

# Problems concerning the Satura of Ennius

Autor(en): **Waszink, J.H.**

Objekttyp: **Article**

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

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

PDF erstellt am: **21.05.2024**

Persistenter Link: <https://doi.org/10.5169/seals-660876>

## **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.

III

J. H. WASZINK

Problems concerning the Satura of Ennius



## PROBLEMS CONCERNING THE SATURAE OF ENNIUS

Once I had accepted the invitation to contribute a paper here on the *Saturae*<sup>1</sup> of Ennius, I got an awkward feeling that this subject might be neither important nor extensive enough for an entire lecture, and it is for this reason that I asked for the liberty to add whatever points concerning Ennius' minor works in general might, in my opinion, lead to a fruitful discussion. However, the more I studied the fragments of this work, the more I became convinced that the subject is important and, moreover, still full of problems, so that now I am certain that the time granted to me will have to be used with the greatest efficiency in order to deal at least with the most fundamental problems and to put forward whatever new interpretations I may have to offer.

As to the importance of the present subject, I would like first of all to quote the following assertion from the *Lezioni su Ennio* by Scevola Mariotti, whose absence from our meeting I regret more than I can say: "Le *Saturae* sono la creazione più originale tecnicamente, non solo di Ennio, ma di tutta la letteratura romana" (p. 123) and, a little further on: "Le *Saturae* diventano così l'opera centrale e più tipica,

<sup>1</sup> Before the discussion of the title (p. 105) I quote it in its usual plural form.—It is to be regretted that TERZAGHI, who was one of the great specialists on Lucilius, hardly speaks about Ennius in his book *Per la storia della Satira* (Messina 1944). His main thesis is: "...rispetto al contenuto, la satira romana non può aspirare a vanto di originalità." I could not get hold of E. BOLISANI, *Le Satire di Ennio, Atti e Mem. della Reale Accad. di Scienze e Lettere in Padova*, 1935. Dr. P. F. Beatrice (Padova) most kindly provided me with a photocopy of Bolisani's rare book *Ennio minore* (Padova, Editrice "Messaggero", 1935), which contains an edition of the fragments of the *Saturae*—to which he also reckoned all the *Varia* with the sole exception of the *Eubemerus*—with an Italian translation and notes on pp. 30-65. When in the sequel I quote Bolisani without adding the title of a publication, it is this work which is meant.



per la loro esperienza stilistica, di Ennio, l'eredità più personale che egli ha lasciato alla tradizione letteraria romana." This statement is the natural outcome of Mariotti's conviction that the most essential feature of Ennius' poetry is the *uarietas* and that, for that reason, "dobbiamo ricercare l' 'antecedente' (s'intende in un senso ideale, non di necessità cronologico) dell'arte degli *Annali* nelle *Saturae*."

As to the second point: in studying the history of the interpretation of the fragments of the *Saturae* from Columna, Scaliger and Casaubonus to the present day—and it is at this point that I want to mention with special emphasis the chapter on Ennius' *Saturae* in Professor C. A. van Rooy's important monograph *Studies in Classical Satire and Related Literary Theory* (Leiden 1965)—, I arrived at the conclusion that with regard to this work practically all the essential details have never been established, and in the present state of our knowledge can not be established with certainty, the main reason being, of course, that here we can not, as in the case of the *Annales* and the tragedies, start our investigation from the main rules of a genre already well-known from Greek literature—*satura quidem tota nostra est!* In the first place, we have no certainty about the question whether it was Ennius himself who gave the title *Saturae* or *Satura* to his work. Further, we do not know whether the division into separate books, which we find for the first time in Porphyrio, was made by the poet himself. Next there is a discussion about the question whether minor works as, for instance, the *Epicharmus*, the *Eubemerus*, and the *Sota*, formed part of the whole of the *Saturae* or not. Then there is the question whether Ennius' *Saturae* are directly, or at least somehow, to be connected with a notion which it has become usual to call "the pre-Livian dramatic *satura*", and this problem is immediately dependent on the more fundamental question whether this term denotes something real or not. A further point of discussion is whether the

*Saturae* of Ennius had already occasionally a satirical character in the modern sense of the word. And finally there is the question whether Ennius has imitated, or was at least influenced or inspired by, the *Iambi* of Callimachus. From all this it is evident that in this paper a considerable amount of earlier literature will have to be mentioned—it is impossible to discuss problems about which so many controversial things have already been said without at least indicating what has been said. Moreover, any new interpretation which I may have to offer will always have to start from a discussion of what one or more predecessors in the field have said—needless to say that in the course of my study of this subject the number of interpretations which I regarded as new decreased continuously, since I discovered an increasing number of scholars who *ante nos nostra scripserunt!*

Let us now first concentrate our attention on the question of the original title of the work. It has become usual to regard it as self-evident that the title *Saturarum libri IV*, which can be reconstructed from the quotations found in the Roman grammarians, goes back to the poet himself. However, a more accurate investigation shows that in modern literature on Ennius the use of this title derives both its generality and its authority from an entirely apodictic statement by Vahlen in the introduction of his second edition of the fragments, p. ccxiv, which is best quoted in full here: "... quia praeter grandioris poesis opera poemata multa non magni ambitus et varii argumenti variaeque metrorum formae sed quorum hoc commune consilium erat ut suadendo dissuadendo doctrina et exemplis mores regerent facere consuevit, ea in quattuor libros collegit quibus *Saturarum libri* inscripsit nihil significans nisi quod in *satura* voce inesse grammatici docuerunt."<sup>1</sup> No proof is given for any part of this elaborate statement.

<sup>1</sup> In his first edition of the fragments of Ennius, which appeared almost half

The first to doubt the correctness of this assertion was Hendrickson, who was followed by Marx, Deubner, and Pasoli. I also want to mention that Dr. Jocelyn observes that "*The quattuor libri saturarum* mentioned by Porphyrio... and quoted by Nonius, Macrobius and the Danieline Servius must be a late arrangement."<sup>1</sup>

In this context it is first of all necessary once more to consider the evidence. In Roman literature, as far as it has been preserved, the word *satura* as the denomination of either a poem or a collection of poems occurs in a coherent text (not a title) for the first time in Horace. We find it at the beginning of the well-known "consultation" of Trebatius (*Sat.* II 1, 1 s.): *Sunt quibus in satura uideor nimis acer et ultra | legem tendere opus*. Here *satura* denotes the genre as a whole, as is rightly pointed out in Kiessling-Heinze's commentary; we may add that the word is used there as a generally known, and therefore certainly as an already traditional term. In the plural, as a designation of definite poems, the word occurs in *Sat.* II 6, 7: *saturis Musaque pedestri*: here Horace understood by *saturae* the poems which we now call his satires, that is, single poems, not the collection of them.

When from Horace we go back in time, the first author to be taken into account is Varro. About him Friedrich Leo observes (*Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, 423, n. 1): "Varro schrieb

a century earlier (1854), Vahlen declared Ennius' *Saturae* to be dependent upon the "dramatic *satura*" (p. lxxxi); cf. *infra*, pp. 110-111.

<sup>1</sup> HENDRICKSON, *Class. Philol.* 6 (1911), 120 ff. and 334 ff.; MARX, *Römische Volkslieder* (*RbM*, N. F., 78 (1929), 398-426; now also in *Aufsätze zur früh-lateinischen Dichtung*, Darmstadt 1969, 45-73), 414 (cf. already the introduction of his edition of Lucilius, I, xiii); L. DEUBNER, *Die Saturae des Ennius und die Jamben des Kallimachos* (*RbM*, N. F. 96 (1953), 289-292), 289; A. PASOLI, "Satura" drammatica e "satura" letteraria (*Vichiana* 1 (1964), 3-41), 33 ff.; H. D. JOCELYN, *The Tragedies of Ennius* (Cambridge 1967), 13, n. 8. The best "doxography" of this question is given by VAN ROOY, *op. cit.*, 46, n. 8.

*saturae* und *de compositione saturarum* (er kennt also sicher *satura* schon als Bezeichnung des einzelnen Gedichts ...).” This supposition is indeed the most plausible one; I can not on this point share the scepticism of Pasoli (*op. cit.*, 22) who observes that the four books of *Saturae* mentioned by St. Jerome in his well-known catalogue of Varro’s works are mentioned by nobody else, not even by Horace in his Satires, and may, therefore, perhaps be ascribed to Varro Atacinus, whom Horace does mention as a poet of *saturae* (*Sat.* I 10, 46; cf. also H. Dahlmann in his well-known article on Varro, *RE*, Suppl. VI (1935), 1276). Apart from the fact that this hypothesis can not be proved in any way, there is still the work *De compositione saturarum* which, as della Corte supposes (*Varrone, il terzo gran lume romano*<sup>2</sup>, Firenze 1970, 250, n. 23), may have been composed “come giustificazione o come apologia dei libri delle ‘Menippee’ stesse.” I am, therefore, inclined to assume that Varro indeed used the word *satura* exactly like Horace, that is, as an indication of the genre as a whole<sup>1</sup> and of a single poem belonging to the genre. I also can not share Pasoli’s doubts concerning the use of the word *satura* in connection with Varro’s poems and short treatises in prose in the trend of

<sup>1</sup> According to Pasoli, the literary *satura* had nothing to do with the dramatic *satura* which, in his conviction, is a historical entity with an Etruscan name derived from the verb ‘*śaθr*’ which meant *orare* in both senses of the word. For the sake of clearness I quote the summary of his argument (p. 37): “Dunque la filologia ufficiale del II-I secolo a. Chr., quando—secondo la nostra ipotesi—chiamò col nome di *satura*, pensando alla ‘pienezza’ e alla ‘varietà’, il genere letterario di Ennio e di Pacuvio prima e di Lucilio poi (escludendo, come sopra dicemmo, Varrone Menippeo), si trovò di fronte il nome di *satura* riferito al melodramma in musica etrusco-latino d’età pre-letteraria, e credette che il nome della *satura* letteraria e quello della *satura* drammatica non fossero se non due accezioni dello stesso termine; spiegò pertanto il nome di quell’antica forma drammatica dicendo che quei melodrammi si chiamavano *saturae* perchè erano *impletae modis*.” Since by this “official philology” he understands “la scuola stiloniano-varroniana”, he, too, assumes that Varro also used *satura* as an indication of the literary genre in question.



Menippus<sup>1</sup>, though I am not certain that he used the plural in this context.

In the fragments of Lucilius the word *satura* does not occur, a fact which, of course, can not be regarded as conclusive proof for the assertion that he never used it either to designate the whole of his work or single poems. As has been observed by Marx and Pasoli, he uses the terms *ludo ac sermonibus nostris* (1039 M.) and *poemata* as a designation of his poems. Therefore, the possibility exists that he limited himself to the employment of these terms, but there is an equally strong possibility either that both the singular and the plural of *satura* occurred in the lost part of his work or—a possibility which I consider a little more plausible—that he used only the singular to denote the greatly varied collection of his *sermones* (*poemata*), just as is the case in the sentence from Diomedes which I shall quote presently.

Therewith we come to Ennius. The first Roman author to use *satura* in connection with his works is Quintilian who writes (*Instit. orat.* IX 2, 36): *Mortem ac Vitam contententes in satura tradit Ennius*. Here we can of course not decide whether in the case of Ennius Quintilian understood the term *satura* as indicating the collection as a whole or one single poem forming part of it. Gellius is the first to introduce his quotations from this work by using the plural *saturae* (II 29, 20 and VI 9, 1 *Ennius in saturis*; XVIII 2, 7 *in saturis Quinti Enni*). That, however, this use of the plural in quoting Ennius' work was introduced at a later date may, in my opinion, be regarded as certain on account of the

<sup>1</sup> PASOLI's main argument is (pp. 35-36) that in Cic. *Acad.* I 2, 8, where Varro himself is presented as speaking about this work, the word *satura* is not mentioned: *in illis ueteribus nostris, quae Menippum imitati, non interpretati, quadam hilaritate conspersimus*. But in the conversation which—as usually in Cicero's philosophical works—precedes the treatment of the subject, a paraphrase of a title is more to be expected than an exact quotation of that title, especially when it is the author himself who is speaking.

statement by Diomedes (*GL* Keil I 485, 30 ff.), who is there copying Suetonius (who in his turn may have copied Varro): *olim carmen quod ex uariis poematibus constabat satira uocabatur quale scripserunt Pacuuius et Ennius*<sup>1</sup>. If indeed this sentence goes ultimately back to Varro—a supposition regarded as practically certain by Pasoli, *op. cit.*, 23 and 35—and Varro had real evidence at his disposition, there is little reason for doubt, but the latter premise remains uncertain. As to the division into four books (we can rule out the possibility of the existence of a sixth book, as will be discussed in the sequel), for which Porphyrio is our earliest witness, this may, in my opinion, have been introduced in the period between Gellius and the latter author, that is, in the period of an enhanced interest in archaic Roman literature.

My conclusion must, therefore, be that, though we can not prove anything, there is a possibility seriously to be considered that Ennius used *Satura* in the singular as the title of this work<sup>2</sup>.

One further observation. It has frequently been supposed that by means of a title *Saturae* Ennius wanted to render Greek titles in the plural which were used in the Hellenistic period, like Ἀτακτα and Σύμμεικτα. If there was such an influence of Greek titles at all, I am much more in favour of the supposition of M. Coffey<sup>3</sup> that Ennius may have imitated the title of the Σωρός of Posidippus.

<sup>1</sup> Cf. also JOCELYN, *op. cit.*, 13, n. 8: "There is no getting round the plain words of Diomedes (Suetonius): *olim ... Ennius*." Of the *Satura* of Pacuvius nothing is known except this sentence in Diomedes; cf. I. MARIOTTI, *Introduzione a Pacuvio* (Urbino 1960), 19.

<sup>2</sup> Thus also KRENKEL, *loc. cit.* I disagree with VAN ROOY, *op. cit.*, 46, n. 8, who quotes passages from late authors as Gellius, Nonius and Macrobius in favour of the assumption that Ennius already used the plural *Saturae* as the title of his work.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the summary of his paper on the *Satura* of Ennius in: *Römische Satire, Wiss. Zeitschr. der Univ. Rostock* 15 (1966), Gesellschafts- und sprachwiss. Reihe, Heft 4/5, 417.

Next, we have to examine a hypothesis which, in my opinion, has for a long time hampered the study of the present subject. As we all know, Lucian Mueller, followed by Pascal, Bolisani, della Corte, Puelma Piwonka and several other scholars<sup>1</sup>, has tried to demonstrate or at least to make plausible that originally *Saturae* was the general title of *all* the minor works of Ennius. As it seems to me, we are by now justified in regarding this supposition as definitely refuted, especially on account of two facts put forward more than sixty years ago by Franz Skutsch<sup>2</sup>. In the first place, it is extremely improbable that the very frequent quotations like *Ennius in Epicharmo*, *Ennius in Eubemero*, *Ennius in Sota* should refer, not to independent works but to parts of a greater work, since this would be entirely against the habits of Roman lexicographers and grammarians. Further, it is equally improbable that a work like the prose adaptations of the *Ἱερὸς λόγος* of Euhemerus should have belonged to a collection of *Saturae*. Skutsch gives no further comment on this point which he clearly regards as self-evident; perhaps it is useful to add that Quintilian says explicitly that Varro was the founder (*condidit*) of the kind of *satura* which also contained prose<sup>3</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> Lucian MUELLER, *Quintus Ennius* (Petersburg 1884), 107, still expresses himself cautiously: "Dass die Ambracia, die Lehrgedichte Epicharmus, Euhemerus, Protreptica (*sic*) und Hedyphagetica, endlich der Sota und die Epigramme Theile der Satire ausmachten wird nirgends bezeugt, ist aber sehr wahrscheinlich"; C. PASCAL, *Lo Scipio di Ennio*, *Athenaeum* 3 (1915), 369-395; *id.*, *Riv. di filol.* 47 (1919), 73; E. BOLISANI, *Atti del Reale Istituto Veneto*, 1932-1933, and *Ennio minore* (cf. p. 99, n. 1); F. DELLA CORTE, *Intorno alle Saturae di Ennio*, *Atti della Reale Accad. delle Scienze di Torino*, Vol. 71, Tom. II (1936), 198-205; M. PUELMA PIWONKA, *Lucilius und Kallimachos* (Frankfurt a.M. 1949), 181-193.

<sup>2</sup> In his article Ennius in *RE* V (1905), 2598.

<sup>3</sup> Gellius II 29, 30: *Hunc Aesopi apologum Q. Ennius in satiris scite admodum et uenuste uersibus quadratis composuit*. Quintil. *Instit. orat.* X 1, 93: *alterum illud etiam prius saturae genus, sed non sola carminum uarietate mixtum condidit Terentius Varro*. According to PASOLI, *op. cit.*, 20 and 24, *condidit* does not

I further want to eliminate right here what I regard as a second serious mistake, *viz.*, the supposition that Ennius' *Scipio* was identical with the third book of his *Saturae*. This hypothesis was first formulated by L. Lersch: De Ennii Scipione, *RhM* 5 (1837), 416, on account of the similarity of two fragments, *viz.*, one quoted by Nonius Marcellus, p. 66, 27: *Ennius satyrarum lib. III: testes sunt | Lati campi quos gerit Africa terra politos* and one which occurs in Cic. *De Oratore* III 42, 167: *Testes sunt Campi magni*. The identification was adopted in his first edition by Vahlen, who in his introduction, p. lxxxiv, is strongly critical of Lersch's argumentation without, however, adding any argument himself; he rejected it in his second edition, p. ccxvi. Lucian Mueller also accepted the identification and made an attempt to blend the two fragments into one<sup>1</sup>. However, we know that Ennius was by no means averse from repeating himself: I only mention the use made of the motive of the revelation in a dream in both the proem of the first book of the *Annales* and the *Epicharmus* (cf. p. 136, n. 1). There is, therefore, no reason to regard the *Scipio* as a part of the *Satura*. And therewith we may inversely regard the *Satura* as an independent work existing by the side of the other minor works of Ennius.

It is now with the greatest possible circumspection that I want to consider the much-discussed question whether Ennius' *Satura* can have been influenced in any way by what it has become usual to call "the dramatic *satura*".

denote the *inventor* but the "perfezionatore" of the genre; cf. also BOLISANI, 13-15.

<sup>1</sup> In his edition (p. 75) he combines these two verses into one fragment (*Sat.*, *Lib. III / Scipio*, fr. VII): *testes sunt campi magni ... | lati campi, quos gerit Africa terra politos*. In the critical apparatus he adds: "add. in priore versu ut puta: virtuti' meai." In his book *Quintus Ennius*, 108-109, he put these words into the text; in this he is followed by Bolisani.



In the famous discussion concerning the authenticity or the degree of authenticity of Livy's description of the evolution of Roman drama I take the side of those who are convinced that in general the facts mentioned by Livy—that is, by Varro—belong to historic reality but that the connection made between them is due to Varro's reconstructive (or merely constructive) tendencies: the performances by the Etruscan dancers in 364 B.C., the *Fescennina licentia* with its exchange of *uersus alterni* as well as the activity of Andronicus consisting in *argumento fabulam serere* belong to reality, and for that reason I am inclined also to believe in the reality of the *impletas modis saturas* mentioned there. As I have expounded elsewhere<sup>1</sup>, I find a strong support for this supposition in the fact that still in 115 B.C., there existed performances by “a Latin singer and a Latin flute-player” (*Latinus cantor et tibicen*), who were clearly regarded as truly vernacular artists, since they were excepted from the expulsion of *histriones* which took place in that year. However, we should under no condition assume the existence of more than is mentioned in Livy's report. It is worth while to quote the relevant sentence here again: after mentioning the professional *histriones* Livy says: *qui non, sicut ante, Fescennino uersu similem incompositum temere ac rudem alternis iaciebant, sed impletas modis saturas descripto iam ad tibicinem cantu motuque peragebant*. I entirely agree with the interpretation of this sentence by Dr. Jocelyn in the introduction to his edition of the fragments of Ennius' tragedies, p. 13: “The word—*viz.*, *satura*—must have denoted at one time some sort of stage performance. It can hardly be a mere invention on the model of Aristotle's τὸ σατυρικόν. All, however, that Livy's story at VII 2, 4 ff. implies is that the

<sup>1</sup> In my paper Tradition and Personal Achievement in Early Latin Literature (*Mnemosyne* IV 13 (1960), 16-33), 20; a further elaboration in my 'Fachbericht' Zum Anfangsstadium der römischen Literatur, *Aufgang und Niedergang der römischen Welt*, Festschr. Joseph Vogt, I (Berlin 1972).

*bistriones* presented on a *scaena* at public festivals arrangements of words in a variety of metrical patterns accompanied by pipe music and called *saturae*. There is no suggestion that these *saturae* involved consistent acts of impersonation." To the last words he adds the wise observation: "Talk of 'dramatic' *satura* is confused and misleading."

It is this very point which we must keep in mind continuously when we try to imagine—there can be no question of a real investigation—how an influence of such performances on various poems in Ennius' *satura* could be possible at all. Such an influence, which was already assumed by Vahlen in his first edition (p. lxxxi) was postulated with great emphasis by Otto Weinreich<sup>1</sup>, who assumed that the dramatic element—we may as well say: the dialogue—was particularly important in the *satura*. The possibility of such an influence is discussed with much greater reserve by Mariotti in his important paper *Titoli di opere enniane*, *Maia* 5 (1952), 271-276, in which his chief aim is to point out that, as Ennius in his *Annales* conferred an entirely new meaning upon a long-existing Latin term, he did—I would rather say: he may have done—exactly the same thing in the case of the *Satura*. I must, however, strongly disagree with a suggestion by Timpanaro to which Mariotti assents (*op. cit.*, 272, n. 2), *viz.*, that we may find a parallel for the dramatic *satura* as a whole of loosely connected "little scenes" in the second part, *viz.*, the part which comes after the parabasis, of the comedies of Aristophanes. In fact we should keep the *satura* apart from any truly *dramatic* performance, that is, a performance involving impersonation, a distinction already made in the chapter of Livy: for there it is said explicitly that a real drama was first introduced at Rome by Andronicus—the words *argumento fabulam serere*

<sup>1</sup> *Römische Satiren... eingeleitet und übertragen von OTTO WEINREICH* (Zürich 1949), xviii-xix.

are quite clear in this respect, for they show that the real essence of a drama is found in the plot which is immediately connected with the *diverbiūm*. It is, in my opinion, evident that in this chapter the *satura* is presented by Varro as the prototype of the *canticum* of Latin comedy—the very element which failed in the *vēa*.

It is for the same reason that I can not possibly believe that the fragment which Festus p. 257 M. quotes from a *Satura* of Naevius, viz., *Quianam Saturnium populum pepulisti?* can stem from a dramatic *satura*, as was first assumed by Hendrickson, *Amer. Journ. Philol.* 15 (1894), 19 s., and then by Lejay (edition of the *Satires* of Horace, xcvi f.) and, with particular gusto, by Weinreich, *op. cit.* Mariotti (*Maia* 5 (1952), 272, n. 1) thinks of a *fabula togata*, Marx (*op. cit.*, p. 416) of a political pamphlet. I must confess that, like Eduard Fraenkel (*RE*, Suppl. V, 640), I am entirely at a loss about this fragment<sup>1</sup>. But to return to the *satura* of Ennius: If we find traces of a dialogue in the fragments of this work we should not, with Weinreich, regard these as an element deriving from the old *saturae*: we must either trace them back to popular tradition, the *Fescennina licentia*—let us not overlook Livy's statement that in the *saturae* the *histriones* no longer *uersum alternis iaciebant*—or assume (and this is in my opinion quite plausible) that Ennius' *Satura* shows already an influence of full-fledged comedies, and most probably already of Roman comedies. I can thus completely agree with the negative attitude of Vahlen in his

<sup>1</sup> Pasoli's view that a dramatic *satura* did exist at Rome but that it had no connection at all with the dramatic *satura* (cf. p. 103, n. 1) is shared by VAN ROOY, 23 ff.—The *Satura* of Pomponius must have been a *fabula Atellana*, since Pomponius is not known to have written anything which belonged to a different genre. FRASSINETTI in his edition of the *Fab. Atell.* (Rome 1967), 108, thinks in this context of "un tentativo di riesumazione della *satura* preliviana, con musica e danza e senza *Oscæ personae*". I could not get hold of C. MARTIN, *Etude sur la satura dans la littérature latine archaïque des origines à Pacuvius*, thèse, Univ. libre, Bruxelles, 1942.

second edition (p. ccxiv) and of Deubner (*op. cit.*, 290) towards those scholars who postulated a thorough influence of a dramatic *satura* on Ennius' collection of various poems.

On account of the preceding considerations I arrive at the conclusion that the only thing which the *Satura* of Ennius can have owed to a preliterate (not : a dramatic) *satura* was a tendency to strive after *uarietas* in the choice of both the metres and the subjects (in order to prevent misunderstandings, I add that it is only the variety of the subjects, not their proper characteristics, which, in my opinion, should be connected with such an influence). However, it may be more correct to say that the preliterate *satura* only strengthened in Ennius an older, more general, and typically Roman tendency to create *uarietas*, a tendency of which this *satura* was only one more manifestation. In fact, such a tendency is equally present in the technique, probably invented by Naevius, of blending together the plots of two Greek dramas (cf. on this question H. Drexler, *Plautin. Akzentstudien*, 369, and his paper *Der Anfang der römischen Literatur*, in *Das neue Bild der Antike* (Leipzig 1942), II, 74 f.). It must also lie at the root of Plautus' continuous creation of new and fantastic words, and of *numeri innumeri* in the *cantica* of his plays (cf. on this point my *Fachbericht* mentioned in n. 1, p. 108).

We now come to the much-discussed question whether the *Satura* of Ennius contained satirical elements in the sense in which this adjective is used nowadays. I can be brief on this subject, because it has already been treated with as much exactness as sagacity by van Rooy in his chapter on Ennius ; I feel justified in limiting myself here to quoting the main sentence of his argument. Against the statement of Friedrich Leo (*op. cit.*, 206), "die Gedichte hatten kein 'satirisches Element'", which he rightly qualifies as merely apodictic, van Rooy observes (*op. cit.*, 32-33): "...the relevant fragments of his work manifest a clearly satirical tendency



in so far as he hits out or mocks at harmful elements in contemporary Roman society"; he is equally right in pointing out a little further on that the satirical element is manifest here "only as one *out of many*"<sup>1</sup>. However, a second point should be added here, *viz.*, that Ennius does not seem to have attacked definite individuals, a thing which Lucilius must have done from the very beginning of his career, for the early satire from the twenty-sixth book which contains his 'program' can only have been caused by complaints about such attacks. In this he continues, and in my opinion imitates, though in a different genre, Naevius' endeavour to introduce the habit of ὀνομαστὶ κωμωδεῖν at Rome. This is a habit of which, as far as our knowledge goes, no trace can be found in the work of Ennius<sup>2</sup>.

If I am not mistaken, it is these personal attacks in the *Saturae* of Lucilius together with his gradual giving up of polymetry in favour of the dactylic hexameter which makes us too much inclined to overlook the *primary* importance of the element of *uarietas* in Lucilius—after all quite a number of his *Saturae* are not "satirical" at all—and, in connection with that fact, a priori to underestimate the still quite important similarities between the *Saturae* of Ennius and

<sup>1</sup> We must certainly reject the exaggerated ideas on this subject of E. M. PEASE in his paper The Satirical Element in Ennius, *Transactions of the Amer. Philol. Assoc.* 27 (1896), xlviii-l. I limit myself to quoting the essential sentence of the paper: "Nothing could be more natural then (*viz.*, after Andronicus had introduced the Attic New Comedy at Rome) than that Ennius should remodel the old satirical medley into the literary *Satura*", etc. Also DEUBNER in his paper *Die Saturae des Ennius und die Jamben des Kallimachos*, 290-291, overstates in my opinion the importance of the satirical elements in Ennius' *Saturae*. The same holds good for Altheim's judgement of the Crested Lark, for which cf. *infra*, p. 125.

<sup>2</sup> One may wonder whether Ennius' famous allusion to Naevius by means of the purposely vague plural *alii* in *scripsere alii rem* (*Ann.* 213) is not a silent criticism or correction of the very man to whom he alludes. On the possible influence of Naevius on Lucilius' aggressivity cf. my paper Tradition and Achievement (cf. n. 1, p. 108), 32.

Lucilius. I need hardly say that I disagree entirely with Puelma Piwonka, who made a sharp distinction between the *Saturae* of Lucilius, which he regarded as highly dependent on the *Iambi* of Callimachus, and the, in his opinion, more moralizing *Saturae* of Ennius and Varro (*op. cit.*, 192). It is these similarities which are rightly emphasized by, for instance, Vahlen, Marx and Mariotti<sup>1</sup>. Now among these similarities we must mention in the first place the habit of both poets to speak in these poems about their personal lives and about their poetry. I think it appropriate to discuss this subject in the first place.

Lucilius had chosen both the character and the social function of his poetry as the subject for the "programmatic" poem which had been included in, and which probably opened, the earliest book of his *Saturae* which was written in *versus quadrati* and which in the final edition of his poems became the twenty-sixth book. This poem contained a discussion between the poet and an adversary, or a critical friend. From the fragments so much at least is clear that Lucilius underlined the fact that in his poetry he could only be just himself: I remind you of the well-known verses (622 and 623 Marx) *ego si qui sum et quo folliculo nunc sum indutus non queo* and *ita ut quisque nostrum e bulga est matris in lucem editus*. Now Mariotti ('Titoli', 274, n. 4) has already connected another verse from this poem, *ego ubi quem ex praecordiis exfero uersum* (590 M.), with the famous lines quoted by Nonius from the third book of Ennius' *Saturae* (vss. 6-7 V.).

*Enni poeta salve, qui mortalibus  
Versus propinas flammeos medullitus.*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the excellent paraphrase of the main thesis of Puelma Piwonka's book and the acute criticisms by H. HERTER in his review in *Deutsche Literaturzeitung* 71 (1950), 490-496.—The passages to which I allude in the text are: VAHLEN<sup>2</sup>, *Praefatio*, ccxv; MARX, ed. of Lucilius, xiv; MARIOTTI, *Titoli di opere enniane*, 274, n. 4.

I would like to discuss this fragment for a moment in spite of the fact that Professor Suerbaum has already said the most essential things about them in his book *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung römischer Dichter*, p. 262 with note 744, a passage to which I want emphatically to refer you.

Mariotti underlines the importance of the similarity of the expressions *ex praecordiis* and *medullitus*: evidently in his opinion the adverb *medullitus* is to be connected with the verb *propinas*. The same interpretation is given by Weinreich, *op. cit.*, 4, in his German translation: "Heil, Dichter Ennius, dir, der du den Sterblichen | Kredenzest Verse, feurige, aus tiefster Brust!" We may add the paraphrase by Friedrich Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, 206: "der sich so anreden liess, brachte seine Gedichte ans Licht weil sie in seiner Seele wohnten." After long considerations I have arrived at the conclusion that this interpretation is the most plausible one<sup>1</sup>—we may indeed say that both poets declared to have put their heart into their poetry.

I agree with Mariotti—I may also add a similar statement by Leo, *op. cit.*, 161<sup>2</sup>—that in the two present verses Ennius also refers to his own poetry. There remains, of course, the important difference that Ennius thus in his *Satura* refers to a different genre, *viz.*, to his epic poetry, whereas Lucilius speaks in a *satura* about his *Saturae* in general.

The first question now is, who is addressing Ennius here. However, before I begin to discuss this point, I want to put forward that—as must already be evident from what I said at the beginning of this paper—I recant my earlier adherence<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup> There is an alternative, *viz.*, that *medullitus* refers—or at least *also* refers—to *flammeos*; but at the moment this is not of primary importance.

<sup>2</sup> "In den Satiren liess er sich anrufen mit dem Wort: 'Heil, Dichter Ennius, der du den Sterblichen flammende Verse zutrinkst aus innerster Brust!'" Thus also KRENKEL, ed. of Lucilius, 14: "Du kredenzt den Sterblichen deine Verse, die stets voll flammenden Feuers, aus tiefster Brust."

<sup>3</sup> The Proem of the *Annales* of Ennius, *Mnemosyne* III 3 (1950), 236.

(an adherence which had no further importance there for my argument) to Pascal's assertion that the two verses under discussion belonged to the *Scipio* (Pascal just borrowed this view from Lucian Mueller who, as we mentioned already, regarded this poem as identical with the third book of the *Saturae*)<sup>1</sup>.

Now several scholars, of whom I mention here Till, Knoche and Bieler<sup>2</sup>, assume that Ennius is here presented as addressing himself, whereas others, among whom Weinreich is to be mentioned in the first place<sup>3</sup>, suppose that the verses belong to the description of a symposion, where the poet is addressed by his host or one of his fellow-guests. Not knowing that here again I had a predecessor, *viz.*, Lucian Mueller, as I was admonished by Professor Suerbaum<sup>4</sup>—who, I am glad to say, agrees with my interpretation,—I have defended in my first paper on the proem of the *Annales* the supposition that Ennius was addressed here by the Muses. Since my argument is rather different from that of Mueller, I ask for your permission to quote a few lines from that paper (p. 237): "... if I am not mistaken, the verses under discussion are much too solemn for the atmosphere of a symposion (*mortalibus* = fellow-guests?): it seems considerably more probable that they allude to the central fact of Ennius' inner life, *viz.*, to his access to real poetry or, to use his own language, to his initiation at the *fontes Musarum*

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *supra*, p. 107, with n. 1.

<sup>2</sup> R. TILL, Die Anerkennung literarischen Schaffens in Rom, *Neue Jahrb. für Antike und deutsche Bildung* 3 (1940), 162; U. KNOCHE, *Die römische Satire*<sup>2</sup> (Göttingen 1957), 18; L. BIELER, *Geschichte der römischen Lit.*, I<sup>2</sup> (Sammlung Göschen, Berlin 1965), 49.

<sup>3</sup> *Epigramm und Pantomimus* (Sitzungsber. Heidelberger Akad. d. Wiss., Phil. hist. kl., Jahrg. 1944-1948, 1. Abh.), 147; *Id.*, *Röm. Satiren*, 7.

<sup>4</sup> L. MUELLER, *Quintus Ennius*, 110; adopted by MAXIM. RICHTER, *Priscorum poetarum et scriptorum de se et aliis iudicia* (*Comm. Philol. Jenenses* XI 2, Leipzig 1914), 26 (both quoted by SUERBAUM, *loc. cit.*).



from which he 'drank his gift to mankind'." I do not want now to enter into a discussion on the *fontes Musarum* but I want to make a few further observations which, as it seems to me, have some importance in the present context<sup>1</sup>.

The first point to be inquired into is the meaning of *propinare* in the present context. In his *Studi sugli scrittori latini* (Torino 1900), 46, Carlo Pascal has already drawn attention to the verses of a Hellenistic poet, *viz.*, Dionysius Chalcus, which are quoted by Athenaeus, XV 669 E: δέχου τήνδε προπινομένην | τήν ἀπ' ἐμοῦ ποίησιν and, two lines further on, αἰοιδᾶς ἀντιπρόπιθι. Since this Dionysius was a poet of *skolia*, it may be regarded as practically certain that these verses served as an introduction to a poem sung at a symposion. Pascal takes it for granted that Ennius knew the epigram of Dionysius from the first hand (*uel uertisse uel imitatione expressisse*).

Now here we may indeed find an excellent specimen of Ennius' method in making use of his examples in Hellenistic poetry—perhaps we had better say: in working up the suggestions which Hellenistic poetry had to offer him. The important thing is that, if indeed it is the Muses or one special Muse, probably Calliope, who was presented as speaking these lines, Ennius has brought this image into an entirely different atmosphere, *viz.*, that of the *genus sublime*, though, on the other hand, he has left intact the main element of the original idea. The Hellenistic poet offers a poem to a fellow-guest as if it were a cup of wine, or rather wine in a cup of which he has drunk a small part himself before offering it to his fellow-guest. This typical grecism (a Greek verb incorporated into the Latin first conjugation) has not

<sup>1</sup> I want to observe here in passing that I entirely fail to see, why, as is postulated by A. MARASTONI, *Studio critico su Ennio minore* (*Aevum* 35 (1961), 1-27), 6, the two verses under discussion should be thought to betray once more (together with the proem of *Annales* I and the *Epicharmus*) an influence of the doctrine of Pythagoras.

been introduced by Ennius into the Latin language: we find it, almost certainly before Ennius began the composition of his *Satura*, three times in Plautus, *viz.*, in the *Stichus* (probably composed in 200 B.C.), 468: *propino tibi salutem plenis faucibus*, in the *Pseudolus* (191 B.C.), 1282: *manu candida cantharum dulciferum propinat amicissima amico*, and in the *Curculio* (date uncertain), 359: *propino magnum poclum: illa ebibit*. In the dictionary of Lewis and Short it is assumed that in the verses under discussion *propinare* has a metaphorical meaning, for it is placed there under the heading: "C. In general, to give, deliver, furnish to one". If I am not mistaken, it is this interpretation of the verb which lies at the root of Friedrich Leo's paraphrase which I have just quoted ('brachte ... ans Licht'). However, the purport of the passage is lost, if we do not assume that the verb is used here with its original meaning: it is said that Ennius offers to mortal beings, to mankind, a drink of fiery verses, after first having such a drink himself.

If this interpretation is correct, the next question is what exactly we are to understand by this fiery drink. If I am not mistaken, two ideas have been blended together here, *viz.*, that of the drinking of wine and that of a draught from the sources of the Muses.

About the association with the drinking of wine there can, in my opinion, not be any doubt. The strongest argument is, of course, the very use of the verb *propinare*. In the second place, the adjective *flammeus* evokes an association with the idea of the *calor vini*, for which an endless number of passages can be quoted. I only refer here to two passages from Horace, *viz.*, *Epod.* 11, 14: *calentis ... feruidiore mero* and to the famous words from the Ode to the *pia testa* (III 21, 11-12): *narratur et prisci Catonis | saepe mero incaluisse uirtus*; I may also remind you of the well-known sentence from Euripides' *Alcestis* (758-759): *ἕως ἐθέρμην' αὐτὸν ἀμφιβᾶσα φλόξ | οἴνου*.

We may perhaps add the consideration—it would be too much to call it an argument—that for the composition of his verses Ennius used to seek his inspiration in wine, as we are told in the famous line from Horace, *Epist.* I 19, 7-8 : *Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma | prosiluit dicenda*. It is to this fact that he alludes in the line which Hug, followed by Vahlen, has first attributed to the *Satura* : *numquam poetor nisi* (*nisi si* Vahlen) *podager*, and in his first edition the latter scholar regarded this line as belonging to the same poem as the two verses under discussion. However, this would lead to the conclusion that the poem in question was written in a mocking tone, which does not tally with the loftiness of the two verses. I want to observe in passing that, since the line from Horace clearly echoes the verse of Ennius, I regard it as certain that we should not follow Vahlen in reading *nisi si* instead of the simple *nisi* which we find, also after *numquam*, in the later poet (equally unnecessary is Lucian Mueller's addition of *sim*).

Now I venture to suppose, in the first place on account of the choice of the solemn word *poeta*, that in these verses there was also a solemn element, *viz.*, an association with the sources of the Muses which certainly must have been mentioned in the proem of the seventh<sup>1</sup>, and almost certainly in the proem of the first book of the *Annales*. This association is practically obvious if indeed these verses were presented as spoken by the Muses (or, more probably, by Calliope). But however this may be, the really important thing is that in this poem, as is evident from the second line of the fragment, Ennius spoke about what I have called "the central fact of his inner life", *viz.*, his composition of

<sup>1</sup> PASQUALI's observation is mentioned by TIMPANARO, *Studi ital. di filol. class.* 1948, 22, n. 2. The fact that the priority belonged to Pasquali was noticed by MARIOTTI, *Lezioni su Ennio*, 144; however, SUERBAUM, *op. cit.*, 278, n. 787, has found that there is a much earlier predecessor, *viz.* PASCOLI (*Epos* I<sup>2</sup>, Livorno 1911, 34).

a really great epic poem in the metre of Homer. It is this emphasizing of the value of his achievement which shows Ennius' pride, and, if I am not mistaken, also the not unusual concomitant of pride, *viz.*, his uncertainty: indeed the present verses are the second description of the value of his epic poetry after the ὕψος of the proem of the first book of the *Annales*, for the proem of the seventh book of this poem had been both a retort to criticisms and a renewed vindication of his importance as an epic poet. Therewith Ennius created one of the main features of the literary *satura*: Mariotti (cf. pp. 113 f.) was certainly right in pointing out a similarity between the 'programmatic' satire of Lucilius and the fragment under discussion. A similar reaction to the acceptance by the Roman public of a *new* form of poetry, *viz.*, his *Odes*, is found in Horace's first letter concerning Roman literature (*Epist.* I 19); it is a curious coincidence that it is this very poem in which Horace speaks about Ennius' *prosilire ad arma dicenda*.

Thus, though Ennius may have found the first suggestion for the composition of the present verses in a Hellenistic poet, who connected the idea of προπίνειν with that of ποίησις, we may yet say—as was already emphasized by Friedrich Leo<sup>1</sup>—that the verses bear the stamp of his personality and that, moreover, they find their natural explication in his situation as a poet. It is for this reason that I have not yet raised the much discussed question whether we are to suppose a direct influence of the book of *Iambi* of Callimachus on the composition of his *Satura*.

Let us begin by stating that the existence of such an influence is by no means impossible or even improbable.

<sup>1</sup> *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, 206, n. 1: "Dass der Ausdruck *poesin propinare* auch griechisch vorkommt..., nimmt ihm nichts von seiner Unmittelbarkeit und persönlichen Prägung."



Of the remaining minor works of Ennius four show a direct influence of Hellenistic literature, *viz.*, the *Euhemerus*, the *Sota*, the *Hedyphagetica* and the *Epigrams*. A second interesting point to be mentioned here, be it in passing, is that three of the authors translated or imitated are natives of Sicily, *viz.*, Epicharmus of Syracuse, Euhemerus of Messene and Archestratus of Gela. This fact should undoubtedly be connected with another fact, *viz.*, that it is by no means accidental that the first performances of regular dramas at Rome took place one year after the end of the first Punic war, which was a *bellum Siculum* in the first place; it is in Sicily that great numbers of Romans must have become acquainted with Greek tragedy and comedy<sup>1</sup>. Further, an influence of the narration of the dream at the beginning of Callimachus' *Aitia* on the proem of the first book of Ennius' *Annales* remains probable—let us be cautious and say, *pace* Erich Reitzenstein and Marconi<sup>2</sup>, that it is probable rather than improbable. I can find no serious objection against the careful formulation by Mariotti<sup>3</sup>: “Comunque si pensi dell'inizio degli Annali, non sembra facile negare la vicinanza della produzione minore di Ennio allo spirito callimacheo, e a me continua a parer probabile che la stessa concezione delle Saturae enniane sia ispirata di Giambi di

<sup>1</sup> Cf. the famous third chapter (Die Anfänge, pp. 47 ff.) of LEO's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*.

<sup>2</sup> The supposition that the dream narrated in the proem of the *Aitia* has brought Ennius upon the idea of introducing a dream into the proem of the *Annales* is accepted by MARIOTTI, *Lezioni su Ennio*, 60; O. SKUTSCH, *The Annales of Quintus Ennius* (London 1953), 10; PUELMA PIWONKA, *op. cit.*, 187; W. H. CLAUSEN, Callimachus and Latin Poetry, *Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies* 5 (1964), 181-194. It is contested by E. REITZENSTEIN in *Festschrift für Richard Reitzenstein* (Leipzig-Berlin 1931), 63 ff.; R. PFEIFFER, ed. of Callimachus, I (Oxford 1949), 4; G. MARCONI, Il proemio degli *Annales* di Ennio, *Riv. di Cult. Class. e Medioev.* 3 (1961), 244-245.

<sup>3</sup> In his review of K. ZIEGLER, *Das hellenistische Epos*<sup>2</sup> (Leipzig 1966), in *Gnomon* 43 (1971), 150.

Callimaco... Questo naturalmente non vuol dire che Ennio fosse un callimacheo osservante."

Before giving a brief survey of the development of this hypothesis and of the various arguments which have been advanced, I would like to make a preliminary observation. Already the interpretation of the two verses to which I have perhaps devoted too much time, and, to a much higher degree, the examination of the fragments of the *Annales* show with perfect clearness that, whenever Ennius is imitating earlier poets or at least following suggestions offered by their work, there is never question of slavish imitation in the modern sense of the word—he has always put the stamp of his personality on anything he wrote. The most striking example, at least in my opinion, is his use of the motive of a dream which, if he did borrow it from the proem of Callimachus' *Aitia*—as I am convinced he did—received an entirely different function in the proem of the *Annales*. We should, therefore, be very much on guard against any tendency to exaggerate the importance, or rather the intensity, of an influence of Callimachus on his *Satura*.

A few words then about the history, and hence about the gradual development, of this hypothesis. It was expressed for the first time by Wilhelm Kroll in his revision (with Franz Skutsch) of the sixth edition of Teuffel's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur* (Leipzig-Berlin 1916), 193; he gave a further elaboration of his thought in his well-known paper *Hellenistisch-römische Gedichtbücher* (*Neue Jahrbücher* 37 (1916), 93-106), 95. As it seems, his hypothesis did not become known to Gallavotti, who in his edition of the fragments of the *Iambi*, which appeared in 1946<sup>1</sup>, put the

<sup>1</sup> Callimaco, *Il libro dei Giambi a cura di CARLO GALLAVOTTI* (Naples 1946), 11. I want to quote in this context the following excellent remark by A. LESKY in his *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur*<sup>2</sup>, 766, on the *Iambi* of Callimachus: "In seiner Buntheit war das Buch eine rechte *satura lanx*, wie die Römer die Opferschüssel voll verschiedener Gaben nannten. Es ist verständlich, dass

following question: "Ci è forse dato di scorgere qui più che altrove la vera origine della satura latina?" The most thorough elaboration of this hypothesis is given in a short but important paper by Ludwig Deubner, *Die Saturae des Ennius und die Iamben des Kallimachos*, *RhM*, *N.F.* 96 (1953), 289-292. Deubner assumes a strong dependency of Ennius on Callimachus; among other things he assumes "dass Ennius zu seinen *Saturae* durch die Iamben des Kallimachos angeregt wurde". As the two main arguments for this hypothesis he mentions the fact that each volume of poems was written in a variety of metres and, further, the circumstance—or rather his personal opinion—that in both a satiric element must have been quite prominent. After him, Ulrich Knoche in *Die römische Satire*<sup>2</sup>, 17-18, gave a more reserved version of this supposition. Finally, van Rooy in his monograph on the satura, 35-37, successfully reduced Deubner's somewhat exaggerated statements to an acceptable presentation of the case, which I can not describe here in detail but which will be mentioned in the discussion of the most important fragments; at the moment I limit myself to quoting an essential part of van Rooy's conclusion (*op. cit.*, 37): "Let us not doubt that Ennius had read the *Iambi* of Callimachus and had been inspired by their varied content. No doubt the *Iambi* were also a main source of his interest in iambic poetry as a genre, and led him to the reading of Archilochus and other exponents of this genre. Undoubtedly he also found himself more attracted to the comparative mildness of Callimachus than to the scathing and abusive temperament of Archilochus."

man gerade von den *Iamboi* des Kallimachos die Linie zur frühen römischen Satire gezogen hat. Solche Betrachtung verträgt sich durchaus mit der Anerkennung dessen, was an der Leistung der lateinischen Dichtung eigenständig ist, und bedeutet nur eine Einschränkung, nicht aber eine Widerlegung von Quintilians Wort: *satura quidem tota nostra est* (X 1, 93)."

It is in this context that the interpretation of a passage from the tenth satire of the first book of Horace becomes important. Horace discusses here the fact that, if Lucilius lived in the Augustan period, he would certainly see that the verses which he had written were quite clumsy and asked for correction, even if it is true that they were more polished than those of older Roman poets (vss. 65-67): *fuerit limatior idem | quam rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor | quamque poetarum seniorum turba*. A great number of scholars from Ianus Dousa down to the present day (I limit myself to mentioning Vahlen, Knoche, Büchner and van Rooy<sup>1</sup>) are convinced that by the *rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor* Horace must mean Ennius. Büchner even considers the possibility that the adjective *rudis* may contain an allusion to Ennius' birth-place without realizing, as it seems to me, that almost four centuries ago no less a scholar than Isaac Casaubonus took an even further step by regarding *Rudius* instead of *rudis et* as the original reading (he forgot that Ennius called himself a *Rudinus*, *Ann.* 377). If this interpretation were certainly correct, we would have to state the surprising fact that Horace had not noticed any influence of Greek literature on the *Satura* of a poet who was so deeply under the spell of that same literature. However, this interpretation is not certain at all and not even plausible; it is, in fact, considerably less probable than that defended by Nipperdey, Lucian Mueller, Leo, Heinze, Eduard Fraenkel and Rudd, *viz.*, that *auctor* only indicates, to say it in Nipperdey's words, *eum, qui condiderit... carmen aliquod rude, et in quo nulla Graecae artis vestigia insint*, which,

<sup>1</sup> The "doxography" of this question is given by RUDD, *Phoenix* 14 (1960), 36 ff., to which should be added the further literature mentioned by BÜCHNER, *Gnomon* 22 (1950), 243-244. See also VAN ROOY, *op. cit.*, 45, n. 6; KRENKEL, ed. of Lucilius, 13; J. CHRISTES, *Der frühe Lucilius. Rekonstruktion und Interpretation des XXVI. Buches sowie von Teilen des XXX. Buches* (Heidelberg 1971), 200.



as he rightly observes, amounts to the same thing as saying : *non dico rudem esse Lucilium, et Graeca arte Graecisque litteris destitutum*. So we are not forced to assume that Horace regarded Ennius' *Satura* as a *Graecis intactum carmen*.

I now turn to the elements in Ennius' *Satura* which, in my opinion, can somehow be traced back, be it only to a certain degree, to the *Iambi* of Callimachus. In the first place I want to mention—of course—the treatment of questions concerning literature—we may also say : the emphasis laid on the importance of both poetry and poets. Let us not forget for a moment that words like *Enni poeta salve* were in more than one respect something entirely new for Rome. They refer, of course, to the proem of the *Annales*, and may be called the outcome of it; but firstly the proem owes almost certainly its most vital element to Callimachus and, moreover, the idea of speaking about a *poeta* in a special poem does come from Greece, and it is Callimachus who in his poetry discussed literary questions all the time.

In the second place I regard it as probable that the idea to insert fables—which as such belong to a much simpler level of culture than Alexandrian poetry was!—in a volume of variegated poems was suggested to Ennius by Callimachus. Further I am, like van Rooy (*op. cit.*, 36), very sceptical about the possibility that the famous contest between Life and Death should owe anything to this poet, but, on the other hand, I wonder whether the fragment concerning mustard and onions (vss. 12-13) is not somehow to be connected with the traditions of iambic poetry. Finally, the origin of the moralizing character of a number of the fragments will require further investigation. Let us now consider these various points.

Though the material is much too scanty to admit of any further conclusion, I yet venture to conjecture that in the domain of literature Ennius has only spoken about his own

endeavours and achievements and, therewith, about his own situation as a *poeta*—the polemics against Naevius were almost certainly confined to their common ground, that is, to epic poetry (*i.e.*, the *Annales*). It may be—but we do not have any certainty about this—that these effusions were a starting-point for telling a number of either proud or amusing things about himself, and Ulrich Knoche (*op. cit.*, 18) may be right in supposing that the *Satura* is the source of the rather numerous anecdotes about Ennius' peculiarities.

Let us return to the second point : as I said already, we may regard it as fairly probable that the *Iambi* of Callimachus at least influenced Ennius in his decision to include fables in his *Satura*, though, apart from the observations made a moment ago, we must certainly remain alive to the fact that an influence of the very famous *αἶνοι* of Archilochos is not out of the question ; cf. pp. 108 and 130, n. 1. The second *Iambus* of Callimachus, which contains a fable, is written in choliambic trimeters ; on this account, two points at least have to be considered. In the first place, I am inclined to assume that in Callimachus this fable had a rather strongly satirical character ; in the second place, I want to point out that no fragment of the *Satura* is known which has this metre ; but this may be due to mere accident. In Ennius' *Satura* there must have been at least three fables (to which Buecheler endeavoured to add a fourth by his transposition of the fable of *Cura* which we find in Hyginus, *Fab.* 220, into *uersus quadrati* in *RhM* 41 (1886), 5-6), *viz.*, the famous one of the Crested Lark, of which Gellius gives a paraphrase in prose, and two others of each of which only one line has been preserved. The first of these is quoted by Varro (*LL* VII 35), of course without indication of its provenance, and runs as follows (vs. 65) : *Subulo quondam marinas propter astabat plagas*. The attribution of this verse to a fable is certain on account of the fact that it fits in completely with the fable told by King Cyrus in Herodotus I 141. The

circumstance that the same story is told by this author is particularly important in this context, because Callimachus was greatly interested in Herodotus; in the fragments of his *Iambi* two passages certainly show his influence<sup>1</sup>; I shall return to this point in the sequel. Further, I would like to add the observation that the line contains the word *quondam* which often occurs in the first line of a fable as, for instance, Phaedrus I 6, 3: *Vxorē quondam Sol cum uellet ducere*; *id.* I 24, 2: *In prato quondam rana conspexit bouem*; I 28, 3, *etc.* Then there is the next verse in Vahlen's collection (66), which is probably also a *uersus quadratus*<sup>2</sup>: *Propter stagna ubi lanigerum genus piscibus pascit...*; perhaps we should add *mare* or *lacus*, for Paulus ex Festo says that the poet is speaking here about a *palus*. I agree with Krenkel (*op. cit.*, 15) that this verse may have been the first, or at least one of the first lines of a fable.

With regard to these three fragments of fables I want to make the following observations. In the first place it should be noted that two of them certainly, and the third probably, were written in the ancient Roman *uersus quadratus* and that—as far as my knowledge goes—there are no traces of any Greek fable written in trochaic tetrameters; it is, in my opinion, quite probable that it is Ennius who first used this metre for this genre. In the second place, I want to point out that there is nothing particularly satirical and caustic in

<sup>1</sup> The ninth *Iambus* (on the ἑρμῆς ἐντεταμένος) is certainly influenced by Herod. II 51, cf. PFEIFFER, *ad loc.*, and C. M. DAWSON, *The Iambi of Callimachus*, (*Yale Class. Stud.* 11 (1950), 1-168), 94.—In *Iamb.* 12, 58 the mentioning of the enormous Indian ants certainly comes from Herod. III 102, cf. PFEIFFER, *ad loc.*, and DAWSON, *op. cit.*, 113, n. 58. An entirely different interpretation is given by BOLISANI, 43, who reads *quidem* instead of *quondam* and, following PASCOLI, thinks that an *omen* is described which presented itself to Scipio, and which was similar to the *omen* which Caesar received on crossing the Rubicon (Suet. *Caes.* 32).

<sup>2</sup> I can not subscribe to the—entirely apodictic—statement by A. GRILLI, *Studi enniani* (Brescia s.a.), 116, that this verse should be a dactylic hexameter.

these fragments of Ennius' fables, though this has been asserted from several sides<sup>1</sup>; so no conclusions concerning the sources which made Ennius write these fables can be drawn from the tone in which they are written. Finally, we should not lose sight of the fact that Lucilius, too, narrated a fable, *viz.*, the well-known one about the lion and the fox (vss. 980-981 Marx). This once more brings his *Saturae* nearer to the *Satura* of Ennius and provides us with one more argument against Puelma Piwonka's thesis of a fundamental difference between the *Saturae* of the two poets.

I think it is the right place here to add a few words concerning a verse about the localization of which I am completely at a loss, *viz.*, the famous hexameter *Simia quam similis turpissima bestia nobis!* Knoche (*op. cit.*, 20), regards it as entirely uncertain that this verse, which is quoted by Cicero (*De nat. deor.* I 35, 97) as a verse of Ennius without any further indication, should have been part of the *Satura*. Against this view I would like to observe that a part of this line is quoted by Serenus in his *Liber medicinalis*, 819: *sive homo seu similis turpissima bestia nobis | vulnere dente dedit*, and that it is this very author—who, as it seems, possessed a certain knowledge of older Roman literature—who elsewhere<sup>2</sup> alludes to a verse which almost certainly formed part of the *Satura*, *viz.*, *numquam poetor nisi podager*. The possibility that this verse was part of a fable is not excluded, though I must confess that I can not easily imagine a context in which it may have occurred. I only want to mention the sup-

<sup>1</sup> For instance by ALTHEIM, *Gesch. d. lat. Sprache* (Frankfurt a.M. 1951), 359: "In der von Gellius nacherzählten Fabel der Haubenlerche ist das Verhalten derer gezeigelt, die meinen, sich auf Verwandte und Freunde statt auf eigene Kraft verlassen zu dürfen."

<sup>2</sup> On Ennius' podagra he writes (vss. 706-707): *Ennius ipse pater, dum pocula siccat iniqua, hoc vitio tales fertur mernisse dolores*. It is evident that Serenus knows both the verse of Ennius and that of Horace, which has the same beginning. On Serenus' rather remarkable quotations from old Latin literature cf. SCHANZ-HOSIUS, III, 28.



position of Puelma Piwonka (*op. cit.*, 189) who assumes for this verse an influence of the Cynic-Stoic diatribe, as also for vs. 63: *Meum non est, ac si me canis momorderit* (quite improbable is the connection of this verse with Scipio by Lucian Mueller and Bolisani, who thought that the *Scipio* was identical with the third book of the *Saturae*).

We now come to a fragment which has been left unexplained by Vahlen, Lucian Mueller and Warmington and which may perhaps prove to be of particular interest. I mean the only fragment from book IV (vss. 12-13), which is quoted by Macrobius in order to provide an example of *tristis* with the meaning "bitter", viz., *neque ille triste quaeritat sinapi neque cepe maestum*. Krenkel (ed. of Lucilius I, 14) gives the fragment under the title "Der Triefäugige" ("The Blear-eyed Man", *lippus*). I wonder whether a different hypothesis is not to be preferred, viz., that mustard and onions are rejected here as a particularly disagreeable or even disgusting kind of food. In this context one might consider the possibility that before *ille* something like *quisquis sapit* should be supplied. This leads us to various observations. In the first place we should note that this same qualification of onions is mentioned by the two authors of *saturae* after Ennius, viz., Lucilius (194 M.): *flebile cepe simul lacrimosaeque ordine tallae* (*talla* is the peel of the onion)—from the description of a *rustica cena*, according to Charisius—and Varro, *Sat. Men.* 250: *flebile esitet caepe*, and from this we may infer that it has come to belong to the traditional material of the Roman *satura*. We can, however, take a further step, for the same subject is touched upon in two verses from Naevius' comedy *Apella* (which almost certainly means "The Jew"<sup>1</sup>). We find there a formal execration

<sup>1</sup> *Apella* with Alpha privans = *sine pelle*, i.e. *sine praeputio*; cf. RIBBECK's note in *Com. Lat. Fragm.*, *ad loc.*, and V. PISANI, *Apella*, *Paideia* 8 (1953), 8. Whereas in Egypt onions were regarded as holy plants which it was not allowed to eat (Plin., *NH* II 16 and 101; Juven. 15, 9; cf. *TLL* III 847,

of the man who introduced onions as a nourishment: *Ut illum di perdant qui primus holitor caepam protulit*, and in a iambic senarius we find once more mentioned the discomfort caused by onions: *cui saepe edundod oculus alter profluit*. We have here a specimen of that typical execration of an inventor, which also occurs in a famous fragment of Plautus, in which the inventor of *horologia* is cursed by a hungry parasite. This is a theme which occurs already in Euripides and Aristophanes, and further in Middle and New Comedy; we can refer to Eubulus and Menander<sup>1</sup>.

There is, however, also another poem in which a quite similar vegetable is cursed in a somewhat different form, which may be regarded as a variation of the first one, *viz.*, the third *Epode* of Horace, where it is said that garlic should only be eaten by a man who has killed his father. In this connection it is worth while to observe that Nonius mentions in one breath all the three vegetables under discussion: *acria, . . . ut est sinapi caepe alium*. No Greek model of this poem is mentioned by Kiessling-Heinze *ad loc.* and by Eduard Fraenkel in his discussion of it (*Horace*, 68-69). However, I like to quote the latter's excellent characterization of this poem as containing "a good deal of mocking pathos and quasi-Archilochian indignation delivered with feigned grandiloquence".

7-13), they are mentioned as the food of the Jews during their stay in Egypt in *Numeri* 11, 5 (cf. *TLL ibid.*, ll. 28-35). Cf. the verse in the well-known 'Alphabet' of WILHELM BUSCH: "Die Zwiebel ist der Juden Speise."

<sup>1</sup> Cf. for this subject LEO, *Plautin. Forsch.*<sup>2</sup>, 154, and K. THRAEDE, Art. Erfinder II (geistesgeschichtlich), in *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum* V (1962), 1225-1226.—As entirely improbable I regard the interpretation of this fragment by WEINREICH who says (*op. cit.*, 4-5) that the mustard and the onion are mentioned here as the characterization of a frugal meal—he entirely overlooks the fact that the present passage is quoted by Nonius because *tristis* there means *amarus*, a notion which has nothing to do with frugality, and the further passages which he quotes are not relevant in any respect.

We thus see ourselves faced with two possibilities ; our material is, of course, much too scanty to admit of any decision. There is a possibility that Ennius found a subject like this described in a volume of *Iambi*, either by Callimachus or by Archilochus. For the sake of completeness I want to observe, firstly that convincing proofs of an influence of these poems of Callimachus on the *Epodes* of Horace have not become known to me<sup>1</sup>, secondly that at all events Lucilius mentions the name of Archilochus, whom he seems to have followed in one of his *Saturae*<sup>2</sup> ; therefore I do not want to exclude the possibility of a direct influence of Archilochus on Ennius. But there is also a second possibility which, in my opinion, deserves more serious consideration than it has received till now, *viz.*, that in his *Satura* Ennius worked up suggestions offered, not by the entirely enigmatic “dramatic *satura*”, but by existing drama, which in this case amounts to an influence of the then already flourishing Roman comedy. After all the author of the comedies *Cupuncula* and *Pancratiastes*—literally tenth-rate according to the canon of Volcacius Sedigitus—may well have realized that in this field at least he had no reason to look down upon the poet whose epic poem he so thoroughly despised.

It is this latter point about which I want to add a few observations before summing up the result of my investigations. I must begin here by eliminating at once what

<sup>1</sup> No convincing examples of an influence of the *Iambi* on the *Epodes* are mentioned by PASQUALI in his famous book *Orazio lirico* in which he stresses throughout (and occasionally overstates) the influence of Hellenistic poetry on Horace's *Odes* and *Epodes*.

<sup>2</sup> Lucil. 698 M. (732 Krenkel): *metuo ut fieri possit: ergo <anti> quo ab Archiloco excido*. IANUS DOUSA already connected this line with the famous fragment of Archilochus (74 D.): *Χρημάτων ἄελπτον οὐδέν, etc.* PUELMA PIWONKA, *op. cit.*, 50, conjectures: *ego <hoc anti> quo*, on which KRENKEL *ad loc.* observes: “Da Lucilius dem Archilochus offenbar über einen längeren Abschnitt gefolgt war, hat die Konjektur..., in diesem einen Punkt weiche ich von A. ab, von PUELMA PIWONKA viel für sich.” Cf. also the note by E. BOLISANI, *Lucilio e i suoi frammenti* (Padova 1932), 268.

might at first sight seem to provide by far the strongest argument in favour of my hypothesis, *viz.*, the graphic description in six verses of a parasite which Vahlen, though with great hesitation, has included in his edition as a fragment of the sixth book of the *Saturae* (vss. 14-19). This fragment is mentioned by Donatus in his commentary on Terence, *Phormio* 339-342, as the model imitated in these verses. The indication of the passage is entirely corrupt in the manuscripts of Donatus: the words *sed ex sexta satyrarum Ennii* are a very audacious conjecture by Stephanus. The most important manuscript reads *sed de cen...*, for which Leo (*Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, 206, n. 2) conjectured "vielleicht Caecilius" which is considerably more plausible, since the verses in question are strikingly good and therewith far above the level of Ennius in the domain of comedy.

Yet there remain a number of cases in which an influence of definite comedies, or rather of the general activity in this field in Ennius' time, must be regarded as possible and even probable. Van Rooy has already observed (*op. cit.*, 49, n. 56): "There are, of course, interesting similarities of style between the Ennian *Saturae* and Roman Comedy"; he also points out the fact that Caecilius Statius was at one time a friend of Ennius. I wonder whether we may not quote in this context the second fragment of the second book (vs. 5) which, as it seems to me, describes a general turmoil of highly active or nervous people: *restitant occurrunt obstant ostringillant obagitant*. (Bolisani, 33, refers it to "la vita tumultuosa del foro"). Deubner (*op. cit.*, 290) quotes this verse as an example of "iambisches Ethos" which may amount to the same thing, and a similar view seems to be held by Puelma Piwonka (*op. cit.*, 186, n. 3), whereas Weinreich (*op. cit.*, 5) thinks that it may belong to the description of a battle.

In the second place there are the four well-known verses containing a lengthy pun, by means of endless repetition,



on *frustrari*, *frustra* and *frustra esse* (*fr. inc.* iii, vss. 59-62). These have already been connected by Dr. Jocelyn with the equally lengthy word-play on *otium* and *negotium* in the chorus of Ennius' *Iphigenia* (*fr.* xcix Joc.) and, moreover, with some similar passages in Plautus (*Amph.* 33-36; *Capt.* 255-256; *Pseud.* 704-705). We may add *Bacch.* 548 where we find the same words as in Ennius: *atque i se cum frustrant, frustrari alios stolidi existimant*. This striking similarity with a passage from Plautus is, in my opinion, particularly important, since I have the impression that Ennius was acquainted with Plautus' plays—after all by no means a surprising fact, or rather what was to be expected—and has borrowed at least several expressions from this great master of the Latin language. In this connection I do not want to mention the verb *propinare* (*cf. supra*, pp. 117 f.), which may be a Grecism belonging to colloquial Latin like *graecari* and *obsonare*, but I wonder whether Ennius did not borrow from Plautus the adverb *medullitus* which occurs twice in the latter's comedies (*Most.* 243; *Truc.*—from 189 B.C.—439).

A puzzling case is the fragment in hexameters quoted by Varro *LL VII* 71: *decem coclites quas montibus summis | Ripaeis fodere*. This fragment, which Hug attributed to the *Satura*, must be connected, as was first seen by Otfried Mueller, with the statement in Herodotus III 116 (*cf. ibid.* IV 27) that in the North of Europe much gold is found which the one-eyed Arimaspoi get hold of by stealing it from the griffions; it is, therefore, quite possible that to *quas* we should with Lachmann supply *massas*. It is interesting to see that, in support of this conjecture, Lachmann refers to a passage from Plautus, *viz.*, *Mil. glor.* 1065: *nam massas habet: Aetna mons non aeque altust*. Warmington translates: "ten nuggets which the One-eyed have mined on the Ripaeian mountaintops" with the explication: "The *fr.* suggests a mocking allusion to ostentatious wealth." Although we may reckon with a certain influence of Herodotus on early Roman

historiography<sup>1</sup>, which makes it probable that his work was known at Rome during the life-time of Ennius, I wonder whether we should not take into account the possibility of an influence of Callimachus. I have already (pp. 120 f.) discussed the fact that this poet and scholar was particularly interested in Herodotus, as was demonstrated by Ernst Howald in an important paper<sup>2</sup>. Since the verse seems to betray a mocking tone, as was suggested by Warmington, we come once more to think of the *Iambi* of Callimachus.

The *certamen* between Life and Death (*Inc.* 1), which is unfortunately only mentioned by Quintilian (IX 2, 36), certainly has its place in an old tradition of Greek comedy but in this case it is not Roman comedy of which I am thinking. It is in fact by no means impossible that Ennius was influenced by the particularly famous ἀγών between Earth and Sea in a comedy of Epicharmus, since it is certain that he was acquainted with what in the Hellenistic period was regarded as 'Epicharmean literature'. In the summary of the lecture given by Mr. Coffey at the symposium on the *Satura* at Rostock (cf. n. 3, p. 105) I find the judicious remark that the staging of discussions between personified abstract notions was in the Greek tradition chiefly connected with Epicharmus. Quite interesting is the fact that Novius wrote a *fabula Atellana* with the same title. Van Rooy, *op. cit.*, 36, has rejected Deubner's attempt to find a model for this poem of Ennius in the contest between laurel and olive-tree in Callimachus' first *Iambus*<sup>3</sup>; I agree with van Rooy's

<sup>1</sup> W. SOLTAU, *Die Anfänge der römischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Leipzig 1904), 267; cf. also H. BALL, *Die Bekanntschaft römischer Schriftsteller mit Herodotus* (Progr. Berlin 1890).

<sup>2</sup> In his paper *Ionische Geschichtsschreibung* (*Hermes* 58 (1923), 113-146), 133-139. W. SCHMID, *Gesch. der griech. Lit.*, I (München 1934), 666, n. 4 adds the observation that both authors are greatly interested in aetiologies.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. M. COFFEY, *op. cit.* (see n. 3, p. 105). The last discussion of the influence of 'Epicharmean' literature on Ennius is given by A. MARASTONI, *Enniana*

emphasis on the different character of the highly literary poem of Callimachus but I regard it as probable that this poet, too, influenced Ennius' decision to devote a poem to an ἄγών.

A last problem to be treated here—I repeat that in this paper any attempt at completeness is out of the question—concerns the problem whether Ennius' *Satura* contained poems possessing a certain amount of ὕψος. This question pertains particularly to the first fragment of the second and the third fragment of the third book. The first fragment (vss. 3-4) runs as follows: *contemplor | inde loci liquidas pilatasque aetheris oras*. Here we find two expressions which belong to the *genus sublime*, viz., *inde loci* and *aetheris oras*. The first expression occurs twice in the fragments of the *Annales* (vss. 22 and 530), whereas the combination *aetheris orae* is found five times in Lucretius, and *aetheriae orae* three times<sup>1</sup>; this makes it practically certain that this locution, too, was borrowed by Ennius from his epic poem. Thus it is quite credible that the present fragment is from a poem which possessed a certain ὕψος. The explication of *pilatas* given by the Servius Danielinus, viz., *firmas et stabiles ... quasi pilis fultas* is, in my opinion, not correct in so far as the *quasi* should disappear: the verse is evidently to be connected with passages like *Odyssey* I 53, where the columns “which

minora quaedam ex opusculis decerpta, *Miscellanea critica*, II (Leipzig, Teubner, 1965), 219-227. — In his edition of the fragments of the *Fabulae Atellanae* (*Poetarum Latinorum Reliquiae: Aetas rei publicae*, VI 1, Rome 1967), 111, P. FRASSINETTI proposes the following supposition: “si incentrava probabilmente su un contrasto nello stile della vetusta commediola epicarnea.” Cf. also VAHLEN<sup>2</sup>, ccxiii, who observes at the end: ... *certe ei suam partem παραινέσεως vel νοουθετήσεως, ut par est in satura, non defuisse non ambiguum est*. LEO, *op. cit.*, 206, is uncertain: “Wir haben leider die Wahl, ob wir uns das Gedicht des Ennius mehr in die Nähe von Novius' ‘Tod und Leben’ oder von Kallimachos' ‘Lorbeer und Ölbaum’ denken wollen.” Cf. also A. DIETERICH, *Pulcinella*, 78, und R. HIRZEL, *Der Dialog* I (Leipzig 1895), 423.

<sup>1</sup> *Aetheris orae*: II 1000; III 835; IV 215; V 143, 683. — *Aetheriae orae*: IV 411; V 85; VI 61.

keep heaven and earth apart" are mentioned. Puelma Piwonka, *op. cit.*, 183, n. 1, quite erroneously refers to Sophocles *Aias* 108, where Sophocles speaks about pillars supporting the roof of a house. On the other hand, Puelma may well be right in supposing that Ennius is here describing one more dream (besides those narrated in the proem of the first book of the *Annales* and in the *Epicharmus*), this time combined with a contemplation, a θεωρία, of the universe. One feels inclined to put the question whether the first line of the first book of Lucilius, *aetheris et terrae genitabile quaerere tempus*, is a quotation from a poem belonging to a *satura* which the younger poet regarded as not suited to the genre—in this context it may be of importance that the first line of the first satire of Persius, *o curas hominum, o quantum est in rebus inane!* is perhaps also a quotation. At all events Lucilius may, as Marx observes, have coined the adjective *genitabilis* after the example of Ennius' *genitalis* (*Ann.* 115). Lucian Mueller thought of a reference by Lucilius to Ennius' *Epicharmus* and *Eubemerus* but in my opinion the interpretation given by Marx is more probable, *viz.*, that here a friend of the poet is speaking who advises him to compose, rather than a *Satura*, a *carmen physicum*, for which then an example could be found in one of the poems forming part of Ennius' *Satura*. When, after all, it is probable that the fragment *Enni poeta salve* is, to a certain degree, the repetition of a scene from the proem of the *Annales*, the poet may have included in his *Satura* a similar repetition of the verses *de rerum natura*<sup>1</sup> in that same proem.

<sup>1</sup> I use this opportunity to point out once more that this revelation of the *rerum natura* by Homer in this context (*Lucr.* I 126) should not be imagined as a lengthy discussion on this subject but that almost certainly it contained only as much as was necessary in order to understand the doctrine of the transmigration of souls. It had in fact the same function as the revelation (*vs.* 723 *ordine singula pandit; expandere* in *Lucr.*, *loc. cit.*) by Anchises of the same subject in *Aen.* VI 724-751. Cf. on this subject what I have written in *Mnemosyne* IV 3 (1950), 221-222. It is for this reason that in the well-



I am quite uncertain about the localization of the fragment from the third book *testes sunt | Lati campi quos gerit Africa terra politos* (vss. 10-11), which is so surprisingly similar to the fragment from the *Scipio*: *testes sunt | Campi magni*. There is, of course, a fairly great possibility that Ennius repeated himself once more<sup>1</sup> and that, after or before writing the *Scipio*, he included a *laudatio* of Scipio maior in his *Satura*, as is supposed by Mariotti<sup>2</sup>. Weinreich (*op. cit.*, 5) seems to think of a reminiscence of personal experiences of the poet; however, we have no record that the second Punic war ever brought Ennius to Africa.

As to the verses 2, 8 and 63, Friedrich Leo (*op. cit.*, 207) supposes that they stem from a moralizing context ("einen moralischen Zusammenhang"). It is indeed quite plausible that Ennius' *Satura* contained more moralizing poems—or poems with a moral—than the three fables of which we know. Probably the proverbial expression found in the hexameter (v. 70) *Quaerunt in scirpo soliti quod dicere nodum* should be added to this group. Some scholars speak, though rather vaguely, about the possibility that Ennius should have experienced the influence of the famous *Diatribes* of Menippus. As regards chronology, this is quite possible but I am still not much inclined to regard this as probable, since the qualification of Varro's *Satura* or *Saturae* by means of the adjective *Menippeus* looks like the announcement of a novelty. Further, I can not, in the absence of any further

known sentence of Fronto *magister Enni Homerus et somnium* the importance of the word *magister* should not be overstressed.

<sup>1</sup> To the examples quoted above (p. 107) more can be added; a particular striking instance is the similarity of *Sc.* 185 *Constitit credo Scamander, arbores uento uacant* and *Varia* 12 (from the *Scipio*): *Constitere amnes perennes, arbores uento uacant*.

<sup>2</sup> *Lezioni su Ennio*, 125; *Titoli di opere enniane*, 274, n. 4 (here he refers to the fact that the eleventh book of Lucilius (394 ff. M.) may have contained a similar *laudatio* of Scipio Minor).

proof, follow Deubner when he asserts (*op. cit.*, 290) that the verses which he regards as moralizing, *viz.*, vss. 1, 2, 5, 8-9 and 59-62, show a "iambisches Ethos" and are therefore—he does not say this explicitly but it is evident from the context that we should infer this—primarily due to the influence of the *Iambi* of Callimachus.

*Illuc unde abii redeo.* I entirely agree with Mariotti that the most essential feature of the *Satura* of Ennius was a continuous striving after *uarietas*, which may be regarded as typical of ancient Roman culture. This *uarietas* showed itself in the wide range of *uaria poemata* which together constituted this *Satura* and which show both the influence of Greek Hellenistic literature, which Ennius had studied and imitated with so much zeal, and of the still quite young Roman literature, of which the comedies of Plautus should perhaps be mentioned in the first place. The question whether Ennius' Roman models also included the remnants—preserved in whatever form—of a preliterate *satura* will probably never be solved.

## DISCUSSION

*M. Skutsch*: The first point I wish to make is really a query only: does Mr. Waszink hold with Mariotti that the *Annals* are, if not in a chronological sense, yet in some sense a *Satura*?

*M. Waszink*: Ich glaube nicht, dass diese Formulierung die Meinung von Mariotti richtig wiedergibt: Mariotti will m.E. nur sagen, dass man die *Satura* sozusagen als eine Vorarbeit oder —um mit ihm jeden Gedanken an Priorität auszuschliessen— als eine Bearbeitung auf einem mehr bescheidenen Niveau der verschiedenen Fazetten seiner Dichtung in den *Annales* zu betrachten hat.

*M. Wülfing*: Ist der Eindruck ganz falsch, dass Ennius' hochbewusster, zuweilen spielerischer Umgang mit der Sprache auch witzig wirken konnte, selbst an einigen *Annalen*stellen, dass mindestens Ennius so etwas nicht ganz streng vermied?

Ich denke an das onomatopoetische *taratantara* (*Ann.* II 140), an das Unwort *gau* (ich bin mir bewusst, dass Ennius auch homerische Sonderformen mag haben nachbilden wollen; bei *do*, vielleicht auch bei *cael* naheliegend) oder an die 'tmesis' *Massilitanas* (*Ann.* 610) und *cere - comminuit - brum* (*Ann.* 609). Übermut des Könners?—Da kann dann manches zwischen *Saturae* und den anderen Gattungen hin- und hergewirkt haben.

*M. Suerbaum*: Aus der mehrfach bezeugten Anführung *Ennius satyrarum libro* ... würde auch ich nicht schliessen, dass der originale Titel *Saturarum libri quattuor* gelautet hat. Ennius ist nämlich ein Vertreter des *Satura*-Typs, den Diomedes als *carmen quod ex uariis poematibus constabat* charakterisiert. In diesem Sinne ist also *Satura* ein Synonym zu *liber*, das ja auch eine Zusammenfassung von *x uaria poemata* ist. *Saturarum liber* wäre also eine

Tautologie. Ich neige deshalb zu der Annahme, dass der originale Titel der Ennianischen Sammlung *Satura* (oder aber, falls Ennius diese seine vermischten Gedichte nicht in einer einzigen Rolle, sondern in Einzelpublikationen veröffentlicht haben sollte, evtl. auch *Satura prima*, *Satura secunda* usw.) gelautet haben wird.

*M. Skutsch*: Is it not legitimate to infer from *De compositione saturarum* that a plurality of compositions are meant? Would the author not have used the singular if the genre as such had been in mind?

*M. Waszink*: I reckon with a possibility that Varro was thinking of the *Satura* of respectively Ennius, Lucilius, himself, etc., at all events of a plurality of authors.

*M. Suerbaum*: Die These, der Ennianische *Scipio* sei eine *satura*, beruht nicht einfach auf der hypothetischen Zusammengehörigkeit oder gar Identität des Fragmentes aus dem III. Buch der *Satiren*, *Sat.* 10 sq. *testes sunt | Lati campi quos gerit Africa terra politos* mit dem wahrscheinlich aus dem *Scipio* stammenden Fragment *Var.* 8: *Testes sunt Campi Magni*, sondern in erster Linie auf dem Tatbestand, dass der *Scipio* nachweislich aus Partien verschiedenen Versmasses (mindestens Septenaren und Hexametern) bestand. Damit können wenigstens wir ihn als *satura* jenes älteren Typs bezeichnen, die Diomedes als *carmen quod ex variis poematibus constabat* definiert. Ob der *Scipio* dagegen in der Antike zu den sog. *libri saturarum* des Ennius gezählt (und mit Buch III identifiziert) wurde, ist eine andere, davon zu trennende Frage. Vgl. dazu meine *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer röm. Dichter*, Hildesheim 1968, S. 239 f. mit Anm. 701.

*M. Jocelyn*: One should not build too much on a single quotation occurring in a context like Macrobius, *Sat.* VI 4, 6. Items in blocks of quotations by grammarians tended to become confused.



*M. Badian* : I should point out that, while I quite agree on the grammarians, the assignment of a hexameter (*Var.* 14) to the *Scipio* comes from Macrobius, who cannot be lightly dismissed. Polymetry therefore seems securely attested.

*M. Skutsch* : I have long held the view (although I cannot here set it out in detail) that in the notorious Livy chapter and in the (partly contradictory) statements on the banqueting songs in Cato and Varro we have the *disiecta membra* of a peripatetic theory on the beginnings of literature adapted to the circumstances of Rome. I do not see any connection between any earlier dramatic satire and the work of Livius Andronicus.

*M. Suerbaum* : Mir scheint aus dem vieltraktierten Livius-Kapitel VII 2 hervorzugehen, dass—zu verstehen ist immer : nach der Darstellung des Livius—bereits auf der sog. *satura*-Stufe der Entwicklung ein Dialog vorhanden war und nicht erst durch Livius Andronicus (auf der *fabula*-Stufe) eingeführt wurde : sogar schon die Fescenninen-Stufe ist dialogisch (*alternis iaciebant*). Die sog. dramatischen *saturae* scheinen einzelne Sketche ohne zusammenhängende Handlung gewesen zu sein. Neu auf der *fabula*-Stufe ist nicht die Rollendarstellung (die kann es durchaus in den *saturae* gegeben haben), sondern die zusammenhängende Handlung : bei *Livius* ... *ab saturis ausus est primus argumento fabulam serere* ist nicht nur das *argumento*, sondern auch das *serere* bedeutungsvoll.

*M. Waszink* : I do not see any reason to change my opinion in these matters : there remains the possibility of performances without improvisation, as Mr. Jocelyn has observed. And the source of Livy, almost certainly Varro, may have regarded those performances, which he clearly contrasts with the *plots* of a full-fledged comedy (*argumento fabulam serere*), as the *exempla* of that part of Latin comedy which is not the dialogue (*diuerbium*, on which the plot is based), *viz.* the *cantica*.

*M. Badian* : I am already on record as totally disbelieving the "tradition" on *Tafellieder*, which I suspect Cato made up (see my chapter on The Early Historians in *The Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey). Did Ennius know that story? We are not told in which book of the *Origines* Cato mentioned it, but it might well be the first. This seems to have been written early, perhaps some time in the 180s : he is said by Plutarch to have written it for the education of his eldest son. If so, Ennius may well have read it in Cato before he wrote this passage.

*M. Jocelyn* : I do not believe that *Sat.* 6-7 was meant as the utterance of a Muse or that it had any direct connection with the *Annales* proem. The principal metaphor, as Mr. Suerbaum reminds us, came from the area of the symposium. Archilochus, Aeschylus and Cratinus had established a tradition of poetic bibulousness and to this tradition Ennius clearly attached himself somewhere in his writings (*numquam nisi potus ad arma prosiluit dicenda* etc.). If, however, Ennius described himself drinking anything in the *Annales* proem, it was water, not wine. Again the verses of the *Annales* came from the Muses (*insece Musa manu Romanorum induperator quod quisque in bello gessit cum rege Philippo*) not from the poet's spinal marrow. Ennius *Sat.* 6-7, like Lucilius fr. 590, surely refers to satirical poetry, concerned as this was with contemporary life, the poet's own personal experience etc.

*M. Waszink* : As I have expounded in my first paper on the proem of *Annales* I (*Mnemosyne* 1950), I am convinced that in 217 *Nos ausi reserare* we should supply *fontes* (cf. my paper, p. 116, n. 1). Combining this with *Musarum scopulos* (215), I regard it as certain that in the proem of *Ann.* VII *Musarum fontes* were mentioned. This again must be combined with Propertius III 3, 6, *Unde pater sitiens Ennius ante bibit*, where *unde* refers to Hippocrene mentioned in III 3, 1. It is said by many scholars (not by all) that we should explain this as a mere metaphor. I only want to say now that the *onus* of proof does not rest upon those who defend the literal interpretation, *viz.* that Propertius alludes to a

scene actually described by Ennius. Finally, I see a confirmation of this supposition in the well-known line of Lucilius (1008 M.): *quantum haurire animus Musarum e fontibus gestit*, which may, in my view, certainly be regarded as a parody of the proem of the *Annales*.

*M. Skutsch*: Would Professor Waszink say that there is a direct connection between *Enni poeta salve* and the proems of the *Annals*?

*M. Waszink*: Yes, I would say so. I am convinced that the fragment refers to the *fontes Musarum* which, as I expounded, were certainly mentioned in the prologue of *Ann.* VII, and almost certainly in the prologue of *Ann.* I.

*M. Skutsch*: I would still hold that the object of *reserare* in *Annals* VII is not *fontes* but *fores*. It is remarkable that in Plato's *Phaedrus*, 245 a, where the ποιητικὰ ὄρρα of the Muses are mentioned, the context is exactly the same as here: the relationship between τέχνη and inspiration (see *Stud. Enn.* 125).

*M. Suerbaum*: In *Ann.* 217 *nos ausi reserare* möchte ich noch immer (vgl. meine *Untersuchungen*, S. 278 ff.) *fontes* ergänzen: einmal weil Ennius eher als an Platos *Phaedr.* 245 a (mit der Tor-Metaphorik) an die im Hellenismus, zumal bei Kallimachos, so stark ausgeprägte Symbolik des Wassertrinkens angeknüpft haben wird, zum andern weil Vergil in einer im Ethos und offenbar im Wortlaut von Ennius abhängigen Stelle *Georg.* II 175 *sanctos ausus recludere fontis* gebraucht. Auf Vergil fusst Stat. *Silu.* II 2, 38 sq. *reseret . . . fontes* und auch Columella X 435 *ueteres ausus recludere fontes*.

*M. Jocelyn*: The fact that drinking water of inspiration is a commonplace of classical Latin poetry proves nothing about *Ann.* 217. It was also a common place of Greek poetry (as early as Pindar, *Ol.* VI 84-7, *Isth.* VI 74-5). I find Columella's supplement *fores* more convincing than Pascoli's *fontes*. Admit-

tedly this involves a philosophical rather than a poetical common place but there are many traces of philosophical doctrine in the *Annales*, apart from the account *de rerum natura* in the first book (cf. *Ann.* 163, 211, 218-9, 518, 521-2, 542-3).

*M. Skutsch* : I should have thought that *nec quisquam* in *Ann.* 218 can only be meant to be illustrative : "just as nobody can dream of philosophy before he has studied it." If the sentence referred to Ennius himself we should have to write *coepi* with H. Fränkel or to insert *prius quam sam «hic» discere coepit*.

*M. Badian* : I think it is genuinely possible to take lines 218-19 in the two opposite ways that have at times been suggested : one, that Ennius worked hard at philosophy before he had his vision ; the other, that he was the first man to have a vision of philosophy before he had studied it. Cicero only tells us (probably from Ennius) that, through familiarity with Homer's works, he came to have his vision of Homer. But Homer is not philosophy (which is clearly his Pythagorean revelation). So it is still possible that Ennius said that, through knowledge of Homer, he had his dream of Homer, and then his revelation of philosophy before he had actually studied that subject. This is by no means *better* than the alternative interpretation. I merely want to insist that it should be left open, and that we should not claim to be certain where we cannot be.

*M. Suerbaum* : Das Vorkommen von Fabeln in Ennius' *satura* sollte man nicht einseitig auf literarische Einflüsse, etwa auf das Vorbild von Kallimachos' Iamboi (in denen offenbar nur vereinzelt Fabeln vorkommen), zurückführen. Gerade wenn die nächste Parallele zu einer der Ennianischen Fabeln (*Sat.* 65) bei Herodot (I 141) vorliegt und es einzelne Fabeln vor Ennius z.B. auch schon bei Hesiod gegeben hat, ist nicht einzusehen, warum generell Kallimachos' Iamboi Ennius in diesem Punkt beeinflusst haben sollen. Ich möchte vielmehr in der Fabel — nach der Definition von Jolles — eine «einfache Form», ein unliterarisches,



volkstümliches Erbe sehen, auf das immer wieder von einzelnen Literaten zurückgegriffen werden konnte. Als erster der Fabel als selbständiger Gattung den Rang wirklicher Poesie verliehen zu haben, kann sich Phaedrus rühmen, weil er als erster eine Reihe von Gedichtbüchern geschrieben hat, die nur aus Fabeln bestanden. Das gelegentliche Vorkommen von Fabeln in der römischen Satire wird dadurch nicht berührt. Es scheint von Ennius inauguriert zu sein; jedenfalls bieten auch die späteren römischen Satiriker, z.B. Horaz, Fabeln. Doch ist zu bedenken, dass hier neben Ennius (oder gar durch Ennius?) die popular-philosophische Diatribe eingewirkt haben wird (vgl. dazu G. A. Gerhard, *Phoenix von Kolophon*, Leipzig 1909, 246 f.; M. Puelma Piwonka, *Lucilius und Kallimachos*, Frankfurt a.M. 1949, 184 f. 356).

*M. Waszink*: Ich habe aber *nur* gesagt, dass Ennius durch die Lektüre der Iamben des Kallimachos *mitangeregt* sein kann, um Fabeln unter die *uaria poemata*, die seine *satura* ausmachten, aufzunehmen. Es ist sehr wohl möglich, dass Ennius in diese *satura* auch mehr Volkstümliches aufgenommen hat, aber es ist doch evident, dass er in fast allen seinen Gedichten griechische Dichtung als sein, wenn auch mehr oder weniger nahes, Vorbild betrachtet hat.

*M. Suerbaum*: Es ist unleugbar, dass autobiographische Elemente in der Ennianischen *satura* eine grosse Rolle spielten und nach ihm bei Lucilius in einem Masse, dass Horaz *Sat.* II 1, 30 ff. von ihm sagen konnte: *ille uelut fidis arcana sodalibus olim | credebat libris...*, | *quo fit ut omnis | uotiuu pateat ueluti descripta tabella | uita senis*. Dabei drängt sich mir die allgemeine Frage auf, warum wir geneigt sind, den autobiographischen Angaben in satirischer Dichtung (z.B. auch bei Horaz) zu vertrauen, den scheinbar autobiographischen Elementen z.B. in der Lyrik oder Elegie dagegen nicht. Offensichtlich hängt diese Einstellung (die allerdings nicht immer herrschte, wenn man z.B. an die Rekonstruktionen eines « Liebesromans » Catulls denkt) mit dem verschiedenen literarischen Genus zusammen. Anscheinend ist die

(traditionslose?) *satura* nicht so stark der « Gefahr » ausgesetzt gewesen, traditionelle Motive zu übernehmen und als quasi-individuelle Erlebnisse zu stilisieren. Die *satura* scheint von Anfang an unverfälschter gewesen zu sein, sie scheint unstilierter, direkter, wenn man so will, prosaischer zu sprechen.

*M. Badian*: Mr. Suerbaum has made an important point. I should add that we have the ancients' own assessments of their genres and of the credibility of each to guide us. Horace plainly tells us that Lucilius' autobiographical passages should be (on the whole) accepted. Elsewhere we are told no less clearly that a poet's account of his amatory experiences should *not* be believed. Of course, we must always be watchful and critical. But until we have evidence to the contrary, we may surely be (and we normally are) guided by the ancients' own assessment of their conventions.

*M. Wülfing*: Die Glaubwürdigkeit autobiographischer Angaben hält immer so lange, bis wir mit der topischen Wiederkehr konfrontiert werden. Diese Entdeckung ist tatsächlich in der hochformalisierten Elegie und Lyrik häufiger gemacht worden als in den Ich-Aussagen der *satura*. Das *sermoni propiora* hat eben auch seine Bedeutung für den Inhalt.

*M. Suerbaum*: Die Erklärung von Hor. *Sat.* I 10, 66 *rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor* im Sinne von *si quis Graecis intactum carmen scripsit* befriedigt nicht recht, weil es zum Stil der Polemik gehört, konkrete, nicht fingierte Gegner anzugreifen. (Wer hat denn überhaupt ein solches *Graecis intactum carmen* verfasst, wenn die *poetarum seniorum turba* ausgeschlossen ist?) Man möchte erwarten, dass mit jenem *rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor* ein bestimmter Autor gemeint ist und Lucilius anschliessend dann *überhaupt* über die *poetarum seniorum turba* gestellt wird (mit dem üblichen Übergang von der individualisierenden zur generalisierenden Aussage). Nach der Argumentation des Horaz braucht es nicht unbedingt ein Satiriker zu sein, dem Lucilius an

*lima* überlegen ist; denn Lucilius hatte nach Vs. 53-55 Accius und Ennius (und zwar Ennius offenbar — und in Wirklichkeit — als Epiker), also Nicht-Satiriker, getadelt (zur Entsprechung von Vs. 53 ff. / Vs. 64 ff. vgl. meine *Untersuchungen*, S. 340). Jenes *Graecis intactum carmen* ist darum nicht notwendigerweise auf die *Satura* zu beziehen, zumal Horaz diese ja zu Beginn von *Sat.* I 4 ausdrücklich an griechische Vorläufer, die alte attische Komödie, anknüpft.

Der *Graecis intacti carminis auctor* braucht nicht der Begründer einer Dichtungsgattung zu sein, an der sich die Griechen überhaupt nicht versucht haben (eine solche Gattung könnte, jedenfalls nach der späteren Theorie, nur die *satura tota nostra* sein); es könnte vielleicht auch der Verfasser einer Einzeldichtung gemeint sein, die von griechischem Einfluss unberührt ist; also evtl. auch Naevius als Verfasser des *Bellum Poenicum*.

Nachträglich sehe ich, dass sich eine Beziehung des *Graecis intactum carmen* auf die *satura* halten lässt, ohne dass Horaz dabei mit seiner eigenen Betonung griechischen Einflusses auf die *satura* zu Beginn von *Sat.* I 4 in Konflikt gerät, wenn Horaz sagen wollte, dass die *satura* erst seit Lucilius unter griechischem Einfluss gestanden hat, dass die *ältere* Form der *satura* dagegen noch ein *Graecis intactum carmen* war. Dann wäre der *rudis auctor* von Vs. 66 doch Ennius, und zwar *auctor* nicht nur im Sinne von *scriptor*, sondern auch von εὑρετής.

*M. Badian*: We are informed—I could not say how reliably—that Naevius wrote satires. If so, Horace may well refer to this; though I agree with Professor Suerbaum that his wording does not wholly exclude a reference to other kinds of verse (i.e. verse of any kind in Saturnian metre). It seems to me more likely that the author here referred to is one who has not been previously named; and the judgment seems too absurdly inappropriate to Ennius to be applicable to him. On the other hand, it clearly echoes the spirit of Ennius' own judgment on Naevius, and Horace may be following this and even be alluding to it. I

cannot easily accept the suggestion that the *auctor* is intended to be imaginary and understood with an "indefinite article": for this, Latin normally uses a *si quis* construction. I suspect this suggestion is based on a modern-language type of thinking really irrelevant to Latin.

*M. Skutsch*: I must confess that as long as we have no more than a title *satura* for Naevius, citing a piece as unconnected with anything which we know about later Satire as *quianam Saturnium populum pepulisti*, it seems to me illegitimate to suspect Naevius in Horace's *auctor*.

*M. Wülfing*: Es mag schwierig sein, *auctor* im Sinne von «irgend ein Verfasser» zu verstehen — diese Probleme sind ja längst von Nipperdey und Eduard Fraenkel, *Horace* 131, A. 3, behandelt worden — aber unvergleichlich schwieriger dürfte es doch sein, an der Stelle «Ennius» zu verstehen. Warum ist sein Name vermieden, obwohl er im Vs. 54 genannt war (etwa *weil* er dort genannt war?). Wie soll ihn das Publikum in der Beschreibung *rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor* erkannt haben? Alle Beweislast liegt bei denen, die Ennius in diesem *auctor* sehen wollen.

Naevius kommt auch nur dann in Frage, wenn Unberührtheit vom Griechischen gängige Charakteristik für ihn war. Oder, wenn man den früher immer betonten «Urheber»- (*auctor*) Begriff auf seine *satura* (?) anwenden zu können glaubt.

*M. Waszink*: I can only say that in the remarks by Messrs Suerbaum, Badian and Skutsch I cannot find an argument for giving up Nipperdey's and Fraenkel's interpretation of the passage under discussion.



