

SANDER M. GOLDBERG – GESINE MANUWALD, *Fragmentary Republican Latin. Ennius, Testimonia. Epic Fragments*, Volume I, Loeb Classical Library 294, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018, lxxxviii+498 pp., ISBN 978-0-674-99701-1

SANDER M. GOLDBERG – GESINE MANUWALD, *Fragmentary Republican Latin. Ennius, Dramatic Fragments. Minor Works*, Volume II, Loeb Classical Library 537, Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2018, vi+428 pp., ISBN 978-0-674-99714-1

These are the two first volumes in the series *Fragmentary Republican Latin (FRL)* in the Loeb Classical Library. Time is gradually running out for the four volumes of Eric H. Warmington's *Remains of Old Latin* that appeared between 1935 and 1940. Or is it not quite so simple? I would guess that if classicists have had only one text of Ennius on their shelf, it is Warmington's *Ennius* in the first volume which covers Caecilius as well. The Loeb Ennius appeared only seven years after the third edition of Johannes Vahlen's *Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae* (Lipsiae: Teubner 1928) which was a reprint of the 1903 edition (V<sup>2</sup>). Warmington revised his edition in 1956 and 1961. With its two concordances it served also professional scholars well: they could easily compare it with Vahlen's edition. Warmington's Loeb had the additional advantage over Vahlen's even for classical scholars that it encompassed translations of all Latin. In view of the many difficult or enigmatic fragments, the users were grateful both for the translations and for Warmington's short comments, often invaluable.

In 1967 a new chapter in Ennian studies was opened up when H. D. Jocelyn published his excellent and rather austere commentary on the tragic fragments (*The Tragedies of Ennius. The Fragments edited with an Introduction and Commentary*, Cambridge). Then in 1985 appeared Otto Skutsch's magisterial *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford: Clarendon Press) with its learned commentary. As neither of these fundamental editions had translations of the fragments, the average user of the Loeb Ennius was understandably left somewhat behind. Our new century shows no sign of abatement in scholarly interest: In 2007, Alessandro Russo published the first volume of thorough discussions devoted to *Le opere minori* comprising *Praecepta, Protrepticus, Saturae, Scipio* and *Sota* (Pisa: Edizioni ETS). Not long afterwards, in 2012, Gesine Manuwald treated the tragic fragments in the non plus ultra volume of scrutiny of the philological tradition in *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta (TrRF), Vol. II. Ennius* (Göttingen:

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht). It is in the nature of things, and definitely on the positive side, that editions like the above-mentioned have prepared the ground for a new and revised Loeb edition, not indeed to “replace” old Warmington’s edition in the way e.g. David Kovacs’ *Euripides* (1994 – 2002) has replaced Arthur S. Way’s *Euripides*. A brand new Ennius should be put next to the old one on our private shelves, not least as a constant reminder of the many uncertainties connected with fragmentary material: *quot editores, tot sententiae* is very much still valid.

The first main impression of the *FRL Ennius* is utterly positive. Goldberg and Manuwald (G & M) have not only given us carefully revised texts of the fragmentary material and highly qualified translations to go with it, but a more complete Ennius has now emerged for the benefit of the general reader in a way not conceived in the thirties of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. The collection of *testimonia* (I 1-93) is the best introduction imaginable to the corpus of fragments. In the new edition the fragments are arranged in chronological order according to the age of the sources whereas the *Testimonia in TrRF* have a rough arrangement according to topics primarily dealt with.

Jocelyn’s importance for this edition is singled out as he was an editor keen to embed the fragments in their original context. The ambition of this edition is to make the secondary texts equally accessible for readers as Ennius’ own fragments. In other words, the reader becomes in a way a co-editor having to assess the reception of Ennius as much as the transmitted text. This is obviously a stimulating challenge for readers of any competence and not least for the Latinists themselves. If one had the impression in early volumes of the Loeb enterprise that the texts were a secondary matter and that readable and enjoyable translations were the main thing, this relationship has changed a lot in later generations. The former precedence of the translation definitely had to be adjusted in the case of a fragmentary material that seldom reaches the length of an episode, a scene or a poem. Any user would appreciate a translation which first and foremost serves as a reliable guide. The first long quote from the *Annales* is provided by Cicero in his *De divinatione* (1. 40). William A. Falconer translated Ilia’s dream in the following way in 1923: “The Vestal from her sleep in fright awoke/ And to the startled maid, whose trembling hands/ A lamp did bear, thus spoke in tearful tones” as a rendering of *excita cum tremulis anus attulit artubus lumen, / talia tum memorat lacrimans exterrita somno* (now 34-5 Sk.). However much this is a “real piece of literature, a thing to be read for the pure joy of it” the translation does not offer much help for those interested in the Latin left side: the syntax is turned upside down; there is no word for “vestal” in Ennius’ text, *anus* is rendered by “maid”. Warmington, having preferred *quom* to *cum*, is closer to the Latin text in his prose rendering in 1935: “When the old woman roused up, had with limbs a-tremble brought a light, then the maid, frightened out of sleep, spoke thus in tears”. G & M, reading with Skutsch

*et cita* and *cum* as a preposition, have: “and quickly the old woman, with limbs atremble, brought a light./ Then, in tears, frightened out of sleep, she recounts these things.” The new prose translation has become a real servant to the Latin text: it even adapts the layout of the hexameter unity (it is bit confusing, though, that the Latin has kept the comma after line 34 as if *cum* was still *quom*). So a general trend in the series’ development has become very tangible in the editions of fragmentary poets.

**Vol. I:** The *Annales* part which fills up the volume with its 153 items and 623 lines together with the 14 items of *fragmenta dubia* is as near a reprint of Skutsch’s fragments as one could possibly have – and thank goodness for the preserved numbering! The only exception is that the editors in some few places have adopted the conjectures or supplements of Skutsch who was too modest to adopt them in his own edition (58 *Aeneia*, 74 *in Murco*). Consequently only Vahlen’s (21903) and Warmington’s numbering appear in the concordances.

Not being able to take the editors to task for original textual proposals the present reviewer can do nothing better than to mention some of his own marginalia to Skutsch’s edition. If in the following I feign confidence, it is in the hope to spark off discussion in the longer run.

**42 corde capessere:** I cannot read Skutsch’s sober note without asking myself why he did not add cruces to *corde*. Our editors G & M seem to share their predecessor’s sense of puzzle by their parenthetical question mark after the translation “to embrace you [?]”. The key to a successful emendation lies in a better category of meaning for *capessere*. Here it is as an intransitive verb of motion, ‘betake oneself’, cf. Plautus *Rud.* 178 and Apul. *Met.* 1. 22. *Inde* suggests itself easily instead of *corde*: *neque posse/ inde capessere* “without being able to get away” – a good description of a person’s situation in a dream. I have dealt with this fragment in my forthcoming *Critica*.

**69-70** pars ludicre saxa

iactant inter se **licitantur**

I suggest

pars ludicre saxa

iactant inter se **licitantes**

Two finite forms so close to each other is not very probable, as a subjunction would hardly have been skipped in line 69.

**98 †Virgines** nam sibi quisque domi Romani habet sas. “The context is almost certainly the abduction of the Sabine women.” The abduction leads to uproar among Rome’s neighbours. *Sas* is the anaphoric pronoun (= *eas*) placed at the end of the line like in 357; with *habet* as governing verb one would expect a predicative noun to go with it. The construction is illustrated by e.g. Nep. 2. 9. 4 *non minus me bonum amicum habebis, quam fortem inimicum ille expertus est*. The noun object ousted by *virgines* can hardly be any other than *servas*. The sentence is an utterance reflecting the injured party’s point of view.

**125 volturus in †spinetof** miserum mandebat homonem; spinetum

is a gloss, maybe a literary association written above the line so that it ousted *spinis* in the quotation and was adopted by someone who did not care about the metre. The word *spinetum* is found at Verg. *Ecl.* 2. 9. **182** *hos ego vi pugna vici victusque sum ab isdem*. Skutsch is certainly right with E. Bährens that *in pugna* is corrupt both as to metre and Latinity. J. S. Speijer suggested convincingly *vi*. So far so good. Most probably, the ablative *pugna* is also corrupt, however. The line should in my view read *hos ego vi pugnae vici victusque sum ab isdem*. One could compare Livy 7. 20. 9 *in Faliscos vis belli conversa est*.

**220-21** As to the warrior maiden called “Paluda”, I have proposed a solution in *Glotta* 90, 2014, 174-179; an analysis of the second line of the same fragment (221 Sk.) is forthcoming in my book *Critica*.

**298** *virī varia validis † viribus luctant*. I am tempted to propose <sorte> *virī varia validis* <cum> *viribus luctant*.

**313** *mortalem summum Fortuna repente / reddidit † summo regno famul † ut † optimus esset*. This is what I make out of the last line: *reddidit in summo regno ut famul infimus esset*.

**332** The line should have an indented space. The almost obvious supplement to *veluti* is *ac* (6 times in Vergil). Warmington suggested *is* which would hardly have been left out as belonging more closely to the main sentence.

**371-73** Hannibal audaci cum pectore de me hortatur  
ne bellum faciam, quem credidit esse meum cor  
suasorem summum et studiosum **robore belli**

G & M rightly comment that the syntax of *studiosum robore* is unexplained. I for one cannot understand why Skutsch finds “little sense” in Bergk’s *roboris* adding that it does not go well with *suasorem*. As for *robur belli* it may be compared with *vis belli* and *vis pugnae* above (on line 182)

**385-6** infit: “O cives, quae me fortuna fero sic  
contudit indigno bello confecit acerbo

I begin with the clear corruption, *fero sic*: an adjective going with *bello* is the obvious emendation, namely *feroci*. If one thinks how *feroci* would have been pronounced in the early centuries of our era, this ablative suggests itself; the remaining *c* was added to supply a monosyllable at the end. Then the abl. *indigno* becomes improbable: either *indignum* or *indignē* is likely. For the sake of clarity the latter is preferable. After *bello* we have to add a connective *et* or *ac* and change *acerbo* to *acerbē*. *Indigne* and *acerbe* suit each other excellently, cf. Cic. *Clu.* 42: *Sed cum esset haec ei proposita condicio, ut aut iuste pieque accusaret aut acerbe indigneque moreretur, accusare, quoquo modo posset, quam illo modo emori maluit*. CIL VI 38425: *P. Grattius Celer ... infelix indigne subiectus, acerbe morte nefanda occisus* whereby *indigne* points to an act “which is ‘shocking’ or ‘a shame’ because it conflicts with accepted notions of what is right and proper” (Fordyce on Cat. 101,6). My text, then, is this:

infit: “O cives, quae me fortuna feroci  
contudit indigne bello ac confecit acerbe!”

**454** I would suggest: erip<uere> patres pueris plorantibus offam.

Some few misprints and imperfections will surely be corrected in a reprint: p. 122 (4): The text from Cic. *Acad.* 2.88 should be repunctuated with a full stop after ‘audiret’ and a comma after ‘somnia’. – p. 132 (17): Satuturniam > Saturnia. – p. 236 (28): Navium > Naevium – p. 260 (6, 308): Flos > flos – p. 278 (8, on 336): equitatem > aequitatem – p. 306 (5, on 381): tali > teli – p. 376 (47) vidatur > videatur.

**Vol. II:** Those who are by now familiar with the exceptional edition *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*, the huge successor to Ribbeck’s collection, are grateful to have access to such an archive of information. But they will certainly also appreciate the present volume for providing them with a handy guide to the former edition. The radical Loeb abridgement can immediately show them what the present editors consider most valuable in the wealth of information in the former. A little more than half of this volume consists of the dramatic fragments. The numbering follows (of course) *TrRF* Vol. II; the concordances for this part comprise only Vahlen<sup>2</sup> and Warmington, not Jocelyn. If one wants to compare Jocelyn one must turn to *TrRF*’s concordances. This is a bit inconvenient since Jocelyn’s dense commentary will be in demand for a long time to come. In more than forty instances, Jocelyn resorted to the ‘ultimate expedient’, cruces, in his text presentation. He is in other words utterly wary of adopting emendations. In less than half of these cases G & M have followed Jocelyn in his use of these corruption markers, and rightly so. See for example line 5 Joc. (Nonius, p. 147. 18):

†nam consilius† obvarant quibus tam concedit hic ordo

Manuwald adopted here in her *TrRF* text Timpanaro’s brilliant emendation (1947):

**4** nam consili<is i>us obvarant, quibus tam concedit hic ordo  
In the Loeb edition even the pointy brackets have been omitted. I should recommend as general practice to print first the text as transmitted (with the possible variants in an app. crit.) and thereupon the emended text below it in this way:

1) nam consilius obvarant quibus tam concedit hic ordo

2) nam consiliis ius obvarant, quibus tam concedit hic ordo  
consiliis ius *Timpanaro 1947, 71*

The question then arises whether the editors should have refrained from cruces more often. A reviewer must at least be allowed to raise the issue in some places and make some propositions:

**32** sed quasi aut ferrum aut lapis  
durat rarerent gemitum †conatur trabem†

I have discussed this interesting case in more detail in my forthcoming *Critica*. Lipsius’ *conatu trahens* seems quite convincing in my view and ought perhaps to have had as prominent a place in the new Loeb as

in Warminton's old. Here the above-mentioned two step presentation would be particularly appropriate.

The following suggestions reflect more my own search for meaning than a critical attitude to the texts as presented.

**42,3** tum pariter euan euhoe euhoe euhium  
 modifying Fabricius' supplements I would suggest (taking *euhans* as a pres. part.):  
 tum pariter euhans euhoe euhoe euhium

**56** quae mea comminus machaera atque hasta † hospius manu †  
 I suggest  
 quae mea comminus machaera atque hasta redhostiunt manu

**130** set civitatem video Argivum incendere

I have argued in favour of the passive infinitive *incendier* in my *Critica* (forthcoming).

**132** neque sepulchrum quo recipiat habeat, portum corporis,  
 ubi remissa humana vita corpus requiescat malis  
 I suggest  
 ubi remissum humana vita corpus requiescat malis

**139** impetrem facile ab animo ut cernat vitalem † babium †  
 I suggest  
 impetrem facile ab animo ut cernat vitalem halitum

Misprints are rare: **1a** (p. 6) *iussu Dolabella* > *iussu Dolabellae*. – **90** (p. 96-97) *tu, qui ceteris cavere didicisti* does not mean "You, who have taught others to beware". – **188** (p. 194-195) *venisse* is "sold", not "bought".

EGIL KRAGGERUD  
 University of Oslo  
 egil.kraggerud@ifikk.uio.no