



The Original Form of Naevius' Bellum Punicum

Henry T. Rowell

The American Journal of Philology, Vol. 68, No. 1. (1947), pp. 21-46.

Stable URL:

<http://links.jstor.org/sici?sici=0002-9475%281947%2968%3A1%3C21%3AATOFONB%3E2.0.CO%3B2-0>

The American Journal of Philology is currently published by The Johns Hopkins University Press.

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/about/terms.html>. JSTOR's Terms and Conditions of Use provides, in part, that unless you have obtained prior permission, you may not download an entire issue of a journal or multiple copies of articles, and you may use content in the JSTOR archive only for your personal, non-commercial use.

Please contact the publisher regarding any further use of this work. Publisher contact information may be obtained at <http://www.jstor.org/journals/jhup.html>.

Each copy of any part of a JSTOR transmission must contain the same copyright notice that appears on the screen or printed page of such transmission.

JSTOR is an independent not-for-profit organization dedicated to and preserving a digital archive of scholarly journals. For more information regarding JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

THE ORIGINAL FORM OF NAEVIUS'
BELLUM PUNICUM.

From statements of Suetonius and Santra, it is known that Cn. Naevius wrote his *Bellum Punicum* in the form of a single unbroken narrative which was later divided into seven books by C. Octavius Lampadio, probably in the second half of the second century B. C.¹ That this edition of Lampadio was used either directly or indirectly by some of the later writers who refer to the *Bellum Punicum* is indicated by their identification of specific books as the sources of their quotations and references.² Consequently scholars who have compiled and edited the fragments, since the revival of learning, have distributed them among seven separate books³ and there can be no quarrel with this arrangement.

¹ Suetonius, *De Grammaticis*, 2; Santra *ap.* Nonius, *s. v. septemfariam*, I, p. 250 Lindsay; cf. Buecheler, *Rh. Mus.*, XL (1885), p. 148. That Lampadio was influenced by Crates of Mallos in undertaking this division is not unlikely (cf. Hendrickson, *A. J. P.*, XIX [1898], p. 286), but the words of Suetonius (*ibid.*) do not permit the certainty with which the matter is treated by Birt (*Das antike Buchwesen*, p. 481) and Hillscher (*Jahrb. f. d. class. Phil.*, Suppl. XVIII [1892], p. 359).

² Of the 61 fragments cited by Morel (*Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum*, pp. 17 ff.) which can be attributed to the *Bellum Punicum*, 24 are assigned to specific books by the ancient sources. The authors who cite entirely or chiefly by Lampadio's edition are Charisius, Macrobius, Nonius, and the authors of the commentaries on Virgil which pass under the names of Probus and Servius Danielis. Priscian cites with and without book number which indicates the use of both ancient editions. Verrius Flaccus (as the source of Festus) and Varro seem to have used Naevius' original edition exclusively. For a detailed discussion, see L. Strzelecki, *De Naeviano Belli Punici Carmine Quaestiones Selectae* (Polska Akademia Umiejetności, Rozprawy Wydziału Filologicznego, T. LXV, 2 [Krakow, 1935]), pp. 1-5.

³ They are so distributed in the following editions: Ernst Spangenberg, *Quinti Ennii Annalium Libb. XVIII Fragmenta. Accedunt Cn. Naevii Librorum De Bello Punico Fragmenta Collecta*, etc. (Leipzig, 1825); Ernst Klussmann, *Cn. Naevii Poetae Romani Vitam Descripsit*, etc. (Jena, 1843); Johannes Vahlen, *Cn. Naevi De Bello Punico Reliquiae* (Leipzig, 1854); Emil Baehrens, *Fragmenta Poetarum Romanorum*

The method, however, which has been followed in assigning specific fragments to specific books has long needed to be challenged. From 1595, when Merula first expressed an opinion regarding the contents of the first books of the *Bellum Punicum*,⁴ until the near present, certain fragments have been assigned to certain books in flagrant violation of the testimony of the ancient authors by whom they are preserved. These dislocations have not only affected our views regarding the continuity which Naevius observed in describing the first Punic War. They have also created the prevailing concept of the place within the opening books occupied by the legendary material which Naevius also treated and the relation of that material to the historical account of the war.

The manner in which this occurred deserves to be noted. First of all, certain fragments were arbitrarily dislocated in order to fit them into a preconceived notion of the original order of contents of the poem. This can be clearly seen in the early reconstructions of Spangenberg⁵ and Klussmann⁶ which influenced Vahlen's arrangement⁷ in which those fragments alone which seem to pertain to legendary events are assigned to the first two books. Subsequently, as this notion of the order of contents was passed on unaltered in its essentials from scholar to scholar, it acquired an independent authority and began to enjoy the respect due to an established fact. It then either caused the precarious base on which it rested to be ignored or was adduced as a reason for accepting the dislocations which made its existence possible. So great is the power of repetition.

Now the traditional reconstruction—for so we shall call it henceforth for convenience—of the *Bellum Punicum* is reproduced in recent works of scholarship substantially as follows:

Naevius began his epic with the Fall of Troy and the wan- (Teubner, 1886); and Willy Morel, *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* (Teubner, 1927). In this article, fragments of Naevius will be given the numbers which they have in Morel's edition unless otherwise stated.

⁴ Paul Merula, *Q. Enni, Poetae cum Primis Censendi, Annalium Libb. XIII quae apud Varios Auctores Supersunt Fragmenta Collecta*, etc. (Leyden, 1595). Merula's observations on the *Bellum Punicum* begin on p. 49 of his commentary and are made chiefly to illustrate the text of Ennius. Nevertheless, it is there for the first time, so far as I can ascertain, that we find the germ of a reconstruction of contents.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 188. ⁶ *Op. cit.*, pp. 29 f., 216 f. ⁷ *Op. cit.*, pp. 9-14.

derings of Aeneas. These events together with the founding of Rome and possibly that of Carthage occupied the first two books. The main theme of the poem, the first Punic War, began with Book III and continued through Book VII, that is, to the end of the poem.⁸ Roman history between the founding of Rome and the first Punic War was not included.⁹

The reason for this arrangement, however, was not easily explained. The omission of events between the founding of the city and the first Punic War did not allow the material of the first two books to be interpreted as the opening part of an annalistic account of Roman history in verse similar in plan and purpose to the *Annales* of Ennius. Since Dido and Anna appeared in the *Bellum Punicum* (frg. 6) and the main theme of the poem was a war between Rome and Carthage, many scholars found it reasonable to assume, especially in the light of Virgil, that Dido and Aeneas were made responsible in some way for the enmity between the states which they had founded¹⁰—an enmity which flared into open warfare in 264 B. C. Those

⁸ This reconstruction appears in Schanz-Hosius, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, I⁴ (1927), p. 53; Cichorius, *Röm. Studien* (1922), p. 25; Fränkel, *R.-E.*, Suppl. VI (1935), col. 638; Enk, *Handboek der Latijnse Letterkunde*, II, 1 (1937), p. 73. Leo (*Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, p. 81), who is also inclined to accept it, suggests, nevertheless, that the historical account may have begun early in Book II, a suggestion that is condemned by Fränkel (*loc. cit.*). In the literary histories of Klotz, Ussani, and Wight Duff, the prevailing view is stated as an established fact which needs no further discussion.

⁹ Lucian Mueller alone, so far as I know, attempts to prove by detailed arguments that Naevius treated the entire history of Rome down to the first Punic War (*Q. Ennii Carminum Reliquae* [1884], pp. XX-XXXII). His conclusions are repeated without discussion of evidence by Marchesi (*Storia della letteratura latina*, p. 46) while Terzaghi (*Storia della letteratura latina*, p. 53) implies their adoption. Plessis (*La poésie latine*, p. 13) is noncommittal. But the evidence against Mueller's conclusions is overwhelming; cf. Strzelecki, *op. cit.*, p. 6, note 2; Leo, *op. cit.*, p. 82, and Fränkel, *loc. cit.*

¹⁰ Whether Naevius brought Dido and Aeneas together and if so, how fully his account is reflected in Book IV of Virgil's *Aeneid*, has been debated for over a century; see the exhaustive lists of proponents and opponents in A. S. Pease, *Publi Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Quartus*, pp. 18-19, notes 120 and 121. Strzelecki (*op. cit.*, pp. 12-24) is now to be added to the list of proponents.

who declined to accept this theory were compelled to assume another link between the legendary and historical parts of the poem. As stated by Leo, whom Fränkel cites in this connection, "Also war es nur die Entstehung Roms um deren willen Naevius die Einleitung vorausgeschickt hat."¹¹

This, then, is the traditional reconstruction. But it has been finally challenged by Ladislaus Strzelecki, who published his monograph, *De Naeviano Belli Punici Carmine Quaestiones Selectae*, in 1935.¹² Part of this work is of capital importance since it contains a new concept of the original form of the first three books of the *Bellum Punicum* based on a new arrangement of the fragments. The approach is new, to be sure, only in so far as it breaks with the traditional method of reassigning certain fragments arbitrarily. In principle it is hardly radical since it consists in following the evidence of the manuscripts.¹³ Without anticipating the general plan which Naevius might or should have followed in composing his epic, Strzelecki advocates placing the fragments where they are said to belong by the ancient authors in whose works they are preserved and not where they have to be placed to support the traditional reconstruction of contents.

Unfortunately, Strzelecki's monograph does not appear to have received the consideration which it deserved before the Second World War¹⁴ and no one, to my knowledge, has yet made

¹¹ Leo, *op. cit.*, p. 82; Fränkel, *loc. cit.*, col. 638.

¹² See note 2 above.

¹³ Strzelecki, *op. cit.*, pp. 5-11; 36-38.

¹⁴ The only critical review known to me which attempts to do justice to Strzelecki's treatment of the order of contents is that of Haffter (*Deut. Lit. Zeit.*, LVIII [1937], pp. 659-663). Haffter does not accept Strzelecki's proposed rearrangement of the fragments explicitly, but sees no obstacle to its acceptance. Of the writers of short notices who do not discuss the details, Amatucci (*Boll. Fil. Class.*, XLII [1936-37], p. 133) accepts the rearrangement as logical and soundly based on existing evidence; Ernout (*Rev. Phil.*, XI [1937], p. 182) and Constans (*Rev. Ét. Anc.*, XXXVIII [1936], p. 241) are noncommittal; the reviewers for the *Rivista di Filologia* (XV [1937], p. 431) and the *Bulletin Budé* (suppl. crit., VIII [1936], p. 113) do not touch upon the rearrangement; Skutsch (*C. R.*, L [1936], p. 149) devotes thirteen lines to it and concludes flatly that it fails. I have been unable to find any mention of Strzelecki's work in American learned journals.

full use of its conclusions.¹⁵ Part of this neglect, at least, is probably due to the author's greater interest in tracing reflections of the *Bellum Punicum* in Virgil's *Aeneid* than in working out his reconstruction in more than a cursory manner. I wish to give Strzelecki full credit for his accomplishment which is the work of a pioneer. But I believe that it can be stated in all fairness that he is content to show us in a few bold strokes the way which we must travel in the future, but does not concern himself with many details of the departure or accompany us for any distance on the way.

My purpose, therefore, in writing this article is to follow the way indicated by Strzelecki as far as it will take us in regard to the original form of the entire poem. The fragments which the traditional reconstruction has displaced are the foundation stones of any reconstruction and their position in the work as a whole must be tested far more rigorously than Strzelecki cared to test them. This can be done only by examining them separately in the light of the textual tradition. Next, when the evidence for their position has been established, their contents must be analyzed for what they can tell us about the order and contents of the first three books of the poem. Finally, when this step has been completed, we shall be in a position to investigate the order and form of the remaining four books in the light of our new conclusions.

If the technical investigation which has been proposed succeeds in creating a new concept of the poem's original form, it will have created a new problem simultaneously. Many of the fragments which have not been displaced or have been assigned by conjecture will have to be rearranged and a new and detailed reconstruction of the entire contents, especially of the legendary part, will have to be undertaken. Such a reconstruction must lead eventually to questions regarding the genesis of the poem: What did Naevius know of the Trojan Legend? How did he select and transform material already at hand? What did he add which was peculiarly his own creation? Why did he choose

¹⁵ Klotz, who accepts the rearrangement, used it only in connection with a single point; cf. *Rh. Mus.*, LXXXVII (1938), p. 190, and p. 36 below.

a particular form in preference to others? In time these questions must be answered, in so far as the evidence permits.

For the present, however, the task must be the laying of a firm foundation for future investigation along the lines just indicated. For only after it has been laid and its flaws detected can further work be carried out with profit. It therefore seemed advisable to conduct an investigation which attempted no more than to furnish a new conception of the original form of the poem as a whole and to develop its implications and consequences in other studies.

As has been indicated above, the evidence of a seven book edition of the *Bellum Punicum* and the fact that certain fragments are attributed to specific books in our sources make any reconstruction of the poem depend on the relative order of the fragments and notices. The following fragments are assigned expressly to the first three books:

Nos. 5, 13, 19, 21, and 32	to Book I
Nos. 22, 23, 29, and 30	to Book II
Nos. 3 and 24	to Book III

Yet, of these fragments, Nos. 3, 24, and 32 have been assigned arbitrarily to other books by modern scholars. Let us now see to what extent such displacements can be justified.

Fragment 32 which has been reassigned to Book III (Vahlen, Baehrens, Morel) reads as follows in Morel's edition (p. 23):

	Manius Valerius
consul partem exerciti	in expeditionem
ducit	

The verses are preserved by Charisius (p. 163 Barwick; p. 128 Keil) with the notice: *Gn. Naevius Belli Punici* I. In the *Codex Neapolitanus* from which this passage in other sources is ultimately derived, the *praenomen* of Valerius is given in abbreviation as *M*. Hence Barwick and Keil read *Marcus*. But since the only Valerii who were consuls during the first Punic War are known to have borne the praenomina *Manius* and *Lucius*, we must accept the emendation, as old as Merula's edition, of *M* for *M* and identify the consul of the passage with

Manius Valerius Maximus, consul in 263 B. C. who conducted military operations in Sicily in the course of the same year.¹⁶

Emending the number of the book, however, from I to II with Spangenberg and Klussmann or from I to III with later scholars is quite a different matter. Baehrens and Cichorius alone, so far as I have been able to ascertain, have sought paleographic grounds for assuming a corruption in the text.¹⁷ They found them in the fact that the *praenomen* of the consul in abbreviation follows directly upon the number of the book. Hence confusion between an original III and the M' of *Manius* is assumed. But this common assumption did not lead to common results. For Baehrens suggests that the manuscript *IM* represents an original IIII followed by *Valerius*, while Cichorius conjectures an original III *M'*.

Yet, the facts of the matter are these. The *Neapolitanus* and all its derivatives, that is, the sum total of existing evidence, give the reading I according to Keil and Barwick, who made thorough studies of them. This is the only firm evidence which we have. Behind it we cannot go except in conjecture and such conjecture must be properly justified. Its only justification in this instance is the assumption which has become powerful by repetition but is actually devoid of any supporting evidence that Naevius did not begin the *Bellum Punicum* with the war which gave it its title but with the fall of Troy. Hence this fragment which refers to the Punic War had to be assigned to Book II or III or even IV according to the opinions of the several editors regarding the place in the poem where the legendary account ended and the historical account began. Paleography was then called upon by a few to furnish questionable support for a desired emendation. The rest simply made the emendation without the slightest regard for the textual tradition.

¹⁶ Consulship and *praenomen* of Manius are expressly attested by the *Fasti Consulares*, *C. I. L.*, I², 1, p. 22; *Fasti Triumphales*, *ibid.*, p. 46; Polybius, I, 16; cf. Pliny, *H. N.*, VII, 214, and *Ineditum Vaticanum*, 4 (Drachmann, *Diodors röm. Annalen*, p. 69). Morel (*ad loc.*) assigns Valerius' consulship incorrectly to the year 262, an error which he apparently took from Cichorius to whom he refers in his notes; cf. *Römische Studien*, p. 27.

¹⁷ Cichorius, *loc. cit.*; Baehrens, *F. P. R.*, *ap. crit.* on frg. 35, p. 48.

Fragment 24, which has been reassigned to Book II (Vahlen, Baehrens, Morel), reads as follows in Morel's edition (p. 21) :

Manusque susum ad caelum	sustulit suas rex
Amulius divis<que>	gratulabatur

The verses are preserved by Nonius under *gratulari: gratias agere* (p. 165 Mueller, p. 167 Lindsay) with the notice: *Naeuius Belli Punici* III. The emendations *manusque* for *isque* (Merula) and *rex* for *res* (Stephanus) are also accepted by Mueller and Leo.¹⁸ Lindsay retains the manuscript readings. In the second line, the emendation *Amulius* for *Amullus* has been accepted by all editors since Bentinus. Given the part played by Amulius in the legend of Rome's foundation, it is reasonably certain. The manuscript *gratulabatur divis* (retained by Lindsay) has been rearranged in various ways to accord with the several editors' opinions of what a Saturnian verse should be. Morel, as indicated by his reference *ad loc.*, adopted Leo's version, which is as satisfactory as any other.

But there is no reason to emend the number of the book from which the passage was taken except to make it support the traditional reconstruction. Since Naeuius was believed to have begun his account of the first Punic War with Book III, there could be no place in Book III for the mention of an event which was so clearly connected with the legendary history of Rome. Hence, editors reassigned the fragment to Book II in spite of the fact that all manuscripts give Book III as its source.

The last of the dislocated fragments is Number 3, which has been reassigned to Book I (Vahlen, Baehrens, Morel). In Morel's edition (p. 17) it reads as follows:

Postquam avem aspexit	in templo Anchisa,
sacra in mensa penatium	ordine ponuntur;
immolabat auream	victimam pulchram.

The fragment is preserved by Probus (*ad Verg. Ecl.*, 6, 31 [p. 336 Hagen; p. 14 Keil]) with the notice: *Naeuius Belli Punici libro tertio sic* (the *Monacensis* gives: · 3 · libro). The *Anchises* of the *Vaticanus* was emended to *Anchisa* by Keil,

¹⁸ *Der Saturnische Vers* (*Abh. Gött.*, VIII [1905]), 5, p. 33, note 4; p. 52, note 5.

an emendation later adopted by Hagen and Leo.¹⁹ The rest of the text is based on a uniform manuscript tradition. Furthermore, it is confirmed from *templo* to *ponuntur* by Cynthius Cenetensis,²⁰ a scholar of the fifteenth century who in composing a commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid* appears to have used the now lost Bobbio manuscript of Probus which was the archetype of all existing manuscripts and of the *editio princeps*.²¹ But for our present purpose, the words with which Cynthius introduces his citation are of greater importance. They read, as reproduced by Mai: *Et Naeuius belli punici lib. · III ·*.

Thus, the original position of the fragment is well attested by the sum total of our evidence. But this evidence has been consistently ignored in favor of the traditional reconstruction. Obviously a fragment which mentions Anchises could not find an appropriate place in a book (III) which was believed to have begun with the opening events of the first Punic War. On the other hand, its contents could be interpreted conveniently as a sacrifice undertaken by Anchises in connection with the fall of Troy or the setting forth of the Trojans to seek a new home. Hence reassignment of the fragment from Book III to Book I.

These, then, are the fragments of the *Bellum Punicum* which have been dislocated by scholars in order to give them new positions in the contents of the poem as a whole. The analysis of the sources in which they are preserved has shown that the dislocations, so far as the manuscript tradition is concerned, are thoroughly unjustified. We shall therefore follow the order of the fragments attested by the sources in examining what the fragments have to tell about the original form and contents of the poem. In a way, this will be a second testing of the sources in regard to the fragments' position. For if intolerable diffi-

¹⁹ *Op. cit.*, p. 44, note 1.

²⁰ Mai, *Class. Auct.*, VII, p. 386.

²¹ On Cynthius' use of Probus, see Keil's edition of Probus' *Commentary*, pp. VIII-IX. The descent of all existing manuscripts and the *editio princeps* from the lost *Bobbiensis* is maintained by Keil (*op. cit.*, pp. V-IX), Hagen (Thilo-Hagen edition of Servius, III, 2, p. VIII), and F. M. Wheelock (*Harv. Stud. Class. Phil.*, XLIV [1933], pp. 247 ff.). Wheelock, however, who adduces new material, argues for a less direct descent than was assumed by his predecessors. See his stemma on p. 248 where X¹ represents the *Bobbiensis*.

culties are placed in the way of understanding the contents by returning the fragments to where they are said to belong, we shall have to suspect again that the sources are in error.

In establishing the text of fragment 32 above, we also established a firm date for the historical event to which it refers. This was the year 263 B. C. when Manius Valerius Maximus was consul and conducted military operations in Sicily.²² After Valerius and his consular colleague had raised the siege of Messena, which was being besieged by a Carthaginian and a Greek army, the latter under the command of Hiero, Valerius pursued Hiero to Syracuse. There he forced him to come to terms which included an alliance with the Romans.²³

De Sanctis suggests that our Naevian fragment refers to Valerius' first invasion of Syracusan territory, an event in which he sees the beginning of Roman imperialism.²⁴ Cichorius does little more in his commentary than restate what Naevius tells us except that he assumes that the military operation in question was a sally into the interior which took place during the siege of Messina.²⁵ Since the Latin phrase *expeditionem ducere* means no more than to lead out troops on a military operation,²⁶ we know for certain only that Naevius is referring to a march, sally, or campaign undertaken by Valerius.

Little as this fragment may add to our historical knowledge of the first Punic War, it is of capital importance for our under-

²² See note 16 above.

²³ I am here following De Sanctis' interpretation of the sources (*Storia dei Romani*, III, 1, pp. 114 ff.) as best explaining why a triumph was accorded to Valerius alone of the two consuls (cf. *C. I. L.*, I², 1, p. 46). Frank (*C. A. H.*, p. 675), apparently accepting the statement of Diodorus (XXIII, 4), has both consuls pursue Hiero. But even if it was a joint pursuit, the *Ineditum Vaticanum* (4) mentions Valerius alone as making the treaty with Hiero; cf. De Sanctis, *op. cit.*, p. 116, note 37.

²⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 114.

²⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 27.

²⁶ *Expeditio* in the general sense of a military operation is well attested by Sallust (*Jug.*, 37; 103; *Hist.*, frg. 98. 6 Maurenbrecher), Caesar (*B. G.*, V, 10), Hirtius (*B. G.*, VIII, 6 and 8), and Cicero (*Div.*, I, 33, 72; II, 30, 65). The precise nature of the operation is sometimes added *expressis verbis* or can be inferred from the context. That the meaning of *expeditio* in the military terminology of the Empire is generally "campaign" (a military operation of some magnitude) can be ascertained from a glance at Dessau's *Index* (*I. L. S.*, III, p. 509).

standing of the original form of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*. Both its position in Book I and its reference to an event of the year 263 B. C. indicate beyond reasonable doubt that Naevius did not begin his poem with the fall of Troy and the legend of Aeneas, but with the historical subject which gave the poem its name. Moreover, Naevius' method of handling the events of the war in chronological order, as attested by the fragments of the last four books, allows us to assume that the part of the war which preceded the military operation mentioned in the fragment was also described in the same Book I and preceded the fragment in the order of the text. It would be absurd to assume that Naevius could have omitted the crossing into Sicily and the military operations of 264. It is unlikely that he would not have touched, at least, upon the war's immediate causes.²⁷ These causes and events must have furnished the contents of the opening part of the poem.

On the other hand, it is certain that episodes from the fall of Troy and the legend of Aeneas were also included in Book I.²⁸ This legendary material continued to be treated in Book II and, as we shall demonstrate below, in Book III. Since Naevius used the same chronological method of ordering his legendary material as he used in describing historical events, we have no grounds to assume any interruption of the legendary account by historical digressions of which no traces have survived. On the contrary, all the evidence points to a continuous presentation of the Trojan legend from the fall of Troy to the founding of Rome on the soil of Latium.

The point has now been reached where we must ask whether the order of contents or the contents themselves, as we have just analyzed them, present difficulties such as to compel us to question the correctness of the source which assigned the basis of our reconstruction, Fragment 32, to Book I. By following the evidence so far we have reached the conclusion that the legendary part of the poem was inserted within the body of the main

²⁷ Frg. 31 appears to refer to the formal declaration of war by the Romans; cf. Cichorius, *op. cit.*, pp. 26 f.

²⁸ Fragments 5, 13, and 17, dealing with the fall of Troy and the wanderings of Aeneas, are all assigned specifically to Book I in our sources.

narrative, that is, the account of the first Punic War. In other words, we have a story within a story, the former relating events which precede in time the events contained in the latter. If such a device did not occur elsewhere in ancient literature, we might be entitled to doubt the evidence which produced it. But, indeed, the opposite is the truth, for we have a precedent of the greatest authority: Odysseus' account of his wanderings contained in Books IX-XII of the *Odyssey*. The differences in purpose and treatment in the inserted narratives of Homer and Naevius are obvious. They can best be analyzed in connection with the purely literary problems which, as I have said above, do not lie within the scope of this article. Here, I shall simply emphasize that Homer set the example for the formal device and that it had already been made known to the Latin reader through the version of Livius Andronicus. It could have struck but very few literate persons of the period as something entirely new.

If, then, we have no right to displace Fragment 32 because it has created something unprecedented in a literary form, we must now attempt to estimate how far down Naevius carried his account of the first Punic War in Book I before beginning his account of the legendary material.

As we have seen, Fragment 32 refers to an event of the year 263. Two fragments (33 and 34) which are not assigned to any book in our sources, have been referred to the siege of Agrigentum in 262 by Cichorius with some probability.²⁹ Even without them we would have to assume that Naevius described this important event. The question is where? Was it before or after the insertion of the legendary material?

Fortunately three lines of the *Bellum Punicum* (frg. 19) preserved by Priscian (I, p. 198 Hertz) and assigned expressly to Book I furnish the means of approach. They read as follows:

Inerant signa expressa	quomodo Titani
bicorporos Gigantes	magnique Atlantes
Runcus ac Purpureus	filiis Terras

It is obvious that this passage was originally part of a description of a monument or object which either was itself figured or

²⁹ *Op. cit.*, pp. 28 ff.

contained statues. Consequently, since the time of Spangenberg many identifications have been proposed.³⁰ About them it can only be said that they are not convincing because of the manner in which they are made. A monument or work of art which Naevius mentioned or might well have mentioned in the course of his poem is taken as the object of identification. Then, without further evidence, it is assumed that the figures which are expressly mentioned by Naevius in Fragment 19 were contained in the object in question.

There is, however, an identification which is an exception to the rule and recommends itself as resting on a reasonably firm foundation. In 1935, Hermann Fränkel called attention to the passage in the *De Architectura* in which Vitruvius describes the architectural figures which the Greeks called *ἀτλαντες*, the Romans *telemones*.³¹ The function of these male figures was to support *mutuli* or *coronae*, or to put it more generally, they served as male counterparts, architecturally speaking, of female Caryatids. Fränkel then pointed out that the oldest and most famous monument known to us which contained *magni Atlantes* was the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum in Sicily; further, that a description of this temple has been preserved by Diodorus;³² finally, that mentioned therein were sculptured representations of a gigantomachy and the fall of Troy. Hence the fragment of Naevius in question would belong to a description of the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum.

This was all pure gain. But confidence in the traditional reconstruction of contents prevented Fränkel apparently from following his valuable discovery to its logical conclusion. Although he was aware of the part played by Agrigentum in the first Punic War and although he could assume reasonably that Naevius himself had seen the temple in the course of his campaigns, nevertheless he connected Naevius' description of the temple with a hypothetical visit of Aeneas to Agrigentum. In other words, he assumed a retrojection of the historical temple

³⁰ Spangenberg, *op. cit.* (see note 3 above), p. 196: figureheads or figures on Roman warships; Baehrens, *F. P. R.*, p. 46: temple at Cumae; Waser, *R.-E.*, Suppl. III, col. 701: shield.

³¹ Fränkel, *Hermes*, LXX (1935), pp. 59 ff.; Vitruvius, VI, 7, 6.

³² XIII, 82.

known to Naevius into the legendary past, because the fragment describing the temple belonged in Book I and that book was considered by all to have dealt exclusively with legendary events.

If we turn now to the remains of the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum, we find ample evidence for the existence of the *Atlantes* although archaeologists cannot agree on the position which they occupied in the structure of the temple.³³ Of the Giants and Titans mentioned by Naevius in the same passage we have no certain remains.³⁴ But the express statement of Diodorus that a Gigantomachy stood in the east part of the temple³⁵ and the evidence of the *Atlantes* compel us to agree with Fränkel that Naevius' Giants and Titans are to be identified with the figures which stood in the Gigantomachy. The mention of Titans does not militate against the identification. In classical antiquity, Giants and Titans were often confused or brought together in a single group,³⁶ and, whereas Diodorus

³³ On the temple in general, the following important studies have appeared since the work of Koldewey and Puchstein (*Die Griechischen Tempel in Unteritalien und Sicilien*, pp. 153 ff.); Pace, *Mon. Ant.*, XXVIII (1922), pp. 174 ff., and Marconi, *Agrigento* (1929), pp. 57 ff. There is also a brief description in Robertson, *Greek and Roman Architecture* (2nd ed., 1943), pp. 122 ff. On the *Atlantes* the most thorough study is that of Marconi (*Bollettino d'Arte*, VI [1927], pp. 33-45), restated briefly in his *Agrigento*, pp. 168-170. Earlier hypotheses regarding the position of these figures in the structure of the temple are summarized by Pace, *loc. cit.*, pp. 185 ff. The hypothesis of Koldewey and Puchstein (*op. cit.*, pp. 160 ff.) that the *Atlantes* were situated in the intercolumniations on the outside of the temple to provide additional support for the architrave has been strengthened by Marconi's investigations.

³⁴ It is possible, though far from certain, that a fragment of sculpture depicting a lion's tail comes from the Gigantomachy. Otherwise, the sculptural remains are too few and fragmentary to be identified.

³⁵ The pertinent lines of Diodorus are as follows (XIII, 82, 4): τῶν δὲ στοῶν τὸ μέγεθος καὶ τὸ ὕψος ἐξαισιον ἐχουσῶν, ἐν μὲν τῷ πρὸς ἔω μέρει τὴν γιγαντομαχίαν ἐποιήσαντο γλυφαῖς καὶ τῷ μεγέθει καὶ τῷ κάλλει διαφερούσαις, ἐν δὲ τῷ πρὸς δυσμὰς τὴν ἄλωσιν τῆς Τροίας, ἐν ᾗ τῶν ἡρώων ἕκαστον ἰδεῖν ἔστιν οἰκείως τῆς περιστάσεως δεδημιουργημένον.

³⁶ On the confusion of Giants and Titans in ancient authors, see Maximilian Meyer, *Die Giganten und Titanen in der antiken Sage und Kunst*, pp. 144 f., especially note 211; cf. pp. 1 ff. Additions to Meyer's evidence have been made by Wüst, *R.-E.*, VI (A), col. 1503.

was giving a generic indication, Naevius was describing the several kinds of figures.

We may therefore conclude that Naevius described the siege and fall of Agrigentum in Book I before beginning his account of the fall of Troy in the same book. Furthermore, as we shall see below (pp. 43 ff.), the historical events which are described directly after the legendary material make it unlikely that Naevius could have carried his historical account in Book I much beyond the end of the year 262. To these considerations, we must add the following reasons for concluding that the last historical event described by Naevius in Book I was in fact the fall of Agrigentum.

The first reason is that the fall of Agrigentum was an appropriate point at which to abandon the historical for the legendary, to turn from Rome's present to Rome's past. This event meant more to the Romans than the completion of a tedious and difficult military operation. As Polybius tells us,³⁷ it was then that the Romans became aware of their power and began to entertain hopes of driving the Carthaginians out of Sicily. No longer were they content to have saved the Mamertines and to enjoy the profits which they had already reaped from the war. They now perceived the advantages of a total victory and set their minds on it. The hesitant step of 264 had become a determined march toward the acquisition of an empire.

From the vantage point of time Polybius saw this clearly. But I do not believe that we would be expecting too much of the Latin poet who had himself fought in that war³⁸ if we assumed that he too, when he came to write his poem, recognized the same turning point as Polybius. If the past was to be considered, here was the appropriate place to begin, the place whose fall had determined the deadly struggle which was destined to endure for the next hundred years.

The second reason is that the Temple of Zeus at Agrigentum furnished material which the poet could use to effect a transition between actual events and the legendary past. It has already been noted that the counterpart of the Gigantomachy in the east part of the temple described by Naevius was a representation of the fall of Troy. That the latter might be connected with

³⁷ I, 20.

³⁸ Naevius, frg. 2.

Naevius' account of the legendary material occurred to Alfred Klotz, who having accepted Strzelecki's new arrangement of the fragments, attempted to find an historical event which would lead naturally to the legendary insertion.³⁹ Having failed in his attempt, he added the following suggestion, apparently an afterthought since it appears in the form of a K(orrektur N(ote) to his completed article: "Oder sollte die Erzählung von Aeneas vielleicht mit dem Giebelschmuck des Zeustempels zusammenhängen und an die Eroberung dieser Stadt angeschlossen sein, die doch einen Wendepunkt des Krieges bezeichnete?"

The "Giebelschmuck" to which he refers is obviously the sculptured representation of the fall of Troy which according to Diodorus was in the west part of the temple.⁴⁰ But that it, or the Gigantomachy, which was its counterpart on the east, stood in a pediment is pure assumption. Neither the language of Diodorus nor archaeological remains permit more than hypotheses with regard to their places in the structure of the temple.⁴¹ Comparisons may be made with other temples of the same century⁴² which had sculptured representations of the same two subjects, but they will produce little profit. Scholars agree substantially that the fall of Troy assigned by Pausanias to a place above the columns of the second temple of Hera in the

³⁹ *Rh. Mus.*, LXXXVII (1938), pp. 190-192.

⁴⁰ See note 35 above.

⁴¹ Jahn (*Annali*, XXXV [1863], p. 245, note 1) and Pace (*loc. cit.*, pp. 244 ff.), who do not believe that the temple had pediments, distribute the two groups over metopes. Koldewey and Puchstein (*op. cit.*, p. 164) and Marconi (*Agrigento*, pp. 171 f.) assign them to pediments. But the fact remains that neither Diodorus nor the remains permit certain attribution.

⁴² The temple of Zeus at Agrigento had not been completed by 409 B. C. (Diodorus, XIII, 82, 2), although it is clear from the same passage that it already then contained the Gigantomachy and the fall of Troy. Pace conjectures reasonably that the temple was begun shortly after the battle of Himera in 480 B. C. when the Agrigentines set their prisoners to work quarrying marble from which to build their greatest temples (*loc. cit.*, pp. 178 f.; cf. Diodorus, XI, 25). On stylistic grounds, Marconi assigns the *Atlantes* to the decade 480-470 B. C. and the fragments of sculpture to 450-440 (*Agrigento*, p. 66). If Marconi is correct, these sculptures are not far removed in time from those with which they are now compared.

Argive Heraeum occupied the west pediment.⁴³ On the other hand, the Gigantomachy mentioned in the same passage is assigned to metopes.⁴⁴ On the Parthenon, scenes from a Gigantomachy and from the fall of Troy occupied metopes.⁴⁵ So far as I know, the fall of Troy is not represented elsewhere in a pediment, on a series of metopes, or on a frieze.⁴⁶ But the numerous Gigantomachies which can be added to those just mentioned appear in all three positions.⁴⁷ In view of this comparable material, it is safe to assume only that the Gigantomachy and Fall of Troy of the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum were represented on pediments or on metopes.

Yet wherever they were, it is certain that they could be seen clearly. Diodorus states (XIII, 82, 4) that the Gigantomachy was depicted *γλυφαῖς καὶ τῷ μεγέθει καὶ τῷ κάλλει διαφερούσαις*. As to the heroes portrayed in the Fall, *ἕκαστον ἰδεῖν ἔστιν οἰκείως τῆς περιστάσεως δεδημουρημένον*. Since the phrase *οἰκείως τῆς περιστάσεως* has been interpreted loosely as referring to the form and garments of the figures,⁴⁸ it will not be irrelevant to our subject to analyze its meaning more carefully.

To begin with *οἰκείως*, it is an adverb derived from an adjective

⁴³ Pausanias, II, 17, 3. On the temple in general, see Waldstein, *The Argive Heraeum*, pp. 117 ff. On the position of the sculptured groups, the following are in substantial agreement: Jahn, *loc. cit.* (see note 41 above); Curtius, *Peloponnesus*, II, p. 570; Heydemann, *Iliupersis*, pp. 8 f.; Frazer, *Pausanias*, III, p. 182; Waldstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 148 ff.

⁴⁴ See references cited in the preceding note.

⁴⁵ The latest and most detailed study of these metopes is that of Praschniker in which appropriate reference is made to earlier discussions (*Parthenonstudien* [Wien, 1928]). For the east metopes (Gigantomachy), see pp. 186 ff.; for the north metopes (Fall of Troy), see pp. 87 ff. We shall return to the north metopes in more detail below.

⁴⁶ In speaking of the Fall in this connection, I mean those events alone which are part of the capture of the city. Such scenes from the Trojan War as are represented on the west pediment of the Temple of Aphaia at Aegina or on the east frieze of the Treasury of the Siphnians at Delphi do not concern us here.

⁴⁷ The evidence has been collected by Waser, *R.-E.*, Suppl. III, cols. 670 ff.

⁴⁸ Pace translates (*loc. cit.*, p. 186): "in cui ciascuno eroe può ravvisarsi dalla forma e vestimento caratteristico"; Mueller (in the Didot edition, I, p. 522): "ubi heroum unumquemque videre est ad habitus sui formam elaborate fabricatam."

which governs both the genitive and the dative case. When the adverb governs a noun in the genitive, it means simply "in a manner appropriate to" the meaning of the noun which it governs. In another passage of Diodorus (XVI, 38, 6) Phayllus meets his end *ἐπιπόνως καὶ τῆς ἀσεβείας οἰκείως*, that is "painfully and in a manner appropriate to his impiety." Again Polybius (XV, 10, 1) has Scipio address his forces before Zama *βραχέως μὲν, οἰκείως δὲ τῆς ὑποκειμένης περιστάσεως* that is, "briefly but in a manner appropriate to the occasion." The statues, then, of the several heroes in Diodorus' group could be seen fashioned in a manner appropriate to the *περίστασις*. In the context, this *περίστασις* can mean but one thing: the event, vicissitudes, or circumstances in which they were portrayed. And as Diodorus has just told us, this was the fall of Troy.

We may therefore conceive of a group of figures, each of which had been given the attitude and attributes of the part which had been assigned to it in the scene as a whole. Fortunately, we have a strong parallel to support this concept. Four of the metopes on the north side of the Parthenon are sufficiently well preserved not only to place their subject matter beyond doubt but also to provide a fair idea of the way in which it was presented. Metopes XXIV and XXV represent Menelaus' first meeting with Helen after the fall of Troy; XXVII and XXVIII the flight of Aeneas, Anchises, Ascanius, and probably Creusa from the fallen city.⁴⁹ I refer the reader to the descriptions given by competent archaeologists for the details. Here, I would only state that the episodes are executed dramatically, that the gestures of the figures befit the persons whom they

⁴⁹ Michaelis first recognized that metopes XXIV and XXV represented the episode of Menelaus and Helen (*Der Parthenon*, p. 139). His view, which was generally accepted, has been confirmed most recently by Praschniker's careful reëxamination of the metopes themselves and his comparative study of the same episode as represented on vases (*op. cit.*, pp. 98 ff.). The identification of the Aeneas episode (XXVII and XXVIII) is the work of Praschniker (*op. cit.*, pp. 107 ff.) and is accepted by Studniczka (*Neue Jahrb.*, V [1929], p. 645). Here we need not discuss other metopes of the north side, the interpretation of which is uncertain in regard to their place in the Fall, or the still unsettled question whether all the metopes of this side were devoted to the Trojan legend.

represent in the situations where they find themselves, that material attributes such as armor, garments, and statues are appropriately provided, and that all in all ἡρώων ἕκαστον ἰδεῖν ἔστω οἰκείως τῆς περιστάσεως δεδημιουργημένον.

To return now to Naevius, it was such a dramatic representation of the fall of Troy which he must have seen on the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum. It has already been noted that he described its counterpart, the Gigantomachy, in some detail. We can well ask ourselves if he would have done so if it had not belonged to a building which in another part offered him material suitable to his literary purpose. Naevius, after all, was not writing a description of the monuments of Sicily. But more important is this: the earliest fragments of the *Bellum Punicum* which refer to the Trojan legend, one of which is expressly assigned to Book I, describe Aeneas, Anchises, their wives, and their followers escaping from Troy.⁵⁰ We do not know to what extent the poet may or may not have described preceding events, but the fragments which we have represent a motif which we found on the Parthenon metopes and can reasonably assume to have been included in the group at Agrigentum.

We have then an event which was a turning point not only in the first Punic War but in Roman history as a whole. At such a moment before the next irrevocable step was taken, it would have been appropriate to pause for consideration of the contestants and their antecedents. In regard to the Romans, the ultimate causes of Rome's existence, the fall of Troy and the departure of Aeneas, were there to see, the first certainly, the second very probably, on the most important temple of the city where the historical event took place. In the present condition of our evidence, I believe that we are justified in assuming that Naevius used the fall of Troy represented on the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum as a point of departure for his legendary account.

From this point on—and we are, I would recall, within Book I—the *Bellum Punicum* was devoted to legend. That this legendary part extended at least as far as the founding of Rome is indicated by Naevius' identification of Romulus, the founder of Rome, as the grandson of Aeneas by a daughter (frg. 25) and

⁵⁰ Frgs. 4 and 5. The latter is assigned to Book I by Servius Danielis on *Aeneid*, II, 797 (II, p. 506 Rand).

his mention of the Palatine (frg. 27). In the traditional reconstruction, the founding of Rome is assigned to Book II on the grounds that Naevius began his account of the first Punic War at the beginning of Book III. But here again what we have learned from our examination of Fragments 3, 24, and 32 in relation to their proper position in the poem will lead us to a different conclusion.

First of all, we have seen that Naevius began his account of the first Punic War not at the beginning of Book III but at the beginning of Book I. In the second place, it has been demonstrated that Fragments 3 and 24 are assigned to Book III in our sources and have been dislocated in direct violation of the evidence in order to make them fit into the traditional reconstruction. Let us now see what their contents teach us regarding the place where Naevius ended his legendary account to return to the first Punic War.

Fragment 24 mentions King Amulius. In the account of Livy⁵¹ and Dionysius of Halicarnassus⁵² he appears together with his brother Numitor as the last of the long line of Alban Kings, whose literary existence can be traced as far back as the History of Fabius Pictor.⁵³ In the same authors it is also Amulius who orders Romulus and Remus, the sons of his brother Numitor's daughter, Ilia or Rea Silvia, to be drowned.⁵⁴

Since Naevius made Romulus the grandson of Aeneas,⁵⁵ there was no place in his account for the line of Alban Kings who fill in the period of time between the fall of Troy as dated by the Greeks and the founding of Rome as dated by the Romans. As noted already by others, Naevius ignored Roman chronology in composing the legendary part of his poem and drew on one or several versions of the founding of Rome which were earlier than that of Fabius.⁵⁶

On the other hand, although the Amulius of Naevius could not have occupied the same position among the Alban Kings

⁵¹ I, 3, 10.

⁵² I, 71, 4.

⁵³ Frg. 5^a, *H. R. R.*, Peter; cf. Leuze, *Die röm. Jahrzahlung*, pp. 86 ff.

⁵⁴ Livy I, 4, 3; Dionysius, I, 79, 4 = Fabius, frg. 5^b.

⁵⁵ Frg. 25.

⁵⁶ Cf. Leo, *Gesch. d. röm. Lit.*, pp. 83 f.; Mesk, *Wien. Stud.*, XXXVI (1914), p. 22.

which he occupied in the works of Fabius and later historians, there are unmistakable indications that his part was played in Latium and that it was connected with the legend of Romulus. First of all, Amulius is called *rex* in the fragment from the *Bellum Punicum* (24), while he appears in the *praetexta Lupus*, also by Naevius, as *rex Albanus*.⁵⁷ The title of the play alone would suggest that it dealt with the story of Romulus and Remus, and Leo's correct interpretation of a passage of Donatus has placed the matter beyond reasonable doubt.⁵⁸ We may reason, then, that Naevius would not have been likely to use two different versions of the same events, one in his play and the other in his epic. Differences in treatment and detail we must of course assume, but not to the extent of changing the basic rôles and relations of the principal characters.⁵⁹

In the second place, we have the testimony of Ennius. He, too, made Romulus the grandson of Aeneas by a daughter and Amulius a king of Alba.⁶⁰ In these elements of the legend, there is complete correspondence with Naevius and if Ennius was not following him directly, he at least was drawing upon a common source. Whether we may assume with Mesk that Ennius continued to follow this common source in handling other parts of the legend⁶¹ is uncertain and need not concern us here. For our purpose we have learned that the Amulius of Fragment 24 of the *Bellum Punicum* was king of Alba and as such played a part in the events in Latium after the arrival of the Trojans which led to the founding of Rome. And since Fragment 24 belonged to Book III, part of Book III, at least, contained a part of the legendary account.

We now come to the last of the dislocated fragments, Fragment 3. In it, Anchises is performing a sacrifice. The ritual is Roman (*auspicia, templum, penates*),⁶² but this does not allow us to assume anything about the place where the sacrifice was

⁵⁷ Frg. 1, *T. R. F.*³, p. 322 Ribbeck.

⁵⁸ Donatus on Terence, *Ad.* 537. Leo's views (*op. cit.*, p. 90, note 1) have been accepted by Fränkel (*R.-E.*, Suppl. VI, col. 627).

⁵⁹ Cf. Mesk, *loc. cit.*, pp. 28 f.

⁶⁰ See the *testimonia* collected by Vahlen on Ennius, *Ann.*, frgs. 28 and 30.

⁶¹ Mesk, *loc. cit.*, p. 29.

⁶² Cf. Weinstock, *R.-E.*, XIX, col. 420.

performed. Naevius might well have used a Roman ritual in describing a sacrifice performed by Anchises in Troy. But the fact that the fragment in question belongs to Book III and the knowledge which we now have that legendary events in Latium were described in that book make it very likely that the sacrifice took place in Latium.

Hence, Naevius would have brought Anchises to Latium. This is contrary to the Virgilian account and, apart from the influence exercised by the traditional reconstruction, this discrepancy has played no small part in moving scholars to reassign the fragment to Book I. But if we dismiss Virgil from our minds for the moment, there is no good reason to believe against the evidence that Naevius could not have brought Anchises to Italy with Aeneas.

In the first place, Anchises' presence in Latium is not peculiar to Naevius' account. Cato brought Anchises to Latium in his *Origines*⁶³ and his death there is mentioned expressly by Strabo.⁶⁴ Dionysius, we may assume, had this version in mind, when he reports that there were authors who said that the tomb of Aeneas in Latium was built originally for Anchises by Aeneas.⁶⁵

In the second place, so far as our evidence permits us to judge, there was no fixed tradition about Anchises, at the time when Naevius was writing the *Bellum Punicum*, which would prevent him from being brought to Latium. Naevius knew from Greek authors that Anchises had escaped the destruction of Troy and so he portrayed him.⁶⁶ If the ἀπόλλους Αἰνῆου represented on the Tabula Iliaca faithfully reflects an incident from the Ἰλίου Πέριος of Stesichorus—and this is far from certain⁶⁷—, Naevius may have known of Anchises' departure for the West with Aeneas. From that point on, the poet was free to do what he wished with the character of Anchises. What could be more natural, then, than to have him accompany his son to the end of his voyage, especially if the prophetic books which Venus had given to Anchises⁶⁸ could be used to advantage in Latium?

⁶³ Frg. 9, Peter.

⁶⁵ I, 64, 5.

⁶⁴ V, 3, 2, p. 229.

⁶⁶ Frgs. 4 and 5.

⁶⁷ Cf. Bowra, *Greek Lyric Poetry*, pp. 103 ff. For a description of this scene, see Mancuso, *Memorie Acad. Lincei*, XIV (1911), p. 719.

⁶⁸ Naevius, frg. 13a.

Where, then, did Naevius return to his account of the first Punic War? We have no fragments dealing with the War assigned to Book III in our sources. Fragment 39 which describes a Roman raid on Malta is assigned to Book IV in our source. It is the earliest event in Book IV which we can identify with complete certainty and it took place in 258 or 257, more probably in the latter year.⁶⁹ Fragment 36, however, which is also assigned to Book IV, has been identified by Cichorius as referring to an event of 260. It reads:

virum praetor advenit auspicat auspicium
prosperum.

Cichorius points out that only three occasions are attested on which a praetor commanded an army outside of Rome during the first Punic War: in 260, 248, and 242 B. C.⁷⁰ Inasmuch as the last two dates would be too late for Book IV, he chooses the event of the year 260 when the *praetor urbanus* was sent out from Rome to take over the command of Scipio who had been captured by the enemy.

The reasoning is sound and the conclusion attractive. But before we come to a final conclusion regarding the place where Naevius resumed his account of the first Punic War, we must see if the evidence furnished by subsequent fragments can help us.

There are no fragments assigned to Book V in our sources. As to Book VI, Fragment 45 is assigned to that book by Nonius. It has been identified by Cichorius with great probability as referring to the arrogant attitude toward his troops of P. Claudius Pulcher, consul in 249.⁷¹ Fragment 48, also assigned to Book VI by Nonius, mentions the seventeenth year of the war. Although the event to which it refers must remain a matter of conjecture, the date of the event is certain: 248-247. In Fragment 50, assigned to Book VII, the terms of the peace which brought the war to an end in 241 are mentioned.⁷²

⁶⁹ Cichorius, *op. cit.*, p. 39.

⁷⁰ *Op. cit.*, p. 32.

⁷¹ *Op. cit.*, p. 45.

⁷² That Fragments 49 and 50 do not belong together in context, although they both derive from the same passage of Nonius, was first observed by Buecheler (*Kleine Schriften*, I, pp. 387 f.). The division is accepted by Lindsay in his edition of Nonius (pp. 760-761) and Morel has

This evidence has been carefully selected in order to furnish the firmest possible foundation for a concept of the order and contents of the later books. Only such fragments as were assigned to specific books in their sources were considered and among these, only those were discussed which could be referred to datable historical events either with complete certainty or great probability. In several cases attractive and reasonable identifications made by Cichorius were discarded as falling short of the established criteria. A conspectus will assist analysis.

<i>Fragment</i>	<i>Book</i>	<i>Date of Event</i>	<i>Quality</i>
36	IV	260	Very Probable
39	IV	258 or 257	Certain
45	VI	249	Very Probable
48	VI	248-247	Certain
50	VII	241	Certain

We have here four Books (IV-VII) covering a period of nineteen years. It is certain that events of 258 or 257, 248 or 247, and 241 were mentioned in books IV, VI, and VII respectively. It is probable that events of 260 and 249 were mentioned in Books IV and VI. Thus, the order of the probable fragments fits in nicely with that of the certain fragments. The conclusion is obvious: in Lampadio's seven book edition, the last four books seem to have been divided so that each book contained the events of about five years of the war. We cannot assume that the divisions were absolutely even, since the number and importance of the events to be described varied from year to year. Also Lampadio, as shown by his inclusion of historical and legendary material in Book I, was dividing by quantity⁷³ rather than contents. Nevertheless, the evidence indicates a reasonably uniform proportion between the various books and the periods which they covered.

given the fragment the numbers cited above. Cichorius (*op. cit.*, pp. 50 ff.) has shown that Fragment 49 probably refers to an event of 248 and belonged to Book VI. This does not affect Nonius' statement that the lines composing Fragment 50 came from Book VII.

⁷³ On the basis of the average length of seven books of the *Iliad*, Leo estimates that the *Bellum Punicum* contained between 4000 and 5000 verses (*op. cit.*, p. 81), Birt about 7000 verses (*Buchwesen*, p. 462). Both these estimates are reasonable, but the evidence allows them to be no more than conjectures.

Returning now to the place where Naevius abandoned his legendary account to resume that of the first Punic War, we may reason as follows. If Fragment 36 of Book IV is correctly identified as referring to the year 260—and I think it is—the legendary part of the poem must have run at least as far as the end or the beginning of the end of Book III. For there was only a single year of the war to be treated, 261, between the fall of Agrigentum at the end of 262⁷⁴ where the legendary part began within Book I and the arrival of the *praetor urbanus* in 260 in Book IV. We cannot assume, of course, that Lampadio made the end of the legendary account coincide with the end of Book III, for, as we have seen above, he did not work in this way. In view of this, he may have included the events of 261 at the end of Book III, or even extended the end of the legendary account into Book IV. But it could not have gone far into Book IV since this book had to contain certainly the historical events from 261 to 258 or 257 and probably those down to 256 or 255.

On the other hand, if we discard the evidence of Fragment 36 as uncertain, we still must distribute the events of 261 to 258 or 257 between Books III and IV. In this case the reasonable assumption is again that Book IV contained approximately the events of 260 to 255 and that consequently the legendary part ended somewhere in the vicinity of the end of Book III.

The conclusions which have been attained in the course of this study may now be summarized: Naevius began his *Bellum Punicum* with an account of the opening years of the first Punic War. He carried this account down to the fall of Agrigentum in 262 B. C. where he abandoned the historical narrative in order to begin an account of Rome's origins from the fall of Troy and the setting forth of Aeneas. The fall of Troy represented in the sculptures of the temple of Zeus at Agrigentum afforded him a means of transition. The legendary account was extended without interruption to the founding of Rome. At this point, Naevius returned to the first Punic War with the historical events of the year 261. The rest of the poem was devoted to a chronological account of the war down to its end.

⁷⁴ In December according to De Sanctis (*op. cit.*, III, 1, p. 211) on the basis of Polybius, I, 18, 6, and I, 19, 5.

Lampadio divided Naevius' continuous narrative into seven books approximately as follows: Book I contained the account of the war as far as the fall of Agrigentum in 262 as well as the beginning of the legendary account of Rome's origins from the fall of Troy. Book II and all or the greater part of Book III contained the continuation of the legend. If Book III was not entirely devoted to the legend, it also contained the historical events of the year 261. It is possible, however, that the very end of the legendary account was contained in the beginning of Book IV. If this was so, Book IV, like Book I, contained both a legendary and an historical part. The rest of Book IV and Books V, VI, and VII continued the narrative of the war, each of them covering a period of about five years.

HENRY T. ROWELL.

THE JOHNS HOPKINS UNIVERSITY.