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A comparative estimate of the Latin literature which we know existed and the scanty remains which have survived to us is not without some interest and value. This is true even though it be not possible to know or even guess with a fair degree of accuracy the entire original amount of Latin literature. Prof. A. F. West has made general comparisons in answer to the questions: "To what degree of completeness has the record been restored, and what judgments in the way of literary evaluation may we safely make?" He gives figures which are surprising to anyone who surveys the situation for the first time. Out of the seven hundred and seventy-two authors recorded in the literary histories of Schanz and Teuffel, two hundred and seventy-six have no extant fragments, and three hundred and fifty-two exist only in fragments. From the one-fifth which remain, sixty-four have lost more than half, forty-three have lost less than half, and only thirty-seven have been preserved in entirety.

The aim of this thesis is to study in greater detail what Prof. West has given in a general way. The whole field of Latin literature is obviously too great to cover here. It has therefore been necessary to limit the discussion to the period from 240 to 88 B.C., and to the poetry of this period. The poets have been taken up in the order of their treatment by Martin Schanz in his Geschichte der römischen Litteratur.

2 (Mueller's Handbuch der klassischen Altertumswissenschaft VIII, 1, 1, 1907).
Schanz has given separate consideration (pp. 14-26) to the period before 240 B.C., in which he includes the elements of the national literature, such as in lyric poetry, the songs of the Salii and the Fratres Arvalis; in dramatic poetry, the joking dialogues of the great festivals and the dramatic satire. The same festive spirit that led to these induced the custom of the triumphal songs with which an army would follow its victorious general. For epic poetry, there were neniae or funeral songs, eulogizing the dead, and the banquet songs which Cato said praised the virtues and deeds of illustrious men. Last of all comes the didactic poetry, embracing the vaticinia and praecenta of Marcius, an anonymous poem on agriculture, and the sortes or lots, written in hexameter verse. The literary remains of this period are rather too obscure for the purpose of a thesis of this kind, and have therefore been excluded.

Schanz (pp. 2-3) has characterized the second period as that of literature under the influence of Hellenism, and puts the beginning in 240 B.C., the year when the First Punic War ended. 272 B.C. might also be considered as its beginning, as it is the year in which Livius Andronicus, the first poet of this new epoch, came to Rome. The end of this period is placed in 88 B.C., after the Social War was ended and the treaty concluded in which Rome permitted enfranchisement to the Italians. This is significant in that it marks the beginning of the Latinization of Italy and hence Rome's rise to a world-power.

Except in the case of Plautus and Terence, the literary remains of this period are of a fragmentary character. Among
the earlier writers who preserve the fragments is M. Terentius Varro in his De Lingua Latina, 1 46-45 B.C. Cicero also makes many citations in his rhetorical and philosophical works. There is a marked difference in the value of his citations and those of the grammarians and lexicographers, in that he quotes fragments because of some distinctive literary merit or moral teaching, but they cite to illustrate unusual words and constructions. The chief remaining sources follow in chronological order. Aulus Gellius in the second century wrote a miscellany known as the Noctes Atticae. 2 Sextus Pompeius Festus was a grammarian, probably of the third century. In his work, the De Verborum Significatu, 3 he abridged a work probably of the same name, by Verrius Flaccus, an antiquarian of the latter part of the first century B.C. The first half of Festus' book is lost, owing to the fact that it was supplanted by a later abridgment. To the fourth century belong Nonius Marcellus, Aelius Donatus, Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius, Flavius Sosipater Charisius, and Servius Marius (or Maurus) Honoratus. Nonius wrote a lexicographical and grammatical work, the De Compendiosa Doctrina. 4 Donatus wrote commentaries on authors of the classical period; 5 Macrobius wrote the Saturnalia; 6 Charisius,

1. (ed. Mueller, Leipzig 1883.)
2. (ed. Hosius, Leipzig, 1903.)
3. (ed. Mueller, Leipzig, 1839; Ponor, Budapest, 1899.)
4. (ed. L. Mueller, 1888.)
5. (ed. Wessner, Leipzig, 1902.)
6. (ed. Eyssenhardt, Leipzig, 1893.)
the *Ars Grammatica*;¹ and Servius, commentaries on Vergil.²
To the sixth century belong the *Institutiones Grammaticae* of Priscian,³ and to the seventh century the *Etymologiae* or *Origines* of Isidore.⁴ In the age of Charlemagne, Paulus Diaconus (Paul Warnefrid) made an abridgment of Festus which for some time supplanted the earlier work until there was only one manuscript left, and that, incomplete.

The manner in which citations are made by these writers varies widely, and the degree of certainty in their assignment to known works and authors varies accordingly. The best kind of identification is, of course, where the author's name and the name of the work, with book number if possible, are cited. Conjectures as to assignment may be made with varying shades of probability, (a) by identification with the Greek original known to have been used in a given work, (b) by identification of subject matter, (c) by identification of meter, (d) by the title alone when only one author or one important author is known to have written on that subject, or when the man who quotes has a predilection for quoting from a certain author, as Cicero from Ennius.

For the dramatic works of this period, use has been make of Ribbeck's *Scaenicae Romanorum Poesis Fragmenta*;⁵ and for other

2. (ed. Thilo et Hagen, Leipzig, 1881.)
4. (ed. Lindsay, Oxford, 1911.)
5. (Leipzig, 3rd ed., 1897-8.)
poems, Baehren's *Fragmenta Poetarum Romanorum*; for Ennius, Vahlen's *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae*, and for Lucilius, C. Lucilii *Carminum Reliquiae* edited by Marx. The numbers of the fragments are given according to these collections. The citations of the fragments have been tested both in regard to the placing of the fragment and to the determination of titles. All uncertain cases have been studied, especially where there is doubt due to variant manuscript readings.

In order to make an estimate of the bulk of what is lost as compared with that of what remains, it is necessary to obtain the average length of the various units of literary measurement, such as the book, *carmen*, and play. The book among the ancients was, for physical reasons, of far more determined length than in modern times. Ease in handling and in reference had to be sought for in books, which were at best awkward to use, and too great length interfered. Birt estimates the number of lines for a book of poetry as from seven hundred to eleven hundred, occasionally going as low as five hundred, but rarely in Latin poetry exceeding eleven hundred, except in Lucretius, the six books of whose *De Rerum Natura* show the following

1. (Leipzig, 1886.)
2. (Leipzig, 2nd ed., 1903.)
3. (Leipzig, 1904-5.)
4. (Where there is overlapping, Ribbeck's numbering has been chosen in preference to Baehrens', and the numbering of Vahlen and Marx in preference to all others.)
5. (In Lucilius only those fragments designated by Marx with asterisks have been thus tested.)
6. (Das Antike Buchwesen, pp. 286-307)
numbers: 11109, II 1174, III 1092, IV 1279, V 1455, VI 1284, averaging 1232. Yet Lucretius is, perhaps, for the study of early Latin poetry, the safest criterion to follow, as he represents more nearly than any other extant poet the period to which the authors under discussion belong. That longer books are characteristic of the literature of this period, is shown by Apollonius Rhodius who in his Argonautica exceeds the average length for a book to an even greater degree.

Another problem comes in the length of poetry not measured by the units of books and plays, as for instance the songs written by Livius Andronicus to be sung in procession, perhaps like Horace's Carmen Saeculare. Here the only standards of measurement we have are much later poems such as this by Horace, of seventy-six lines, and such poems would be obviously likely to vary greatly in length, according to the occasions for which they were composed. The error from lack of definite information in this case is not so important as it might be, since there are few of these poems to deal with in the period under consideration.

As to the length of the dramas, the comedies of Plautus and Terence, and, to a lesser extent, the tragedies of Seneca serve as evidence. The average length of Plautus' plays (omitting the Vidularia) is 1061 lines, of Terence's 1012, of both 1050, of Seneca's 1186. Consequently with Seneca as a check, it would probably be reasonably near the truth to consider 1050 lines as the average length of a drama and to estimate the proportions of lost and extant accordingly.

In computing the comparative amounts of extant and lost works for each author, the total bulk will be assumed to be the number of titles x the average number of lines for each class. In the
fragments preserved, parts of lines are considered as whole lines, and the percentage extant is calculated.

Even with this method there are many opportunities for error. Many of the lines of which there are only one or two words left are, from lack of any good basis for discriminating against them, considered as whole lines. There are doubtful identifications, and, on the other hand, lines which probably belong to plays which we know, but which for lack of sufficient proof have to be classed among the uncertain fragments. The estimated length of the particular books and plays is always subject to doubt. Yet these errors probably tend to neutralize one another and the final reckoning should show some approximation to the real facts.

In the case of extant plays of Plautus and Terence no attempt has been made to allow for lacunae (except in the Vidularia) or for possible interpolations.

Baehrens and Ribbeck have placed under the heading Incerta the fragments for which the evidence is not sufficient for assignment to a particular work or author. These fragments have been supplemented by others which they appear to have assigned upon insufficient evidence. It is practically impossible to assign the Incerta to any particular period. Consequently they are omitted, with no attempt at the unprofitable task of their classification.
To prepare the way for an intelligent reckoning of the extant amounts of the different authors I have, in the following pages, treated all cases in which there is reasonable cause for confusion or doubt, due to uncertainty either in the ascription to a given author or in the placing of a particular fragment among an author's works. Mere cases of variant spelling, where no confusion is likely to arise, and all fragments concerning which there is no doubt are reckoned in the summaries at the end of the thesis, but receive no comment in the section immediately to follow.

The bracketing of a title indicates its exclusion from the remains of the author to whom it is ascribed.

In Ennius' Annales, I have used the line number in Vahlen's edition; in citing the fragments from Baehrens, I have, following his custom, used Arabic numerals; in citing those from Ribbeck, Roman.
Aegisthus

V  Non. 176: Livius Aegistho:
Livius Bentin. Mueller; Lucilius codd.
The mistake in the codices might have come from
the "Lucilius" which occurred a little earlier.
Livius and Accius, as far as we know, were the
only poets who wrote dramas of this name. Livius
is probably referred to here, because paleograph-
ically Livius and Lucilius could more easily be
confused than Accius and Lucilius.

Aiax Mastigophorus

I  Non. 127: Livius Aiace:
II  Non. 207: Titus Livius pisi † aiace mastigophoro:
pisi ad tacematico foro C., Titus del. Iun. Schol.
ad Plauti Capt. 615: Hortamenta, flagella quibus
aurigae utuntur cum equos hortantur: Aiax Mas-
tigophorus.
If there were two plays we should expect Nonius in
127 to have been more specific. Sophocles wrote
a tragedy called the Aiax Mastigophorus.

Danae

Non. 473: Naevius Danae
Livius codd., Naevius edd.
The change from "Livius" to "Naevius" in the editions
was probably made because the play of Naevius was
the better known. By the principle of lectio difficilior, it would seem best to retain "Livius".

Ino


Plessis (La Poesie Latine, p. 5) thinks that the names Livius and Laevius were confused, and that this really refers to the Ino of Laevius. Karl Schenkl (Wien. Stud. XVI, 1894, p. 159) does not think that the lines thus introduced came from Livius, but that they were inserted when the play was worked over. I have followed Ribbeck in assigning the lines to the Ino of Livius.

COMEDIES (Ribb. p. 3)

(Virgus)

Fest. 174 M.: Levius in Virgo (so the mss., Livius Mueller, de Mirmont)

Many conjectures have been made as to the names of the play: Auriga, Vargo, Verpus, and Virgo.

I have referred the play to Laevius on the authority of the codices.

EPIC

Odissia

Fragments 5, 8, 10, 16, 20, 23, 27, 28 have been kept here because they are cited either from Livius or the Odissia and because they show marked
similarity to the following Homeric passages: I, 136 ff., I, 248; II, 422 or XV, 287; IV, 557; VI, 295; VIII, 138; VIII, 322; X, 395; XII, 17.

Fragments 6, 18, 31, 33, 34, 35 have been referred to the incerta of Livius because there is not sufficient resemblance to the following Homeric passages with which they have sometimes been compared: I, 169; V, 411; XV, 373; II, 243; XIX, 225; XIX, 439.

40 Non. 493: Livius in Odissia:
Laberius codd., Livius edd. Bentin.
"Livius" is probably the correct reading since we know Laberius only as a writer of mimes.

41 Prisc. gramm. II, 234: idem alibi.
This fragment has been assigned here, though not by Baehrens, to the Odissia, on the basis of its similarity to the Odyssey VII, 234 ff.

On the Number of Books of the Odissia

Prisc. gramm. II, 321, 7: Livius Andronicus in I Odissiae; Odissia H. Odissiae rell.
Prisc. gramm. II, 151: Livius in VI VII H. Dresd., III spscr. Lipe. No important codices omit the number, although there is variance in the number itself.

Prisc. gramm. II, 231: idem alibi:

Tolkiehn (Wochenschrift für klass. Philol. 1900, Sp. 558) says that this form of citation is unusual in Priscian, and suggests the emendation "idem in libro VII" from the resemblance between
the citation and the Odyssey VII, 96 f.

A comparison of the fragments assigned by Baehrens to the Odissia with the Odyssey (such as is made at length by De Mirriont, pp. 95-133) shows that the translation was not made invariably line for line. Fragment 22, containing three lines, is equivalent to the Odyssey VIII 138-139. Fragments 2, 5, 12, 23, 32, 37, and 38 are abridged forms of passages in the Odyssey. Fragments 6, 18, 29, 31, 33, 34, 35, 39, 41, and 45, probably on account of their abridged form, cannot be readily identified with the Odyssey.

There is a strong probability that, considering the early date of the poem, and the fact that book-making was not yet a well-developed art, the Odissia was not published in twenty-four, though it might have been published in five or six books. Horace (epist. 2, 1, 69) says: non equidem insector delendave carmina Livi/esse reor, memini quae plagosum mihi parvo/Orbilium dictare. Bentley reads "Laevi" instead of "Livi", following the codex Reginensis. He bases his departure from the conventional explanation on the fact that a teacher of the standing of Orbilius would not use for instruction...
a work containing so many obsolete words as the Odissia. Weissenfels (Wochenschr. für Klass. Philol. 1904, sp. 628) thinks that Bentley's reading is wrong and that a few obsolete words would not prevent a Roman scholar from making use of the venerable, highly prized Odissia. I have followed Schanz and Weissenfels in considering Livius' Odissia was used as a school book. If Livius did intend its use to be such, the probability is that he did not write it in twenty-four books.

Most of the citations give no book number and the numbers are all low in the few which do give them. It is possible that there was originally one large book which was later divided, as was Naevius' Bellum Punicum. This would account for the difference in citations. However, in consideration of the doubt existing, the fragments have been referred, as by Schanz p. 57, to a single book.

HYMNS

Fest. 330 M.: Cum Livius Andronicus bello Punico secundo scripsisset carmen quod a virginibus est cantatum, quia prosperius res publica populi Romani geri coepta est, publice ♠ adtributa est et in Aventino aedis Minervae in qua liceret scribis histrionibusque consistere ac dona ponere, in honorem Livi quia his et ♠ scriebat fabulas et agebat. Livy XXVII, 37, 7: Decerevere item pontifices ut virgines ter novemae per urbem euntes carmen cance-
tent. Id cum in Iovis Statoris aede discerent conditum ab Livio poeta carmen, tacta de caelo aedis in Aventino Iunonis Reginae.
De Mirmont (pp. 193 ff.) thinks there was only one hymn, for otherwise Livy would not have failed to speak of both. I have here followed Schanz (p. 60) in assuming the existence of two poems, one a song of thanks, the other a song of entreaty.
**Anonymous Tragedies (Baehrens pp. 52-53)**

**Carmen Priami**

Varro. *ling.*, VII, 28: In carmine Priami quod est:

**Carmen Nelei**

Charis. *gramm.*, I, 84: ut in Odyssia vetere et in Nelei carmine aeque prisco:

5 Festus 314 M.: strigores in Ne(lei carmine prost) rigosis positum (invenitur......)

This fragment, emended by Ursinus, has been excluded because there is too little basis for the emendation.

6 Festus 197 M.: ut in veteribus carminibus:

This fragment has been excluded for lack of evidence. [1] Neither the form, the subject matter, nor yet the use of "carmen" will decide absolutely whether these are tragedies or poems of some other sort.

But the Carmen Nelei is in iambic verse, as are the dramas of Livius Andronicus, Naevius, and Ennius, while the epics of Livius and Naevius, on the other hand, are in Saturnian verse, and Ennius' *Annales* in dactylic hexameter. Mueller (Fest. 388 M.) thinks that the Carmen Nelei is based on the Tyro of Sophocles and De Mirmont (p. 218) notes the interest that such a subject would have for the Romans on account of its similarity to the Romulus legend. I have therefore considered the Carmen Nelei and the Carmen Priami, whose titles would seem not inappropriate, at least, for a tragedy, as tragedies, although I recognize the uncertainty of books with the title of "carmen".

Hector Proficiscens

I Prisc. 801 P.: Naevius in Hectore proficiscente...


These probably refer to the one drama Hector Proficiscens.

COMEDIES (Ribb. pp. 6-35)

Acontizomenos

I Char. gramm. 188 P.: prime, Plautus in acontizomeno.

Plautus cod.; Naevius ed. princ.

Schoell (ed. Plautus, Truculentus V p. 72, 1884) emends: Plautus in (....item Naevius in) Acontizomeno. This emendation is based on a line in the Truculentus containing "prime," which is the only known case of the word in Plautus.

Agrypnuntes

Non. 65: Naevius Trypuntibus:...

Amnagremnuntes

Non. 150: Naevius Amnagremnuntiis:...

Amnagremnuntiis (-bus) codd.


Though Ribbeck has placed these together, two separate titles have been made where owing to the necessity of too great emendation.
Colax

III Non. 462: Naevius colace.

colace corr. Bentin; colare codd. This emendation has been accepted owing to the ease of the paleográfical error.

Commotria

Varro, ling. VII, 54 M.: in Cosmetria Naevii:

cometria Par. 7489; ométia Guelf.; cometria Vindobon; comedia Par. 6142; cosmetria Aldus; cosmotria vulg.; aemathia vulg. marg.; cementria ed. Scioppius; commotria Turnebus, Ribbeck.

In spite of this variation, and the doubt as to the correct spelling, it is probable that this fragment is from a comedy of Naevius and that it cannot be identified with any other known title.

Corollaria

Dion. gramm. 395 P.: Naevius in corollaria.

Neuius M; Meuius B.

Naevius was an unimportant poet of Vergil's time, and it is improbable that he wrote a comedy of this name.

Demetrius

W. H. Grauert (Philol. 2, 1847, p. 126) considers the Demetrius a praetexta, based on the story of Demetrius, an Illyrian noble who received a province from Rome. He brought war against Rome, was conquered, and fled to King Philip of Macedonia, whose councillor he was until he fell
in battle.

Klussman considers Demetrius a *comoedia palliata*, 

based on an emendation of Festus 217 M.

Alexis and Turpilius wrote comedies called Demetrius.

**Nautae**

Festus 310 M.: ....(sup) parum puni

..........cat Nevi† de

(bello Puni) co. Et in Nautis

This fragment and title are kept here although their uncertainty is recognized.

**Nervolaria**

Non. 151 M.: Naevius Nervularia:

Naevius vulgo; Novius coni. M.; Ennius Jun.;

Herularia L., II.; erularia G.

This is clearly a play of Naevius and though the spelling is doubtful, there seems no chance for confusion with any other known play.

**Personata**

Paul. Fest. 217 M: Personata fabula quaedam<

ut† ......

Mueller emends to "quaedam Naevi ut", and I have here accepted his emendation.

**Tarentilla**

II Isid. Orig. I, 26: Ennius de quadam impudica (11.1-3)

Paul. Fest. 29 M.: Naevius in Tarentilla (1. 2)

Thesaurus nov. Lat., in A. Mai auct. class. VIII,

54: Livius (1. 2).

Thesaurus nov. Lat., in A. Mai auct. class. VIII,
372: Plautus (1. 2).
Festus gives the most definite citation, and is followed as being more trustworthy evidence than Isidore.

Tunicularia
The emendation to "Naevius" is probably correct.
II Varro, ling. VII, 108: ut apud Naevium...in Aunicularia.
The emendation to "Tunicularia" is accepted here.

(Tabellaria) (Ribb. 325)
Non. 218 M: Novius Tabellaria.
Novius codd.; Naevius edd.
This is probably a play of Novius, for there is no manuscript evidence for Naevius.

Sanniones (Ribb. 324)
Non. 218 M: Naevius Sannionibus.
The evidence here seems to be about evenly divided, but I have here attributed it to Naevius.

Fretum (Ribb. 34)
Varro ling. VII, 70: quibus testimonium est quod fretum† est Naevii.
Mueller suggests the emendation of "quod fretum est" to "quadrigeminis." The form of citation, however, is not unusual (cf. Varro ling. VII 15, 28, 46), and the play Fretum is here assigned to Naevius.
Diobolaria (Schanz, p. 64)
Fulg. srm. ant. 43: Neius in Diobolaria.

Philemporos (Schanz, p. 64)
Fulg. srm. ant. 21: Neius in Philemporo.
These comedies are omitted by Ribbeck on account of the reputation of Fulgentius, whose citations are characterized as "untrustworthy, partly from mere negligence, partly from conscious falsification." (Skutsch in Pauly-Wissowa, Real-Encyclopädie VII, 1, 219). They are retained here from lack of more particular evidence against them.

Satura (Baehrens, p. 51)
Atta wrote a Satura which was a comoedia togata, and Pomponius wrote one which was an Atellana. Of course, there is a possibility that Satura may here be a miscellany.

Ludus (Baehrens, p. 52) (Ribb., 1902)
posteriore libro P, ME (ludo in marg.), Y. It is possible that we have in "poetae ludo" and the variant a corruption of the original name of the play. Moore (Am. Jour. Phil. 1902, p. 437) discusses the Ludus and Lupus (Fest. 270 M.), and suggests that the name is Ludus, the Lydian, the Etruscan.
Alimonium Remi et Romuli

(Romulus, Ribb., p.321)


II Varro ling. VII, 107: ut apud Naevium in Romulo. There is a possibility of two plays here, but it is more simple to assume the shortening of a lengthy bulky name.  
(Lupus, Ribb. 322)

I Festus 270 M.: Naevius in Lupc Vel  Veiens regem salutant ibae albnum mulium comitem senem sapientem, contra redhostis Min salus  Though there is a possibility of a separate play Lupus, it seems advisable to put this fragment under the Alimonium Remi et Romuli on account of the probable identity of the subject matter.  
Ribbeck makes two plays out of these fragments, Romulus and Lupus.  
Schanz considers that there was probably only one play, the Alimonium Remi et Romuli.

EPIC  
(Baehrens, pp. 43-51)

Bellum Punicum

4. Servius, Aen. III, 10: Naevius inducit uxores
Aeneae et Anchisae cum lacrimis Ilium relinquentes his verbis...
The fragment, which is thus introduced, is referred to the *Bellum Punicum* on account of the meter and subject matter. 6. Paulus 20 M.: Aenesi dicti sunt comites Aeneae. This fragment is excluded *for* lack of evidence. 1, 7, 36, 38, 39: These lines have been referred to the *Bellum Punicum* because they are attributed to Naevius and are of appropriate meter.

29. Fest. 293 M: et meminit (.....Naevius) qui ait in belli (Punic libris...)

The emendations are by Mueller. The fragment has been excluded because too great emendation is necessary. Fragments 8, 14, 34, 49, 56, 57, 58 are referred to the *incerta* of Naevius since the evidence for their attribution to the *Bellum Punicum* is not sufficient.

**Number of Books in Bellum Punicum.**

Suet. *gramm.* 2: C. Octavius Lampadio Naevii Punicum bellum, quod uno volumine et continenti scriptura expositum divitit in septem libros. *

Baehrens p. 50, §48. Non. 474, 16: Naevius belli poenici lib. VII.

* (Non. 170, 17: Septifariumut multifarium.

Santra de verborum antiquitate III: quod volumen unum nos lectitavimus, set postea invenimus septifarium divisum. *This may perhaps refer to Naevius*.)
I have considered the number of books of the Bellum Punicum to be seven, for although it was originally published in one book, we have good evidence that it was sufficiently bulky to permit of division into seven books.
IV M. PACUVIUS

TRAGEDIES (Ribb. pp. 86-157)

Antiopa

XV  Schol. Persii I, 77: Antiopam verrucosam
Persius dicit quae apud Dirceen servitio oppressa
in squalore fuit: inluiue corporis.......  
This is referred to Pacuvius, as he is the only
known author of an Antiopa.

Armorum Iudicium

VI  Fest. 281 M.: Pacuvius in arm (orum iudicio)
Tuque......

Pacuvius Ursinus, emendation of title, Mueller

Atalanta

V  Non. 65: Pacuvius Tantalo:
Atalanta corr. Junius. The correction has been
followed here.

Chryses

VI  Varro ling. V, 17: sic caelum et summum ubi
stellae, et id quod Pacuvius, cum demonstrat,
dicit: (11. 1, 2) cui subiungit (1. 4)

Cic. div. I, 57, 131: ut ille Pacuvianus qui
in Chryse physicus....... Cur? quaeo, cum ipse
paucis interpositis versibus dicas satis luculente.
(11. 5-7)
Non. 144, 10: Pacuvius Chryse: (1. 3)

Although Bergk (Opuscula I, 68) has assigned
lines 1, 2, and 4 to the Antiopa, I have here
followed Scaliger and Ribbeck in assigning them to Chryses on the basis of the close connection of subject matter.


I have assigned the whole line to the Chryses of Pacuvius because there seems to be no other evidence that Plautus wrote a Chryses which is, by title, a tragedy, or an Iliona and because we have Varro's authority that Pacuvius wrote the last part of the line.

Dulorestes

XIX Non. 90: Ennius Dulorestes

Pacuvius coni. Scaliger: Perhaps the name of Pacuvius had fallen out with the words of Ennius.

I have followed Scaliger because there are thirty-one citations ascribing the play to Pacuvius and no others ascribing a Dulorestes to Ennius.

XXVIII Non. 307: Pacuvius Dulorestes: (11. 1-2)

Non. 479: Accius Dulorestes: (1. 2)

I have ascribed XXVIII to Pacuvius on the same principle as XIX.

Hermiona

The fragment has been placed among the incerta of Pacuvius, because the correctness of the emendation is doubtful.

Iliona

VI Non. 382: Pacuvius Iliona:

Pacuvius Roth accius Lugdunensis actius

Harleinus accius rell.

Pacuvius is the only known author of an Iliona.

The codex Lugdunensis shows a probable step in the corruption of the name from Pacuvius to Accius and Actius.

XV Non. 505: Ennius Andromacha aechmalotide.....

......Iliona:

I have followed Junius here in ascribing this citation to the Iliona of Pacuvius because Pacuvius' tragedy was well-known, and there is no other known author of an Iliona.

Medus (Medius, Medea)

XXIII Fest. 229 M.: altum est ac fundum (habet longe Pacuvius)

in Medo: neque

The emendation of Mueller has here been accepted, since there is no other known author of a Medius.

Niptra

Fragments I and II have been assigned to the Niptra because of the distinctive subject matter.
IV Fest. 217 M.: Pacuvius in Teucro....etinni patris:
Scaliger's emendation of "etinni patris" to "et in Niptris" is here accepted.

VI Non. 223: Accius Niptris:
I have followed Priscian in ascribing the fragment to Pacuvius because Pacuvius is the only known writer of a play of this name.

Periboea

XXVII Varro ling VII, 6: ut in Periboea:
I have assigned this fragment to Pacuvius, as he is the only known author of a Periboea.

Teucer

Cicero (orat II, 46, 193) gives a quotation from Pacuvius, which was from a speech of Telamo. The lines have been ascribed to the Teucer, because fitting exactly the circumstances which one would expect in a play with this title.

PRAETEXTA

Paulus (Ribb., pp. 325-326)

II Non. 510: Novius Paulo. codd.
I have followed Ribbeck in accepting the emendation of Iunius, because there are three other pieces of evidence for a Paulus by Pacuvius and none for one by Novius or Naevius.
SATURA (Schanz, p. 131)

Diom. *gramm.* I, 485: olim carmen quod ex variis poematibus constabat satira vocabatur, quale scripserunt Pacuvius et Ennius.

Porph. *Hor. sat.* I, 10 46: quum alii alia carminum genera consummate scriberent, quorum mentionem habuit, sermonum autem frustra temptasset Terentius Varro Narbonensis, qui Atacinus ab Atace fluvio dictus est, item Ennius, qui quattuor libros saturarum reliquit, et Pacuvius huic generi versificationis non suffecissent, se id scribere ait ita, ut aliis maior sit, Lucilio minor.

The evidence that Pacuvius wrote satire is good, but as it does not mention at all the number of books, we can not safely assume more than one book.
Harpazomene

II Non. 200: Caecilius Sarpazomene emended by Iunius to Harpazomene.

Hymnis

IV Cic. fin. II, 7,22: ut illud in ore habeant ex Hymnide:

I have followed Ribbeck in assigning the fragment to Caecilius because he is the only known writer of a Hymnis.

Hypobolimaeus (Subditivos)

VII Fest. 353 M.: (Caecilius in Hypo)

bolimaeo: Habitab (at in Tugurio nullo) perculo.

In VII and VIII I have accepted the emendation of Mueller.

VIII Fest. 274 M.: et in Artemone: et (Caecilius) in Hypobolimaeo: Prius...ntam feceris. Ratus sum...

Hypobolimaeus Chaerestratus

Hypobolimaeus Rastraria

Hypobolimaeus Aeschinus

Ritschl (Parerga p. XIV) thinks that there were only two Hypobolimaei, one of which Caecilius took over from Menander, the other from Philemon, and that the other titles can be identified with these. Grauert (Ritschl, Parerga p. XIV) thinks that the
Hypobolimaeus and the Hypobolimaeus Rastraria were one drama, called by two names like some Plautine dramas. In the absence of any sure means of identifying any one of the plays with another, I have considered it safest to follow Schanz (p. 132), ascribing the four plays to Caecilius.

**Imbrii**

IV Non. 194: Caecilius Synephebis.
infoebis Harleianus, inphoebis Urbin.308;
in imbris rel.; Synephebis Ribbeck.
I have followed the best manuscript evidence in ascribing the fragment to the Imbrii.

**Karine**

III Prisc. 726 P.: Caecilius in Cratino;
Meineke has emended the citation to "in Karine", an emendation accepted here.

**Obolostates or Faenerator**

VI Non. 483: Caecilius Venatore.
VII Non. 42: Caecilius Venatori.
Feneratore Spengel.
I have accepted Spengel's emendation here.

**Pausimachus**

II Non. 127: Caecilius Pausimacho.
Nausimacho Lugdunensis, Harleianus; Epinausimachoch 
reell.; Pausimacho Mercer.
Although this fragment may refer to an Epinausimachus of Caecilius, I think it is safer, con-
sidering the variant reading, to ascribe it here to the Pausimachus.

Plocium

XVIII Non. 146: Caecilius Potio.

Plocio ed. 1526

I have assigned the fragment here because of many other pieces of evidence for a Plocium.

Synepebi

I Cic. nat. deor. III, 29, 72: ille vero in Synepebis Academicorum more contra communem opinionem non dubitat pugnare ratione qui...dicit:

This fragment has been assigned to Caecilius since beside the doubtful reading in III, there is no other known poet who has written a play of this name.


est Schoem.; ut ille Baiter; ut Terentius Erl; Statius alii; Plautus alii.

The fragment is here assigned to Caecilius, as he is the only known writer of a Synepebi.

Exincertis fabulis Caeciliii

XXXVII Hor. a. p.238 ut nihil intersit Davusne loquatur et audax Pythias emunoto lucrata Simone talentum,

An custos famulusque dei Silenus alumni. Comm. Cruq. in l. l.; Pythias persona comica in comoedia Lucilii quae inducitur per astutias accipere argentum a Simone domino suo in dotem filiae.

Lucilius cod.; Caecilius Orelli.
I have considered it safer to omit this, though the reading "Lucilii" cannot stand and may be a confusion for "Caecilii".
VI Q. ENNIIUS

TRAGEDIES (Vahlen, pp. 118-188)

Aiax

II Fest. 329 M.: Ennius:
This fragment has been placed among the incerta of
Ennius from lack of sufficient evidence for identi-
fication with the Aiax.

III Varro ling. VI, 6: Ennius aiax quod lumen, iubarine
in caelo cerno?
Varro ling. VII, 76: aiax quod
aliquod or aliquot, codd.
This is placed among the incerta of Ennius on ac-
count of the necessity for too great emendation.

Alexander

VI Paul. Fest. 369 M.: Ennius:
This fragment is referred to the incerta of Ennius.

XI Fest. 217 M.: In Alexandro:
The Alexander of Ennius is the only one for which
there is evidence, and this fragment has been refer-
red to it.

Andromache or Andromache Aechmalotis

III Varro ling. X, 70: itaque Ennius ait:
This line has been assigned to the Andromache be-
cause of its resemblance to v. 8 of Euripides' 
Andromache, the influence of which is seen in the
other fragments of Ennius' play.

VI Cicero (Tusc. I, 44, 105) gives the passage with no
mention of author or title. The subject matter, however, and the parallel passage in Euripides' Andromache (v. 399) seem to warrant its identification with Ennius' Andromache.

XII Varro ling. VII, 6: ut in Andromacha

Cicero (Tusc. I, 21, 48) gives the quotation with no mention of title or author. An Andromache was also written by Bassus, but he is too late for Cicero to quote, so it seems safe to refer this fragment to Ennius.

Andromeda

VIII Varro ling. VII, 16: Ennius:

Vahlen has attributed this to the Andromeda; O. Mueller and Ribbeck, to the Medea. On account of the uncertainty as to the correctness of either of these attributions, it is here referred to the incerta of Ennius.

Cresphontes

Rhet. Her. II, 24, 38 and II, 25, 39:

I have followed Vahlen who omits these eight lines saying that Wecklin has disproved the identification.

Erechtheus

I Serv. Aen. II, 62: Ennius:

Vahlen has placed the lines here because of the subject matter. I have referred them to the incerta of Ennius from lack of sufficient evidence.

III Fest. 162:...(Enn)ius in Erechtheo.

As we have no mention of any other Erechtheus,
Mueller's emendation is probably correct.

**Eumenides**

I  Cic. *de orat.* I, 45, 199: quod apud Ennium dicat ille Pythius Apollo:
These lines correspond to ll. 604 ff. of the *Eumenides* of Aeschylus, whence Ennius probably took his subject matter.

VI Varro *ling.* VII, 19: Ennius:
Scaliger has ascribed this line to the *Eumenides* on the basis of a parallel passage in Aeschylus ll. 742 ff. The likeness does not seem sufficiently close and the line has been considered among the *incerta* of Ennius.

VII Cic. *Tusq.* I, 28, 68:
This fragment has been retained on the basis of its quotation by Cicero, and its similarity to Aeschylus' *Eumenides* ll. 885 ff.

**Hectoris Lytra**

IV Cic. *Tusq.* II, 16, 38 and *Orat.* 46, 155
These verses were kept because they were Ennian and because the subject matter was suitable.

V Cic. *S. Rose.* 32, 89 and *Schol. Gronovius* h. l.p. 434, l,Or.
The scholium refers the fragment to the time when Achilles would not fight on account of the loss of Briseis. Ribbeck identifies the fragment with the *Hectoris Lytra*, Bergk with the *Achilles*. It is here placed among the *incerta* of Ennius.

VI, VII, VIII, XVIII are similarly placed since
they offer no further information than the name of the author.

**Hecuba**

**III** Varro ling. VII, 6: ut in Hecuba:
This fragment may be from the *Hecuba* of Accius, but it is placed here because, if we may judge from the frequency of the citations, this is the better known play.

**VIII** Cic. fin. II, 13, 41: Hoc dixerit potius Ennius
The parallel between VIII and the *Hecuba* of Euripides (l. 627), though close, is hardly closer than between it and Bacchae 910. The fragment is therefore placed among the incerta of Ennius.

**XI** Cic. orat. 45, 153, (no title or author mentioned)
The parallel between this line and the *Hecuba* of Euripides (l. 837) is hardly sufficiently convincing for the identification of the passage.

**XIII** Cic. Lael. 17, 64: Quamquam Ennius recte:
The parallel between this line and the *Hecuba* of Euripides (l. 1226) seems to warrant the identification of the fragment with Ennius' *Hecuba*.

**Iphigenia**

**II** Varro ling. VII, 73; V, 19: itaque dicit Andromeda nocti et Agamemnon: in altisono caeli clipeo; et Ennius item;
While this possibly belongs here, it is not capable of proof, and must therefore be considered among the incerta of Ennius.

**III** Cic. div. II, 26, 57: qui quidem silentio noctis ut
ait Ennius:
This fragment like II is put among the incerta.

IV Cic. Tusc. IV, 36, 77: alternis enim versibus
intorquentur inter fratres gravissimae contumeliae
ut facile appareat Atrei filios esse.
The parallel between this fragment and Iphigenia at
Aulis of Euripides (ll. 317 ff.) is good. Naevius
also wrote an Iphigenia, but if this were from his
play, his name would probably have been mentioned,
since he was not as well-known as Ennius.
Fragments VII and IX are Ennian lines which are ac-
cepted here for their likeness to Euripides' Iphigen-
ia at Aulis. (ll. 446-447, 1. 708)

VIII Cic. Att. XIII, 47, 1, (no author or title mentioned)
This is placed among the incerta incertorum poetarum.

XII Cic. rep. I, 18, 30: de Iphigenia Achilles
This is accepted, like fragment IV.

Medea Exul

III Cic. Tusc. III, 26, 63: ut illa apud Ennium nutrix:
The subject matter aids in the identification, as
well as the similarity to Euripides' Medea 1. 57.

IV Cic. epist. VII, 6, 1, (Medea is mentioned but no
author). Although Accius also wrote a Medea, it
seems safer to assume that this is by Ennius, both
because Cicero is quoting and because Ennius' play
is the more famous.

VI Cic. Rab. Post, 11, 29: regum autem sunt haec im-
peria. This fragment is accepted here like IV in
consideration of the similarity between the fragment and Euripides' Medea 352.

VII Cic. nat. deor. III, 25, 65: atque eadem Medea patrem et patriam fugiens:
The identification of this fragment is like that of IV.

IX Charis. gramm. IV 284-286 K, (no title or author mentioned)
These lines are conjecture from the two passages and placed here because of the subject matter and the close parallel to Euripides' Medea (ll. 476 ff)

X Cic. de orat. III, 58, 217, (no author or title mentioned)
The fragment is kept here because there is a close parallel in Euripides' Medea (ll. 502 ff), and that Cicero quotes it may be a slight argument in favor of its identification.

XI Cic. Tusc. IV, 32, 69: quid ait ex tragœdia princeps ille Argonautarum:
This is kept on the same principle as X.

XVII Non. 470: Ennius Medea: Asta atque Athenas anticum opulentum oppidum.
Varro ling. VII, 9: ut apud Ennium in Medea:
Contemplo et templum Cereris ad laevam aspice.
The Medea is one of the plays which Cicero said were taken over verbatim from the Greek. The thought, however, was really taken over rather than the word. The fact that XVII 1. 1 seems to call for a scene in Athens for which there is no parallel in Euripides,
has led some scholars to think that there were two plays, the Medea and the Medea Exul. This surmise rests to some extent on the joining of the two lines in XVII, and there is no authority for the union. In addition, neither Cicero nor Varro seems to have known of more than one play. Consequently I have here followed Wahlen who has made only one play, rather than Ribbeck who has made two.

Phoenix

II Cic. orat. 46, 155: idem poeta.

The fragment has been referred to the incerta of Ennius.

IV Non. 245: Ennius quo enicitum quo enicitum codd., Phoenice tum coni. Columna.

These lines have been accepted here on the basis of the paleographical emendation.

Telamo

II Cic. Tusc. III, 13, 28 and III, 24, 58: et Telamo ille declarat

There is no other Telamo cited by Ribbeck.

IV Cic. div. II, 50, 104: an noster Ennius? (ll. 316-317)

Cic. nat. deor. III, 32, 79: Telamo autem uno versu locum totum conficit, cur di homines negligunt. (l. 318)

Cic. div. I, 58, 132: atque haec quidem Ennius qui paucis ante versibus: esse deos, censet, sed eos...

....(ll. 319 ff.)
These have been united and ascribed to Telamo on account of the striking similarity of the subject matter.

**Thyestes**

III Cic. *inv.* I, 49, 91, (no author or title given)  

Fable 88 of Hyginus, which has a scene between Thresprotus and Atreus and Thyestes, led Vahlen to accept the fragment. Feeling that the evidence was not sufficient, I have placed it among the *incerta* of Ennius.

Fragments VII, VIII and XI have been accepted because of the dramas of this name; that of Ennius is the best known and so the most likely to have been quoted by Cicero without mention of the author.

X Cic. *Tusc.* III, 19, 14: *ecce tibi ex altera parte ab eodem poeta:*

As the subject matter is not distinctive, this fragment is placed among the *incerta* of Ennius.

**EPIC**

**Annales**

In the *Annales* all fragments have been accepted if they were Ennian, in hexameter, and with suitable subject matter. The following are cases where Vahlen's identification has not been accepted. In citation, the line number rather than the fragment number is given:


Lines 26, 27, 28, 56, 57, 60, 61, 73, 74, 76, 264, 309, 374, 375, 376, 377, 378, 379, 400, 455, 457, 458, 463, 464, 467, 468, 475, 476, 478, 479, 480, 481, 482, 483, 484, 485, 487, 490, 491, 497, 498, 499, 511, 513, 514, 515, 516, 517, 518, 523, 524, 525, 529, 529, 530, 532, 540, 542, 543, 545, 549, 551, 552, 553, 554, 555, 556, 558, 560, 561, 562, 563, 564, 566, 568, 573, 574, 575, 576, 577, 580, 581, 582, 583, 584, 585, 586, 588, 590, 593, 594, 595, 596, 598, 600, 603, 604, 605, 609, 611, 612, 613, 616, 622, 625, 626, 628 have been placed among the incerta of Ennius, owing to the lack of evidence, in my judgment sufficient for assignment to the Annales.

Lines 65, 66, 97, 135, 169, 178, 302, 311, 397, 486, 533, 541, 547, 548, 610, 617, 618, 619, 620, 623, 624, 627 have been placed among the incerta incertorum poetarum.

Lines 602, 606, 614, 615 have been omitted because the direct form is not quoted, but merely the substance of the original.
The number of books in the *Annales* has been rather definitely decided as eighteen. For this number we have the following evidence:

Dio. *gramm.* I, 484 K: epos Latinum primus digne scripsit is qui res Romanorum decem et octo complexus est libris, qui et annales inscribuntur, quod singulorum fere annorum actus contineat, sicut publici annales quos pontifices scribæque conficiunt, vel Romanis, quod Romanorum res gestas declarant.

Non. 63: Ennius *lib.* XVIII:

Gell. XIII, 21, 14: contra vero idem Ennius in annali duodevicesimo:

Pliny is witness that Ennius himself divided the *Annales* into books.


Festus 257 M.: Quippe significare quod ni, testimonio est Ennius l. XL.† XL cod., XI Ursinus.

This citation from Festus is the only evidence we have that is opposed to the number eighteen. The emendation of Ursinus has been accepted here as a reasonable and paleographically easy explanation.

**MISCELLANEOUS**

*Saturae*


A *praetexta Sabinae* is reasonable but not an epic
embracing four books with different meter. The numeral III might have risen by dittography from the last letters of "Sabinarum".

I have placed these lines among the incerta of Ennius, considering it doubtful whether to place them with the Saturae by the emendation of Colonna, or to place them with the praetexta Sabinæ by omission of the "quarto".


In the gap there are these readings:

This fragment has been placed among the uncertain fragments of uncertain authors both because of the doubtful variant readings and the good evidence in Porph. Hor. sat. I, 10, 46: Ennius quattuor libros saturarum reliquit.

Lines 21-57 have been omitted because they are not quoted directly. Lines 65-70 have been referred to the incerta of Ennius because there is no further evidence.

Scipio

III, IV: These fragments have been referred to the Scipio because they are by Ennius and have suitable subject matter.

V These three lines have been assigned, though without
absolute certainty, to this place, because Cicero quotes them as the words of Scipio, and the probability is that they were by Ennius. Lersch (Rhein. Mus., V, 1837, p. 420) has considered the Scipio to be a part of the Saturae. His important arguments are (1) that when Gellius (IV, 7) says: "ex libro qui Scipio inscribitur", he meant: "ex libro satararum". (2) Line 8 which is universally assigned to the Scipio is also in Nonius 66 ascribed to the Saturae. L. Mueller and Baehrens have followed Lersch, but Vahlen and Ribbeck have separated the Scipio and the Saturae. I have followed Vahlen and Ribbeck since Lersch's first argument is based on a doubtful emendation; and his second on the fact that a line, which is ascribed by scholars to the Scipio on account of its subject matter, is assigned in another place to the Saturae.

Sota

III Fest. 356 M.: Ennius...............et in Nasota:
I have kept this with the Sota on the basis of the emendation of "Nasota" to "Sota".

This has been kept because it seems to be in Sotadean meter: alii rhetorica tangent.

V This Sotadean verse has been omitted because there is no evidence as to its authorship.

Protrepticus, Praecepta
These have been treated as a single work because they are the Greek and Latin expressions for the
same idea.

**Epicharmus**

II, VI: Varro ling. V, 59: itaque Epicharmus de mente humana dicit istic (VI), ut humores frigidae sunt humi ut supra ostendi. Quibus iunctis caelum et terra omnia exgenuerunt quod per hos natura:(II).

III, IV, VII have been kept because they were by Ennius and had suitable subject matter.

**Euhemerus or Sacra Historia**


This fragment has been excluded because the form is not certain. Fragments I-XII have been excluded because they were not in direct form.

(Akrostichon) (Vahlen, p. 239)

Cic. div. II, 54, 111: non esse autem illud carmen furentis cum ipsum poema declarat.....tum vero ea quae akrostichis dicitur, cum deinceps ex primis primi cuuisque versus litteris aliquid connectitur, ut in quibusdam Ennianis: Q. ENNIUS FECIT. This title has been excluded because the akrostich might have come in any of his works, not merely in a work by itself. The Ilias Latina (Schanz, II, 2, 3d ed. p. 121) has an acrostich: ITALICUS SCRIPSIT or ITALICE PIERIS SCRIPSIT, which might lead one to conjecture that the acrostich of Ennius came in his Annales.
I have followed Schanz in assigning to Plautus, outside of the twenty-one Varronian plays, the following: Acharisticus, Addictus, Agricolas, Anus, Artemo, Astraba, Bacaria, Bis Compressa, Boecia, Caecus or Praedones, Calceolus, Carbonaria, Cesistic, Colax, Commerentes, Condalium, Cornicula, Dyscolus, Faeneratrix, Fretum, Frivolaria, Fugitivi, Hortulus, Lenones Gemini, Lipargus (?), Nervolaria, Pagon, Parasitus Medicus, Parasitus Piger, Plocinum (?), Saturio, Scematicus (?), Sitellitergus, Trigemini. These have been assigned on the basis of references and citations. The Vidularia has been considered incomplete and the original amount has been estimated from the average of the remaining plays.
COMEDIES (Schanz, pp. 135 ff.)


cum fabulis *Ritschl*, cu. c. et *u. w.* fabulis *A*.;
cum c. et VIII fabulis *D*.; cum c. et octo fabulis *B*.;
cum centum et octo fabulis *ceteri*.

This is the only evidence we have for the large number of plays ascribed to Terence. There is great doubt as to the reading. (It may have been written CVIII and so have arisen by dittography from the preceding CVM). In any event, if the plays, whatever their number, were lost at sea with Terence, they were not published and so do not form a part of Latin literature.
IX TRABEA

COMEDY (Ribb., p. 36)

AQUILIUS

COMEDY (Ribb., p. 38)

LICINIUS IMBREX

COMEDY (Ribb., p. 39)

There is no necessity here for commenting on these three authors.

P. LICINIUS TEGULA

CARMEN (Schanz, p. 167)

Livy, 31, 12, 9: carmen sicut patrum memoria Livius; ita tum condidit P. Licinius Tegula. As in the case of the processional songs of Livius Andronicus, I have, of necessity rather than arbitrarily, assumed the length of this carmen to be seventy-six lines.

LUSCIUS LANUVINUS

COMEDIES (Ribb., p. 96)

Ex Incetis. Fabulis

I Ter. Haut. prol. 30: nec ille pro se dictum existumet / qui nuper fecit servo currenti in via / decesse populum: cur insano serviat /
De illius peccatis plura dicet, cum dabit / alias novas, nisi finem maledictis facit.

II Ter. Phorm. prol. 4: qui ita dictitat quas
antehac fecit fabulas/ tenui esse oratione et
scriptura levi:/ quia nusquam insanum scrpsit
adulescentulum / cervam videre fugere et sectari
canes,/ et eam plorare orare ut subveniat sibi.

The fragments have not been counted since there is no direct quotation.

I U V E N T I U S

COMEDIES (Ribb. pp. 94-96)

Anagnorizomene

Fest. 298 M.: nam mussari si....s in
agnorizomene: quod...
Paul. 299 M.: Terentius mussare pro tacere
posuit, cum ait: sile.....

The confusion between "Terentius" and
"Iuventius" is rather common, and the emendation
 rests on this and that Terence is not known to
have written an Anagnorizomene. I have excluded
the fragment, however, as the evidence is based
on conjecture.

Ex Incertis Fabulis

IV Varro ling. VII, 104: Sueti a volucribus;
sues codd.; avolerat codd.; a volucri Spengel.
I have excluded this fragment.
VATRONIUS

COMEDY (Ribb., p. 131)

Burra

C. C. L. V, 8, 50 G: Burrae Vatroniae fatuæ ac stupidae, a fabula quadam Vatroni auctoris quam Burra inscripsit vel a meretrice Burra.

SEXTUS TURPILIUS

COMEDIES (Ribb., pp. 98 ff. I)

Demetrius

XVII Fest. 351 M.: ...lius in Demetrio.

Naevius wrote a Demetrius, but I have kept the fragment here, since the emendation to Turpilius is the easier.

Demiurgus

V Cic. epist. IX, 22: ut ille in Demiurgo.

I have kept the fragment, as there is no other known author of a Demiurgus.

Epiclerus

VII Non. 215: Turpilius etglero.

I have accepted here Bentin's emendation of "etglero" to "Epiclero."

Lindia

I, VII, Non. 397, Non. 343: Turpilius India.

I have here accepted the emendation of "India" to "Lindia."
XL. ACCIUS

TRAGEDIES (Ribb., pp. 154-263)

Andromeda

X  Non. 323: Accius Andromeda

in Andromeda ed. A. 1476; automedia codd.
I have here accepted the emendation in the
Aldine edition.

Armorum Judicium

XVI: Fest. 359 M.: Tammodo antiqui ponebant pro modo,

ut Attius: Tammodo, inquit,....

I have referred this line to the incerta of
Accius from lack of more definite evidence.

Atreus

Fragments III, V, VI, VII, VIII, IX, IXa, XIV,
XVI have been here accepted on account of the
subject matter and the names of the speakers,
although neither the author nor the title is
mentioned.

Bacchae

III  Non. 213: Accius Vaccis

I have followed Junius in his emendation of "Vaccis"
to "Bacchis," easily justified by the common con-
fusion between "b" and "v".

IX  Non. 136: Accius Vacces.
I have followed the edition of 1526 which reads
"Bacchis."

XIX Fest. 314 M.: (Accius) in Bacchis:, ec Accius

Mueller
There is no other known Latin play of this name.

**Chrysippus**

III Fest. p. 302 M.: Acer in Chrysippo

**Accius Ursinus**

I have followed here the emendation of Ursinus.

**Epigoni**

**Erigona**

These are probably two distinct plays and are here so counted, but, owing to the variant readings in the citations, I have made no attempt to distinguish the fragments.

**Minos or Minotaurus**


Macr. *sat.* VI, 5, 14: Accius...idem in Minotauro.

Both citations give the same line, so there is uncertainty as to the title.

**Tereus**

IX Non. 355: Accius....idem Pereo

Tereo Junius

**Ex Incertis Fabulis**

XXXIII Fest. 301 M.: sospitem Acc(ius)

sospitem Acc(ius) according to De Ponor

I have accepted the emendation.

**VARIA** (Baehrens, pp. 266 ff.)

**Didascalica**

8 Gell. VI, 9, 16: L. Accius in Sotadicorum libro I.

No other work of Accius, so far as we can judge
from the fragments, was in Sotadean verse.
The fragments of the Didascalica can be emended
to Sotadean more easily than to any other meter.
In consequence I have here accepted fragment 8
and fragments 18 and 20 as well, which are Sotadean verses ascribed in the mss. to Accius.

Evidence as to the Number of Books.

That there were at least nine books of the
Didascalica is well attested by three citations in the ninth book:
Charis. gramm. I, 142 K: poematorum...Accius...
didascalicorum VIII
Charis. gramm. I, 220 K: Accius in didascalicon VIII
Prisc. gramm. I, 92 H: Accius in didascalicon VIII

Parerga

Non. 61, 19: Accius parergorum lib. I
This citation leads us to the conjecture that there were at least two books of the Parerga.

Praxidicus

23 Pliny nat. 18, 200: Attius in praxidico.
0. Ribbeck (Schanz, 181) tries to identify the Praxidicus and the Parerga. He bases his argument (Rhein. Mus. 41 (1886), p. 631) on a hymn (where) Persephone is addressed as Praxidice. Praxidice, however, refers to Persephone as a avenging divinity and is thus scarcely possible as a
subject of an agricultural work. (Schanz, p. 130) Crusius (Philol. 57 (1898) p. 646) thinks that Accius has called this work by the name of a supposed authority in astrology, just as Ennius did in the Euhemerus. O. Ribbeck (Rhein. Mus. 41, (1886), p. 631) considers that all the works of Accius outside of his tragedies are included in the Parerga, but with the meaning which Crusius has put with probable correctness on "Praxidicus," his argument is destroyed, and his theory no longer explains the large number of books cited for the Annales.

**Pragmatica**

24 Non. 156: Accius pragmatico lib. I

These citations show that there were probably at least two books of the Pragmatica.

**Annales**

1 Prisc. gramm. I, 163 H.: Accius...annali I
2 Fest. 146: Accius annali XXVII.

Citation 1 giving the book number I is an argument against Ribbeck's theory that the Parerga was composed of all of Accius' works outside of his tragedies.

Baehrens suggests "annalium VII," but the text tradition has "annali XXVII" with no apparent doubt.

*1: Schanz, p. 180.*
XI  C. TITIUS

TRAGEDIES  (Schanz, p. 185)


Protesilaus

Antonius Vulscus (13th Heroide of Ovid) says that Pacuvius and Titius wrote tragedies of the same name, Protesilaus.

From Cicero, we may safely assume that Titius wrote at least two tragedies, and undoubtedly many more, though our evidence does not justify us in counting more.

L. CORNELIUS BALBUS

FABULA PRAETEXTA  (Schanz, p. 190)

Iter

Cic. epist. X, 32, 3: Illa vero iam ne Caesaris quidem exemplo, quod ludis praetextam de suo itinere ad L. Lentulum procos. sollicitandum posuit, et quidem, cum ageretur, flevit memoria rerum gestarum commotus.

X, 32, 5: etiam praetextam si voles legere, Gallum Cornelium, familiarem meum, poscito. No fragments remain.
Traces of other Praetextae (Schanz, p. 190)

All these traces are extremely doubtful, and furnish no basis for reckoning any other dramas.

C. JULIUS CAESAR STRABO

TRAGEDIES (Ribb., pp. 263-264)

No fragments here require comment.

TITINIUS

FABULAE TOGATAE (Ribb., pp. 157-187)

Barbatus

Though there is great variation in the title (Barato, Varrato, Baratto etc.) there seems to be little doubt, however, that they all refer to one play, Barbatus.

Quintus

II, III, V, VI give: Titinius lib. V:

This error evidently arose in copying, and the fragments belong here.

Setina

III, Non. 304: Titinius sediam metuo;

Setina metuo Mercer

The "Setina" may have disappeared before the "sediam," but the fragment is here placed among the incerta of Titinius.

Insubra (Ribb., p. 183, out of alphabetical order)

Non. 476: Titinius Ilarubra;
Ilarubra codd.; Hidubra ed. princ.; Ulubrana Mommsen; Hilla rubra Quicherat; Insubra Ribbeck.

In spite of the various conjectures, the play remains distinct from any others.

**Incerta**

XVIII b and XIX are excluded because they are cited in indirect form.

T. Q U I N C T I U S A T T A

**FABULAE TOGATAE** (Ribb., pp. 188 ff.)

**Satura**

Isidore, **orig.** 6, 9: sicut indicat Atta in satura. I have followed Ribbeck and Schanz in considering the Satura a play, although Baehrens prefers to consider it as a satire.

**Epigrammata** (Schanz, p. 194)

Non. 202: Atta in epigrammatis. Mercer feels that the name either of Cinna or Tibullus has been lost here. I have followed Baehrens in assigning the line to Atta.

L. AFRAN IUS

**FABULAE TOGATAE** (Ribb., pp. 193-265)

**Ida**

Fest. 206 M.: et Afranius in Ida. Other titles have been given, as Ira, Icta, and Iuri Consulta (ICTA).

**Proditus**

Although there has been some doubt as to whether
this is to be identified with the Prodigus. I have followed Ribbeck in considering the dramas as distinct.

Prosa or Rosa

III Fest. 231 M.: in rosa.

Here it is not even certain that this is the title of a play.

Repudiatus

VIII has been excluded as it is not cited directly.
SATURAE

45 Non. 262: confidentia rursum temeritas audacia
Pacuvius in Atalanta.....: idem lib. X:
Vahlen has conjectured that in the gap there was a
quotation from the first or second book of Lucilius
in which the word "confidens" appeared. I have not
accepted the line here.
I have omitted the following lines because they are
not quoted directly: 3, 95, 96, 148, 165, 272, 348,
371, 373, 382, 383, 384, 396, 421, 437, 477, 517, 518,
586, 594, 922, 925, 926, 927, 952, 967, 1132, 1133, 1144,
1149, 1150, 1151, 1168, 1169, 1177, 1178, 1180, 1189,
1209, 1212, 1223, 1241, 1254, 1261, 1262, 1263, 1299,
1300, 1317, 1322, 1339, 1354, 1355, 1361, 1364, 1365,
1374.
Fragments have been assigned to the Saturae whenever
there is evidence that they are by Lucilius, since we
have no knowledge of any other work he has written.
Lines 592 and 593 have not been accepted, as lines 595
and 596 give a more complete version which is probably
more correct.
872 Non. 405: Lucilius lib. XXVIII: latere....
Cic. Tusc. I, 44, 107: Exsecratur luculentis sane
versibus apud Emnium Thyestes, primum ut naufragio
pereat Atreus...
There are two possibilities (1) that Lucilius was
quoting from Ennius, (2) that there is a lacuna in Nonius. I have not accepted the lines here, but have referred them to Ennius' Thyestes.

928-932 Non. 463: (Lucilius lib.) XXVII

I have not accepted the lines here because the evidence for Lucilius is not strong enough.

942, 943 G. L. IV p. 212, 10 K: nasus hic an hoc nasum?

antiqui neutraliter dicebant. Itaque Lucretius:

Lucretius never uses the masculine or neuter of "nasum", but there are examples of the neuter use in Lucilius. In consideration of this and the plausibility of meter and subject matter, I have followed Vahlen in assigning these lines to Lucilius.

959 C. G. L. II p. 131, 61: muttonium προβαοκάυινυν

λουκιλιος edd.; λουκιος codd.

968 C. G. L. V, 58, 39: cordipugis.

This has been referred to Lucilius from its similarity to "noctipugam" (v. 1222) which Lucilius uses. Considering the variant readings, of "noctipugam", I have thought it safer to exclude it.

969 Non. 274, (No mention is made of Lucilius.)

I have excluded the line from lack of more definite evidence.

1092 Non. 35, (No mention is made of Lucilius.)

The subject matter fits in rather well with book XXX, and the line is left here although it is far from certain.
1099 C. G. L. II, 52: acactum ἀκατεσσαλονιανος
codd. ἐσ Λουκιλιος margo cod. Leid.
I have kept the word although the evidence is not conclusive.

1103 Capitol. Pert. 9: denique ex versu Luciliano
agrarius mergus est appellatus
Luciniano B., P. Luciviano ed. princ.
Line 1103 has been kept because the emendation is fairly simple.

1109 Festus 313: gravis tar....Apulidae pe..
Paulus 312: Stlembus gravis, tardus sicut Lucilius
pedibus stlembum dixit equum pigrum et tardum.
I have kept line 1109 from a comparison of the two citations.

1110 C. G. L. II, 20, 37: aquilum μελανον εω λουκιλλιος
μέλαν εω Αουκιλλιος ed. Stephan.
I have followed Marx in accepting the emendation of Stephanus.

1181 Cic. Att. VI, 3, 7: Tibi autem valde solet in ore
esse: Gravius....
The line has been ascribed to book XI of Lucilius
in which there seems to be an account of Granius' dinner. I have excluded the line because it depends on the emendation of "Gravius" to "Granius", for which there is no manuscript evidence and because, even with the emendation, the identification is doubtful.
1306 Non. 229: Lucilius Roth; Lucretius codd.
I have excluded the line from lack of basis for the emendation.

1351-1352 Charis. gramm. I, 58 K: Lucretius:
Lucretius codd.; Lucilius Cramer.
This line has been excluded on the same principle as 1306.

1356 Varro, Men. 253 B. alterum bene acceptum...
This part of a hexameter line has been ascribed to Lucilius because bene with an adjective is rather frequent in Lucilius. I have excluded the fragment as the evidence does not seem sufficient.

1357, 1358, 1359, 1360, 1362, 1364, 1365, 1366, 1367, 1368, 1370, 1371, 1372, 1373, 1374, 1375, 1376, 1377, 1378 have been excluded because there seems to be no cogent evidence for their (attribute) assignment to Lucilius.

Lucilius Neapolitanus: Caecilius vetus codex Dousae.
I have retained this fragment since there seems to be manuscript authority for the reading "Lucilius."

1369 Fulg. serm. 23, p. 118 Helm: unde et Lucilius ait.
I see no reason to discredit Fulgentius here.

Evidence as to the Number of Books.
Marx (pp. 66-74) gives many quotations from book XXX showing no variant readings. We have no evidence of a higher book number.
XIII SUMMARY

LIVIUS ANDRONICUS: Epic: Odissia 45 ll.; tragedy: Achilles 1 l., Aeristhus 13 ll., Ajax 3 ll., Andromeda 1 l., Danae 1 l., Equus Trojanus 2 ll., Hermione 1 l., Tereus 6 ll., Ino 8 ll.; comedy: Gladiolus 1 l., Ludius 1 l.; hymns: two; incerta 21 ll.

Of the original amount .00804 has been preserved.

ANONYMOUS: Carmen Priami 2 ll., Carmen Nelei (excluding 5. 6) 5 ll.


Of the original amount .00492 has been preserved.

Of the original amount .01809 remains.


Of the original amount .3709 remains.
PACUVIUS: tragedy: Antiope 23 ll., Armorum Judicium 21 ll., Atlanta 30 ll., Chrysea 36 ll., Dulcestes 44 ll., Hermion 28 ll., Iliona 27 ll., Medus 25 ll., Niptra 28 ll., Penteus —, Perineea 37 ll., Teucer 32 ll., incerta 93 ll.; praetexta: Paulus 4 ll.; Satura —.

of the original amount .0309 remains.


of the original amount .006598 remains.


of the original amount, all is preserved.

TRABEA: Fabula Palliata: —, incerta 6 ll.

AQUILIUS: Fabula Palliata: Baetia 10 ll.

TEGULA: Carmen:— -.

LUSCIUS LANUVINUS: Fabula Palliata: Phasma -., Thensaurus 2 11.

IUVENTIUS: Fabula Palliata:— -., incerta 7 11. (excluded: IV).

VATRONIUS: Fabula Palliata: Burra -.


of the original amount .0159 is preserved.

AUTHOR UNCERTAIN: Fabula Palliata: Adelph - 2 11., Hydria -., Gorgos -.


Of the original amount .007477 is preserved.

TITIUS: tragedy: Protesilaus -.


BALBUS: praetexta. Iter -.


Of the original amount .0131 remains.

ATTA: Fabula Togata: Aedilia 2 11., Aquae Caldae 2 11., Conciliax 1 1., Gratulatio 1 1., Lucubratio 2 11., Materterae - Mecalensia 2 11., Nurus 1 1., Satura 2 11., Securus 1 1., Supplicatio 1 1., Tiro Profiscicens 1 1., incerta 6 11.; Epigrammata 1 1.

Of the original amount .00186 remains.


Of the original amount .00948 remains.

LUCILIUS: Satirae 1289 ll.

Of the original amount .03487 remains.

Of the whole amount of poetry by the preceding authors .066059 remains.

Professor West, in the article cited (P.A.P.A., 1902, p. XXV) calculates that "four-fifths of our writers and apparently more than four-fifths of their writings are beyond our reach". His figures, of course, cover a far larger period than that here discussed, and a period which is, on the whole, better represented in actual works than the early poets of the Republic. The figures, however, which I have given are based upon a more detailed study of the remains than was possible in an article of the scope of Professor West's, and may, I believe, be considered for their period as reasonably exact.

*The Incerta Incertorum have not been counted here.

**60-63 of Schang have been omitted from lack of time.