor allem bei Homer nachweisen könnte. (Dort wäre etwa auf *Ilias* XIV 164 f. zu verweisen.)

M. Waszink : What still puzzles me, is that in this interpretation the notions of wine and sleep are separated from each other, whereas it is usual to combine them; I only refer to Vergil *Aen.* II 265 : *urbem somno uinoque sepultam.* So I wonder how people who are *uino curati* can be *acres* at the same time.

M. Suerbaum : Beide Verse zusammen (*Ann.* 367/368) sind die Beschreibung einer Hochstimmung. *Acris* dürfte am ehesten als statische Charakterisierung (" die Helden ") zu verstehen sein. (Vgl. etwa die nur scheinbar paradoxe Aussage bei Verg. *Aen.* XI 869 *fugit: acer Atinas.*)

M. Skutsch wishes to add : I overlooked, and Professor Badian points out to me, that Columna took acris *to be acc. plur. — inevitably so since, as shown by his silence, he forget about Priscian's statement.*

* * *

M. Suerbaum : Die Argumente dafür, mit dem *postquam*-Vers (*Ann.* 149) das III. *Annalen*-Buch beginnen zu lassen, sind überzeugend. In der Tatsache, dass auch Vergil das III. Buch der *Aeneis* mit einem *postquam* beginnt (und von ihm abhängig Silius das III. Buch der *Punica*) möchte ich eher ein Kuriosum sehen, auch wenn der Auftakt von *Aeneis* III in einer Rückschau raffend erzählt (also, wenn man so will, Ennianisch ist). Der *postquam*-Satz bei Ennius selbst ist keine Rückschau, sondern eine blosse Zeit-Konstatierung des Beginns von Tarquinius' Herrschaft, die kaum anders auszudrücken war.

M. Jocelyn : I agree with Mr. Skutsch that *bonus* here has no political tendency at all. If it did it would be in the opposite direction to radical populism. I should adduce two considerations. Firstly, in the mid first century and doubtless earlier *bonus* was part of the jargon of political debate ; the stout conservative used it of his like-minded fellows. Secondly, the Virgilian Aeneas hardly noticed the existence of the *populus,* much less did he court them, and yet *bonus* was thought an appropriate epithet for him (*Aen.* V 570) as for other equally respectable heroes.

M. Waszink : Es ist auch zu beachten, dass der Anfang von *Aen.* III (*Postquam ... Priamique euertere gentem*) may have been influenced by *Ann.* I 17 : *Cum ueter occubuit Priamus sub Marte Pelasgo* (cf. Vahlen's Praefatio, p. CXLIX).

* * *

M. Badian : Mr. Skutsch's question whether Ancus Poplicius could be identical with Ancus Marcius : I am afraid I cannot comment on Dionysius without careful investigation of what is known of his sources at this point. I certainly agree that he would not invent these names—the question is whether his source might have, and (if so) why. This I cannot answer.

I find difficulty in identifying a Latin leader with one who became a King of Rome, and I cannot understand why memory of this should drop out, when Etruscan and Sabine connections were remembered and stressed ; nor can I understand why he should have changed his *nomen.* Certainly a *nomen* not known for centuries after is no difficulty : compare (e.g.) " Hostilius " ; and many of the *nomina* of the early Republic are of this nature. It is perhaps worth mentioning that Diodorus produces a military tribune " Marcus Ancus " (*sic*), otherwise unknown : an obvious fiction.

The *popularis aura* of Ancus Marcius is hard to explain, but there may be a connection with the aedile M' Marcius, Pliny,

N.H. XVIII 15, who appears to have been the first man to distribute grain to the plebs (at an *as* per *modius*) : if so, he must belong to the mid-fifth century—if he is historical. There was also an early Marcius who passed a law restraining usury. The later Marcii obviously prided themselves on early *populares* in the family.

M. Skutsch : The answer to Mr. Badian's question as to why a Latin successor to the kingship of Rome should have seemed more disgraceful than a Sabine or Etruscan one may well be that the relationship was too close. But in any case we are not concerned merely with a succession here but with the defeat and replacement of a Roman king.

* * *

M. Suerbaum : Wenn *quadrupes* in 232 als Oberbegriff für Kavallerie und Elefanten gebraucht ist, müsste man annehmen, dass beide Einheiten gleichzeitig angegriffen haben. Ist das historisch zu belegen?

M. Skutsch : The relevant section of my commentary shows, following Norden, that the battle was that of the Trebia, in which the rout of the Romans was accomplished by cavalry *and* elephants.

* * *

M. Suerbaum : Zu *iucundus* in 245 möchte ich Folgendes bemerken: Gellius' Paraphrase berücksichtigt auffallender Weise ein *facundus* in 245 nicht und bezieht sich mit *comitate* auf *suauis* und wohl auch auf ein *iucundus*, wie es von Herrn Skutsch konjiziert wird. Das legt nahe, die Textverderbnis als nach-gellianisch anzusprechen. Könnte sich *suo contentus* in 245 auf das Verhältnis zum *patronus* beziehen?

M. Skutsch : suo contentus, in the literal sense the opposite of *auarus*, may easily pass to the more general sense of " content

with his lot "; *beatus* means virtually the same ; cf. Hor. *Epist.* II 1, 139 *agricolæ . . . paruo beati*.

* * *

M. Waszink: You think *sectis foliis*, in line 263, too unpoetic; but are the immediately following words, *amaro corpore buxum*, so much more poetic?

M. Skutsch : amaro corpore would seem to have far more point than the " incised leaves " of the cypress, since the " bitter taste " of the *buxum* would be not purely descriptive but expressive of its nature as the tree of sorrow.

* * *

M. Badian: With regard to 619, I should welcome Mr. Skutsch's great improvement in a very poor line. The decisive question seems to me to be whether the reading we have is indeed likely to go back as far as (say) Verrius Flaccus, not to mention the late Republic : if so, it becomes very difficult to believe that it can be corrupt. Cancik (quoted by Professor Skutsch) showed that Priscian's *despoliantur*, undoubtedly from Caper, would fit well into this line, where Donatus gives *spoliantur*. He suggested a common source (Probus or Pliny), but refuses to discuss, as irrelevant to his purpose, whether Donatus may have found *Ann.* 619 in Caper. For our purpose it *is* important, and it is very likely that Caper was in fact the common source : Priscian attests that he wrote on precisely this problem (" active " for " passive " forms etc.) and refers his reader to him for further information on it. Donatus' text may simply be corrupt, or a slip on the author's part ; or he may himself have had a corrupt text, of Caper or an intermediary.

Caper, who used Probus, is agreed to have lived in the second century A. D. Since Gellius does not know him, I suggest one

may assume the latter part of the century.   We have no reason to doubt that he collected (or collated) his own material for the work concerned.   As Gellius shows, there were texts available, and corrupt texts at that.   There are no grounds for assuming that this line, as we have it, goes back to Republican or Augustan times.   Hence Mr. Skutsch's suggestion may be accepted.

M. Jocelyn : The verse may sound a little wooden but makes perfectly good sense.   I think it is a mistake to impose too much uniformity on Ennius' language.   There is a degree of prosodical and morphological oscillation in the *Annals* as in other Republican poems and indeed in Homer's *Iliad*.   The oblique forms of *is* are much less common in tragedy than in comedy and epic doubtless reduced their incidence even further but it seems to me unreasonable to suppose a complete ban on them in the *Annals*.

Spoliantur is surely a credible variant of *spoliant*.   Admittedly there are no other cases of deponent for active in the *Annals* fragments but the tragic fragments have deponent *contemplatur* (*Sc.* 114) and yet, to judge from Plautus' usage in comedy (on which see P. Langen, *Beiträge zur Kritik und Erklärung des Plautus*, Leipzig, 1880, p. 60), active *contemplo* was normal Latin in the early second century.

Mr. Skutsch's *despoliant umeros* limits the spoilers' activity somewhat.   Certainly ἀπ' ὤμων τεύχε' ἐσύλα is one of the *Iliad's* commonest formulae but *et corpora nudant* suggests that Ennius was thinking of more than the corselets worn by the fallen enemy.

M. Wülfing : Für das homerische Vorbild gilt natürlich, dass ὦμοι für den Körper als ganzen steht.

M. Skutsch : I do not quite see the force of Mr. Jocelyn's objection.   Since Ennius says they despoil them and leave the bodies naked, why should he not say that they strip the armour from their bodies and leave the bodies naked? Γυμνόν is said by Homer of a body stripped.