Jürgen Blänsdorf, *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum Praeter Enni Annales et Ciceronis Germanicique Aratea* post W. Morel et K. Büchner editionem quartam auctam curavit J. B. Bibliotheca Teubneriana, Berlin - New York: Walter de Gruyter, 2011, pp. xxiv + 490, ISBN 978–3–11–020915–0.

J. Blänsdorf's revised and enlarged *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum* is the fifth edition of these poetic fragments, despite the ordinal *quartam* in the title, to be published in the Teubner series, following E. Baehrens 1886, W. Morel 1927, K. Büchner 1982, and Blänsdorf himself 1995. Each of Baehrens' successors brought changes of plan and scale to the collection: Morel drastically reduced the number of fragments in Baehren's ambitious collection; Büchner began the practice of including bibliographies for the fragments and, in the case of translations, e.g., Cicero's translations of Homer, added extensive quotation of the Greek source texts; and Blänsdorf expanded the bibliographies and added *testimonia* on the lives and works of the poets. (Devoting more than two pages, 323–5, to *testimonia* about the poetic inclinations of Nero seems excessive, especially in light of the meager fragments that follow.) The chief difference between the 2011 edition and its immediate predecessor is the addition of fragments that had not previously been included. The largest group of new fragments belongs to Ennius (pp. 73–86), 46 fragments in all from the following works, *Sota*, *Saturae*, *Hedyphagetica*, *Scipio*, *Epicharmus*, *Praecepta*, and also the epigrams. Since *FPL* is not only a collection of fragments but also, in the case of early Latin poetry, serves as an instrument for the study of a period whose poetic output is represented almost exclusively by fragments, the addition of Ennius's poetry, other than epic and drama, helps to enlarge the picture of developments in genre and meter and fills in what was a rather conspicuous gap in the collection between the fragments of Naevius and Hostius. To make room for this new material the lengthier Greek quotations have been trimmed. For the reader's convenience the editor provides page references to authors and texts in the editions of Courtney (Oxford 1993) and Hollis (Oxford 2007).

There are improvements in this new edition for which readers can be grateful, first and foremost in the revision of the texts of some of the fragments as printed in the 1995 edition: p. 174 (Cicero, fr. 34.23), L. Mueller's *patriis* for the transmitted *patris* (1995) sets the meter straight; p. 185 (Q. Cicero on the zodiacal constellations), Wakefield's *flamina* in line 1 is a necessary correction of the transmitted *flumina* (1995); p. 304 (Gaetulicus), the variant *praecedunt* is superior to *praecidunt* (1995); p. 315 (Caesius Bassus

2.6), Blänsdorf rightly prints *coronet* (Leutsch) for the corrupt *coronis* (1995); p. 380 (Tiberianus 8.9), the unexplained *iubis* (1995) is now replaced by Courtney's sure correction *iugis*; p. 452 (fr. 83), the insertion of Pithoeus's *est* corrects what was in the previous edition an unmetrical line; unfortunately, this correction is counterbalanced in the second line by the adoption of Buechner's conjecture *si*, which results in the unmetrical *si quibus*; what was Ovid, fr. 18 (= *Ars. Am.* 2.300; p. 289 of the 1995 edition) has now been removed. *Cilnius* is no longer printed as the name of Maecenas (pp. 249–254); *Ticidas* has been replaced by *Ticida* (pp. 228–229); and *Crassitius* is corrected to *Crassicius* (pp. 225–226). In response to S. Harrison's suggestion, the editor now identifies the meters of fragments that are not in the dactylic hexameter or elegiac distich. (This is a helpful practice but can be taken too far; in the case of Ennius's *Sota*, pp. 73–4, there is no need to identify each fragment as a sotadean. And readers may be perplexed by the editors procedure in identifying the meter of the fragments of Accius's *Didascalia* (pp. 97–100), which not all scholars agree was composed in verse. Here the identification of the meter depends on the adoption of numerous conjectures cited in the *apparatus*, which the editor himself does not print in the text; the reader is required to reconstruct the text in order to establish the meter.)

Despite these improvements the books usefulness continues to be impaired by its unreliability and the unevenness of the editor's performance. Take, for example, the fine invocation of Venus in the anonymous fragment on p. 445. In line 4 Blänsdorf prints *coeptanti, Venus alma, fave*; in his 1995 edition he printed the manuscript reading *coeptantem… fove*. When readers consult the *apparatus* to learn the source of this new reading, they will be surprised to find that there is no mention of it; it was proposed by Bücheler in the article cited on p. 445 and was later independently suggested by S. Harrison in his review of the 1995 edition, also cited on p. 445. Bücheler's emendation gives the traditional language of the poet's request for assistance in an invocation and is undoubtedly right; at the same time, however, the *apparatus* should make clear to the reader what is transmitted by the manuscripts and what is conjecture. In line 4 the period after *fave* disrupts the structure of the invocation by separating from the divinity invoked the relative clause that explains what aspect of the divinity's power or experience is relevant to the poet's undertaking. Again in the same line, Bücheler suggested that in the phrase *semina caeli*, a reference to the story of Venus' birth from the sea foam fertilized by the blood of Uranus, *caeli* should be printed *Caeli* as the Latin name of Uranus; the suggestion is at least worth recording in the *apparatus* but receives no mention here; cf. Cicero, fr. 33.2 (p. 172), *generata Caelo*, Prometheus addressing the Titans. In line 13, according to two manuscripts, our poet describes the earth as supported by the weight of its elements (*ponderibus fundata suis*); according to two other manuscripts, it is described as balanced by that weight (*ponderibus librata suis*).

The editor is persuaded by an Ovidian parallel (*Met.* 1.13, *ponderibus librata suis*) that *librata* is the genuine reading. Two considerations weigh against that conclusion: first, the contexts are different; in our passage the earth has settled into position (*resedit* 12), supported (*fundata*) by its own weight, while in the Ovidian parallel *librata* is appropriate to the image of the earth hanging suspended in the air (*pendebat Met.* 1.12); *fundata* makes better sense in combination with the notion of settling into position than *librata*; second, transmissional probability favors the displacement of an original reading *fundata* by *librata* as a result of harmonization to the text of *Met.* 1.13 (see also Cicero, *Tusc.* 5.69) rather than the displacement of an original reading *librata* by *fundata*. In line 21 the editor adopts S. Harrison's conjecture *vitemus* for the transmitted *libamus*; it is unclear why the conjecture is printed in angular brackets. On the basis of an interesting parallel, Valerius Flaccus 1.181 (*primas linquet cum puppis harenas*) I would suggest reading *linquamus*, which brings us closer to the transmitted reading and fits the poet's notion of getting underway. In the *apparatus* (18) there is no reason to record Mommsen's *dextra*. Bücheler noted that in these twenty-one lines there are no elisions.

I have focused on a less well-known fragment because in reading such a fragment readers are especially reliant on the editor's guidance to help them through unfamiliar territory. Here that guidance is not as reliable as it should be. Though anonymous, this invocation of Venus deserves no less attention than the fragments of Cinna and Cornelius Gallus. Here follow additional observations on the texts; they are referred to by page number and fragment number.

P. 13: The heading should read *A. Atili Calatini Elogium*. P. 79 (Ennius, *Hedyphagetica* fr. 28.3): Blänsdorf reads *caradrumque apud Ambraciae sus*. This comes as a double surprise because he does not explain in the *apparatus* how he understands *caradrum* (presumably a body of water of some kind) and he does not identify the source of the conjecture *sus*; the manuscripts give *umbraciae finis*; R. Helm conjectured *sus* in his edition of Apuleius's *Apologia* (Teubner 1959), citing Athenaeus 7.326 e–f and Ovid *Hal.* 132 for *sus* as the name of a fish. Even with the passages cited by Helm this *sus* is pretty hard to swallow. A reference to Skutsch's discussion in *Studia Enniana* (London 1968) 38–39 would have been helpful here, since Blänsdorf appears to be following his interpretation, at least in part. Courtney (p. 22) and Olson and Sens (*Archestratos of Gela*, Oxford 2000, 241–5; not cited in the bibliography) print *Caradrumque apud Ambraciai*; see their notes. P. 82 (Ennius, fr. 34): The text should be printed to indicate that *gero* does not begin a new line but belongs to the previous one. P.84 (Ennius, fr. 39.7–8: In the *apparatus* (7) the conjecture *haec<e>* is attributed to Courtney; it belongs to L. Spengel who proposed it in his first edition of Varro's *de ling. Lat.* (1826): *haecce* [sic]. In line 8 the conjecture

arbusta, proposed by Spengel in his second edition of *de ling. Lat.* (1885), preface lxxi, and later independently by Courtney, should be adopted; the transmitted reading *urbes* is out of place in the list of living organisms that are the beneficiaries of Jupiter's nurture. Spengel (1885: preface lxxi–lxxii) has an interesting discussion of the fragment. P. 85 (Ennius, fr. 43): In the second line of the epigram Muretus's *quivit*, which is supported by Seneca's paraphrase (*potuisse*), should be read instead of Pincianus's *quibit*. P. 88: The heading should read *L. Aemili Regilli Titulus*. The time has come for future editors of *FPL* to print the entire text of this inscription reported by Livy, 40.52, instead of just the first line. Although the text is garbled and may be mixed with Livian paraphrase, it is a precious piece of Latin that deserves to be included here. If there is room in *FPL* for the *carmen* of the Arval Brothers, then there is room for the whole of Aemilius's titulus. J. Briscoe's *Commentary* on Livy, Books 38–40 (Oxford 2008) is a good place to start. P. 111 (Porcius Licinus, fr. 6.4): F. Leo's punctuation of this line with a semi-colon after *pecus* is to be preferred. P. 158 (Cicero, fr. 3a): Although the source of this fragment, Asinius Gallus, was hostile to Cicero, the main reason for labeling it *dubium* seems to be an overly delicate concern for Cicero's sexuality. P. 161 (Cicero, fr. 6.78): Davies' conjecture *patria*, ablative with *vacat*, gives the required sense, as Courtney pointed out; the transmitted reading, *patriae*, retained by the editor, stands in need of parallels to explain this use of the dative with *vacare* to mean "free from". The *OLD* cites one parallel, the line in question. In the *apparatus* (78) Madvig's conjecture *vacat id* is misreported as *patriae vacat*. P. 173 (Cicero, fr. 33.6) Much is said in the *apparatus* about split anapests in defense of the form *Mulciberi* but there is no mention of the variant *Mulcebri*, a syncopated form, transmitted by one branch of the tradition. P. 179 (Cicero, fr. 43.2) The *apparatus* does not record that one branch of the manuscript tradition has *navigassem*. P. 196 (fr. 8.1): Delete the comma after *omnes*. P. 215 (Calvus, fr. 12): Since Blänsdorf retains *celeris* and adopts Büchner's conjecture *vexatur*, it is unclear what the fragment means. P. 225 (epigram on Crassicius): The note in the *apparatus* (1) suggests that the spelling *Zmyrna*, rather than *Smyrna*, with the preceding *credere* scanned as a dactyl, is preferred by editors; see the comments of Courtney, p. 306, and Hollis, pp. 29–30 and 38. P. 236 (Varro Atacinus, fr. 13.1): Hollis's conjecture *ut* for *at* should be adopted; it results in a clearer construction, being coordinate with *sic* in line 3. The variant *aetherius*, modifying *orbis*, is preferable to the other variant *aetheriis*, usually printed by editors, because *orbis* stands in need of an epithet to signify that it is the celestial sphere. P. 304 (Gaetulicus): Housman's conjecture *aera* for the transmitted *aere* is a necessity. P. 320 (Lucan, fr. 6.2): Blänsdorf adopts Scaliger's *flammatum*, modifying *Phaethonta*, in place of the transmitted flammati, modifying *poli*. Scaliger's conjecture results in a harsh asyndeton (*raptum…flammatum*) that abruptly conflates two sepa-

rate events in the Phaethon story, his being carried off (*raptum*) by the Sun's chariot from its regular course through the zodiac and his being struck by Jupiter's thunderbolt (*flammatum*). Here Lucan is expressing a paradoxical inversion of the natural order, "the heavens set on fire" (*flammati poli*). P. 365 (Tertullian, fr. 2, a new addition): Traina's suggestion that this is an irregular hexameter is very unlikely, especially since Calcidius (p. 399, fr. 10) managed to get it right. Tertullian's main goal appears to be a close translation of Empedolces' Greek; hence the unwieldy compound *circumcordialis*, which contains a cretic, presumably Tertullian's own coinage. The line, without *sensus*, could pass as an iambic senarius, probably accidental and a sign that it is prose. P. 378–80 (Tiberianus): The treatment of Tiberianus's fragments, which Courtney criticized as unsatisfactory in his review of the 1995 edition, remains so in this edition. Fr. 1 is the third line of a poem of twenty-eight lines preserved in *Anth. Lat.* 719b. It is difficult to imagine a good reason for creating a single-line fragment out of a larger text; the editor's reference to *Anth. Lat.* 719b does nothing to alleviate the difficulty. Fr. 3 is labeled *dubium* and consists of a lemma only (Servius on *Aen.* 6.532); the text, which was present in the 1995 edition, will now be found as a fragment of Terentianus Maurus on p. 374. The only reason the fragment was attributed to Tiberianus in the first place was that Baehrens emended the name *Terrentianus* in Servius's note to *Tiberianus*. So fr. 3 is not a fragment; it is a footnote that records the editor's change of mind about the plausibility of Baehren's conjecture and the authorship of the fragment. Fr. 4 has neither lemma nor text, only a cross-reference to line 10 of fr. 8. I understand this reference to mean that fr. 4, though a blank, is to be supplied from Fulgentius's quotation (*Myth.* 1.21) of lines 8–9 of fr. 10; again a fragment created out of a longer text. The inclusion of these two text-less fragments could have been avoided if the editor had decided not to adopt the numeration of Mattiacci's edition of Tiberianus (Florence 1990). P. 422 (fr. 33 on Arcas and Callisto): The first line of this fragment has been subjected to various alterations. If the text of Micyllus's *editio princeps* (1535) of Hyginus's *Fabulae*, the source of the fragment, is trustworthy, *tuque Lycaoniae mutatae semine nymphae*, then the simplest solution to the syntactic and interpretive problems posed by the line is to read *semina* (vocative) for *semine*: "You, offspring of the transformed nymph, daughter of Lycaon", i.e., Arcas, son of Callisto, the daughter of the Arcadian Lycaon.

In some cases it is not clear why a fragment has been placed in its present location in the collection. P. 96 (Accius, *Didascalia*, fr. 6): This first fragment of a work that may or may not be in verse is a quotation by Gellius (3.11.4–5) of *prose* from book one of the *Didascalica*. Its status as a poetic fragment remains a mystery. P. 164 (fr. 12a): The famous spondaic line that gives a neoteric wind blowing from Epirus is oddly included among the fragments of the *de consulatu suo*, even though a note is appended to the

fragment stating that it doesn't belong to that poem. It is generally regarded as an impromptu verse inspired by the occasion of his letter to Atticus. P. 180 (Cicero's *Aratea*): Cicero's translation of Aratus's *Phaenomena,* with reference to editions of the poem, is mentioned by title and *testimonia* only, near the end of the section containing Cicero's translations from Greek epic (pp. 167–80), drama, and some minor pieces. As one of Cicero's earliest poetic compositions, if not the earliest, the *Aratea* should stand at the very beginning of his fragments; and if chronology is insufficient to justify such a placement, then its importance as a major hexameter poem from the Sullan period is. Here it's worth commenting that this practice of including the names of authors and their works but omitting their texts (Germanicus, *Aratea*, p.303; Petronius, p. 317) merely highlights the contradictory impulses that drive editorial practice in the composition of this volume; on the one hand, the effort to edit a collection of poetic fragments that includes all the important texts and can serve as a standard reference work and, on the other, the anxiety-inducing compromise of excluding important texts which readers will have to find elsewhere but whose existence, whether as fragment or complete poem, it is felt necessary to acknowledge for the sake of inclusiveness. And in the case of Petronius's poems, that acknowledgement does not include mention of Courtney's edition (1991); see now also Aldo Setaioli, *Arbitri Nugae: Petronius' Short Poems in the Satyrica* (Frankfurt am Main 2011). P. 197 (fr. 10 on the consulship of Caninius, a new addition to *FPL*): This delightful fragment on Caninius, consul-for-a-day, is attributed by Macrobius (*Sat.* 2.3.6) to Cicero but is found among the *versus populares in Caesarem et similia.* This placement would suggest that the editor doubts Cicero's authorship, though he makes no explicit statement about authenticity. Since Cicero makes a similar comment in *ad. fam.* 7.30.1 (not cited), without, however, expressing his contempt in iambic *senarii* (contrary to the editor's practice elsewhere the meter is not here identified), there seems no good reason to doubt its authenticity. As an excellent specimen of Cicero's biting wit, it should be included among his other fragments. The editor notes that it is necessary to transpose the word *suo* in Macrobius's quotation (*suo somnum non vidit*) to produce a *senarius* (*somnum non vidit suo*) but the scholar responsible for recognizing the quotation as a *senarius* and making the transposition is not named; it was Scaliger. Another of Cicero's squibs on the ephemeral Caninius in this same letter (*ad fam.* 7.30.1) makes a trochaic *septenarius* if the words *neminem prandisse* are transposed, thus: *Ita Caninio consule scito prandisse neminem* (Consul Caninius was under such a term-crunch, nobody had time for lunch). Our comic consul continues to remind us of the joys of *libertas.* P.300 (Rabirius, fr. 6 (*dub.*): On the dubious testimony of the late fifth-century mythographer Fulgentius, the epic poet Rabirius, whom Velleius Paterculus names along with Vergil as the outstanding poets of the age, is saddled with a verse that contains a false

quantity (*abstemium* with short *e*; cf. Horace, *Epist.* 1.12.7) and a woman's name, *Mettenia*, if that is the correct spelling, that is patently derived from the name of the husband who, according to Pliny the Elder (*Hist. Nat.* 14.89) and Valerius Maximus (6.3.9), killed his wife for drinking wine; the bludgeoner's name is variously transmitted as *Mecen(n)ius/Maetennius/Meten(n)ius* and *Metellus*. These defects were pointed out by Haupt, who, in the paper cited in the bibliography, exposed the line as Fulgentius's own creation. Labeling the fragment *dubium*, is, in these circumstances, an understatement; it would be better placed in the section of *incertorum versus*. P. 445 (fr. 75). This elegiac distich disparaging Domitian, which is preserved in the Juvenal scholia (4.38) and attributed by the scholiast to Martial, is included in the section *incertorum versus* and is introduced under the heading *Martialis fragmentum (?)*. Why it should be placed here and its authenticity impugned is unclear. Most of Martial's editors, e.g., Friedländer, Lindsay, Heraeus, Shackleton Bailey, accept the lines as genuine, although there is debate about where the lines belong in the corpus of Martial's poetry; most editors put them at the end of the *liber spectaculorum*, Friedländer at the end of book 11; Shackleton Bailey notes that they do not belong (*alienum*) in the *liber*. See the comments of K. Coleman, *Martial: Liber Spectaculorum* (Oxford 2006) xx; she calls the distich "a rank intruder". It is possible that the epigram to which these lines once belonged circulated outside the published collections of Martial's poems, a scurrilous parting shot fired off after the tyrant's assassination that was never intended to be included in his books. In any case, more than a question mark is needed to impugn the authenticity of these lines. Moreover, in expressing his doubts Bländorf need not have relegated them to the motley assortment of *incertorum versus*. It would have made good sense to include them among popular verses aimed at the Caesars where their artistry and their sting would be highlighted by similar pieces (see pp. 194–7, 264–5, 301, 328–9). The scholiast's note that quotes these lines indicates that they are the conclusion of an epigram; therefore, a lacuna should be indicated before the first line. Ausonius's imitation is worth citing (23 *Caesares*.90–4). Two specimens of *versus populares*, a trochaic *septenarius* on Germanicus (p. 302, fr. 6) and an epigram on Caligula (p. 306) are mislabled lampoons (*in Germanicum* and *in Caligulam*); the first is an outcry of public rejoicing at the report, later proved false, that Germanicus recovered from his illness; the Caligula-epigram is an expression of legionary pride that Caligula was born in the camp. The correct placement of a fragment can obscure its literary value. The brilliant afflatus and memorable reverberations of Lucan's reinterpretation of Nero's *sub terris tonuisse putes* (p. 327, fr. 5) transforms that fragment into witty epigram (it can be read as part of an elegiac pentameter) and acute criticism; poetic and intestinal thundering inflate the imperial muse.

The orthography needs some revision: *cygnus* (p. 272, fr. 4); *genitrix* (p. 280, fr. 9.1) *Phthia* (p. 170, fr. 27; p. 397, fr. 2, where the 1995 edition has the correct spelling *Pthia*. In the famous Naevius-epitaph (p. 69) the editor adopts the spelling *Orcho*, with the aspirate, on the authority of Gellius's manuscripts. The consequences of this choice were not thought through. Given what we know from inscriptions and Cicero, *Or*. 160, about orthographical practice in writing the aspirate for Greek loan-words and native Latin words, the spelling *Orchus* would not be found in an epitaph written at a time roughly contemporary with Ennius, which is the period indicated by its placement in the collection. If this spelling were original, one would have to conclude that the epigram was written sometime after the middle of the second century or possibly later. It is more likely, however, that in his quotation of the text Gellius, or his source, was following the misguided orthographical precept of the influential grammarian Valerius Probus who maintained that the correct spelling was *Orchus* (Servius on *G*. 1.277 and 3.223). If it is assumed that the epigram was written within a generation after Naevius's death, then *thesaurus Orci* was the poet's final destination.

The addition of new material and the process of digitizing the text have resulted in the introduction of misprints into the *testimonia*. Here are some examples: p. 72 (Gellius 17.21.43), the consul's name is *Mamilius*, not *Manilius*; p. 73 (Cicero, *div*. 2.111, for 2.11.1), the words *cum deinceps* are omitted before *ex primis*; p. 79 (fr. 28, Apuleius, *Apol*. 39), *Hedyphagetica* is omitted before *versibus*; p. 83 (fr. 35a), read *aestatem* for *aetatem*; p. 211 (Cicero, *fam*. 7.241.1), read *Hipponacteo* for *Hipponacte*; p.212 (Gellius 19.9.7), *inquiunt* is mistakenly included within the quotation; p. 212 (Cicero, *Brutus* 283), read *audientibus* for *adientibus*; p. 220 (Catullus 95.1), read *messem* for *mensem*; p. 224 (Cinna, fr. 11), lines 3–4 of Callimachus, epigram 27, are mispunctuated; p. 335 (Pliny, *epist*. 4.14.2), read *scripserunt* for *scriperunt*. Misprints in the texts of the fragments are few: p. 75, fr. 10 *occcurrunt*; p. 160, fr. 6.26 *noctumo*; p. 365 fr. 2, *circumcordialist*.

To conclude, this new edition is an improvement, for the most part, over its predecessor and shows in places the beneficial influence of the advances made by the editions of Courtney and Hollis in the textual criticism and interpretation of the fragments. The addition of the Ennian fragments increases the usefulness of the volume, which now offers a fuller representation of the variety in subject matter and meter to be found in Latin poetry up to the middle of the second century BC. As a collection of a formidably heterogeneous assortment of texts spanning eight centuries of poetic production in Latin, the majority of which are orphans, adopted by circumstance and housed in alien environments, this volume fills the need for a convenient reference guide that provides an organized *corpus* to shelter these strays. At the

same time, it must be said that there is still room for improvement in editing the fragments of the Latin poets.

D. Mark Possanza
University of Pittsburgh
possanza@pitt.edu