

# Ennius as a dramatic poet

Autor(en): **Jocelyn, H.D.**

Objektyp: **Article**

Zeitschrift: **Entretiens sur l'Antiquité classique**

Band (Jahr): **17 (1972)**

PDF erstellt am: **25.06.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660849>

## **Nutzungsbedingungen**

Die ETH-Bibliothek ist Anbieterin der digitalisierten Zeitschriften. Sie besitzt keine Urheberrechte an den Inhalten der Zeitschriften. Die Rechte liegen in der Regel bei den Herausgebern.

Die auf der Plattform e-periodica veröffentlichten Dokumente stehen für nicht-kommerzielle Zwecke in Lehre und Forschung sowie für die private Nutzung frei zur Verfügung. Einzelne Dateien oder Ausdrucke aus diesem Angebot können zusammen mit diesen Nutzungsbedingungen und den korrekten Herkunftsbezeichnungen weitergegeben werden.

Das Veröffentlichen von Bildern in Print- und Online-Publikationen ist nur mit vorheriger Genehmigung der Rechteinhaber erlaubt. Die systematische Speicherung von Teilen des elektronischen Angebots auf anderen Servern bedarf ebenfalls des schriftlichen Einverständnisses der Rechteinhaber.

## **Haftungsausschluss**

Alle Angaben erfolgen ohne Gewähr für Vollständigkeit oder Richtigkeit. Es wird keine Haftung übernommen für Schäden durch die Verwendung von Informationen aus diesem Online-Angebot oder durch das Fehlen von Informationen. Dies gilt auch für Inhalte Dritter, die über dieses Angebot zugänglich sind.

II

H. D. JOCELYN

Ennius as a Dramatic Poet



## ENNIUS AS A DRAMATIC POET

### I. — INTRODUCTION

The metre and language of the account which Ennius gave in the first fifteen books of his *Annals* of the establishment and growth of the Roman empire from the arrival of Aeneas in Italy to the return of his patron Fulvius Nobilior in triumph from Aetolia were striking novelties. Ennius was certainly the father of Latin epic poetry. Where other genres are concerned he may not merit this title. A degree of traditionalism seems to have marked the scripts which he wrote for performance at certain regular festivals of the state gods and on special occasions like statesmen's funerals and victory thanksgivings. Some of these scripts were versions of Attic tragedies popular in contemporary Greek theatres, some versions of similarly popular Attic comedies and some dramatisations of events of Roman history. All three types had been performed at the festivals for a number of years when Ennius arrived in Rome. The versions of tragedy and comedy never reproduced exactly the Attic originals. The manner of performance was in many ways different from that of the theatre of Dionysus. How Ennius learnt the craft of writing scripts or whether he ever established sufficient ascendancy over the theatrical environment to make innovations of his own we do not know. The epigrammatist Pompilius knew of no human teacher that Ennius had had and so called him a *discipulus Musarum*<sup>1</sup> but his dramatic fragments are full of the phrases of predecessors<sup>2</sup> and show

<sup>1</sup> See Varro ap. Non. p. 88,5 (= *Menipp.* 356 Buecheler). The reference to Pacuvius shows that Pompilius was not thinking of epic poetry.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. his translation of Euripides, *Med.* 49 οἴκων κτῆμα δεσποίνης ἐμῆς as *erilis fida custos corporis* and Naevius, *Trag.* 21-2 *uos qui regalis corporis custodias/agitatis*. See further below, p. 74.

no rhythms that were not inherited from the same predecessors<sup>1</sup>. The fragments of the plays on Roman historical themes do not differ in verbal or metrical style from those of the versions of Attic tragedies.

The scanty evidence which we possess concerning some thirty scripts allows us to say very little about these scripts as poetic wholes. Fragments are often difficult to disentangle from the text of the authors who quote them and corruption is widespread. The critic of the tragic fragments, which constitute the great majority, has no complete contemporary script to guide him nor even anything written within the direct tradition of Republican tragedy, in the way, for example, that the *De rerum natura* and the *Aeneid* were written by men immersed in the poetry of the *Annals*. He must work with assumptions drawn from Attic tragedy and from the comic scripts of Plautus and Terence, particularly when he wants to do more than interpret the individual words of an ancient quotation or allusion. It is always possible that a false analogy between different dramatic types will lead to a false general assumption and thus ultimately to a false interpretation of a particular fragment. Certainty is unattainable. Minute examination of particular fragments is more likely to demolish old views than to establish solid new ones but seems to me the only way of making progress.

This paper will be concerned with two quotations by Cicero of a version of an Attic tragedy set in the Achaean camp before Troy and with a quotation by Julius Victor of a play organised by Ennius himself around the siege of newly established Rome by an alliance of Sabine communities led by Tattius of Cures. My choice of quotations is not a random one. I wish to avoid repeating things I have said

<sup>1</sup> See further below, pp. 72 ff.

in my book on Ennius' tragic fragments, to correct a number of errors of that book and to open up for discussion an area of Ennius' dramatic writing which borders on epic poetry, the source of his lasting fame. War was a tragic theme which appealed to Roman audiences<sup>1</sup> and often appeared in Ennius' scripts. When he went to Aetolia in 189 as a member of Fulvius' staff he was already a famous poet<sup>2</sup>. His association with Fulvius and love of Homer together seem to have sparked the composition of the *Annals*<sup>3</sup>. Such verses, however, as 139 *heu quam crudeli condebat membra sepulchro*, 195 *non cauponantes bellum sed belligerantes* and 531 *clamor ad caelum uoluendus per aethera uagit* contain locutions quite absent from the *Iliad*. They have many parallels in the scripts surviving from the Athenian stage<sup>4</sup> and this suggests that the translation of tragic ῥήσεις formed some part of Ennius' apprenticeship for relating the major events of Roman history in epic verse.

## II. — THE PASSAGES TO BE DISCUSSED

Cicero, *S. Rosc.* 89-91 (~ Ennius, *Sc.* 173):

*haec tu Eruci tot et tanta si nactus esses in reo, quam diu diceres. quo te modo iactares. tempus hercule te citius quam oratio deficeret. etenim in singulis rebus eiusmodi materies est ut*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Capt.* 60 ff.; Cicero, *Fam.* VII 1, 2; Horace, *Epist.* II 1, 189 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cicero, *Tusc.* I 3.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. on the date of composition of the *Annals* O. SKUTSCH, *CQ* 42 (1948), 98 f. (= *Stud. Enn.* pp. 38 f.).

<sup>4</sup> With *Ann.* 139 compare Aeschylus, *Theb.* 1020-21 πετηγῶν τόνδ' ὑπ' οἰωνῶν... | ταφέντ' ἀτίμως. With *Ann.* 195, *ibid.* 545-6 ἐλθῶν δ' ἔοικεν οὐ καπηλεύσειν μάχην, | μακρᾶς κελεύθου δ' οὐ καταισχυνεῖν πόρον. With *Ann.* 531, *ibid.* 348-50 βλαχαὶ δ' αἰματόεσσαι | τῶν ἐπιμαστιδίων | ἀρτιτρεφεῖς βρέμονται.

*dies singulos possis consumere. neque ego non possum; non enim tantum mihi derogo, tametsi nihil adrogo, ut te copiosius quam me putem posse dicere. uerum ego forsitan propter multitudinem patronorum in grege adnumerer, te pugna Cannensis accusatorem sat bonum fecit. multos caesos non ad Trasumennum lacum sed ad Seruiliium uidimus.*

*quis ibi non est uulneratus ferro Phrygio?*

*non necesse est omnes commemorare, Curtios, Marios, denique † mammeos †, quos iam aetas a proeliis auocabat, postremo Priamum ipsum senem Antistium, quem non modo aetas sed etiam leges pugnare prohibebant. iam quos nemo propter ignobilitatem nominat, sescenti sunt, qui inter sicarios et de ueneficiis accusabant; qui omnes, quod ad me attinet, uellem uiuerent. nihil enim mali est canes ibi quam plurimos esse, ubi permulti obseruandi multaue seruanda sunt. uerum, ut fit, multa saepe imprudentibus imperatoribus uis belli ac turba molitur. dum is in aliis rebus erat occupatus, qui summam rerum administrabat, erant interea qui suis uulneribus mederentur, qui tamquam si offusa rei publicae sempiterna nox esset, ita ruebant in tenebris omniaque miscebant; a quibus miror, ne quod iudiciorum esset uestigium, non subsellia quoque esse combusta; nam et accusatores et iudices sustulerunt. hoc commodi est, quod ita uixerunt, ut testes omnes, si cuperent, interficere non possent; nam dum hominum genus erit, qui accuset eos non deerit, dum ciuitas erit, iudicia fient.*

Schol. Gronouianus p. 311, 30 Stangl:

*FERRO FRUGIO in Ennio haec fabula inducitur, Achilles (Eberhard: achillis cod.) quo tempore propter Briseidam cum Graecis pugnare noluit; quo etiam tempore Hector classem eorum incendit. in hac pugna Ulixes uulneratus inducitur et fugiens <ad> (add. Graeuus) Achillen uenit. cum interrogaretur ab Aiace cur fugisset, ille ut celaret dedecus † uitium †: «quis ibi non est (enim cod.) uulneratus ferro Frugio?» et quo tendit haec fabula?*

*scimus Sullam in pueritia turpissimum fuisse, unde Sallustius dixit: «mox tanta flagitia in tali uiro pudet dicere.» Fruges autem dicuntur infames.*

Cicero, *Tusc.* II 38-39 (~ Ennius, *Sc.* 161-172):

*cur tantum interest inter nouum et ueterem exercitum, quantum experti sumus? aetas tironum plerumque melior, sed ferre laborem, contemnere uulnus consuetudo docet. quin etiam uidemus ex acie efferri saepe saucios, et quidem rudem illum et inexercitatum quamuis leui ictu ploratus turpissimos edere. at uero ille exercitatus et uetus ob eamque rem fortior medicum modo requirens a quo obligetur*

*o Patricoles  
inquit*

*ad uos adueniens auxilium et uestras manus  
peto. priusquam oppeto malam pestem mandatam hostili manu*

...

*neque sanguis ullo potis est pacto profluens consistere*

...

*si qui sapientia magis uestra mors deuitari potest.  
namque Aesculapi liberorum saucii opplent porticus.  
non potest accedi ...*

*certe.*

*Eurypylus hic quidem est. hominem exercitum.*

*ubi † tantum luctum continuatus † (GKR; tantum luctus continuatur ε) uide quam non flebiliter respondeat, rationem etiam adferat cur aequo animo sibi ferendum sit:*

*qui alteri exitium parat,  
eum scire oportet sibi paratam pestem, ut participet, parem.*

...

*abducat Patricoles, credo, ut conlocet in cubili, ut uolnus obliget. si quidem homo esset; sed nihil uidi minus. quaerit enim quid actum sit:*



*eloquere eloquere res Argium proelio ut se sustinet.*  
*:: non potest ecfari tantum dictis quantum factis suppetit*  
*laboris ...*

*quiesce igitur et uolnus alliga. etiam si Eurypylus posset non posset*  
*Aesopus.*

*ubi fortuna Hectoris nostram acrem aciem inclinatam ...*  
*et cetera explicat in dolore; sic est enim intemperans militaris in*  
*forti uiro gloria. ergo haec ueteranus miles facere poterit, doctus*  
*uir sapiensque non poterit? ille uero melius ac non paulo quidem.*

C. Iulius Victor, *Ars rhet.* VI 4 (*de locis post rem*), p. 402,  
 28 Halm (~ Ennius, *Sc.* 370-71):

*ab euentu in qualitate ut: «qualia sunt ea, quae euenerunt aut*  
*quae uideantur euentura, tale illud quoque existimetur, ex quo*  
*euenerunt»;* ut <in> (add. Halm) *Sabinis Ennius dixit:*

*cum spolia generis detraxeritis ...*

...

*quam inscriptionem dabitis?*

*generis Ian: generi cod.*

### III. — CONCERNING THE ACHILLES

— a —

The Gronovian commentator names Ennius as the author of the three trochaic metra which Cicero quotes at *S. Rosc.* 90. Analysis of the arrangement of quotations at *Orator* 155 shows that Ennius was also the author of the dialogue between Eurypylus and Patroclus quoted at some length at *Tusc.* II 38<sup>1</sup>. Both quotations are of a play dramatising the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. T. BERGK, *Ind. lectt. Marburg* 1844, VIII ff. (= *Kl. phil. Schr.* I 220 ff.). DELRIO and G. HERMANN, *De Aeschylī Myrmidonibus Nereidibus Phrygibus Dissertatio*, Leipzig, 1833, p. 8 (= *Opusc.* V 142), had imagined Accius to be the author.

events of the day described by Homer at *Il.* XI 1 to XVIII 239. The play was set in front of the quarters of Achilles in the Achaean camp. Two titles of tragedies with this setting are known, an *Achilles* and a *Hectoris lytra*.

The *Achilles* was a version of a play by the fifth century Attic poet Aristarchus<sup>1</sup>. The only thing which emerges with any certainty from the fragments cited as belonging to it is that it concerned the period of Achilles' refusal to take part in the fighting before Troy and contained an account of a battle involving Ajax<sup>2</sup>. The tone of Nonius' quotation at p. 277, 23 (= *Sc.* 6)

*serua ciues, defende hostes cum potes defendere*

suggests that danger is immediate, that at the moment of speaking the Achaeans are rather more hard pressed than they were on the night of the embassy of Ulysses, Phoenix and Ajax described in the ninth book of the *Iliad*. The action of the *Achilles* is therefore to be imagined as proceeding during the day which began with the eleventh book of the *Iliad*.

The wording of the last mentioned fragment illustrates prettily one of the difficulties which faced Latin poets adapting Attic scripts and the kind of solution which appealed to Ennius. The authority which Agamemnon had over the contingents from various Achaean communities forming his army was quite different from that exercised by a Roman consul over his officers and troops whether citizens or allies. Achilles' behaviour and even more the reaction of Agamemnon and the other βασιλῆες to it were inconceivable in a Roman camp. Ennius could have used words and phrases

<sup>1</sup> See, in addition to my commentary, pp. 161 ff., *YCS* 21 (1969), 97 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Festus' quotation at p. 282, 9 Lindsay (= *Sc.* 16) *prolato aere astitit* (~ Homer, *Il.* VII 224-5 τὸ πρόσθε στέρνοιο φέρων Τελαμώνιος Αἴας | στῆ ῥα μάλ' Ἔκτορος ἐγγύς et XI 485-6 Αἴας δ' ἐγγύθεν ἦλθε φέρων σάκος ἥυτε πύργον | στῆ δὲ παρέξ.

rendering his dialogue utterly remote from contemporary considerations and more or less faithful to the spirit of the original. Instead he set out to make his audience think of Ulysses, Ajax and the rest as citizens of the same community as Achilles (*ciues*)<sup>1</sup> and to play on the emotions associated with common citizenship. The phrase *serua ciues*<sup>2</sup> would have reminded Roman hearers immediately of one of the deeds of military heroism they most admired and the crown of oak leaves presented *ob ciuis seruatos*<sup>3</sup>. It may even be that the wording and the asyndeton of the two imperative phrases *serua ciues*, *defende hostes* reflected the way in which this deed was conventionally commemorated. Beside the Ennian fragment should be set Polybius' τοὺς ὑπερασπίσαντας (~ *defende hostes*) καὶ σώσαντάς τινας τῶν πολιτῶν ἢ συμμάχων (~ *serua ciues*)<sup>4</sup>, the inscription on the Capitoline statue of M. Aemilius Lepidus reconstructible from the legend of a coin of 66 B.C.—AN. XV. PR. H. O. C. S. (= *annorum quindecim progressus hostem occidit, ciuem seruauit*)<sup>5</sup>—and Valerius Maximus III 1, 1 *Aemilius Lepidus puer etiam tum progressus in aciem hostem interemit, ciuem seruauit*, Cassius Dio LIII 16, 4 . . . οἱ ὧς καὶ ἀεὶ τοὺς τε πολεμίους νικῶντι (~ *defende hostes*) καὶ τοὺς πολίτας σφύζοντι. At any rate the critic of Ennius' tragic fragments must expect to meet some odd confluences of heroic Greece and second century Rome.

The *Hectoris lytra* enacted the theme of the twenty-fourth book of the *Iliad*, namely Achilles' surrender of Hector's corpse to Priam. The commonly accepted view of the play's

<sup>1</sup> Homer has the word *πολίτης* only at *Il.* II 806 (talking of the Trojans).

<sup>2</sup> Contrast the Homeric φράζου ὅπως Δαναοῖσιν ἀλεξήσεις κακὸν ἡμᾶρ (*Il.* IX 251) and the Aeschylean Ἑλλανὰ μὴ προδῶς στρατόν (fr. 221, 5 Mette).

<sup>3</sup> This phrase is often found on Augustan coins (*B.M.C. Rom. Emp.* I, 445). Cf. Polybius VI 39, 6-7.

<sup>4</sup> VI 39, 6.

<sup>5</sup> E. A. SYDENHAM, *Coinage of the Rom. Rep.*, 829.

action<sup>1</sup> has it include the two days on which the Homeric Hector attacked the newly fortified Greek camp, the night during which a new set of armour was manufactured for Achilles, the day on which Achilles drove back the Trojans and slew Hector, the twelve nights and days during which Achilles kept Hector's corpse in his quarters as well as the night on which Achilles surrendered the corpse to Priam. I should now want to argue much more strongly than I did in my commentary against this view.

Aristotle must have deduced his rule demanding that the action of a tragedy should take place within one solar period<sup>2</sup> from what he observed in late fifth and early fourth century scripts. Those scripts which we possess either entire or in large part practically all keep the imagined time of action within twelve hours. The Aeschylean *Ἀγαμέμνων* and *Εὐμενίδες* have opening scenes set days before the beginning of the main action but they are early plays, going back to 458 B. C. Sophocles' *Τραχίνια* and Euripides' *Ἀνδρομάχη*, *Ἰκετίδες* and *Σθενέβοια*<sup>3</sup> have journeys performed within the action which in reality would have taken several days but proceed as if such journeys took no more than an hour or two. There is no known example of the kind of play the *Hectoris Iytra* has been thought to be.

It is also the case that Attic tragedies had a chorus present in the orchestra during most of the action and that the Latin poets imagined a similar body present on the stage platform for their versions<sup>4</sup>. One of Nonius' quotations (p. 472, 21 [= *Sc.* 186])

<sup>1</sup> Cf. recently A. GRILLI, *Studi Enniani*, Brescia, 1965, p. 176 n. 20.

<sup>2</sup> *Poet.* 5, 1449 b 12 ff.

<sup>3</sup> On the difficulties of the hypothesis published by H. RABE, *RbM* 63 (1908), 147 ff., see B. ZÜHLKE, *Philologus* 105 (1961), 1 ff. and 198 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Cicero, *Fam.* VII 6, 1 (~ Euripides, *Med.* 214 ff.), [Probus], Virgil, *Ecl.* VI 31 (~ Euripides, *Med.* 1251 ff.). The Roman theatre had no space

† *ser uos et uostrum* †  
*imperium et fidem Myrmidonum uigiles commiserescite*

corrupt though it is<sup>1</sup>, reveals without any doubt that the *Hectoris lytra* had a chorus of *uigiles* (νοκτοφύλακες)<sup>2</sup>. Accordingly most of the action of the play must have taken place during one of the watches of the night on which Priam came secretly to Achilles' quarters. From three other Nonian quotations<sup>3</sup> it can be deduced that the watch was the first. Before the *uigiles* arrived on stage there would have been room for no more than a prologue speech describing events prior to the action and one dialogue between actors.

To the prologue speech I should assign the trimeters quoted by Nonius at p. 355, 3 (= *Sc.* 158-9):

*Hector ui summa armatos educit foras*  
*castrisque castra ultro iam ferre occupat.*

Where their text is concerned, I am ready to abandon my scepticism about Mercier's emendation *ui summa* (*ei summa* codd.) but wish to maintain the hiatus between *castra* and *ultro*. S. Timpanaro has correctly pointed out<sup>4</sup> that *ui summa* need mean no more than "very energetically". Nevertheless, while this phrase might accompany verbs like *expetere* (Plautus, *Cas.* 80) and *niti* (Ennius, *Ann.* 412) appro-

for an orchestra of the Athenian type (see Livy XXXIV 44, 5 and Vitruvius V 6, 2).

<sup>1</sup> S. TIMPANARO, *Gnomon* 40 (1968), 669 demolishes some of the arguments adduced in my commentary. I am not convinced, however, that *uostrum imperium* could mean "the *imperium* which you obey (and of which you are in a sense the representatives)".

<sup>2</sup> O. RIBBECK's observation at *Die römische Tragödie im Zeitalter der Republik*, Leipzig, 1875, p. 638 is thus at odds with his reconstruction of the play at pp. 118 ff.

<sup>3</sup> See below, p. 53.

<sup>4</sup> *Gnomon* 40 (1968), 669.

priately enough, it still seems to me out of place with the Ennian *educit*. In such a context Hector surely had to deal with disciplined troops, not stubborn bullocks. *Summa ui* (the adjective normally precedes) is a very common phrase in the military writers Caesar and Livy and *educere* an even more common verb. The collocation *summa ui educere* never occurs. *Summa ui* accompanies verbs and verbal phrases which can be placed in two categories: into one category fall *agere* (Livy XXIV 28, 5), *contendere* (Caesar, *Gall.* III 15, 1; VII 70, 1), *defendere* (Livy X 17, 10; XXVI 6, 6), *hortari* (XXIII 45, 1; XXX 18, 2), *niti* (XLIV 11, 8), *petere* (XXII 6, 2), *tendere* (XXXII 32, 7), *tueri* (XXXII 14, 2), *arma apparare* (IV 1, 5), *bellum parare* (I 56, 13; III 4, 2; XLII 25, 3), *bellum apparare* (III 57, 8); into the other category fall *aggredi* (XXXVI 24, 2; XXXVII 17, 2), *depopulari* (X 27, 5), *expugnare* (IV 35, 10; X 1, 7), *obsidere* (XXV 20, 1), *oppugnare* (VI 9, 10; XXI 7, 1; XXIII 18, 5; XXVII 12, 6; XXVII 28, 13; XXXII 4, 1; XXXII 16, 10; XXXV 25, 2; XXXVIII 5, 10; XL 25, 6; XLI 11, 2; XLII 63, 3); *resistere* (II, 54, 2; II, 56, 4; XXXII 15, 1; XLII 50, 10), *restare* (IV, 58, 4), *ad bellum cooriri* (IV 56, 5), *bellum gerere* (XXXII 21, 19), *eruptionem facere* (*Gall.* VII 73, 1), *proelium conserere* (XXIX 7, 3). In regard to Ennius' *Hector ui summa armatos educit foras*, I should now like to take *ui summa* and *armatos* together, comparing Homer, *Il.* II 65-6 θωρηξαι . . . πανσυδιη and Livy I 58, 8 *Tarquinius . . . ui armatus* and leaving the exact interpretation open. The text of the next verse, *castrisque castra ultro iam ferre occupat*, has, admittedly, a peculiar look about it. Even such purists as Caesar and Cicero varied the standard military phrase *castra conferre* with the polyp-ton *castra castris conferre*<sup>1</sup>, but although Vossius' *conferre* normalises both metre and phraseology in Ennius' verse, there are enough cases of the replacement of the compound

<sup>1</sup> See the passages collected by E. LOMMATZSCH at *TLL* IV 180, 73 ff.

in *con-* by the simple verb in tragedy as well as of hiatus after the fifth element of the trimeter to allow the transmitted text to stand.

Where the substance of the two trimeters is concerned, the prologue speaker seems to me to refer to the beginning of the day upon which Hector was slain, in particular to a movement not described but only hinted at by Homer, *Il.* XX 47-74. There are those who would have him refer to the exit of the Trojans from the city described at *Il.* VIII 55-9<sup>1</sup> or their exit from their place of bivouac described at *Il.* XI 56-66<sup>2</sup>. Discussion is difficult because some Attic tragedian stands between Homer and Ennius and because both Attic tragedians<sup>3</sup> and Latin translators tended to write about heroic battles with the military conditions of their own times in mind. Ennius wrote his two trimeters undoubtedly thinking more of contemporary fighting than of the Attic text in front of him. Roman and Carthaginian armies regularly moved from one fortified or fortifiable position to another and when about to join battle manoeuvred for the better fixed position on the terrain. With the Ennian trimeters one might compare Livy XXI 39, 10 *occupavit tamen Scipio Padum traicere et ad Ticinum amnem motis castris, priusquam educeret in aciem, adhortandorum militum causa talem orationem est exorsus* and XXVI 12, 14 *sic ad Cannas, sic ad Trasumennum rem bene gestam coeundo conferundoque cum hoste castra, fortunam temptando*. Homer's Achaeans did not move far from their ships and did not fortify their camp until the tenth year of the war. His Trojans ordinarily kept within the walls of the city<sup>4</sup> and Hector's bivouac on two

<sup>1</sup> Cf. O. RIBBECK, *Die römische Tragödie*, p. 119.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. A. SCHÖLL, *Beiträge zur Kenntnis der tragischen Poesie der Griechen I*, Berlin, 1839, p. 491.

<sup>3</sup> See below, pp. 56 f., 84 f.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Il.* V 789; VII 1; VIII 58.

successive nights in the plain between the city and the Achaean ships was an act of unusual boldness; Hector put no fence or ditch around his bivouacking troops<sup>1</sup>. The armies of fifth century Athens and its rivals used as a rule natural rather than artificial fortification for their camping places<sup>2</sup> and, not surprisingly, Euripides' Πῆσος represented Hector's bivouac exactly as in the *Iliad*<sup>3</sup>. The prologue of the original Ἑκτορος λύτρα would likewise have begun its description of the day's events in terms more Homeric than those of Ennius'

*Hector in summa armatos educit foras  
castrisque castra ultro iam ferre occupat.*

Parallel is the way in which Terence altered a Menandrian slave's account of the birth of a child with contemporary Roman customs in mind<sup>4</sup>.

To the speech of a messenger describing the battle in which Hector fell I should assign three quotations by Nonius (pp. 504, 30; 510, 32; 518, 3 [= *Sc.* 181, 180, 182-3]):

*aes sonit, franguntur hastae, terra sudat sanguine  
saeuiter fortuna ferro cernunt de uictoria  
ecce autem caligo oborta est, omnem prospectum abstulit.  
derepente contulit sese in pedes.*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Il.* VIII 542; XI 56 ff.; XVIII 297 ff.; XX 1 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Writing in the fourth century Xenophon describes fortifying a camp as a barbarian rather than a Greek practice (*Cyr.* III 3, 26-7). Pyrrhus found the organisation of his Roman enemy's camps quite amazing (see Plutarch, *Pyrrh.* 16, 4) and perhaps introduced it into his own army's practice (hence the peculiar doctrine found at Livy XXXV, 14, 8 and Frontinus, *Strat.* IV 1, 14). Nevertheless, as Polybius VI 42 shows, traditional notions died hard.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. vv. 523-4. For the Achaean wall see vv. 989-90.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Donatus, *Andr.* 771 *LIBERAE testimonia libera contra seruum. et hoc proprium Terentii est, nam de Romano more hoc dixit.*



A corollary of this is that the author of the original Ἐκτορος λύτρα not only diverged in details from the Homeric narrative<sup>1</sup> but omitted the twelve days which the *Iliad* had elapse between Hector's death and Priam's recovery of his body. For an Attic dramatist to telescope an epic story in this way is entirely credible; for him to extend an action over several days to include everything from the Homeric Hector's first sally from the city at Zeus' behest to the transport back of his corpse is not.

One of Nonius' quotations (p. 469, 25 [= *Sc.* 179])

*qui cupiant dare arma Achilli † ut ipse † cunctent*

corrupt and obscure though it is, seems to demand an interpretation which cuts across my view of the play's action. This quotation looks as if it should be of a speech made between Patroclus' death and Achilles' acquisition of fresh armour. Such, however, is the strength of the deduction to be made from the quotation of Priam's address to the *vigiles* and from the known structure of Attic tragedy that another interpretation has to be found for *qui cupiant dare arma Achilli † ut ipse † cunctent*. I should suggest tentatively that it comes from a speech reporting conversation or statements made at the time Achilles had no armour to fight in.

A *Hectoris lytra* reconstructed on the supposition that it resembled an Attic drama of the classical period could not accommodate the two untitled fragments with which we are here concerned. The *Achilles* on the other hand could. There is, of course, no absolute certainty attainable in these matters but we shall assume henceforth that it was Aristarchus, a contemporary of Euripides, who reduced the narrative of *Il.* XI 1 to XVIII 239<sup>2</sup> to the dramatic form we can

<sup>1</sup> With *Sc.* 182-3 contrast Homer, *Il.* XXII 131-7. Mists etc. obscuring vision on the battlefield are common enough elsewhere in the *Iliad*. On *Sc.* 180 see further below, p. 77.

<sup>2</sup> Perhaps even of *Il.* XI 1 to XXII 404. See below, p. 58 f.

glimpse through what Cicero quotes at *S. Rosc.* 90 and *Tusc.* II 38.

— b —

The Gronovian commentator and modern interpreters take the three trochaic metra quoted at *S. Rosc.* 90

*quis ibi non est uulneratus ferro Phrygio?*<sup>1</sup>

as alluding to deeds perpetrated by Sulla's less worthy followers between the victory at the Colline gate in November 82 and the end of the proscriptions in June 81. The *Sullani* would be identified with the "Phrygians"<sup>2</sup> of Ennius' play. It is odd, however, that in the very next sentence one of the victims of the *Sullani* should be referred to with the metrical phrase *Priamum ipsum senem*<sup>3</sup>. In any case to talk of the *Sullani* first as death-dealing Carthaginians and then as wound-dealing Phrygians makes an unfortunate anti-climax. I would suggest therefore that with *quis ibi non est uulneratus ferro Phrygio?* Cicero refers to prosecutions of certain persons made in the courts near the *lacus Seruilius* during the pre-Sullan era. Those prosecuted would have revenged their metaphorical wounds during the proscriptions. Indeed Cicero says just this four sentences later: *dum is* (i.e. Sulla) *in aliis rebus erat occupatus, qui summam rerum administrabat, erant interea qui suis uulneribus mederentur.*

My hypothesis gives Cicero's oblique and highly literary attack on the effects of the proscriptions much more elegance and point: the victims are imagined at one moment as the

<sup>1</sup> The correct spelling would be *Brugio*; cf. Cicero, *Orat.* 160; Quintilian, *Inst.* I 4, 15.

<sup>2</sup> Unlike Homer the tragedians regularly identified the Phrygians and the Trojans (cf. Euripides, *Rhes.* 75; 585; 727; 814 et al.).

<sup>3</sup> A. EBERHARD, *Lectio-num Tullianarum Libellus Primus*, Leipzig, 1872, p. 12, has found a number of supporters for his suggestion that the phrase is a tragic quotation.

beleaguered Trojans, the heroic ancestors of the Romans, and at another as the third century Romans who fell at Trasumene and Cannae; the *Sullani*, on the other hand, are at one moment the Achaean destroyers of Troy and at another the Carthaginian agents of Juno's wrath against the Trojans and their Roman descendents<sup>1</sup>. The verse fragments which appear in Cicero's writings can at times be both quotations of old poems and part of the narrative or argument in hand<sup>2</sup>.

The note in the Gronovian commentary describing the scene of Ennius' play from which Cicero's quotation comes is garbled but perhaps not quite as much as some have thought. This scene was based on the narrative of *Il.* XI 396-488: the whole Achaean army, with the exception of the Myrmidons, is out in the plain and the βασιλῆες are doing deeds of glory in front of the ordinary troops; after suffering a spear wound Ulysses is rescued by Menelaus and Ajax and sent back to camp in his chariot; Menelaus and Ajax stay in the fight but there is no suggestion of cowardice on Ulysses' part<sup>3</sup>. The tragic dialogue between Ajax and Ulysses in front of the quarters of Achilles to which the commentator refers must have been preceded by a messenger's speech, or some equivalent, narrating a course of battle rather different from Homer's: there has been a general reverse and Ajax, showing an enmity towards Ulysses which arose at a much later stage in the old epic story<sup>4</sup>, blames the reverse on Ulysses' failure to stand his ground.

The differences between the tragic dialogue and the Homeric narrative are quite explicable. In dramatising this

<sup>1</sup> See Servius, *Virgil, Aen.* I 281 on the end of Juno's wrath in Ennius' *Annals*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the quotation of the Achilles at *Verr.* II 1, 46.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the way that the other wounded heroes return to camp: *Il.* XI 251 ff. (Agamemnon); 369 ff. (Diomedes); 504 ff. (Machaon); 581 ff. (Eurypylus).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Homer, *Od.* XI 543 ff.; Arctinus, *Aeth.* exc. Procl. p. 106 Allen; schol. *Hom. Od.* XI 547.

narrative Aristarchus had been bound by certain conventions. He could not set a scene on the actual field of battle. He could not, except in very special circumstances<sup>1</sup>, shift his action from one scene to another. The 'Pῆσος of Euripides, based though it was fairly closely on the tenth book of the *Iliad*, related from in front of Hector's quarters in the Trojan camp all the events of the night described in that book and telescoped them within the period of a single watch. There was nothing technically to prevent Aristarchus from making a personage of his 'Ἀχιλλεύς relate exactly the details of the Homeric fighting or from casting his debates in an Homeric mould. Nevertheless surviving Attic scripts show that Aristarchus' fellow poets neither sought an archaeological accuracy in describing such things as the division of the watches of the night<sup>2</sup> and methods of signalling<sup>3</sup> nor hesitated to represent the epic βασιλῆες as contemporary στρατηγοί<sup>4</sup>. They frequently created scenes of argument informed by a contemporary military ethos<sup>5</sup>. The order of events<sup>6</sup> and the details<sup>7</sup> of epic stories had for them nothing sacrosanct. It is thus not at all surprising to find in Aristarchus' 'Ἀχιλλεύς a conversion of Ulysses' departure with a wound from the battle field into the rout of a hoplite

<sup>1</sup> The only shifts of scene evidenced in Attic tragedy are in the early *Αἰτωαῖαι* (fr. 26 Mette) and *Ἐὐμειδῆς* (234; 488) of Aeschylus and *Αἴας* (815) of Sophocles.

<sup>2</sup> Contrast Euripides, *Rhes.* 5; 527 ff. and Homer, *Il.* X 253 and schol.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Rhes.* 144; 989 and schol. Eur. *Phoen.* 1377.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the way in which the Euripidean Eteocles does not set himself at one of the seven gates but exercises a general supervision over all seven (*Phoen.* 1093 ff.; 1163 ff.).

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Heracles* 160 ff.; 190 ff. and particularly Plautus, *Amph.* 238-41 (probably a parody of an Attic messenger's speech at base).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Rhes.* 501-2 (theft of Palladium).

<sup>7</sup> Contrast Sophocles, *Ai.* 1273 ff. and Homer, *Il.* XVI 112 ff. (firing of Achaean ships); Euripides, *Androm.* 107-8 and Homer, *Il.* XXII 463-5; XXIV 14-17 (dragging of Hector's body).

phalanx and a retrojection in time of the famous enmity between Ajax and Achilles.

With the Attic dialogue lost and less than a verse of the Latin version surviving little can be said about what Ennius himself contributed. Debates about the behaviour of Roman troops and officers in similar circumstances<sup>1</sup> would doubtless have affected his language. Making the piper accompany the utterances of Ajax and Achilles may but need not have been Ennius' idea. A number of arguments set in catalectic trochaic tetrameters are to be found in late fifth century Attic scripts<sup>2</sup>.

A later passage of Cicero's speech for Sextus Roscius and the Gronovian commentator's note may have something to tell about another scene of the same play. Describing how Titus Roscius sent Glaucia with news of Sextus Roscius' death to Capito, Cicero calls Glaucia *Automedontem illum, sui sceleris acerbissimi nefariaeque victoriae nuntium*. This is of a piece with the earlier identification of the villainous *Sullani* with the Achaean sackers of Troy. The commentator writes: *AVTOMEDON Achilles auriga fuit. posteaquam Achilles Hectorem uicit, posuit aurigam suum in curru, ut iret et nuntiaret occisum Hectorem. modo adludit Cicero: Roscium Achillem dicit, Glauciam Automedontem*. This was not Homer's version of the events immediately following Hector's death and it is a reasonable supposition that the commentator, or rather his source<sup>3</sup>, had in mind a tragic scene in which Automedon brought back news to the camp of a Myrmidon victory. There could have been no dragging of Hector's corpse behind Achilles' chariot. It looks as if there had not even

<sup>1</sup> For the general Roman attitude to cowardice and indiscipline cf. Polybius VI 24, 9; VI 37, 11-38, 4; Livy VII 13, 4. For the reaction to particular cases cf. Livy XXIII 25, 7; XXV 6, 13 ff.; XXVI 2, 7 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Heraclēs* 855 ff., *I.A.* 317 ff., *Phoen.* 588 ff.

<sup>3</sup> Asconius is known to have written a commentary on the speech for Sextus Roscius; see Gellius XV 28, 4-5.

been a single combat of the epic type but rather an engagement between hoplite units in which Hector fell and after which Achilles, like some fifth century στρατηγός, directed a mopping-up operation.

Homer had Ulysses wounded early one morning and Hector killed late in the day following. The conventions of tragedy would have prevented a poet extending his action over such a long period. At the same time they would have allowed him to omit some events of Homer's narrative and to telescope the rest<sup>1</sup> in order to provide a theatrically satisfying plot. It is a possibility worth considering that Cicero had in mind Ennius' version of Aristarchus' Ἀχιλλεύς at *S. Rosc.* 98 as well as 90.

— c —

At *Tusc.* II 38 the dialogue speaker, who is here Cicero himself<sup>2</sup>, adduces a tragic Eurypylos as an example of a man who has learnt through habituation to endure pain. He quotes a large number of verses from an episode in which calmly and unweepingly the wounded Eurypylos describes to Patroclus what happened on the field of battle. This scene depended ultimately on the narrative of Homer, *Il.* XI 804-48<sup>3</sup> and must have belonged to the same play as the one between Ulysses and Ajax from which Cicero quotes at *S. Rosc.* 90.

A chorus would have been required to stand in the orchestra by the script which Aristarchus constructed from Homer's narrative and on the stage-platform by Ennius' version<sup>4</sup>. This circumstance has been neglected by inter-

<sup>1</sup> See above, p. 58.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Tusc.* V 32.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also XV 390 ff.; XVI 27.

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 49.

preters, who explain the phrases *ad uos, uestras manus* and *sapientia . . . uestra* in Eurypylus' address to Patroclus as due to the presence of Achilles by Patroclus' side, at the same time failing to say why Eurypylus did not also address by name the Myrmidon leader himself—a grossly discourteous omission by heroic standards. In any case Achilles enjoyed more fame as a medical practitioner than did Patroclus<sup>1</sup>. I suggest therefore that Achilles was quite absent from the stage-platform when Eurypylus arrived and that those whom Eurypylus addressed along with Patroclus were a chorus of attendants (θεράποντες / *caculae*). This hypothesis will also aid interpretation of certain features of Cicero's comments on the exchange between the two heroes.

The relationship between the tragic episode and Cicero's discourse is more complex than has been thought. The episode was obviously a famous one. Aesopus, the leading tragic actor of the first century B.C. Roman stage<sup>2</sup>, found the role of Eurypylus a challenge to his powers. Where such episodes were concerned, Cicero often made the speaker in a philosophical dialogue quote selectively, expecting the interlocutor (and ultimately the reader) to supply what had been omitted. At times he even allowed comments to be passed on what had been omitted from the quotation. This is how I should explain the quotation of iambic tetrameters and bits of tetrameters from the address of the Pacuvian Polydorus' ghost to his mother at *Tusc.* I 106<sup>3</sup> and the following remark about *tam bonos septenarios*. Pacuvius must have made the ghost drop into catalectic trochaic tetrameters (*septenarii*)<sup>4</sup> so as to narrate the story of his murder and it was to these trochaic verses rather than to the introductory

<sup>1</sup> See Homer, *Il.* XI 832 and Pliny, *NH* XXV 42.

<sup>2</sup> See Cicero, *Fam.* VII 1, 2, *Sest.* 120-23, Horace, *Epist.* II 1, 82.

<sup>3</sup> *Trag.* 197-201.

<sup>4</sup> See below, pp. 72 ff., on the metrical structure of such episodes in Roman drama.

iambics that Cicero's remark referred. At *Tusc.* II 38 Cicero assumes his young<sup>1</sup> interlocutor to be similarly familiar with the episode from Ennius' *Achilles*. His manner is very different from that in which in the previous argument about the nature of pain he presented his own versions of speeches by the Sophoclean Hercules and the Aeschylean Prometheus. There he assumed that the young man would find the verses a novelty and tried to explain what he was doing<sup>2</sup>.

Five acatalectic iambic tetrameters and the first five elements of a sixth are quoted from Eurypylus' opening address to Patroclus :

*o Patricoles ad uos adueniens auxilium et uestras manus  
peto priusquam oppeto malam pestem mandatam hostili manu  
neque sanguis ullo potis est pacto profluens consistere  
si qui sapientia magis uestra mors deuitari potest  
namque Aesculapi liberorum saucii opplent porticus  
non potest accedi*

Many editors of Cicero's dialogue and of Ennius' tragic fragments treat this as a full, continuous quotation. There are, however, a number of reasons for regarding it as left deliberately lacunose. The adverbial clause *priusquam... manu* demands to be preceded or followed by an imperative or a jussive subjunctive or some equivalent phrase<sup>3</sup>. One can hardly press *auxilium et uestras manus peto* into standing for *auxilium et uestras manus date*. Cicero's own phrases, ... *medicum modo requirens a quo obligetur... ut conlocet in cubili, ut uolnus obliget*, strongly suggest that the tragic hero made not

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Tusc.* II 28.

<sup>2</sup> *Tusc.* II 26.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Capt.* 831-2: *aperite hasce ambas fores, | priusquam pultando assulatim foribus exitium adfero*; *Curc.* 210: *tene etiam, priusquam hinc abeo, sauium*; *Epid.* 615-16: *quin tu mihi adornes ad fugam uiaticum, | priusquam pereo*? A statement of determination would also be appropriate; cf. Terence, *Andr.* 311 *omnia experiri certumst, priusquam pereo*.



only a general appeal for help but a specific one as well, namely for his wound to be bandaged. The principal statement *neque sanguis ... potis est ... consistere* demands to be preceded by another statement, negative or positive, about Eurypylus' physical condition<sup>1</sup>. The conditional clause *si qui... mors deuitari potest* likewise hangs in the grammatical air<sup>2</sup>.

Nobody in this company, I hope, will want to say that Eurypylus' grammar was meant to reflect the state of shock and exhaustion resulting from his wound. It might, however, be reasonably argued that in his tragic scripts Ennius' syntax tended to approach the looseness, redundancy and illogicality of everyday speech more closely than a classical taste would approve and that the utterances given to Eurypylus illustrate this tendency. Two interesting ancient judgments to this effect are to be found in Cicero's *Orator*: at § 36: *Ennio delector, ait quispiam, quod non discedit a communi more uerborum. Pacuuius, inquit alius; omnes apud hunc ornati elaboratique sunt uersus, multo apud alterum neglegentius*; and at § 109: *an ego Homero, Ennio, reliquis poetis et maxime tragicis concederem ut ne omnibus locis eadem contentione uterentur crebroque mutarent, non numquam etiam ad cotidianum genus sermonis accederent: ipse numquam ab illa acerrima contentione discederem?*

The Ennian Eurypylus' discourse contains at least two examples of what might be called colloquial looseness: the

<sup>1</sup> Perhaps about pain (cf. Homer, *Il.* XVI 517-19: ἔλκος μὲν γὰρ ἔχω τόδε καρτερόν, ἀμφὶ δὲ μοι χεῖρ | ὀξείης ὀδύνησιν ἐλήλαται, οὐδέ μοι αἷμα | τερσῆναι δύναται) or perspiration (cf. Homer, *Il.* XI 811-13: κατὰ δὲ νότιος ῥέεν ἰδρώς | ὤμων καὶ κεφαλῆς, ἀπὸ δ' ἔλκεος ἀργαλέοιο | αἷμα μέλαν κελάρυζε).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Aul.* 390-91: *aulam maiorem, si pote, ex uicinia | pete*; *Bacch.* 870: *em illoc pacisce, si potes*; *Mil.* 1084: *sinite abeam, si possum, uiua a uobis*; *Persa* 30: *si tu tibi bene esse pote pati, ueni*; *Rud.* 1177: *hunc, si potes, fer intro uidulum*; Terence, *Phorm.* 197: *atque id, si potes, uerbo expedi*; 378-9: *peto, | si tibi placere potis est, mi ut respondeas*; *Hec.* 395-6: *nunc, si potis est, Pamphile, | maxume uolo doque operam ut clam partus eueniat patrem*; 635-6: *ego, Pamphile, esse inter nos, si fieri potest, | adfinitatem hanc sane perpetuam uolo*.

*magis* of *si qui sapientia magis uestra mors deuitari potest*<sup>1</sup> and the *ut participet* of *eum scire oportet sibi paratam pestem, ut participet, parem*. Most modern editors follow Bentley in altering *paratam* in the latter sentence to *paratum* but produce thereby a use of *participare* and the accusative not evidenced before Gellius XV 2, 7<sup>2</sup>. Timpanaro's explanation<sup>3</sup> of the transmitted text as a contamination of ... *sibi paratam pestem parem*<sup>4</sup> with ... *sibi paratum pestem ut participet parem*<sup>5</sup> runs into the same difficulty. If, however, *participet* be taken as the equivalent of *particeps sit* we have a structure of sentence parallel with Plautus, *Epid.* 606: *exitiabilem ego illi faciam hunc, ut fiat, diem*<sup>6</sup>. Plautus uses *participare* both as a factitive verb ("aliquem participem facere")<sup>7</sup> and as an intransitive ("participem esse")<sup>8</sup>. A number of first conjugation denominatives have a similar double function in Republican Latin<sup>9</sup>. Ennius' craggy sentence may therefore be allowed to stand.

In writing with such a wide stylistic range as this the critic can find little firm ground. Nevertheless nowhere in the very copious remains of Republican drama is there a sentence at all like one consisting of the first four iambic tetrameters which Cicero quotes at *Tusc.* II 38. Ribbeck

<sup>1</sup> Bergk wrote *magistra* above *magis uestra* in his copy of Ribbeck's first edition of the tragic fragments (*Kl. phil. Schr.* I 682). For Ennius' use of *magis*, cf. the examples collected by Bulhart at *TLL* VIII 58. 78 ff. under the rubric 'res comparata aliis modis indicatur aut certe subauditur'.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also Apuleius, *Met.* IX 24; *Apol.* 14.

<sup>3</sup> *SIFC* n.s. 21 (1946), 61-2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Epid.* 125: *paratae iam sunt scapulis symbolae*.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Mil.* 295: *tibi iam ut pereas paratum est*.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. also Plautus, *Persa* 760: *ego omnis hilaros ludentis laetificantis faciam, ut fiant*; *Poen.* 453-4: *nec potui tamen | propitiam Venerem facere, uti esset, mihi*.

<sup>7</sup> *Cist.* 165; *Mil.* 232 and 263; *Stich.* 33. Cf. Lucretius III 692.

<sup>8</sup> *Persa* 757; *Truc.* 748.

<sup>9</sup> X. MIGNOT, *Les Verbes dénominatifs latins*, Paris, 1969, p. 282 lists *celerare*, *commodare*, *durare*, *geminare*, *maturare*, *praecipitare* and *superstitare* along with *participare*.

was surely right to propose lacunae before and after *neque sanguis ullo potis est pacto profluens consistere*.

The sentence following the quotations from Eurypylus' address to Patroclus would complete an iambic tetrameter begun with *non potest accedi*:

:: *certe Eurypylus hic quidem est. hominem exercitum.*

Most interpreters follow Bentley in making this an utterance by Patroclus. Pohlenz gives it to Achilles, whom he imagines Eurypylus to be addressing along with Patroclus. There are grave difficulties in both views.

Sentences consisting of *hic quidem est* and a proper name or status indication are indeed common in Roman drama<sup>1</sup>. Such sentences, however, while sometimes preceded by an exclamation of surprise like *atque, attat, attatae, pro di immortales, pro supreme Iuppiter* or *sed*, never are by *certe*. Again, they always come from a speaker at the moment he recognises the person named. A dialogue in which persons receive a direct and rather formal address extending to at least six iambic tetrameters and then express a surprised recognition of the person addressing them would be a dramatic monstrosity. At Plautus, *Persa* 788-9, which is superficially similar to the Bentleyan dialogue, the leno's

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 660: *meus uir hic quidem est*; 1075: *Amphitryo hic quidem <est> erus meus*; *Aul.* 728: *atque hic quidem Euclio est*; *Bacch.* 774: *atque hic quidem, opinor, Chrysalust*; 1105: *hic quidem est pater Mnesilochi*; *Merc.* 365-6: *attatae, | meus pater hic quidem est*; *Mil.* 361-2: *pro di immortales, | eri concubinast haec quidem*; 1283: *naclerus hic quidem est*; *Most* 447: *meus seruos hic quidem est Tranio*; 1063: *erus meus hic quidem est*; *Persa* 14: *Toxilus hic quidem meus amicust*; 201: *Paegnium hic quidem est*; 309: *Sagaristio hic quidem est*; 790: *Dordalus hic quidem est*; *Poen.* 1122-3: *pro supreme Iuppiter, | erus meus hic quidem est*; *Pseud.* 445: *meus hic est quidem seruos Pseudolus*; *Stich.* 238: *Epignomi ancilla haec quidem est Crocotium*; 458: *hic quidem Gelasimus est parasitus*; 464: *Epignomus hic quidem est*; 655: *sed Stichus est hic quidem*; *Trin.* 1055: *meus est hic quidem Stasimus seruos*; *Truc.* 93: *sed haec quidem eius Astaphium est ancillula*; Terence, *Eun.* 228-9: *attat, hic quidem est parasitus Gnatbo | militis*.

*o bone uir,*

*salueto, et tu, bona liberta*

is shouted across a distance to persons turned away from him and Toxilus'

*Dordalus hic quidem est*

is uttered as he sees and recognises the *leno*. An utterance like *Eurypylus hic quidem est* made after Eurypylus' address to Patroclus and his companions could only come from a person standing apart from this group<sup>1</sup> or by a new entrant.

A further point is that *certe* at the head of a statement in dramatic dialogue does not signal novelty but rather takes up a previous utterance in some way. Used alone it confirms the belief of the person who has asked a question, whether this is the speaker himself or another. An instructive contrast is provided by Plautus, *Bacch.* 534-5: *estne hic hostis quem aspicio meus? | certe is est*; *Trin.* 1071-2: *estne ipsus an non est? certe is es, | is est profecto*; Terence, *Andr.* 906: *Andrium ego Critonem uideo? certe is est*; *Ad.* 78: *sed estne hic ipsus de quo agebam? et certe is est* on the one hand and Plautus, *Amph.* 1072-5: *quis hic est senex qui ante aedis nostras sic iacet? ... Amphitryo hic quidem <est> erus meus*; *Aul.* 727-8: *quinam homo hic ante aedis nostras eiulans conqueritur maerens? | atque hic quidem Euclio est*; *Bacch.* 773-4: *quis loquitur prope? | atque hic quidem, opinor, Chrysalust*<sup>2</sup> on the other. Followed by *equidem* the adverb counters or corrects the implication of a previous statement; as at Plautus, *Mil.* 430-33: *persecutari hic uolo, | Sceledre, nos nostri an alieni ... :: certe equidem*

<sup>1</sup> During the time between Charmides' question *sed quis hic est qui huc in plateam cursuram incipit?* at *Trin.* 1006 and his recognition of Stasimus at v. 1055: *meus est hic quidem Stasimus seruos* there is no contact between the two personages.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Bacch.* 1104-5; *Mil.* 361-2 and 1281-3; *Persa* 13-14, 200-201 and 308-9; *Poen.* 1122-3; *Pseud.* 445; *Stich.* 237-8; *Trin.* 1006-1055; Terence, *Eun.* 228.

*noster sum*; *Persa* 208-9: *feminam scelestam te astans contra contuor.* | :: *certe equidem puerum peiorem quam te noui neminem*<sup>1</sup>. It would seem therefore to be no accident that the collocation *certe hic quidem* does not occur in dramatic dialogue<sup>2</sup>.

Ribbeck gave *certe Eurypylus hic quidem est. hominem exercitum* to Cicero. The same considerations, however, just adduced concerning the usage of *certe* in drama also apply to the usage of Cicero's letters, speeches and dialogues. I suggest therefore that at *Tusc.* II 38 Cicero imagines his interlocutor mentally asking whether the verses just quoted come from the famous scene showing the wounded Eurypylus and represents himself answering with *certe* ("of course") and following up with a quotation of something said in the course of the scene, namely *Eurypylus hic quidem est. hominem exercitum*, words which would form the end of an iambic trimeter, an iambic tetrameter (acatalectic) or a trochaic tetrameter (catalectic)<sup>3</sup>.

Where the speaker of *Eurypylus hic quidem est. hominem exercitum* is concerned, there are three possibilities: (i) Achilles entering the stage unobserved during Eurypylus' address to Patroclus or (ii) Patroclus already on stage and overhearing a monody or monologue uttered by Eurypylus as he enters the stage or (iii) the chorus in similar circumstances. The latter two possibilities would entail that Cicero doubled back

<sup>1</sup> *Certe* sometimes follows *quidem* in a statement (cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 417; *Bacch.* 1177; *Truc.* 963) but the words refer to separate elements of the statement.

<sup>2</sup> *Certe* (Accius, *Trag.* 268) and *quidem* (Ennius ap. Varr. *LL* VII, 93 [= *Sc.* 419]) occur only once each in the remains of tragedy, each word possessing perhaps already a slightly unpoetic tone, and so the absence of collocation is not significant. Both words occur frequently in the remains of comedy on the other hand and these are quite sufficiently extensive to allow firm deductions.

<sup>3</sup> For *certe* in reply to a question cf. Terence, *Haut.* 431 *uenit?* :: *certe*; for *certe* after the quotation of another person's statement cf. Cicero, *Sest.* 77 '*atque uis in foro uersata est*'. *certe. quando enim maior?*

to an earlier point in the tragic episode for his quotation<sup>1</sup>. An eavesdropping Myrmidon king seems somewhat implausible and can be ruled out. The degree of sympathy evinced by the exclamation *hominem exercitum*<sup>2</sup> suggests the chorus rather than the unfeeling<sup>3</sup> inquisitor Patroclus.

Something has gone wrong with the text of Cicero's next phrase, *ubi tantum luctum continuatus*. However one corrects it, it must refer to *luctus* on stage. Patroclus is represented as merely inquisitive<sup>4</sup>, Eurypylus as an uncomplaining proto-Stoic. I suggest therefore that Cicero had in mind the reaction of the chorus to the sight of Eurypylus stumbling along as the result of his wound rather than treading militarily<sup>5</sup>.

Following the exclamation *uide quam non flebiliter respondeat, rationem etiam adferat, cur aequo animo sibi ferendum sit* an undoubted quotation begins:

*qui alteri exitium parat  
eum scire oportet sibi paratam pestem, ut participet, parem.*

This is usually treated as the full reply to an unquoted question from Patroclus. I suggest that Cicero is still concerned with the dialogue between Eurypylus and the chorus, i.e. that Eurypylus answered a question about how he

<sup>1</sup> In comedy the person recognised has usually uttered something. At Plautus, *Most.* 1063 and *Truc.* 93 there has been offstage noise preceding the person's entry.

<sup>2</sup> For the force of *exercitus* here cf. Plautus, *Epid.* 529; *Merc.* 65 and 228; *Persa* 856 et al. For the exclamatory accusative cf. Plautus, *Amph.* fr. VI *ut † laruatus † edepol hominem miserum. medicum quaeritat.*

<sup>3</sup> Cf., however, Homer, *Il.* XI 814-15.

<sup>4</sup> M. SEYFFERT (Leipzig, 1864) made *heu exercitum ubi tantum luctus continuatur* words uttered by Patroclus.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the reaction of the chorus in a parallel scene at Euripides, *Phoen.* 1350-1: ἀνάγετ' ἀνάγετε κωκυτόν, ἐπὶ κάρα τε λευκοπήχεις κτύπους χεροῖν.

received his wound, prefixing his answer with the gnome which Cicero quotes.

Cicero's next statement, *abducat Patricoles, credo, ut conlocet in cubili, ut uolnus obliget*, has not been forced by anyone into verse. The alliteration, however, the asyndeton and the anaphora have the flavour of archaic poetry. I suggest, therefore, that Cicero has adapted to his own discourse a hopeful prophecy by the Ennian chorus. The following statement, *si quidem homo esset; sed nihil uidi minus* dismisses the prophecy.

With *quaerit enim quid actum sit* Cicero leaps forward to the dialogue between Eurypylus and Patroclus. The iambic tetrameter.

*eloquere, eloquere res Argium proelio ut se sustinet*

is Patroclus' question. What Cicero quotes of Eurypylus' reply, consisting of a full acatalectic iambic tetrameter and the first three elements of a second

*non potest ecfari tantum dictis quantum factis suppetit  
laboris*

is probably complete in itself. To judge, however, by the structurally parallel dialogue at Terence, *Hec.* 415-23 :

*:: ain tu tibi hoc incommodum euenisse iter?  
:: non hercle uerbis, Parmeno, dici potest  
tantum quam re ipsa nauigare incommodumst.  
:: itan est? :: o fortunate, nescis quid mali  
praeterieris qui numquam es ingressus mare.  
nam alias ut mittam miserias, unam hanc uide :  
dies triginta aut plus eo in nauis fui  
quom interea semper mortem exspectabam miser ;  
ita usque aduorsa tempestate usi sumus.*

Eurypylus would have continued his answer after a further enquiry from Patroclus.

The next two sentences, *quiesce igitur et uolnus alliga* and *etiam si Eurypylus posset non posset Aesopus*, are understood by many as addressed by Cicero in his own voice to Patroclus with reference to the dialogue quoted. The point of *igitur* becomes obscure and *ecfari* has to be supplied with *posset*, producing a quite pointless and tasteless insult to the actor Aesopus. Vahlen and Pohlenz take the first sentence as addressed to Eurypylus but in so doing are forced to interpret *alliga* as "allow yourself to be bound up". The difficulty about *posset* in the second sentence remains. The only way out is to suppose that the two sentences refer to conversation between Eurypylus and Patroclus which Cicero has omitted to quote.

Many critics have tried to treat the first sentence as an actual part of the dialogue between the two heroes but have found themselves obliged to make alterations to the transmitted text: Bentley proposed *PATR. laberis, quiesce. EVR. et uolnus alliga. PATR. tace*; Hermann *EVR. quiesce et uolnus alliga*; Bergk *PATR. tu quiesce igitur et uolnus alligauero*. If it were not for *igitur*, which seems never to be an anapaest in Republican drama, the sentence as transmitted would form the end of an iambic verse. The use of *quiescere* in the sense of *tacere*<sup>1</sup> and perhaps the variation of *uolnus obligare*<sup>2</sup> with *uolnus alligare* give it an unprosaic air. I suggest that Cicero loosely adapted to his own discourse a piece of advice offered to the inquisitive Patroclus by the Ennian chorus. Where the second sentence is concerned, I should supply *quiescere* with *posset* and understand Cicero to be making a joke about stage conventions.

The manner of Cicero's *ubi fortuna Hectoris nostram acrem aciem inclinatam et cetera explicat in dolore* suggests that *ubi*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Ennius ap. Diomed. *Gramm.* I 387, 30 (= *Sc.* 160).

<sup>2</sup> With *medicum modo requirens a quo obligetur* and *ut uolnus obliget* compare *Nat. deor.* III 57: *primusque uolnus dicitur obligauisse*.



*fortuna Hectoris nostram acrem aciem inclinatam* begins a fresh utterance rather than carries on from *non potest ecfari*... One would interpret: "he delivers while in pain the speech beginning *ubi fortuna*..."<sup>1</sup>. This speech was a reply to a specific question about how the survivors of Eurypylus' unit got back to the camp and must have gone to some length. As Eurypylus told the story of the Achaean retreat Patroclus bound his wound.

— d —

The narrative of Homer, *Il.* XI 804-48, on which the episode I have tried to extract from Cicero's argumentative and allusive discourse depends, suffered a number of alterations at the hands of Aristarchus and perhaps also in its turn at those of Ennius. I shall now attempt to elucidate these alterations.

The Homeric Eurypylus limps back into camp with an arrow in his thigh and meets Patroclus in the vicinity of Ulysses' quarters as Patroclus makes his way back across the camp from Nestor's quarters. One of Asclepius' sons, Machaon, lies wounded through the shoulder in Nestor's quarters. The rest of the Achaeans, including Asclepius' other son, Podalirius, are still fighting in the plain. Patroclus puts his arm around Eurypylus' waist, leads him into the latter's own quarters and treats him by removing the missile and sprinkling a pharmaceutical powder upon the site of the wound.

In having the whole action performed or narrated before Achilles' quarters Aristarchus followed the tragic convention of his time<sup>2</sup>. In having one of the heroes, albeit a minor

<sup>1</sup> On whole plays and narrative poems being indicated by their opening words see E. J. KENNEY, *CR* n.s. 20 (1970), 290 and the works there quoted.

<sup>2</sup> See above, p. 57.

one<sup>1</sup>, narrate the details of a battle he departed somewhat from convention. Detailed accounts of happenings off stage which affected the interests of those on stage were ordinarily given by a person of low degree<sup>2</sup>, a private soldier, herald or personal slave, unnamed as a rule in the tragedian's script<sup>3</sup> and dubbed an ἄγγελος by the ancient editors. Aristarchus could have had Eurypylus' ἠνιοχός or ὑπασπιστής come to Achilles' quarters and ask for Patroclus to come to Eurypylus, reporting by the way the details of the battle. He preferred the unusual but highly dramatic device of making one of the highborn participants, Eurypylus himself, report the battle. I can find only one comparable episode in extant Attic scripts, that in which the Sophoclean Hyllus describes to his mother how Hercules donned the shirt steeped in the blood of Nessus<sup>4</sup>. Hyllus was not physically involved in the events he describes, Lichas having carried Deianira's gift to Hercules, but was much more emotionally concerned than any ordinary ἄγγελος could have been. His narrative gained force in the telling from his own situation. The Aristarchean Eurypylus' narrative of the fighting in which he himself had been wounded would have had an even greater emotional impact.

If I am correct in supposing that Ennius made his chorus utter the identifying *Eurypylus hic quidem est* after a monody

<sup>1</sup> On Eurypylus see Homer, *Il.* II 734-7. *Il.* I 144 ff.; II 404 ff. and XIX 40 ff. make it clear that he was not one of the great βασιλῆες.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Aeschylus, *Ag.* 503-680; *Pers.* 249-514; *Theb.* 375-652; Sophocles, *Ai.* 719-83; *Ant.* 223-77; Euripides, *Androm.* 1070-1165; *Bacch.* 1024-1152; *El.* 761-858; *Hec.* 484-582; *Hel.* 1512-1618; *Herc.* 909-1015; *Hcl.* 784-866; *Hipp.* 1153-267; *Ion* 1106-228; *I.A.* 414-39; 1532-612; *I.T.* 1284-419; *Med.* 1116-230; *Orest.* 852-956; *Phoen.* 1067-1199; 1335-479; *Rhes.* 728-803, *Suppl.* 634-770.

<sup>3</sup> Talthybius is the exception who proves the rule.

<sup>4</sup> *Trach.* 733-812. The matter is touched on without mention of the Sophoclean scene by E. FRAENKEL, *De media et noua comoedia quaestiones selectae*, Diss. Göttingen, 1912, pp. 43 ff.

from the wounded hero then Ennius here altered the original script. Attic tragic scripts as a rule did not have an ἄγγελος arriving after a choral ode identified<sup>1</sup>. Where, however, the ἄγγελος arrived in the midst of conversation between actors or between the chorus and an actor he was identified<sup>2</sup>. The identification always came, except in one special case<sup>3</sup>, before the ἄγγελος said anything. A person of high degree making his first appearance, as Eurypylus pretty certainly did in the episode in question, was named either before he reached the centre of the stage or in his own opening speech or in the reply made by the person he addressed. Individual remarks and conversations aside about a newcomer were more the marks of a comic script. Ennius, who had his chorus on the stage platform itself rather than in the area in front of the stage<sup>4</sup> and who, like most, if not all, of his predecessors in the Roman theatre, translated both tragic and comic scripts, seems to have made Eurypylus' entry conform to a local dramatic type.

Ennius almost certainly replaced the metrical pattern of Aristarchus' episode. Extant Attic scripts for the most part have the ἄγγελος arrive uttering iambic trimeters but occasionally, in emotionally tense circumstances, make the piper accompany the newcomer's opening utterance and the utterances of the chorus and the actors already on stage<sup>5</sup>. The narrative, however, always has to be delivered in spoken trimeters<sup>6</sup>. The stichic acatalectic iambic tetrameters with

<sup>1</sup> Cf., however, Aeschylus, *Ag.* 493 ; *Theb.* 369-74 ; Euripides, *Erectheus* fr. 65, 11 Austin ; *Hipp.* 1151-2.

<sup>2</sup> Cf., however, Euripides, *Androm.* 1070 ; *I.A.* 415.

<sup>3</sup> Euripides, *Rhes.* 732.

<sup>4</sup> See above, p. 49.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Herc.* 909 ff. ; *Phoen.* 1335 ff. ; *Rhes.* 728 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Significant is the way in which at Aeschylus, *Pers.* 176 the Persian queen drops from trochaic tetrameters to iambic trimeters in order to give the chorus the details of her dream.

which the Ennian Eurypylus first addresses Patroclus have no analogues in Attic scripts, tragic or comic, except in an episode of Sophocles' satyr play *Ἰχθυεῖται*, where, after the chorus has stated its business to Cyllene and conducted a lengthy conversation with her in trimeters, there is a riddling interchange in tetrameters about the nature of Hermes' lyre<sup>1</sup>. In translating the episode of Aristarchus' *Ἀχιλλεύς* in question Ennius substituted a traditional metrical pattern of the Roman stage, into whose ultimate origins we need not here go but whose popularity is easily illustrated. A fragment of Ennius' *Hecuba*<sup>2</sup> shows that he turned the entry anapaests of the Euripidean heroine into iambic tetrameters<sup>3</sup>. A noisy newcomer to the door of Achilles' quarters in the *Hectoris lytra* seems to have used similar tetrameters<sup>4</sup>. The speech of this play which describes the battle leading to Hector's death was set in trochaic tetrameters<sup>5</sup>; so too the speech of the *Andromeda* which described the slaying of the sea monster<sup>6</sup>. Comic scripts employed the whole pattern visible in Cicero's quotation of the episode of the *Achilles* with conscious ridicule of the sister genre. Whereas Attic comedians regularly made the bringer of news from off stage speak throughout in trimeters<sup>7</sup>, Plautus put many such scenes into musically accompanied verse, lengthening out the news-bringer's opening utterance, filling it full of allusions

<sup>1</sup> 238 ff. Page.

<sup>2</sup> ap. Varr. *LL* VII 6 (= *Sc.* 196).

<sup>3</sup> *Hec.* 59 ff.

<sup>4</sup> ap. Non. pp. 489, 29; 490, 6 (= *Sc.* 156-7). Contrast the noisy entrances at Euripides, *Held.* 646; *I.T.* 1307. At *I.A.* 317 and *Rhes.* 11, however, the piper's music sounds.

<sup>5</sup> See above, p. 53.

<sup>6</sup> ap. Non. pp. 20, 18; 183, 18 (= *Sc.* 114 and 118-19).

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Menander, *Aspis* 1 ff.; *Georgos* 31 ff.; *Sicyonios* 169 ff.; *Naucleros* ap. Athen. 474 c (= fr. 286 Körte).

to heroic legend and raising the level of the style to near the tragic. He favoured the acatalectic iambic tetrameter in particular to open with<sup>1</sup> and only rarely concluded with trimeters<sup>2</sup> rather than trochaic tetrameters.

The occurrence of a number of the Ennian Eurypylus' unusual phrases in Plautus' comic scripts, namely *oppeto malam pestem*<sup>3</sup>, *hostili manu*<sup>4</sup> and *non potest ecfari tantum dictis quantum factis suppetit laboris*<sup>5</sup>, suggests that there existed a large store of traditional scenic vocabulary as well as of metrical patterns upon which the poet could and did draw. It would therefore be idle to come to conclusions about Aristarchus' argumentative and verbal style from the style which Ennius employs in the episode under examination. The extended alliteration and word play of *oppeto ... opplent, peto ... priusquam oppeto ... pestem, potis ... pacto profluens, paratam pestem ... participet parem, manus ... mandatam ... manu*<sup>6</sup> and the rhyming isocolon of *tantum dictis quantum factis*<sup>7</sup> have a very Roman sound. The metaphor in *res Argiuum ... se sustinet* was one which Roman statesmen were probably already using in orations about the community's welfare<sup>8</sup>. The substance of *qui alteri exitium parat eum scire*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Amph.* 153 ff.; 984 ff. and 1053 ff.; *Bacch.* 925 ff.; *Capt.* 516 ff.; *Merc.* 111 ff.; *Poen.* 817 ff.; *Stich.* 274 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Bacch.* 997 ff. (a letter has to be read out).

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Asin.* 21-2: *ut tibi superstes uxor aetatem siet | atque illa uiua uiuos ut pestem oppetas*; *Capt.* 525-6: *neque de hac re negotium est | quin male occidam oppetamque pestem eri uicem meamque*. The normal phrase was *mortem oppetere* (Ennius ap. Non. pp. 494, 3; 507, 19 [= *Sc.* 203]).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Capt.* 311: *tam mihi quam illi libertatem hostilis eripuit manus*.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Pseud.* 108: *utinam quae dicis dictis facta suppetant*.

<sup>6</sup> An exhaustive analysis of the alliterative patterning in Eurypylus' utterances can be found in A. GRILLI, *Studi enniani*, pp. 175 ff.

<sup>7</sup> Cf., however, Aeschylus, *Theb.* 962 ff.; Euripides, *Androm.* 497; *Phoen.* 1292.

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Cicero, *Mur.* 3: *is cui res publica a me iam traditur sustinenda magnis meis laboribus et periculis sustentata*.

*oportet sibi paratam pestem, ut participet, parem* is thoroughly Greek as one may see from Euripides, *Herc.* 727-8 *προσδόκα δὲ δρῶν κακῶς | κακόν τι πράξειν*<sup>1</sup>. It was, however, common practice for the Latin translators of tragedy and comedy to insert such gnomes near the beginnings of speeches, especially where, as here, a higher than usual stylistic effect was being sought<sup>2</sup>. The grim irony with which, as in the phrase *malam pestem mandatam hostili manu*, the language of business and commerce is applied to killing looks Ennian, or at least Roman. The receiver of something *mandatum* ordinarily expected no material remuneration for his trouble<sup>3</sup> but neither did he expect any positive harm to result. *Socii ac participes* of an enterprise expected to gain a profit rather than incur a loss from the delivery of something *paratum*<sup>4</sup>. I should not, however, deny the possibility that Aristarchus employed similar metaphors. Both Aeschylus<sup>5</sup> and Euripides<sup>6</sup> affected on occasion to find a paradoxical likeness between the warrior and the businessman.

I turn now from the form of the tragic episode to the substance of what the actors are made to say.

Ribbeck's supplement of the trochees quoted by Cicero

*ubi fortuna Hectoris nostram acrem aciem inclinatam <dedit>*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Com. inc. 82 *ab alio exspectes alteri quod feceris*. The gnome softened the traditional view expressed at Archilochus, fr. 66 D: *ἐν δ' ἐπίσταμαι μέγα, | τὸν κακῶς με δρῶντα δεινοῖς ἀνταμείβεσθαι κακοῖς* and Aeschylus, *Theb.* 1049: *παθῶν κακῶς κακοῖσιν ἀντημείβετο*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Ennius ap. Cic. *Nat. deor.* III 65 (= *Sc.* 266-8) and Euripides, *Med.* 364 ff.; Terence, *Andr.* 959-60 and Donatus *ad loc.*

<sup>3</sup> On *res mandatae* see Cicero, *S. Rosc.* IIII-III3.

<sup>4</sup> For *parare*, 'acquire through commerce', cf. Plautus, *Most.* 67 et al.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Theb.* 545-6.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. *Phoen.* 1227-8.

is as probable as such supplements can be<sup>1</sup>. The tragic Eurypylus described a much more serious reverse at this point of time than did Homer; a whole unit of the Achaean army had been forced back, whereas in the *Iliad* Ajax had simply retired from in front of the embattled φάλαγγες<sup>2</sup>. Cicero's discourse makes it clear that Eurypylus got an honourable reception. If this reception is contrasted with the accusations of cowardice hurled at the similarly wounded Ulysses in an earlier scene of the play<sup>3</sup>, we may guess that Eurypylus was able to tell of an organised retreat made by the survivors of the Trojan onslaught. The play thus continued to replace the individual combats of the *Iliad* with something like a tactical engagement between fifth century armies. The poet responsible for this alteration of the Homeric narrative was quite certainly Aristarchus.

Rather than *Hector* or *Troiani* the tragic Eurypylus talks of *fortuna Hectoris*. By this phrase Ennius meant either a personal attribute of Hector which conduced to his success or an external success-bringing force which attached itself peculiarly to him. It cannot have the meaning one might expect, namely "Hector's actual success", without causing an intolerable tautology. In any case only the plural *fortunae* seems to be used in this way in extant dramatic texts<sup>4</sup>. In favour of the first interpretation is a fragment of the *Hectoris lytra* already referred to, *Sc.* 180:

<sup>1</sup> For the use of *dare* with the past participle (absent from the prose of Caesar and Cicero) cf. Plautus, *Cas.* 439; *Cist.* 595; *Mil.* 258 and 1174; *Most.* 298; *Persa* 457; *Pseud.* 881 and 926; Terence, *Andr.* 683; *Haut.* 950; *Eum.* 212; *Phorm.* 974; Virgil, *Aen.* XII 437; Livy VIII 6, 6.

<sup>2</sup> If the Latin corresponds with anything in Homer it is *Il.* XI 544: Ζεὺς δὲ πατὴρ Αἴανθ' ὑψιζυγος ἐν φόβον ὄρσε. Where the phraseology is concerned one might compare *Il.* V 37: Τρῶας δ' ἔκλιναν Δαναοί and VI 5-6: Αἴας δὲ πρῶτος... Τρώων ῥῆξε φάλαγγα.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 56 ff.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Asin.* 515; 629 et al.

*saeuiter fortuna ferro cernunt de uictoria*<sup>1</sup>

Here *fortuna* must be an instrumental rather than a circumstantial ablative: luckiness as well as skill in using weapons will decide the outcome of the battle<sup>2</sup>. Where the second interpretation is concerned, it may be noted that the Romans worshipped a number of *Fortunae* with separate spheres of influence, including a *Fortuna populi Romani* whose temple stood on the Quirinal<sup>3</sup>. Ennius may have adapted this latter deity to the more individualistic world of the Achaean and Trojan heroes. The two interpretations suggested do not cancel each other out. In the early second century a number of nouns, e.g. *fides*, *honos*, *mens*, *uenus*, *uirtus*, signalled both personal attributes and external divine forces to which the state paid cult with temples and altars. Certainly the Romans of the Republic valued the luck of the individual commander quite differently from the Greeks of any age, putting it on a level with his courage and tactical skill<sup>4</sup>. There is nothing at all like *fortuna Hectoris nostram acrem aciem inclinatam dedit* in the *Iliad*. Homer usually attributes success in combat to the power of one of the Olympian deities and specifically names the deity on the occasion of the success<sup>5</sup>. In Attic tragic scripts success is occasionally attributed to purely human skill and exertion<sup>6</sup>. Where

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also Livy I 42, 3: *in eo bello et uirtus et fortuna enituit Tulli*; IX 18, 11: *quin tu homines cum homine, duces cum duce, fortunam cum fortuna confers*; XXII 23, 3: *qui bellum ratione, non fortuna gereret*.

<sup>2</sup> *Fortuna ferro cernere* seems to be a unique phrase. For *ferro decernere* cf. Ennius, *Ann.* 133; Virgil, *Aen.* VII 525; XI 218; XII 282; Livy VII 26, 1; XXIII 46, 14; XXVIII 21, 6; XXXIX 15, 14; XL 8, 19.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. K. LATTE, *Römische Religionsgeschichte*, Munich, 1960, p. 178 and note 3.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Antichthon* 3 (1969), 44 f.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. *Il.* XI 318-19; XVI 103; XVI 844-5; XVII 630. At *Il.* VII 288-92 the context makes it clear that by θεός and δαίμων Hector means Ζεύς.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Hcl.* 841-2; *Suppl.* 703-5 and 714-18.



external agencies are admitted the speaker may use Homeric terms<sup>1</sup> but will more often speak of an undefined θεός<sup>2</sup> or δαίμων<sup>3</sup> or θεοί<sup>4</sup> or even ἡ τύχη<sup>5</sup>. Human and non-human agencies are as a rule kept rigidly distinct. The only approximation to the ideas in *fortuna Hectoris nostram acrem aciem inclinatam dedit* that I can find in extant Attic scripts is at Euripides, *Suppl.* 589-93: σοὶ δὲ προστάσσω μένειν Ἄδραστε κάμοι μὴ ἀναμίγνυσθαι τύχας | τὰς σάς. ἐγὼ γὰρ δαίμονος τοῦμοῦ μέτα | στρατηλατήσω κλεινὸς ἐν κλεινῷ δορί<sup>6</sup>. Ennius seems to have regarded contemporary ideas about the factors in military success more than the actual text of Aristarchus' Ἀχιλλεύς.

The tragic Eurypylus had his wound bandaged—quite different treatment from what he received in Homer's narrative<sup>7</sup>. The *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* have two references to bandaging<sup>8</sup>, both in descriptions of immediate first aid. Wounds are normally treated with φάρμακα<sup>9</sup> and the function of the military surgeon is described at *Il.* XI 514-15 without any reference to bandages:

ἰητρὸς γὰρ ἀνὴρ πολλῶν ἀντάξιός ἄλλων  
 ἰοὺς τ' ἐκτάμνειν ἐπὶ τ' ἥπια φάρμακα πάσσειν.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Rhes.* 319-20.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Rhes.* 64, 583-4, 597-8, *Suppl.* 596-7.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Rhes.* 995-6.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Aeschylus, *Theb.* 417-18.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. Sophocles, *Ant.* 328.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Aeschylus, *Ag.* 1568-70: ἐγὼ δ' οὖν | ἐθέλω δαίμονι τῷ Πλεισθενιδᾶν | ὄρκους θεμένη τάδε μὲν στέργειν. Menander, Fr. 714, 1-3 Körte: ἅπαντι δαίμων ἀνδρὶ συμπάριστᾶται | εὐθὺς γενομένῳ, μυσταγωγὸς τοῦ βίου | ἀγαθός.

<sup>7</sup> *Il.* XI 828-32 and 842-8.

<sup>8</sup> *Il.* XIII 598 ff.; *Od.* XIX 456 ff.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. *Il.* IV 189 ff.; V 401 ff.; V 899 ff. See also Virgil, *Aen.* VII 758; XII 391-406. Silius, however, has men bandaged at *Pun.* VI 68-93 (contrast V 344-368).

Nevertheless quite complex bandaging procedures were in use by the time of Aristarchus<sup>1</sup> and vase painters felt able to represent them in heroic scenes<sup>2</sup>. We may suppose that it was Aristarchus who caused Eurypylus to be bandaged. 'There could have been no arrow protruding from Eurypylus' thigh demanded by the Ennian script. If there had been Cicero would surely have mentioned it. This lack of realism, or avoidance of sensationalism, may also be attributed to Aristarchus.

The address of the tragic Eurypylus to Patroclus refers to the quarters of Machaon and Podalirius as if they were camp hospitals. Now in the *Iliad* the sons of Asclepius are fighting βασιλῆες, like Eurypylus except that they had superior medical skills; professional surgeons are as rare as bandages<sup>3</sup>. Nowhere in the *Iliad* are a number of wounded men treated in the one place<sup>4</sup>. The Homeric Achilles had an αἴθουσα (*porticus*) in his κλισίη<sup>5</sup> and Aristarchus might conceivably have put similarly elaborate structures anywhere in the Achaean camp<sup>6</sup>. If camp hospitals existed in the fifth century he could have turned the quarters of Machaon and Podalirius into hospitals or Machaon and Podalirius themselves into hospital supervisors, if not professional surgeons. It is unlikely, however, that such hospitals did exist in this century. Accounts of Greek armies on campaign in the next century mention ἰατροί often

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Hippocrates, *Medic.* 3 (9, 208), *Ulc.* 1 ff. (6, 400 ff.).

<sup>2</sup> Cf. the late sixth century painting of Achilles tending Patroclus (BEAZLEY, *ARV*<sup>2</sup> I p. 21).

<sup>3</sup> Anonymous ἰητροί are mentioned only at *Il.* XIII 213 and XVI 28.

<sup>4</sup> At *Il.* XI 658-9: οἱ γὰρ ἄριστοι | ἐν νηυσὶν κέαται βεβλημένοι οὐτάμενοί τε. At XI 825-7: οἱ μὲν γὰρ δὴ πάντες, ὅσοι πάρος ἦσαν ἄριστοι, | ἐν νηυσὶν κέαται βεβλημένοι οὐτάμενοί τε | χερσὶν ὑπο Τρώων.

<sup>5</sup> *Il.* XXIV 644.

<sup>6</sup> Αἴθουσα and στόα do not occur in the remains of tragedy; παστάς occurs at Sophocles, *Ant.* 1207 and Euripides, *Or.* 1371.

enough<sup>1</sup> but never camp hospitals<sup>2</sup>. This is no accident for Greek generals as a rule encamped their forces in a naturally protected position and rarely put up artificial defence works<sup>3</sup>. Their camps were notoriously lacking in orderliness<sup>4</sup>. It is significant, I think, that the Hector of Euripides' 'Pῆσος has the wounded Thracian charioteer sent to his palace in Troy for treatment<sup>5</sup>, not to any surgeons accompanying the Trojan forces.

*Aesculapi liberorum . . . porticus* is, I suggest, Ennius' transposition into heroic terms of a contemporary Roman camp *ualetudinarium*. The noun *porticus* could denote a temporary verandah made from wood and canvas<sup>6</sup> as well as a permanent colonnade of stone and the working surgeon notoriously needed the light such structures could afford<sup>7</sup>. The fragment of the *Hectoris lytra* quoted by Nonius at p. 355, 3 (= *Sc.* 158-159)

*Hector ui summa armatos educit foras  
castrisque castra ultro iam ferre occupat*

and discussed earlier shows how prone Ennius was to merge the practices of the armies of his own time with what he found described in Attic tragedies.

It will be said with some justice that nothing at all is recorded about medical services in the Roman army in the

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Xenophon, *Lac.* 13, 7; *Anab.* III 4, 30; *Cyr.* I 6, 15; III 2, 12; V 4, 17. See also Hippocrates, *Medic.* 14 (9, 218), Onasander I 13-14.

<sup>2</sup> The implication of Xenophon, *Cyr.* V 4, 17 is that Cyrus did not have anything of the sort in the camps he set up.

<sup>3</sup> See above, p. 53, n. 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Polybius VI 42.

<sup>5</sup> See vv. 872 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Caesar, *Ciu.* II 2, 3; Columella VII 9, 9; VIII 11, 3; VIII 14, 1; IX *praef.* 2; IX 7, 4; IX 14, 14.

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Hippocrates, *Med.* 2 (9, 206), Galen ad Hippocr. *Off.* 8 (18B, 678).

time of Ennius<sup>1</sup> and argued that the *ualetudinaria* described by 'Hyginus' in his account of the permanent imperial camp<sup>2</sup> and the *optiones ualetudinarii* of imperial inscriptions<sup>3</sup> had no early Republican forerunners. Now, certainly, Polybius does not mention anything like them in his account of second century Roman methods of quartering troops<sup>4</sup>. But neither does he mention armourers or animal attendants or the like. And when, at a later point of his history<sup>5</sup>, he describes the Roman method of distributing the spoils of victory he refers to οἱ ἀρρωστοῦντες as a separate category alongside the camp garrison, the reserves and those on special duties. Clearly the wounded were not left to die on the field or to look after themselves. One would indeed expect the care of those likely to be again militarily useful to be organised as diligently as the building of the rampart and the laying out of the camp streets and assembly places, activities which always surprised Greek observers<sup>6</sup>. The links in this argument are tenuous but everything tends towards the conclusion that Ennius put a second century Roman *ualetudinarium* into the Achaean camp before Troy<sup>7</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> For speculation see E. H. BYRNE, *Medicine in the Roman Army*, *CJ* 5 (1909-10), 271 ff.; O. JACOB, *AC* 2 (1933), 313 ff.; J. HARMAND, *L'Armée et le soldat à Rome de 107 à 50 avant notre ère*, Paris, 1967, pp. 201-9.

<sup>2</sup> *Munit. castr.* 4, 35. Cf. Vegetius II 10 on the *aegri contubernales*, Macer, *Dig.* XLIX 16, 12, 2 on inspection of the 'ualetudinarii'. For the identification of *ualetudinaria* in remains of imperial *castra* see R. SCHULTZE, *Bonn. Jahrb.* 139 (1934), 54 ff. and I. A. RICHMOND, *Proc. Brit. Ac.* 41 (1955), 315.

<sup>3</sup> *CIL* VIII 2553; 18047; IX 1617.

<sup>4</sup> VI 27, 1-31, 9.

<sup>5</sup> X 16, 5.

<sup>6</sup> See above, p. 53, n. 2.

<sup>7</sup> However one interprets them, Cicero, *Tusc.* II 39 and the passage of Ennius there quoted provide no evidence for military conditions at the time the *Tusculans* were written. On the other hand it cannot be argued from the fact that some high ranking officers took private physicians on campaign with them at this time (see Brutus ap. Cic., *ad Brut.* I 6, 2; Suetonius, *Aug.* 11;

## IV. — CONCERNING THE SABINAE

It is clear from the similarity between the series of questions addressed by the Euripidean Jocasta to her son Polynices come into Thebes to parley

φέρ', ἦν ἔλῃς γῆν τήνδ' — μὴ τύχοι ποτέ —  
 πρὸς θεῶν, τρόπαια πῶς ἀναστήσεις Διῖ;  
 πῶς δ' αὖ κατάρξῃ θυμάτων, ἐλὼν πάτραν,  
 καὶ σκῦλα γράψεις πῶς ἐπ' Ἰνάχου ῥοαῖς;  
 Θήβας πυρώσας τάσδε Πολυνείκης θεοῖς  
 ἀσπίδας ἔθηκε<sup>1</sup>;

and the words quoted by the fourth century rhetorician Julius Victor<sup>2</sup> from Ennius' *Sabinae*

*cum spolia generis detraxeritis, quam inscriptionem dabitis?*

that the Latin poet's knowledge of Attic tragedy affected greatly the way in which he handled stories not previously reduced to dramatic form<sup>3</sup>. The relationship of Roman historical drama to Attic tragedy continued long afterwards to be a close one. The dialogue between the Accian Tarquin and his councillors quoted by Cicero at *Div.* I 44-5 had as its base that between the Persian queen and the chorus of the Πέρσαι concerning the queen's dream<sup>4</sup>.

Plutarch, *Cato min.* 70, 2) that no general provision was made for looking after those wounded in battle.

<sup>1</sup> *Phoen.* 571-6.

<sup>2</sup> P. 402. 30 Halm, writing *de locis post rem.* Victor must be using a fairly ancient source. The second century orator C. Fannius is also cited in this chapter of his work. Cato is quoted at p. 448, 3 and the reading of *comoediae ueteres et togatae et tabernariae et Atellanae fabulae et mimofabulae* recommended at p. 447, 32.

<sup>3</sup> I leave to one side the theory of W. SOLTAU (*Die Anfänge der römischen Geschichtsschreibung*, Leipzig, 1909, pp. 31 ff.) that Ennius actually invented the story of the Sabine women.

<sup>4</sup> 159-225.

In his reconstruction of the *Sabinae* Ribbeck<sup>1</sup> imagined an episode like that described by Livy<sup>2</sup>, Ovid<sup>3</sup> and Plutarch<sup>4</sup>, in which Hersilia and others of the Sabine women intervened between the embattled armies of Tatius and Romulus<sup>5</sup>. This flouts all that we know of the conventions of tragedy. The nature of the episode from which Victor's quotation comes must be reconsidered.

It is necessary, however, first to point out that the text of the quotation is even more corrupt than has been imagined and that the connection between it and Euripides, *Phoen.* 571-6, suggested by Vahlen and commonly accepted<sup>6</sup>, is far from straightforward.

Ian's *generis* for the transmitted *generi*<sup>7</sup> seems probable enough. It remains, however, impossible to make the words fit any known pattern of Republican dramatic verse<sup>8</sup>. The two clauses, *cum spolia generis detraxeritis* and *quam inscriptionem dabit*<sup>9</sup>, form in themselves unexceptional iambic

<sup>1</sup> *Die römische Tragödie*, p. 206. VAHLEN, *RhM* 16 (1861), 580 (= *Ges. phil. Schr.* I 418) was first to suggest that Victor, whose work was first printed in 1823, was quoting from a *fabula praetexta*.

<sup>2</sup> I 13, 1-3.

<sup>3</sup> *Fast.* III 205-228.

<sup>4</sup> *Romul.* 19, 1-5.

<sup>5</sup> Ribbeck's reconstruction is followed by F. LEO, *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* I, Berlin 1913, p. 197.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. G. WILLIAMS, *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*, Oxford, 1968, p. 254.

<sup>7</sup> See the second volume of his Macrobius (Quedlinburg and Leipzig, 1852) p. 527. M. LEUMANN, *TLL* VI ii 1770, 31, s.v. *gener*, thinks that *generi* can stand as a genitive singular. The dative, however, appears regularly with *spolia detrabere* (Varro ap. Fest. p. 189; Livy IV 19, 5; IV 20, 6; XXX 44, 10).

<sup>8</sup> T. BERGK, *Philologus* 33 (1874), 294 (= *Kl. Schr.* I 361) argued that Victor paraphrases in prose something from the *Annals*. S. MARIOTTI, *Lezioni su Ennio*, Pesaro, 1951, p. 134 suggested a measurement in Reizian cola but withdrew it in the 1963 reprint of this book.

<sup>9</sup> Ian's *dicabit* is unnecessary. for the type of phrase cf. Ennius' *orationem dare* (*Sc.* 306) and Livy's *impressionem dare* (IV 28, 6).

sequences and in this shape Vahlen leaves them <sup>1</sup>. Ribbeck follows Lucian Mueller in inserting *patres* after *quam*. Warmington marks a lacuna the size of a cretic after *destraxeritis*. I suggest that much more has been omitted, at the very least a reference to where the alleged fathers-in-law will put the *spolia* they take. They might be hung on a battlefield *τρόπαιον* <sup>2</sup>, dedicated in the temple of a deity <sup>3</sup>, or nailed up in the principal room of a private house <sup>4</sup>. Only then was there a question of inscribing them <sup>5</sup>. It is significant that Leo has to supplement considerably his paraphrase of the Ennian words: "wenn ihr den Leichen eurer Schwiegersöhne die Rüstungen abzieht *und sie als Tropäon aufstellt*, welche Inschrift wollt ihr darauf setzen, *um euern Sieg zu feiern?*" <sup>6</sup> I leave it to others to guess at the Latin of the missing discourse but warn against the use of Euripides, *Phoen.* 571-6 either in doing this or in mentally interpreting the transmitted Ennian words.

Upon his ἦν ἔλης γῆν τήνδ' Euripides hung three sarcastic questions, one about *τρόπαια* to be set up on the plain before Thebes, one about *θύματα* of thanksgiving and one about the inscription of armour dedicated in the temples of Argos. Here, as often elsewhere <sup>7</sup>, he imported the practices of contemporary Greek states into the heroic world. Homer knew

<sup>1</sup> In his first edition Vahlen wrote *quam* <inpie> *inscriptionem dabit*; at *RbM* 16 (1861), 580 (= *Ges. phil. Schr.* I 418) *quam* <nam> *inscriptionem dabit*.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Sophocles, *Ant.* 142-3; Euripides, *Hcl.* 786-7.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Homer, *Il.* VII 81-3; Aeschylus, *Ag.* 577-9; *Theb.* 276-8; Livy I 10, 4-7; IV 20, 3-11.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Aeschylus, *Theb.* 478-9; Sophocles, *Phil.* 1428-9; Polybius VI 39, 10; Livy X 7, 9 and XXIII 23, 6.

<sup>5</sup> For a very curious interpretation of Ennius' meaning cf. W. KLUG, *TLL* VII i 1849. 80, s.v. *inscriptio*.

<sup>6</sup> *Geschichte*, p. 197. The italics are mine.

<sup>7</sup> See above, pp. 56 ff.

of sacrifices of thanksgiving for victory<sup>1</sup> and the dedication of captured armour to deities<sup>2</sup> but nothing of *τρόπαια*<sup>3</sup> or of inscriptions<sup>4</sup>. The emotional effect of the first Euripidean question depended on the fact that Eteocles and Polynices came from the one *οἶκος* and shared one household god, *Ζεὺς ἐρκεῖος*. It would have been peculiarly impious for one to dedicate the armour of the other to *Ζεὺς τροπαῖος*. Ennius certainly had Euripides in mind when he wrote the *Sabinae* but the customs of the people in whose language he was writing differed from Athenian customs. The Romans of the early second century had no equivalent of *Ζεὺς ἐρκεῖος*. Their *Lares* were associated more with the earth than with the upper air. They left nothing on a field of battle except the corpses of the enemy<sup>5</sup>. Their nearest equivalent of *Ζεὺς τροπαῖος* was *Iuppiter feretrius* but they dedicated captured armour to this god in a temple in Rome itself rather than on a battle field memorial<sup>6</sup>. When we consider how much liberty Ennius permitted himself with the customs and practices described in the Attic plays he actually translated we may be certain that in writing plays like the *Sabinae* he would have ensured that the customs of heroic Italy did not diverge too far from those of the second century<sup>7</sup>. It is most unlikely that the speaker of *cum spolia generis detraxeritis . . . quam inscriptionem dabitis?* referred to *τρόπαια*.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Il.* IV 119-21.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. *Il.* VII 81-3.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Thucydides II 92, 4-5 ; Gorgias, *Epitaph.* (fr. 6 Diels-Kranz).

<sup>4</sup> Cf. the helmet dedicated by Hiero to Olympian Zeus in 474 (*SIG*<sup>3</sup> 35 B.a.).

<sup>5</sup> The Romans seem to have first set up a trophy on a field of battle in 121 BC (Florus I 37, 6: *cum hic mos inusitatus fuerit nostris*).

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Livy I 10, 4-7 and IV 20, 3-11 ; Plutarch, *Marcell.* 7-8 ; Virgil, *Aen.* VI 855-9 and Servius *ad loc.*

<sup>7</sup> Cf. Terence's excision of Apollodorus' reference to a mourner having his hair cut *ne externis moribus spectatorem Romanum offenderet* (Donatus, *Ter. Phorm.* 91).



Two possibilities are left, one that the *spolia* were to be nailed up in Sabine houses, the second that they were to be dedicated in temples. Consideration of second century Roman practice with regard to *spolia* seems to exclude the first. Whatever the heroes of Homer might have done, ordinary Roman fighting men were not permitted to strip corpses during a battle. Those detailed to do so afterwards did not themselves have the disposal of what they took<sup>1</sup>. The commanding officer distributed items to reward acts of bravery<sup>2</sup> and supervised the burning of what might have been previously vowed to some deity<sup>3</sup>. Those who received an item as decoration would nail it up in a prominent position in the family house<sup>4</sup>. If, however, the commanding officer himself slew the enemy's leader he could dedicate the latter's armour in the temple of *Iuppiter feretrius*<sup>5</sup> and have it suitably inscribed. Ennius, it would seem, had the dedication of *spolia opima* in mind when he wrote *cum spolia generis detraxeritis . . . quam inscriptionem dabitis?*

We can now turn to the problem of where in Ennius' *Sabinae* the words which Victor quotes stood. Attic tragedies were always set in front of a temple or a palace or military commander's quarters, never on a field of battle<sup>6</sup>. If, as there is good reason to suppose, Roman historical dramas followed Attic conventions, then Ennius' *Sabinae* must have been set in the Sabine camp. This is precisely whither Dionysius, in his version of the story<sup>7</sup> had Hersilia lead her

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Polybius X 16, 2-9.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Polybius VI 39, 10.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Livy I 37, 5; VIII 1, 6; VIII 10, 13; VIII 30, 8; X 29, 18; XXIII 46, 5; XXX 6, 9; XLI 12, 6; XLV 33, 2.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. (in addition to Polybius VI 39, 10) Livy X 7, 9 and XXIII 23, 6.

<sup>5</sup> See above, p. 85, n. 6.

<sup>6</sup> See above, pp. 56 ff.

<sup>7</sup> *Ant. Rom.* II 45-46.

embassy. One must, however, be careful of the Attic analogy. Comparison of the title *Sabinae* with the like of 'Ικετίδες, Εὐμενίδες, Τραχίνιαι, Βάκχαι and Φοίνισσαι might seem to support the view that Hersilia's companions formed a chorus of the Attic type. Such a chorus, however, would have had to be present from near the beginning of the play right to the end. Hersilia's companions could have formed at most a παραχορήγημα of the type found in the 'Ιππόλυτος and the 'Αλέξανδρος<sup>1</sup>. I suggest that Ennius did write a part for a group present through most of the play and that it consisted of Sabine men. These were included in Hersilia's address as the chorus of the *Achilles* were included in Eurypylus' address to Patroclus. *Sabinae* would be a title like the Euripidean 'Ηρακλεΐδαι.

There remains the question of who the individual was whom Hersilia addressed. The historians' accounts<sup>2</sup> might lead one to think that it was Tatius, the king of Cures and leader of the Sabine alliance. Yet the tone of what Hersilia says suggests that the man she is primarily addressing is her own father and that the husband she has primarily in mind is her own. On the other hand, her words imply the prospect of a combat between leaders, like the one between Romulus and the king of Caenina or the one between Claudius Marcellus and the Gallic chieftain Viridumar. We are thus brought up against a situation familiar to students of the *Annals*, namely conflict between the poet's version of early Roman history and that of the prose annalists. I suggest that in the *Sabinae* Hersilia was cast as the wife of Romulus, as indeed she was by many of the prose annalists<sup>3</sup>, that her

<sup>1</sup> See schol. Eurip. *Hipp.* 58.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Cn. Gellius ap. Gell. XIII 23, 13; Livy I 13, 1-5; Ovid, *Fast.* III 205-28; Dionysius Hal. *Ant. Rom.* II 45-6; Plutarch, *Romul.* 19, 1-5.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. Livy I 11, 2; Plutarch, *Romul.* 14, 7. For the story that Romulus assigned her to Hostus Hostilius see Dionysius Hal. *Ant. Rom.* III 1, 2; Plutarch, *Romul.* 14, 7; Macrobius, *Sat.* I 6, 16.

father Hersilius, whom the annalists ignore, was the principal Sabine leader, a kind of Hector or Turnus, and that Tatius remained in the background, a kind of Priam or Latinus. Ennius would have set his play in front of the quarters of Hersilius and formed the chorus out of *uigiles* like those in the *Hectoris lytra*. This is a tenuous hypothesis, you may say, but one consonant, I think, with the particular evidence provided by Victor's quotation and the general tendencies observable in Attic plays and their Roman adaptations.

## DISCUSSION

*M. Skutsch*: If I may begin with two minor questions they would be: (a) You did not mean to suggest that either comedy or Latin play was as assiduously cultivated by Ennius as Greek tragedy? (b) Can it really be said that the situation in Aristarchos is more urgent than in Homer?

*M. Jocelyn*: To question (a) I should say no. To question (b) I should say yes, but not very dogmatically.

\* \* \*

*M. Badian*: I did not quite understand your interpretation of *Sc.* 179: in what sort of context would you place it? It seems to me highly dramatic and rhetorical in form—particularly if you take the *qui* to be an ablative—and difficult to fit into a mere narrative as it stands.

*M. Jocelyn*: I do not fully understand *Sc.* 179 either as it is transmitted or as Junius emended it. It looks, as I said, at first sight like a remark made by some person between the despoilment of Patroclus' corpse and Achilles' acquisition of a new set of armour. My tentative suggestion was that someone quoted the remark in a conversation held during the night on which Priam ransomed Hector's corpse.

*M. Waszink*: How are we to translate this verse? Is *qui* an interrogative or a relative pronoun? I wonder whether there is not a very sarcastic tone here: "Are there not brave men here who want to give arms to Achilles, in order to be lazy (far from the battle) themselves?"

*M. Jocelyn*: I remain unwilling to offer a full interpretation of *Sc.* 179.

*M. Skutsch*: The greatest difficulty about Mr. Jocelyn's reconstruction of the *Hectoris Lytra* seems to me this: quite apart from line 179 there are several other fragments, 180, 181, 182, which it would perhaps be barely possible to account for in a play as envisaged by Mr. Jocelyn but which taken together with 179 rule out a play strictly to be called *Hectoris Lytra*. Therefore we must either assume that Aristarchos' play included the Trojan attack, the death of Patroclus, the death of Hector and Priam's visits to Achilles—an assumption which seems impossible to me—or we must conclude that a whole trilogy went under a title properly—and perhaps to begin with only—belonging to the third play.

*M. Jocelyn*: Mr. Skutsch's suggestion is a very interesting one but no exact parallel for such a method of citing tragedies exists even among Greek writers. *Sc.* 180, 181, 182 do not worry me but I must confess that *Sc.* 179 does.

*M. Suerbaum*: Die Fragmente mit den Kampfschilderungen (*Sc.* 181-184) müssen auf jeden Fall aus einem Botenbericht stammen, der vermutlich vor Priamus erstattet wird und möglicherweise den Tod Hektors behandelt. Der Vers *Sc.* 179 ist aber in einem solchen Botenbericht nicht vorstellbar.

\* \* \*

*M. Badian*: To turn to the historical interpretation you suggested for the passage from Cicero, *Pro S. Roscio*: I cannot see how you can dissociate the Ennian line Cicero quotes from the "slaughter" at the *lacus Seruilius*, especially since the line contains *ibi*, which seems to refer (*prima facie*) to the same place and occasion; i.e., if the slaughter at the *lacus Seruilius* refers to the proscriptions, then the line ought to do so as well, embroider-

ing the same theme. If you want it to refer to something totally different, a series of legal actions by the anti-Sullans, preceding and (in part) causing the slaughter at the *lacus Seruilius*—then I can only say that Cicero has expressed himself with unreasonable obscurity and incoherence. That is, unless you have evidence (of which I am not aware at the moment) that the *lacus Seruilius* (referred to by *ibi*) had a proverbial association with prosecution which would suffice to make that meaning clear despite the *prima facie* reference to the proscriptions, with which—even apart from this passage—the *lacus* is particularly associated in our sources.

*M. Suerbaum* : Das Ennius-Zitat (173) muss in Ciceros Kontext eine bestimmte Pointe haben, nach der *Phryges (ferro Brygio) Sullani* sind.

*M. Badian* : I agree that we must look for more than the use of the verse as mere superficial decoration. The scholiast at least did so, and succeeds in giving it some contemporary point. He may well be right, for all we can tell—the allusion would be sufficiently veiled for Cicero to plead innocence if Sulla disliked it. But is there not a far more obvious interpretation of “Phrygian swords”? (I am assuming that I am right in maintaining the traditional interpretation of the line as referring to the proscriptions). An army had just been brought back from Asia Minor to conquer Rome, and this army had in fact executed the slaughter of the proscriptions. The audience can hardly have failed to think of the “Phrygian swords” as Sulla’s army. One might add that Mithridates, the enemy of Rome, had become Sulla’s ally and furnished him with supplies for the attack on Italy.

*M. Jocelyn* : I still find the scholiast’s explanation beyond belief. Mr. Badian’s explanation is much more plausible. Even so, to refer to Sulla’s army as a pack of Asiatics at such a juncture of time seems extraordinarily bold.

*M. Suerbaum* : Es ist schwierig zu sehen, wieso in *Sc.* 173—wie der Scholiast will—eine Entschuldigung des Odysseus liegen soll. Wenn *alle* Griechen verwundet sind, warum flieht nur *er*? *Sc.* 173 würde besser als höhnischer Vorwurf in den Mund des Ajax passen, doch bezeugt der Scholiast ausdrücklich Odysseus als Sprecher.

\* \* \*

*M. Waszink* : I cannot bring myself to believe that Ribbeck was right in supposing that there are lacunae before 163 *neque* and after *consistere*. The passage contains a closely knit argument : 164 *magis* is motivated by the sentence opened by *namque* (165) ; and further there is a clear correspondence between 161 *uestras manus* and 164 *sapientia uestra*. These words must remain near each other, and therefore no lacunae need be assumed before or after v. 163. I would rather regard this verse as a parenthesis, which is not surprising in an emotional speech like the present one : after all Eurypylos is in danger of bleeding to death.

*M. Skutsch* : Lines 161, 162 and 164 fit together very well if we understand, as I think we must, that the *magis* of 164 points forward to *namque* in 165. 163 looks as though it had intruded from somewhere else.

\* \* \*

*M. Badian* : I am not worried by the fact that *certe* (*Sc.* 166) is not actually attested in this phrase of recognition. With Professor Skutsch, I doubt whether it can be Cicero's. The fact that the phrase is so often introduced by an oath in comedy seems to show that an asseverative particle was called for ; and since an oath was out of the question here, the more neutral *certe* seems sufficiently justified. As for the delayed recognition by the chorus (I agree with Professor Jocelyn that this is best assigned to the chorus) : could it not be due to the fact that Eurypylos has been very much knocked about in Ennius' version? There is certainly plenty of blood flowing, as both the fragment itself

and Cicero's commentary make clear. If dramatic justification is needed, this would amply provide it.

*M. Jocelyn*: I do not think that such a degree of realism as Mr. Badian's last suggestion implies ever obtained in the classical theatre.

*M. Suerbaum*: Eine Erklärung des Cicero-Kontextes *etiam si Eurypylus tacere posset, non posset Aesopus* erscheint mir nicht überzeugend; jedenfalls wäre das ein recht frostiger Witz Ciceros. Er würde dann sagen: Eurypylus fühlt sich ausserstande, das Kampfgeschehen darzustellen (Vs. 170 sq.) — also könnte er schweigen; der Schauspieler Aesopus aber muss seinen Part unbedingt sprechen. (Von den verschiedenen Erklärungsversuchen dieser Schwierigen Stelle, die ich nachträglich eingesehen habe, hat mir noch am ehesten die von R. Kühner in seinem *Tusc.-Komm.* <sup>4</sup>, Jena 1853 vertretene eingeleuchtet: *etiam si Eurypylus haec in dolore explicare posset, non posset idem facere Aesopus*; Sc.: *ut homo in contemnendo dolore inexercitatus.*)

\* \* \*

*M. Badian*: You think that at Sc. 165 Ennius introduced the idea of a kind of "military hospital" by analogy with Roman conditions. But I do not know of any such institutions in the Roman army during the Republic. A passage in Dionysius (IX 50), obviously based on contemporary conditions, shows soldiers binding up their own wounds—or pretending to do so; and even Caesar mentions no organized medical care for soldiers.

*M. Waszink*: In this connection I would rather think of an association with healings at the *aedes Aesculapii* built on the island in the Tiber soon after 291 B.C.

\* \* \*

*M. Skutsch*: As to the fragment of the *Sabine Women*, I believe Mr. Jocelyn overlooks that the situation in the *Sabinae* is different



from Euripides' *Phoenissae* 571 ff. Here no town enters into consideration, it is merely a question of the fathers-in-law killing the sons-in-law. I cannot admit that any question such as "what will you do with the spoils?" is missing. In fact, any such question would seem to me to reduce the effectiveness of the sentence, which takes it for granted that the spoils are to be dedicated. The metrical difficulty is minimal: an iamb word is needed to complete two senarii, and L. Mueller's *quam* <*patres*> not only mends the metre but improves the style by emphasizing *quam*.

*M. Badian*: I do not think the reference to the *spolia opima* is a necessary, or indeed a very happy, suggestion. This had happened only twice in Roman history; and since it could only happen where a commander killed an enemy commander, the plural seems to make it unlikely that it is in the poet's mind here. Actually, it does not much matter what the Romans usually did with captured armour—certainly Greek *tropaea* are out of the question as early as this. But all that is certainly said here is that the armour will be stripped off and then an inscription will be set up. Now, inscriptions that in various ways celebrate victories were common enough in Rome. If we refuse to believe that Ennius is blindly transferring a Greek custom, we are still not committed to any particular view of what happens to the spoils (dedication, burning, or any combination): all that is assumed is that after victory (and the taking of spoils that marks it) an inscription must be composed to celebrate it.

*M. Jocelyn*: There may have been a reference to Romulus taking the *spolia opima* from the king of Caenina in the prologue of the *Sabinae*. The Ennian Hersilia, like Eurypylus at *Sc.* 161, addressed a plurality but had one person in mind. Mr. Badian's arguments are weighty ones but I still think that *cum spolia generis detraxeritis* is a particular reference to the stripping of armour from men killed in battle and not a pictorial equivalent of *cum uiceritis*.

*M. Waszink*: I wonder whether, if one thinks that a word has fallen out, it should not be *soceri* rather than *patres*.

As to the inscription: the habit concerning Greek τροπαῖα is, in my opinion, not entirely out of the question, since we have just heard from Mr. Jocelyn that the *praetexta*, too, was to a high degree influenced by Greek tragedy.

*M. Badian*: I could accept *soceri*, but I really do not think *patres* will do. First, it is odd for one person to speak to the assembled Sabines and call them "Fathers"; only one of them is her father. Also—perhaps more important—the word *patres*, as a vocative, is so closely connected with the Senate (as the normal form of address used there, with or without *conscripti*) that I cannot see a poet bluntly using it here in an address to a group of (private) "fathers". I would rather suggest an address to her own father, i.e. *pater*. We have just looked at *Sc.* 161. It will serve as a parallel. *Patricoles* is individually addressed there, and then there is at once a change to the plural (*ad uos*)—as Mr. Jocelyn rightly pointed out at the time, the attendants are included. Similarly here I suggest "*cum spolia generis detraxeritis, o pater*". (Compare "*O Patricoles*", l.c., and, of course, the famous and pathetic "*o pater, o patria*" speech).

*M. Skutsch*: I fail to see why the fact that *patres* in the vocative mostly refers to senators should prevent us from assuming that it could refer to a plurality of fathers, in the rare situation where several girls have to address several fathers. It seems a little unnatural to assume that the senatorial address made it impossible for the girls to say *patres*. What else should they have said?

