

CCXXVI

Seruius, Verg. *Aen.* 9.255-6 (integer aevi | Ascanius): INTEGER  
AEVI, adulescens cui actas integra superest, unde Ennius

*deos aevi integros*

401

dicit quibus multum aevi superest.

CCXXVII

Seruius auct., Verg. *Aen.* 9.747 (hoc telum mea quod ui dextera  
uersat): VERSAT, librat, iactat. et est Ennianum

*uersat muconem.*

402

This fragment seems to describe an encounter between two warriors; while one is temporarily blinded, the other takes to his heels. The vision of Homer's warriors is frequently obscured on the field of battle by mists, etc. (cf. *Il.* 16.790 ff., 17.644 ff., 20.321 ff., 20.441 ff.) but there is no exact parallel in the *Iliad* for Ennius' Latin. I should guess that the final encounter between Achilles and Hector is being described; Homer's account is somewhat different (cf. *Il.* 22.136-7 \*Εκτορα δ' ὡς ἐνόησεν ἔλε τρομασ' οὐδ' ὄρ' ἔτ' ἔτλη | αὐθι μὲναι, ὄπισσω δὲ πύλας λίπε, βῆ δὲ φοβηθεῖς) but so too is his account of several other events described or enacted in Ennius' tragedy.

The abrupt asyndeton and change of subject do not compel one to postulate a lacuna between *abstulit* and *derepente*. If there is something missing here it becomes doubly hard to understand why Nonius quoted *ecc* . . . *abstulit* in an article illustrating the adverb *derepente*.

**167 ecce autem caligo oborta est; omnem prospectum abstulit; cf.** Anon. *Bell. Afr.* 52 nisi . . . *pulsis* . . . *uento flatus omnium prospectu offuscet*, Virgil, *Aen.* 8.253-4 *inuoluimque domum caligine caeca | prospectum eripientis oculis*, Livy 4.33.8, 10.32.6.

*Ecce autem* indicates either the speaker's surprise at an unexpected turn of the action (cf. Plautus, *Merc.* 748, 792), or as here, his feeling that the hearer will be surprised at what he is to narrate (cf. Virgil, *Aen.* 2.201-5 *Laocoön . . . taurum ingentem mactabat ad aras. | ecce autem gemini . . . angues | incumbunt pelago*). *Prospectus* appears elsewhere in republican drama only at Plautus, *Mil.* 609.

**168 contulit sese in pedes:** cf. Plautus, *Bacch.* 374 *me continuo contulit profinam in pedes* (paratragic); *pedibus se dare* seems to have been the regular phrase (Naevius, *Com.* 35, Plautus, fr. 15); Plautus, *Capt.* 121 *si non est quod dem, mene his dem ipse* — *in pedes* is humorously meant. L. Mueller was thus quite wrong to excise *contulit sese in pedes* from the Ennian fragment as being untragic.

*Sublime iter* (cf. *vv.* 190-1) indicates that the fragment refers to the horses of the sun-god (cf. Pindar, *Ol.* 7.71-2 ὁ γενέθλιος ἀκτίων ποττήρ, | πύρ πνεόντων ἀρχὸς Ἰππῶν, Euripides, *I.A.* 159 πύρ τε θεορῆτων τῶν Ἀελλοῦ, Virgil, *Georg.* 1.250 *nosque ubi primus equis Oriens afflavit anhelis*, *Aen.* 12.114-15 *cum primum alto se gurgite tollunt | solis equi, lucenique elatis maribus efflant*) rather than to those of any of the heroes (cf. Euripides, *Alk.* 493 πύρ πνεῶνσι μυκτήρων ἄπο, Lucretius 5.29 *et Diomedis equi spirantes naribus ignem*, Virgil, *Aen.* 7.280-1 *geminosque iugalis | semine ab aethero spirantis*

*naribus ignem*). Omitting *ut* and comparing Ennius, *Var.* 11-12 *sol equis iter repressit unguis iolantibus*, | *consistere animas petennes, arbores uento uacant* Vahlen argued that the fragment belonged in the same context as *lxxii*. This is an acute suggestion but I should prefer to leave *ut* and take the fragment as part of a simile.

**169 quadrupedantes:** an odd formation, restored at Accius, *Trag.* 603, securely transmitted at Plautus, *Capt.* 814 *qui adiehintur quadrupedantii cruciantii cantherio* (a tragically styled parody of a praetor's edict), Virgil, *Aen.* 8.595-6 *agnine facto | quadrupedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula canpium*, 11.614-15 *perfractaque quadrupedantium | pectora pectoribus rumpunt*; perhaps concocted by Ennius himself for the sake of sound-play with *halitantes*. Tragedy has *quadrupes* commonly of animals (Naevius 25, Ennius 157, Pacuuius 2, Accius 315, 381), comedy only once (Terence, *Andr.* 865 [perhaps paratragic]). The formation *quadrupedans* is of the same type as *uidans* (Ennius, *Trag.* 179), *uiridans* (Accius, *Trag.* 244), *uauimans* (Plautus, *Truc.* 435 [paratragic]), a type of formation rare in old Latin and confined to poetry in classical Latin.

**halitantes:** only here in Latin; *halare* itself is rare and confined to poetry.

Schöll took this fragment as spoken by Achilles to a worried Patroclus after Ulysses has come with bad news from the battle-field. It could as easily be spoken by Priam to a companion while on the way to Achilles' tent or by Achilles to Priam after the ransom has been arranged. The Attic tragedians made Ulysses the opponent of all just and merciful arrangements.<sup>1</sup>

**170 nomus:** probably the regular form in the common language; its absence from the rest of extant drama is accidental; *nominus* does not appear either; the situations of drama leave little scope for the first person plural; *nesti, nossem* etc., *nosse* are common in Plautus and almost universal in Terence.

Aulus Gellius asserts at *Noctes Atticae* 11.4 that the *Hecuba* of Ennius was a version of Euripides' homonymous tragedy and quotes three verses of the Greek script along with the particular Latin rendering. At 2.23 he makes a

<sup>1</sup> Vahlen (*E.P.R.*<sup>2</sup>, p. 145) appears to have taken the fragment as spoken by Menelaus to Ajax after the wounded Ulysses has shouted for help (Homer, *Il.* 11.463 ff.); such an interpretation would require a quite incredible change of scene.

similar but much more extended comparison between Menander's Πρόκιον and Caecilius' version. The extant scholia to Terence's comedies contain scraps of similar comparisons between Terence's Latin and the Greek of his originals. We may suppose that Gellius based his assertion about Ennius' *Hecuba* either on a detailed personal knowledge of the texts of this play and the Euripidean or on a didascalical notice of the type affixed to the extant texts of the six comedies of Terence and the *Sitchus* of Plautus. It has a reliability quite lacking in apparently similar assertions by Varro and Cicero about particular Latin tragedies (see above, p. 236).

Nomius Marcellus gives Ennius the title *Hecuba* eleven times. The eight pieces quoted seem to come from grammatical sources rather than Nomius' own knowledge of the text. The wording of only two of them (frs. xc and xcii) parallels Euripides' Greek<sup>1</sup> as closely as does that of Gellius' quotation (LXXXIV) but the others can be fitted into free versions of Euripidean speeches without upsetting at any point the framework of the Greek plot. This circumstance indicates clearly what others only suggest, namely that the republican poets rarely followed the exact wording of the Athenian classics they were hired to adapt. It is accordingly improper to use, as many have done, the text of Euripides' Ἑκάβη as an aid in restoring that of the Ennian fragments.

A trimeter, *ueter fatorum terminus sic iusserat*, is attributed by Priscian (*Gramm.* II 264. 15) to a *Hecuba* of Accius. If *fata* be interpreted as 'oracles' the trimeter has no counterpart in Euripides' Ἑκάβη. If it be interpreted as 'fate' or 'destiny' there are a number of possible counterparts: cf., for example, vv. 43 ἡ περρωμένη, 584 θεῶν ἀνώγκισιν. The imagery of the boundary stone is absent from Euripides' Ἑκάβη but can be found elsewhere in Attic tragedy (cf. Aeschylus, *Ag.* II 54-5 πόθεν ὄρουσ' ἔχεις θεοπέσιτος ὁδοῦ | κακορρήμονες, *Choe.* 927 πατρός γὰρ αἴσα τόνδε σοῦρῖζει μῦθον, Sophocles, *O. T.* 723 τοιαῦτα φῆμι μαντικῶς διόρισαν). Land division was a frequent source of metaphor in republican dramatic writing (cf. Plautus, *Poen.* 48-9) and it is possible that the author of *ueter fatorum terminus sic iusserat* drew upon it to express the rather un-Roman notion of a fixed immutable destiny.<sup>2</sup> Hermann<sup>3</sup> suggested that Priscian was in error in attributing the trimeter to Accius' *Hecuba* rather than to Ennius' *Hecuba*. Such errors are

<sup>1</sup> P. Victorius, *Variarum Lectionum libri XXV* (Florence, 1553), x 1, compared Euripides, *Hek.* 826 ff. and 497 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Lucretius, 1. 75-7 *unde refert nobis nictor quid possit oriri, | quid nequeat, finita potestas denique cuique | quam sit ratione atque alte terminus haerens* (Epicurean natural law), Virgil, *Aen.* 4. 612-14 *si . . . necesse est | et sic fata Iouis poscunt, hic terminus haeret*, Horace, *Carm. saec.* 2. 5-7 *uosque ueraces cecinisse Parcae | quod senel dictum est stabilisque rerum | terminus seruet*.

<sup>3</sup> On Eur. *Hek.* 578 (Leipzig, 1800).

common enough in the grammarians' and the singularity of the reference to Accius' *Hecuba* makes the existence of the play dubious. On the other hand the titles *Alexis*, *Eriphyla* and *Persidae* are given by Priscian to Accius each on a single occasion and occur nowhere else in our sources; the existence of these it would be folly to doubt. Furthermore the usage of republican drama favours the interpretation 'oracle' for *terminus fatorum* rather than 'fate'.<sup>2</sup>

At *Ling.* 7.6 Varro illustrates the use of the word *templum* from the plays *Hecuba*, *Periboea* and *Andromacha*; copious quotations elsewhere give an *Andromacha* to Ennius and a *Periboea* to Pacuvius; but for the doubts about Priscian, *Gramm.* II 264. 15 one would be tempted to assign Varro's first quotation to Accius, the third of the classical tragic trio. With some doubts I have followed editorial tradition and printed it alongside the pieces directly attributed to Ennius' *Hecuba* (fr. LXXXIII).

There is no unambiguous evidence that Cicero knew Ennius' *Hecuba*. On the other hand his works contain many quotations of Ennius' *Andromacha* and Pacuvius' *Ilionia*, tragedies similar in many ways structurally to the *Hecuba*.<sup>3</sup> Accordingly quotations such as those at *Tusc.* I. 37<sup>4</sup> and *Orat.* 153<sup>5</sup> which recall structural elements of Euripides' Ἑκάβη (vv. 1-2, 837, 1040-4) need not be attributed to Ennius' adaptation.<sup>6</sup>

Where *sententiae* with parallels in Euripides' Ἑκάβη are concerned even greater scepticism is justified.<sup>7</sup> The remains of Euripides' tragic production are full of general statements about society, religion, politics, morality, etc.<sup>8</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Using a common source Priscian, *Gramm.* II 260. 4 and Nonius, p. 223. 2 attribute a fragment the one rightly to the *Niptra* of Pacuvius the other wrongly to a *Niptra* of Accius; cf. the clear errors at Nonius, pp. 75. 8, 90. 10, 116. 8, 117. 18, 170. 12, 176. 12, 209. 25, 223. 2, 382. 12, 479. 13, 515. 12.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Marx, *SB Leipzig LXIII* (1911), 62.

<sup>3</sup> On *Ilionia* see Zieliński, *Tragödien von Libri Tres* (Kraków, 1925), pp. 48, 124.

<sup>4</sup> See Columna, *Q. Ennii Frag.* p. 376.

<sup>5</sup> See Ribbeck, *Die röm. Trag.* p. 145, Havet, *RPh* xxviii (1904), 219 ff.

<sup>6</sup> Scaliger, *Comet. Varr. Ling.*, on 10. 70, attributed to *Hecuba* the *canticum* quoted at *Tusc.* 3. 44 on the grounds that it resembled Euripides, *Hek.* 158-60, overlooking that later, at 3. 53, part of the *canticum* is quoted as coming from *Andromacha*.

<sup>7</sup> Two trimeters quoted by Cicero at *Tusc.* 2. 13 were assigned by Columna to Ennius' *Hecuba* because of their similarity to Euripides, *Hek.* 592-5. In *RhM* xvi (1861), 443 ff., Mommsen published some Virgilian scholia (*Breu. exp. Geogr.* 1. 1, p. 199. 3 Hagen) quoting the verses as from Accius' *Atrous* and thus confirming Muretus' restoration of Cicero's corrupt introductory words as *illud Accii 'probae* (*illud acimprobae RK: acimprobae GV*).

<sup>8</sup> See C. W. Friedrich, *Die dramatische Funktion der euripideischen Gnomem* (Diss. Freiburg, 1955).

often repeated from one play to another. Valben printed the words *nimum honi est cui nihil est mali* attributed to Ennius at *Fin.* 2.41 (fr. CLXXXII) as a fragment of *Hecuba* on the grounds of its similarity to Euripides, *Hek.* 627-8 κείνος ἀλβιώτατος, | ὅτω κατ' ἤμαρ τυγχάνει μηδὲν κακόν.<sup>1</sup> The idea recurs at *Ba.* 910-11 τὸ δὲ κατ' ἤμαρ ὅτω βίωτος | εὐδαίμων μακαρίζω.<sup>2</sup> Valben also printed among the fragments of *Hecuba* the *amicus certus* in *re incertia cernitur* attributed to Ennius at *Lael.* 64 (fr. CLXXXV). The substance of this trimeter appears not only at *Hek.* 1226-7, ἐν τοῖς κακοῖς γὰρ ἀγαθοὶ σπαρέονται | φίλοι,<sup>3</sup> but also at *Or.* 454-5, ὄνομα γὰρ, ἔργον δ' οὐκ ἔχουσιν οἱ φίλοι | οἱ μὴ 'πὶ ταῖσι συμφοραῖς ὄντες φίλοι.<sup>4</sup> Ennius seems to have employed *sententiae* much more frequently than did his successors Pacuvius and Accius. He quite certainly altered the emphasis of some of those which he found in his originals (see below on LXXXIV) and added others totally absent (see below on CVIII); it is possible that he omitted some which did not appeal to him.<sup>5</sup> In circumstances like this it seems pointless to try to localise *sententiae* in particular plays; too many possibilities are open.

## LXXXIII

The personages of tragedy frequently address the open sky above the stage; cf. Aeschylus, *Prom.* 88 ὦ Διὸς αἰθήρ, 1091-2 ὦ πάντων | αἰθῆρ κοινὸν φῶς εἰλαστων, Sophocles, *El.* 86, Euripides, *Ion* 1445, fr. 443. The heroine of Euripides' *Ἐκέβη* refers sarcastically to the practice at *vv.* 334-5 ὦ θύγατερ, οὐμοὶ μὲν λόγοι πρὸς αἰθέρα | φοῦδοὶ μάντην ριφέντες ἐπι σοῦ φόνου.<sup>6</sup> The only near parallel in the play with Ennius' iambic tetrameter is the anapaestic address to the lightning bolt of Zeus at *vv.* 68-70, ὦ στεροπὰ Διός, ὦ σκοτία νύξ, | τί ποτ' ἀρούμεν ἔννευχος οὐτο | δειμῶσι φάσμι σσι.<sup>7</sup> But Ennius can be shown quite certainly in other places to have altered the metrical structure and the substance of his original no less drastically (see below on fr. LXXXIV).

<sup>1</sup> Muretus (*Variarum Lectionum libri VIII* [Venice, 1559], v 13) seems to have been the first to make this identification.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. also Euripides, *Herakles* 503 ff., *Hik.* 953 f., *Hipp.* 1111 ff., fr. 196, fr. 714.

<sup>3</sup> Hartung (*Euripides Restitutus* 1, p. 529) was the first to make this identification.

<sup>4</sup> Cf. *Or.* 665-8.

<sup>5</sup> Among the fragments of Menander's Ἄνδρεια (43) and Ἐαντὸν τιμοποιήμενος (132) are *sententiae* which have no equivalents in Terence's adaptations. The substance of *Andria* 959-60 is said by Donatus to come from Menander's *Ἐνόρχος* but it has no equivalent in the Latin version of this play.

<sup>6</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Andr.* 91 ff., *I.T.* 42 f., *Med.* 57 f. Comedy parodies it; cf. Menander, *Sam.* 111, Plautus, *Trin.* 1070, Terence, *Ad.* 790.

171 *templum caelitum*: cf. (a) Accius, *Trag. praet.* 2, Varro, *Men.* 56, (b) Ennius, *Ann.* 541 *templum magnum Iouis alitionantis*, Lucretius 5.1188 in *caeloque deum sedes et templa locarunt*, (c) Ennius, *Ann.* 49 *caeli caerulea templa*, Terence, *Eun.* 590 *templa caeli summa* ('sententia tragica'—Donatus), Lucretius 1.1014, 1105 et al., (d) Lucretius 5.1204-5 *magni caelestia mundi | templa super stellisque micantibus aethera fixum*, (f) Seneca, *Herc.* f. 3 *templa summi . . . aetheris*. The only comparable phrase in extant Attic tragedy seems to be Aeschylus, *Pers.* 365 τέμενος αἰθέρος.

The word *templum* probably came from the augural language (see above on *v.* 88).<sup>1</sup> It is difficult to say whether *caeles*, which occurs four times elsewhere in republican tragedy and only once (Plautus, *Rud.* 2) in comedy, was a sacral word or a poetic creation (~ οὐράνιος, οὐρανῶν). It is absent from classical prose. Yet its second element is not common in poetic neologisms.

*splendidis*: elsewhere in tragedy at Accius 678; absent from comedy. This could be accident, for *splendere* occurs at Lucretius, *Com.* 6, Plautus, *Poen.* 314, *Rud.* 3 (*splendens stella*), *splendor* at Plautus, *Asin.* 426, *Aul.* 602, *Merc.* 880, *Mil.* 1. However the incidence of adjectives in *-idis* seems to be somewhat greater in tragedy than in comedy. Ploen counts 40 formations in comedy and 27 in tragedy, 10 of which do not occur in comedy.

## LXXXIV

Ennius' opening *haec*, which has no counterpart in the Greek of *vv.* 293-4, τὸ δ' ἄξιμα, κἀν κακῶς λέγη, τὸ σὸν | πέσει, must refer to the content of his version of *vv.* 288-92, ὡς ἀποκτείνων φθόνος | γυναικας, ὅς τὸ πρῶτον οὐκ ἐκτείνετε | βρωμῶν ἀποσπᾶσαντες, ἀλλ' ὥκτιρατε. | νόμος δ' ἐν ὑμῖν τοῖς τ' εὐθεροῖς ἴσος | καὶ τοῖσι δούλοις αἰματος κείροι πέρρι. One may doubt whether he adapted the substance of *vv.* 291-2; this was an anachronistic reference to the protection which Athenian law gave to slaves against arbitrary acts on the part of their masters<sup>2</sup> and would have created sympathy for the speaker in the Athenian theatre; but in second-century Rome, where masters enjoyed unrestricted power over the lives of their slaves, it would have sounded merely paradoxical. At *Stich.* 446-8, *atque id ne nos miremini, homines servulos | potare, amare atque ad cenam condicere*: | licet haec Athenis nobis, Plautus feels obliged to explain the behaviour of his Menandrian slaves.

<sup>1</sup> Ennius could be employing an architectural metaphor (see above on *v.* 3); for *templum*, 'roof-beam' cf. Lucretius 2.28, Paulus, *Fest.* p. 505.1 f., Vitruvius 4.2.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Isocrates 18.52, Demosthenes 21.46-9, Ps. Xenophon, *Ath.* 1.10.

The substance of *vv.* 204–5 λόγος γὰρ ἔκ τ' ἔδοξόντων ἴων | κᾶκ τῶν δοκούντων αὐτῶς οὐ τούτων σθένει was a commonplace both in the fifth century and later; cf. Euripides, *Andr.* 186–7 ἔγώ δὲ ταρβῶ μὴ τὸ δουλεῖν μέ σοι | λόγων ἀπίωσθι πῶλλ' ἔχουσαν ἔνδικα, fr. 327, *Trag.* Graec. inc. fr. 119, Cicero, *S. Rosc.* 2 *quia si qui istorum dixisset quos uidetis adesse, in quibus summa auctoritas est atque amplitudo, si uerbum de re publica fecisset, id quod in hac causa fieri necesse est, multo plura dixisse quam dixisset putaretur. ego autem si omnia quae dicenda sunt libere dixerō nequaquam similiter oratio mea exire atque in uolūis emanare poterit.* For the purely general contrast between οἱ δοκούντες and οἱ ἔδοξόντες Ennius substitutes a particular one between *opulenti*, 'those with *opes*, with social power and influence', and *ignobiles*, 'those without a *nomen*, of obscure and humble family'. This contrast is not apt to the situation of Ulysses and the enslaved Hecuba. Ennius must have had in mind not the text of his original or even its plot but one of the themes of contemporary political debate. He would have known that critics chide Euripides for making his heroes and heroines speak like contemporary Athenian philosophers and politicians.<sup>1</sup> In making his Hecuba utter something quite incongruous with the dramatic situation he also had Euripides as a forerunner, if not in Ἐκάρῃ certainly in other plays.<sup>2</sup> His motive, like that of Euripides, would have been a straightforward desire for theatrical effect, something to which the Aristotelian canons of organic unity are not always relevant.

Euripides' spoken trimeters are replaced with musically accompanied trochaic tetrameters. These verses bring with them here, as elsewhere, an amount of figurated language absent from Euripides' trimeters (whose *breuitas* is noted by Gellius). Αὐτῶς οὐ τούτων obviously inspires *aequa non aequa*, a type of polyptoton common in Attic tragedy but rare in Roman drama.<sup>3</sup> The phrase *facile . . . flexeris* is chosen for an alliterative effect quite rare in Attic tragedy but common in the republican adaptations.<sup>4</sup> Λόγος . . .

<sup>1</sup> Ennius may have read a commentary on the Ἐκάρῃ containing remarks like those in the extant scholia; cf. *ad* 254 τούτα εἰς τὴν κατ' αὐτῶν πολιτείαν λέγει. καὶ ἔστι τοιοῦτος ὁ Εὐριπίδης, περιόπτων τὰ κατ' αὐτῶν τοῖς ἥρωσι καὶ τοῖς χρόνοις συγχέων, 808 οὐ καλῶς φησι ταῦτα ὁ Ἀγαμέμνων. Ἐχρην γὰρ αὐτῶν ἀπὸς δόντα τὴν χάριν σιωπήσοι καὶ μὴ ἐλέγξαι τὴν ἑαυτοῦ γύωμην· οὐ γὰρ ἀνάγκη τοιαύτη ὑπέκτειτο βασιλεῦς ὢν.

<sup>2</sup> See Lucian, *Iou. trag.* 41. 689, the scholiast on *Phoin.* 388, modern scholars on *Herakles* 1340–6.

<sup>3</sup> The only exact parallel I can find is Plautus, *Amph.* 355 *familiaris, accipiere faxo haud familiariter.*

<sup>4</sup> Cf. Naevius 13 *mea manu moriare*, 28 *lino linquant lumina*, Ennius 118 *spumant sanguine*, 165 *sudat sanguine*, 181 *modice morem gerit*, 184 *grauiter gemam* et al.

αὐτῶς is turned into the highly elaborate *eadem dicta eademque oratio*; the doubling of one word or phrase with another of much the same meaning, the anaphora, the balancing of one colon with another slightly longer are certainly to be found in some trimeter speeches of Attic tragedy and comedy but they are most at home in the long verses of the Latin adaptations (see above on *vv.* 9, 19). The units of sense of the Latin discourse are made to coincide with those of metre in the normal manner of republican drama.

**173 nam cum opulenti locuntur:** Porson's *nam opulenti cum locuntur* removes an instance of hiatus after a monosyllable in the thesis of a trochaic verse,<sup>1</sup> gives the general *opulenti* an emphasis corresponding with that of the particular *tu* placed in front of the conjunction *etsi* in *v.* 172 and produces an order of words common in republican drama but rarer later and therefore likely to be 'modernised'.<sup>2</sup> I am not sure however that these are grounds firm enough for altering the paradoxos.

*Opes* usually stands for social power and standing rather than property (*diuitiae*) in the speeches of republican drama. *Opulentus* is sometimes difficult to distinguish from the much more commonly occurring *dines* (it is opposed to *pauper* at Plautus, *Aul.* 247, 461, 479, Caecilius, *Com.* 170 ff.) but at Plautus, *Circ.* 284–6, *nec usquam quisquam tam opulentus, qui mi opistat in uia | nec stratus nec tyrannus quisquam nec agoranomus | nec demarchus nec comarchus*, and *Rud.* 713, *de senatu Cyrenensi quemuis opulentum uirum*, it bears plainly the meaning 'socially powerful, influential'.<sup>3</sup>

**ignobiles:** the meaning here cannot be anything but 'socially obscure', as at Pacuuius, *Trag.* 221 and Terence, *Phorm.* 120. At Livius, *Com.* 3, Plautus, *Amph.* 440, *Pseud.* 592, 964 it is 'unknown to one individual or another'. *Nobilis* means 'known to one individual or another' at Plautus, *Poen.* 758, *Pseud.* 1112, *Rud.* 619, *Trin.* 828; 'socially eminent' at Plautus, *Cist.* 125 (suspected of lateness by some scholars), Terence, *Ad.* 15, 502, *Eun.* 204, 952,

<sup>1</sup> The only other tragic instance of this hiatus seems to be Accius 345. For a list of the instances transmitted by the codices of Plautus in which *cum* and *quom* stand unelided in *thesi* see Maurenbrecher, *Hiatus und Verschleifung*, pp. 35 ff.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 91–2 *histriones anno quom in proscenio hic | Ionem inuocant, uenit, 427–8 legiones quom pugnabant maxime, | quid in tabernaculo fecisti?*, *Cas.* 7–8 et al. However for the 'modern' type of order cf. Plautus, *Capt.* 77–9 *quasi mures semper edimus alienum cibum; | ubi res prolatae sunt, quom rus homines eunt, | simul prolatae res sunt nostris dentibus, Cas.* 417–18, *Circ.* 105–6 et al.

<sup>3</sup> Among the classical prose writers only the historians Sallust and Livy have *opulentus* at all commonly. On Livy's usage see Drexler, *RhM* cii (1959), 55–8.

*Haut.* 227, 609. Plautus uses *nobilitas* three times (*Capt.* 299, *Mil.* 1324, *Rud.* 933) of social eminence. The two sets of meanings must have been already coexistent before 184 B.C. By the first century *nobilis* was a fully technical term of the political vocabulary, denoting a member of one of those families whose names were known as a result of ancestral consulships and which enjoyed an almost complete monopoly of the principal magistracies. Ennius' first patron, Cato, had been forced to make his political way in a climate of opinion well described by *vv.* 173-4.

**174 eadem dicta eademque oratio:** the two phrases can be distinguished; *dicta* are the words and *oratio* the way they are uttered; cf. *v.* 258 *quam tibi ex ore orationem duxit dictis dedit*.

## LXXXV

Tears drip in Attic tragedy rather less frequently than blood and sweat; but cf. Aeschylus, *Choe.* 185-6, *Prom.* 398-401, Euripides, *Herakles* 1354-6, *Ion* 876, as well as Euripides, *Hek.* 760 ὄρεξ νεκρὸν τόνδ' οὐ κοταστάρζω δόκρυ; Mercerus thought that fr. lxxxv was a version of this latter passage, in which Hecuba draws Agamemnon's attention to the corpse of Polydorus, and restored it as *nide hinc meae in quem lacrumae guttatim cadunt*. Vossius restored it as *nide hanc meae in quam* etc. suggesting that the words are spoken by Hecuba to Ulysses as he grasps her daughter Polyxena. This suggestion involves less alteration to the paradoxos and is none the worse for implying that Ennius altered slightly the form of the Euripidean Hecuba's appeal at *vv.* 277-81. Scaliger had let the words transmitted stand and set them in a version of Thalybius' account of the death of Polyxena (cf. *vv.* 519-20 *vūv τε γὰρ λέγων κακὰ | τέρξω τόδ' ὄμμα*).

**175 lacrumae guttatim cadunt:** contrast the form of the expression at Propertius 4. 1. 144 *gutta quomae ex oculis . . . cadet*. The adverb *guttatim* occurs elsewhere in republican drama only at Plautus, *Merc.* 205 and not again until Apuleius.

## LXXXVI

In moments of good fortune the personages of tragedy and comedy frequently, if not regularly, address thanks to the gods; cf. Sophocles, *Ant.* 330-1, *Tr.* 200-1, Euripides, *Herakleidae* 869, Menander, *Sam.* 269-70, Plautus, *Capt.* 768 ff., 922 ff., *Merc.* 842 ff., *Mos.* 431 ff., *Persa* 251 ff., 753 ff., *Poen.* 1274 ff., *Rud.* 906 ff., *Stich.* 402 ff., *Trin.* 820 ff. Ennius' personage gives ironical thanks for ill fortune. The malignity of the gods is a constant theme of Euripides' 'Εκάρη—231-3 κάγωγ' ἔρ' οὐκ ἔθυησκον οὐ μ' ἔρρηθ θανειν, | οὐδ' ὄλεσέν με Ζεύς, τρέφει δ', ὅπως ὄρω | κακῶν κακ' ὄλλα μείζον' ἢ τέλειαν' ἔγω, 57-8 ἀντιστηκώσας δέ σε | φθαίρει θεῶν τας

τῆς πόροισ' εὐπρεξίσις, 199-201 ὄαν ὄαν αὐ σοι λώβον | ἐχθίσταν ἀρήταν τ' ὄρσέν τις δάμιον, 721-2 ὠ τλήμων ὡς σε πολυπνονωτάτην βροστῶν | δάμιον ἔθηκεν ὄστις ἔστί σοι βραρῦς, 958-60 φύρουσι δ' αὐτοί θεοί πάλιν τε καὶ πρόσω | ταραγμῶν ἐντιθέητες, ὡς ὄγνωσιζα | σέβωμεν αὐτούς—but there is nothing parallel with the Ennian irony in this play or elsewhere.<sup>1</sup> I suggest that the Latin words come from an outburst by Hecuba on hearing of the discovery of Polydorus' body.<sup>2</sup>

The words *Iuppiter* and *gratulator* (in the sense 'give thanks') belonged properly to the sacral language; the second was always used in auspicious circumstances. Of the Attic tragedians Aeschylus was particularly fond of employing sacral words and phrases in paradoxical contexts (cf. *Ag.* 645 πρέπαι λέγειν ποιῆται τόνδ' Ἐρινύων, 1144-5 στένουσ' ἀμφιθάλλη κακοῖς | ἄηδων βίον, 1385-7 καὶ πεπτωκῶσι | τρίτην ἐπενδιδωμι, τοῦ κοτὰ χθονός, | Ἄιδου, νεκρῶν σωτήηρος, εὐκταῖαν χάριν). Ennius indulges in similar paradox at *Trag.* 287: *qui illum di deaeque magno maestissint malo*.<sup>3</sup>

Fraenkel has argued<sup>4</sup> that Ennius' tetrameter parodies not just the Roman sacral language in general but the particular prayer offered to *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus* by the triumphing *imperator*.

**176 Iuppiter tibi summe:** the disjunction of the epithet by *tibi* moved to second place in the sentence<sup>5</sup> was unusual in Ennius' day and could be imitative of the style of sacral formulae.

*Summus* was a common epithet of *Iuppiter* in comedy (cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 933 et al.), along with *supremus* and *maximus*. It seems to be a poetic translation of ὕψιστος or ὑπατος rather than a borrowing from the sacral language. Cicero's public orations always refer to *Iuppiter Optimus Maximus*.

<sup>1</sup> Zeus is abused directly to his face at *Herakles* 339-47 . . . ὄρετῆ σε νικῶ θηητὸς ὄν θεὸν μέγαν' | . . . ἀμφοῖς τις εἰ θεός, ἢ δίκαιος οὐκ ἔπος.

<sup>2</sup> Cf. Düntzer, *Zeitschr. f. d. Alt.* 1838, pp. 52 f., who alleges an oxymoron and compares Eur. *Hek.* 232 and 784. Columna's theory, accepted by Ribbeck and Vahlen, that the words form Hecuba's cry of triumph after the revenge taken upon Polyestor would require a *bene re gesta* in the text; cf. the context of Plautus, *Rud.* 1178-9 *quom istae res male euenit tibi | Gripe gratulor*. A. Della Casa, *Dioniso xxxv* (1962), 69 f., offers a good criticism of Columna's but no convincing interpretation of her own.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. also the way in which Lucretius expresses the Epicurean detestation of religion in language redolent of the traditional Roman cult at 1. 82-3: *quod contra saepius illa | religio peperit scelerosa atque impia facta; Propertius' use of the sacral phrase* at 1. 1. 20 and 3. 19. 18.

<sup>4</sup> *Pl. im Pl.* pp. 238 ff. (= *Elementi*, pp. 229 ff.), on Aeschylus, *Ag.* 1387.

<sup>5</sup> Cf. the disjunction of *per* and its object discussed above on *v.* 3.

**tandem male re gesta:** *tandem* is to be taken closely with *male*; 'really, positively'; cf. Plautus, *Curc.* 7 *tandem es odiosus mihi*.

The ablative absolute is not common in either republican comedy or tragedy and here the normal phrase would be a clause introduced by *quom*, *quod* or *quia*. There is some evidence that the absolute construction originated in the official language; the prayer of thanksgiving addressed by successful generals to Jupiter may have contained the phrase *re bene gesta*. Perhaps at one time *rem gerere* was proper to the official language but it is used so often in comedy of the doings of *priuatii* (even the absolute phrase occurs eight times: Plautus, *Amph.* 655, *Persa* 754, *Stich.* 402, 411, 507, *Trin.* 592, 1182, Terence, *Ad.* 775) that we must suppose it to have been unremarkable in common parlance in the early second century.

**gratulor:** rare in the meaning 'gratias ago' (elsewhere in drama only at Caecilius, *Com.* 9, Terence, *Haut.* 879, Afranius, *Com. tog.* 21) and then only in addresses to gods.

## LXXXVII

The general sense of this fragment is clear despite the corruption it has suffered; a person is addressed in whose state the written law provides no penalty for the murderer of a parent or guest. This was notoriously true of historical Athens, at least as far as parenticide was concerned;<sup>1</sup> the Roman Twelve Tables imposed various kinds of death penalty for various kinds of crime but seem to have left the punishment of homicide in general to private arrangement.<sup>2</sup> How the prosecution of L. Hostius, the first for patricide known to the Roman annalists, was mounted we do not know. At any rate the case must have been still fresh in the minds of Ennius' audience (see above on fr. xiv). The language and style of the fragment recall strongly the remains of republican *leges*.

There appear to be verbal links between the fragment and remarks made by the Euripidean Hecuba as she appeals to Agamemnon to punish Polymestor (*scriptis* . . . ~ 866 νόμων γραφῆται; *quis parentem aut hospitem necasset* ~ 803-4 οἴτινες ξένους | κρείνουσιν ἢ θεῶν ἱερὰ τοιαῦτα φέρεται). Jacobus Nicolaus of Loo<sup>3</sup> accordingly made it belong to a version of vv. 798-805. Anachronistic talk of written law is common in Attic tragedy (cf. Aeschylus,

<sup>1</sup> On Solon's law see Cicero, *S. Rosc.* 70, Diogenes Laertius 1. 59.

<sup>2</sup> See Latte, *TAPH/A* LXVII (1936), 24 ff., *RE* Suppl. VII (1940), s.v. *Todesstrafe*, 1614, *ZSavSt* LXVII (1950), 51 ff., W. Kunkel, *Untersuchungen zur Entwicklung des römischen Kriminalverfahrens in vorsullanischer Zeit* (Munich, 1962), pp. 38 ff.

<sup>3</sup> *Miscellaneorum Epiphiliidum Libri X*, VIII 7, apparently first published in J. Gruterus, *Lampas*, Tom. v, Suppl. (Frankfurt, 1606), p. 588. On Jacobus see W. Clausen, *CPh* IIX (1964), 96.

*Hik.* 707-9, Sophocles, *Ant.* 454-5, Euripides, *Hik.* 433-4, *Ion* 442-3) and Greek thought commonly associated offences against guests with those against parents (cf. Hesiod, *Erg.* 327-34, Aeschylus, *Eum.* 269-71, Aristophanes, *Barr.* 146-50). But it is difficult to associate the point of the fragment with that of 798-805 or indeed with anything in Hecuba's utterances at this stage. Vossius referred it to Hecuba's reply to Polymestor in the debate before Agamemnon. The absence here of any verbal counterpart to Ennius' Latin does not count against Vossius' theory but again it is difficult to see what point the Latin could have had. Osann<sup>1</sup> referred the fragment to Agamemnon's speech refusing to punish Hecuba and in particular to vv. 1247-8, but looked at as a whole it is no possible version of τῶν οὖν πρὸς ὑμῖν ῥόδιον ξενοτροπεῖν | ἦμῖν δὲ γ' ἀσχερὸν τοῖσιν Ἑλλησιν τόδε. Scholars may of course be mistaken in seeking a point related to the plot and arguments of the Euripidean play. Ennius may be making his actor speak of contemporary Rome or contemporary Athens. I must admit, however, that even so the point eludes me.

177-8 **quis parentem aut hospitem | necasset:** for relative *quis* cf. *Lex XII tab.* 1.4 *proletario iam cui quis uolet uindex esto*, II 2, *Lex luci* *Lucer.* *C.I.L.* 1<sup>2</sup> 401.5, *Lex Sil. ap. Fest.* p. 288.34, *Cato, Agr.* 145.1, 148.2, *Plautus, Merc.* 991 *supplici sibi sumat quid uolt ipse ob hanc iniuriam*; it was clearly a legal archaism already in the early second century.

*Necare*, which occurs twice elsewhere in tragedy and nine times in comedy (not in Terence), probably also had an archaic tone, though much less pronounced than that of *quis*; comedy, reflecting the common language, preferred the compound *enicare* (28 times in Plautus, 5 in Terence; I include the metaphorical usage).

For the meaning 'murder' cf. *Festus*, p. 174.26, *Rhet. inc.* *Her.* 1.23.

The relative clause precedes the principal quite rarely in drama but does so regularly in republican legal texts.<sup>2</sup>

178 **īquos quis cruciati perbiteret:** if Junius' *quo quis cruciati* be accepted we have either a very loose arrangement of relative and principal clauses, for which there is no parallel in particular but quite a few in general (cf. Plautus, *Aul.* 790-1 *qui homo culpam admisit in se, nullus tam parui pretii | quin pudeat quin purget sese*, *Capt.* 941 *quod bene fecisti referetur gratia et al.*), or the use of *quis* as an indefinite after an interrogative/relative pronoun, for which the only exact parallel I can find is Ennius, *Sat.* 61-2 (*nam qui sese | si se Usenet | frustrari quem frustra sentit, | qui frustratur is frustra est si non ille est frustra*).

<sup>1</sup> *Annl. crit.* 127 ff.

<sup>2</sup> See W. Kroll, *Glotta* III (1912), 8 ff.

For *cruciatu peribiteret* cf. Plautus, *Pseud.* 776-8 *interminatust. . . si quis non hodie minus misisset sibi, | eum cras cruciatu maximo peribitere, Rud.* 494-5. *Cas.* 300, *Epid.* 513, Cicero, *Nat. deor.* 3. 81. The verb *baetere/peribitere* seems to be evidenced from the Twelve Tables (Varro, *Men.* 553); it and its compounds occur sporadically in Plautine comedy as high-falutin variants of *ire*, etc. Tragedy appears to have affected the verb rather more frequently (*peribitere*, for example, occurs 3 times against *perire* 5; comedy has *peribitere* only twice but *perire* over 200 times) and for longer. The whole phrase *cruciatu peribitere* may come from the language of the law; the Romans regularly accompanied legal execution with torture (see above on fr. xiv).

## LXXXVIII

This fragment might come from any of a number of contexts in Ennius' play; cf. Euripides, *Hek.* 26-7 κτανὼν ἐξ οἴδμ' ὄλος | μεθ' ἧχ', 28-9, 446, 634, 701, 781-2, 797, 938, 1259.

179 *undantem salum*: cf. Accius, *Trag.* 401 *undante in freto*.

The adjective *undans*, like other similar formations, seems to be restricted to poetry in classical Latin. It occurs in republican comedy only at Plautus, *Epid.* 436.

*Salus* masculine seems to occur only here in Latin. *Salum* neuter occurs sporadically in classical prose and verse. It must have been a borrowing from Greek first made in the nautical language; *mare* determined the gender perhaps from the beginning. Ennius may have been unsure of the gender or have varied it for poetic reasons with that of *σάλος* in mind.

## LXXXIX

This fragment must have been uttered by Hecuba as Ulysses, unpersuaded by her arguments, left the stage with Polyxena. If the less well attested reading *heu me miserum* is correct the speaker was Polymestor as the Trojan women proceeded to slay his children. At neither point in the action has Euripides' Greek anything parallel.

Warriors normally washed in water after battle (cf. Homer, *Il.* 23. 35 ff., *Od.* 22. 478, Sophocles, *Ai.* 654-6, Virgil, *Aen.* 2. 718-20). The Ennian Hecuba predicts a ghastly reversal of the normal practice. The murderers of Attic tragedy were ritually purified by animal blood (cf. Aeschylus, *Eum.* 283, 452, fr. 327, Euripides, *I.T.* 1223, *Sthen.* 17 ff.) but this practice seems to have been unknown at Rome and one cannot assume any allusion to it in Ennius' Latin.

180 *lauere sanguen sanguine*: for the idea of bathing in blood cf. Euripides, *Hek.* 1281 φόνια λουτρό, *Furius ap.* Gell. 18. 11. 4 *sanguine diluuntur*

*tellus*, Virgil, *Georg.* 3. 221 *lauit ater corpora sanguis, Aen.* 10. 727-8 *lauit improba laeter | ora cruor*, 12. 721-2 *sanguine largo | colla armosque lauant*, Propertius 4. 10. 37-8 *desecta Tolunni | cervix Romanos sanguine lauit equos*.

For the polyptoton cf. Sophocles, *O.T.* 100-1 φόνω φόνον πάλιν | λύντος, Euripides, *El.* 857-8 αἴμα δ' αἴματος | πικρὸς δανεισιμὸς ἦλαθε τῷ θανάτῳ νῦν, *Heraclides* 40 ὄς φόνω σφῆση φόνον, *I.T.* 1223-4 ὄς φόνω φόνον | μισαρὸν ἐκνήψω, Accius, *Trag.* 82-3 *cum patre patrius patrum hostifice | sanguine sanguen miscere* (Passeratius: *miscere* codd.) *suo, Trag. praet.* 4 *luc patrum* (Buechelet: *ue patrum* codd.) *hostili fuso sanguen sanguine, Lucretius* 3. 71 *caedem caede acumulantem*.

## XC

This fragment clearly comes from a version of Euripides, *Hek.* 824-35 καὶ μὴν - ἴσως μὲν τοῦ λόγου κενὸν τόδε, | Κύπριν προβάλλειν· ἄλλ' ὁμῶς εἰρήσεται· | πρὸς σοῖσι πλευροῖς παῖς ἐμὴ κοιμίζεται | ἡ φοιβῶς, ἢν καλοῦσι Κασάνδραν Φρύγες. | ποῦ τὸς φίλος δῆτ' εὐφρόνας δειξῆς, ἀναξ, | ἢ τῶν ἐν εὐνῇ φιλάττων ἀσπασμάτων | χόριν τίν' ἔξει παῖς ἐμῇ, κείνης δ' ἐγὼ; . . . τὸν θανάτῳ τόνδ' ὄρξῃ; | τοῦτον καλῶς δρῶν ὄντα κηδεστήτην σέθεν | δρῶσαις.

Absent from the Greek is the emphasis upon obedience to the will of the male during sexual intercourse (*morem gerit*) and upon restraint of the female's desires (*uereunde et modice*). Even where marriage and concubinage in general are concerned Attic tragedy does not emphasise so strongly the virtue of female obedience; cf. the Euripidean Andromache's account of her relationship with Hector at *Tr.* 645-56, in particular 655-6 ἦδη δ' αἰπέ χρῆν νικῶν πόστιν, | κείνῳ τε νίκην ὦν ἐχρῆν παριέναι, and Hecuba's advice to Andromache on how to treat her new master at *Tr.* 699-700: τίμα δὲ τὸν παρόντα δεσπότητην σέθεν, | φίλον διδοῦσα δέλεαρ ἀνδρὶ σὼν τρόπιον.

In the society depicted by comedy and its Roman adaptations obedience was the chief characteristic which distinguished the γυνὴ γαμετῆ/*matrona* from the ἑταῖρα/*amica*; cf. Pap. Didot. 1. 14-16 ἔστ' ἀνδρὶ καὶ γυναικὶ κείμενος νόμος, | τῷ μὲν διὰ τέλους ἦν ἔχει στέργειν αἶε, | τῇ δ' ὄσ' ἄν ἴβι ἥτο ἢ *morem geras*, | *quid ille faciat ne id operetur, quo eat, quid rerum gerat* (father to married daughter), *Amph.* 839-42 *non ego illam mi doctem duco esse quae dos dicitur | sed pudicitiam et pudorem et sedatum cupidinem, | deum metum, parentum amorem et cognatum concordiam, | tibi morigera atque ut munifica sim bonis, prosin probis* (wife to accusing husband), Ovid, *Ars* 3. 585-6 *hoc est uiceres quod non patitur amari: | conueniunt illas cum uoluerit uiri*. There was always something a little paradoxical about female obedience outside legal wedlock; cf. Plautus, *Men.* 202, *Most.* 188 ff., Terence, *Andr.* 285 ff.



For restraint of female desire cf. Plautus, *Amph.* 840, Turpilus, *Com.* 37–9 *quae mulier uolet | sibi suum amicum* (Acidalius: *summam amicum* codd.) *esse indulgentem et diuturnum*, | *modice atque parce eius seruiat cupidines*—Jason's denunciation of Medea's lust at Euripides, *Med.* 522 ff., Clytemnestra's boast about her σωφοσύνη at Euripides, *I.A.* 1159, and the story told by Plutarch at *Mor.* 140c indicate that such restraint was not a peculiarly Roman marriage ideal.

The Euripidean Hecuba appeals to Agamemnon not only through the pleasure he has had of her daughter but also through the quasi-legal relationship which the association of Agamemnon and Cassandra has in her view established between the Greek king and herself (*vv.* 834–5 τοῦτον καλῶς δρῶν ὄντα κηδεστήν σέθεν | δρόσεις).<sup>1</sup> This would have been a difficult notion to put straight into Latin. Ennius seems to have substituted the notion that Cassandra's sexual behaviour was more like that of a legal spouse than that of an ordinary concubine. The notion assumed a climate of social ideas common to Rome and historical Athens. There is nothing specifically 'Roman' about the passage except its language.<sup>2</sup>

**181 tibi in concubio... morem gerit:** for *concupere* of the female's part in sexual intercourse cf. Terence, *Hec.* 393. *Concupitum* occurs elsewhere in republican drama only at Plautus, *Trin.* 886 (*concupitum... noctis*). The phrase *morem gerere* and the adjective *morigerus*, to judge by Plautus, *Capt.* 966, *Cas.* 463, 897 and Terence, *Ad.* 214–15, seem to have served in the common language as sexual euphemisms.<sup>3</sup>

**uerecunde et modice:** cf. Cicero, *Tull.* 5 *uerecunde modiceque*, Livy 26.49.16 *uerecunde ac modeste*, Ammianus 16.7.3 *uerecunde et modice*.

## XCI

Personages who have suffered misfortune frequently express the desire for suicide in both Attic and Roman drama; cf. Euripides, *Andr.* 841 ff., *Heracles* 1146 ff., 1247 ff., *Tr.* 1282 f., Plautus, *Asin.* 606 ff., *Cist.* 639 ff., *Mil.* 1240 ff., Terence, *Andr.* 606 (*non dixit gladium aut laqueum me esset tragicum*—Donatus), *Phorm.* 552, Seneca, *Phoen.* 105 ff., *Herc.* f. 1221 ff. The Hecuba of Euripides' Ἐκάρβη nowhere expresses this desire but frequently makes plain her distaste for life and asks others to kill her: *vv.* 167–8 οὐκέτι μοι βίος | ἀγαπᾶσθες ἐν φάει, 386–7 ἤμεός δ' ἄγοντες πρὸς πυρῶν Ἀχιλλέος |

<sup>1</sup> Cf. Euripides, *Tr.* 308 ff.

<sup>2</sup> For a somewhat different view see G. W. Williams, *JRS* XLVIII (1958), 20.

<sup>3</sup> Cf. the use of *nubere* at Plautus, *Cist.* 43–4, *nuptiae* in the example of *translatio... obscenitatis uitandae causa* at Rhet. inc. *Hec.* 4.45.

## 316

κεντέϊτε, μή φείδεσθ', 391 ὑμῆεις δέ μ' ἀλλὰ θυγατρὶ συμφωνεῖσαστε, 396 πολλὰ γ' ἀνόγκη θυγατρὶ συνθεσθῆναι ἐμέ, 505–6 ἄρα κάμ' ἐπισηφάξει τάφω | δοκοῦν Ἀχαιοὺς ἦλαθες; ὡς φίλ' ἂν λέγοις. The chorus of this play interpret the speech of the childless and blinded Polymnestor at *vv.* 1096–106 as motivated by a suicidal urge. It is therefore anybody's guess where fragment XCI would have stood in the action of Ennius' adaptation.

The text of the fragment is plainly corrupt. Vahlen printed the paradoxis, perhaps having in mind such passages as Sophocles, *Phil.* 1004, *Tr.* 1089, Euripides, *Alk.* 837, *Heracles* 268–9, *Med.* 496–7, 1244, *Tr.* 1178, Neophonon, *fr.* 2.12, Aristophanes, *Thesm.* 776. But the verb *date* rules out an apostrophe to the speaker's own hands and the absence of qualification an address to the hands of others. Scaliger's *amis* runs up against the difficulty that *amis* in republican comedy (it is absent from tragedy) has a contemptuous tone when applied to women of the upper orders. It could be that two distinct quotations, *miserete manus date* and ... *date ferrum qui me anima priuem*, have been run together in Nonius' article as at pp. 467.32, 478.26 and elsewhere; *miserete manus date* might then belong to a version of Euripides, *Hek.* 59 ff. and ... *date ferrum qui me anima priuem* to some play other than *Hecuba*.

**182 miserete:** for the active form cf. Ennius, *Ann.* 171; the deponent form is regular in drama except for the impersonal *miseret*.

**qui me anima priuem:** cf. Sophocles, *Phil.* 1427 νοσφιεῖς βίου, Plautus, *Men.* 905 *anima priuabo uitrum*, Lucretius 5.997 *donec eos uita priuarant uermina saena*; contrast Plautus, *Trin.* 129 *dedisti... gladium qui se occideret*.

## XCII

This fragment clearly belongs to a version of Euripides, *Hek.* 492–8 οὐχ ἦδ' ἔνοσσα τῶν πολυχρόσων Φρυγῶν, | οὐχ ἦδε Πριάμου τοῦ μὲγ' ἀλβίου δάμορ; | καὶ νῦν πόλις μὲν πᾶσ' ἀνέστηκεν δορί, | αὐτῇ δὲ δούλη γοαῖς ἀπαις ἐπὶ χθονὶ | κέϊται, κόνει φύρουσα δύστηνον κόρα. | φεῦ φεῦ· γέρον μὲν εἶμ', ἄμωσ δὲ μοι θανεῖν | εἴη πρὶν ἀσχηρὰ περιπτεσθῆν τύχη τινὶ. The Talthybius of the Tróades refers explicitly to his own poverty (*v.* 415) but the matter of wealth and poverty is a constant theme of the Ἐκάρβη, discussed explicitly at *vv.* 317 ff., 492 f., 1218 ff., and it is not surprising that Ennius should make it explicit again in an otherwise fairly close version of *vv.* 497–8.

Ennius here for once keeps the spoken iambic verse of his original. Stylistically he moves away with the nominal phrase *mortem obpetam*, the repetition *senex... senex* and the alliteration of *graniter gemam*.

**183 mortem obpetam:** a fairly common phrase in classical prose but absent from the rest of republican drama.

## 317

**euenat:** this form and *euenant* are restored with a fair degree of certainty five times in Plautine comedy (C<sub>urr.</sub> 39, *Epid.* 290, 321, *Mil.* 1010, *Trin.* 41),<sup>1</sup> each time at the end of a metrical unit and in a context of some solemnity; *eueniat* and *eueniant*, which occur 19 times in comedy, were clearly the normal forms in the common language.

**184 senex:** this type of pleonasm is hard to parallel in either Greek or Roman drama but cf. Ennius, *Trag.* 298-9 *neque sepulcrum... habeat, portum corporis, | ubi... corpus requiescat.*

**grauter gemam:** cf. *Trag.* inc. 116, Virgil, *Georg.* 3. 133, Ammianus 14. 5. 7.

## IPHIGENIA

The title *Iphigenia* is given to Ennius by Verrius, the Virgilian scholiast,<sup>2</sup> Aulus Gellius and Iulius Rufinianus; and to Naevius by Nonius Marcellus (p. 370. 23). The piece which Nonius quotes as from Naevius' *Iphigenia* is corrupt to the point of almost complete obscurity<sup>3</sup> but since at least one piece of verse quoted with his name and no title comes from a play set on the Black Sea coast<sup>4</sup> we may suppose that he adapted Euripides' *I.T.* or another tragedy on the same theme.<sup>5</sup> The five pieces quoted as from Ennius' *Iphigenia* put this play without much doubt in Aulis.

Scaliger<sup>6</sup> considered that Ennius adapted the extant version of Euripides' *I.A.* and most scholars have accepted his opinion. Wilamowitz suggested<sup>7</sup> that *vv.* 590-7 of the extant *I.A.* is a remnant of a version of the play containing a chorus of soldiers and that Ennius adapted this version; M. Lenchantin De Gubernatis<sup>8</sup> had earlier suggested that Ennius' immediate model was a tragedy based on the Euripidean *I.A.* Certainly more than one acting

<sup>1</sup> Cf. *Pseid.* 1030 (*adueniat*), *Rud.* 626 (*perueniat*), *Trin.* 93 (*perueniant*).

<sup>2</sup> Schol. Veron. *Ed.* 5. 88 uses Verrius' lexicon either directly or indirectly. Servius auct. *Aen.* 1. 52 probably draws on the same source; Festus (p. 510. 19 ff. s.v. *uasius*) may have omitted the Ennius passage from his epitome.

<sup>3</sup> See the restorations attempted by Mariotti, *StudUrb* xxiv (1950), 176, *Il Bellum Poenicum e Arte di Nevio* (Rome, 1955), p. 131, and O. Skutsch, *CR* N.S. 1 (1931), 146-7, viii (1958), 48.

<sup>4</sup> *Trag.* 62 (Cicero, *Orat.* 152).

<sup>5</sup> The *ἰφίγεια* of Polyidus was set among the Taurians (Aristotle, *Poet.* 16. 1455a6, 17. 1455b10).

<sup>6</sup> *Comiect. Varr. Litig.*, on 7. 73.

<sup>7</sup> *Hermes* LIV (1919), 51 ff. (= *Kleine Schriften* IV [Berlin, 1962], 289 ff.).

<sup>8</sup> *MAT*, LXIII (1913), 416.

## IPHIGENIA

version of the Euripidean *I.A.* must have existed in theatrical circles and since Lenchantin wrote there have turned up pieces of what looks like a post-Euripidean tragedy dealing with the sacrifice of Iphigenia.<sup>1</sup> However the five pieces attributed to Ennius' *Iphigenia* can be interpreted as coming from an adaptation of the Euripidean *I.A.* no more free than certain other republican adaptations whose originals are certainly known. The continuing popularity of the *I.A.* in Athens and other Greek cities<sup>2</sup> and Ennius' well-evidenced predilection for Euripides give Scaliger's opinion a certain advantage over the others. Bergk<sup>3</sup> tried to explain the divergences from the *I.A.* in terms of 'contaminatio' with Sophocles' *ἰφίγεια*, a play which certainly dealt with the sacrifice but was probably set in Argos rather than Aulis.<sup>4</sup>

A title *Iphigenia* seems to be referred to by the author of the rhetorical treatise addressed to Herennius (fr. xciii) and by Cicero (fr. xcva). Since in the one case the personages Agamemnon and Menelaus are named and in the other Achilles we may suppose that Ennius' tragedy rather than Naevius' is meant. Nonius appears to quote from Achilles' speech in an article of uncertain origin (fr. xcva).<sup>5</sup>

No other republican play about events at Aulis is known but both Ennius and Accius wrote a *Telephus* dealing with a later episode in the saga. Behind Ennius' *Telephus* there stood quite probably Euripides' homonymous tragedy, a tragedy to which the *I.A.* bore a striking resemblance; in both plays there was a quarrel between Agamemnon and Menelaus and a speech by Achilles complaining of the delay in setting out for Troy; the baby Orestes was used in the *I.A.* by Iphigenia (on Clytemnestra's orders) to soften Agamemnon, in the *Τηλέφος* by Telephus (perhaps too on Clytemnestra's orders) to impel Agamemnon to protect him against the spying Greeks; various arguments and *sententiae* appeared in both plays.<sup>6</sup> A certain caution is therefore required in dealing with fragments not attri-

<sup>1</sup> Pap. Brit. Mus. 2560; Milne, *Cat.* p. 57 nr. 78; A. Körte, *APF* x (1932), 53.

<sup>2</sup> There are verbal allusions in Eubulus, fr. 67. 10 (370), Philetactus, fr. 4 (701), Menander, *Sam.* 329 (1602) and the Alexandrian Machon 21-4 Gow (22-3). Plautus refers to the story at *Epid.* 490-1, perhaps echoing his original. One of Euripides' two plays about Iphigenia was re-performed at the Great Dionysia of 342/1 (I.G. II<sup>2</sup> 2320). Euripides' name and scenes from the *I.A.* appear on a Megarian bowl (nr. 10 in U. Hausmann, *Hellenistische Reliefbecher aus attischen und böotischen Werkstätten* [Stuttgart, 1959]) of the late third century.

<sup>3</sup> *Ind. lecti. Marburg* 1844, xiv (= *Kl. phil. Schr.* 1. 229). In *Commentatio de Fragmentis Sophoclis* (Leipzig, 1833), p. 15, Bergk had proposed Sophocles' *ἰφίγεια* as Ennius' original.

<sup>4</sup> See Zielinski, *Tragödienmon Libri Tres*, p. 271.

<sup>5</sup> Verrius could be the source; cf. Paulus, p. 163. 12.

<sup>6</sup> E.g. *Telephos* fr. 714 ~ *I.A.* 17 ff., 446 ff.; fr. 719 ~ *I.A.* 1255-75.

# THE TRAGEDIES OF ENNIUS

THE FRAGMENTS  
EDITED WITH AN INTRODUCTION  
AND COMMENTARY

BY

H.D. JOCELYN

*Reader in Latin in the  
University of Sydney*



CAMBRIDGE  
AT THE UNIVERSITY PRESS

1967