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Preface

The real life of Rome did not permit itself to be Hellenized in any vital part, but the more Rome subjected herself to the formative discipline of Greece, the more clearly the natural energy of national life revealed itself.

(E. Fraenkel, Inaugural Lecture, Oxford, 13 February 1935.)

In a well-known passage of the thirteenth book of the Odyssey, Odysseus tells a long and circumstantial story to Athene, who is disguised as a young shepherd. There is not a word of truth in his tale, and at the end mortal and goddess recognize each other for the first-class deceivers they are (vv. 287 ff.). A Greek audience, as Stanford comments, would enjoy this back-chat between the wisest of gods and wiliest of men, because they admired a tall tale for its own sake.

And it is with a tall Greek tale that literary historians have been too often fascinated. They like nothing so much as to dilate on the backwardness of the "untutored Romans," when they are trying to say something about the first beginnings of artistic endeavor at Rome. Of course they have Horace on their side:

Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit, et artes
Intulit agresti Latio: sic horridus ille
Defluxit numerus Saturnius, et grave virus
Munditiae pepulere: sed in longum tamen aevum
Manserunt hodieque manent vestigia ruris.

(Epp. II. 1. 156-60)

But what we have to remember is that Horace was not so much a professor as a partisan in his literary judgments. Even Cicero, as D. R. Shackleton Bailey points out to our readers, is not wholly reliable here. Horace was concerned to defend the Roman revolution as it had affected literature. That is perfectly legitimate. But we should not look to him for truths about the situation which really existed, and we should not use convenient quotations from him as an excuse to avoid thought.
Preface

For in fact, if we teach our students the sort of literary history which insists that the Romans could not or did not stir hand or foot in matters artistic until they made contact with the Greeks, and then that they became what is so often called by the unpromising name of "imitators," we are doing a grave disservice to our cause. First of all, we are implying that the difficult language Latin is only going to make sense if there is added to it the difficult language Greek, and, though this may be true in the long run, I am not sure it is true immediately, and so true that it has to be thrust upon students as a first principle. Secondly, as a corollary from this first mistake, we will be tempted to downplay the originality of Roman literature, and to be suggesting all the time that, whatever its merits, they are as pale moonlight when compared with the bright Apolline sun of Hellenism. Why should anyone want to be bothered with the second-rate, even though there have been scholars who have not hesitated to apply that epithet to the very Latin authors over whose texts they have lingered so attentively?

The most pressing question of Latin literary history becomes therefore, as Gordon Williams argues later in these pages, the question of Roman originality. Were the Romans "untutored" or were they not? The first point to get clear in our answer is that they were not a tabula rasa, smooth and blank, waiting for some Greek seal to be impressed upon them. We need to introduce from our colleagues in modern languages the concept of "reception." No one thinks, for example, that the British had no literary aptitude of their own if someone writes about the "reception" of Russian literature in England in the 19th century. The Romans received plenty, no doubt, from the Greeks, as they did from the Etruscans, though that is matter for another volume. But they took it, not onto a wax tablet, but into a curious olla, a pot, of their own devising, and in doing so they immediately gave what they got fresh contours, a fresh context, a fresh "deformation," to use a word of which French critics are fond.

The peculiar outlines of the Roman aesthetic imagination may be seen if we study three phenomena, the circus, the triumph and the carnival, where it is hardly likely that the Romans had to wait for Greek inspiration before they moved. Archaeologists tell us that the circus at Rome was built as early as the time of the kings, and that the games held there were associated with the god Consus, the god who presided over the harvest home, when the grain was "hidden" (condo) in store to be produced in time of winter's bleakness. As Roman civilization developed, the circus took an ever stronger hold on the Roman popular imagination, until at Byzantium the rival factions of the Blues and the Greens, as in the case of the Nika revolt against Justinian, could
threaten the destiny of the emperor himself. But we must remember that it is precisely from the start of a horse race in the Circus that Ennius drew his picture of the tense wait at the very foundation of the City to see whether the gods would favor Romulus or Remus.

Anxiety filled all the men as to which of the two would be ruler. As, when the consul means to give the signal, all men look eagerly at the barrier’s bounds to see how soon he will send forth the chariots from the painted mouths — so the people waited.

The Romans were, in a profound sense, a Circus people right from the start. This is why that archetype of all the modern popular introductions to Roman civilization — L. Friedlaender’s *Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms*, available in English translation* — should be among the first books to be utilized by the teacher, and the first to be browsed through by the student. What we need of course is an updating of Friedlaender with good, modern illustrations.

What does the Circus entail? What do we mean by saying that the Romans were “a Circus people”? For one thing, it means accepting the primacy for the Roman imagination of comedy: obviously not of Greek comedy, a view against which George Sheets rightly protests. This need not imply that the Romans were always expecting their readers and viewers to laugh, since the comic, pushed beyond a certain point, can also terrify, as admirers of Dante will testify. Perhaps we might say that the Romans had a deep awareness of the grotesque. Does not Horace, in the *Ars Poetica*, begin by warning the budding poet against the Picasso-like depiction of a girl with a beautiful head, a horse’s neck, and a fish’s body? (We should savor this description. Scholars hasten to agree with Horace, but never say a word about the extraordinary fact that he should have chosen this, of all, examples to illustrate his theme.) Does Horace not speak of the Roman public’s taste for “striking marvels,” *speciosa miracula* like Homer’s Antiphates, Scylla, Cyclops, Charybdis (*A.P. 144-45*)? And does not the same poet, who began by warning us against the mermaid with the horse’s neck, end his poem with a bear that turns into a leech and alters its gender in the process?

Like the bear which has found the strength to break the bars of his cage, the untimely reader of verses scatters in flight unlettered and lettered alike: if he manages to catch someone, he grips him and kills him by his recitation: he is a leech, who will not relax her hold on the skin until she is glutted with blood (*A.P. 472-76*).

At the end of the second book of his *Odes*, this same Horace describes his metamorphosis into a swan, complete with rough skin (*asperae pelles*) on his legs. Scholars have never known what to make of this absurd image.

From "grotesque" I have slid to "metamorphosis." This is in fact a basic circus concept, which can vary from the party hat and long nose to the clown’s full dress regalia. Another variant of it is wearing one’s Sunday best in order to go to church, just as Domitian ordered that Romans should attend the games wearing their togas. In the sweltering Roman summer, the order was hygienically absurd, as Martial complains. But hygiene had nothing to do with it. There was a folk idea of great antiquity at work here, and ultimately a religious reason. "Friend, how camest thou in hither, not having on a wedding-garment?" said by the King to his guests, is an aspect of the same feeling.

The student of Ovid’s *Metamorphoses*, especially if he begins with the account of creation, will not take long to deduce that metamorphosis has biological roots. The scientist looking through his microscope will not need much convincing, as he gazes at the squirming and ever-changing shapes on his plate, that nature dearly loves the cycle of growth and change, a cycle in which death becomes an incidental in the natural round. But, though the Roman farmer had no microscopes, did he not grasp the same truths in his walks around his fields, or in his daily contact with his animals? Horace may have sneered at the "traces of the farmyard" which he still found in Roman poetry, just as Catullus sneered at the *Annales Volusi*. But without those traces, and more than traces, Roman poetry would not be Roman. J. E. G. Zetzel shows this for Ennius and Catullus 64, and Georg Luck for Naevius and Virgil.

Another implication of the circus idea is freedom: freedom from constraint, as when the trapeze or high-wire artist performs his or her death-defying act, or when the clown on tall stilts breaks the ban on human height: but also freedom of thought and expression. Here one may quote Naevius at one end of the time-scale: *libera lingua loquemur ludis liberalibus*, written in the third century B.C.: and at the other a passage from C. A. Trypanis’ *Medieval and Modern Greek Poetry* referring to the Hippodrome in Byzantium. Trypanis writes (p. xxxvi):

The hippodrome became much more than a mere race-course; it was an assembly, a substitute for the vanished Comitia, the last asylum of the liberties of the Populus Romanus. There the people, forgetting the rivalry of the two main political parties — the Blues and the Greens — into which they were originally divided, could call an emperor to account or demand the dismissal of an unpopular minister.
The Roman Saturnalia, in which slaves briefly assumed the cap of liberty and were able to speak freely to their masters, like Davus in the seventh satire of Horace’s second book, shows that this license of language was built into the Roman calendar. It too is something sacred, and that is why *parrhesia*, the freedom of the Athenian citizen in his democratic state to say what he liked, is also a term much used in St. Paul’s Epistles.

Now it is possible to see how that peculiarly Roman phenomenon, the triumph, fits into a larger pattern. It had its metamorphosis, as when the face of the triumphing general was painted vermillion, like that of the statue of Jupiter Optimus Maximus. It had its freedom, as when the soldiers in the triumphal procession were allowed to sing rude verses about the personal habits of their leader. “Look out for your wives, citizens: we are escorting a bald adulterer,” was what they sang about Julius Caesar (*moechus* punning on the Atellane *Maccus?*) in the trochaic meter typical of comedy. And of course there was the slave who stood behind his master in the chariot, whispering all the time “Hominem te memento,” rather like the priest on Ash Wednesday.

The circus, the triumph, the Saturnalia or carnival: as we read Friedlaender’s pages we can find their common elements, and begin to appreciate the quality of the shaping aesthetic imagination which makes it nonsense to speak of the Romans as “mere” farmers before the Greeks moved in. But there is one important question which Friedlaender does not tackle, and which it would be essential to confront if his book were to be updated for use by our students. How does this sort of imagination jibe with the imagination we are conditioned to look for in the authors we read in class? A full answer to this question would really demand the re-writing of Roman literary history. In some authors, such as Ovid, we can feel the carnival presence without too much difficulty. But what about Virgil? What about the *Aeneid*, that poem of tragic intensity? Yet even the *Aeneid* becomes a poem of metamorphoses, when we study the complex relationship a character like Dido bears to Greek figures as disparate as Nausicaa, Helen, Circe, and from Apollonius Rhodius, Hypsipyle and Medea. Or what about the internal metamorphoses, when Turnus, Juturna and queen Amata in book XII at the culmination of the epic replay Anna, Dido and Aeneas from book IV? Nowadays scholars would not find any of this too new. But perhaps they would not have taken so long to discover what a strange poem the *Aeneid* is if they had not been so anxious to ignore Roman aesthetic independence.

Nor would scholars ever have been so ready to see in the *Aeneid* a propaganda blast from an Augustan mouthpiece if they had understood
the right of circus freedom. The very fact that the Aeneid is polyphonic (quite literally, since Virgil was famous for the “extraordinary harlotries” of his voice) means that it cannot signify one thing only. As characters blend into one another, as Aeneas and Turnus interchange, for example, the characters of Homer’s Hector, Achilles and Ajax, we are no longer able to say straightforwardly that one of them represents the right and another the wrong. It is the same suspension of commitment as was enjoyed by the soldiers in the triumphal procession, except that what was enjoyed by them so briefly is here eternalized in the timeless dimension of great art.

Readers of the Aeneid from at least the time of St. Augustine, if not that of Ovid, have always been inclined to sympathize with Dido against Aeneas, and this may explain why in the Middle Ages Turnus is held in high regard, while Konrad of Hirtzau reports that, after his victory, Aeneas made himself so unpopular among his Italian subjects that eventually he was struck down by a lightning bolt! Metamorphosis, the carnival dissolution of one semblance into another, shows that for Virgil Dido was meant as a somewhat more terrifying symbol than sentimentalists realize. Book III of the Aeneid, where Aeneas recounts his adventures in his Mediterranean wanderings, is crucial for the understanding of this. The book culminates with the picture of mount Etna, in all its dreadful might, and the horrible Cyclops, who threatens, along with his brothers, to destroy Aeneas and his company. Scholars chide this book as uninspired and dull. But what they will not see is that “the fires of Etna” were a well-known topos for the passion of love. The comparison may be traced from Catullus, through Horace, Ovid, Seneca, Petrarch to Sannazaro and Ariosto. In fact, Aeneas is not telling his story to us. He is telling it to queen Dido, who is hanging with rapt and love-sick attention on his every word. Caeco carpitur igni is what we will hear of her at the start of book IV. What Virgil has done is to show us what the “fires of Etna” are really like, and the threat which they pose to Aeneas. This is the reality which underlies the posturing of Dido’s Hellenistic court.

And the Cyclops, the man-eating monster who so powerfully anticipates Dante’s image of the devil in the bottommost pit of hell, eternally devouring Brutus, Cassius and Judas? When Dido is cursing Aeneas, she threatens him with Hannibal:

\[
\text{exoriare aliquis nostris ex ossibus ultor}
\]
\[
\text{qui face Dardanios ferroque sequare colonos}.
\]

(IV. 625-26)

And we know of Hannibal that, when he was in Italy, he was indeed one-eyed: altero oculo capitur (Livy XXII. 2. 11). It is laughable, and
yet it is from just such laughable material, and ultimately from the car-
nival, that Virgil's high tragedy is constructed.

The Roman aesthetic imagination is not wholly different from that of the Greeks, but it has its own rude, native vigor. *Hirsutae coronae* may have been criticized by Propertius, as John Miller will show, but at this distance they look well on the brows of that *rustica proles* which conquered the world and appropriated forever the literature of Europe. *Plus est ingeni Romani terminos in tantum promovisse quam imperi.*

* * *

The following papers were presented in their original form at the *Hirsutae Coronae* Conference held at the University of Minnesota. Warmest thanks are expressed to Professors John Miller and George Sheets for the energy and enthusiasm shown in organizing the conference, and for their subsequent editorial labors. A grant from the University of Minnesota towards the expenses of preparing the present volume is also gratefully acknowledged. The order of papers as presented has been preserved.

Once again Frances Stickney Newman generously undertook the burdensome task of preparing this issue on UNIX* and of producing the indexes. She receives our inadequate thanks for countless hours of labor.

Dr. William Plater, Associate Director of the School of Humanities, continued to encourage and sustain our efforts. His reward is, we hope, to see what has been done.

J. K. Newman

---
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HIRSUTAE CORONAE

Archaic Roman Poetry and its Meaning to Later Generations
Foreword

The papers collected in this volume were presented on November 5-6, 1981, at the University of Minnesota at a conference entitled "Hirsutae Coronae: Archaic Roman Poetry and its Meaning to Later Generations." The title, Hirsutae Coronae, was taken from Propertius' attribution to Ennius of a "shaggy crown," an image which embodies the principal issues forming the focus of the conference. Of these issues, one concerns the literary achievement of the earliest poets — why a corona at all? — a topic which has attracted increasing attention in recent classical scholarship. A second issue centers more particularly on the differing attitudes of later Roman authors toward the archaic poets, and the use which such authors made of them. Lastly, Propertius' reference to Ennius invites consideration of the broader issue of the relationships among authors of all periods in the context of an evolving literary tradition. Each of the seven papers in this collection addresses one or more of these issues. In several instances, the same text is treated by more than one paper, although from different critical perspectives. For this reason particularly, the Index Locorum which appears at the end of the volume may prove helpful to the reader.

It is a pleasure for us to thank John Wallace, Associate Dean of the Graduate School of the University of Minnesota, for his early support and repeated assistance in obtaining funding for the conference itself, and toward the publication of its proceedings. We are also happy to associate our efforts with the tribute being paid by his colleagues at the University of Illinois to Professor Emeritus John Lewis Heller, formerly Professor of Classics and Chairman of Department at the University of Minnesota in Minneapolis.

John Miller and George Sheets
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*Memini Me Fiere Pavum*

Ennius and the Quality of the Roman Aesthetic Imagination

J. K. NEWMAN

Anyone who studies the history of early Latin literature is struck by its evidence of two extremes: a dependence on Greek models on the one side, and on the other an inability to reproduce those models with any degree of satisfying fidelity. Plautus’ practice of *contaminatio*, shared with Naevius, Ennius and Terence, would be an example. So would his introduction of the *canticum* into the chaste elegance and controlled economy of the Greek New Comedy.

As sophistication grew, Roman writers themselves expressed impatience with their predecessors’ ineptness. One of the most surprising features of Horace’s literary criticism is its iconoclasm, which does not of course spare Ennius. In a conservative age, bent on the restoration of inherited values, the voice of Augustan orthodoxy is strangely raised in rejection of past achievement: *hodieque manent vestigia ruris*.

Literary historians have often yielded to the temptation to take these assertions of discontinuity at face value. Ennius, the argument would run, was ultimately of no use to Virgil. Is the younger poet not reported to have tastefully described his relation to his predecessor as ‘collecting gold from Ennius’ dung’? He was even less use to Propertius or Ovid. By the time of Persius, the opening of the *Annales* has become a joke. The archaists of Tacitus’ time, determined to replace the *Aeneid* with something really primitive, end up reading Lucretius! Even the so-called Ennian revival of the second century has, it may be urged, much more to do with the recovery of an Alexandrian frame of reference for literary experiment, in which Ennius is cast as the inimitable Homer, than it has to do with the sober appreciation of the poet’s
real merits.¹

But, although this kind of literary history has its necessary function, it can obscure what every admirer of Roman civilization knows, that beneath all the surface dissimilarities runs a persistent, common stream of Roman genius. It is this common element which the study of Ennius helps us to define.

Its first aspect is bizarre. What a jarring disharmony is produced in the mind of the Hellenist by Ennius' assertion of his (or Homer's) poetic phylogenesis, going right back to ornithology, at the start of his epic! Not that Greek epic writers had failed to make similar odd claims: Empedocles had declared that he had been a boy, a girl, a bush, a bird, and a scaly fish in the sea.² But this had not been directly at the beginning of his poem, and in any case the Katharmoi was no ordinary epic. Choerilus of Samos had commented on his poetic problems at the opening of his Persica (fr. 1 Kinkel) — but with what good sense! Stesichorus may have raised something akin to Ennius' claims, if we can trust an epigram by one of the Antipaters in the Anthology: "The burning plain of Catana is the burial ground of Stesichorus, bounteous, measureless mouthpiece of the Muse. Fulfilling Pythagoras' doctrine of nature, the soul that earlier was Homer's came to dwell a second time in his breast" (A. P. VII. 75).³ But Stesichorus, though he bore the burden of epic song, bore it on a lyre.

What jars the purist then in Ennius is his union of the disparate. The expository epic is one thing: the historical is another, and the choral lyric is yet a third. The Annales, so clearly by their very title a historical epic, take up into themselves a metamorphosing autobiography more suited to the philosopher or the lyrist, and thrust it upon the reader's attention by inserting it at their very beginning.

The combination of the historical epic in this proem with the imitation of Callimachus' Dream from the opening of the Aetia is of a

¹The evidence for Ennius' Fortleben is collected by M. Schanz — C. Hosius, Geschichte der römischen Literatur I (repr. Munich 1959), pp. 98-99. See also L. Friedlaender, Darstellungen aus der Sittengeschichte Roms II (10th ed., repr. Leipzig 1922), pp. 195, 197-98. The Alexandrian preoccupations evinced by the learned Gellius on the one side, and the poetae novelli on the other (on whom see H. Bardon, La littérature latine inconnue II [Paris 1956], pp. 233 ff.), enable us to understand how already Hadrian could express admiration for both Ennius and "neoteric" poetry. It was more than Catullus, for whom the Ennian threat was still alive, could do!

²Fr. 117 Diels — Kranz = 104 Gallavotti.

piece with this queerness. The Alexandrians opposed Hesiod to Homer. Ennius borrowed Hesiod’s Muses from the opening of the Theogony, but makes them dance, not on Helicon, but on Olympus, as some sort of signal of his Homeric inclinations. Accius would later pay Ennius the same kind of backhanded compliment, borrowing the title Annales for what looks suspiciously like a Roman version of the Aetia. Our longest fragment seems to form an attempt to derive the Roman Saturnalia from the Athenian Cronia.\(^5\)

These confusions of distinctions crystal clear to the Greeks are not confined to literary symbols. E. Norden, one of the few scholars of his generation to have understood the effrontery of Ennius’ Annales, remarks on their extraordinary conversion of Roman consuls and tribunes into Homeric heroes, aided by the use of the newly imported hexameter.\(^6\) What could a Greek have thought, what did a Roman think when, instead of Metti Fufetti, he heard Metioeo Fufetioeo?\(^7\) Not merely the peacock poet but, it turns out, the whole poem is a gigantic metamorphosis. And yet this is exactly where Ennius, far from being atypical and “no use” to his successors, in fact represents the essence of the Roman aesthetic — and one may add religious — experience.

The Roman predilection for metamorphosis is well known. Ovid and Apuleius both use the title. Horace, who warns against it at the start of the Ars Poetica, ends that poem by talking about a bear which, in the final line, unexpectedly becomes a leech. The same poet claims at the end of his second book of Odes that he is being changed into a swan, complete with asperae pelles on his legs.\(^8\) The grotesque vision impinges too closely on middle-aged reality to be truly funny.

But, even when Virgil himself comes to think about epic, whatever his surface reluctance to follow the Ennian model, he immediately

\(^{5}\)Fr. 3 Morel - Buechner.
moves to metamorphosis.9 A large part of the programmatic Eclogue 6
sounds like a rehearsal for the poem which Ovid would later write.
Metamorphosis recurs in Georgics IV, where the story of Orpheus and
Eurydice is told by a literally Protean vates: and finally it is found in
the Aeneid, where a poet that no one will call unformed or primitive
uses contaminatio from a myriad different sources, and notably from the
Iliad, Odyssey, Greek tragedy and the Argonautica, to compound the
shifting identities of his heroic protagonists.10 Before the moody gaze of
Roman lyrical and musical genius, Greek certainties, Greek clarities,
dissolve and blur, much as the canons of classic art yield, as the
Renaissance ages, to the pressures of late Michelangelo’s or Bernini’s
chisel.

“Greek certainties dissolve” — but, as usual, we must not push
these generalizations too far. The characteristic use of metamorphosis
in Greek literature can tell us a great deal about the nature of Roman
aesthetic perception. If we are looking for metamorphosis in Greek,
two sources are important. One is lyric, the other comedy.

Pindar, for example, likes to double his mythical figures. In the
first Olympian, Pelops finds a twin in Ganymede. Elsewhere Psamatheia
finds one in Thetis (N. 5); Zeus in Poseidon (I. 8); Danaë in Alcmenes
(I. 7). When the poet remarks in this last passage: “She received the
mightiest of the gods, when at midnight he snowed with gold” (v. 5),
we expect a reference to Danaë, whose story was already alluded to in
its familiar form in an early ode, the twelfth Pythian. But the antistrophe paradoxically begins with a reference instead to Alcmenes.

This blending is typical of the Greek poet’s imagination.11 The
whole relevance of the “irrelevant” myth of the first Nemean turns
upon it. When baby Heracles strangles the snakes, and inspires
Teiresias to a prophecy of future godhead, earned by a life of labors, to
be crowned by fighting for the gods against the Giants, we have to see
that already the snakes are an embryo version of the snake-limbed
Giants. Only then can it be understood how the comic nursery scene,

9 Max, cum res Romanas incohasset, offensus materia ad Bucolica transitiit says Donatus
(Vit. Verg. 19). This may not have marked such a radical break with Ennius. Virgil
quotes Callimachus (Ecl. 6. 3-5 = Aet. pref. 22-24), who had himself shown the way to a
10 The overt metamorphoses of Polydorus, apparently invented by Virgil (Aen. III.
22 ff.), and of Aeneas’ ships into nymphs (IX. 77 ff., X. 219 ff.), fit then into a larger
pattern.
11 See my article "Pindarica," forthcoming in Rheinisches Museum. The difference
between Pindar, here perhaps typical of his countrymen, and the Romans is illustrated by
P. 8. 95-96. For Pindar metamorphosis is tragic, as it is ultimately for Plato.
interpreted by the religious insight of the "prophet of most high Zeus" (v. 60), forms a unity with the rest of the ode — an ode which, incidentally, ends, like comedies of Aristophanes and Menander, with a wedding. Just as the Theban seer detects in the babyhood exploit of Heracles his whole triumphant future career, so the Theban poet Pindar detects in his patron's chariot victory at Nemea the possibility and promise of a similar success in the future.12

Menander is, of course, a master of metamorphosis, since what else are the kaleidoscopic tricks of New Comic plots, with their reversals of what was thought to be known, and recognitions of what was previously unknown, except the continually fresh presentations of the same truths? Like Callimachus and like Virgil, Menander is able to use a heroic model to dignify a modern scene. S. M. Goldberg, for example, notes a long messenger's speech in the Sicyonius "incorporating significant echoes of tragedy," and emphasizes that here there is no question of parody. "The tragic device keeps its own colour and value in the dramatic structure. Some of Menander's finest effects come from the juxtaposition of the two modes."13 Handley says of tragic influence on Menander generally that

...it extends to the subtler form of reminiscence in which a comic scene is given overtones by echoing a famous incident in tragedy, or by following a tragic pattern of structure, language, or metre...So in the Dyscolus...when the stricken Knemon is brought out from his house...the situation which the comic plot has created gains in depth from the echo in stage spectacle, and perhaps in language, of the situation of a stricken hero in tragedy: the audience is to realize that the major crisis of Knemon's life is at hand, and the comparison which the dramatist suggests helps to bring this realization about.14

So, in talking about himself as a peacock's reincarnation, or even as Homer's avatar; in viewing Roman soldiers as Homeric heroes, Ennius was not doing anything utterly incomprehensible to the Greeks. But what they had earlier done at the popular level, in some ways marginally, was put by the Annales at the very center of Roman literature. In this respect they are a most faithful witness to the essence of the Roman aesthetic imagination, comic, lyrical, and, to the classical Greek, baroque.

Metamorphosis — masking and unmasking — is a variant of mimesis, and Aristotle is not wrong when he makes mimesis the germ of literature. The Romans have too often been presented as pallid imitators of the Greeks. In reality, we should speak, as the Preface has argued, not of their imitation of Greek literature, but of their reception of it. They were not a *tabula rasa* waiting for a first impression. They had their own powerful tradition of mimesis. The Roman triumph, which deserves study as an aesthetic phenomenon,\(^1\) would be one example. Mainly however this Roman tradition centered in the *ludi*, ultimately in the circus, theatre and amphitheatre. No profounder discrepancy between Greek and Roman civilization could be found than at this reference point. The Athenians banished violence in their theatre to the messenger’s speech. The Romans enjoyed bloodshed, torture, death in all its forms enacted before their very eyes. And yet, for them, as for the Athenians, theatrical experience was both felt to be characteristic of their culture, and was religious!\(^2\)

What kind of religion was this? Here another and fundamental difference from classical Greece claims attention. The Greeks, so pessimistic about man’s lot, extended this pessimism to their myths also. Pindar’s epinicians compare their victor patrons with the heroic past with some sense of daring. In the first *Nemean* just mentioned, the poet concludes with the mythical prophecy of Teiresias. He does not spell out the application of his story to Chromius, his patron, directly, because he prefers his listener to do his work for him. This is certainly an artistic device. Later Callimachus, an ardent student of Pindar’s narrative technique, would sum up its rationale in the *Aetia.*\(^3\) But it is also a skilful avoidance of commitment. The poem is offered as a possibility to Chromius, not as a guarantee.

A fine instance of this Greek reserve which is relevant to our theme is seen in the sixth *Pythian*. In its myth, first the poet narrates the gripping story of the self-sacrifice of Antilochus, which saved his father Nestor at a moment of danger in the battle for Troy — but at the cost of the son’s own life. The myth ends. “Those things are past,”

---

\(^1\)See F. Noack, “Triumph und Triumphbogen” in *Vorträge der Bibliothek Warburg* 1925-26 (below, note 25), pp. 147 ff.


the poet comments (v. 44), "but of men now even Thrasybulus has most closely approached his father's measure." Eduard Fraenkel remarks of this idiomatic "of men now":

What seems to be expressed in all these passages is a definite shrinking from the use of the unrestricted superlative of praise: the measure of human modesty is preserved by limiting oneself to what can be asserted from one's personal knowledge.\(^{18}\)

But already Fraenkel notes that neither the Great King of Persia nor the emperor Nero felt this Hellenic \textit{aidos}. After his success in the festival contests, Nero is extolled because "first of all Romans in history he conquered it" (Dio Cassius, LXIII. 20. 2). The student of Rome however must understand that this is not just crass insensitivity. It is a more robust outlook on life. The Greeks saw the world as running down, from gold to silver to bronze to iron. The Romans saw the ever-fresh possibility of renewal.

Some examples at the further end of the tradition will eventually illumine Ennius. Statius says of Domitian's \textit{Saturnalia}:

\begin{quote}
I nunc saecula compara, Vetustas,
antiqii lovis aureumque tempus:
non sic libera vina tunc fluebant
nec tardum seges occupabat annum. (\textit{Silvae} I. 6. 39 ff.)
\end{quote}

Compare if you like, Antiquity, the times of old Jove and the Golden Age: the fact remains that in those days there were no such liberal streams of wine, nor did the harvest then run ahead of the slow yearly round.

Statius is impressed at this circus celebration by the emperor's condensation in appearing among his subjects to share their meal. At the one table, class distinction is banished. Children are there, women, the common people, the knights, the senate. Liberty relaxes awe. All, rich and poor alike, may boast that they are the guest of our prince. It could be a description of some Christian Communion.\(^{19}\) Indeed, in a later book, a letter of thanks to Domitian for a dinner invitation to the

\(^{18}\) \textit{The Agamemnon} of Aeschylus (repr. Oxford 1962), p. 269 with note 1. The extravagance of Pindar's eulogy of Hiero at \textit{P.} 2. 60 is visible from the contrast between \(\tau \omega \nu \pi \alpha \rho \omicron \omicron \theta \varepsilon\) of the text and the expected \(\tau \omega \nu \\nu \nu\).

\(^{19}\)St. John Chrysostom's \textit{Katekhikos Logos}, used in the Orthodox Church on Easter Sunday, especially emphasizes these motifs. O. Freudenberg, \textit{Poetika Syuzheta i Zhan-}
ra (Leningrad 1936), speaks on p. 159 of the procession before the performance of Attic tragedies as consisting of the entire city, rich and poor, in holiday attire, led by the archon in charge. Her argument (pp. 168, 179-80), that Rome exhibits in primitive form theatrical elements developed and sophisticated by the Greeks, is extremely suggestive.
imperial palace is headed "Eucharisticon."

Scholars have traced the history of the religious phenomenon of the sacred meal, enlisted in ruler cult already in the Hellenistic world.\(^\text{20}\) At that meal, the gods themselves are present to bless and bestow benediction. There is no question amid such revelry and good cheer of looking back wistfully to some vanished happiness. This is what Statius tells us about Domitian, who is a second Jupiter:

\begin{quote}
Parva loquir, necdum aequo tuos, Germanice, vultus:
talis, ubi Oceani finem mensaque revisit
Aethiopum sacro diffusus nectare vultus
dux superum secreta iubet dare carmina Musas
et Pallenaeos Phoebum laudare triumphos.
\end{quote}

\textit{(Silvae IV. 2. 52 ff.)}

This sort of language is very familiar to Christians. They too share a meal with their Lord, at which distinctions of earthly rank are transcended by the new freedom which is in Christ. They too know that it is not a matter of looking back to some vanished order, since the New Law far surpasses the Old. Thomas Aquinas asserts at the Feast of Corpus Christi:

\begin{quote}
In hac mensa novi Regis
Novum Pascha novae legis
Phase vetus terminat.

Vetustatem novitas,
Umbram fugat veritas,
Noctem lux eliminat. \textit{(Lauda Sion, saec. xiii)}
\end{quote}

We have come a long way from Pindar's "Those things are past," and discreet refusal to underscore the parallels between Chromius and Heracles.

O. Weinreich has expressed the Roman attitude excellently. The new reality lends a retroactive credibility to the false tales of myth, while at the same time proving the superiority of the imperial world to the past. Mythical happenings might be doubted. No one could doubt the evidence of his own eyes. The world of the emperor is more valuable than that of myth. Divine wonders are put in the shade by the \textit{miracula Caesaris}. So are the wonders of the old world by the new marvel which is the Colosseum. Accordingly, the birthday of the emperor is holier than the birthday of Zeus, imperial gladiators perform

better than Heracles.\textsuperscript{21}

The idea that the present is not a jaded copy of a superior past, but on the contrary outdoes it, was so appealing to the Roman mind that eventually it became a topos. \textit{Taceat superata vetustas} says Claudian of Stilicho's exploit in putting a stop to Rufinus' nefarious career, "The days of old are surpassed; let them keep silence, and cease to compare Hercules' labours with thine!"\textsuperscript{22} Here is another contrast with the first \textit{Nemean}.

Martial uses the same idiom three centuries before Claudian in the \textit{Liber Spectaculorum: sileat, 1. 1; prisca fides taceat, 6b. 3; taceantur stagna Neronis, 28. 11.} It is in the heightened atmosphere of the \textit{ludi} that these phrases make sense. The metamorphosis here and now is so complete that no rivalry of the past is possible.

Dante, author of a religious \textit{Comedy}, borrows exactly this language when he is describing a metamorphosis in hell which he feels outvies those of pagan poetry. The direct rivalry is with Lucan and Ovid: but the formulation, \textit{taccia Lucano...taccia...Ovidio}, is from Martial and Claudian.\textsuperscript{23}

J. Sinclair adds: "There seems to be something of the same irony in [Dante's] elaborately, as it may appear irrelevantly, picturesque reference to the ancient fable of the phoenix in connection with Fucci's alternate dissolution and revival [i.e. in the previous canto, 24. 106 \textit{ff.}]; as if he had said: 'These are old stories; this is true, it is happening now'."\textsuperscript{24}

This is the attitude which Weinreich finds in the Flavian writers. It is also the attitude of Thomas Aquinas, Dante's mentor, about the Christian Eucharist. It is the Roman Church which has historically insisted that the Bread and Wine are the Real Body and the Real Blood, not some sort of symbol or reminder of a past action. Conditioning Roman aesthetics, and also of course their product, the Roman arena offered the real bodies and real blood of its gladiators in an act not just


\textsuperscript{23}\textit{Inferno} 25. 94 and 97.

of amusement, but also of religious worship.\textsuperscript{25}

The Romans then, and Dante their successor, apprehend myth quite differently from the classical Greeks. The mythical world has not vanished. At any minute it can not only be recalled, but also outdone. When Ennius recast the struggle of Rome with Carthage in Homeric terms, he was not so much imitating Homer as challenging him, suggesting that the Roman imperial present is something bigger and better than the stories of the past. What for the Greek Thucydides, who ventured to assert that the Peloponnesian War was more important than the Trojan or Persian Wars, was the dry and audacious rationalism of prose, has for the Roman become the stuff of poetry.\textsuperscript{26}

This way of looking at the world is a fancy dress and circus affair. Roman culture is a culture of the marquee and big top, though we must avoid the error of therefore despising it.\textsuperscript{27} This is why the Roman ludi are just as important in the study of Roman aesthetic perception as the theatre of Dionysus is for that of the Athenians. Even the attendants at the gladiatorial games, for example, were got up as divine beings. Those whose job it was to test whether the fallen were dead or alive were costumed like Mercury (Psychopompus). Those who dragged out the bodies through the Porta Libitinensis were Charons. Those charged with flogging the reluctant into the fray were Larvae.\textsuperscript{28}

Martial’s poetry provides rich evidence of the identification of the combatants or victims of the amphitheatre with their mythical counterparts.\textsuperscript{29} Sidonius, the fifth-century Christian saint and bishop, helps us to realize how the populace still felt in his time. In poem XXIII to Consentius he pays homage to the realism of actors such as Caramallus or Phabaton: “Whether the daughter of Aeetes and her Jason are being

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item It communicated itself to Polybius: cf. την Ῥωμαίου νεροχίαν, I. 2; F. Focke, “Synkrisis,” \textit{Hermes} 58 (1923), p. 349. Friedlaender, \textit{op. cit.} (above, note 1), II, p. 107, notes that the Greek orator Libanius (\textit{De vita sua} 5) praises certain gladiators as “pupils of the 300 at Thermopylae.” Martial would have said that they were better than their teachers.
\item Friedlaender has two unforgettable pages, II, pp. 98-99. A new analysis of the originality of Roman literature is demanded by the theories of Freudenberg and Bakhtin. But this ocean is too vast to be embarked on here!
\item Friedlaender, II, pp. 50 with n. 4 and 75; Weinreich, \textit{Studien zu Martial}, p. 31.
\item Weinreich, \textit{op. cit.}, pp. 29 ff.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
shown, with the barbarian Phasis...whether the feast of Thyestes..." Sidonius continues with the realistic description of all kinds of old stories, which amazingly are now no longer old. All the marvellous events of myth are as available to the Roman public as the nearest pantomime. Martial had already written to Domitian: *Quidquid fama canit, praestat harena tibi.*

What the arena offers indeed is not merely the replication of the past, but its superior. Martial likes the *cedat* topos found in Statius, and before that in Propertius. His *nec se miretur*, Caesar, *longaeva vetustas* (*loc. cit.*) eventually found pithy expression in Claudian’s *taceat superata vetustas*. It is the fairground Barker’s exaggeration raised to the level of literature, and hence it will not surprise us to learn that the topos is already anticipated in Ennius’ older contemporary, Plautus. *Superavit dolum Troianum atque Ulixem Pseudolus* says Simo of the eponymous hero of that play (*Pseud. 1244*), and his verb *superavit* already looks ahead five or six centuries to Claudian’s *superata*. In the *Bacchides* (925 ff.) the slave Chrysalus develops a long analogy between his tricks and the exploits of the Greeks in the Trojan War. He makes his points by way of metamorphosis, the sliding identities so characteristic of the *Aeneid*. In the course of the same *canticum* he first tells us: *ego sum Ulixes* (940). Six lines later we hear: *ego Agamemno, idem Ulixes Laritius* (946). In another fourteen lines he has become Achilles: *ego occidi Troilum* (960). He is, it seems, a whole catalogue of heroes rolled into one, and yet we know that he is only a slave talking big! He applies his analogies to others, as the logic of his transformations demands: *sed Priamus hic multo illi praestat* he says of Nicobulus (973). “This Priam far outdoes the old.”

Eduard Fraenkel, who adduces these and other examples as characteristic of Plautus’ genius, notes that to the Roman poet’s plastic fancy Greek mythology is infinitely malleable. He asks if inconsistencies of this type could even be imagined in a Greek poet. The answer is yes — but the poet might be Pindar or Bacchylides.

A fine example of Greek mythical blending may be discovered in the second *Olympian*. Describing the inhabitants of the Isle of the Blessed, Pindar reserves the end of his fourth triad for a touching vignette: “and there Achilles was borne, after she had persuaded the

---

32 These Plautine examples are noted by E. Fraenkel. *Elementi plautini in Plauto* (Florence 1960), pp. 7 ff.
heart of Zeus with her prayers, by his mother'': the pathetic last noun, concluding the triad, hints at a world of maternal grief. But in fact the appeal to Zeus by a bereaved mother on behalf of a dead son, answered with a grant of immortality, was originally made, according to Proclus, by Eos on behalf of Memnon in the *Aethiopis of Arctinus.* And Memnon is shortly to be mentioned by Pindar here as the third of Achilles’ famous victims. It is after the reverberations of these names that Pindar goes on to say that he has many arrows beneath his arm, vocal to the intelligent, though to the general they need interpreters. He is asking us to look beneath the surface of his art. When we do that, we find that metamorphosis is one of the most typical procedures of a poet who so often speaks of himself in komic language.

In one aspect then Pindar and Plautus are not so very far away from each other. Pindar is a lyric poet, using komic language to denote the essence of what he is doing. Plautus is a comic poet, using lyrical *cantica* to denote the essence of what he is doing, what makes his plays different from the Greek New Comedy. The Plautine elements in Plautus, the Roman elements in Latin literature, are a unique blend of the comic and the lyric. In another passage adduced by Fraenkel, Pina-cium remarks:

> Contundam facta Talthubi contemnamque omnis nuntios; simulque ad cursuram meditaborn me ad ludos Olympios.
>  
> *(Stichus 305-06: the rhyme is noticeable)*

The combination of mythology and athletics in a comic context reminds one of scenes on certain red figure vases, perhaps the kind referred to by Pindar in his encomium to Thrasybulus. In the *Casina* (759 ff.) Plautus’ Pardalisca explicitly claims that neither Nemea nor Olympia ever had such jolly games to show as are going on now before the spectators’ eyes. The stage and the circus suddenly blend into one.

---

34Fr. 1 Kinkel.
35W. J. Slater’s *Lexicon to Pindar* cites 10 examples of ἱκμαξ, 15 of ἱκμος, 5 of ἴγικμος, 3 of ἴπικμος, 1 of προκόμιος, 1 of στυγκομαξ, 1 of ἀγλακκκομος. By contrast Snell-Maehler’s *Index Vocabularium* to Bacchylides gives 1 example of ἱκμαξ, 4 of ἱκμος, none of the others. Bacchylides does not use the word programmatically at all.
37 Fr. 124 a 4, Sn.-M. “Athletes provide the largest single class of everyday life scenes in Archaic red figure”: J. Boardman, *Athenian Red Figure Vases: the Archaic Period* (London 1975), p. 220.
38 *Circus noster eccum odest, Cornicula* fr. 1, Leo: Fraenkel, *El. plautini*, p. 7. This is the “All the world’s a stage” theme: Bakhtin, *Rabelais* (above, note 8), pp. 10, 288: Curtius, *op. cit.* (above, note 22), p. 146.
Ennius was the translator of Euhemerus’ *Hier Anagraphe*, the most famous document of a tendency deeply layered in the Greek spirit to raise man to the level of the gods, visible earlier in another celebrated book, Prodicus’ *Horae*. Plautus had not failed at Rome to anticipate these conjunctions. *Mea Iuno, non decet esse te tam tristem tuo Iovi* says Lysidamus to Cleustrata in the *Casina* (230). And again in the *Truculentus* (515): *Mars peregre adveniens salutat Nerienem uxorem suam; and in the Persa: O mi luppiter / terrestris* (99-100). Fraenkel speaks of an imagination which works through “on the spot identifications.” So it was that the face of the triumphing general was painted with vermilion, like that of the statue of Jupiter Optimus Maximus on festival days. Scholars have been shocked. But do they mistake the nature of Roman aesthetics in taking all this too logically?

We can in fact see Plautus’ and Ennius’ imaginations working in parallel in this very matter. Ennius had compared Scipio by implication with Alexander the Great. Lactantius is horrified that the same Scipio should be allowed by Ennius to say:

> Si fas endo plagas caelestum ascendere cuiquam est.  
> Mi soli caeli maxima porta patet. (fr. 23-24, *Epigr.*)

This *soli* is a study in itself. It has a long history, but within the pagan world it derives from a Greek religious use of *eis* and *μόνος*, applied then to a leader such as Demetrius Poliorcetes by the Athenians, and ultimately becoming a catchword in certain academic circles. But its development at Rome was in the circus. *Hermes Martis saeculi voluptas*, cries Martial: *...Hermes et gladiator et magister...Hermes, quem timet Helius sed unum, Hermes cui cadit Advolans sed uni...Hermes gloria Martis universi, Hermes omnia solus et ter unus* (5. 24). And where else were the Acclamations chanted but in the Hippodrome at Byzantium?

---

40El. plautini, p. 92.
Evidently Ennius is turning the elder Scipio into a forerunner of the emperors. But the Roman imagination thinks of its grandees in circus terms, and this is why the same idiom is found in Plautus’ comedies:

Alexandrum magnum atque Agathoclem aiunt maximas
duo res gessisse: quid mihi fiat tertio,
qui solus facio facinora immortalia? (Most. 775-78)

Fraenkel also adduces Aul. 701 ff.: ego solus supero...ego sum ille rex Philippus. Plautus is talking comically, and Ennius seriously, but the Roman aesthetic imagination hardly thinks in such polar extremes. Was not another of Ennius’ patrons, M. Fulvius Nobilior, according to Livy the first to introduce both the venatio and athletics to the Roman public? Did he keep his aesthetic perceptions in two compartments?

German scholars have fine passages on the psychology inspiring the fleeting identifications of Plautus and the circus. Can it ever be defined with precision what is meant by such mythical masking? Is it conscious claim and identification? Is it jest, ambivalent comparison, formula, or just poetic small change? Perhaps all of these things at once. “A grotesque development projects the individual case into a fantastic world, adding to it huge dimensions and a coloring of motley unreality.” But are these not interpretative principles which might aid the understanding of the Georgics and the Aeneid? “In his unbridled passion for images, Plautus links, with dizzying daring, things which are obviously mutually incompatible.”

We may now draw together what makes Ennius typical of the Roman aesthetic imagination.

(a) The Romans apprehend myth quite differently from the classical Greeks. Perhaps the easiest way to summarize this difference is to say that they saw it through comic rather than tragic eyes. It was not a vanished ideal, “once upon a time,” but rather something which could be recovered, and indeed surpassed, in the here and now. This is why

44C. A. Trypanis, Medieval and Modern Greek Poetry (Oxford 1968), no. 79.
45XXXIX. 22. 2. See Weissenborn — Müller ad loc.
46Cancik, op. cit. (above, note 16), p. 103.
48El. plautini, p. 53.
Ennius could describe the battles of consuls and tribunes in Homeric terms, while aiming to make a somewhat different impact on his audience from the trite equations implied by the Hellenistic historical epic. His listeners would be predisposed to see the present as something likely to be better than the past, rather than to recognize with a yawn the tired propaganda put out by hired mouthpieces. Alexander the Great had said that he would rather be Homer’s Thersites than Chorilus of Iasos’ Achilles, and he wept at Achilles’ tomb because Achilles had had such a poet to celebrate his glory (and he had not). But, for the Roman, it was not a matter of second-best. Homer was alive and well and living in Rome, and Ennius could recite his pedigree to prove it.

(b) An important corollary follows about Ennius’ sense of time. If the past is recoverable here and now, time may, in that recovery, be telescoped. The whole significance of the present is that it overcomes time, coalesces with the past and the future (Statius’ nec tardum seges occupabat annum). Can it be coincidence that the parts of Ennius which Cicero quotes at greatest length are Ilia’s dream and the taking of the omens by Romulus and Remus from the Annales, along with Cassandra’s prophecy from the Alexander? Evidently these seemed to him congenial and characteristic. In every case, we are dealing with an incident in which the past or future is suddenly available in the present (and this is true too of the opening of the Medea). The telling simile used in one of these passages, the taking of the omens at the foundation of Rome, is drawn from the circus and its chariot races:

Expectant, veluti consul cum mittere signum
Volt omnes avidi spectant ad carceris oras,
Quam mox emittat pictis e faucibus currus,
Sic expectabat populus atque ore timebat
Rebus, utri magni victoria sit data regni.49

Here, the repetition expectant, spectant, expectabat shows us a present devoured by the future with which it is pregnant. It is the drum roll, before the trapeze artist does his leap. The Romans obviously knew in a notional way that Romulus had won. Suddenly certainty dissolves, and that notional knowledge is put in doubt by a consciousness of time’s ambivalence. Breathlessly, we worship at the shrine of Cronus (Chronus) / Saturn.

49 Fr. 84-88 V (translated in part above, p. vii). See Friedlaender, op. cit. II, p. 48, who also quotes Tertullian, De spect. 16. The significance of seeing / not seeing at primitive spectacles is examined by O. Freudenberg, Mit i Literatura Drevnosti (Moscow 1978): cf. the “Summary” in English, pp. 601-02.
(c) The awareness of words is another aspect of an awareness of the many facets of metamorphosing truth. The scientist may seek to capture his aseptic reality in clinically pure prose. The poet estranges his discourse, makes us think about the distorting mirror which any language must be which seeks to reflect an elusive totality. Distorting mirrors make us laugh, and a language which calls attention to itself is likely to do just that. Now perhaps we can understand why Plautus did not follow the Greek New Comedy in its limpidly exquisite simplicity. He was a Roman, and had a more powerful sense of the grotesque. By the same token, some of the extraordinary experiments of which Ennius is anxiously purged by his defenders may also spring from the same comic source, now raised to epic dignity, geloion become spoudogeloion, like so much in major European literature since. Once again, either / or categorizations are useless at Rome. In this regard, it may be quite wrong to set Ennius over against the Roman neoterics. They operated at the theoretical level with mutually exclusive, Alexandrian classifications. But at the practical level, Ennius may have been just as much a cantor Euphorionis in his way as any of his critics. His manipulation of the hexameter in the Ilia’s Dream fragment is extraordinary. Later, Ausonius was able to incorporate some of the old poet’s tricks into his Technopaegnia.

(d) The Roman, and Ennian, addiction to contaminatio is the product of the Roman attitude to time. The achievements of the past are not frozen, each a Platonic Form stored in a timeless heaven. One story may be seen in terms of another, be crossed with another, even at the expense of inconsistency, because the total effect sought is not one of clear logic. Lucian relates that one mime dancer, in his depiction of the child-devouring Cronus, strayed into that of the supper of Thyestes, while another confounded the fiery death of Semele with that of Medea’s victim Glauce. One wonders if these were mistakes on the part of the often brilliantly gifted dancers so much as incomprehension on the part of the critic. After all, we already saw in the fifth century

50 G. Duckworth. The Nature of Roman Comedy (Princeton 1952), lists on pp. 345 ff. Plautus’ comically extravagant inventions, part of a long tradition still flourishing in our time (Joyce).


52 Somewhat played down by H. D. Jocelyn. Ennus (Cambridge 1967): see his index s.v. ‘contaminatio’. But must not the remark of Terence, Andria prologue 16 ff. be given due weight?

53 De salt. 80: Friedlaender II, p. 132.
B.C. another choric poet making similar "errors."\(^5^4\)

To borrow an analogy from choral lyric, the Roman voice is not univocal, but polyphonic. Aeneas and Turnus play hide-and-seek with the Homeric stereotypes of Achilles and Hector because, in so complex a world, no simple equations with the fixed, heroic past are possible. *Senseram quam idem essent* Cicero had written in solemn earnest of Caesar and Pompey.\(^5^5\) Manilius and Cassiodorus agree that, in its lighter aspect, such identity in diversity is the art of the pantomime.\(^5^6\)

Virgil carries this Protean mutability into his epic. Seneca carries it into his tragedies. His Hippolytus is like Pentheus, his Phaedra like Pasiphaë, his Medea like Orestes. Lucan makes his Caesar and Pompey like Jason and Medea, who also came to grief in Thessaly. It is a Plautine technique, the *Comedy of Errors* suddenly become a nightmare.\(^5^7\)

(e) The parallels for Roman imagination in Greek literature, if we are to do justice to a poet like Ennius, should be sought primarily in lyric and comedy. These are sometimes the same thing, since there is a comic — or komic — lyric. The boundless optimism of the Plautine world spills over into that of Ennius. At the court of Ptolemy Euergetes, Callimachus had assailed Euhemerus. Ennius translated him. Not Isis, as Ptolemaic propaganda declared, but human genius could transform the world.\(^5^8\)

Mathematical logic operates with the concept of the "null class," basically meaning that a certain set of categories is handy, even when its real reference is minimal. In studying Roman literature, we need perhaps to operate with the concept of "suppressed laughter,"\(^5^9\) that is to say, the comic apparatus continues to be deployed, even when the expected response is hardly a smile. The techniques are the same, but the scherzo is transposed into the minor mode. Does not Plato argue that comedy and tragedy are both likely to be written best by the same best poet? So in Roman literature, Ovid is Lucan's teacher, even though Lucan is not, ostensibly at least, writing a *Metamorphoses*. Reading some of the outrages detailed by the *Pharsalia*, we hardly know at times whether to laugh or cry. But Servius remarks in his preface to

---

\(^{5^4}\)Above, p.176.

\(^{5^5}\) *Ad Att. X.* 8. 5: see *Augustus and the New Poetry* (above, note 17), pp. 249-50.

\(^{5^6}\) Manilius V. 481: Cassiodorus, *Var. IV.* 51. 9: Friedlaender II, p. 129.


the fourth book of the *Aeneid: paene comicus stilus est.* If we could avoid categorizing Roman literature in terms of a classicizing hierarchy of genres — epic, tragedy, and only then comedy, lyric, satire — we might view its achievements in a juster perspective. What I am really saying is that the literary historian of Rome should begin from the *spoudogeloion.* This would carry the implication that Varro Reatinus is a major poet of the classical period.

(f) It is indeed Varro who records that once upon a time the Capitoline Hill overlooking Rome was called instead *Mons Saturnius,* exactly, one may add, as the Hill of Cronus overlooked the Altis at Olympia. Varro points to Ennius' name for Latium, *Saturnia terra.* The *Sacra Historia* told how, driven all over the world by armed pursuers, Saturn had with difficulty found a refuge in Italy. Saturn lived on in the Roman mind as the god of a golden age. Virgil himself promises that Augustus will restore that bountiful time: *aurea condet / saecula qui rursus Latio, regnata per arva / Saturno quondam* (*Aen.* VI. 792-94). The blood of her father continued to flow in the veins of Juno, and Ennius does not want us to forget it: *Responsid lun O Saturnia sancta deorum* (*Ann.* fr. 64 V: cf. 491). Juno represents some principle of opposition to Jupiter's purposes (*Ann.* fr. 291). All this is either completely unknown to Homer, or else, as in the case of Juno's opposition, slanted quite differently by the Roman poet.

The Roman state in Ennius' own lifetime had officially recognized the importance of both Saturn and Juno in new ways. In December 217, after the terrible defeats of Trasimene and Cannae, Livy reports that sacrifice was offered at the temple of Saturn and a *lectisternium* ordained, arranged by the senators themselves, along with a public feast: *ac per urbem Saturnalia diem ac noctem clamata, populusque eum diem festum habere ac servare in perpetuum iussus* (*XXII.* 1. 20). The *Saturnalia* had of course been celebrated long before 217. Livy's account describes some public acceptance by the authorities of a popular festival into state cult, no doubt occasioned by the desperate need to

---


60Cf. Friedlaender, II, p. 119, note 5: "Interessant ist, dass sich hier (i.e. in the later imperial period) ein unverkennbares Eindringen von Elementen der Komödie in die Tragödie zeigt."

61 *De Ling. Lat.* V. 42: *Ann.* frr. 25, 26-27 V.

62 *Sacra Historia* 95-97 V.

bolster morale.64 This explains why Saturn is so much more important to Ennius than Cronus is to Homer.

Similarly, in 207, Juno received extraordinary honors on the Aventine, with a procession and hymn written by Livius Andronicus. A fragment of Livius (14 Morel = 12 Buechner) is variously attributed to this hymn, or to the Odissia: sancta puer, Saturni filia, regina. It has the same "Saturnian" ring as Ennius' Iuno Saturnia. Nothing corresponds to this in Homer.

The Roman Saturnalia, originally perhaps the celebration of the winter sowing, carried with them their own peculiar ethos, and notably the freedom granted to slaves. Horace's Davus takes advantage of it to read his master a Stoic lesson (Sat. II. 7). It is indeed the essence of this popular style to be open to question, polyphonic rather than monotonous. There never can be any final answers. But too great fidelity to the comic spirit entailed its own dangers: in Alexandria, there was the fate of Sotades (though Ennius did write Sotadea). In Rome, there was the fate of Naevius, who had written Libera lingua loquemur ludis Liberalibus. This was another rustic festival of fruitfulness and fertility. In spite of this, the tradition of free speech persisted at Rome to quite a surprising degree. Seven hundred years after Naevius (509 A.D.) Cassiodorus writes, paraphrasing Martial (who also wrote in Sotadic meter):

Mores autem graves in spectaculo quis requirat? Ad Circum nesciunt convenire Catones. Quidquid illic a gaudenti populo dicitur, iniuria non putatur. Locus est qui defendit excessum. Quorum garrulitas si patienser excipitur, ipsos quoque principes ornare monstratur.65

Emperors and embryo-emperors had to tolerate this outspokenness on the part of their subjects. In 59 B.C. popular opposition to Julius Caesar made itself apparent, according to Cicero, in the theatre.66 At the other end of the time scale, in Byzantium, the Hippodrome continued to provide an outlet for protests. A modern scholar remarks of the Acclamation of the Greens already quoted above (p. 186):

Much has always been made of the remarkable complaint addressed to Justinian by the Greens....It is certainly a strange and interesting conversation, but those who argue (or imply) that this sort of interchange is a new development of the Byzantine period are evidently unaware what a thoroughly Roman tradition it is.67

---

There was not of course a coherent political program which inspired such manifestations. The Byzantine emperors were not interested in dialogue with their subjects in any real sense, and eventually their Russian successors would reduce the people to total silence. But even ritualized survivals are survivals of something, and tokens of possibility. The κωφόν πρόσωπον of Boris Godunov remains a mighty presence on stage.68

While they lasted, these demonstrations actually took literary form. Dio Cassius speaks of the outcry for the end of the civil war between Severus and Albinus in 196 as seeming to come from a well trained choir (LXXV. 4. 5 ff.). In Byzantium, the transference of the so-called “political meter” from the Acclamations to literature gave modern Greek poetry (from about the year 1000) its principal meter.69 Once again we have striking proof of the centrality of the circus atmosphere to the Roman aesthetic experience.

Ennius’ patron, M. Fulvius Nobilior, we noted, was the first Roman to introduce the venatio. In the tenth century, the princes of Kiev, in their anxiety to set up a Russian state which should in no way fall short of the Byzantine model, arranged that they should pass from palace to cathedral along corridors painted with circus scenes70 — a last memory of the great days of Rome Old and New. Even Mr. Hearst of San Simeon, like a Renaissance prince, surrounded his version of Schifanoia with caged exotica. The tradition of the circus king is very long. Nero, who took his decision to murder Britannicus during the Saturnalia when he was himself such a king, did the same as Hearst.71

We stand here in an area whose boundaries are not easily drawn. The circus king is transient, a figure of fun, and yet at the same time an object of religious awe. In our day, Georges Rouault has made us familiar with the mocked Christ as an example of this ambiguity, not so

68Cameron has a fine chapter (op. cit., pp. 175 ff.) which modifies romantic liberal notions of the role of the Hippodrome. For the silence of the Russian people, see Pushkin’s last stage direction in Boris Godunov: narod bezmolstvet.
much imposing this interpretation, as simply rediscovering the intent of the Gospel narratives. An emperor like Constantius II could enjoy the witticisms of the audience, and his subjects indulge in them, because, when understood in the proper spirit, such jokes were quite in harmony with the recognition of his claim to overlordship, were indeed a religious affirmation of his status. At the Roman triumph, the soldiers of the victorious general were permitted to make rude remarks about their leader, and at his side in the chariot a slave kept whispering Hominem te memento, rather like the priest on Ash Wednesday, after Mardi Gras the day before. But great generals — even Cicero — still craved triumphs!

At the end, a caveat. Although the triumphing general at the end turned his chariot up the Capitoline Hill, said by Varro to have been once the hill of Saturn, himself a carnival king, it does not look as if this spirit communicated itself to the Annales. Ancient tradition accuses Ennius anyway of having been a bad comedian, and Ennius does not seem to have leavened his fusions of myth and Roman reality with the necessary awareness of transience (Fraenkel’s “identificazioni immediate”). In this regard, he may have been frightened by Naevius’ fate, and the reminder given to the Romans by Accius in his Annales of the true nature of the Roman Saturnalia, in which master and slave reverse their roles, may have been pointed. This could also explain Accius’ exaggerated notions of his own importance as a writer. When later the great Augustan epics of Virgil and Ovid restored to their heroes the element of ambivalence missing in Ennius, they may have been truer to the essence of the Roman aesthetic imagination and, by giving it more convincing formulation, have contributed to the ultimate disappearance of their pioneering forebear.

University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign


The Plautine *palliata* is conventionally understood to be an adaptation of Hellenistic New Comedy to the very different tastes of a Roman audience. Thanks to a modern tradition of sympathetic Plautine criticism, a tradition which seems to have begun with Friedrich Leo¹ and is especially indebted to Fraenkel’s great book on Plautus,² scholars now have a much higher regard for the literary merit of the Plautine *palliata* than was once the case.

However there has been no real change in the way Plautus’ relationship to his Greek models is viewed. Concepts like “expansion,” for example, or “omission,” “conflation” (*contaminatio*) and other types of alterations detailed by Fraenkel in his account of Plautine composition, clearly reflect the perspective of the Greek models. The “alterations,” after all, are alterations to these Greek models. Plautus himself seems to invite such a perspective in ostensibly programmatic statements like: *Philemo scripsit, Plautus vortit barbarum,*³ “Philemon wrote it, Plautus turned it into foreign fare.” It is well known, of course, that *barbarus* and related forms tend to be used ironically by Plautus, so that this verse also could mean “Philemon wrote it, Plautus made it intelligible to you clods,” and perhaps “Philemon wrote it, Plautus ruined it.” But even when one makes allowance for the fact that the line is as much joke as statement of fact, it still seems to characterize Plautus’ compositional method as the act of adapting a Greek model to a new purpose.

¹In particular, his *Plautinische Forschungen* (Berlin 1895) and *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, I (Berlin 1913), pp. 133 ff.
Such a view of the Plautine method is generally associated with a rather unflattering assessment of the sophistication of the Roman audience. We have just seen that even in Plautus this attitude may have provided one of the ironies behind barbarus. It also persists as an assumption behind much Plautine scholarship. At one point in a recent essay on the nature of Roman comedy, for example, Konrad Gaiser seems to think of Plautus’ audience as no more attentive than a pack of mules. Referring to the Plautine prologue he notes that Plautus had to get the attention of his restive audience through uncouth means; he had to try to get hold of the people and drag them along with him; he had to amuse them with coarse jokes, and facilitate their comprehension of the play’s plot. In response to this judgment, one might wonder why Plautus bothered to try, if it was that hard to make the New Comedy palatable. Once again, however, it should be noted that Gaiser’s remarks reflect the perspective of the Greek theatergoer, who apparently would not require the same degree of assistance in order to enjoy and understand such comedies.

To illustrate what I mean, let us briefly look at the Plautine palliata through the eyes of some Samnite enthusiast of the Atellan farce. Now one arrives at a very different judgment of Plautus’ intentions, and a very different judgment of his audience as well. Lovable old Dossenus has been turned into an uppity Greek slave. One’s enjoyment of the stooge, Pappus, has been undermined by seeing him burdened with a spineless and spendthrift son. Overall, a robust, national art form has been mongrelized and enfeebled just to gratify the Roman audience’s unwholesome preoccupation with the underside of Hellenic culture. Now perhaps this alternative view of Plautine comedy is not widely held among non-Samnites, yet it seems only slightly less legitimate than the more traditional view of Plautus’ dramatic purposes. It is true that Plautus never claims to be adapting Oscan mimes, as he does seem to claim with respect to Greek comedies, but there may be other reasons to account for that difference. Citing a Greek model, for example, was clearly something of a convention in the Roman palliata, a convention to be followed, ignored, or parodied, like any other in Plautus. As a convention, its relevance to Plautus’ literary goals is questionable. Furthermore, we must remember that many of Plautus’


5."Plautus musste die Aufmerksamkeit seines unruhigen Publikums durch größere Mittel gewinnen. Er musste versuchen, die Leute zu packen und mitzureißen, musste sie mit derben Witzern unterhalten und ihnen das Verständnis des dramatischen Geschehens erleichtern" (loc. cit.).
plays do indeed ignore this convention, by failing to cite any model at all. Nevertheless, I am not seriously going to defend the Samnite's position on this issue. I am, however, going to challenge the Greek's. This I propose to do by treating the question of what Plautus did to his Greek models as essentially irrelevant. A more interesting and pertinent question seems to be: "What did the Greek models do to Plautus?"

At this point my own audience may be getting rather restive. "What," it may be asked, "does Plautus' relationship to his Greek models have to do with the title of this paper?" Actually, as I hope to demonstrate in what follows, the question of Plautus' response to contemporary Roman tragedy is closely involved with the question of how he used his Greek models; but it will take me a few minutes to show precisely how the two issues are interconnected. Our point of departure will be an examination of certain aspects of literary parody in Plautus. This, in turn, will bring us to a consideration of how the palliata acquired its own distinct literary identity. And from there we shall return to the issue which has been outlined in my introduction.

The nature and purposes of literary parody in Plautus form so large and complicated a subject that I cannot hope to deal comprehensively with it here. Fortunately, however, a comprehensive review is not required for my purposes, although a few general remarks would be in order before I turn to the more detailed consideration of certain specific issues.

Over the past century, scholars have devoted increasing attention to the nature and purposes of literary parody in Plautus. Leo, in his *Plautinische Forschungen*, had identified what he considered to be two general types of literary parody. One of these types was the parody of some situation familiar from tragedy or epic. A good example is the distraught messenger's speech, such as Pardalisca's *canticum* from the *Casina*.

621 Nulla sum, nulla sum, tota, tota occidi, cor metu mortuumst, membra miserae tremunt, nescio unde auxili, praesidi, perfugi mi aut opum copiam comparum aut expetam:

625 tanta factu modo mira miris modis intus vidi, novam atque integram audaciam. (*Cas. 621 ff.*)

Pardalisca has burst out of the house pretending that the delectable

---
6 The interesting questions of self-parody and parody of strictly comedic conventions are omitted from consideration here.
7 Above, note 1, pp. 119 ff.
Casina has gone mad and is chasing other members of the household with a sword in her hand and murder in her heart. Quite obviously the scene evokes a situation common in tragedy where a messenger recounts some mayhem which has taken place offstage. The mock-tragic tone of Pardalisca’s song is realized through a number of stylistic features which are characteristic of contemporary Roman tragedy. As examples of such features the following can be mentioned: (1) the repetition of words and phrases for pathetic effect, e.g., nulla sum, nulla sum, tota, tota occidi (v. 621); (2) the abundant alliteration, e.g., cor metu mortuomst, membra miserae tremunt (v. 622, cf. 625); and (3) the striving for amplitude through weighty periphrases and grandiloquent juxtapositions of near synonyms, e.g., opum copiam (v. 624) in place of a simple opes, and auxili, praesidi, perfugi (v. 623, cf. 625).

The other type of literary parody which Leo attributed to Plautus differs from the first in that it involves the use of ostensibly tragic style in contexts which are otherwise completely free of tragic associations. A good example comes from the Pseudolus, where Calidorus is greeted by the play’s namesake. 8 Pseudolus announces that he will greet his man in the grand manner (magnificé), and thereupon modulates into the following passage:

io te, te, turanne, te, te ego, qui imperitas Pseudolo,
quaero quoi ter trina triplicia, tribu’ modis tria gaudia,
artibus tribu’ tris demeritas dem laetitias, de tribus

fraude partas per malitiam, per dolum et fallacias;
in libello hoc opsignato ad te attuli pauxillulo.

CALI. illic homost. CH. ut paratragoedat carnufex!

This passage is particularly interesting because of the comment upon it which is offered by Charinus in v. 707: ut paratragoedat carnufex! By putting this observation into the scene, Plautus unambiguously reveals an explicit consciousness of caricaturing tragic style. The passage enables us, therefore, to identify at least some of the devices which the poet specifically associates with such style. Most obvious are the same features which we noticed in connection with Pardalisca’s canticum: anadiplosis, pleonasm, alliteration and parechysis. Additionally, one might call attention to the paronomasia and polyptoton involving the numeral tres and related forms, the anaphora of tribus and per, the word imperitas in v. 703, which seems to be something of a gloss in place of the more customary imperas, and the grand sounding abstract nouns malitiam and fallacias in verse 705a. Yet, although all of this rhetorical finery undoubtedly does have its counterpart in contemporary Roman

8 Pseud. 703 ff.
tragedy, we must beware of jumping to the unwarranted conclusion that such features are tragic in any specific or exclusive sense. The uncertainty exists because many of these same features comprise a pervasive aspect of what has to be counted “normal” Plautine style too. Glosses, for example, are liberally scattered throughout Plautus, sometimes appearing in passages otherwise of the utmost plainness. Thus the appearance of one here is unlikely to be “parodic” in any obvious way. The same point could be made of the grand sounding abstract nouns,\(^9\) the anaphora, the word play and almost all of the remaining features.\(^10\) Certainly the anadiplosis, however, here amusingly reduced to a virtual stammer in verse 703, as well as the excruciating pleonasm of verses 704 ff., not to mention the spluttering alliteration which permeates the whole passage, are here being overworked to parodic effect. Perhaps not coincidentally, these were the very same markings which stood out in the Casina passage we looked at earlier. We might tentatively conclude, then, that the most salient characteristics of tragic style per se, at least as satirized by Plautus in these two passages, would appear to be its noisiness and wordiness.

More than one scholar has seen an allusion in verse 703 of this same passage to the notorious Ennian hexameter: \textit{O Tite tuue Tati tibi tanta tyranne tulisti.}\(^11\) Syntactically, however, the two passages are quite dissimilar, and their shared alliteration seems to be due to accident more than design. Whereas the Ennian alliteration depends upon an elaborate and artificial pattern of word choice and polyptoton, the effect in Plautus results simply and inescapably from the anadiplosis. No doubt the shared word \textit{turanne} has provided the strongest inducement for connecting these two passages, but again coincidence may be the better explanation. The choice of word is well motivated in the context of an address by a servus callidus to his erus adulescens, particularly when the mode of address is styled to be \textit{magnifice}. Furthermore the word echoes a type of metaphorical description which is perfectly common elsewhere in Plautus.\(^12\) Taken together, these points argue against connecting the Plautine and Ennian lines, despite their superficial similarity. Nevertheless, our discussion of them has served to introduce an important issue in the study of Plautine parody, namely to what extent

---


\(^11\) 109 V.

\(^12\) E.g. Capt. 825: \textit{non ego nunc parasitus sum, sed regum rex regalior.}
Plautus parodies, if he does so at all, specific works and passages of contemporary tragedy and epic.

It is difficult to answer this question with any assurance, in view of the very fragmentary remains of tragedy and epic from this period of Roman literature. My own opinion is that many of the alleged examples of such parody in Plautus are mirages, much like the probably spurious connection between the two passages which were just discussed. Yet not all of the examples proposed by scholars in this regard can be so easily dismissed. One of the most convincing comes from the famous “Trojan” canticum of the Bacchides, in which the victorious slave, Chrysalus, compares his complete duping of the senex to the sack of Troy:

925 Atridae duo fratres cluent facisse facinum maxumum, quom Priami patriam Pergamum divina moenitum manu armis, equis, exercitu atque eximiis bellatoribus milli cum numero navium decumo anno post subegerunt. non pedibus termento fuit praeut ego erum expungnabo meum sine classe sineque exercitu et tanto numero miliwm. cepi, expungnavi amanti erili filio aurum ab suo patre. nunc prius quam huc senex venit, lubet lamentari dum exeat. o Troia, o patria, o Pergamum, o Priame periisti senex, qui misere male mulcabere quadrigentis Philippis aureis.  
930 nam ego has tabellas opsignatas, consignatas quas fero non sunt tabellae, sed equos quem misere Achivi ligneum.

I will not discuss the, to me unconvincing, suggestion of Marmorale and others,14 that this passage is an extensive travesty of a song from Naevius’ Trojan Horse, but wish to concentrate instead on the often repeated judgment that verse 933 of Chrysalus’ song, o Troia, o patria, o Pergamum, o Priame periisti senex, alludes to the opening line of the famous lament of Andromache in Ennius’ Andromacha: O pater o patria o Priami domus.15 It is not just the shared alliteration, or even the shared vocabulary which supports the connection — both features are simply too natural in this context to be of much weight. The parallel rhythm and word order are perhaps stronger evidence. But what seems the strongest evidence is the lack of motivation for such an apostrophe in this specific song. One could remove verses 932-34 of the song without causing the slightest disturbance to the flow of the surrounding context. Verse 932, in particular, shows up as a very lame transition to

13 *Bacch.* 925 ff.  
the apostrophe, since the satiric "lament" which it introduces is immediately given up in favor of a return to the comic elaboration of the Trojan metaphor. Thus there seems little reason for such an apostrophe, and little effect to it, unless it serves to evoke a memorable tour de force which was known to the audience from elsewhere.

On the assumption that Chrysalus' apostrophe does allude to the lament of Andromache, it is interesting that the nature of this "parody," to call it that, seems to invite no ridicule of its target. Such satiric effect could easily have been achieved by, for example, extending the apostrophe for another phrase or two. But Plautus has avoided such satire here and, I would argue, in all other similar contexts. What is the allusion's purpose then? Fraenkel has shown how the Plautine servus callidus typically compares his own exploits with the deeds of gods, heroes, and famous men from Greek myth and history. An example can be found in the guiding motif of the very canticum we are discussing; namely, Chrysalus' self-comparison with the Atreids.\(^{15}\) The comic self-importance conveyed by such conceits is thoroughly in keeping with the larger-than-life character of the servus. It would follow that much the same purpose is served by evoking "high" literature. The fun arises from the presumption of the servus. It does not depend upon something inherently humorous in the style of the allusion itself, nor in its target. My point is simply that ostensibly parodic allusions of this type serve to complement and assist in the development of a comedic convention, rather than to form the focus of a joke. As such they are not truly parodic, at least not in the sense of embodying satire or caricature of their models.

Thus far we have reviewed three different kinds of literary parody in Plautus. There was the parodic evocation of a situation familiar from tragedy or epic; the caricature of certain stylistic flourishes typically found in tragic language; and the parodic allusion to some specific work of contemporary high literature. Of these three phenomena, the first is quite common. One thinks of the additional examples provided by prophetic dreams in the Miles and the Rudens, the ravings of a mad-dened character in the Menaechmi and the Mercator, the threat of suicide in the Cistellaria, the eye-witness account of an epic battle in the Amphitruo, and other similar instances. Conversely, the frequency of parodic allusion to specific works of literature is much more difficult to assess, in view of the very fragmentary remains of tragedy and epic which have survived from this period. With regard to those very few

\(^{15}\)92-99 V.

\(^{16}\)On this canticum in particular see Elementi Plautini, pp. 62 ff.
examples which have been plausibly conjectured, the following generalizations can be hazarded. The model is evoked, either by a close verbal echo or by name, in a context of surrounding magniloquence. The allusion is fleeting and clearly subsidiary to the larger effect of that context. And lastly, the purpose of the allusion is simply to augment the hyperbole of the idiom of self-characterization. In assessing the frequency of the remaining type of literary parody, the caricature of high style per se, there arises a problem to which we must now devote more particular attention.

The traditional view of the difference between the style of Plautus and that of contemporary tragedy and epic is that the former is a reflection of the *sermo cottidianus*, while the latter has its origin in the ceremonial language of old Roman religion and law. Certainly there is a basis in fact for this view, but so bald a formulation of it is oversimplified. Anaphora, pleonasm, exotic vocabulary, archaic morphology, mnemonic alliteration — such elements of style assuredly were derived originally from juridical and religious language, where they served an obvious functional purpose. Once they had defined the idiom of the earliest Roman literature, however, they were free to be extended or modified in whatever direction the development of literature chose to take them. Many students of Plautine language, such as Jean-Pierre Cèbe in his stimulating and helpful book just mentioned on caricature and parody in Roman art, have assumed that the ceremonial style is not natural to comedy, and therefore must be parodic of something external to comedy. Such a view would be more convincing, if all the instances of ceremonial style were limited to contexts of obviously, or even plausibly, parodic intent. But the facts are otherwise. Let us consider a passage like the following, for example, a stretch of *senaritii* in which Saturio, the splendid parasite of the *Persa*, introduces himself to the audience.

53 Veterem atque antiquum quaestum maiorum meum servo atque optinco et magna cum cura colo.  
55 nam numquam quisquam meorum maiorum fuit quin parasitando paverint ventris suos: pater, avos, proavos, abavos, atavos, tritavos quasi mures semper edere alienum cibum, neque edacitate eos quisquam poterat vincere,  
60 neque is cognementum erat duris Capitonibus.

Saturio's language incorporates most of the hallmarks of the ceremonial

---

18 *Persa* 53 ff.
style. There is the fulsomeness — *servo atque optineo et magna cum cura colo* (54); parechesis and alliteration — *nam numquam quisquam meorum maiorum* (55); glosses, including both elevated abstract nouns and archaisms — *edacitate* (59), *cognomentum* (60); and the list could be extended. Such language is clearly bombastic, but in what sense can it be parodic? When virtually every scene of almost every play contains examples of similar bombast, the sheer abundance of the phenomenon seems to preclude any intention of stylistic parody. This, then, is the problem: if the ceremonial style is a Plautine addition to the idiom of comedy, then what effect was sought — or achieved, whether sought or not — by working it to such excess?

Probably the most commonly accepted answer to this question is the one suggested by Fraenkel. In his discussion of the aesthetic differences which separate the Plautine *palliata* from its Greek New Comedy models, Fraenkel calls attention to fundamental differences in the cultural contexts of the two art forms. A simple fact like the different social status of the actors — citizens in the Greek setting, slaves and foreigners in the Roman — will undoubtedly have influenced the way in which these plays were approached by their respective audiences. Fraenkel argues that the form of Greek New Comedy was perfectly suited to the particular cultural interests which had brought about its development. Once transplanted onto Roman soil, however, a living and evolving organism became an artificial and arbitrary device for serving quite different aesthetic purposes.19 The thesis of Fraenkel’s book, of course, is that Plautus sensed these different purposes naturally, and that he transformed the style of Greek comedy to conform to them, while keeping the form of Greek comedy more or less intact. A primitive artistic taste, he argues, is not satisfied with a portrait of ordinary daily life.20 In other words, the Romans had no use for the kind of “realism” for which Menander was so much admired. Fraenkel continues:

Plauto e il suo pubblico pretendono dal dramma l’inconsueto: se gli originali non sono pronti ad offrirlo, provvede il rielaboratore a inserirvelo per forza. Grazie a tali interventi, in non pochi passi anche la commedia romana fornì, almeno ai suoi spettatori, gli stessi elementi che per quel medesimo pubblico costituivano una delle maggiori attrattive della tragedia.21

---


20 Ibid., p. 368.

21 Ibid., p. 370.
It is, then, to this alleged taste for the grand and the different that Fraenkel assigns Plautus' extensive use of the language of tragedy. The point seems to be that Roman audiences liked their tragedy and wanted their comedy to be stylistically similar to it. What are the implications of this view for the question of stylistic parody in Plautus? One seems to be that much or most of the ostensibly tragic style in the plays is not parodic at all, being instead a kind of motif, like the leatherette cushion on a seat of molded plastic in a McDonald's restaurant. But a second implication might be that there was no distinct tragic language which the Roman audience perceived as fundamentally different from the language of comedy. Such was not, I believe, the view of Fraenkel, but I hope to show that it deserves consideration none the less.

With these observations in mind, let us now set about answering the question which was articulated in the introduction to this paper: "What did the Greek models do to Plautus?" To answer this question will entail defending the following specific propositions.

1. At the time when it came into being in the later third century, Roman literature was characterized by a relatively homogeneous style and range of subjects — namely those shared by epic and tragic poetry.

2. The first 80 years or so of Roman literary development, down to the time of Terence in the mid-second century, witnessed the gradual emergence of the palliata as a distinct and independent genre with its own stylistic identity. An important corollary to this proposition is another one: that the origin and evolution of the Roman palliata can be viewed as essentially a process of increasing differentiation from the genre of tragedy.

3. Plautine comedy represents a kind of mid-point, or perhaps critical turning point, in the evolution of the palliata.

4. To view Plautine comedy in this way helps to explain its style more satisfactorily than the traditional view which assigns a separate identity to the palliata from the beginning. Moreover this evolutionary view of the palliata is consistent with other developments in Roman literature of the archaic period.

Let me now take up a defense and more detailed discussion of these propositions.

In referring to the essential homogeneity of early Latin literary style, I do not mean to suggest that tragedy and comedy were indistinguishable at some point in the Roman past. Instead I am proposing that each successive stage of the development of formal literature in the Greek manner at Rome — beginning first with Livius Andronicus'
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retelling of the Homeric *Odyssey*, turning later to tragedy and *praetextae*, later still to *togatae* and *palliatae* — involved some measure of stylistic differentiation from its predecessors. In the case of the *palliata*, this differentiation reflected at least two external influences. One was the vulgarization of literary style in response to the popular idiom of improvisational farce. The other was an increasing accommodation to the elegant plainness of the style of Greek New Comedy. The case for this evolutionary view of the development of the *palliata* rests partly on a number of characteristics which the *palliata* shares with tragedy in the time of Plautus, but which it has given up by the time of Terence. One of these, as we have seen, is the apparently purposeless abundance of ostensibly tragic language in Plautus. Another is the form itself of the *palliata*, which clearly imitates and, therefore, is probably derived from the form of tragedy. Fraenkel’s well-known theory about the origin of the Plautine *cantica*\(^\text{22}\) is a perfect illustration of what I mean. The problem of the *cantica*, it will be remembered, is that Hellenistic New Comedy has none — this despite the fact that such songs are perhaps the most distinctive and artistically polished elements in Plautine dramaturgy. Fraenkel demonstrated that *cantica* were also present in the earliest Roman tragedy. From this identity he deduced that Plautus had imported the convention of lyric song from tragedy into comedy. But another way of accounting for the identity would be that Plautus (or perhaps some predecessor like Naevius) imported the plots and cast of characters of Greek comedy into the preexisting form of Roman drama, which was perforce tragedy.

Another formal identity between the two genres was clarified in an important study of poetic language in early Latin literature by Fraenkel’s pupil, Heinz Haffter.\(^\text{23}\) Haffter demonstrated something very interesting about the statistical distribution of the more highly marked elements of tragic style in Plautus. He found that archaisms, etymological figures, periphrases, abstract nouns, and other such elements tended to occur much more frequently in the *cantica*, the trochaic long-verse, and the expository opening lines of individual scenes. In other words, the distribution of tragic language is primarily a function of the formal structure of the play, rather than of its content. This suggests that the bulk of such language is not an aesthetic innovation by Plautus, but is instead merely a reflection of the artistic form in which he composed. Haffter noted that this distribution more or less corresponds to the division between the underlying Greek model and the Plautine additions to it. He saw it as a confirmation of Fraenkel’s

thesis that it was precisely in these formal additions to the Greek models that Plautus showed the greatest stylistic independence from the Greek models. But once again, a negative image of the same picture gives us Roman tragedy as the starting point; the innovation is an increasing approximation to the style and aesthetic of Greek comedy.

I have suggested that the Roman *palliata* ought not to be thought of as a genre which was born fully formed. Such an argument makes sense not only in view of the vast differences between Plautine and Terentian comedy, but even from the considerable variety of style and form which one encounters within the corpus of Plautus. Some plays, like the *Miles*, have few or no *cantica*. Some, like the *Captivi* and *Trinummus*, are so serious in tone as to appear almost un-Plautine. Some plays contain unique formal experiments, like the parabasis of the *Curculio* or the vaudevillian amorphousness of the *Stichus*. Others, like the *Mercator*, seem unusually faithful to the structure of Greek New Comedy. This variety seriously undermines the thesis of John Wright's interesting and influential study entitled *Dancing in Chains: the Stylistic Unity of the Comoedia Palliata*.24 Wright argues that there was really only one conventional form of the genre, and that Terence's work was a generally unpopular break with tradition. But surely the evidence of the Plautine corpus reveals that the *palliata* was a series of comic experiments. The variety and extent of these experiments disprove the existence of any canonical form to the genre, at least as Plautus practiced it.

Looking at the subject in this way gives us a different view of Plautus' method of composition. As opposed to adapting Greek comedy to Roman tastes, he appears to be participating in the creation of a new Roman comedy, one which combines the formal structure of Roman tragedy with much of the style and humor of the country farce. Added to this concoction are the romantic, at least to a Roman audience, and faraway settings and plots of Greek comedies.

Both Leo and Fraenkel called attention to the extraordinary similarities between Plautine and Aristophanic comedy. They felt these were due to a combination of coincidence and putative vestiges of Old Comedy style in the Greek models which Plautus was borrowing from. We might note, however, that the relationship which I am proposing between Plautine comedy and contemporary Roman tragedy is very similar to that which existed between Aristophanes and Attic tragedy of the fifth century. In both cases the comedic genre feeds on the form

23 Untersuchungen zur altlateinischen Dichtersprache (Berlin 1934).
24 American Academy in Rome Papers and Monographs XXV (Rome 1974).
George A. Sheets

and style of its counterpart in high literature. In neither case could that form of comedy have existed in the absence of the tragic genre to which it responded. The larger than life quality of the Aristophanic hero and of the Plautine trickster, the lyric song, the criticism of literary style and all of the word-play which results from a stylistic self-consciousness born of such criticism, the burlesque stage effects—these and other elements shared by the two authors are motivated by their similar response to tragedy. Two other major components in Aristophanic comedy appear to have been Sicilian mime and some sort of formalized country pageantry. As has already been suggested, two other components in Plautine comedy were the Greek New Comedy and the Italian country farce.

The evolutionary direction taken by the palliata was an increasing fidelity to the style and form of Greek New Comedy. In Terence, the lyric meters of Roman tragedy have given way almost exclusively to the iambic and trochaic measures of his Hellenistic models. The characters of heroic dimension, like Ballio the pimp and Tranio the slave, have been largely replaced by the unspectacular, even if psychologically more interesting, roles of Menander. Hyperboles of language, both the bombastic grand style and the coarseness of the mime, have surrendered to the quiet refinement of an elegant sermo cottidianus.

In a well-known passage from the prologue to the Andria, Terence defends himself against the charge of spoiling his Greek models, by citing Plautus as an example of an acknowledged classic who was equally free in his use of Greek material. At first sight it seems surprising that an author whose style is so fundamentally different from that of Plautus can claim to be doing the same thing as Plautus did. Yet from the point of view proposed in this paper, they were indeed both doing the same thing—both were freely borrowing from Greek comedy whatever they found of use, and ignoring the rest. For this reason, incidentally, Fraenkel is not convincing when he argues that Plautus was placed under certain constraints by his Greek models—for example in that he was forced to obey a convention of dramatic unity. The Stichus and Miles by themselves suffice to show that Plautus felt no such constraint. But as the palliata became more and more faithful to, and therefore dependent upon, Hellenistic New Comedy, such conventions no doubt did become more compulsory.

The development of the palliata to a canonical and Hellenic form reflects a similar development in the other genres of Roman literature of the second century. Ennius’ Greek-style epic, for example, with its

Alexandrian aesthetic orientation and rejection of the native bardoic tradition, and, most importantly, with its immense literary self-consciousness, is a very close parallel to the formalization of the palliata under Terence. Similarly in tragedy, although the evidence is very meager, it appears that Accius in the later second century followed still further in the direction which had been set by Pacuvius toward greater fidelity to contemporary Greek drama. It is noteworthy that his Didascalica, as well as the Satires of Lucilius, reveal an academic interest in literature which is akin to the discussion of literary issues found in Terence. My point is that the increasing Hellenization of the palliata reflects both an increasing Hellenization of Roman art generally, and a corresponding formalization of what constituted viable literature.

An answer has now been proposed to the question which was put in the introduction to this paper. A rendering into Latin of Hellenistic New Comedy ought not to be thought the central goal of Plautus' comedic interests. Certainly the Greek comedy was a critically important component in the heterogeneous form of comedy which Plautus was instrumental in developing. But it was only that — a component. A play like the Amphitruo, of course, does not even have a New Comedy model. Yet Plautus' comedic interests did not follow in the direction to which that particular experiment pointed. Instead it led to the formalization of the palliata as we know it under Terence.

Let me conclude by observing that the thesis which I have proposed in this paper has a particular application to the theme of this conference. In a well-known passage of the Attic Nights (II. 23), Gellius compares several passages of Caecilius' Plocium with the Menandrian loci on which they are ostensibly modeled. To Gellius' mind, Caecilius shows up very badly in this comparison. Not only, we are told, is no attempt made to render whole passages of Menandrian elegance, but Caecilius even stoops so low as to replace such passages with a lot of vulgar humor taken from the mime. He sacrifices the purity and realism of Menander's language (sinceritatem veritatemque verboram) to the bloated language of tragedy (verba tragici tumoris). Gellius concludes by offering the judgment: non puto Caecilium sequi debuisse quod assequi requiret.27

Gellius' judgment of Caecilius is not unlike the view which many critics have formed of Plautus. It is a view which may already have been emerging in the time of Terence, although it was certainly furthered by the stylistic prescriptions of the later Republic, when puritas was

---

26 F. Leo, Geschichte der r. Literatur (above, note 1), pp. 397 ff.
27II. 23. 22.
the nearly universal watchword of all who aspired to good Latinity. Cicero, for example, disparages the use of tragic style in comedy, and of comic style in tragedy. The same sentiment is echoed by Horace (AP 89) and Quintilian (X. 2. 22). The proper avoidance of the Scylla and Charybdis of tragic bloating and mimic buffoonery is a quality which Euanthius much admired in Terence, while at the same time deploiring its absence in Plautus and other early comedians. But perhaps this whole tradition of anti-Plautine criticism in later Roman literature is founded on a misunderstanding of what Plautus was attempting to do. If we could ask Plautus directly about the judgment of posterity, he might reply in the words which he gave to more than one of his glorious servi: bene ludificatumst, which perhaps we may paraphrase as, "They missed the point entirely!"

University of Minnesota

28 De opt. gen. or. 1.
29 The obscure author of the essay on comedy which accompanies Donatus’ commentary to Terence. The argument is found at III. 5 (p. 20 W).
Roman Poets as Literary Historians
Some Aspects of *Imitatio*¹

GORDON WILLIAMS

Literary history — like the history of any art — involves a special difficulty; it is that of reconciling a general scheme of development and a linear movement in time with the problem of the individual genius who creates new things. That has not been made easier in recent years when New Critics tried to expel the writer from the text, and then Deconstructionists called the very existence of the text into question. Yet literary history is fundamental to our studies, and this essay starts from the observation that every poet perforce indulges in literary history (sometimes explicitly, sometimes implicitly) in order to establish a position for himself in an already existing tradition. For originality matters, and always did.

The concept of *imitatio* was particularly useful to Roman poets as a tool for analyzing the relation of a writer to his predecessors. But the concept itself is complex and two aspects of it will be distinguished in what follows.² First there is *imitatio exemplorum*, imitation of models; this tends to be focussed on questions of form and style. Second there

¹An early version of this paper was the subject of a seminar at the Humanities Research Centre of the Australian National University; I am most grateful to the Director and other Research Fellows for their help and criticism. I owe a further debt to members of the audience at the Conference in the University of Minnesota for their helpful comments.

is *imitatio vitae*, the Platonic and Aristotelian concept that art imitates reality, that it holds up a mirror to life; this tends to be focussed on content. Roughly speaking it could be said that the former aspect can be used to explain continuity and development, the latter to give an account of individual genius. That is, *imitatio exemplorum* can be used to estimate a writer’s position in the pre-existing tradition; *imitatio vitae* can estimate his originality. But that formulation is clearly faulty, and there is as much difficulty in keeping the two aspects of *imitatio* separate, as there is in maintaining a distinction between form and content. For ideas can come as readily from reading predecessors as they can from immediate personal experience, and the very dichotomy of form and content seems to be denied in the rhetorical practice of poets from Catullus to Horace (which did not, however, inhibit their use of the dichotomy when it was useful to them theoretically).3

The problem was made the more acute for early Roman poets by a particular circumstance that makes early Roman literature a fascinating area for study. Generally, if allowance is made for individual quirks of archaism or a special interest in imitating much earlier writers, each successive writer can to some extent define himself in terms of his relation to his immediate predecessors. That is true too of early Roman poets, but the situation was immensely complicated by the existence of a constant interference that distorted the system. Each Roman writer was forced to confront and interpret afresh for himself a long-existing and permanent body of highly sophisticated literature in Greek. In fact, the development of Roman literature can also be measured by the nature and the extent of the increase in Roman understanding of Greek literary culture (and that was one criterion that Cicero used in his *Brutus* as an index of progress in the history of oratory in Rome).

The analysis that follows will be partial and idiosyncratic: Pacuvius and Accius will regretfully be omitted, as will the *Odes* of Horace. But these — and many others — can easily be found a place in the scheme. My aim is not to be complete, but to explore a curious continuity in the attitudes of Roman poets from earliest times to the age of Augustus.

The strange origins of Roman literature and its Athena-like birth are vital factors in its history till the time of Ovid. In some ways the writers themselves are their own best historians. Most poets felt constrained to confront this situation explicitly as part of their own poetic activity; in a few it has to be sought in implications. But all of them

3This is the general thesis of my *Figures of Thought in Roman Poetry* (Yale University Press 1980).
Gordon Williams

had to find their places in a gravitational field of a complexity quite unknown to any Greek. To them, as to any poet, originality was of prime importance. Although that could be defined slightly differently at different periods and in different genres, what was always needed was the establishment of a distance from predecessors that could accommodate the traditional and even the conventional but absolutely exclude anything approaching mere repetition or plagiarism.

I. The Early Poets

Two series of fragments of the Annales have been preserved in which Ennius confronted his own situation theoretically. The first is now only a mere patchwork of tiny fragments and comments by later writers. They come from what was an initiation-scene at the beginning of the epic in which Ennius had a dream on the mountain of the Muses. In the course of the dream Homer appeared and revealed that, after various metempsychoses, his own soul had now passed finally into Ennius' body. What is happening here is that Ennius is claiming explicitly to be Homerus redivivus, Homer returned to life: that is, he is not one of the Homeridae so frequently mocked by the poets of Alexandria, but in some sense the revered Homer himself. Thus he escapes Alexandrian criticism that was directed against imitations of Homer. The consequence is a further implicit claim: in this Latin epic on the history of Rome Ennius is doing with the Roman material what Homer would have done had he been a Roman. This establishes the proper generic connection which resides in certain aspects of the form, but it also leaves room for a claim to originality both in content and in the linguistic relationship of Latin with Greek.

The other fragments are from a second prooemium with which Ennius opened the seventh book (or the third triad) of the Annales. The text is uncertain in details, but the main ideas are clear (213-17 Vahlen):

scripsere alii rem
versibus quos olim Faunei vatesque caneabant,
cum neque Musarum scopulos....
...nec dicti studiosus quisquam erat ante hunc.
nos ausi reserare....

Others have written history in meters that Fauns and oracle-mongers used to chant, since no one had yet scaled the rocks of the Muses or

---

4See O. Skutsch, Studia Enniana (London 1968), pp. 18-29, with further references.
5Skutsch. op. cit.. pp. 31-34 and 119-29, with further references.
achieved real learning before me; it was I who unloosed the bars <of the gates to Parnassus>....

This is an outspoken and arrogant denial of any *imitatio* by Ennius of his Roman predecessors; they used Saturnian meter (not Homeric hexameters); they could make no claim to *φιλολογία* (*doctrina*); and they owed their inspiration to the Italic fountain goddesses, the Camenae, not to the Greek Muses. Cicero recognized that Ennius was here trying to deny any influence or merit to Naevius, and he made this blunt comment (*Brutus* 75-76):

> Tamen illius, quem in vatibus et Faunis adnumerat Ennius, Bellum Poenicum quasi Myronis opus delectat. sit Ennius sane, ut est certe, perfectior; qui si illum, ut simulat, contemneret, non omnia bella persequens primum illud Punicum acerrimum bellum reliquisset. sed ipse dicit cur id faciat. ‘Scripsere’, inquit, ‘alii rem vorsibus’ – et luculente quidem scriperunt, etiam si minus quam tu polite. nec vero tibi aliter videri debet, qui a Naevio vel sumpsisti multa, si fateris, vel, si negas, surripuisti.

However the *Bellum Poenicum* of him [Naevius] whom Ennius reckons among oracle-mongers and Fauns gives the same pleasure as a work of <the sculptor> Myron. One may agree that Ennius is — as he certainly is — more polished. But if he really despised <Naevius> as he pretends, he would not, in recording the history of all the wars, have omitted that most bitter first Punic was. But he himself tells us why he does that. “Others,” he says “have written the history in verse” — and very well they wrote too, even if less smoothly than you. And you have no reason to think otherwise, since you either took many things from Naevius if you confess it, or you stole them if you deny it.

Cicero, the literary historian, was deeply offended by Ennius’ denial of a debt to a distinguished predecessor and he takes him to task severely, schoolmaster-fashion, in direct apostrophe. Ennius was clearly anxious to establish his originality against all Roman predecessors by claiming a debt only to Greeks. But Cicero saw, and had clear evidence for his perception, that *imitatio exemplorum* cannot be avoided by any writer and, even more important, that for a Roman poet that necessarily involves *imitatio* of Latin predecessors.

No fragment of Ennius’ dramatic poetry shows him reflecting on his own poetic activity. For that we turn to Plautus whose situation was different from that of Ennius in his epic poetry. He claimed specifically to be “translating” (*vortere*) Greek plays of the New Comedy. Yet that modest and apparently self-effacing claim is falsified both by the facts and by Plautus’ own words. There are two passages that are worth
special notice in this context. The first is in the *Bacchides* where the
slave Chrysalus says (649-50):

\[
\text{non mihi isti placent Parmenones, Syri,}
\text{qui duas aut tres minas auferunt eros.}
\]

I have no interest in your Parmenoes and Syruses who steal merely
two or three *minae* from their masters....

This is not only the characteristic boasting of a Plautine slave; it is also
a self-conscious reference to the Greek models. Plautus himself is
claiming superiority for his character Chrysalus over the ordinary run of
slaves as they appear in Greek comedies. That claim to originality (a
well-founded one) is made even more strikingly in *Mostellaria* 1149-51
where the following dialogue occurs:

THEO. quid ego nunc faciam? TRAN. si amicus Diphilo aut Philemoni es,
dicitio is quo pacto tuos te servos ludificaverit:
opthomas frustrationes dederis in comoediis.

THEOPROPIDES. What am I to do now? TRANIO. If you are
friendly with Diphilus or Philemon, tell them how your slave made a
fool out of you: you will be giving them excellent plots for their
comedies.

Here the old man is in despair as he suddenly realizes how abject a fool
he has been made by his own slave, and his rhetorical question expects
either no answer or an answer quite different from what he gets. It is
highly probable that the author of the Greek original of *Mostellaria* was
Philemon. His contemporary and rival was Diphilus, and in the Greek
play Philemon made a public hit at his rival in this dialogue. What
Plautus has done, however, has been to convert that into a hit both at
Diphilus and at the author of his own Greek model. This fantasy,
which supposes both to be alive (though they were dead for more than
half a century), is rightly put in the mouth of the slave Tranio. For
Plautus’ originality in respect to his plays as against their Greek models
is largely concentrated in the characters of his slaves. Here he claims
superiority not only, as Philemon did, to Diphilus, but also to Philemon
himself who ought, if Plautus is “translating,” to be reckoned the real
author of the *Mostellaria*. Of course Plautus was not translating, but it
is only in such unobtrusive ways that he allows his own pride in ori-
ginality to appear.

However another splendid slave is given a finely ironic claim in
*Pseudolus* 401-04:

\[
\text{sed quasi poeta, tabulas quom cepit sibi,}
\text{quaeat quod nusquam gentium est, reperit tamen,}
\text{facit illud veri simile quod mendacium est,}
\]
nunc ego poeta fiam.

But as a poet, when he has taken up his note-pads, looks for what does not exist anywhere in the world, yet finds it and lends verisimilitude to what is a lie, now I shall become a poet.

Pseudolus has undertaken the apparently impossible double feat both of finding a very large sum of money at no notice and also of gaining the girl who has been sold by the pimp Ballio to a mercenary soldier. The difficulties are enormously increased by features that, because of their Roman character, can be shown to have been invented by Plautus. So what the slave has been set to do is also a figure for the problem the poet of this very play had in achieving originality; here that was solved by the invention of new material.

So Plautus establishes a claim to originality for himself in outdoing his Greek models, and he largely substantiates that claim by blending recognizably Roman elements into the basically Greek plot. Consequently imitatio exemplorum is only very partial for Plautus not only in style (where there is far more than the difference between Latin and Greek in question), but also in subject-matter. It is to be noted that, in the extant plays at any rate, there is no polemic against Roman predecessors, in spite of the fact that enough fragments of Naevius remain to show that Plautine imitatio of him was very considerable. The question of the threat posed by predecessors will become clearer in the case of Terence.

The prologues to Terence’s plays provide the first example of extended literary criticism by a Roman poet. They are cast in the form of a polemic against “a malevolent old poet” (Andria 6-7), Luscins Lanuvinus, who is represented as holding strongly to views that are rejected by Terence, and as having, from his own theoretical position, made explicit attacks against each of Terence’s plays. A number of points are of special interest. Terence openly asserts his relationship to specific Greek plays, even representing this relationship as “word for word translation” (Adelphi 11); yet he claims originality for himself, speaking of “fresh new comedies” (de integro commodias, Andria 26; cf. Heautontimorumenos 4-6, 28-30).

But Terence also makes clear a close relationship to Roman predecessors, saying at Andria 18-21:

qui quom hunc accusant, Naevium, Plautum, Ennium
accusant quos hic noster auctores habet,
quorum aemulari exoptat neglegentiam

---

Those who accuse him [Terence] also accuse those whom our poet claims as his models — Naevius, Plautus, Ennius; he is more interested in emulating their carelessness than the pedantic carefulness of those critics of his.

The accusation supposed to have been made against Terence was of using plot-elements of two Greek comedies to make only one Latin play. The critic polemically designated this activity as "spoiling" (Andria 16, contaminari) plays, and asserted that it is to be condemned. Terence fully admits the charge but argues for imitatio exemplorum: he is merely imitating his Roman predecessors. But he expresses this in a very significant way by using the word aemulari; this echoes Hellenistic use of ζηλός and ζήλωσις, and Terence is claiming not just to be passively imitating but also improving on and even surpassing his revered predecessors in this respect (though he avoids challenging Plautus by re-working the same plays).

The same accusation is faced in the prologue to Heautontimorumenos in a slightly different form (16-21):

16 nam quod rumores distulerunt malevoli multas contaminasse Graecas dum facit paucas Latinas: factum id esse hic non negat neque se pigere et deinde facturum autumat.
20 habet bonorum exemplum quo exemplo sibi licere facere quod illi fecerunt putat.

It is indeed true that malevolent critics have spread rumors to the effect that he [Terence] has spoiled many Greek plays in making a few in Latin; he does not deny that he has done this, but asserts that he has no regrets and that he will continue to do it. He follows the model of fine writers whose precedent he considers makes it legitimate for him to do what they have done.

The point of view here put into the mouth of Luscius Lanuvinus is that there is, as it were, a limited pool of material from which Roman comedies can be made; the pool is constituted by Greek plays, and previous use of a Greek play by a Roman poet renders that play unavailable to others. This principle is extended here to Greek plays that have supplied only a fraction of their thematic material. The theoretical assumption is that a Latin play is best if it is most faithfully translated.

8 Below, p. 218.
from a single play.

The prologue to the *Eunuchus* carries the argument further. It opens with a strong statement of the importance of realism. Then Luscius Lanuvinus is represented as having reshaped his attack on Terence. He has now accused Terence of plagiarism, on the ground that, in taking the characters of the parasite and the soldier from Menander's *Kolax*, he in fact took them from a play that had been "translated" not only by Naevius but also by Plautus. Here the underlying assumption is that plagiarism is only involved if a dramatist, in some sense, imitates a Roman, but not a Greek, predecessor.

Terence's immediate defense is that he did not know that either the *Kolax* or the *Eunuchus* had previously been translated into Latin. There is no reason to disbelieve this. The conditions of the production of plays at Rome in the early period were such that there could be no question of a complete — or indeed anything but a chaotically random — collection of texts by predecessors being available. Luscius Lanuvinus could easily have had the luck to hit on texts that had not been available to Terence.

But this was only an opening argument designed both to assert his own honesty and to condemn, by implication, the pedantic irrelevance (cf. *Andria* 21, *obscuram diligentiam*) of his critic. But it has this further significance. In the prologue to *Adelphi* Terence makes clear that the scene he has "translated word word" from the *Synapothnescontes* of Diphilus is the one scene in the play that Plautus omitted when he based his *Commarorientes* on that same play of Diphilus. Terence was not interested — in fact carefully avoided — imitating and emulating Plautus' workmanship by challenging him where comparison was immediate. He imitated — and improved — Plautus' methods and dramatic practice.

Terence continues with a very interesting line of argument (35-41):

35 quod si personis isdem huic uti non licet
qui mage licet currentem servom scribere,
bonas matronas facere, meretrices malas,
[parasitum edacem, gloriosum militem,]
puerum supponi, falli per servom senem,
40 amare odisse suspicari? denique
nullum est iam dictum quod non dictum sit prius.

However if *<our poet>* is forbidden to make use of the same char-

---

9This is considered below, p. 220.
acters, is it any more possible to portray a running slave, to create matrons that are good, whores that are bad, a parasite that is greedy, a soldier who is boastful, to show a child being substituted, an old man being tricked by a slave, love, hatred, suspicion...? In short, nothing whatever is said now that has not been said before.

Here Terence is making two important points. First, he is implicitly denying that there is any difference between imitatio of Greek models and of Roman models since both draw on exactly the same pool of material. Second, he is facing the essential problem of originality: the conditions of poetic composition are such that originality does not come, within a given genre, from the invention of new material, since the criticism that any particular thing has in fact been said before can always be shown to be plausibly grounded; originality can only come from the way in which the material is handled. That is the point of his criticism of Luscius Lanuvinus (Eun. 7-8): *qui bene vortendo et easdem scribendo male / ex Graecis bonis Latinas fecit non bonas* ("who made bad Latin plays out of good Greek plays by translating accurately and composing badly"); the playwright who claims to translate still has the opportunity for originality in using the material, and he must exercise that opportunity in order to avoid producing a dull inferior copy of the Greek. Hence, as Cicero was to make clear, imitatio of predecessors, whether Greek or Roman, is not only inevitable, it is desirable, and is a prime resource of the poet.

***

If we look back over the literary criticism of these three poets, several features emerge. Because of the conspicuous difference created by the shift from Greek to Latin none of these poets felt threatened by the need for imitatio exemplorum so long as the predecessors were Greek, but both in Plautus and in Terence the idea of surpassing predecessors, whether Greek or Roman, is a key concept in establishing their own positions. Only Ennius felt threatened by Roman predecessors to such an extent that he felt obliged to deny their influence.

It is more significant that all three poets show strong awareness of the element of imitatio vitae, in the sense of experience, from wherever derived, re-interpreted and transposed into traditional literary forms that must be reckoned the common property of all.

Ennius took Roman historical experience and rethought it, looking at it through the eyes of Homer and of other Greek poets (especially tragedians). The short-lived invention of the *fabula praetexta* is a paradigm for this literary procedure of reshaping Roman material to
adapt it to a Greek literary form, and of bodying it out with actual Greek thematic material.

Plautus, following the lead of his Roman predecessors, recast the form of Greek New Comedy and blended Roman elements with Greek in such a way as to create a fantasy-world that is entirely the product of his own imagination, that exists neither in Athens nor in Rome, and that enables him to look at Romans (barbari) and Greeks from a new and unexpected point of view. His imitatio vitae thus creates a satisfying impression of originality.

Terence’s interest in realism as a critical principle is emphatically repeated in his prologues (Heaut. 30-32; Eun. 10-13; Phorm. 4-8). It is realism in the sense of truth to the realities of life and it is a direct expression of his own view of imitatio vitae. In his plays it appears clearly in his recasting of formal features that, though traditionally accepted on the stage, contradicted the realities of life: for instance, he frequently converts what was a monologue or soliloquy in his Greek model into dialogue, and, in general, he modifies the highly rhetorical style of Plautine dramatic dialogue in the direction of a truer representation of the way people actually speak in real life. It also appears in the consistency of his presentation of the Greek milieu, even in details that he himself invented and added to the play (like the character of Antipho in Eunuchus). In this respect he was conspicuously, if silently, correcting his Roman predecessors, especially Plautus. This presented him with an interesting opportunity that he skilfully exploited. Plautus felt free to make his characters, mostly his slaves but also his old men, use Greek every now and then. What Terence was able to do was to exploit the inherent tension between Greek action and Roman language, not in any spirit of Plautine burlesque (with Romans viewed as barbari), but in such a way that Roman elements are given an existence only on the linguistic level as “objective correlatives” and sometimes even as metaphors of emotions.10

II. Lucilius

The importance of Lucilius lies in his invention of a new literary genre whose basis purported aristocratically to be the personal experience of the individual. What gave value to this experience was not any intrinsic weight or importance that it possessed, but simply that it belonged uniquely and peculiarly to one single and distinct individual personality. The literary strategy of the satiric poet was to obliterate

10For some examples see Williams, Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford 1968), pp. 291-94.
any distinction between his poetic persona and that of the private individual. However this chaos of experience of all kinds had to be accommodated to expression in verse and for this purpose forms had to be devised. The closest analogy in earlier Roman literature was the *fabula praetexta*, but that had a ready-made form in the genre of Greek tragedy. There was, however, no possible Greek predecessor whose model could be followed for satire, and so Lucilius was forced to take note of Latin predecessors for form and style. The category of form in this case was wide and ranged from technical questions of meter to adaptations of what comes close to content, as, for instance, in the *concilium deorum* of *Satire* 1, in which Lucilius took over an epic theme that had been used by Ennius in imitation of Homer. Lucilius reacted to this necessity in two ways that are by now familiar. First, he attacked and criticized his Roman predecessors; the fragments give evidence of polemic against Ennius, Caecilius, Accius, Pacuvius, Plautus, and Terence.\(^{11}\) In this way he established himself as a poet against his predecessors, and in this respect he was consequently very like Ennius himself (the poet to whose technique he owed most). Second, he made a great point of appealing to Greek poetic theory (even to the extent of using Greek words) and especially to the influential pronouncements of Callimachus.\(^{12}\) This is analogous to Ennius' appeal to Homer, and its implication is that Lucilius' originality in subject-matter (his *imitatio vitae*) is matched by his following Greek predecessors on problems of form and style — a claim that was designed to guarantee him immunity from Latin predecessors.

### III. General Observations on the Early Period

First, there was a clear prejudice against confessing to *imitatio* of Latin predecessors; even Terence, who seems an exception in this respect, transformed his claim to belong closely to a tradition established by Latin dramatists into an assertion that he is surpassing his predecessors in the tradition. Furthermore, his claim to belong to a Latin tradition is conspicuously offset by his far greater faithfulness to the Greekness of his Greek models. Of course this prejudice was no more than a prejudice, since, as Terence no less than Cicero recognized, *imitatio* of Latin predecessors could not possibly be avoided.

Second, a strong distinction is made and maintained (if only implicitly) between *imitatio exemplorum* and *imitatio vitae*. In the case of

---

\(^{11}\) For Accius and Ennius, Horace *Sat*. 1. 10. 51-55 (see below, p. 229); detailed references in the Index to Marx's edition s.vv.

\(^{12}\) Details in M. Puelma Piwonka, *Lucilius und Kallimachos* (Frankfurt 1949) and
the former the *exempla* were actually, or were claimed to be Greek, and
so the *imitatio* in Latin could only be in various ways partial and
modified; it could be regarded as being concentrated more on form and
style than on content. But *imitatio vitae* opened the path to freedom,
for it might involve what could be represented as being purely Roman
(as in the cases of Ennius and Lucilius) or Greek blended and
transmuted with Roman elements (as in the case of Plautus), or, as
with Terence, Greek improved and purified by a more attentive obser-
vation of real life as such.

Third, when these poets wished to establish their generic legi-
timacy and give (however rudimentary) a theoretical basis to their
activity, they made appeal to Greek predecessors. This is particu-
larly strange in the case of Lucilius, who had no Greek predecessors. Here
again Terence is only an apparent exception, for his appeal to a Latin
tradition is used polemically to legitimate a practice that *ex hypo-
thesis* he could not find in his Greek models, and on every theoretical question
he is obviously measuring his activity by the standards of Greek prede-
cessors.

There is a general feature worth noticing that permeates every
aspect of the problem in this period. This is the apparently universal
respect for the excellence of Greek literary culture which is clear even
in Plautus’ claim to surpass his Greek models. It is to this ingrained
attitude that, for instance, Terence’s assertion (clearly false) that he is
translating his Greek model “word for word” should be referred. It
can be seen also, for example, in Plautus’ admiring, if comic, use of
the adjective *Atticus* as a recommendation of quality. Originality could
be won from *imitatio* of Greek models because a poet could be the first
to do something or other in Latin; that claim is made by Ennius, Lae-
vius, Lucretius, Virgil, Horace, Propertius, Manilius, Ovid, and
Phaedrus. Of course the claim acquired in time the status of a com-
monplace but it remained at least a rhetorical means for a Latin poet to
assert his originality. In time too the idea of “word for word” transla-
tion fell into disrepute, and Cicero could say (*de finibus* 3. 15): *nec
tamen exprimi verbum e verbo necesser erit, ut interpretes indiserti solent* ("it
will however be unnecessary to translate word for word, as unqualified
translators do"); Horace endorsed this condemnation in *Ars Poetica*
133-34. But the respect for Greek culture can even be seen in a state-
ment of Afranius. He was writing comedies that were explicitly
Roman, were set in Italy, and could therefore have no Greek models.
He says in the prologue to his *Compitalia*:

Italo Mariotti, *Studi Luciliani* (Firenze 1960).
fateor: sumpsi non ab illo modo, 
sed ut quisque habuit conveniret quod mihi 
quod me non posse melius facere credidi, 
etiam a Latino.

I agree that I did: I borrowed not only from him [Menander] but according as any had anything to offer that suited me and that I thought I could not do better myself — even from a Latin poet.

Afranius freely confesses to borrowing from Greek poets for a purely Roman genre; that need occasion no great surprise. But he postpones to a climax his admission of the inconceivable act of borrowing even from a Latin poet. Humor and irony are used to underline the gravity of the confession.

IV. Catullus and his Successors

Catullus was clearly a beneficiary of Lucilius' estate, the tradition of using private autobiographical material as a basis for poetic composition; but, not surprisingly, Catullus gives no hint of such a debt. Instead, the three general attitudes found to be characteristic of the early poets are found in Catullus too. Not only does he acknowledge no debt to Roman predecessors (except indirectly, in occasional echoes, such as that between the opening of poem 64 and the prologue to Ennius' Medea); he conducts vigorous polemic against poets whose debt to the tradition that derived from Ennius was conspicuous, pilloried in the archetypal figure of Volusius (36, 95) who used history as his subject-matter. The Roman poets he approves are, by contrast, his own contemporaries and friends who shared a common point of view; not for nothing did Cicero refer to the whole group impatiently as New Poets. Their most conspicuous claim was to have broken with tradition.

Second, in his imitatio exemplorum his models were Greek poets, a relationship that he did not trouble to conceal. When he goes to the length of close translation, he subverts it strongly: in poem 51 by the self-mocking ironic final stanza added to Sappho's poem; in the case of poem 66 by the introductory poem 65, apologizing and explaining that in his grievous personal situation translation was all he could do. In poem 64, where the material was Greek mythology, that traditional poetic resource has been modified not only by the highly individual, unpredictable, and even intrusive persona of the poet (in which respect

13 Ad Att. 7. 2. 1; Orator 161.
he had a model — to some extent — in the *Hymns* of Callimachus), but also by the most unexpected reflections with which the poem ends (384-408) on the contemporary political and social situation in Rome and Italy. In general, however, his *imitatio vitae* was largely based on every aspect of his own private life.

Third, Catullus’ theoretical reflection on poetic composition relies heavily on the ideals especially of Callimachus, as in poem 95 where contempt for Volusius who is in the tradition of Ennius is balanced by Callimachean contempt for the inflated Antimachus, an imitator of Homer; while approval is given to the epyllion *Zmyrna* of his close friend Cinna. Catullus, for all that he claimed and wished to be regarded as “new,” was nevertheless displaying very much the same attitudes that the predecessors from whom he so anxiously wished to dissociate himself had in their time displayed.

It is less surprising that the same set of attitudes should be clear in Lucretius, though they are differently expressed. Unlike Catullus, he mentions a revered predecessor (I. 116-26):

116 an pecudes alias divinitus insinuet se,
Ennius ut noster cecinit, qui primus amoeno
detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam,
per gentes Italas hominum quae clara clueret;

120 etsi praeterea tamen esse Acherusia templap
Ennius aeternis exposit versibus edens,
quo neque permaneant animae neque corpora nostra,
sed quaedam simulacra modis pallentia miris;
unde sibi eortam semper florentis Homeri

125 commemorat speciem lacrimas effundere salzas
coeipisse et rerum naturam expandere dictis.

...or whether by divine direction it [our soul] is implanted in other creatures, as our Ennius sang who was the first to bring down from lovely Helicon a wreath of deathless leaves that would win shining glory throughout the Italian clans of mankind; although besides that he nevertheless explains, setting it out in eternal verse, that the regions of Acheron exist but that neither our souls nor our bodies endure to that point, only wondrously pallid images of them; and from here he recalls that the ghost of ever-flourishing Homer rose before him and began to pour forth salt tears and explain the nature of the universe in speech.

The most superficial reading of Lucretius reveals his enormous debt to Ennius. But here Ennius is firmly put in his place: he was indeed the

---

14See Williams, *op. cit.* (above, note 10), pp. 700-06.
first great Roman poet and his fame is everlasting; however he belonged to a certain historical period and in his subject-matter he was not only wrong but also self-contradictory. The implication is clear that imitation of Ennius meant also correction of him, but Lucretius leaves the availability of Ennius for imitation as a mere implication and makes no attempt to criticize him other than in his opinions. But a relevant implication resides in what he goes on to say (136-45):

136   nec me animi fallit Graiorum obscura reperta
      difficile inlustrare Latinis versibus esse,
      multa novis verbis praesertim cum sit agendum
      propter egestatem linguae et rerum novitatem;
140   sed tua me virtus tamen et sperata voluptas
      suavis amicitiae quemvis efferre laborem
      suadet et inducit noctes vigilare serenas
      quaeuentem dictis quibus et quo carmine demum
      clara tuae possim praepandere lumina menti,
145   res quibus occultas penitus convisere possis.

Nor does it escape my mind that it is difficult to illumine the dark discoveries of the Greeks in Latin poetry, especially since much must be treated by means of neologisms because of the poverty of our tongue and the novelty of the subject-matter; yet nevertheless your excellence and the pleasure of the sweet friendship I long for persuade me to endure any effort and induce me to keep awake through quiet nights searching for the words and the poetry to spread a bright light before your mind so that you can see deeply into things that are hidden.

Here Lucretius claims originality for himself and his claim is based on the nature of his subject-matter; but the implication is also clear that no Latin predecessor can possibly help with the most serious problems. The real function of Ennius does not emerge till much later, and then only obliquely (1. 921-34):

921   nunc age quod superest cognoscere ct clarius audi.
      nec me animi fallit quam sint obscura; sed acri
      percussit thyrso laudis spes magna meum cor
      et simul incussit suavem mi in pectus amorem
925   Musarum, quo nunc instinctus mente vigenti
      avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante
      trita solo. iuvat integros accedere fontes
      atque haurire, iuvatque novos decerpere flores
      insignemque meo capiti petere inde coronam
930   unde prius nulli velarint tempora Musae;
      primum quod magnis doceo de rebus et artis
      religionum animum nodis exsolvere pergo,
      deinde quod obscura de re tam lucida pango
carmina, musaeo contingens cuncta lepore.

Now come, get to understand what remains and hear it the more clearly. And it does not escape my mind how dark these things are; but a great hope of fame has spurred my heart with its penetrating goad and has simultaneously injected sweet love of the Muses into my soul. Now, inspired by that, with vigorous mind I traverse pathless regions of the Pierides, previously trodden by the foot of none. It is my pleasure to reach untouched springs and drink of them, and it is my pleasure to pluck completely new flowers and make a glorious crown for my head from them, from which the Muses have never wreathed the brow of any man previously: in the first place because I teach important things and I strive to free the mind from the tight knots of superstition; in the second place because I lay out such bright poetry on a dark subject, touching everything with the charm of the Muses.

The phrases here echo what he said in praise of Ennius, especially concerning the idea of being the first. But the emphasis is heavily on his own originality in the twin pictures of pathless regions never before trodden by anyone, and of a completely new crown presented by the Muses. What is remarkable here is that this originality is consistent with following Epicurus.\(^\text{15}\) The claim, here left implicit, is that Lucretius can, in the word used by Terence, rival Ennius in being the first in a new way of his own by doing something never done before. Lucretius’ driving ambition for an immortal fame of his own is consistent with admiration for, and imitation of, Ennius. But the emphasis on things Greek is to be noticed. Even in style he cannot be much helped by Latin predecessors since it is only Greeks who have wrestled with these ideas before. Only two men are treated by Lucretius as gods, and both are Greeks. Epicurus is constantly so treated because of the originality and power of his thinking. But he wrote in prose and so could not be a model, other than in contributing to *imitatio vitae*, for Lucretius. The other Greek so treated was a poet, and he is given a laudation that is greater than Ennius’. The passage of no less than eighteen lines ends thus (I. 729-33):

\begin{verbatim}
nil tamen hoc habuisse viro praeclarius in se
730 nec sanctum magis et mirum carumque videtur.
carmina quin etiam divini pectoris eius
vociferantur et exponunt praclare reperta
ut vix humana videatur stirpe creatus.
\end{verbatim}

...yet <Sicily> clearly never possessed anything more glorious, anything more holy, anything more admired or more loved than this

\(^{15}\)Below, pp. 227-28
man. Moreover the poems of his godlike soul speak forth and expound his shining discoveries so that he seems hardly born of human stock.

Empedocles is treated as the greatest of a whole series of Greeks; but they were, for all their genius, basically wrong. In fact the praise of Empedocles is subverted in the lines that follow on grounds of falsity in his subject-matter, so that what remains eternal in him is his poetry, his style, and in this respect he provided a model for Lucretius — a Greek, not a Roman model. It is the second of the two bases for Lucretius' claim to immortal fame (933-34) that he employs poetry to carry and recommend the doctrines of Epicurus (whose subject-matter is the first basis, vv. 931-32, for Lucretius' fame), and in that effort his great predecessor and model was Empedocles, who stood to Homer in a similar relation to that of Lucretius to Ennius. Once again the influence of the Latin predecessor, Ennius, is played down in favor of the Greek Empedocles, though this is done only very indirectly.

Here it is worth remarking that Lucretius' relation to Empedocles, mediated by Ennius, is exemplified in a memorable phrase.\(^\text{16}\) Empedocles in frag. 26 Wright (20 Diels) speaks of the uniting of the bodily parts in life and their disintegration in death (5): \(\pi\lambda\dot{\alpha}\zeta\varepsilon\tau\alpha\iota\alpha\nu\dot{d}i\chi\'\ \varepsilon\kappa\alpha\sigma\tau\alpha\ \pi\varepsilon\rho\iota\gamma\mu\imath\iota\nu\ \beta\iota\iota\iota\omega\iota\ \) \((\text{torn asunder})\) they wander, each separately, about the shoreline of life." Ennius (114 V) said of Romulus \(\text{tu produxisti nos intra luminis oras}\) ("you brought us forth within the coasts of life"): cf. 131 V. The phrase \(\text{in luminis oras}\) is used no less than nine times by Lucretius.\(^\text{17}\)

The relation with Ennius is expressed (I. 116-26) in terms of Ennius' primacy in his own time. That idea of relativity (viz. that a poet's achievement is to be judged in relation to his age) which Lucretius uses to distance Ennius from himself is important for literary history and is used impressively by Cicero in his \(\text{Brutus}.\)\(^\text{18}\) It left Lucretius free from a paralyzing sense of Ennius' greatness on the one hand and of the necessity to denigrate him (as Ennius did his predecessors) on the other.

Another concept is used by Lucretius to deal with his relation to Epicurus. It is remarkable that in the passage quoted above (I. 921-34) Lucretius speaks of his own originality in the figure of the pathless, untrodden wilderness. Yet he can praise Epicurus in the prooemium to
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\(^{16}\)For other parallels between Lucretius and Empedocles, see M. R. Wright, \(\text{Empedocles: The Extant Fragments}\) (Yale University Press 1981), "Index locorum", p. 352.

\(^{17}\)I. 22, 170, 179; II. 577, 617; V. 224, 781, 1389, 1455.

\(^{18}\)Especially 292-300.
Book III, especially in vv. 3-6:

```
te sequor, o Graiae gentis decus, inque tuis nunc
ficta pedum pono pressis vestigia signis,
non ita certandi cupidus quam propter amorem
quod te imitari aveo.
```

It is you that I follow, O glory of the Greek race, and in the tracks that you have marked out I now plant my carefully placed footsteps, not so much desiring to rival you as because through love I am longing to imitate you.

He goes on to compare himself to a swallow (in relation to Epicurus’ swan) and then to a bee sipping from Epicurus’ pages. What is striking here is the explicit picture of following step by step and the equally explicit denial of *aemulari* in favor of an *imitari* that arises from inspiration (*amor*). What allows this close imitation of Epicurus to exist side by side with a strong claim to originality is a clear-cut distinction between form and content, figured in the image of Lucretius as a doctor administering unpleasant medicine (the ideas) wrapped in sweet-tasting honey (the poetry). Epicurus is only relevant to *imitatio vitae*, but that is so totally transformed by the poetic form that the *imitatio exemplorum* is consistent with a claim to complete originality and primacy. The importance of the thematic material (I. 931-32) is independent of its origin in Epicurus, and the junction of it with the poetry (I. 933-34) creates the second element in Lucretius’ claim to originality; with Epicurus he did not need to strive for primacy (*certare*), but as against a Latin predecessor he had to assert his own originality.

The same pattern can be seen in Horace’s *Satires*. He had an acknowledged predecessor in Lucilius and he established himself by attacking his predecessor. He does this with tact and restraint, but explicitly. The attack on Lucilius’ style is undertaken in his own voice, but the attack on Lucilius’ tone and subject-matter is put into the mouths of anonymous readers who are also supposed to criticize Horace for adopting a similarly hostile tone towards his targets. In *Satires* I. 4 Lucilius is approved for his outspoken attacks on vice (cf. *Sat.* I. 10. 3-4), but he is criticized for his hasty and careless style (9-13); however the poet avoids this issue for the moment by agreeing not to consider whether satire is really poetry and by concentrating on an explanation and defense of its subject-matter. In *Satires* I. 10 he comes back to the question of Lucilius’ style,19 treats satire as subject to the severe

---

19This strategy is tactful, since it allows Horace to get in his brief but pungent criticism of Lucilius in *Sat.* I. 4. His return to the problem is then motivated in *Sat.* I. 10 by Horace’s assertion that someone has objected to his criticism of Lucilius’ style and that
standards by which poetry should be judged (7-19), and finds Lucilius seriously deficient. Here Horace uses the same argument from relativity as Lucretius. He points out that as he criticizes Lucilius, so Lucilius attacked his Latin predecessors, Accius and Ennius (53-55), and also that Lucilius was admirable by the standards of his own time but that, had he lived in Horace’s, he would have changed much (64-71). The argument relieves the attack from self-serving meanness and arrogance.

That effect is also achieved by another stratagem. In Satires I. 10 Horace speaks of satire as being the one poetic genre that he could write, in which he is better than “Varro of Atax and certain others who tried it and failed,” but he is inventore minor (“inferior to the inventor,” 48). This statement is carefully insulated from the relativistic attack on Lucilius in 64-71. The theme is repeated twice in Satires II. 1: at line 29 where the poet says nostrum melioris utroque, “better than either of us”; and at 74-75 quicquid sum ego, quamvis / infra Lucili censum ingeniumque, “of whatever account I am, although inferior both in income and in genius to Lucilius.” The superiority of the inventor was what Lucretius could fully concede without threat to himself, since Epicurus was generically remote. But in each instance the Horatian admission of inferiority is modified — in I. 10, 48 by limiting it to the fact of generic invention itself; in II. 1. 74-75 by including income ironically with genius; and in II. 1. 29 by associating Trebatius also with the inferiority.

Another stratagem used by Lucretius is also made to work for Horace. This is the drawing of a very sharp distinction between style and content and so between imitatio exemplorum and imitatio vitae. This is done in Satires I. 4 in such a way as certainly to make clear the poet’s attitude to Lucilius’ stylistic shortcomings but yet to postpone to Satires I. 10 the detailed attack. That device enabled Horace to claim stylistic originality for himself by showing the deficiencies of his only real predecessor; the ideals of poetic composition that he asserts are his own, but they are also measured against the highest standards of his own age. It is the case with Horace, as it was with Lucretius, that only the junction of style and subject-matter — not either by itself — can constitute his real claim to originality and uniqueness. In imitatio vitae the nature of the genre allowed Horace to regard Lucilius as the exemplary predecessor but did not endanger his claim to originality. Since the genre was founded on personal experience, the subject-matter was ex hypothesi original. In fact Horace represents his own procedure as
founded, without any reference to Lucilius, on the moralizing of his own father (I. 4. 103-26) and on his consequent acquisition of a unique moral sense of his own, such that his satire becomes a natural extension of his own moral self-reflections. The satiric writer’s relation to his own writing is figured in *Satires* II. 1 as that of a man with faithful and intimate friends to whom he entrusts the secrets of his life in all its aspects (30-34); that is the model which Lucilius handed on to him.

The relationship with Lucilius is exemplary in *Satires* I. 5 where a sufficiency of fragments remains from Lucilius’ *Iter Siculum* to establish a close connection between it and Horace’s account of his journey to Brundisium in 37 B.C. Porphyrio (the third century commentator on Horace) says of this (on *Sat.* I. 5. 1):

Lucilio hac satyra aemulatur Horatius iter suum a Roma Brundesium usque describens, quod et ille in tertio libro fecit, primo a Roma Capuam usque et inde fretum Siciliense.\(^{20}\)

Here the commentator interprets the relationship as one of *aemulatio*, as if Horace were challenging and trying to surpass Lucilius; but the concept of *aemulatio* belongs in this form to a later age and has little relevance to what Horace does. Lucilius was the “inventor” of the genre, he gave it shape and form, and he defined (if only implicitly) its “rules” (*leges*). A particular journey possesses of necessity a structure and a series of typical features that makes it similar to any other journey. What Horace does in *Satires* I. 5 is to authenticate his own autobiographical presence in the poem as the narrator of experiences of his own, but he also structures his own experience on the pattern provided by Lucilius. This can be expressed in a general way in the form of a far-reaching distinction. It is to be drawn between imaginatively reliving and reshaping particular experiences (which can come from any source, including the books of predecessors) in accordance with the totality of one’s own experience (which can also include books); and, on the other hand, regarding experience as pre-existing in a given package in such a way that the problem becomes one not of re-interpretation, but of exercising ingenuity on giving the package a new shape in accordance with the rules of *inventio*. The latter attitude becomes characteristic of writers who followed Ovid and the procedure is then certainly one of explicit *aemulatio*, of taking what the earlier writer provides and of outdoing him by discovering potentialities in it that he failed to exploit. In the former, however, *imitatio vitae* and *imitatio exemplorum* become united in a single process, so that Horace can both imitate Lucilius but also substantiate the presentation of his own

---

unique experience of life. It was the same procedure that allowed Lucretius to follow Epicurus step by step and yet legitimate a claim to real originality. That too was the procedure of Horace in relation to Lucilius, and that was the true model for Samuel Johnson’s imitation of Satires 3 and 10 of Juvenal in London and The Vanity of Human Wishes.

There was also a third way in which Horace followed the pattern of imitatio set by early Roman poets: when he seeks theoretically to establish his own generic legitimacy he appeals to Greek writers. This is the true explanation of the extraordinary piece of literary history that opens Satires I. 4. There he claims that Lucilius was totally dependent on Eupolis, Cratinus and Aristophanes, the poets of Old Comedy, and they are emphatically designated as poetae. They can therefore constitute models of poetic excellence by which Lucilius can be measured and found wanting. But the topic is no sooner raised in Satires I. 4 than it is dropped by the poet’s agreeing to shelve the question whether satire is poetry or not. It is, however, taken up again in Satires I. 10, and, after a careful definition of the ideal style required for satire (7-15), the poet says (16-17):

illi scripta quibus comoedia prisca viris est
hoc stabant, hoc sunt imitandi.

It was on this that those men who wrote Old Comedy took their stand, it is for this that they must be imitated.

Great Greek predecessors must supply literary standards — for the age of Horace no less than for that of Lucilius; but one must no more use Greek words in Latin poems (as Lucilius did — 20-30) than one must go to the length of actually trying to write in Greek (as Horace once did — 31-35). That idea of Greeks supplying standards returns in the important passage where the concept of relativity is applied to Lucilius (64-67):

fuerit Lucilius, inquam,
comis et urbanus, fuerit limatior idem
quam rudis et Graecis intacti carminis auctor,
quamque poetarum seniorum turba....

I most certainly concede that Lucilius was elegant and witty and far more polished than the composer of a rough poem untouched by Greek culture, in fact than the whole crew of earlier poets....

The literary distinction that Lucilius achieved was due to the fact that he carefully studied and adopted (as he claimed) the standards of Greek predecessors. But now Horace, while recognizing Lucilius’ virtues in terms of the time at which he lived, can apply the same
standards with more rigor and understanding. Cicero in his *Brutus* had used this concept of increasing acquaintance with Greek literary culture as a versatile and potent tool in analyzing development in Roman oratory.

For Virgil in his *Eclogues* there was no Latin predecessor and he had no need — indeed, clearly, unlike Catullus, no inclination — to attack or even criticize another poet (except perhaps for Maevius and Bavius, whoever they were). But, like Catullus, he gave loud acclaim to distinguished elder contemporaries, G. Asinius Pollio and G. Cornelius Gallus. Neither of them wrote poetry in the least generically related to pastoral, but in *Eclogue* 10 Virgil invented an ingenious way of defining the relation of pastoral to elegiac love-poetry by transposing Gallus to Arcadia, a venture that could then be shown poetically to be impossible.\(^{21}\) The *Georgics*, however, were different. Here Latin predecessors were probably confined to prose-writers, but Virgil draws emphatic attention to Lucretius. The subject-matter of the *De Rerum Natura* (as defined in *Georgics* II. 490-92) came within the scope of the secondary field of the *Georgics* and the poet establishes what amounts to a polemical position against Lucretius. He prays to the Muses whose devotee he is and by whom he is deeply inspired (II. 475-76; the language echoes that of Lucretius) to teach him the nature of the universe (477-82). But the depressing idea occurs to him that his own talents may be deficient for that undertaking (483-84); if so, may he be inspired (*amare*) by the beauties of the countryside, and, as he speaks, he feels the inspiration coming over him (485-89). Then, corresponding to the dichotomy he has set up between understanding the nature of the universe on the one hand and coming to know the countryside on the other, there comes the assertion of the felicity (*felix*) of the man who has achieved intellectual dominance over the human condition (490-92) and the good fortune (*fortunatus*) of him who has come to know the deities of the countryside (493-94). What is particularly interesting here is not only the wish to match the achievement of a Lucretius (and the sense that it may be beyond his powers),\(^{22}\) but also the implicit denial of Lucretius' dichotomy between subject-matter and form, between the teachings of Epicurus and the poetic inspiration of the Muses. For Virgil the Muses are the source of both: that is, failure to understand the universe is a failure of poetry. That idea of the unity of form and content, such that alteration of the one necessarily involves adjustment of the other, can be seen to underlie the

\(^{21}\) For this interpretation see Williams, *op. cit.* (above, note 3), pp. 231-36.

\(^{22}\) For details, *ibid.*, pp. 250-51.
poetics of three highly original earlier poems, *Eclogues* 4, 6 and 10.

This meant that for Virgil the distinction between *imitatio exemplorum* and *imitatio vitae* was artificial (in a way to be defined), and that view had important consequences. First, poetic inspiration was therefore a totality such that material from whatever source was transformed and became the absolute possession of the poet who used it. Second, the question whether a predecessor to whom a poet was indebted was Greek or Roman came to be of utter indifference. Third, the text of a predecessor could become active in the later text in such a way that it was not challenged by the later text but extended its scope. The artifice of distinguishing between *imitatio exemplorum* and *imitatio vitae* was transformed in all of Virgil’s poetry into a more creative distinction. All of his poetry can be seen to make use of a relationship between primary and secondary fields; this often seems to correspond to the relationship between the two types of *imitatio*, but that distinction tends to become unhelpful. It works quite well in the *Eclogues* where the primary field is usually constituted by specific reference to the poetry of Theocritus (though in *Eclogue* 10 it is the secondary field that is so constituted). However in the *Georgics* the primary field concerns the specified technical subject-matter of farming, while the secondary field embraces the human condition as such in all of its most far-reaching aspects. In the *Aeneid* the primary field is the announced subject-matter of the poet, the tale of what happened to one man in a period of less than a decade in the twelfth century; this field can certainly be regarded in part as related to the two epic texts of Homer. The secondary field concerns the whole panorama of Roman history and especially the period of the poem’s composition in the age of Augustus: this field can correspondingly be regarded as belonging more closely to *imitatio vitae*. In each case the secondary field is deliberately left incomplete; instead indexes to the proportionality of the two fields enable the reader to sense and reconstruct the secondary in imagination. Analogous techniques can be seen in a few poems of Catullus and in Propertius’ early work, and there may be something remotely similar to the technique of the *Eclogues* in the seventh *Idyll* of Theocritus. But essentially this was Virgil’s invention and it influenced some later work of Horace. However, Virgil’s work and much of Horace’s was being misinterpreted from a time soon after it was composed, because attitudes to literature underwent a radical change in the later age of Augustus.

---

Yet in another way Virgil followed the pattern of his Latin predecessors. On the one hand he appealed to Greek predecessors to establish generic legitimacy, and on the other he claimed primacy in spite of their existence. In the *Eclogues* his predecessor was Theocritus, and he also makes clear allusion to Callimachus in the opening of *Eclogue* 6 where he also claims primacy for himself. However he is much more explicit in the *Georgics*. At II. 173-76 he says:

salve, magna parens frugum, Saturnia tellus,
ma
gna virum: tibi res antiquae laudis et arte
ingredior sanctos ausus recludere fontes,
Ascreaumque cano Romana per oppida carmen.

Hail, great mother of harvests, land of Saturn, great mother of heroes: in your honor I begin on themes of ancient glory and on a skill, bold to open up springs of inspiration, and through Roman towns I sing a Hesiodic song.

Here a claim to primacy resides in the verb *recludere* and the language echoes Lucretius’; but Hesiod remains the acknowledged master. The claim to primacy is even more powerful in the prooemium to Book III (10-13 *primus...primus...*), but there the primacy is confined to Italy. The poet also expresses a longing for poetic fame which he can only achieve by avoiding the hackneyed themes of Greek mythology (3-9). A third passage (III. 289-93) alludes expressly to Lucretius:

nec sum animi dubius verbis ea vincere magnum
quam sit et angustis hunc addere rebus honorem;
sed me Parnasi deserta per ardua dulcis
raptat amor; iuvat ire iugis, qua nulla priorum
Castaliam molli devertitur orbita clivo.

But my mind is in no doubt how mighty a task it is to master these themes in words and add poetic distinction to narrow topics. But sweet inspiration (*amor*) compels me to traverse deserted heights of Parnassus; it is my delight to scale ridges where no path of a predecessor turns aside to Castalia by an easy slope.

The allusion to Lucretius is clear in the word for word imitation of that poet’s anxiety about his task. For Lucretius the difficulty lay in the obscurity of his subject-matter. But for Virgil it lies in giving distinction to humble material (sheep and goats), and here he relies for a moment on the Lucretian distinction between form and content that had previously been implicitly denied; here it was practically useful. The Greek predecessor, as in Lucretius, can here be ignored from this point of view where originality must come from the difficult and innovating conjunction of subject-matter and style. This was a fact about poetic originality that Terence had recognized.
Propertius, unlike Virgil but like Horace the satirist, had to contend with obvious Latin predecessors. Poets like Catullus and Cornelius Gallus could not be overlooked; Catullus invented the genre of love-elegy with poem 68 and Gallus developed it. Propertius does not criticize either poet in order to establish a place for himself. His technique is to write literary history in a novel way. In II. 34 he finds a place for himself in a tradition that he traces as starting with Varro of Atax, then Catullus, then Calvus, then Gallus, and finally Propertius (85-94). But he precedes this list with a detailed treatment of Virgil's fame as poet of the Aeneid, the Eclogues, and the Georgics; this treatment (61-84) occupies more than twice the space devoted to elegiac love-poetry. This is a strange procedure, but its purpose (indeed it is the whole strategy of the passage in the poem) is certainly to define poets in terms of their subject-matter. This serves to limit Propertius' indebtedness to his Latin predecessors to subject-matter. But, as with Horace, this means that his claim to originality is left unimpaired, since, ex hypothesi, the genre being based on the personal experiences of the poet, his imitatio vitae must be his own, however widened and conditioned by reading and structured by literary experience. In fact Propertius actually claims to surpass both Calvus and Catullus simply because the unhappiness of his situation, which is the basis of his poetry, makes Cynthia who is the cause of it the most notorious beauty in literature (II. 25. 1-4).

Consequently Propertius follows earlier Latin poets in making a strong distinction between imitatio exemplorum and imitatio vitae. That left him as free as his predecessors to appeal to Greek poets on questions of technique and generic legitimacy. The paradox emerges that his imitatio vitae is confined to Latin predecessors; but his imitatio exemplorum is focussed on Greeks like Callimachus and Philetas, especially the former (in II. 1. 40; II. 34. 32; III. 1. 1-6; IV. 1. 64) who from earliest times provided Roman poets with the doctrinal apparatus of poetic technique. But a curious difficulty emerged from this for Propertius in his later poetry. He there proposed for himself the highly un-Callimachean subject-matter of the history of Rome (IV. 1. 1-70). He confesses however (57-64):

moenia namque pio conere disponere versu:
  ei mihi, quod nostro est parvus in ore sonus!
  sed tamen exiguo quodcumque e pectore rivi
  fluxerit, hoc patriae serviet omne meae.

Ennius hirsuta cingat sua dicta corona:
  mi folia ex hedera porrige, Bacche, tua,
  ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Umbria libris,
  Umbria Romani patria Callimachi.
Indeed I am set on trying to align the walls <of Rome> in patriotic poetry — alas for me, only a tiny tonal range is mine! Nevertheless whatever the trickle that shall flow from my tiny breast, every drop of it shall be in the service of my country. Let Ennius wreath his poetry with a shaggy crown: allow me, Bacchus, leaves from your own ivy so that Umbria may lord it, swollen with pride over my books of poetry, Umbria the homeland of the Roman Callimachus.

But, however Callimachean Propertius is able to make his proposal sound by referring to aetiology, this formulation with its patriotic devotion, is alien to the Greek poet. That is underlined by the fact that the smallness of scale and tone, which were in earlier poems treated as ideal virtues, turn out in this context to be weaknesses. Indeed the poet is here being compelled to appeal to Callimachus not for doctrine on technique but on subject-matter, and when a Roman predecessor is to be named he can only be Ennius, the very poet who had to be rejected in the recusatio III. 3, where Propertius’ small voice made it impossible for him to follow Ennius. But here in IV. 1 he is rejecting the earlier erotic subject-matter (to which he clung in III. 3) and the only Latin predecessor he can now name is Ennius. The difficulty arose from the possibility that Callimachus could revere Homer but declare him off limits for contemporary poetic imitation; he was therefore able to pour scorn on the Homeridae and their followers. That still left him with Hesiod as an acceptable model. But, unlike the high esteem in which later Greeks held Homer, later Roman poets could only regard Ennius as primitive and rough and quite unsuitable as a model. Propertius was therefore forced to make the traditional distinction between form and content in order to criticize Ennius and refuse him as a model for style, while acknowledging his distinction in Lucretian terms and following him in subject-matter. Propertius had no one like Hesiod to substitute for Ennius, and so he is here compelled to present himself as the Roman Callimachus by the very odd procedure of making Ennius Callimachean.

V. Conclusion

What I have tried to show is that the extraordinary way in which Roman literature took its first origins compelled poets for a century and a half to devise a complex and flexible theory of imitatio that was capable of defining their relationship to, and maintaining a distance, not only from Greek models but, even more, from predecessors in their

---

own language. One important aspect of the subsequent development and history of Roman poetry down to and including the age of Augustus can therefore be analyzed in terms of continual adaptations of that basic theory of *imitatio*. The constraints on Roman poets, as each sought for himself an undisputed place in the tradition, and their responses to those constraints, remained very much the same from the beginnings down to the death of Horace in 8 B.C. Already by that time new conditions had begun to take shape, and the new genius of Ovid had been devising new responses to those new conditions; they were to dominate poetic activity for the following century and beyond.²⁵

*Yale University*

---

²⁵I have explored this change in *Change and Decline: Roman Literature in the Early Empire* (University of California Press 1978), especially chapters 2 and 5.
The Romans of Cicero’s day were introduced to the old Latin poets at an early age; set to study them, along with their Greek models, under a grammaticus and to learn passages by heart. What impression they made on the child Cicero is not recorded. His defence of Archias professes devotion to literature, including poetry, from boyhood upwards, but does not particularize. Plutarch’s biography\(^1\) supplies the information that he wrote poetry himself while still a boy, that is to say by 89 B.C. at the latest, producing a work in tetrameters (presumably trochaic) called in Plutarch’s Greek Πόντιος Γλαύκος, “Glaucus in the sea.” The title, suggestive of a Hellenistic epyllion, could reflect the influence of the most notable Latin poet of the period, the now almost obliterated Laevius, whom Cicero never mentions. But the metre tells nothing. Laevius used it, but so had Lucilius in non-dramatic compositions.

Other poems followed and, if Plutarch is believed, carried Cicero into reputation as Rome’s leading poet and leading orator in one. Most of them were probably written in the eighties before he set out on his career in the law-courts, and Plutarch’s statement should mean on a conservative view that in the seventies and perhaps the sixties Cicero’s poetry enjoyed a considerable vogue — decades, to be sure, which seem to have been far from fruitful in this area. He must have been proud of it at the time, yet it is never mentioned in his surviving writings, except for the renderings of Aratus’ poem on astronomy. From the titles preserved it seems that the poet Cicero continued to look to Alexandria; the traditional Roman genres — drama, epic, satire — apparently did not inspire him. If we choose to draw the inference that at this stage Cicero was not the professed admirer of the early Roman

\(^1\) Vit. Cic. 2. 3.
poets which we later find him, there is nothing to gainsay it. His juvenile work on rhetoric, *De inventione*, contains eight illustrative quotations from them, but three of these seem to have been borrowed from the treatise *Ad Herennium* or a common source. The speeches of the years prior to his Consulship contain only one clear quotation, from Ennius, in the defence of Roscius of Ameria.² Allusions are rare too. There is one in the same speech³ to a situation in Caecilius’ comedy *The Changeling* and another in the defence of Caecina,⁴ where the name “Phormio” recalls the title role in Terence’s play. A reference to the Plautine pimp Ballio in the defence of the actor Roscius⁵ can be discounted as arising from his client’s acting of the part. Admittedly the introduction of such allusions, and still more of actual quotations, by a young advocate might be felt as something of a liberty. In the *Pro Roscio Amerino*⁶ he does in fact apologize to the court and even pretends to be uncertain of the name of one of Caecilius’ characters. But, as will presently be seen, the case is much the same with the consular and for some years with the post-consular speeches.

In his mid-forties, probably after a long interval, Cicero took again to verse-writing, but no longer just for art’s sake. The poems *On my Consulship* — a theme which also inspired him to prose, both Latin and Greek — and *On my vicissitudes* (*De temporibus meis*, i.e. his exile and restoration), like the later, probably unpublished, compositions on Julius Caesar and on Britain, were topical, if not tendentious. And so perhaps essentially was the mysterious *Marius*, if it belongs to this epoch. We may conjecture that the banishment of his great co-townsman was its principal theme, seeing that both the two significant fragments⁷ seem to have to do with that episode. It was probably about this time, in the early fifties, that Latin poetry entered on a new, exciting phase with the advent of Catullus and his fellow-neoterics (I use the term without prejudice). They too looked to Alexandria, but more especially to Callimachus and Euphorion of Chalcis. Hence Cicero’s reference in his *Tusculan Disputations*⁸ to his *cantoribus Euphorionis* — whatever exactly he meant by *cantoribus*. For myself I am inclined to agree with the *Oxford Latin Dictionary*: “one who sings the praises
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² *Rosc. Am.* 90.
⁴ *Caec.* 27.
⁵ *Rosc. com.* 20.
⁷ Cic. poet. fr. 7 and 8 (Morel).
⁸ *Tusc.* 3. 45.
(of),’’ given the analogous uses of *canto* and *ceno*; that does not mean that the associations with song and recitation were absent from Cicero’s mind. Indeed, I suspect that he was not entirely clear himself which of several possible senses he intended, and chose the phrase for its contemptuous ring. However that may be, it appears beyond reasonable doubt that these *cantores Euphorionis* are practically to be identified with the “new poets,” *oēwēperoi*, casually but slightly mentioned in a letter to Atticus9 of the year 50, and again, as *novi poetae*, in the *Orator*.10 This of course debouches into another and more important controversy, in which I can only subscribe to Oliver Lyne’s opinion11 that in the context *oēwēperoi* must refer to a recognized group of writers, though the term itself need not and probably should not be taken for a recognized label. The novelties of theme and technique which these writers introduced, not to speak of their poetic merits, will have made Cicero’s juvenile essays look *vieux jeu*. Hence perhaps his disapproval. Literary antagonism did not rule out friendly personal contacts, such as existed between Cicero and Catullus’ best-known “neoteric” associate Calvus — with whom he also disagreed on the theory and practice of oratory. Nor am I one of those who detect sarcasm in Catullus’ *disertissime Romuli nepotum*. But Cicero’s depreciatory remarks about the group are positive evidence of a dislike which could have been surmised even without them, first from the absence in his writings of any reference to individual contemporary Latin poets other than himself and his brother (apart from the incidental mention of Lucretius and one Sallustius in a well-known passage of his correspondence12); and second, from his own abandonment of poetic composition, or at any rate publication, in the mid-fifties. E. M. Morford writes in his article “Ancient and modern in Cicero’s poetry”:13 “...it is a fair supposition that disgust at the trend of Roman poetry in the hands of the younger set in part drove him to turn his back finally on poetry.” But why the disgust? Cicero’s personal vanity had better not be left out of the reckoning. His nose had been put out of joint.

Resenting the new movement, Cicero might naturally go out of his way to make much of the early authors whom the newcomers decried. Not that I question the common view that national sentiment, or jingoism or chauvinism if preferred, was involved, as it also was in
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9 *Attr.* 7. 2. 1.
10 *Orat.* 161.
12 *Q. fr.* 2. 10(9). 3.
his exaggerated appreciation of the elder Cato's oratory and of the wealth of the Latin language. It is worth noting that he shows no such partiality to the Roman historians, but there he has an axe to grind: Rome needed a new and better historian, Cicero.\textsuperscript{14} However, the uprush of the old poets precisely in his speeches of 56-54 is likely to be more than a coincidence.\textsuperscript{15} Quintilian\textsuperscript{16} remarks that quotations from Ennius and company are found chiefly (\textit{praecipue}) in Ciceronian oratory, though Asinius Pollio and those who immediately followed him (\textit{qui sunt proximi}) often introduced them. That seems to imply that Cicero was the first to do this, and that his closer contemporaries, such as Caelius, Calidius, and Caesar, did not follow suit.

Out of thirteen extant speeches belonging to the years 63 to 57 the only one to quote from this literature, unless we count a corrupt scrap in \textit{Leg. Agr.} 2. 93 and a few words in \textit{Post. red. in sen.} 33 which derive from Accius' \textit{Atreus}, is the \textit{Pro Murena} of 63, which has a line from the \textit{Annals} of Ennius, who is called \textit{ingeniosus poeta et auctor valde bonus}, on the relationship between peace and the rule of law,\textsuperscript{17} and another from some tragedy.\textsuperscript{18} The defence of the poet Archias in the following year before a court presided over by Quintus Cicero (a better poet than Marcus, as Marcus was later to tell him) is much concerned with poetry, but not specifically with Latin poetry. Archias, of course, composed in Greek. Ennius, \textit{noster ille Enniius}, is mentioned thrice, Accius once, but only as germane to the discourse.\textsuperscript{19}

Now take 56-54. The \textit{Pro Sestio} of February or March 56 quotes the \textit{oderint dum metuant} passage from Accius' \textit{Atreus}, and a section on theatre demonstrations, apologetically introduced, naturally cites the relevant passages from the plays concerned, not without a complimentary reference to Accius, whom Cicero could remember personally.\textsuperscript{20} Accius is also quoted and complimented in the \textit{Pro Plancio}\textsuperscript{21} of 55 or 54. The opening lines of Ennius' \textit{Medea} (the most often quoted passage in Cicero) embellish the defence of Caelius; another part of that

\textsuperscript{14}\textit{Laws} 1. 5 ff.
\textsuperscript{15}As was recognized by W. Zillinger (\textit{Cicero und die altrömischen Dichter} [diss. Würzburg, 1911, pp. 67 ff.]), who, however, merely associates the phenomenon with the delight in quotation displayed in the contemporary \textit{De oratore}.
\textsuperscript{16}Quint. 1. 8. 11.
\textsuperscript{17}The passage is cited at greater length in two later letters.
\textsuperscript{18}\textit{Mur.} 30, 60.
\textsuperscript{19}\textit{Arch.} 18, 22, 27.
\textsuperscript{20}\textit{Sest.} 102, 117-23, 126.
\textsuperscript{21}\textit{Planc.} 59.
speech has several citations from Roman comedy (one of them perhaps five lines long), with the Terentian cliché *hinc illae lacrimae* later to follow.\textsuperscript{22} The speech *On the consular provinces* has no quotations, but does contain a reference to Ennius as *summus poeta*.\textsuperscript{23} *De harmonium responsis* has theatrical allusions in § 39. Ennius (*summus ille poeta noster*) is twice quoted in the defence of Balbus\textsuperscript{24} and twice in that of Rabirius Postumus,\textsuperscript{25} since *poeta ille noster* in § 28 is surely he. Ennius, Accius, and Plautus come under contribution in different parts of *In Pisonem*\textsuperscript{26} and a tragedian unnamed in the fragmentary defence of Scaurus.\textsuperscript{27} Only the short *Testimony against Vatinius* of 56 lacks all poetical reference; but a letter\textsuperscript{28} reveals that the defence of Vatinius in the same year used a scene in Terence's *Eunuch* to illustrate the orator's situation vis-à-vis the optimates. The six verses in the letter had presumably been recited in court.

After 54 Cicero's urge to quote in public seems to have flagged, or perhaps the nature of the speeches partly accounts for the falling off. The defence of Milo offers nothing in this way, the three *Caesarianae* only a single line from an unknown tragedy.\textsuperscript{29} The *Philippics* are mostly barren: the first has Accius' *oderint dum metuant* again; the second two scraps, one from Naevius (*poeta nescioquis*) and the names of Phormio, Gnatho, and Ballio as typical rascals; the thirteenth another half-line of unknown origin and a phrase adapted from Lucilius.\textsuperscript{30}

In 56-55 Cicero wrote his three Books *On the orator*, first in the series of tracts on rhetoric and philosophy which continued almost to the end of his life, interrupted only by the Proconsulate and the Civil War. Like nearly all of them, it abounds in citations from Latin poetry. As in his speeches, he felt himself precluded from quoting Greek authors in the original, though they sometimes appear in his own translations. The practice of poetic quotation was endemic in Cicero's Greek sources; Chrysippus especially indulged in it *ad nauseam*.\textsuperscript{31} But for Cicero it served not only as literary seasoning but also to air his
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\textsuperscript{22} Caec. 18, 36-38, 61.
\textsuperscript{23} Prov. cons. 20.
\textsuperscript{24} Balb. 36, 51.
\textsuperscript{25} Rab. Post. 28, 29.
\textsuperscript{26} Pis. 43, 61, 82.
\textsuperscript{27} Scaur. 3.
\textsuperscript{28} Fam. 1, 9, 19.
\textsuperscript{29} Deiot. 25.
\textsuperscript{30} Phil. 1, 34; 2, 65, 104, 15; 13, 49, 15.
\textsuperscript{31} Diog. Laert. 7, 18, 1.
enthusiasm for the good old writers whom Euphorion’s disciples scorned. The quotations in De oratore amount to almost 50, a number exceeded only in the Tusculans.

In his extant letters, which in total volume almost equal the rhetorica and the philosophica combined, Cicero was not inhibited from quoting Greek, at least to certain correspondents, including Atticus and his brother. The three Books of letters to the latter, dating from 59 to 54, contain ten or eleven quotations from Greek poets, most of them from Homer, and only one from Latin, to which may be added an allusion to Lucilius.32 Greek quotations also predominate in the Atticus correspondence, but some thirty from Latin are scattered among its sixteen Books. Ad familiares has about as many. Among the “friends” Trebatius Testa and Papirius Paetus get five apiece. Paetus is the only correspondent to produce quotations of his own, from a tragedy of Accius and a comedy of Trabea, except for a line of Pacuvius put in by Caelius Rufus. The letters to Marcus Brutus of 43 contain a line from Plautus’ Trinummus and another from an unknown play, the latter already quoted to Atticus many years previously.

The quotations in the Letters presumably came spontaneously from memory and should offer the most significant pointer to Cicero’s taste and knowledge in this field. About one in five occur more than once in the letters and about one in four occur also in the published works. Thus about half the total are demonstrated as tags firmly rooted in Cicero’s mind. The most favored authors are Ennius (especially Annals and Medea) and Terence, though two of the latter’s six plays, Adelphi (!) and Hecyra are unrepresented. Lucilius, Naevius, and Accius are sparse, and a single quotation apiece represents Pacuvius, Plautus, Caecilius, Trabea, Turpiliius, Afranius, and Atilius. However, some fifteen of uncertain origin without doubt come mostly from one or other of the three tragedians.

Reverting now to the speeches and treatises, we find Ennius again far out in the lead with, on a rough reckoning exclusive of repeats,33 32 citations from the Annals, 65 from tragedies, and six from other works. Of 43 to be ascribed with more or less assurance to particular plays, ten come from Medea, which thus keeps pride of place; but Thyestes, Andromache, and Alcmaeon score between five and eight. At least eight

32 Q. fr. 3. 4. 2.

33 The statistics were compiled independently, but may be compared with the data in Zillinger (see above, note 15). They are presented as indicative of Cicero’s taste and range, not as absolute, which no such statistics well could be, given the many uncertainties of attribution and other variables.
more are represented in the assigned fragments. Pacuvius and Accius follow with 22 and 30 citations respectively and eight or nine assignable plays apiece, the latter's *Atreus*, with perhaps ten citations, being a particular favorite. Naevius crops up occasionally, once in the second *Philippic*, twice in the *Orator*, once in *De senectute* (the play is named, *The wolf*), and with the well-worn *laetus sum laudari me abs te, pater, a laudato viro* in the *Tusculans*.\(^{34}\) Upwards of 50 fragments of doubtful authorship are nearly all from tragedy. In comedy, Terence, commended to Atticus for the elegance of his Latin, remains an easy favorite with 23 citations from five plays; but *Adelphi* scores only three, *Hecyra*, as in the letters, zero. One verse cited as from Terence in the tract *On the nature of the gods* is not to be found in our texts — presumably a lapse of memory on Cicero's part. Caecilius can boast thirteen fragments, three of them from his *Young comrades* (*Synepehebi*). Plautus, on the other hand, fares no better, proportionately, than in the letters; three out of four citations come from *Trinummmus* (one of them in the *De inventione*, but found also in *Ad Herennium*), one from *Aulularia*. Quotations from the smaller comic fry are very scarce; Afranius and Trabea have two each, Turpilius one. Atellan farce is represented by two examples from *Novius* in *De oratore*. Lucilius comes out strongly with fifteen. The only non-dramatic citation, apart from Ennius and Lucilius, is of an epigram by the elder Catulus.

Passing to Cicero's personal comments, one has to own that these do not amount to very much. In the *Brutus* and elsewhere he shows himself an expert and perspicacious critic of his fellow-orators, and his sketch of Roman historiography in the *Laws* is sufficiently incisive and discriminating. But he nowhere takes a similarly comprehensive look at the poets, and what he says of them individually rarely goes beyond banalities. In his speeches Ennius is favored with the titles *summus poeta* and *ingeniosus poeta*, as we have seen, and in the *Tusculans*\(^ {35}\) Cicero is moved at one point to exclaim *O poetam egregium!* and *Praeclarum carmen!* Accius too in the *Pro Sestio* is *summus poeta*, *gravis ille et ingeniosus poeta*, *doctissimus poeta*, whereas Pacuvius, least quoted of the three, is merely *bonus poeta*, in *De oratore*.\(^ {36}\) So it comes as something of a surprise that the little work *De optimo genere oratorum* (§ 2) gives Pacuvius primacy among Roman tragedians, though so far as Ennius is concerned that may have been because he had already been awarded the prize for epic. The same passage puts Caecilius first for comedy (but with a "perhaps"), despite the poor latinity of which he

\(^ {34}\) *Tusc*. 4, 67; cf. *Fam*. 5. 12. 7; 15. 6. 1.

\(^ {35}\) *Tusc*. 3. 45 ff.
stands accused in a letter to Atticus, by contrast with the purity of Terence’s. Horace’s judgments in his Epistle to Augustus will be recalled. It is of interest to compare the earlier comic canon of Volcacius Sedigitus. There too Caecilius comes first out of ten, but Plautus is second, with an easy lead over the rest of the field. The obscure Licinius comes third, Naevius fourth (“when he warms up,” if my conjecture cum fervet is admitted), followed by Atilius, Terence, Turpilius, Trabea, Luscius, and, “for antiquity’s sake,” Ennius. The striking difference, of course, is Cicero’s relative neglect of Plautus (recognized by the omission of his name in the passage of Quintilian referred to above) and his cultivation of Terence, though this may merely reflect a current tendency. As the first century B.C. wore on, Roman schoolmasters would be likely to favor Terence for the quality on which Cicero remarks, the elegance of his diction. And that, I suppose, is why we have Terence complete, while four of his five superiors on Volcacius’ list are no more. Of dimidiate Menander I say nothing, since the authorship of that celebrated appraisal seems to remain in doubt. As for Lucilius, Cicero commends his wit in the same terms as Horace — urbanitas, sal, facete. The complimentary epithet doctus, however, is qualified in another place by the remark that Lucilius’ writings are “of a lighter sort,” ut urbanitas summa appareat, doctrina mediocris.

Of greater interest are a few scattered observations on lesser names, such as the criticism of Livius Andronicus in the Brutus: “The Latin Odyssey resembles a work of Daedalus, and Livius’ plays are not worth a second reading.” That is in line with Ennius’ contempt for Saturnians, though Naevius in the same passage gets kinder treatment: his Punic is like a sculpture by Myron (i.e. it stands somewhere between the primitive and the mature) and, granted that Ennius is the more finished craftsman, he ought not to have affected to despise an author for whom his practice demonstrated some respect. Also in the Brutus Afranius is noticed as “a very clever fellow” (homo perarguttus), “even eloquent — as a playwright.” Atilius, ranked by Volcacius immediately above Terence, is severely handled. The only

36 De orat. 2. 187.
37 Att. 7. 3. 10.
39 See above, note 16.
40 Fin. 1. 7.
41 Brut. 71.
42 Brut. 75-76.
43 Brut. 167.
quotation, in a letter to Atticus, is followed by the comment: "Not very neat — the writer is Atilius, a very harsh versifier (poeta durissimus)." Exactly what Cicero found amiss in the offending iambic tetrameter is uncertain, but durissimus will refer, at least primarily, to technique, as does in my opinion durius in Quintilian's famous pronouncement on Cornelius Gallus. In De finibus Atilius' version of Sophocles' Electra is adduced as an example of poor work, with the added information that Licinius (Lincus?) called him ferreus scriptor. And yet, Cicero adds, he should be read, "for to be unread in our native poets is to be scandalously lazy or else daintily supercilious."

A search in Cicero's works for obiter dicta on early Latin poetry in general is seldom rewarding, but there is interest, and consolation, in the remark (in the Orator) that the rhythm in comic senariai is sometimes barely perceptible. So the schoolboys of Westminster performing Terence as prose might have had Cicero's indulgence, if not his blessing.

Himself a translator from Greek originals, Cicero might be expected to comment at some point on this aspect of Roman verse, dramatic verse at least. In fact he has left two statements on the subject, so contradictory as to raise doubts about the quality of thought and degree of attention he spared for such matters. In his Academic questions he says that Ennius and his successors reproduced the import of their models, not the words: non verba sed vim Graecorum. Yet in De finibus, written the same year, they are described as word for word translators (fabelas ad verbum e Graecis expressas). In both passages Cicero says what it suits his argument to say; but in one of them, that is in De finibus, he is wrong. The Latin tragedies were not literal translations; that much is clear from the survivals.

The Romans, we read in the Tusculans, had been slow to recognize the importance of poetry, and Roman poetry had been held back thereby; but its luminaries were no unworthy match for the glorious

44 Att. 14. 20. 3.
45 Fin. 1. 5.
46 Orat. 184.
48 Acad. 1. 10.
49 Fin. 1. 4.
50 Even allowing for an element of exaggeration in the phrase ad verbum expressas; cf. Ter. Ad. 10-11 eum hic locum sumpsit sibi / in Adelphos, verbum de verbo expressum extulit.
51 Tusc. 1. 3.
Greeks. How assiduously did Cicero read their works? He was at any rate a frequent and knowledgeable play-goer, highly sensitive to the popular demonstrations which often met celebrities like himself as they entered the theatre. A precious passage in a letter to Atticus\[^52\] of 54 illustrates:

I returned to Rome on 9 July and went to the theatre. To begin with, the applause was loud and steady as I entered — but never mind that, I am a fool to mention it. To proceed, I saw Antipho, who had been given his freedom before they put him on stage. Not to keep you too long in suspense, he won the prize; but never have I seen such a weedy little object, not a scrap of voice, not a — but never say I say so! As Andromache at least he stood head and shoulders above Astyanax! ...Now you'll want to know about Arbuscula: first-rate!\[^53\]

But for most of his life Cicero was a very busy man, and there is small likelihood and no evidence that such time as he had left for reading was largely spent on the Latin poets. He had other fish to fry.

Then there is the wider question of Cicero's response to poetry as such. Everyone will think of the purple patch in *Pro Archia*.\[^54\]

Rightly, then, did our great Ennius call poets "holy," for they seem recommended to us by the benign bestowal of God. Holy then, gentlemen, in your enlightened eyes let the name of poet be, inviolate hitherto by the most benighted of races! The very rocks of the wilderness give back a sympathetic echo to the voice; savage beasts have sometimes been charmed into stillness by song; and shall we, who are nurtured upon all that is highest, be deaf to the appeal of poetry?

Eloquent, certainly, but not very revealing. The speech dilates on the moral and recreational value of poetry, but much more on its capacity to immortalize famous men. It tells us nothing directly about Cicero's aesthetic sensibilities. But Seneca has preserved his derogatory opinion of the Greek lyricists; and there is a significance not to be overlooked in his admiration for his client's talent for improvising:

...how often, I say, have I seen him, without writing a single letter, extemporizing quantities of excellent verse dealing with current topics! How often have I seen him, when recalled, repeat his original

\[^{52}\text{Att. 4. 15. 6.}\]

\[^{53}\text{Some things do not change. Horace Walpole wrote to Sir Horace Mann of an eighteen-century Antipho (Letters of Horace Walpole, ed. P. Cunningham [London 1857-59], 1, p. 168): "His acting I have seen, and may say to you, who will not tell it again here, I see nothing wonderful in it; but it is heresy to say so."}\]

\[^{54}\text{Pro Archia Poeta 18 ff. (tr. N. H. Watts [London 1923]).}\]
matter with an entire change of word and phrase!\textsuperscript{55}

One almost expects to be told that he did it standing on one leg. Horace would not have applauded these exhibitions: neither, I fancy, would Catullus. True, Cicero was addressing a jury less literary than himself. But the president of the court was his brother, who later turned out Latin versions of four Sophoclean tragedies in sixteen days during a quiet spell in Gaul.\textsuperscript{56} Cicero approved.

Poets, says the \textit{Pro Archia}, should, according to the best authorities, be considered "holy" because, unlike other artists, who depend on knowledge, rules, and technique, the poet's power comes from Nature and a kind of divine inspiration. Similarly in \textit{De oratore}:\textsuperscript{57} "I have often heard (and they say Democritus and Plato have left it in their writings) that no good poet can come into being without a kindling of spirit and an afflatus of something akin to frenzy." This somewhat one-sided view is suggestive, not in itself, but as showing what Cicero's abstract pronouncements show so often, a victory of acquired doctrine over personal experience. Archias' displays were poetry, at least for Cicero. Were they a product of nature and Platonic frenzy? Were his own \textit{Aratea}? It would seem that he never thought about poetry carefully enough to ask such questions. I do not think G. B. Townend is quite correct when he says:\textsuperscript{58} "Ultimately it must be recognized, as Cicero himself did in moments of depression, simply that he lacked inspiration." Townend was thinking, I imagine, of Cicero's excuse in a letter to his brother, who was urging him to verse composition; \textit{abest ἐνθουσιασμός}. All Cicero meant by that was that he was too busy and bothered at that particular time to develop this \textit{sine qua non}. But whether he knew it or not, he \textit{did} lack inspiration, \textit{all} the time. And it failed to excite him in contemporary genius: blind to Catullus, purblind to Lucretius. As for the old masters, his enjoyment of a bravura passage like Ennius' \textit{o pater, o patria, o Priami domus!} was surely genuine; and it is to Cicero that we owe the preservation of a large proportion of their surviving lines. For that let us be duly thankful, even while we discern an ironic possibility that it was less patriotic pride or literary pleasure than the potent impulse of punctured self-esteem which made him their champion.

\textit{Harvard University}

\textsuperscript{55}\textit{Ibid.}, 18.

\textsuperscript{56}\textit{Q. fr.} 3. 5. 7 (3. 6).

\textsuperscript{57}\textit{De orat.} 2. 194; cf. \textit{Tusc.} 1. 6. 4.

\textsuperscript{58}\textit{In Cicero} (ed. T. A. Dorey, [London 1965]), p. 123.
Catullus, Ennius, and the Poetics of Allusion

JAMES E. G. ZETZEL

It is this backward motion toward the source,
Against the stream, that most we see ourselves in,
The tribute of the current to the source.

Robert Frost, *West-Running Brook*

Almost since Catullus’ own lifetime, it has been axiomatic to any discussion of the so-called new poetry that one of the primary aspects of its novelty lies in its rejection of earlier Roman poetry. The new poets, we are told, turned away from the clumsy style and heroic subjects of earlier Latin literature; they adopted instead the manner and the matter of Alexandrian poetry, particularly of Callimachus. They wrote urbane short poems and recondite epyllia; they made use of Greek words in transliteration and of learned allusions after the manner of the Alexandrians; they polished the hexameter to such a degree that Catullus, in poem 64, shows not a single violation of Hermann’s Bridge. In short, it would seem, the poetry of the neoterics is Greek in all but its use of the Latin language.

To some degree, this description of neoteric style is exaggerated; but it is salutary to remember that there are still reputable scholars who look on Catullus 64 as a translation of a lost Greek original, and Giangrande has tried to identify the model as a product of the school of

---

1 In keeping with the original form of this paper as a lecture, I have added relatively little annotation. The main changes have been occasioned by the appearance, since I delivered the oral version, of Richard F. Thomas’ article (below, note 7), whose examination of Ennian influence on Catullus 64. 1-18 is more detailed than my own, but with whose approach (as will be seen) I disagree. I am grateful to my wife, Susanna Stambler, for her improvements of this article, and to the other speakers and audience at the University of Minnesota for their helpful comments.
Rhianus Cretensis. Few indeed would go so far as that, but the possibility of any extensive debt of Catullus, at least in his longer poems, to the masterpieces of early Roman literature is one that leaves many critics profoundly uneasy. Of the use of Ennius in Catullus 64, C. J. Fordyce remarked that "Alexandrian artifices are imposed on the traditional style of the Latin hexameter as it had come down from Ennius." In other words, in this interpretation Catullus was influenced by Ennius only in so far as such influence was the unavoidable result of their shared use of the Latin language and the dactylic hexameter. What is significant in Catullus’ style is thus the Alexandrian artifice; the Ennian elements are only there because they had to be.

It would be perverse to suggest that Catullus or any of his fellow-neoterics nursed a deep and abiding admiration for archaic Roman literature, but it would be equally foolish to ignore what use is made in Catullus both of archaic diction and of reminiscences of specific passages of Ennius’ poetry. It is clearly not the case that Catullus wished to emulate the forms or the style of Ennian epic. The neoterics preferred to compose epigrams, lyrics and epyllia, not epic. Annals, the form most closely associated with Ennius, were the object of neoteric scorn, deemed suitable for fish-wrappings in poem 95, described as *cacata charta* in poem 36. As a follower of Callimachean theory, Catullus rejected epic, both in terms of its style and in terms of its subject, and no collection of Ennian allusions should be taken to suggest anything else. The goal of this paper is to suggest, however, that Catullus was not totally scornful of archaic Roman poetry. In the first place, Ennius provided a Roman equivalent for the Alexandrians’ use of Homeric diction. And, in the second place, allusions to specific passages of Ennius, like allusions to other authors, are an instrument for conveying poetic meaning. As for the Alexandrians, an imitation of a specific earlier text was often meant to draw the reader’s attention to the similarities or differences between the two works, to provide a subtext of allusions which might reflect on the surface argument of a

---


poem.  

The interpretation of literary allusions is not easy, and not all critics agree on their significance. Richard Thomas, in the most recent discussion of poetic references in Catullus 64, sees the allusions to Ennius, as to other poetic predecessors both Latin and Greek, as polemical in nature: "...A great deal of the intent of the New Poetry is to modify, conflate and incorporate prior treatments. Through this method the poet rejects, corrects or pays homage to his antecedents, and — the ultimate purpose — presents his own and superior version." In other words, the purpose of literary allusions in Catullus is, quite simply, to demonstrate the ability to make literary allusions. The goal of the learned poet is no more than to demonstrate his learning.

No one would deny that the poeta doctus was interested in displaying his erudition, or that at least a part of the pleasure of writing and reading such poetry was to feel the warm glow of superiority to less learned poets and readers. But a poetry that existed primarily for the purpose of displaying learning would be remarkably sterile; and while it may be an apt characterization of, for example, Lycophron or Nicander, it seems scarcely adequate to Catullus 64 or to Callimachus himself. While such poets were, to an extraordinary degree, self-conscious in their deliberate manipulation of the details of language and meter, this technical mastery was not an end in itself, for either the Alexandrians or their Roman imitators.

Although the main purpose of this article is to indicate some of the ways in which allusions contribute to the larger goals of Catullus' poetry, it may be useful to point out that even technical details are manipulated in Catullus 64 in the service of larger goals. We tend to think, following Cicero, that the spondaic hexameter was the hallmark of neoteric style; indeed, Catullus 64 shows the highest proportion of such verses in Latin poetry, having, on the average, one every 14 lines. But even such a deliberate mannerism is by no means evenly distributed. There is not a single spondaic verse in the 70 lines of Ariadne's speech, and only one (and that a Greek proper name) in any speech in the poem. On the other hand, there are seven in the 25 lines of the initial description of Ariadne, three in the 14 lines describing the

6An excellent example of the importance of allusion for the interpretation of Alexandrian poetry will be found in A. Bulloch, "Callimachus' Erysichthon, Homer and Apollonius Rhodius," American Journal of Philology 98 (1977), pp. 97-123.


8On this feature, see J. Bramble, "Structure and Ambiguity in Catullus LXIV,"
appearance of Dionysus, and seven in the 38 lines concerning the arrival of the divine wedding-guests. In other words, the mannerism is manipulated, and was felt to have certain distinct purposes: no matter how fond Catullus may have been of spondaic verses, he thought them appropriate for descriptive passages, but not for direct speech.

Other stylistic features have a similarly uneven distribution. R.O.A.M. Lyne has analyzed the use of verses with a main trochaic caesura in the third foot, and notes their tendency to cluster to create an effect. He also points out Catullus' tendency to give sequences of "emphatically fourth-foot-homodyned lines" to similar effect. And linguistic archaisms show similar groupings: they cluster at the beginning of the poem, in the initial description of the coverlet, and in Ariadne's lament. As Lyne well remarks, "Catullus deploys archaisms as part of a general stylistic plan, as well as to achieve local and individual effect with each instance." 9

What is perhaps most relevant to our purpose here, however, is to note one curious feature of Catullus' use of marked stylistic mannerisms, that the passages which show the highest concentrations of archaic diction also show a high incidence of those features which we more customarily identify as neoteric. This combination is in fact a logical consequence of Catullus' Alexandrianism. Just as Callimachus joined Homeric language with his own coinages, so Catullus combined archaic and modern features. As Clausen remarks in connection with the opening verses of Catullus 64: "All this — and these three lines are typical of the poem throughout — might seem but an absurd confusion of Hellenistic artifice, with Ennius doubling for Homer; yet the voice of Catullus does emerge, powerfully if obliquely." 10 It will be suggested below that Catullus' reminiscences of Ennius, like Callimachus' allusions to early Greek poetry, can refer as much to context and content as to diction alone.

Stylistic mannerisms, however skilfully deployed, can only impart a general tone to a passage or poem; specific allusions have a much more pointed effect. Consider, for example, Catullus' poem on his brother's grave (101):

Multas per gentes et multa per aequora uectus
aduenio has miseras, frater, ad inferias....


9 On these features, see R.O.A.M. Lyne, ed., Ciris (Cambridge 1978), pp. 18-23, 27 ff. The quotation is from p. 28.

10 Clausen (above, note 5), p. 188.
It is not mere adornment or polemic that leads Catullus to mark the description of his voyage to Troy by a clear allusion to the opening lines of the *Odyssey*, nor is it coincidental that an allusion to both these passages is found in Anchises' words to Aeneas in the underworld (*Aen.* VI. 692-93):  

Quas ego te terras et quanta per aequora uectum 
accipio! quantis iactatum, nate, periclis!  

It is eminently appropriate to Catullus' linking of his brother's death with the death of *virtus* and his vision of the Trojan War as the death, not the apex, of the heroic age (68. 89 ff.) that he portray his eastern voyage as a backward *Odyssey*, an anti-*nostos*. And it is equally appropriate that Virgil not only include an allusion to the opening of the *Odyssey* at the end of the Odyssean half of his poem but also reverse Catullus' poem by having the dead speak to the living, not the living to the dead, in Homer's words.  

Not all allusions to previous literature have a function beyond their immediate context, even if we are able to recognize them. When Catullus alludes to the opening lines of the *Iliad* at 64. 152 ff., there does not seem to be any particular resonance;  

13 when he translates the verse of an unknown Hellenistic poet at 64. 111 we have no idea why he does so. Even when he alludes to identifiable lines of Ennius in the opening of poem 64, there is no clear reason for us, or for the poet, to connect the sailing of the Argo to the departure of the Roman fleet in 190 B.C.  

14 But when he alludes to the opening of the *Odyssey* in poem 101, as mentioned above, or when he alludes to one of Sappho's epithalamia in 11. 22 ff., he clearly intended the learned reader to...  

---

11 On these passages see G. B. Conte, "Memoria dei poeti e arte allusiva," *Strumenti Critici* 16 (1971), pp. 325-33.  
12 On beginnings and ends, see below, note 28.  
13 On this passage, see J. E. G. Zetzel, "A Homeric Reminiscence in Catullus," *American Journal of Philology* 99 (1978), pp. 332-33. There have been three replies to this note, by R. Renehan, *AJP* 100 (1979), pp. 473-74, R. F. Thomas, *AJP* 100 (1979), pp. 475-76, and James H. Dee, *Transactions of the American Philological Association* 111 (1981), pp. 39-42. Of these, only that of Thomas seems to me at all cogent; but rather than reply in detail, I will simply point out that his suggestion that Catullus 64. 152 ff. is a commonplace rather than an allusion to *Iliad* I. 4 ff. seems to be refuted, according to his own methods in the article cited above (note 7), by Virgil's double imitation of the lines of both Homer and Catullus in *Aen.* IX. 485 ff. According to the same method, Ovid *Her.* 10. 96 shows that he at least recognized an allusion to Zenodotus' text of Homer in glossing *praeda* with *cibus*. Dee's suggestion that the allusion is unlikely because neither Callimachus nor Catullus was interested in Homer is both absurd and a misreading of the articles of Thomas and Lyne which he cites in justification.  
14 On this passage, see below, pp. 257-58.
compare the context in the source with his own adaptation and to use the original to enhance the appreciation and understanding of Catullus’ poem, not just to admire his *doctrina*.

The same effort of comparison and comprehension is demanded of the reader by most of Catullus’ identifiable allusions to Ennius, in both the epigrams and poem 64. Two epigrams allude to identifiable fragments of the *Annales*, and the technique of allusion is the same as that described above with reference to poem 101.¹⁵ The first of these is generally recognized by commentators on both poets. Catullus concludes poem 115, an ironic praise of Mamurra for his extensive properties, with the couplet (115. 7-8):

\[
\text{omnia magna haec sunt, tamen ipsest maximus ultro,} \\
\text{non homo, sed uero mentula magna minax.}
\]

The alliteration of the final words would alone lead one to suspect parody, and the source survives in a verse of the *Annales* (621 V):

\[
\text{Machina multa minax minitatur maxima muris.}
\]

Ennius is speaking of a siege engine, and Catullus of something rather smaller; but the recognition of the parody clearly enhances one’s appreciation of Catullus’ epigram.¹⁶

The other example of the use of the *Annales* in Catullus’ epigrams is less familiar. The last example in Latin poetry, and the only one in Catullus, of the dropping of final *s* occurs in the last line of the corpus of Catullus, in a poem to Gellius. Catullus states that he has in the past tried to soften Gellius’ attacks on him by seeking to send him poems of Callimachus; now, seeing that that is futile, he will protect himself and reply in kind (116. 7-8):

\[
\text{contra nos tela ista tua euitabimus †amitha} \\
\text{at fixus nostris tu dabi† supplicium.
}\]

This is not the only stylistic peculiarity in poem 116; the same epigram also contains the only purely spondaic hexameter in classical Latin poetry. The archaisms, like the alliteration in poem 115, lead one to suspect parody, especially since the reference to Callimachus suggests that the poem is likely to be concerned with literary polemics.¹⁷ Once

---

¹⁵Both passages are discussed by S. Timpanaro, *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina* (Rome 1978), p. 177, note 42.

¹⁶Vahlen *ad loc.* suggested that the context of Ennius’ line was Marcellus’ siege of Syracuse, but no certainty is possible.

¹⁷On this poem, see C. W. Macleod, "Catullus 116," *Classical Quarterly* 23 (1973), pp. 304-09.
more Ennius supplies a plausible model (99-100 V):

\[
\text{nec pol homo quisquam faciet impune animatus}
\]
\[
\text{hoc nec tu: nam mi calido dabis sanguine poenas.}
\]

Here the parody has a deeper purpose than in the preceding poem: Catullus is ceasing to send Gellius poems of Callimachus as signs of friendship, and is instead sending him weapons, weapons which are, in fact, Ennius. That opposition alone has an obvious literary significance, but it is also important to recognize the Ennian context: Romulus' words to Remus before killing him are transferred to Catullus' attack on one of his rivals.

A short poem does not provide scope for an elaborate set of allusions. In each of these cases, a single line in Catullus makes use of an Ennian reminiscence to add point to a joke, and the original context, whether it is the siege of Syracuse in the first case or the murder of Remus in the second, cannot be said to add more than a slight twist to the epigram and to permit the learned reader to savor his erudition. In the second case, of course, there is something more, because the fact that it is Ennius who is recalled is a deliberate foil to the mention of Callimachus in the second verse. What may be significant, however, in the larger context of the relationship of Catullus to Ennius, is that Catullus can expect his readers to be familiar with Ennius. The style of the earlier poet may be parodied or rejected, but knowledge of the text is a necessity.

It is possible to say rather more about the allusions to Ennius in Catullus 64 than about those in the shorter poems. Not only are there more allusions, but the majority of them seem to form a significant pattern, forcing the reader to recall the Ennian text and use it in interpreting Catullus' poem. Of the five recognizable allusions to Ennius in poem 64, four are to a single work, the Medea Exul, one to the Annales. The last, most recently discussed by Thomas, is of a different, and simpler, type than the others. As Thomas has pointed out,\textsuperscript{19} 64. 6-7:

\[
\text{ausi sunt uada salsa cita decurrere puppi,}
\]
\[
\text{caerula uerrentes abiegnis aequora palmis.}
\]

alludes to two adjacent fragments of the Annales (384-86 V):

\[
\text{uerrunt extemplo placide mare marmore flauo;}
\]
\[
\text{caeruleum spumat sale conferta rate pulsum.}
\]
\[
\text{labitur uncta carina, uolat super impetus undas.}
\]

\textsuperscript{18}I read \textit{nec} rather than \textit{ nisi} in line 100 following Baehrens and Valmaggi and \textit{ dabis} rather than \textit{ das} following Servius Auctus, Valmaggi and Timpanaro.

\textsuperscript{19}Thomas (above, note 7), pp. 156 ff.
The similarities between Catullus and Ennius here are in diction, not in word order or phraseology. As Thomas’ table of parallels suggests, Catullus chose to use these lines of Ennius not because of any contextual similarity between the sailing of the Roman fleet and the departure of the Argo, but because of his desire to use archaic language to evoke a mood.

Before attempting to draw any wide-reaching conclusions from the reminiscences of the *Medea Exul* in Catullus 64, it would be just as well to set them out in detail. The first is in the opening lines of the poem:

> Peliaco quondam prognatae uertice pinus
dicuntur liquidas Neptuni nasse per undas....

As has long been known, the first lines of poem 64 recall the opening of Ennius’ play (246 ff. V = 208 ff. J):

> Utinam ne in nemore Pelio securibus
caesae accidissent abiegnæ ad terram trabes....

Wilamowitz, stating as an obvious fact that Catullus was borrowing from Ennius, pointed out that the order of events in Catullus’ proem was not that of Euripides, who began from the passage through the Symplegades and then went back to the cutting of trees on Mt. Pelion, but that of Ennius, who related the events in strictly chronological order.20 There are several verbal reminiscences of Ennius in the opening lines: *Argiuæ robora pubis* recalls Ennius’ *Argiui in ea delecti uiri*, a phrase not found in Euripides’ prologue, and *auratam optantes Colchis auertere pellem* is, as Klingner notes, extremely close to Ennius’ *uecti petebant pellem inauratam arietis.*21 As Thomas has shown in detail, this passage displays a wide range of allusions; not only to Ennius, but to Apollonius, Euripides, and perhaps others as well.

The other three allusions to the *Medea Exul* occur quite close to one another, in Ariadne’s speech and the accompanying description. The first comes at 64. 171-72:

> Iuppiter omnipotens, utinam ne tempore primo
>Cnosia Cecropiae tetigissent litora puppes....

Although this passage also alludes to Euripides and Apollonius, there can be little doubt that it was meant to recall the first line of the *Medea*

---

Exul cited above. The same fragment of Ennius is also the source of a line in Catullus’ description of Ariadne, 64. 250:

multiplices animo uoluebat saucia curas,

which is clearly drawn from the last line of the opening fragment of the Medea Exul (254 V = 216 J):

Medea animo aegro amore saeuo saucia.

A different fragment of the play is the source for the final, and perhaps the most obvious, allusion to Ennius in Catullus 64, at lines 177-181:

Nam quo me referam? quali spe perdita nitar?
Idaeosne petam montes? at gurgite lato
discernens ponti truculentum diuidit aequor.
an patris auxilium sperem? quemne ipsa reliqui
respersum iuuenem fraterna caede secuta?

These lines are obviously modelled on Medea’s similar despair (276-77 V = 217-18 J):

Quo nunc me uortam, quod iter incipiam ingredi?
Domum paternamne anne ad Peliae filias?

A collection of allusions such as this poses obvious questions of interpretation, and the solution of “allusion for allusion’s sake” will not go far to help us. Thomas suggests that Catullus chose to start his tale of the wedding of Peleus and Thetis from the sailing of the Argo, a legend with which the marriage was not traditionally connected, because the multiplicity of versions of the story of the Argo lent itself to a display of massive erudition suitable for the poeta doctus. But if that is so, why does the proem of the Medea Exul appear not only at the opening of poem 64, but twice more in the ecphrasis describing Ariadne? Surely it would be better, even without considering the content of the poem, to believe at the very least that the use of the same model in both parts of the poem would assist in binding the narrative and the ecphrasis together.

If we set aside for the moment the question of why Catullus chose to allude specifically to Ennius’ treatment of the story of Medea, there are a number of reasons for which Catullus may have chosen to open his poem with the story of the Argo. Thomas is certainly right to stress that, prior to Catullus, the connection of Peleus and Thetis with

---

21Klingner (above, note 20), p. 159.
22Thomas (above, note 7), pp. 163 ff.
23So Bramble (above, note 8), pp. 37 ff.
the Argo is unimportant; but the connection of the voyage of the Argo with the story of Theseus and Ariadne has significant precedent in Apollonius. Clausen has pointed out that the story given by Catullus of Ariadne’s departure from Crete with the knowledge, if not the blessings, of her family is found before him in Apollonius III. 997 ff., where Jason is being highly misleading in his wooing of Medea.\(^2^4\) It is also significant that the marvelous garment given in book I of the *Argonautica* by Hypsipyle to Jason, the cloak on which the marriage of her grandparents Dionysus and Ariadne had been consummated, is used by Medea in Book IV to lure her brother Apsyrtus to his death.\(^2^5\)

The weddings of Peleus and Thetis in Catullus and of Jason and Medea in Apollonius have more in common than the shared presence of the bridegrooms on the Argo and the shared references to the tale of Theseus and Ariadne. Peleus and Thetis were not the only couple to have a remarkable coverlet on their wedding bed: Jason and Medea (*Argonautica* IV. 1141 ff.) consummated their marriage on the golden fleece itself. Unusual wedding songs were performed on both occasions, by the Parcae for Peleus and Thetis, by Orpheus for Jason and Medea. And, of course, the reversal of the traditional mythic chronology in Catullus 64 makes both marriages the direct result of the voyage of the Argo.\(^2^6\)

If we return then to the extraordinary concatenation of allusions to earlier treatments of the Argo at the opening of Catullus 64, it becomes quite clear that Catullus did not alter the traditional tales merely in order to be able to make learned allusions to previous versions, but that the allusions themselves provide an intertextual guide to the interpretation of the poem; the reader is meant to see the parallels between Peleus and Thetis on the one hand and Jason and Medea on the other. At the end of the proem, after he has described Thetis’ falling in love with Jason at first sight, Catullus delivers an apostrophe to the heroes of the Argo (64. 22-25):

\[
\text{O nimis optato saeclorum tempore nati} \\
\text{heroes, saluete, deum genus! o bona matrum}
\]


\(^2^5\)The cloak is described and identified at *Arg. IV.* 423-34; on this see also Clausen (above, note 5), pp. 191 ff. For my understanding of the importance of Ariadne in Apollonius and its relevance to Catullus 64 I owe much to an unpublished lecture of A. Bulloch and an unpublished article of Clifford Weber.

\(^2^6\)There is no need here to repeat the well-known alterations which Catullus made to the traditional tale of Peleus and Thetis; see Fordyce (above, note 3) on 64. 19 for a brief summary.
These verses constitute a reversal of hymnic convention, because the salutation and promise of future song belong to the end, not the beginning, of a hymn.\(^{27}\) And the specific model for this passage exists, at the very end of the *Argonautica* (IV. 1773-75):

\[
\text{'Ιλατ' ἄριστης, μακάρων γένος, αἴδε δ' ἀοιδαί}
\text{εῖς ἔτος ἐξ ἔτεος γλυκερώτεραι εἰεύν ἀείδειν}
\text{ἄνθρώποισ...}
\]

There are two possible reasons for the allusion to the end of the *Argonautica* at the beginning of Catullus’ poem. One is formal: that it seems to be a convention of Alexandrian and neoteric poetry to reverse beginnings and ends.\(^{28}\) But the other is thematic: the story of Peleus and Thetis, as presented by Catullus, is the sequel to the voyage of the Argo. And every reader would know that, in the traditional versions of Greek mythology, the usual sequel to the voyage of the Argo was not the wedding of Peleus and Thetis, but the tragedy of Medea.

That it is Medea and the *Medea* that are present in the opening lines of Catullus 64 is evident; Catullus begins by the obvious allusion to Ennius’ play. What is less frequently emphasized in discussions of the poem, however, is Catullus’ deliberate delay in mentioning his real subject. The putative first reader, coming to this poem without preconceptions and without the title which modern editors have supplied, would immediately assume, from the allusion and from the narrative, that the subject of the poem was Medea.\(^{29}\) It is not until line 19 that Catullus makes clear that it is Peleus and Thetis, not Jason and Medea, about whom he is writing, and then he does so emphatically, by repeating Thetis’ name in three successive lines. The point of that emphasis should be obvious: the poet intended to surprise the reader.

---

\(^{27}\) On the use of hymnic convention see Fordyce and Kroll *ad loc.* and Klingner (above, note 20), pp. 167 ff.

\(^{28}\) This characteristic does not seem to have been sufficiently recognized: but note that Catullus ends poem 64 with an allusion to the opening of Hesiod’s *Eoae* (fr. 1 M-W), and that the first major episode of Callimachus’ *Aetia* (frs. 7, 19-21 Pf) is an episode from the end of the voyage of the Argo, while the last episode (frs. 108-09 Pf) before the *Coma* comes from the beginning of the voyage.

The importance of Medea in the poem to Catullus 64 was rightly stressed more than 25 years ago by Friedrich Klingner, who saw the alterations of the tale as positive and optimistic in tone. Catullus, in his view, rewrote the story of Peleus and Thetis in such a way as to remove all unpleasant aspects of the tale: there is nothing here of Thetis’ unwillingness to wed Peleus, nothing of her subsequent abandonment of him. It is a romantic tale of love at first sight, of the highest peak of mortal happiness, to be contrasted with the unspeakable present adumbrated in the closing lines of the poem. In this view, the importance of Medea is that she is not there, that she functions as an unmentioned tragic foil to the bliss of the tale Catullus tells. More recent critics have paid less attention to the allusions, more to the contradictions and antitheses present in the poem itself: between the use of the word virtus and the unheroic deeds of both Theseus and Achilles which it is used to denote, between the surface brightness of the wedding song and the horrible human sacrifice and bloodthirstiness which it describes, between the happiness of Peleus and Thetis in the poem and the various disturbing elements which Catullus mentions or which were well known to readers from other versions of the tale. The allusions to the story of Medea seem to offer strong support to the latter version, since from the opening words of the poem Catullus makes certain that the reader has her in mind, and that can scarcely be supposed to portend a happy tale.

None of the references to the story of Medea as a whole, however, explains Catullus’ choice of the Medea Exul of Ennius as the specific source for his opening lines or for the later allusions in the Ariadne episode. But a number of reasons may be advanced. There is, in the first place, a generic argument, which applies to Catullus’ use of both Euripides and Ennius. It is obvious that Hellenistic poetry was highly indebted to Euripidean psychology and female characterization and that even Apollonius’ Medea was highly indebted to Euripides’. Furthermore, it is worth pointing out that the epyllion form in particular owes much to tragedy. Although it is formally a variety of epic, it is

30 Klingner (above, note 20), pp. 156-61.
31 The most important of these interpretations are those of Curran (above, note 29), Bramble (above, note 8) and D. Konstan, Catullus’ Indictment of Rome (Amsterdam 1977), with further bibliography. The attacks on such interpretations by Giangrande (above, note 2) and James H. Dee, “Catullus 64 and the Heroic Age: A Reply,” Illinois Classical Studies VII (1982), pp. 98-109 are unconvincing for reasons too numerous to list here. They rely on a cross-examination of individual words and lines without any attention to context, on an unwillingness to read Catullus 64 as a poem rather than a logical treatise, on ignoring all literary allusions, and on a failure to recognize that Roman poetry is different from Greek in more than language.
in many of its techniques a version of tragedy: the extensive use of direct speech, the eclipse of narrative, the emphasis on emotion and psychology are all characteristic of drama rather than of classical epic, and of Euripidean tragedy in particular. Nor is it coincidental that the fragments of the _Hecale_, Callimachus’ _epyllion_, show according to Pfeiffer significant linguistic affinities to Attic drama. If _epyllion_’s genre is epos, its mode is tragic, and it is only reasonable for a poet as learned as Catullus to demonstrate his understanding of his genre through the allusions employed.

As for the choice of Ennius over Euripides, several explanations are possible. In the first place, it is worth remembering that Ennius’ play had represented a development from Euripides’ along the lines suggested by Alexandrian poetry. Where Euripides described his Medea as ἔρωτι θυμὸν ἐκπλαγεῖσ’ ἱάνους, Ennius is animo aegro amore saeuo saucia. The emphasis on female passion is a clear example of Ennius’ debt to Hellenistic poetry, and it is a feature of Ennius’ style which Catullus obviously recognized. It is certainly not impossible that Catullus wished to demonstrate his knowledge that early Roman poetry, like his own (although to a much smaller degree), was indebted to Alexandrian poetry.

Another explanation, already mentioned, deserves further consideration, that, as Clausen observes, Ennius serves Catullus in some respects as an equivalent to Homer. But the debt of Catullus to Ennius is more than his use of the earlier poet as a source of archaisms with which to reproduce the Alexandrian taste for exquisite Homeric diction. The Alexandrian poets made Homer and other early poets the foils against which to operate: they explored their own peculiar desire to reshape the Homeric world by emphasizing poverty, domesticity, and the various unheroic qualities exemplified by Apollonius’ Jason while couching their new approaches in Homeric language. Catullus used Ennius in the same way, as a representative of early Roman poetry and life rather than as the author of a specific text. Catullus, and presumably his fellow-neoterics, desired to naturalize the techniques of Alexandrianism, to interpret and adapt the Roman past and poetic traditions. The large moral and historical themes of Catullus involve a questioning

32 See Pfeiffer on fr. 233.
of the values and meaning of the Roman, not the Greek tradition: not merely the use of annales as a poetic foil, not merely the explicit contrast of mythic past to Roman present at the end of poem 64, but consistently, through the questioning of the language of Roman public life in the epigrams, through the double-edged references to Caesar in poem 11 and to Cicero in poem 49, through the portraits of Acme and Septimius in poem 45. In order to anchor the myths of Greece in the Roman tradition, Catullus uses Ennius as a point of reference, as a source of archaic diction, as a conveyer of traditional ideas of heroism, and as a Roman.

All this may seem extremely subjective and impressionistic, but there is at least one piece of evidence that suggests the larger reasons for which Catullus turned to Ennius as a source of allusion, and to the Medea Exul in particular. In this connection it is worth citing again a few of the lines from Ariadne’s lament quoted above:

nam quo me referam? quali spe perdita nitar...
an patris auxilium sperem? quemne ipsa reliqui
respersum iuuenem fraterna caede secuta?

It has long been recognized that, in this context, the reference to a brother’s blood is rather strange: Ariadne’s brother (more precisely, half-brother) was none other than the Minotaur, a sibling whose death she can scarcely have regretted to any great extent. In the Ennian and Euripidean models, the reference to a brother’s death makes more sense: Medea had been responsible for the murder of Apsyrtus. What is significant, however, is that the passages of Ennius and Euripides in question make no mention of that unfortunate event; Catullus must have added it on his own. Some interpreters explain this passage by connecting it with the circumstances of Catullus’ own life, the intimate relationship of his feelings for Lesbia with his grief for his brother; and that explanation, while it cannot be pressed too far, has much to commend it. But there is also a literary explanation of some interest.


35On the peculiarity of Catullus’ reference, see, for example, Kroll on 64. 150; Konstan (above, note 31), p. 68.

36Konstan (above, note 31), p. 73, note 157 rejects it as “grotesque,” and it is obvious that there is no consistent metaphor employed. For the autobiographical interpre-
Catullus was not the first Roman to add a reference to a brother’s death to an imitation of these lines of Ennius; it had been done some 70 years earlier, in the last speech of Gaius Gracchus before his murder in 121 B.C. (fr. 61 ORF²):

quo me miser conferam? quo uortam? in Capitoliumne? at fratris sanguine redundat. an domum? matremne ut miseram lamentantem uideam et abiectam?

That Gracchus was imitating Ennius is obvious, and that Catullus was writing with full awareness of both passages ought to be.³⁷ Where Ennius has quo nunc me uortam? and Gracchus has quo me miser conferam? quo uortam?, Catullus has nam quo me referam?, changing the prefix of Gracchus’ verb in typically learned fashion.³⁸

It would not do to press the precise significance of this allusion too much. Gracchus, unlike the mythical heroines, had not caused his brother’s death, nor had Catullus. And one should not suggest that Catullus used Ennius’ Medea because Gracchus too had used it; it is used with far too many overtones to be explained so simply. Nevertheless, it was certainly a convenient coincidence, linking the great past of Roman literature with the beginning of social upheavals at Rome and thus with the decay of Roman values that is so important a motif for Catullus. Even if Ennius’ greatest work, the Annales, was not a text which could supply a model for Catullus either in its techniques or in its values, he remained, through his dramatic works, a poetic ancestor to be recognized and acknowledged. To recreate a true Alexandrianism at Rome, it was not enough to imitate the Greek poets slavishly. Cicero, in the Tusculan Disputations (3. 45), interrupted his quotation from Ennius’ Andromacha to address the poet:³⁹

O poetam egregium! quamquam ab his cantoribus Euphorionis contentitur.

If by scorn Cicero meant only the absence of uncritical admiration, he was of course right; but the neoterics were not mere cantores

³⁷Of recent commentators on Catullus only Quinn, to my knowledge, even cites the fragment of Gracchus, but he does not see the consequences. Jocelyn (above, note 33), p. 357 notes both allusions to Ennius, but does not connect them.


³⁹On this passage see, most recently, Lyne (above, note 4), pp. 166, 174 with further references.
Euphorionis and their poetry was Roman in more than language alone. Catullus, and presumably his friends as well, knew that it was necessary to do more than import Greek techniques to create a new poetry at Rome, that it had to be anchored in some way in their own heritage. They had the sense to understand that the rude origins of Latin literature had much to commend them, and that by acknowledging Ennius they could acquire a past on which to build.

This paper has concentrated on the interpretation of a small group of allusions to Ennius in Catullus, but has also involved some brief consideration of a number of larger questions about the nature of Alexandrianism and neotericism as a whole. And perhaps some final observations on that subject will not be out of place. Literary allusion is only part of the larger continuum of relationships between the poet and his past. Catullus may use an archaic word, he may imitate a passage of archaic poetry, he may talk about the relationship of historic or mythic past to the political or poetic present. The important fact, however, is that all these techniques are connected, and they are all significant. The new poet, like the Alexandrian, was concerned with the technical renewal of language, the recovery and renovation of old words. But the interest in old words is directly parallel to his attitude to old poems, and to old ideas. None is to be rejected out of hand, but all have, in one way or another, become stale, trite, or empty. Catullus, like Callimachus, wished to create a different poetics in a different world. Just as the super-human heroes of the Homeric poems had little place in Alexandria and were consequently revised on a smaller scale, so Catullus and his contemporaries rejected the stale words and ideas of Roman politics and military heroism in favor of more private worlds. But in neither the Greek nor the Roman case was that rejection unconditional; both the old poetry and the world of which it had been a part had once been glorious and still remained worthy of respect. If the new poets turned away from Ennius, they did not forget him.

Princeton University
Naevius and Virgil

GE ORG LUCK

There is a collection of J. J. Scaliger’s *Obiter Dicta*, written down by his friends and admirers and published under the title of *Scaligerana*, a fascinating book, reprinted many times: fascinating, because it shows the great scholar in a relaxed, often facetious mood, passing judgment — almost always in a final, apodictic manner — on some person, book, or issue. He was obviously expected to come up with an answer to any problem that surfaced in conversation, and in his comments he often switched from Latin to the vernacular, and back to Latin. What Scaliger said about Ennius might serve as a motto to this conference and could easily be applied to other Latin poets of the early period: “Ennius,” he said, “an ancient poet of great genius. If only we had all he wrote and had lost Lucan, Statius, Silius Italicus and all those guys....” “Ennius, poeta antiquus, magnifico ingenio. Utinam hunc haberemus integrum et amissemus Lucanum, Statium, Sillium Italicum et tous ces garçons-là....”

Scaliger says nothing about Naevius, but I am convinced that he would have placed the lost epic on the First Punic War above the preserved epic on the Second Punic War.

Naevius, as everybody knows, wrote funny plays, serious plays and — late in life — an epic poem in the Saturnian meter, a verse form that is not really understood today and was, it would seem, not completely understood in Virgil’s time. The author of a handbook on metrics who lived under Nero had to admit that he was unable to quote, from the whole epic, one single ‘normal’ Saturnian line. It looks like a fairly simple scheme, yet there are many variations and, once

---

allowance is made for textual corruptions, the possibilities are almost endless.

The fragments of Naevius' *Bellum Poenicum* have been rewritten, rearranged and reinterpreted to the point of frustration, and a whole industry has grown up — especially in Italy — around the meager remains of an early Roman epic. Some of this modern work is highly speculative, because the fragments are all quite short and their context is usually obscure.

We should probably distinguish the different ways in which these fragments are quoted. Some simply survive because an ancient grammarian wished to illustrate an unusual form, an archaic usage, a word that had disappeared from literary Latin or whose meaning had changed since the days of Naevius. Thus Priscian I. 351 H (= fr. 12 Morel) quotes two Saturnians and a half to document the genitive plural *marum* for *marium*, or Festus p. 257 M (fr. 15 M) quotes one line to illustrate the use of *quianam* in the sense of *quare, cur*. Many fragments have been transmitted in this way, without regard to their place in the context, their meaning or their beauty. But a few fragments are preserved in and through the learned exegesis of Virgil’s *Aeneid*, by scholars who were interested in Virgil’s sources and the way in which he used them. Most of them appear in the ‘Servius Danielis’, a few in Macrobius, one in ‘Probus’ and one in a scholion. Another tradition is represented by such authors as Varro and Gellius whose interests were partly grammatical, partly historical.

Incidentally, scholiasts sometimes preserve important material but give it a whimsical interpretation. Virgil narrates (*Aen.* VII. 107-47) the fulfilment of an important omen — the Trojans eating their tables — and has it explained by Aeneas: *genitor mihi talia namque / (nunc repetō) Anchises fætorum arcana reliquit* (vv. 120-21). A scholion in an XIth century MS says that it was the Harpy Celaeno (*Aen.* III. 245), not Anchises, who made that prophecy. This, of course, is just one of several discrepancies between Book III of the *Aeneid* and other books, but the scholiast prefers to think that Venus left to Anchises a collection of predictions, thus giving him divine status, and he quotes Naevius as his authority.

There is no question that a good deal of solid scholarship is embodied in the ancient commentaries and scholia on Virgil, as well as in Macrobius. On the other hand we should not assume that all the authors who quote Naevius had actually read the whole of the *Bellum*

---

3 Paris. Lat. 7930, on *Aen.* VII. 123.
Poenicum. In fact, H. D. Jocelyn⁴ has shown, as clearly as anything can be shown, that Macrobius, and others who claim to know something about Virgil’s sources, actually depend on lists and compilations that were made by various authors, sometimes to accuse Virgil of plagiarism. Hence the phrase, “This whole passage is taken from Naevius,” which appears more than once, should not be accepted as readily as many scholars do accept it. How casually Macrobius, for instance, uses this formula can be seen from his comment on Book IV of the Aeneid where he says: ...ut de Argonauticorum quarto...librum Aeneidos suae quartum totum paene formauerit ad Didonem uel Aenean amatoriam incontinentiam Medae circa Iasonem transferendo (Saturn. V. 17. 4). In this case we have Virgil’s so-called source, and it appears that Macrobius’ charge is simply not true. Apart from the love theme which owes something to the story of Medea and Jason, the fourth Book of the Aeneid has more Homeric reminiscences, it would seem from Ribbeck’s statistics, than direct references to Apollonius of Rhodes. Macrobius evidently never took the trouble of checking his statement; perhaps he never even looked into Apollonius. How valid, then, is his claim that Book II of the Aeneid was copied (translated?) almost word by word from Pisander (paene ad uerbum transcripsit, Saturn. V. 2. 4)? Such sweeping assertions seem to reflect a tradition hostile to Virgil, even though they are no longer used in a polemical way. It had become fashionable, at one point, to dwell on Virgil’s lack of originality or inventiveness, and in order to document this claim scholars accumulated much material, not objectively, but in order to make a case against Virgil.

Among the poets and critics of the Augustan Age there had been a lively discussion concerning the respective merits of ingenium and ars in literary creation (φύσις and τέχνη). Ennius was the great example of much ingenium, little ars, while Callimachus represented the other extreme. Virgil apparently was ranked with Callimachus, and soon after his death, his sources were analyzed. This material was then used, in an uncritical manner, by later scholars, even though they no longer were biased.

Keeping this in mind, one still feels that the design of the Aeneid owes something to the Bellum Poenicum, and this, in turn, suggests that Virgil himself saw something of a design in an early Roman epic which seems so primitive and artless to us, just because some fragments read like prose forced into a rough metrical scheme: Manius Valerius / consul partem exercit in expeditionem / ducit (fr. 32 M). This is the style of a

⁴“Ancient Scholarship and Virgil’s Use of Republican Latin Poetry. I,” Classical
chronicle, not an epic, but there are similar passages in Ennius, and their simplicity does not exclude a certain grandeur and stateliness. After all, Naevius and Ennius were Hellenistic poets, familiar with older and contemporary Greek literature, Hellenistic poets who happened to write in Latin, a language that was just becoming literary, and we can easily believe that the Bellum Poenicum had a structure, a theme, an artistic conception meaningful and pleasing to Virgil. Naevius was poeta doctus, like his Greek colleagues.\(^5\)

The earlier part of the work apparently described the aftermath of the Trojan War, some of the travels of Aeneas, and probably also his love affair with Dido. The assignment of fragments to books is still controversial. In antiquity there were two editions, we are told: one divided into seven books, the other without any book divisions, and that certainly did not help matters. It would seem that the very beginning of the work and most of its later portions were mainly historical, dealing with the events of the First Punic War. Here, Naevius could draw on his own memories, because he had participated in the war as a soldier. The mythical episodes may have been inserted into the historical framework by a sort of flash-back technique. What were Naevius' sources for this part? Probably the Greek historian Hellanicus whose account of Aeneas' exodus is preserved in a long excerpt in Dionysius of Halicarnassus.\(^6\) Hellanicus, in turn, may have borrowed from Stesichorus and other poets.

We cannot be certain about the Dido episode,\(^7\) but several scholars feel today that Naevius deserves credit for the idea of establishing in myth a personal motive for the war he chronicles. It was pointed out long ago that there was more meaning in the mythical forecasting of the

---

5 Cicero (Brutus 75) compares Naevius' epic to a sculpture by Myron, whose technique was far from primitive, though he considers Ennius more polished. Ennius himself seems to have counted Naevius among the vates and fauni of early Latin poetry (almost certainly no compliment, whatever it means), but he silently acknowledges the status of the Bellum Poenicum in his own time by leaving out from his Annales the First Punic War. In an age when archaic poetry had become fashionable again, Fronto, the teacher of Marcus Aurelius, in a letter (p. 62 N) calls Naevius one of those poets who in eum laborem studiunque et periculum urba industriosiis quaerendo (sic scribendum videtur: quaerendi cod.) se commiserne, and he himself certainly admires the insperatum atque inopinatum urbum...quod praeter spem atque opinionem audientium promitum (p. 63). This is true of Virgil, too! For possible echoes of Naevius in Fronto, see now M. P. Pieri, Studi Tragli (Rome 1979), pp. 11 ff.

6 Early Roman History I. 45. 4 - 48. 1 (= FGH I F 31 Jacoby, with Jacoby's commentary in vol. I, pp. 444 ff.).

conflict between Rome and Carthage at a time when these two nations were fighting for supremacy or at least for survival, than in the age of Virgil when the power of Carthage was only a distant memory.  

The fragment (fr. 23 M) that seems to support this view, "gently and knowingly she (or he?) finds out how Aeneas had left the city of Troy,'"

blande et docte percontat, Aenea<s> quo pacto
Troiam urbem liquerit

fits well into the Virgilian context. In Book I of the Aeneid Venus talks to her son Amor about Dido's blandae uoces (670 ff.) that keep Aeneas in Carthage, and towards the end of the same Book, during the banquet in honor of Aeneas, Dido asks him a number of questions which reveal a certain amount of knowledge (doctrina) of the Trojan War and its cast of heroes. Dido, not unlike Cleopatra in Lucan's Pharsalia, Book X, when she entertains Julius Caesar, is pictured as a well-educated Hellenistic queen who wishes to keep up with the latest developments in the world of politics, history or science, and whose table-talk is far from trivial.

Books I - III of the Aeneid seem to correspond in parts to Book I of the Bellum Poenicum, with some characteristic changes noted by ancient commentators. In Naevius, for example, Aeneas and his crew had only one ship (fr. 11 M), but specially built for them by Mercury, while in Virgil the Trojans have a fairly large fleet, even after the devastating storm in Aeneid I which also reflects a theme from the Bellum Poenicum (fr. 13 M). The logic (or logistics) behind this change is simple enough: Virgil had to fill the whole second half of his epic with fighting, but no ancient reader would have understood how so many warriors could have come out of only one ship. For Naevius the problem did not exist: he could make Aeneas disappear from his story, as he turned to history.  

9Learned tradition that goes back to antiquity connects Naevius' fr. 17 with Book IX and fr. 21 with Book X of the Aeneid. It seems to me that fr. 12 should be connected with a curious passage in Book XI (vv. 785-93). Here Arruns prays to the Apollo of Soracte before he throws his spear at Camilla: Summe deum (cf. summi deum regis in Naevius), sancti custos Soracis Apollo, quem primi colimus, cui pines arduor aceruo/ pascitur, et medium freti pietate (cf. fretus pietate in Naevius; the reading pietati, adopted by Morel and others, may be pseudo-archaic) per ignem / cultores multa preminim usestigia pruna. The situation is different: in the Aeneid Arruns supports his prayer to Apollo of Soracte by reminding him that he, Arruns, faithfully performed the ancient (Etruscan?) ritual of walking barefoot over red-hot coals, while, in the Bellum Poenicum it is presumably Anchises who prays to Neptune, brother of Jupiter, whom Virgil calls several times regnator Olympi (cf. regnatorem marum in Naevius). But the accumulation of borrowings from
Material, technical details such as this were important to ancient readers, and they are often dealt with at length in the commentaries that we have. The evidence points to certain objects that Aeneas was able to salvage from Troy, as opposed to other precious things which were captured by the victorious Greeks. There are some references, not all of them easy to interpret, which may be grouped together:

\[
\text{pulchraque } \text{<uasa}> \text{ ex auro uestemque citrosam} \text{ (fr. 10 M)}
\]

(where \text{uasa} has been added by Reichardt) and

\[
\text{ferunt pulchras creterras, aureas lepistas} \text{ (fr. 7 M)}.
\]

It is not clear whether these strange spellings (\text{creterres} for \text{κρατήρες}, \text{lepista} for \text{λεπίσται}) should be attributed to Naevius or to the medieval scribes. Unlike the medieval scribes Naevius knew Greek well, though he may have learned it in the form of a local dialect rather than \text{Koine}. But he is clearly speaking about valuable vessels, and to him it may have seemed an achievement worthy of being recorded that they had been saved in the hour of defeat. In addition to these, Naevius seems to have mentioned a special kind of triangular tables, \text{anclares} (fr. 8 M), used in the worship of the gods. All these objects should be placed in the same context; they were clearly essential for Aeneas and his clan, if they were to continue the cult of their gods in a foreign country, and so they may, in Naevius’ epic, have illustrated Aeneas’ \text{pietas}. Bowls or cups of this particular shape were still used in the temples of the Sabines in Varro’s time, but apparently not in other parts of Italy — perhaps a local survival of Etruscan rites.\(^{10}\)

It is uncertain whether the descriptive fragment (19 M) refers to one of these vessels or to a temple. A great deal has been written about these lines, mainly because of the unique plural \text{Atlantes}. This is the text as most editors print it:

---

\(^{10}\text{It would seem therefore that frr. 7, 8 and 10 M belong to the same context, but that the } \text{uasa, creterres, lepista} \text{e and anclares} \text{are perhaps more likely to be cult objects which were part of the Greek booty described in } \text{Aen. II. 763-65: hoc undique Troia gaza / incensis erpea adytis, mensaeque deorum / crateresque auro solidi; the correspondences (not noticed by the commentators, it appears) are remarkable. But there is also a crater which Anchises fills with wine (Aen. III. 525) when he first sees Italy; it may be the one which he had received from Cisseus, the father of Hecuba and which Aeneas later gives to Acestes (Aen. V. 353-38), clearly a valuable gift, decorated with figures. According to Varro, Ling. Lat. 5. 123, dictae lepistae quae eiammunic in diebus sacris Sabinis uasa uinaria in mensa deorum sunt posita; the same connection between sacred vessels and sacred tables. Both Varro and Virgil may have thought of Naevius.}
inert signa expressa, quomodo Titani,
bicorporis Gigantes magnique Atlantes
Runcus ac Purpureus, filii Terras....

It seems to me that, with two small textual changes, we can cut the whole Gordian knot of problems; for Atlantes read Athamantis, and before Terras insert et:
magnique Athamantis,
Runcus ac Purpureus, filii <et> Terras,
i.e. Runcus ac Purpureus, filii magni Athamantis et Terras. It was easy for Athamantis to become Atlantes, since Atlas was a more familiar figure than Athamas; the ending -antes could be influenced by Gigantes, but the change of I to E occurs very often in texts. The omission of ET after I and before T can also be explained as a form of haplography.

Naevius refers to the Gigantomachy, and both Rhoecus (Runcus) and Porphyron (Purpureus) were Giants who took part in this epic battle: Rhoecus was killed by Dionysus, Porphyron by Zeus. From Pindar, Pyth. 8. 15-17 we know that Porphyron was king of the Giants and their leader in the battle against the gods. Other sources establish a family relationship between a Porphyron and Athamas, but the relationship varies: according to the scholion on Iliad II. 511 Porphyron, Athamas and Olmos were sons of Sisyphus; cf. Steph. Byz. s.v. ‘Argynnos’; scholion on Apollonius Rhod. II. 511; but according to Nonnus, Dionys. IX. 315 ff. Athamas was the father of Porphyron. Hesiod, fr. 10 West makes Athamas the brother of Sisyphus. Though the details are uncertain, the tendency of the mythical tradition seems clear: in one way or another Athamas, Porphyron and Sisyphus are connected as “enemies” of the Olympian gods and victims of their wrath. Thus — if these textual changes are accepted — Naevius may help us to restore a detail of Greek mythology.

* *

The vocabulary of Naevius’ epic and tragic fragments shows some kinship with Virgil’s epic idiom. I have already mentioned quianam meaning cur, quare (fr. 15 M); Ennius still uses it in this sense (Ann. 259 V), and so does Accius (trag. 583). Virgil has it twice (Aen. V. 13; X. 6), both times in direct discourse; in the first instance Palinurus speaks, in the second Jupiter. Quintilian (Inst. Or. VIII. 3. 24 ff.) lists this as one of Virgil’s deliberate archaisms:

...propriis (sc. uerbis) dignitatem dat antiquitas. namque et sanctiorem et magis admirabilem faciunt orationem, quibus non quilibet fuerit usurus, eoque oramento acerrimi iudicii P. Vergilius unice est
unus. ‘ollī’ enim et ‘quianam’ et ‘moerus’ et ‘pone’ et ‘porricerent’ adspergunt illam quae etiam in picturis est gratissima, uetustatis inimitabilem arti auctoritatem. sed utendum modo nec ex ultimis tenebris repetenda....

Other words and phrases Virgil left, as Quintilian would say, in the darkness of the past. I have mentioned fr. 23 M, presumably from the Dido episode:

\[\text{blande et docte percontat, Aeneas} <s> \text{quo pacto Troiam urbem liquerit}....\]

Neither the verb \textit{percontari} (or \textit{percontare}) nor the expression \textit{quo pacto} appears in Virgil, perhaps because they had become too pedestrian in his time, though \textit{hoc pacto} is used, in a technical context, in the \textit{Georgics} (II. 248). Virgil also seems to avoid \textit{pollere} (fr. 30 M), though both Seneca (\textit{Agam}. 805) and Lucan (\textit{Phars. IX}. 795) accept it as a ‘poetic’ word. On the other hand, Virgil does not hesitate to use expressions that must have had a colloquial flavor in his time, and he may have done so because Naevius had established, so to speak, their right of citizenship in the epic idiom. The famous verse \textit{numquam omnes hodie moriemur inulti} (\textit{Aen}. II. 670), the last line of Aeneas’ impassioned speech, echoes a passage from Naevius’ play \textit{The Trojan Horse} (fr. 13 R\textsuperscript{3}).

\[\text{numquam hodie effugies quin mea moriaris manu.}\]

Both in Virgil and in Naevius the use of \textit{numquam} for \textit{non} and redundant \textit{hodie} (added for emphasis) was felt to be colloquial, yet the effect is magnificent.

There is very slight evidence that Virgil took over archaic forms from Naevius that later were normalized in the textual tradition of the \textit{Aeneid}, for instance the adjective \textit{quies}, \textit{quietis} (fr. 22 M) for \textit{quietus} in \textit{Aen. XII}. 559 \textit{urbem / immunem belli atque impune quietam} where the Codex Romanus (5th century) has \textit{quietem}, but I would hesitate to introduce the archaic form here or elsewhere.\footnote{11}

On the whole, considering the meager remains, Virgil seems to have borrowed a good deal from Naevius, not only from his epic but also from the tragedies. The \textit{Trojan Horse} was mentioned already: this play was still performed in Cicero’s time, and Virgil may have had it in mind when he wrote parts of \textit{Aeneid} II. It is certainly no coincidence that in at least two instances Virgilian parallels help us to emend the

\footnote{11}Leipzig 1897.

\footnote{12}Virgil does not use Naevius’ expressive \textit{augescit} (fr. 33 M). He does have \textit{auget} (e.g. \textit{Aen. VII}. 211). He replaces \textit{uicissatim} (fr. 41 M) by \textit{uicissim} (e.g. \textit{Aen. VI}. 531).
text of Naevius’ tragic fragments:

alte iubatos angues implexae (in sese codd. Nonii) gerunt, (trag. 18 R^3)

where Bergk’s emendation (Opusc. I. 331) can be supported by Virgil, Georg. IV. 482-83: caeruleosque implexae crinibus anguis / Eumenides, and
dubii ferventem per fretum intro currimus, (trag. 53)

where the Mss have faventem which is clearly impossible; Onions’ suggestion is plausible not only because of Euripides Iph. Taur. 1386-87
νεώς / λάβεσθε κώπαις ῥόθιά τ’ ἐκλευκαίνετε, but also because of
Virgil Georg. I. 327 implantur fossae et caua flumina crescunt / cum sonitu 
feruetque fretis spirantibus (but R has spumantibus) aequor.

I can think of no better conclusion to this lecture than the epitaph which Naevius is supposed to have written for himself and which is
quoted (fr. 64 M) by Gellius, Noct. Att. I. 24. 2 as an example of Cam-panian arrogance, superbia Campana, though he grudgingly admits that
there is more than a little truth to it, “If it were right for immortals to weep for mortals, the divine Muses would weep for the poet Naevius;
and so, after he was delivered to the treasure-house of Orcus, they for-got in Rome how to speak Latin”:

Inmortales mortales si foret fas flere,
flerent diuae Camenae Naevium poetam.
itaque postquam est Orchi traditus thesauro,
obliti sunt Romae loquier lingua Latina.

Some scholars think that this epitaph is from Varro’s Imagines, com-
posed by Varro himself; if so, one must admire his skill in imitating
Naevius’ style, with its striking alliterations and assonances, and in
recreating Saturnians that have an authentic ring.

Johns Hopkins University
Ennius and the Elegists

JOHN F. MILLER

*Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis.* This pentameter from Ovid’s *Tristia* (II. 424) is often cited by historians of literature as a capsule summary of the Augustans’ ambivalent attitude toward Ennius.\(^1\) He had a powerful literary talent worthy of respect (*ingenio maximus*), but represented an archaic crudeness of style which they above all others had refined (*arte rudis*). Thus, Horace in his *Satires* once quotes a line and a half from the *Annales* to illustrate great poetry, while he criticizes Ennius’ tragic metrics in the *Ars Poetica* and his *Annales* more generally in *Epistles* II. 1.\(^2\) Virgil too, while he probably never actually said that his reading of Ennius was a search for gold in a dungheap,\(^3\) nevertheless substantially refined the many Ennian passages which he imitated.\(^4\) Some would say he even casts ironic light on the original at times.\(^5\) Similarly, Propertius attributed to Ennius a *hirsuta corona* (IV. 1. 61), the crown perhaps signifying some degree of literary achievement, but only a rough one (*hirsuta*) compared with his own.

Of the two poles in this ambivalent attitude, the Augustan elegists Propertius and Ovid leaned heavily toward the negative. As poets who

\(^1\)E.g., C. O. Brink, “‘Ennius and the Hellenistic Worship of Homer.’” *American Journal of Philology* 93 (1972), p. 547: “‘the simple Augustan picture of the father of Roman poetry, Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis.’”


largely defined their genre, after Callimachus, in opposition to epic, they would of course tend to cast the acknowledged father of Roman epic in a bad light. After all, they were heirs of neoteric poetics in its purest form, a stance expressed by Cicero as the contempt of the can- tores Euphorionis for his revered Ennius (Tusc. disp. 3. 45), and one illustrated by Catullus’ scorn for a related work, the Annales Volusi cacata carta (36. 1 and 20; cf. 95. 7-8).

While these elegists’ estimates of Ennius within these schemes are well-known — indeed, they are the stuff of histories and handbooks of literature — it is not often that their mentions and evocations of Ennius are studied closely in context and in relation to one another. This is the aim of the present paper, which seeks thereby to clarify some points in, and note some significant differences between, these two elegists’ presentations of Ennius.

Propertius only mentions or evokes Ennius in pivotal programmatic poems, poems which somehow prepare for or announce a change in the direction of his poetry. The first explicit mention occurs in III. 3, the central elegy in the programmatic cycle opening the third Book in which Propertius seems to be re-examining the nature of his poetry. The re-examination is actually a restatement of his Callimachean ideals, but here it is much more formal, more self-conscious than in Books I and II, the use of Callimachean terminology more elaborate than before. At the opening of a book full of experimentation which greatly expands the limits of his elegy beyond the intensely subjective love-elegy of Books I and II, Propertius takes great pains to assert that his poetry will be no less Callimachean. In III. 3, another recusatio or rejection of epic in favor of his elegy, he goes so far as to picture himself in a situation like that of Callimachus in the Aitia-prologue: a dream of his consecration as a poet on Mount Helicon. The details of this imitation of Callimachus’ prologue are well-known, if in part controversial, and need not be dwelt on here. Suffice it to say that Propertius’ scene is as much aemulatio of his Hellenistic mentor as imitatio. Apollo, for example, appears as a warning figure in both Callimachus and Propertius, but is part of the dream on Helicon only in Propertius. What is particularly significant, though, for the present investigation is that alongside the classic neoteric and elegiac initiation-scene is placed the similar programmatic scene of the inspiration received by Ennius.


7Cf. Virg. Ecl. 6. 3-5 and 64-73, Prop. II. 10, Hor. Sat. I. 10. 31-35; later Ovid Am. III. 1, Ars I. 25-28.
the father of Roman epic.\(^8\) In this, the most formal and elaborate of Propertius’ *recusationes*, he contemplates the fictional origins of both the Callimachean poetics he embraces (the famous *non inflati somnia Callimachii* that he had recommended to Lynceus, II. 34, 32) and the tradition of Roman epic he rejects (the dream of Ennius).\(^9\)

The poem actually begins with Propertius in a situation reminiscent of Ennius’ dream at the opening of the *Annales*, a scene to which he here explicitly refers (6). Ennius had dreamed that the shade of Homer appeared to him either on Helicon or on Parnassus, where he was informed that he was Homer reborn.\(^10\) Although we can be far from certain, his initiation may also have included a meeting with the Muses, and perhaps even a drink from the sacred fount of inspiration. Propertius dreamed that while he rested beside the fountain Hippocrene on Helicon he felt himself able to begin an epic on the Alban kings (1-4: *Visus eram...posse...*). Though the situation roughly parallels that of Ennius, we are aware from the very outset that this is the world of neoteric and elegiac poetics. *Visus eram molli recubans Heliconis in umbra* (1). The opening line suggests a bucolic scene reminiscent of Virgil’s *Eclogues*, which are here echoed,\(^11\) and the word *mollis* too frequently appears as a catchword in elegiac poetics (e.g., I. 7. 19; II. 1. 2; III. 1. 19). More importantly, the elegist is immediately struck by the awesomeness of his contemplated task — *tantum operis* (4) — a condition which is further heightened by the following contrast (5) of his tiny mouth (*parva ora*) with the mighty fountain it approaches (*magnis fontibus*), the fountain “from which thirsting father Ennius drank” (6) the inspiration for his epic poem. Propertius never actually drinks from Hippocrene, and is anyway soon checked from such attempts at epic by the Callimachean Apollo (13 ff.). After instruction from Apollo, and then Calliope, the latter confirms his poetic status as an elegist with the


\(^9\) Ennius’ prominence in III. 3 (and III. 1) may be a further hint that in Book III “the same poet, writing essentially the same sort of poetry as before, relying on the same sources of inspiration, will be turning to Roman subjects”: D. Ross, *Backgrounds to Augustan Poetry, Gallus, Elegy and Rome* (Cambridge 1975), p. 129, with reference to Prop. III. 11 and III. 13.


\(^11\) Cf. *Ecl.* 1. 1 (*Tityre, tu patulae recubans sub tegmine fagi*), noted by Wimmel (above, note 6), p. 244.
appropriate symbolic water. Rather than drinking deep and directly from Hippocrene, Propertius receives on his lips a sprinkling of what is called "the water of Philitas" (51-52; the poet is always associated by Propertius with Callimachus; cf. II. 34. 31-32; III. 1. 1). This water seems to come not straight from the gushing Hippocrene, but from a quiet pool of the same water in the Muses' grotto. The inspiration demanded for elegy is slighter, but also more rarified and civilized, than that required for epic. The main theme of the poem, then, is that of the earlier recusationes II. 1 and II. 10: the elegist's inability, however much he might allegedly wish, to compose epic poetry. With the motif of the initiatory dream on Helicon and Propertius' elaborate water imagery the theme is here applied to the relevant great exemplars of the contrasted poetic genres. For the elegist the dream of Ennius must be corrected; it must become a Callimachean experience.

The sharp contrast drawn by Propertius between Ennian and Callimachean inspiration is by no means fair to Ennius, since, as recent studies have shown, Ennius was himself deeply influenced by Hellenistic poetry, including that of Callimachus. In fact, in Ennius' own dream-scene there was most probably intended an allusion to the well-known dream of Callimachus, and that allusion may well have aimed to express Ennius' own debt to the great Alexandrian master or to Hellenistic literature in general. Elsewhere he seems to point to his affinity with the later Greek tradition when he boasts of himself as dicti studiosus (Ann. 216 V), a phrase that seems to latinize the Alexandrian ideal of the ἄιθαι ὁλογος. It is of course also possible that such an allusion to the Aitia-prologue was to some extent a counter-polemic or anti-Callimachean allusion, since the dream-vision of alter Homerus directly counters Callimachus' influential rejection of the long, grand epic poem. We know of Ennius' capacity for such literary polemic from his harsh remarks on his Latin predecessors in the prologue to Annales VII (213-17 V); and one need not have fully embraced Callimachean aesthetics to be dicti studiosus. If this view is correct, then Propertius here can be seen as rephrasing the same polemical contrast

---


14 See Suerbaum (above, note 10), pp. 271-75.

15 Aet. fr. 1 Pf. For this view see especially W. Clausen, "Callimachus and Roman
found (perhaps only implicitly) in Ennius’ prologue, though from his Callimachean and Augustan point of view.

In the text before us that point of view is discerned especially in the lines devoted exclusively to Ennius (6-12):

6 unde pater sitiens Ennius ante bibit; 
et cecinit Curios fratres et Horatia pil,
regiaque Aemilia vecta tropaea rate,
victricesque moras Fabii pugnamque sinistram
10 Cannensem et versos ad pia vota deos,
Hannibalemque Lares Romana sede fugantis,
anseris et tutum voce fuisset lovem.

On the face of it, the passage appears to set forth in a straightforward fashion a complimentary description of the poet and his poem which might have been written by Cicero. Ennius is called *pater* as the honored originator of the Roman epic tradition, and the six-line list of the *Annales*’ contents emphasizes their historical and nationalistic character: the Horatii and Curiatii of early Rome, the splendid triumphant return of an Aemilius, Fabius Cunctator, whose treatment by Ennius is echoed elsewhere in Augustan literature, the catastrophe of Cannae, and Rome’s miraculous salvation from disaster at the hands of Hannibal and the Gauls. All of these events either were or could have been included in the *Annales*. The naming of several Roman heroes by their family names together in the first half of the list may also suggest the widely alleged encomiastic quality of Ennius’ epic narrative. To Propertius’ parade of Roman worthies, the Curi and Horatii, Aemilius and Fabius, may be compared Cicero’s assessment in his speech for Archias (22): *omnes denique illi Maximi, Marcelli, Fulvii non sine communi omnium nostrum laude decorantur*. All of this seems to suggest an entirely positive estimation of Ennius on the part of Propertius. As Homer was for Callimachus, Ennius is for him admirable, but inimitable.

Yet the reader of these lines must also experience a certain befuddlement. Half of the events here mentioned from one of Rome’s most famous poems seem somehow wrong. The family known elsewhere only as the Curiatii are here the Curii; the most natural interpretation

---

Poetry, Greek, Roman and Byzantine Studies 5 (1964), pp. 185-87.


18For the testimonia and a full discussion see Suerbaum (above, note 10), pp. 198-215 and 248.
of the victory in verse 8 took place after Ennius’ death;\(^{19}\) the Lares are nowhere else said to have driven Hannibal from Rome.\(^{20}\) Commentators generally view these problems as arising from our, or Propertius’, defective knowledge of the text of the Anales. Another possibility rarely considered is that Propertius has intentionally skewed his summary of Ennius’ poem to ironize, however slightly, his apparently straightforward, laudatory account. Since Propertius has jumbled the chronology of the events to produce his own artistic arrangement — glorious Roman victories followed by tempora graviora and Rome’s rescue therefrom\(^{21}\) — it is not unlikely that some at least of these incongruities have an intended literary effect. Propertius elsewhere introduces discordant touches into a list of topics for an epic. In II. 1 his inclusion of civilia busta and eversos focos antiquae gentis Etruscae (27 and 29) among the emperor’s praiseworthy exploits undercuts, though in a different way than that suggested for our passage, the entire epic catalogue. Furthermore, the reference to Ennius himself “thirsting” (sitiens, 6) seems immediately to make the Propertian admiration of pater Ennius ironic. This detail makes him humorously primitive or naive, especially when contrasted with the refined sensibilities of the elegiac parva ora. To go to Hippocrene thirsty suggests not only larger capabilities, but a lack of anything to begin with.\(^{22}\)

If the interpretation outlined here is not wide of the mark, then Ennius in III. 3 corresponds, in the Callimachean scheme of things, more to cyclic or historical epic, which is to be rejected outright, than

19 It is hard to believe that 8 refers to any lesser occasion than the return of L. Aemilius Paullus, the victor of Pydna...": D. R. Shackleton Bailey, Propertiana (Cambridge 1956), p. 139; “No other return of an Aemilius approached this in splendor, and it must be what P. has in mind...” (Richardson ad loc.). Other suggestions are the victories of Aemilius over Demetrius of Pharos in 219 and Antiochus in 190.

20 Elsewhere the retreat of the Carthaginian forces is attributed to one of two minor deities, Tutanus or Rediculus. See Rothstein ad loc.


22 If a picture came to mind here, it would no doubt be the extravagant one in Lucianus’ description of a man who, also in a dream, sits beside a stream or fountain thirsting (sitiens), and all but swallows the whole river (IV. 1024-25; a comparison made by S. Commager, A Prolegomenon to Propertius [Norman, Okla. 1974], p. 68, note 72). With sitiens Propertius may also be obliquely (and humorously) alluding to Ennius’ apparently famous capacity for wine (an emblem of his superior ingenium), even though the inspirational beverage in the present instance is water. Horace comically refers to this at Ep. I. 19. 7-8: Ennius ipse pater numquam nisi potus ad arma / prosulit dicenda. For this interpretation see W. Richter, Römische Dichter (Frankfurt 1958), p. 79, note 1, cited by Suerbaum (above, note 10), p. 234, note 690, and Wimmel (above, note 6), p. 244.
to the inimitable Homer. In the context of the whole poem this sample of the Annales’ contents thus foreshadows the list of epic topics in Calliope’s admonitory address (40-46), where martial Roman historical subjects are emphatically decried.

Ennius is recalled in a similar context, though in a different fashion, in Propertius III. 1, the first poem in the cycle and one which in many ways prepares for III. 3. Again developing the contrast between epic and elegy, Propertius weaves Callimachean terminology into a magnificent sequence of travel images which proudly assert his own poetic achievement (9 ff.). Inverting the epic associations of the Roman triumph, he rides like a general triumphans, the Cupids at his side, a crowd of writers close behind (9-12). Next the chariot is successfully racing against his poetic rivals (13), whom he tells, transferring an image of Callimachus (fr. 1. 25-28 Pf) to a novel context, that it is not possible to ride to the Muses by a wide road (non datur ad Musas currere lata via, 14). At the conclusion to the section he identifies the sort of poets who travel the lata via, and he sharpens the contrast between their poetry and his own (15-20):

15 multi, Roma, tuas laudes annalibus addent,
quem finem imperii Bactra futura canent.
  sed, quod pace legas, opus hoc de monte Sororum
detuit intacta pagina nostra via.
mollia, Pegasides, date vestro serta poetae:
  non faciet capiti dura corona meo.

Many, O Rome, will add praises of you to the annals, singing that Bactra will be the limit of your empire. But my page has brought this work down from the mount of the Muses by an untrodden path, that you may read it in peace. Give soft garlands to your poet, Muses; a harsh crown will not suit my head.

The “many” here are of course the writers of encomiastic historical epic who will follow in the footsteps of Ennius. In the present programmatic context the word annalibus would almost certainly call Ennius’ own epic to the Augustan reader’s mind. But the contrast here is not simply the Callimachean contrast of styles. As Clausen and others have pointed out, the rejection of epic by Roman poets was often moral as well as stylistic, as is brought out here by the mention of the contemporary Parthian campaign (16) and by Propertius’

---


24 Clausen (above, note 15), pp. 193-96; see further Commager (above, note 22), pp. 46 ff.
characterization of his own as a poetry of peace (17).

There is a fuller evocation of Ennius in this passage, however, than that in the single word annalibus. The Gedankengang and language of the following two couplets again call Ennius to mind, this time through an allusion to Lucretius’ description of Ennius’ achievement in epic.²⁵ In what must have been a well-known passage Lucretius referred to “our Ennius...who first brought down from Helicon the crown of eternal leaves, that it might have glorious renown throughout the Italian tribes of mankind” (Ennius...noster...qui primus amoeno / detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam / per gentis Italas hominum quae clara clueret, l. 117-19). From the context we know he is speaking chiefly of the Annales. There is no way to tell whether the image derives from Ennius himself or is simply Lucretius’ own figurative language, ultimately based on Hesiod’s descent from Helicon with a wondrous staff (Theog. 30-31). In either case, Propertius seems clearly to allude to the Lucretian passage. The echo one might think one perceives in the similar combination of a crown with a return from the Muses’ mountain is enhanced by the appearance in both of initial detulit and the word corona, and this after annalibus just above. The effect of this echo is a quite striking one and can be fully appreciated only in the light of one of the poem’s major thematic patterns. Propertius seems to appropriate to his elegy the image applied by Lucretius to the great exemplar of Roman epic, just as he arrogates to himself the heroic role of the triumphantor, and just as later in the poem he illustrates his claim to immortality with the example of Homer (33-34).²⁶ The point of all this is an insistence on his elegy’s equality with, if not its superiority to, epic poetry. By evoking Ennius here, then, Propertius challenges Ennius’ alleged return from Helicon with that of his own pagina. It is Propertius who is primus here, while Ennius is associated with the multi travelling the lata via.²⁷ Likewise, Propertius asks the Muses for a crown, but

²⁵See Nethercut (above, note 23), p. 391.

²⁶For this interpretation see especially Commager (above, note 22), p. 43. He also thinks, along with Nethercut (above, note 23), that verse 24 (maius ab exsequiis nomen in ora venit) imitates Ennius’ epitaph (Varia 18 V: ...volto vivos per ora virum). But if Ennius comes to mind in verse 24, he most probably does so through the mediation of Virg. Georg. III. 8-9 (tempanda via est, qua me quoque possim / tollere humo victorque virum volitare per ora; the beginning of his triumph), the first half of which is recalled at the opening of Propertius’ triumph (9: quo me Fama levat terra sublimis...). The phrase in ora venire is found elsewhere in Propertius (II. 1. 2; III. 9. 32, where Ennius’ epitaph is definitely echoed).

²⁷It is this that differentiates Propertius here from Lucretius at I. 921 ff. and Virgil in Georgics III. 8 ff., both of whom echo and / or evoke Ennius in declarations of their own originality, but without the Propertian contrast with Ennius. Both passages are re-
not the sort Ennius would have brought down from Helicon. The elegist should be wreathed with *mollia sertia*, soft garlands of flowers, appropriate to the delicate private world of love and peace and the slender style which describes that world. No *dura corona* for him, perhaps a wreath of laurel or a gold crown like those of the Roman *triumphtator*, in any case suggestive of the severe matter and manner of epic, a genre which Propertius elsewhere calls *durus versus* (II. 1. 41). Since Ennius is in mind here, we may not be wrong to follow Camps’ suggestion (*ad loc.*) that *dura corona* may also obliquely allude to the technical roughness of early Roman epic, and so reinforce Propertius’ demand above for poetic refinement (*exactus tenui pumice versus eat*, 8).

A more explicit reference to the unrefined quality of Ennius’ verse, of which Ovid will make so much, occurs in a later programmatic elegy of Propertius. This is a passage near the end of IV. 1A, the first in the pair of introductory poems to Book IV, and the one in which the poet announces a new elegy devoted to Roman themes, his aetiological elegies. The context is worthy of close scrutiny, both because of the difficulty of the passage and because it combines the ideas and images in the two earlier evocations of Ennius. After reflecting on early rural Rome and its contrast with the city’s present splendor, and expressing his amazement at the providence that allowed the Trojans to reach Italy, Propertius concludes by announcing his intention to write on national Roman themes (55-58):

55 optima nutricum nostris, lupa Martia, rebus,
qualia creverunt moenia lacte tuo!
moenia namque pio coner disponere versu:
ei mihi, quod nostro est parvus in ore sonus!

He speaks of such a program as equivalent to writing an epic. His wonder at the greatness of Rome’s walls immediately suggests to him the greatness of the poetic task he contemplates. To write of Rome’s walls demands epic ability! The image of laying out the walls was perhaps partly designed to refer to the topographical focus of the aetiological poems, all of which are concerned with monuments or places in the city, but it is also charged with epic associations. In the *recesatio* III. 9 the *caeso moenia firma Remo* (50) were among the epic topics listed, and we remember *alte moenia Romae* at the opening of the *Aeneid* (I. 7). The same is true of *pio versu*, to which we may compare, for example, the *laudes* of Rome in III. 1. 15 which many will add to the annals. He also speaks of this project as an attempt, *coner* (which I called in our poem: on Virgil’s see above note 26; cf. Lucr. I. 929 (*insignemque meo capiti petere inde coronam*) and Prop. III. 1. 20 (*non faciet capitii dura corona meo*).
take to mean "let me try" rather than "should I try"), just as in III. 3 he attempted to drink from the mighty fountain with his parva ora. Here too the poet is struck by the inappropriateness of an elegist's parvus sonus tackling such topics. Tantum operis!

At this point the reader of Propertius' earlier books waits for the excusatio to become a recusatio. But Propertius' trepidation before the present task leads instead to a reaffirmation of his resolve to write pio versus: sed tamen exiguo quodcumque e pectore rivi / fluxerit, hoc patriae serviet omne meae ("But nevertheless, whatever stream flows from my tiny breast, all this will be devoted to my country," 59-60). As always in Propertius, the self-deprecation here is only apparent. We realize this when we notice that the slight stream from a small breast alludes to the ὀλίγη λίβας at the end of Callimachus' Hymn to Apollo (2. 112). The stream is slight, but it is the choicest of waters, far preferable to the broad ocean and the muddy Euphrates signifying cyclic epic. The allusion suggests that, though his inspiration is small, it is still what he prefers. His pius versus will be Callimachean.

It is the undertone provided by this allusion which gives rise to the following couplets, where the oblique reference becomes a proud declaration of his Callimachean style (61-64):

Enniius hirsuta cingat sua dicta corona:
mi folia ex hedera porrige, Bacche, tua,
ut nostris tumefacta superbiat Vmbria libris,
Vmbria Romani patria Callimachi!

As before, an acceptance of Callimachus means a rejection of Ennius. Here the two are both mentioned by name, conspicuously framing the sentence. The contrast of crowns in III. 1 is repeated, but here the emphasis is on stylistic refinement. "Let Enniius wreath his verses with a shaggy (or rugged) crown, for me the ivy of Bacchus," the latter suggestive of his Callimachean inspiration.28 This is Propertius' most direct and his rudest dismissal of Ennius. Although corona does admit of some achievement on Enniius' part, its positive connotations are all but obliterated by hirsuta. If III. 1 and its allusion to Lucretius are in mind here, then the rejection is more contemptuous still. "Let Enniius

---

28 For Propertius' association with Bacchus see II. 30. 38-39 (also ivy; cf. II. 5. 26); III. 2. 9; III. 17; IV. 6. 76; cf. Call. ep. 7 Pf and the discussions of E. Maass, "Untersuchungen zu Properz und seinen griechischen Vorbildern," Hermes 31 (1896), pp. 375 ff. and P. Boyancé, "Properec," in L'influence grecque sur la poésie latine de Catulle à Ovide (Fond. Hardt: Entretiens 2, Geneva 1953), pp. 169 ff. C. W. Macleod argues differently that the address to Bacchus here (compared with Call. ep. 7) and tumefacta in line 63 reverse Callimachean motifs ("Propertius 4.1," Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar, 1976, ed. F. Cairns, pp. 144-45).
wreathe his poems with that shaggy crown he brought back from Helicon.’ Alfonsi would make it even more scornful, since he sees in sua dicta a playful reference to Ennius’ claim to be dicti studiosus (Ann. 216 V). But while dictum is used of poetry only here by Propertius, such usage is not unparalleled elsewhere outside of Ennius (e.g., Lucr. I. 126; V. 56).

The reason for the particular vehemence of this dismissal is that Propertius in the present circumstances realizes his closeness to Ennius, or to what Ennius represented in III. 1 and III. 3. Propertius has now accepted topics of national significance, which he refers to in epic terms, and in this and three of the other aetiological poems he speaks in a solemn patriotic persona suggestive of epic. Yet for all this he insists that his model will be Callimachus, not Ennius. He will write antiquarian elegies along the lines of the Aitia: sacra diesque canam et cognomina prisca locorum (69). And above all else, his style will be Callimachean, in contrast not only to primitive epic poetry — which is the primary reference of hirsuta corona — but also to the “rough” style of epic in general. The hirsuta corona would share this connotation with the dura corona of III. 1. 20. As Margaret Hubbard recently pointed out, the Roman elegies of the Callimachus Romanus are all consciously and aggressively modern (and so anti- or counter-epic) in their application of the elegiac manner to national Roman topics. That aggressiveness is here embodied in the flat rejection of the great exemplar of Roman epic.

When we turn from Propertius to the more voluminous and varied elegiac corpus of Ovid, our investigation must immediately take a new factor into account, namely, that Ovid makes greater use than Propertius did of Ennius’ actual poetry. It should be further noted in this connection that these Ennian reminiscences in Ovid are not restricted to the Annales. Ovid had a considerable interest in tragedy, an interest that included the archaic Latin tragedians as well as their Greek

predecessors. He himself composed a Latin Medea, following the precedent of Ennius. Regarding his nondramatic works, it has been shown not only that several Republican tragedies had a strong influence on certain portions of the Metamorphoses,33 as they had on Virgil’s epic earlier, but also that the epistles of Paris and Helen in the Heroides are indebted to Ennius’ Alexander.34 As one might expect, however, the latter indebtedness seems also to contain a humorous application of the model. Howard Jacobson has noted that the Ennian treatment of the burning firebrand in Hecuba’s dream, signifying that Paris would bring fiery destruction upon Troy, is in Ovid’s story also echoed in the elegiac, erotic context of Paris’ burning passion for Helen.35

This example brings to mind a second reason for the occasional Ennian touches in Ovid’s elegiac works. Ovid is a master of parody who ranges widely in his mock-solemn echoes of serious ancient literature. This is particularly true of the Ars amatoria, where a favorite example is the use of the Ennian phrase Romana iuventus. In the remains of the Annales the phrase occurs three times at line’s end. The young Roman soldiers are courageous (cum pulchris animis, 550 V); they approach the walls (537), perhaps in some battle; they — in a bold Ennian phrase — “dry themselves off from sleep” (469). In Ovid we find: disci bonas artes, moneo, Romana iuventus (I. 459). The noble Roman youth of today are solemnly enjoined by the magister amoris to get a good liberal education, because of its efficacy in love. The high-sounding Ennian phrase accentuates the already mock-serious situation. A similar example is found in Amores II. 11, which begins with echoes of the opening lines of Ennius’ Medea (Sc. fr. 246-54 V) as well as of their later rendition in Catullus 64 (1 ff.). Ovid bewails the sea voyage of his mistress Corinna with the language of the tragic nurse lamenting the departure of her very different sort of mistress.36

Such Ennian echoes in the amatory elegies are few and play but a small role in the very broad parody of other literature. The same is true of the Ennian reminiscences in Ovid’s poetic calendar, the Fasti, his version of Propertius’ Roman elegies. Ovid’s poem shares some of the Annales’ topics, such as Egeria (III. 261 ff.; cf. Ann. 119 V) and

3516. 3-8; op. cit. (above, note 34), p. 302.
Romulus and Remus (II. 365 ff.; cf. Ann. 73-75), and once he quotes an entire line which most scholars take to be from the Annales: unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli (Ann. 65; II. 487; cf. Met. XIV. 814), spoken by Jupiter to Mars concerning the apotheosis of Romulus, where it probably also appeared in Ennius' poem. Otherwise the few Ennian echoes are mostly of phraseology, simply a part of the epic idiom which Ovid is here adapting to elegy. Along with the many more similar reminiscences of Virgil and Lucretius, they add a certain epic flavor and dignitas to the treatment of national topics, as did Tibullus' one imitation of Ennius to the solemn praise of Messala in I. 7. But there is no evidence of extended imitation of Ennius in the Fasti of the sort found in the Aeneid, which is only to be expected. For, although Ovid speaks of the Fasti as a major work (II. 3; IV. 3 and 10), as did Propertius of his Roman elegies in IV. 1, he also follows his elegiac predecessor in adopting as his major model Callimachus' Aitia (I. 1: Tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum).

For all this, the presence of even these few Ennian touches in the Fasti may be significant, as compared with their apparent absence in Propertius IV. They of course reflect the wider orbit of Ovid's literary interests; he was writing the "epic" Metamorphoses and the Fasti at about the same time. They can also be associated, I believe, with a difference in the two elegists' methods for achieving an elegiac equivalent to epic narrative. As was noted above (p. 287), the aitia of Propertius are aggressively counter-epic in their style, relentlessly applying the techniques and modern attitudes of elegy to his Roman themes. Ovid's approach achieves a similar modernization of Roman history and legend, but does so in part by incorporating the traditional features and

37 See F. Bömer's commentary, vol. 2 (Heidelberg 1957), Index s.v. Ennius.

38 Often it is difficult to determine whether the "Ennianisms" come directly from Ennius or from an intermediary. For example, in Ovid's description of the famous battle of the Fabii (II. 195 ff.), which earns three references to Ennius in Bömer's commentary, the phrase celeri passu (205) is attested elsewhere only in Ennius Ann. 71 V, while the couplet 235-36 (una dies Fabios ad bellum miserat omnes: / ad bellum missos perdit ut una dies) reflects Lucr. V. 999-1000 (at non multa virum sub signis milia ducta / una dies dabat exitio) at least as much as it does Ennius Ann. 287 (multa dies in bello conficit unus); similarly, Ovid's concluding reference to Fabius Cunctator (241-42: scilicet ut posses olim tu, Maxime, nasci, / cui res cunctando restituis rem) is closer to Virgil's imitation at Aen. VI. 845-46 (...tu Maximus ille es, / unus qui nobis cunctando restituis rem) than to the Ennian original (above, note 17).

language of epic,\textsuperscript{40} which would include those of \textit{pater} Ennius. Where Propertius ignores or twists the features of epic, Ovid adapts them to the more accommodating world of his elegy.

With the fact that Ovid uses Ennius’ poetry, however sparingly, one might be tempted to associate his somewhat more favorable estimation of Ennius. For, in spite of the fact that Ovid shared the Propertian (and Horatian) view of the archaic poet as artless, he also explicitly acknowledged the powerful poetic talent of Ennius (\textit{ingenio maximus}). But one should not make too much out of these few echoes, nor should one exaggerate the positive aspects of Ovid’s explicit references to Ennius.\textsuperscript{41} The Ovidian treatment of Ennius certainly differs in important respects from that of Propertius, but the latter’s view is broadened and to some extent qualified, rather than actually contradicted.

Ovid mentions Ennius or the \textit{Annales} by name four times, twice in Book II of the \textit{Tristia}, once each in the \textit{Ars} and \textit{Amores}. For him Ennius is perhaps above all else the quintessential, venerable Roman classic. In the \textit{Ars amatoria}, for instance, Ennius’ burial next to Scipio is cited as evidence of the great honor formerly bestowed upon poets (III. 405-12). That Ennius “earned” (\textit{emeruit}, 409) this respected position illustrates the \textit{sancta}\textsuperscript{42} \textit{maiestas} and \textit{venerabile nomen} (407) readily given in olden times, but so sorely lacking in Ovid’s own day. To some readers it may seem ironic that a love-elegist unabashedly appeals to the \textit{fama} of the great exemplar of historical Roman epic. But such is the irony of literary history, not of the text itself. Ennius is not marked out here as the poet of war or history or epic, or even tragedy. He is the exemplary, famous old poet, a Roman classic. Likewise, Ovid in this passage, which is a digression, does not speak as \textit{praecaptor amoris}, nor as elegist, but simply as a contemporary poet.

A more complex mention of Ennius, again without reference to his genre or subject matter, is found in \textit{Amores} I. 15. The elegy is the last in Book I, and so is appropriately programmatic, having as its topic Ovid’s immortality through his poetry. He alludes to Propertius’ treat-

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item See, e.g., Hubbard (above, note 31), p. 134, comparing Propertius and Ovid’s \textit{Fasti}.
\item As was done recently by F. Bertini, “Ov. \textit{am.} I 15, 19 e il giudizio ovidiano su Ennio,” \textit{Bollettino di Studi Latini} 2 (1972), pp. 3-9; see earlier Zingerle (above, note 32), 2, pp. 1-2.
\item It is interesting to note that Cicero reports that Ennius himself called poets \textit{sancti} (\textit{Pro Archia} 18): \textit{quare suo ture noster ille Ennius sanctos appellat poetas, quod quasi deorum aliquo dono auge munere commendati nobis esse videantur.} See Suerbaum (above, note 10), pp. 263-64.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
ment of the theme in III. 1 analyzed above, thereby helping to perpetuate his predecessor’s memory, but also inviting comparison with the earlier elegist’s presentation of Ennius (and Callimachus). The reference to Ennius is brief, but significant. At the opening of a list of Roman authors who have achieved immortality through their works is put *Ennius arte carens* (19). F. Bertini attempted to prove that the phrase *arte carens* here is laudatory, and means *sine artificio*, “without artifice” or “simple.” But the words certainly mean “without art” or “unpolished” and should be read concessively. “Though unrefined, Ennius will always be famous.” As a refutation of the positive interpretation one need but recall the assessment of Callimachus a few lines above (13-14): *Battiades semper toto cantabitur orbe: / quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet.* In the pentameter’s contrast, involving the common juxtaposition of *ingenium* and *ars, arte* is the positive member, which makes the phrase *arte carens* negative, an Ovidian equivalent of Propertius’ *hirsuta corona.*

It is no accident that the couplet on Callimachus is recalled in the mention of Ennius, since the two authors are, as we have seen, naturally contrasted by an elegist. Ovid further associates the two here by concentrating exclusively on their poetic powers and craft, in contrast to the treatment of most of the other poets in the list. This makes them stand out in an even sharper opposition to one another. As in Propertius, Callimachus is the poet of refinement (*arte valet*), Ennius the one without it (*arte carens*). But what is most striking here and most unlike the Propertian position is that both Ennius and Callimachus are criticized. Indeed, these are the only two authors in the list of thirteen whose mention involves any qualification. Now in spite of Ovid’s frequent references to his own *ingenium,* he obviously felt a close kinship with Callimachus. In the present poem he hints at that kinship by making his own wish for immortality correspond exactly to the passage on Callimachus. Compare verse 8 *quaeritur, in toto semper ut orbe canar,* with verse 13 on Callimachus, *Battiades semper toto cantabitur orbe.* Yet he also criticizes Callimachus as lacking *ingenium.* This critique of Callimachus by an admitted Callimachean has bewildered some scholars, but I think that Ovid no doubt intended it to be somewhat shocking. What it does is to set the revered master of elegy in a larger perspective, which is also achieved by placing him in a list of assorted authors. Although this list reflects Callimachean poetics, as in the mention of

---


44Above, note 41, especially pp. 4-6.

45See Morgante (above, note 32), pp. 69-70.
Ennius, it does not develop the familiar contrast of epic and elegy found in Propertius and elsewhere in Ovid's own elegies. Instead — and this is what makes Ovid's boast even greater than Propertius' — Ovid sets himself in the broader world of all ancient literature: epic, elegy, comedy, tragedy, pastoral and didactic. And for the Roman world that would of course include Ennius, whom he criticizes, as one would expect of a Callimachean of sorts, but whom he does not here challenge in the Propertian fashion. Ennius heads the list of Roman classics which Ovid confidently asserts he will someday join. Not inappropriately, the initial position of Ennius corresponds to that of Homer (9-10) in the catalogue of Greek poets, an association which reaches back ultimately to alter Homerus himself.

Just as Ennius is an important figure in Propertius' definitions of his poetry in Books III and IV, so his name is invoked in Tristia II in Ovid's defense of his poetry, or, more specifically, his carmen, the Ars amatoria. At one point the exiled poet argues that, besides the numerous examples of erotic themes in Greek literature which he has just discussed, Roman literature too has multa iocosa, many playful or frivolous things (421-22). He first mentions serious poetry to suggest that it represents but one side of Roman literature. As befits one else-where called pater, Ennius is put first (423-28):

\[
\text{utque suo Martem cecinit gravis Ennius ore,} \\
\text{Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis:} \\
\text{425 explicat ut causas rapidi Lucretius ignis,} \\
\text{casurumque triplex vaticinatur opus:} \\
\text{sic sua lascivo cantata est saepe Catullo} \\
\text{femina, cui falsum Lesbia nomen erat.}
\]

Just as Ennius sang of battle with the appropriate voice — Ennius mighty in genius, but rude in art — and just as Lucretius explains the origins of the devouring flame and prophesies that the threefold structure of the world will collapse, so playful Catullus often sang of his mistress, falsely called Lesbia.

A long list of other erotic authors follows (429-66). For the first time in Ovid Ennius is characterized as an epic poet writing on martial themes (Martem cecinit), which we recall was significant for Propertius. But here there is no Propertian contrast of the elegy of peace and the historical epic celebrating war. Here war is only important as a serious topic, like the cosmic destruction in Lucretius, and unlike the multa iocosa which follow. In fact, Ovid is not really contrasting epic and elegy here at all, but serious and playful or erotic literature. The latter

---

46 This is noted by Bertini (above, note 41), p. 4.
is not even restricted to poetry, but includes Sisenna's prose translations of Aristides' *Milesian Tales* (443-44). Again Ovid's is the broader view of ancient literature. Thus, while Propertius always isolates Ennius as the representative of Roman epic or an unrefined style, thereby making the contrast with himself all the sharper, in the Ovidian passages which contain an evaluation of Ennius the archaic poet is never mentioned apart from other poets. In *Amores* I. 15 Ennius *arte carens* was paired with the tragedian Accius and then associated with a larger group of Roman authors. Here and in the final passage to be discussed he is linked with Lucretius.

As suits a formal argument, Ovid's reference to Ennius here is more plainly expressed than those in Propertius' elaborate and ironic proclamations of his literary credo. Both praise and blame are set forth directly. Ennius is *gravis*, a word which suggests the seriousness and elevation of epic, but which refers primarily to his character, "venerable," "great."47 Matching this impressive stature is his mighty talent — *ingenio maximus*. Yet he was unpolished, *arte rudis*, a variation of Ovid's earlier phrase, *arte carens*. In the pentameter we have the exact opposite of his evaluation of Callimachus in *Amores* I. 15, who was weak in *ingenium*, but strong in *ars*. Both authors are presented in a balanced fashion, as was Ennius also, if somewhat differently, in the earlier poem. There, though lacking in art, he was immortal. But in both cases Ennius' lack of art seems to be the most important factor for Ovid.48 In *Amores* I. 15 *arte carens* suggested a contrast with the admired, if imperfect, Callimachus. Here too *arte rudis* appears to operate in a wider context. Its qualification of the first mentioned example of serious literature seems to help tip the scales in favor of the *iocosa*, as does the much more expansive list of "frivolous" authors that ensues, and that we know will ensue before Ennius and Lucretius are mentioned.

Some 150 lines earlier in *Tristia* II Ovid develops another argument involving Ennius which shows that he himself can still be *iocosus*. He proceeds to answer the objection that, while the *Ars amatoria* was not intended for *matronae*, a Roman matron could still use the erotic instruction aimed at others (253-54).

If that is the case, then let her read nothing, because all poetry can provide sinful knowledge. Why, let her take up the *Annales* of En-


48For a different view see Zingerle (above, note 32), 2. p. 2, and Morgante (above, note 32), pp. 71-73.
Ennius — there is nothing ruder than they; she'll of course read by whom Ilia was made a parent. When she takes up Lucretius' poem, with its opening *Aeneadum genetrix*, she'll ask by whom Venus became *Aeneadum genetrix*, the mother of the Romans.

(255-62, paraphrased)

Ennius' poem is again introduced as a classic serious work. Yet Ovid's argument is obviously not serious at all. Not only is the *Ars amatoria* in form a lover's handbook, but Ovid himself elsewhere in *Tristia* II facetiously claims that other venerable classics are actually erotic works. "What is the *Iliad,*" he asks at one point, "but an adulteress over whom her lover and husband fought?" (371-72). Thus, although Ovid's argument here is a *reductio ad absurdum* of an anticipated objection, its real aim is to perform for the *Annales* and Lucretius' work a *reductio ad amorem*. He makes this even more outrageous by singling out two national myths associated with the foundation of Rome. We can imagine from the substantial fragment of Ilia's dream preserved by Cicero (*De div. I. 20. 40-41 = Ann. 35-51 V*) and a few other scraps (*Ann. 52-59*) that her story figured prominently in the *Annales*. In Ovid's trivialization of Ennius it is only the rape by Mars that is significant, an erotic event that associates Ennius' poem with his own. Both could be misunderstood or misused by a naughty woman so inclined.

Most of this is simply good Ovidian fun and offers no judgment on Ennius. But there is an evaluation here, emphatically negative, again stated parenthetically, and again focusing on Ennius' lack of art. *Nihil est hirsutius illis* (259). For the third time Ovid singles out the archaic poet's lack of art, here with an obvious echo of Propertius' judgment in *hirsuta corona* (IV. 1. 61). As often happens with such allusions, Ovid's *hirsutius* goes beyond the reference to style in Propertius' phrase to include the content of the *Annales* as well. "Let her take up the *Annales* — there is nothing shaggier or less appealing, nothing further from the world of my elegies than they." Since *hirsutus* and the related *hirtus* frequently appear in rustic contexts, there may also be a suggestion of the rustic world of the *Annales*, as in the narrative of Rome's earliest days. This would surely be a crowning touch by the

---

49 For the use of this phrase referring to the same Ovidian technique in other works see G. K. Galinsky, *Ovid's Metamorphoses. An Introduction to the Basic Aspects* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1975), p. 30, and J. B. Solodow, "Ovid's *Ars Amatoria*: the Lover as Cultural Ideal," *Wiener Studien* 90 (1977), p. 112.

50 See Luck (above, note 47), 2. 122 *ad loc.*

51 E.g., (*hirsutus*) *Am. III. 10. 7; A.A. I. 108; Met. XIII. 766; Virg. *Ecl. 8. 34; Georg. III. 231; (hirtus) Met. XIII. 927; Virg. *Georg. III. 287.*
poet whose urbane love-elegies glorified the cultivated present and often mocked the *rusticitas* of the olden days that was so romantically evoked by his contemporaries.\(^{52}\)

To sum up briefly, for the elegists the name of Ennius always called forth a contrast, of epic with elegy, or war with peace, solemn with erotic literature, a crude style with their own polish. Propertius uses Ennius as an important negative symbol in programmatic elegies, where he is always set opposite Callimachus or Callimachean ideals. Therefore, he is always associated with images of poetic inspiration or achievement such as the dream of initiation, the return from Helicon, and the poet’s crown. Ennius is for Propertius the great exemplar of Roman epic, particularly its martial character, its lofty style, and its technical roughness in the archaic period, all of which Propertius challenges with his elegy. The so-called artlessness of Ennius is even more strongly emphasized by Ovid, who also introduces him into discussions of his own poetry. For Ovid too Ennius is diametrically opposed to Callimachus, but Ovid broadens the Propertian view of both Ennius and Callimachus, as well as of ancient literature in general. Though Ennius is lacking in art, he is also great in genius and immortal. Along with this wider focus comes a more distanced treatment, as compared with that of Propertius, and a diminution of Ennius’ importance as a foil in elegiac poetics. But then Ovid in general plays with the poetic problems that Propertius wrestled with. Many Propertian distinctions are levelled or jettisoned, and Ennius, the great Propertian representative of epic and martial themes, becomes, more simply, a defective Roman classic.\(^{53}\)

\(^{52}\)Compare, for example, *Am.* I. 8. 39-42 (*forsitan inimundae Tatio regnante Sabinae / noluerint habiles pluribus esse viris; / nunc Mars externis animos exercet in armis, / at Venus Aeneae regnat in urbe sui*), and a passage particularly relevant to our lines in the *Tristia, Am.* III. 4. 37-40 (*rusticus est nimium, quem laedit adultera coniunx; / et notos mores non satis Urbis habet / in qua Martigenae non sunt sine crimine nati / Romulus Iliades Iliadesque Remus*).

\(^{53}\)I am grateful for the helpful questions and criticisms from the audience and the other speakers at the conference on archaic Roman poetry held at the University of Minnesota in November 1981 where this paper was originally presented.
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SENECA: SELECTED MORAL EPISTLES
Anna Lydia Motto

*Seneca: Selected Moral Epistles* is designed primarily as a rapid reader for lower level Latin courses. It includes the Latin text with notes and facing vocabulary and a complete vocabulary at the end of the book. The epistles selected present a wide variety of reflections relevant to humanistic concerns.

Code: 40 03 08 AC2

Paper $12.00 (10.25)*

PLAUTUS: CURCULIO
John Wright

An annotated edition of Plautus' shortest comedy. The notes, while they should answer the questions beginners in Plautine latinity might have about the text, are also intended to help any reader arrive at an informed understanding of the play.

Code: 40 03 06 AC2

Paper $6.95 (5.50)

A COMMENTARY ON THE VITA HADRIANI
IN THE HISTORIA AUGUSTA
Herbert W. Benario

"Benario has been successful in making the *Vita Hadriani* comprehensible and accessible not only to classical scholars who are experts in fields other than Roman imperial history, but also to graduate students, and even to serious undergraduates."—*The Classical Outlook*

Includes introduction, Latin text, commentary, appendices and bibliography.
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Paper $10.50 (7.00)

SOURCES FOR THE STUDY OF GREEK RELIGION
David Rice and John E. Stambaugh

"At last we have a sensible, fairly complete, intelligently introduced selection of texts for the study of ancient Greek religion that we can put in the hands of students unable to go to the original sources. . . . The topics are central and the illustrative material germane."—*Religious Studies Review*

Code: 06 03 14 AC2

Paper $8.75 (7.25)
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