

REMAINS OF OLD LATIN

EDITED AND TRANSLATED BY
E. H. WARMINGTON, M.A.,
F.R.Hist.Soc.

PROFESSOR OF CLASSICS, UNIVERSITY OF LONDON,
BIRKBECK COLLEGE

IN FOUR VOLUMES

I

ENNIUS AND CAECILIUS



LONDON
WILLIAM HEINEMANN LTD
CAMBRIDGE, MASSACHUSETTS
HARVARD UNIVERSITY PRESS
MCMXLVII

Printed in 1935
Revised and reprinted 1956, 1961, 1967

Printed in Great Britain

INTRODUCTION

*Scope of this work. Limits of the archaic period.
Archaic spelling. Contents*

IN four volumes entitled *Remains of Old Latin*, of which this is the first volume, my object is to present a Latin text and an English translation of Latin remnants, literary and epigraphic, which belong to the archaic period of Roman literary history. I have fixed the limit of this archaic period at 81—80 B.C., which are the years of Sulla's dictatorship. It is indeed true that the limit cannot really be defined with precision, partly because archaisms in spelling and in form survive, especially in epigraphic records, during many years after the date here given. However, for practical purposes, the time of Sulla's supremacy has been found to be the best, even though some of the inscriptions, which are included in the fourth volume, may belong to a somewhat later period; for the year 80, in which Sulla resigned his powers, may be taken to mark the beginning of the golden age in Latin literature, and the archaisms which persist during this age and the early imperial era are natural survivals, some conscious, some unconscious; while some are definitely mistakes or false archaisms. I therefore claim to present, so far as the remains allow, a picture of Latin in the making; but there is one important

INTRODUCTION

thing which must be stated here. I have not tried to reconstruct the spelling used by the old writers,^a but have retained the 'modernised' spelling which our sources for the literary fragments normally show. Sometimes indeed these sources present or seem to present the true archaic spelling. In such cases I have reproduced it. With the exception of remnants like those of the Twelve Tables of Roman Law, the most valuable of the literary remains belonging to the archaic period, as defined above, are fragments from the works of poets; it is the poetic fragments which give the best idea of Latin in the process of development. Hence the literary remains in the first three volumes consist of the fragments of seven poets, namely, Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius, Caecilius, Pacuvius, Accius, and Lucilius. These poets are not taken in chronological order, owing to the necessity of producing volumes of manageable size; but each poet is complete in his volume, this first volume containing Ennius and Caecilius. The inscriptions present both poetry and prose; further introductory matter about them will be found in the fourth volume.

Sources

Our sources for old literary fragments are nearly all later writers of prose. These writers vary very much in nature, belong to widely different eras, and

^a The inscriptions are an obvious exception from this general ruling, for in them the archaisms in spelling and form are nearly all in their original state. Many actual archaisms of Latin will thus be best apprehended by readers if they will study the inscriptions; these include some documents which are much older than most of the literary remains.

INTRODUCTION

differ greatly in the reasons for which they quote the old Latin. Some of them, especially those nearest to the archaic period, quote archaic predecessors largely because the renown of these was still great, and their plays were still widely performed or read, and their whole work had some meaning in the public life of Rome and Italy; while others, especially writers from the beginning of the imperial epoch onwards, were interested chiefly in linguistic peculiarities of various kinds, and, in a few important cases, in the imitation of the archaic poets by later ones. There is no need to review all these sources, but I have thought it advisable to give here some information about certain late sources which are not often read but which are the most fruitful in giving us fragments of archaic Latin. The point of view of these writers is that of grammarians, or of persons who want at the moment to deal with a point of grammar or philology.^a

(i) Nonius. This is the grammarian and lexicographer Nonius Marcellus, who in his *De Compensiosa Doctrina* in twenty books, written about the beginning of the fourth century after Christ, provides us with more ancient literary fragments than any other source does. He consulted a limited number of 'classical' writers, and also other grammarians and lexicographers, and first made large catalogues of words occurring in them, and then compiled his *Doctrina* from these catalogues, in such

^a I wish to point out here that ancient philology was largely ignorant and fanciful, so that many of the derivations given by the sources are absurd and even fantastic; and in quoting them I have not thought it worth while to point this out unless the fact is relevant to the right interpretation of an archaic fragment.

INTRODUCTION

a way that the order of the fragments as he finally quotes them is sometimes the same as their order in the original writer; this is a matter of greatest importance in considering the fragments of Lucilius which are collected in our third volume; further details on this point to be found there. The text of Nonius tends to be very corrupt in the quotations from old writers, and I have thus felt it advisable to give fuller critical notes on his passages than on most of those which come from other sources. The extant manuscripts all come (possibly by way of an intervening MS. now lost) from a lost archetype, and are indicated in these volumes by *sigla* as follows :

- Lu.* Lugdunensis (Voss., lat. fol. 73); 9th cent.; best of all. Well corrected by two hands (*L2*, *L3*).
- F., Flor.* Florentinus (Laur., xlvi, 1); 9th cent.; copied from *Lu*; corrected by two hands. Books I–III only.
- Harl.* Harleianus (Mus. Brit. 2719); 9th–10th cent.; copied partly from *F* and from *Gen.* (see below) in book IV; corrections by *H2*, *H3*.
- Escorial.* Escorialensis (M III, 14); 10th cent.; copied partly from the same source as *Par.* 7667 (see below), partly from *F* (corrected).
- G.* Gudianus (Wolfenb. 96); 10th cent. (source for correctors *H2*, *L3*).
- Lugd.* Lugdunensis (Voss., 4to. 116); 10th–11th cent.
- Bamb.* Bambergensis (M.V. 18); 9th–10th cent.
- Turic.* Turicense fragmentum (C796) 10th cent. (bad).

INTRODUCTION

Par. 7666. Parisinus 7666; 10th cent.

Par. 7665 } Parisinus 7665. Bernensis 347, 357,
Bern. 347, 357 } 10th cent. All portions of one *cd.*

Montepess. Montepessulanus (212); 9th–10th cent.

Ox. Oxoniensis (Bibl. Bodl. Can. Cl. Lat. 279);
10th cent.

Gen. Genevensis (84); 9th cent. (good).

Bern. 83. Bernensis 83; 10th cent. (bad).

Par. 7667. Parisinus 7667; 10th cent.

There is also Cantabrigiensis (Mm. V. 22); 9th cent.; copied from *Gen.*

The edition which I have used is that of W. M. Lindsay, Leipzig, Teubner, 1903, and the numeration that of Mercier.

(ii) Festus. This is Sextus Pompeius Festus (probably of the second century after Christ), whose work is an abridgment of an earlier work entitled *De Verborum Significatu* and written by M. Verrius Flaccus, a famous grammarian of Augustus' time. Only the latter part of Festus' abridgment has survived, and there is only one manuscript of it—the Codex Farnesianus IV. A. 3 (11th cent.) at Naples. Even in this there are large gaps, which can be restored in part from copies of the codex made before it was damaged so much as it is now, and in part from an abridgment of Festus' own work made by Paulus Diaconus (c. 720—c. 800). Paulus' work is extant in a number of codices. The edition used in these volumes is the combined Paulus and Festus edited by W. M. Lindsay, Leipzig, Teubner, 1913.

(iii) Servius. The elaborate commentary on Virgil by Maurus (Marius ?) Servius Honoratus—these names occur in varying order—who gives us

INTRODUCTION

many fragments, was composed about the end of the fourth century after Christ, and is extant in very different groups of manuscripts. One group gives apparently the original commentary of Servius, who is in these volumes referred to simply as Servius. But another group shows the same commentary embedded in other matter, so to speak, or rather supplemented or augmented from an anonymous writer of about the same date. Where the source of an old fragment comes from one of these supplemented contexts, the author is referred to as 'Servius auctus,' 'Servius (supplemented).' Readers will further understand from this the meaning of the phrase *augmenter of Servius*.^a

The edition used for these volumes is that of G. Thilo and H. Hagen, Leipzig, Teubner, 1878–1902, re-issued in 1923.

(iv) Several late grammarians, in particular Charisius, Diomedes, and Priscianus, who give us many fragments at second hand.^b These are all to be found in *Grammatici Latini*, ed. H. Keil (and others), Leipzig, 1857–1880, referred to in these volumes as G. L. K.

(v) Some fragments given by one or two scholars of the medieval and early modern eras have been included, but they differ in trustworthiness. For example, Ekkehart or Ekkehard (there are four with this name), a monk of St. Gall, who died c. 1061; and Osbern of Gloucester (c. 1123–1200) are worthy

^a Note that J. J. H. Savage, in *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, 1932, 77, maintains that the 'Servius auctus' commentary is a mixture or conflation of two commentaries—that of Servius and another of Aelius Donatus who wrote about 25 years before Servius.

^b Priscianus appears to quote directly from Ennius.

INTRODUCTION

of belief. But it is not easy to decide about the German philologist Kaspar von Barth (1587–1658). In his *Adversaria* and his commentary on Statius he professes to quote fragments of Ennius from old sources. In 1636 his library and manuscripts were destroyed by fire, so that, even when he wrote in good faith, he often depended upon his memory. It is thus difficult to trust his authority.

This point leads me naturally to mention the groups of fragments which I have classed doubtfully as spurious; I have included only such as readers who are already familiar with the old poets may expect to find in these volumes. There are others which I have omitted altogether. Amongst these are a number given as genuine by Merula, who acted apparently in good faith. They will be found in Vahlen's third edition of Ennius, on pp. 240–242.

Method of quotation from sources

In presenting each literary fragment, the method used in these three volumes is to give, as a separate 'item,' either the whole passage of the source by which the fragment of old Latin is quoted or referred to, or so much of the passage as may reveal the old author of the quotation (with or without the title or other details of the old author's work), the reason for the quotation, and maybe something of its meaning and context, or of the nature of the work from which it is quoted. These items fall into two classes:

(i) Passages which quote actual words of the old author. These passages give true fragments and form the bulk of the text and translation in the

INTRODUCTION

first two volumes of this series. They are numbered by figures placed over the middle of each item, the numeration representing the lines, or parts of lines, which, printed in distinctive type, are thus deemed to survive from among the lost works of the author.^a Single words not placed in the text or given in a note are collected at the end of each volume.

(ii) Passages which do not give words as actually written by the old author. Some of these reveal a 'hidden fragment' by a paraphrase; others tell us something about the old poet's work, or about its context at some particular point. Such items as these are not numbered, but they are placed in what is apparently the best position for them; where they are separated by spaces from numbered items of class (i), they are to be taken as separate items. In view of the meagre nature of our knowledge about the lost poets, it was felt advisable to include these passages.^b

A word must be said here about C. Iulius Hyginus, from whom I have incorporated a number of important extracts belonging to this second class. Under Hyginus' name has come down to us a mythological treatise written in Latin^c and entitled *Fabulae* or *Fabularum Liber*. This contains about three hundred old Greek legends and gene-

^a With the exception of Ennius' *Euhemerus*, the lines are lines of poetry; in *Euhemerus* the numeration is of lines of text as printed in this volume.

^b Many 'testimonia' about the old author's life, or criticising his work as a whole or a particular work, have not been included. But references to the sources for the lives of the old authors have been given in the introductions to the volumes.

^c There are also fragments of a version or original in Greek.

INTRODUCTION

alogies, and consists of an abridgment, or possibly a union of two abridgments, of the original work. The extant text shows a poor knowledge of good Latin and Greek; if this reflects the mind of the original author, then Professor H. J. Rose, the latest editor, is probably right in rejecting the belief that the author was that Hyginus who was a learned freedman of Augustus. Although it is not easy to decide in every case, Iulius Hyginus' sources appear to have been very often epic poems and Alexandrian works written in prose, less often old Greek tragedies, or hypotheses of these. Sometimes a *Fabula* has been produced from the plots of two or more Greek tragedies 'contaminated.' In a few cases Hyginus' source for a legend appears to be a separate old Latin play or its hypothesis. Where this happens I have incorporated Hyginus' plot into the extant fragments of the Latin play; but the correctness of this use of Hyginus should not be regarded as wholly certain.

The references added at the end of any item in the Latin (not the English) text, and prefixed by the abbreviation Cf. or Cp., generally indicate other sources which give all or part of the old fragment, but are not quoted in this text.

Where several fragments have survived from one book (for example, of Ennius' *Annals*) or one play or other named work of an old poet—especially where the fragments of this particular work are all or mostly quoted by one or two sources (for example, by Nonius)—there the ascription, by the source, to 'Ennius in such and such a book' has, as a rule, only been included in the text of that passage which gives the *first* fragment of a group as arranged by

INTRODUCTION

me. After that, the ascription has been omitted unless there was a special reason; this method has excluded some needless repetition. Where no work of, for example, Ennius is named by the source in quoting a fragment, and yet the fragment is ascribed in this edition to a definite work, the lack of any ascription by the source has been indicated in some way; so also where neither the old work nor the old author of a fragment is mentioned by the source, yet the author or his work, or both are known or can be deduced with probability.

In a good many places the Greek model or source of an old Latin fragment is known or deduced; in such cases the Greek original has been quoted or referred to at the beginning of the relevant item on the Latin page, but not translated. Again, in some cases the source which quotes a substantial fragment shows how the old Latin poet not only drew upon some older Greek source, but also inspired some later Latin poet; thus we have fragments of Ennius which imitated Homer and were imitated by Virgil. In such cases the passages from the original Greek author, from the old Latin poet, and from the later Latin poet, have been given in full, both in text and in translation.

Throughout the literary fragments the reconstruction is mine, save where it is established, well known, and indisputable. There was no room to give the full evidence for various allocations of fragments to probable contexts; but the English translation of many of the items is provided with a heading in italic letters giving the known context, or indicating a probable context, of the old fragment. In those cases where the context cannot be regarded as known,

INTRODUCTION

I do not vouch for the correctness of these headings ; but most of them have a better foundation than mere conjecture. Their function is to indicate the reason why I have put various items in the places where they now stand, and to be if possible a help and a guide. In order to make the series more useful, I have compiled two concordances, which will be found near the end of the volumes. One is intended for the use of persons who possess a standard complete Latin text of any old author and wish to compare, at any point, that text with this ; while the other is intended to assist those who wish to turn from the present text and translation and to consult the latest standard predecessor.

Life of Ennius

Quintus Ennius was born in 239^a B.C. at Rudiae, now Rugge, in Calabria,^b or Messapia, and claimed, as a Messapian, to be descended from King Messapus.^c It was probably because this Italian district had been deeply influenced by Greek culture that Ennius was in later ages called 'Greek' or 'Half-Greek.'^d He was probably quite young when he learnt to speak not only Greek but Latin, for the colony of

^a Gellius, XVII, 21, 43; Cicero, *Brut.*, 18, 72; *Tusc. Disp.*, I, 1, 3. Jerome, *Euseb. Chron.*, anno ab Abraham 1777, 240 B.C. and Abr. 1849, 168 B.C. is wrong.

^b Cic., *pro Archia*, 9, 22; Schol. Bob., *ad loc.*; Cic., *de Orat.*, III, 42, 168; Ausonius, *Technopaegn.*, XIV, 17; Silius, XII, 393 ff.; Strabo, 281-2c. Mela, II, 66 gives the wrong Rudiae near Canusium.

^c Silius, *l.c.*; Ovid, *Ars Amat.*, III, 409; Serv., *ad Aen.*, VII, 691; Suidas, s.v. *Ἐννίος*; Horace, *C.*, IV, 8, 20 and *Acro*, *ad loc.*

^d Festus, 412, 33; Suetonius, *de grammaticis*, 1.

INTRODUCTION

Brundisium was only twenty miles or so from Rudiae; he spoke Oscan also, and used to say that he had three 'brains' because he could speak Greek, Oscan, and Latin.^a From Jerome's mistake in saying that Ennius was born at Tarentum^b it is perhaps right to conclude that he was educated there.

He joined the Roman army and, according to Silius, rose to the rank of centurion. While he was serving in Sardinia in 204 B.C., he was there brought to the notice of M. Porcius Cato, who was at that time quaestor. He is alleged to have instructed Cato in 'Greek letters,'^c which means that he introduced Cato to Greek literature if not to the Greek language. In any case he made a great impression on Cato, and was brought by him to Rome.^d There he lived on the Aventine, according to Jerome, and apparently tended grounds (*loca coluit*) sacred to Tutilina or 'Guardian Goddess,' according to Porcius (Licinus?) in a passage of Varro.^e He was doubtless attracted to the Aventine because in that region had been built, in honour of Livius Andronicus a temple of Minerva for the use of poets and actors. During the first years of his residence in Rome (which lasted during all the rest of his life) he appears to have earned his living chiefly by teaching Greek to Romans^f; but at the same time he took to writing original poetry which increased his income, the death of Livius Andronicus and the banishment of Naevius giving him a good opportunity within the range of

^a Gellius, XVII, 17, 1. See p. 8.

^b Jerome, ann. 1777, 240.

^c Sil., *l.c.*; 'Aurel Vict.,' *de vir. illustr.*, 47.

^d 'Cornel. Nepos,' *Cato*, 1, 4; Jerome, ann. 1777, 240.

^e Jerome, *l.c.*; Varro, *L.L.*, V, 163.

Suet., *l.c.*

INTRODUCTION

drama. In the course of his writing he did much to establish a reasonable system of long and short syllables in poetry, and introduced into Latin the Greek hexameter. In due course he made friends with some of the most enlightened and influential Romans of the day, as is shown below. We can obtain a few glimpses of his character, and in this connexion it is worth while noting the good story which Cicero tells of him^a: Scipio Nasica, who was consul in 191, when he once went to call on Ennius, was put off by the statement of Ennius' maidservant that the master was not at home. But Nasica had his suspicions that, at Ennius' orders, she had not told the truth. So a few days later when Ennius called on Nasica, and asked for him at the front door, Nasica, unseen within, shouted that he was not at home. When Ennius claimed to recognise Nasica's voice; Nasica replied 'Shame on you. When *I* asked for *you*, I believed your maidservant that you weren't at home; don't you believe *me* in person?' It is probably this story which gave rise to the tradition that on the Aventine Ennius lived a thrifty life and kept only one maidservant for his needs.^b However, it is probably a true tradition with regard to his early years in Rome, and it may be that Ennius never became a rich man; for he appears to have been poor even at seventy years of age.^c He was of a convivial nature, and perhaps drank more wine than was good for him. He said of himself 'I never poetise unless I have the gout,' and Horace says of him that he never 'leaped

^a Cic., *de Oratore*, II, 68, 276.

^b Jerome, ann. 1777, 240.

^c Cic., *de Senect.*, 5, 14.

INTRODUCTION

forward to sing of arms' (that is, he never went ahead with the composition of his *Annals*) unless he was drunk.^a Gellius quotes a fragment of Ennius in which the poet is alleged to describe his own character as that of a loyal, trustworthy, and intimate friend of those statesmen who chose to know him.^b

Ennius became indeed a close friend with some of the best Romans of this period, above all perhaps with Scipio Africanus, whom he celebrated in his poetry^c; and with Marcus Fulvius Nobilior and his son Quintus. When Marcus, consul in 189 B.C., went to Aetolia, he took Ennius with him.^d Ennius went not to fight but doubtless because Marcus was a man of culture and Ennius intended to celebrate the coming campaign, as he afterwards did.^e Marcus doubtless rewarded Ennius well; a very late record^f states that, to his discredit, Marcus did no more than give to Ennius one military cloak out of the spoils taken at Ambracia. In 184 B.C. Marcus' son Quintus caused Ennius to be made a full Roman citizen with a grant of land either at Potentia in Picenum or at Pisaurum in Umbria; for it was apparently this Quintus Fulvius who was concerned in the foundation

^a Ennius, *Satires*, 21, pp. 390-1 of this book; Horace, *Epist.*, I, 19, 7-8, Q. Serenus Sammonicus, XXXVI, 706-7.

^b Gell., XII, 4, 4; Ennius, *Annals*, 210-27, as given in full on pp. 78-81.

^c Horace, *C.*, IV, 8, 15 ff.; Cic., *pro Arch.*, 9, 22, and Schol. Bob., *ad loc.*; Ennius' own work *Scipio*; see pp. 394 ff. In later ages the tradition, apparently a true one, of this friendship was much exaggerated—Claudian, XXIII.

^d Cic., *pro Arch.*, 11, 27; *Tusc. Disp.*, I, 2, 3; *Brut.*, 20, 79, where Cic. inaccurately says of E. 'militaverat.'

^e In *Ambracia* and Book XV of the *Annals*; see pp. 142 ff., 358-61. Cp. 'Aurel. Vict.,' *de vir. illustr.*, 52, 3.

^f Symmachus, *Epist.*, I, 20, 2.