Aicher, Peter Jesse

HOMER AND ROMAN REPUBLICAN POETRY

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill PH.D. 1986

Homer and Roman Republican Poetry

by

Peter J. Aicher

A dissertation submitted to the Faculty of The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Classics.

Chapel Hill

1986

Approved by:

George A. Kennedy
Adviser

Sara Mack
Reader

Lawrence Stephens
Reader

PETER JESSE AICHER. Homer and Roman Republican Poetry (Under the direction of GEORGE KENNEDY.)

Livius Andronicus' Odusia, the Homeric borrowings of Ennius and Lucretius, and Cicero's translations of Homer are closely compared with their Greek original; this close confrontation between Latin and Greek is helpful both in assessing the uniqueness of the Latin language and its literature, and in illuminating the poetic techniques of the individual Latin writers.

In his translation of the Odyssey, Livius' use of archaisms, patronymic expressions, and the Saturnian meter show a writer more concerned to create a Latin epic style based on indigenous resources than to duplicate the effect that the original text made upon him. There are indications that he has avoided, on aesthetic grounds, the repetitious features of Homer's style; he clearly relies more heavily than his model on sound effects and pathos.

Ennius, in contrast to Livius, uses numerous stylistic devices to link the Annales to Homeric epic. The liberties he takes in patterning Latin morphology and syntax on Homeric Greek are authorized by the aesthetic ruse that establishes the narrator as the alter Homerus. Ennius' horse-simile and the tree-cutting scene reveal the subjective viewpoint that Brooks Otis finds characteristic of Latin literature, a viewpoint encouraged by the wealth of sound effects and figure in Ennius' versions.

Lucretius was attracted by Homer's visual clarity, but he also shows great skill in adapting Homeric descriptions for his own didactic purposes. The abode of Homeric gods is transformed into a vision appropriate for Lucretius' philosophy; elsewhere a subtle manipulation of images politicizes Sisyphus' stone and implicates Phaiacian splendor in a scheme critical of wealth.

Cicero also rewrites Homer for his own didactic purposes, rendering the translated passages more suitable for the illustration of the arguments in his treatises, where all the passages are found. Cicero's version of the snake-and-bird omen reveals

both an orator and a Roman at work; antitheses and a heightening of emotion especially characterize the scene.

In the Conclusion, the dynamics of poetic influence in pre-Virgilian epic are explored.

Table of Contents

Introduction

Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit. . . "and Rome once captured," one might add, without the word-play of Horace, "has never been released." Both Rome's reliance on Greek models and the academic yoking of both literatures to a single discipline insure that when we examine a Roman poem we have an eye as well on its Greek models. This immediately sets the appreciation of Roman poetry at a disadvantage, and not simply because Latin poems beg comparison with some stunning originals; more detrimental still may be a residual suspicion of imitation, inherited, like a survival instinct no longer needed, from our Romantic ancestors. The premium they placed on the spontaneity of poetic genesis and originality of result lends strong support to the conception of Roman art as the derivative and generally inferior product of a copyist. Since the heyday of Romanticism we have grown more accepting of formal poetic convention; we assert its necessity, laud translation, and acknowledge the great potential that tradition has (if only for its own subversion); few, moreover, would agree with Keats that "if poetry comes not as naturally as leaves to a tree it had better not come at all." Yet, as the work of Hermann Hesse proves, the19th century dies hard, and the Romantic notion of creativity still influences the reputation of Roman poets today: relate two works to each other as model and copy, and prior to the judgment which weighs the virtues of each the superiority of the former is often assumed.

Yet the Romans themselves are also partly responsible for the manner of interpretation which assures their second-class status; it is they who insist on comparison with the Greeks, who wear imitation like a badge, and seem to express a diminished

conception of their own originality and accomplishment. What are we to think of Horace's boast that he is the first to import Aeolic meters into Rome? First, we may think that the meter is better suited to its native soil. But if it is we who prefer the maker to the merchant, it is the Roman poet who encourages us to make this distinction and who arrogates the latter role with such zest that we assume he harbored no pretensions to creativity other than the one of being first to say something in Latin. This of course is not the case. Taking our cue from Augustus, who saved the Aeneid from flame, we must not be tempted to let the Roman poets have the last word on the matter of their own achievements. D. A. Russell's remark about rhetorical criticism should perhaps be broadened to include the critical standards articulated by the poets as well (such as in the "Ars Poetica"): ". . . ancient rhetorical criticism [of Quintilian, 'Longinus,' et al.], though undoubtedly useful in suggesting principles of judgment and helping to elucidate authors' intentions, is fundamentally not equal to the task of appraising classical literature."[1]

In the task of appraisal left to us, it is of some importance to assess the uniqueness of Latin literature; without a sense for what a Roman writer wanted to express and achieve artistically, any divergences from the peculiar virtues of his Greek model will always measure his failure before they signal his personal predilections and achievements. It would be wise to know the depth of Virgil's ambiguity before Homer's clarity of surface be preferred.

Brooks Otis, in an article entitled "The Uniqueness of Latin Literature," centers his appraisal as much on the psyche of Roman writers as on their style. This is evident from the pointed summation of his argument: "Roman literature is what happens when introverts

---

[1] D. A. Russell, Criticism in Antiquity (Berkeley: U of California P, 1981) 6. See also G. Kennedy Classical Rhetoric and Its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times (Chapel Hill: U of N. Carolina P, 1980): "[T]he peculiar features of literary composition were not conceptualized and presumably existed as a kind of secret among a guild of poets who learned them by imitation, experimentation, and something which they regarded as inspiration. Careful comparison of the subtle literary techniques of Horace in his Odes with the warmed over rhetoric of his verse treatise, The Art of Poetry, well illustrates the gulf between practice and theory." (p. 109)

rewrite the work of extroverts."[2] To illustrate this argument, he offers the letters of Cicero for their ability to capture a "concrete, unique moment in a specific personality and a specific milieu," Horace's poetry, which presents and interprets Greek motifs, philosophical generalization and moral commonplace through the medium of the poet's own experiences, Virgil's portrayal of Dido, which shows how a Roman's introspective habit is reflected in the characters he creates, and finally, Tacitus' moral involvement with the people and society whose decline he traces. Otis, after contrasting each of these four authors with his closest Greek counterparts, concludes and recapitulates that in Roman literature "the inner self, the introspective approach, the emphatic narrative, the sense of history. . . really entered literature for the first time."[3]

In contrast to Otis' argument centered on the presentation of the self in literature, A. D. Leeman, in the conclusion to Orationis Ratio, characterizes Roman literature by its penchant for rhetorical effect: "It is indeed clear that the 'rules' of the rhetorical system meant much more to the average Roman writer than to the average Greek writer of the classical or even the Hellenistic age."[4] Leeman traces the Roman passion for rhetorical effect to four possible sources: a) "the typically Roman need for organization and orderly behavior in general," b) the "typical Roman fondness for the ornamental and the pompous," a linguistic equivalent of the toga, c) the "somewhat morbid Roman taste for the mysterious, the weird and the horrifying," for which rhetorical devices provided a suitable means of expression in the form of powerful suggestions and hidden emphasis, and lastly d) "the nature of the Latin language and its potentia. The devices of repetition--repetition of sound, sense and pattern--which constitute the main body of rhetorical expression are found in nuce already in pre-literary Latin texts, especially in the religious carmina, and it is

---

[2] Brooks Otis, "The Uniqueness of Latin Literature," Arion 6 (1967): 204.

[3] Otis 204.

[4] A. D. Leeman, Orationis Ratio (Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1963) 381.

quite natural that Greek rhetorical teaching appealed to the Romans from the first literary generation onwards."[5]

Characterizations of Latin literature by L. R. Palmer and Gordon Williams support and amplify Leeman's remarks on its uniqueness, and share his stylistic (as contrasted to Otis' more psychological) approach. In The Latin Language Palmer cites a passage by Ennius alongside its Greek original to show that, for all the influence that Greek literature exercised on Latin literature even in its cradle, the essential latinity of the language is unmistakable and the "devices of stylization are patently un-Greek:"

ὤ μοι, πῇ δή τοι φρένες ὄιχονθ', ἥις τὸ πάρος περ
ἔκλε' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους;

Il. 24. 201

Quo vobis mentes rectae quae stare solebant
ante hac dementes sese flexere viai

202-3 V.=ROL 194-5

"Here we see exemplified that love of word-play (mentes-dementes) and assonance, especially alliteration, which was deeply rooted in Latin soil, if we may judge from proverbs like mense Maio malae nubunt, and from religious carmina. . . Indeed the occurrence of alliterative word pairs among the Italic peoples. . . shows that alliteration and assonance were endemic among the Italian peoples."[6]

Williams likewise traces features prominent in Rome's Golden Age to early records of Latin and identifies some of the characteristics of early Latin compositions.[7] They were

---

[5] Leeman 381.

[6] L. R. Palmer, The Latin Language (London: Faber and Faber, 1954) 104-5.

[7] Gordon Williams, "The Genesis of Poetry in Rome," in The Cambridge History of Classical Literature, II: Latin Literature ed. by E. J. Kenney (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982) 54-5. Williams must primarily have in mind the lustral-prayer handed down by Cato (De Ag. Cult. 141. 2-3.); other ancient carmina very likely were metrical: see Eduard Norden's Aus Altrömischen Priesterbüchern (Leipzig: Lund, 1939) for an analysis of the Saturnian meter of the hymn of the Fratres Arvales, pp. 229-233.

not metrical, but nonetheless rhythmical, with balanced cola, rhyme, and alliteration; clauses were often related and pleonasm was frequent. The employment of polar expressions (e.g., visos invisosque) and figurae etymologicae rounds off his list of literary methods of expression which both achieved "linguistic satisfaction and emphatic solemnity" in early Latin literature, and which went on to influence "all later artistic writing in Latin, especially in poetry, where their frequent occurrence marks off the style even of a poet like Virgil from that of any of his Greek models."[8]

As part of the following study I will confront the generalizations above with the evidence of Homeric verse rendered by Republican writers, specifically by Livius' in his Odusia, Ennius in the Annales, Lucretius in De Rerum Natura, and Cicero in the Homeric translations embedded in his treatises. It is hoped that the confrontation accomplishes several things: first, the generalizations can be tested by the close verbal comparison that, as Palmer demonstrates above, Homeric borrowings invite. In fact, the opinions reviewed above are largely substantiated by my approach, although with occasional modifications; the particular conjunction of both Otis' "introspection" and Leeman's "devices of repetition" in some Ennian passages also suggests that these two traits are not entirely unrelated (see pp. 76-7).

Comparisons with Homer, however, are useful in revealing not only shared characteristics and common linguistic tendencies, but also much about the individual poetics of each writer, and I have accordingly allowed each chapter some independence in its scope. A varied approach is also demanded by the diverse natures of my authors' texts. Cicero's translations of Homer illustrate philosophical arguments and in several cases it is possible to demonstrate that the divergences from a literal rendition of Homer more immediately reflect their particular polemical context than a general characteristic of the Latin language. Lucretius' Homeric borrowings must likewise be considered in context; only then is Lucretius' great skill in employing the Homeric text for his own poetic devices

---

[8] Williams, CHCL,II 55.

revealed. The Homeric verses of Livius and Ennius, on the other hand, are fragmentary, but their study not only illuminates the earliest, formative stages of Latin epic style but reveals much about the dynamics of influence during such a stage.

Chapter I:
The Odusia

The remains of Livius' Odusia have been transmitted by grammarians commenting on archaic morphology, diction, and syntax (a fact which must be kept in mind when speculating on the translation's style--see nn. 31 and 57). The 33 fragments that remain yield a total of 37 lines, the longest fragment being three lines; some are no longer than a word or two.[1] Scanty as these remains are, it is surprising how much they can tell us, even if the philologist cannot proceed as boldly as the zoologist, who, relying on the consistency of natural law, can construct an entire beast from a bone-chip. In this chapter, rather than commenting on each fragment individually (which has recently been done by U. Carratello[2]), I will proceed topically, examining, after a short introduction on the author and the occasion of his translation, 1) instances in which Livius romanized Greek divinities and concepts; 2) Livius' stylistic transformation of Homer, especially with respect to formulae, patronymics, and archaisms; 3) Livius' relation to later Roman writers and the effect of the Saturnian meter on his reputation; 4) pathos and sound-effects in the fragments, features that that will be considered alongside the generalizations of Otis, Leeman, Palmer, and Williams, as reviewed in the Introduction.

The events of Livius Andronicus' life and the dating of his works are vexed issues, stemming in part from two conflicting accounts of his career handed down by the ancients.

---

[1] For the text and numbering of the fragments I have used Karl Büchner's Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum (Leipzig: Teubner, 1982).

[2] Ugo Carratello, Livio Andronico (Rome: Cadmo, 1979).

Accius has him first coming to Rome in 209 B.C. as a Tarentine Greek taken captive when the city fell that year to the Romans. Cicero, on the authority of Atticus and Varro, criticize's Accius' chronology and dates Livius" production of the first play in 240 B.C. (Brut 72); this dating is more commonly accepted today, although it would make Livius a very old man in 207 B.C., when, in the best documented event of his life, he composed a hymn used in a religious procession. Martin Drury, to whose consideration of the whole question in the Appendix of CHCL,II I refer the more curious reader, suggests that the divergent accounts might refer to dates in the lives of two Livii, father and son, which were then conflated into the life of one.[3]

The relation of the date of Livius' translation of the Odyssey, probably called the Odusia, to any of the other dates in either ancient account can only be surmised, as can the circumstances which occasioned its composition.[4] Schanz-Hosius portrays Livius as a schoolmaster who translated the Odyssey to remedy a gap in the curriculum of nearly non-existent Latin literature. Two ancient references to Livius are perhaps responsible for the assumption that the translation was composed for instruction: Suetonius relates that both Livius and Ennius taught in both Greek and Latin at home and abroad (Suet. De gramm. et rhet., 1); from Horace (Epist. 2.1. 69-71) we learn that Livius was used for instruction when Horace was growing up. Reasoning, however, from this latter reference that Livius composed the Odusia for language instruction would be no more accurate than arguing that the Aeneid (for example) was composed for the classroom, simply because it was later used there. The meaning of Suetonius' passage, moreover, is unclear, and Ed. Fraenkel confesses that the nature of Livius' teaching activity cannot be determined.[5] Schanz-Hosius further speculates that Livius translated only parts of the Odyssey, selecting the

---

[3] CHCL,II, 799-802.

[4] For Odusia as the probable title of the work, see Ulrich Knoche's review of W. Morel's Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum in Gnomon 4 (1928): 692.

[5] Eduard Fraenkel, "Livius", RE (Suppl. 5, 1931): 601.

most fantastic episodes from Homer's text, above all those supposedly occuring in Italian and Sicilian territory: such scenes would especially have captivated Roman schoolchildren.[6] Roman schoolchildren, however, did not have to be entertained, they could be beaten. The evidence of the fragments, moreover, suggests no such selection; there are passages from scenes with the suitors, Telemachus' trip to Sparta, Odysseus' arrival and stay among the Phaeacians, and his return to Ithaca, as well as scenes of men turning into pigs in Italy. Some fragments presume the existence of lengthy scenes in Livius' original; we can infer, for instance, that Livius translated Demodocus' tale about Mars and Venus, if Mercury and Apollo come running to see their capture (fr. 19).[7] It would be more sensible to suggest that Livius and his audience were fascinated by the fabulous, and therefore preferred the Odyssey to the Iliad.

That Livius did not intend to give Rome an Odyssey with all the strangeness of its vanished world and foreign culture is obvious from the first line of his translation, which, in Büchner's words, "wirkt fast wie ein Programm:"[8]

Virum mihi Camena insece versutum

fr. 1

"Ανδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον, ὃς μάλα πολλὰ

Od. 1.1

---

[6] Schanz-Hosius, Geschichte der Römischen Literatur, Vol. 1, (Munich: Carl Beck, 1927) 46.

[7] For a completer analysis of the scenes we can be certain Livius translated, see Maria Verrusio, Livio Andronico e la sua traduzione dell' Odissea Omerica, Philologica 6 (Rome: Bretschneider,1977) 66.

[8] K. Buechner, Römische Literaturgeschichte (Stuttgart: Alfred Kröner Verlag, 1968) 38.

Some of the stylistic features of the line that make it programmatic will be discussed later; my main concern here is with Camena, rendering Homer's Μοῦσα. The Muse had to wait until Ennius for transliteration, as Livius here characteristically substitutes a Roman divinity for a Greek divinity. Livius was very possibly the first person to call upon one of the Camenae as his muse; they were more commonly known as water-nymphs, or goddesses of the source. J. Waszink examines the reasons that may have led Livius to choose this Italian divinity.[9] He argues first that Camena would have reminded Livius' Roman readers of the word carmen, an explanation which is out of keeping neither with Livius' imagination, as revealed by further examples discussed below, nor with the ancient fondness for etymological speculation. Secondly, Waszink shows, the Camenae had assumed by Livius' time the power of prophecy, which rendered them more appropriate for the function of the Muses (who reveal past, present, and future) than simple water-nymphs would have been.[10] This still leaves, however, some distance between the traditional conception of the Camenae and the role of a Muse, a distance which serves to highlight an aesthetic choice; clearly for Livius the approximation of Homer's world in native Latin terms was preferable to the direct link with the Greek text. This is only the first indication of the importance Livius placed on his translation's Latin lineage: for reasons explored later, Livius wanted the Odusia, Homeric, to pass as a work in the Latin tradition, while Ennius wanted his Annales, all Roman, to pass as a direct descendent of Homeric epic.[11]

Circe (Circae in fr. 24) and Latona (Latonas [gen.] in fr. 19) remain the only Greek divinities for whom Livius did not find a cultic equivalent in Rome; the former exception is

---

[9] J. H. Waszink, "Camena," Classica et Mediaevalia 17 (1956): 139-148.

[10] Actually, water-nymphs may have more to do with the Muses than Waszink's pedigree credits them with: in the first six lines of the Theogony, Hesiod has the Muses visiting no less than four springs. Not only then were the Camenae perhaps prophetic, but the Muses were, by poetic associations, goddesses of the source.

[11] For further discussion on this seeming paradox, see my remarks on poetic influence in the Conclusion.

understandable, as Circe, although she is called a δεινὴ θεὸς and is the daughter of Helios (Od. 10.136-37), is portrayed in Homer as more of a witch than a goddess. Livius' use of Latona (= Λητὼ, the mother of Apollo) can perhaps be ascribed to the stunted geneologies of Roman divinities (see p.), but one must also keep in mind the possibility that certain Greek deities and heros had been formerly transplanted into Roman religion (perhaps via the Etruscans). Livius' identifications of Hermes with Mercury (Mercurius, fr. 19) and Chronos with Saturn (Saturni, fr. 2) are traditional enough. In fr. 21, however, we probably have another one of Livius' innovations:

nam diva Monetas filia docuit

Since this very likely renders Μοῦσ' ἐδίδαξε (8. 481 and 488), Moneta (here in archaic genitive form) must be Livius' replacement for Mnemosyne. Moneta, however, was a cult title for Juno, and was never afterwards equated with Mnemosyne;[12] nor, to my knowledge, was Juno thought to be the mother of the Camenae. U. Knoche explains Livius' ch- -e of Moneta in much the same fashion that Waszink explains Camena: again the similarity of sounds in words etymologically unrelated may have played a role in Livius' choice, Moneta being attractive for its ability to suggest, by way of monere, the notion of memory: ". . .wiederum sähe man den grammaticus am Werk."[13] Knoche argues further that Livius saw in the cult title of Juno a way to suggest the relationship between Zeus and Mnemosyne (Hesiod has them coupled for nine fertile days--Works and

[12] Actually, in one of the odder operations of poetic influence, Moneta surfaces again in Keats' "The Fall of Hyperion." There she is properly a prophetess and teacher, but she clearly performs the function that Mnemosyne had in an earlier version of the poem, "Hyperion," and Keats, perhaps in forgetfulness, even refers to Moneta once as Mnemosyne in "The Fall of Hyperion." Even more curious is Moneta's close connection with Saturn, recently ousted by the Olympian gods.

[13] U. Knoche, "Über die Aneignung griechischer Poesie in älteren Rom," Gymnasium 65, (1958), 329; doctus might be better than grammaticus, which suggests an author with some unpoetic interests showing through. That Livius should compose with an eye on the scholia, as H. Fränkel shows him doing in one instance (see " Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen," Hermes 67 (1932), 306), is also in keeping with Alexandrian poetic standards, and need not lead us back to the image of the translator as a schoolteacher without a Latin textbook.

Days, 53-54). Less persuasive is Knoche's assumption that Livius was searching for Roman names because his audience would not have understood the Greek ones: "Der Name der Mnemosyne konnte den Römern nichts sagen."[14] In his focus on the audience of the Odusia (an audience whose knowledge of Greek is difficult to determine), Knoche overlooks the work's own integrity of style and the internal consistency of Livius' epic style. One should not imagine a translator seeking the most efficient words to convey to a Latin speaker the specific relationships of gods and their functions in the Greek text, but rather an artist concerned to create a plausible style, one that the Italian muse of the first line would inspire; a long Greek word could not lightly be introduced into a Saturnian line alongside stylistic features that, as will be seen, drew on further indigenous resources of the Latin language and steered consistently away from Homeric style.

Livius not only adapted the names of Greek gods for his Latin epic, but on one occasion shows a concern for Roman religious sensibilities, and adapts a Greek expression to suit them. Nestor, reviewing for Telemachus' benefit the list of Achaean dead, describes Patroclus:

ibidemque vir summus adprimus Patroclus

fr. 10

ἔνθα δὲ Πάτροκλος θεόφιν μήστωρ ἀτάλαντος

Od. 3.110

Homer's Nestor, with hyperbole not uncommon in Homeric verse, describes Patroclus as an equal of the gods. As powerful and as jealous of their prerogatives as they are, Homeric gods do not live in an untouchable sphere that mortals can only approach in grave reverence; elsewhere in Homer, mortals occasionally taunt and challenge the gods with impunity. The Roman gods were more sensitive. With summus adprimus Livius does his

[14] Knoche, "Aneignung" 329.

pleonastic best to elevate Patroclus to a special position, but his frame of reference remains human; the hero can be best of men, but not equal to a god.[15]

The previous examples reveal an author adapting an original text so that its divinities and concepts are no longer foreign to a Roman audience, and suggest that Livius' work was conservative in spirit, a reflection of the religious status quo. This is misleading, as Knoche and Waszink have recognized[16]; less disruptive of Roman religious conceptions would have been to leave the gods Greek and foreign in conception; as it is, he has called the Roman gods into play, and then given them relationships and roles foreign to their character. Consider the following two fragments:

Sancta puer Saturni filia regina

fr. 12

nam diva Monetas filia docuit

fr. 21

Livius clearly retained the Homeric (and later Greek) conception of the gods as bound together in a family history with an established and complex genealogy; this conception was foreign, however, to "the still dominant conception of impersonal divine figures,"[17] the numinous Roman gods: "Der Dichter. . . verlangt hier also den Römern den neuen Gedanken der Göttergenealogie ab. . ."[18]

Divine genealogy is not the only new thought the Romans would be asked to entertain:

---

[15] See K. Büchner, "Livius Andronicus und die Erste Künstlerische Übersetzung der Europäischen Kultur," Symbolae Osloenses 54 (1979): 44-45, and Alfonso Traina, Vortit barbare (Rome: Edizione dell' Ateneo, 1970) 15.

[16] Knoche, "Aneignung" 330; J. H. Waszink, "Tradition and Personal Achievement in Early Latin Literature," Mnemosyne 13.4 (1960): 25.

[17] Waszink, "Tradition" 29.

[18] Knoche, "Aneignung" 330.

Mercurius cumque eo filius Latonas

(fr. 19)

These gods appear together in the Odyssey (8. 322-3) on their way to see how Hephaistus has caught his wife and the war-god in bed together. Knoche cautions that in casting the Roman gods into such lusty and humorous roles, Livius is not so much engaged in demeaning the dignified and remote gods of Rome as in introducing another level to their existence: "So bereichert Andronicus durch seine interpretatio nicht allein die Phantasie der Römer, sondern er entwickelt auch die Fähigkeit, die Götter mindestens in zweierlei Art zu begreifen, als kultisch verehrte Numina, und als poetische Gestalten."[19] This would have to count as one of the Odusia's significant contributions to Latin literature; from the very start the divine world was open to the poetic imagination, as Livius' transformation of a prophetic water-nymph into his Muse makes clear.

In Livius' description of Patroclus it was seen how the writer diverged from a literal rendering of the text to accomodate a Roman conception of the divine sphere. Elsewhere, his translation of a Homeric metaphor suggests that Homer's picture of man likewise underwent revision for an age with a different understanding of psychology and animation:[20]

mea puera, quid verbi ex tuo ore supra fugit?

(fr. 3)

---

[19] Knoche, "Aneignung" 332.

[20] Livius' translations of certain other lines might have told us much more about his response to Homeric psychology (as portrayed especially by B. Snell and E. R. Dodds); it would be instructive, for instance, to have his version of Homer's formulaic line,

αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ πόσιος καὶ ἐδητύος ἐξ ἔρον ἔντο

Od. 3.67 et al.

which in Virgil's translation undergoes a significant psychological reorientation:

Postquam exempta fames et amor compressus edendi

Aen. 8. 184

Put baldly, for Homeric man ἔρος is a force external to the psyche that can be "thrown off"; in Virgil, amor is rather repressed in an encapsulated self.

τέκνον ἐμόν, ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων;

(Od. 1. 64)

A. Traina gives Livius' version a bad grade: the metaphor of fleeing in Homer's version has been retained and the notion of a barrior that is crossed is preserved, but the vividness of ἕρκος ὀδόντων is lost: " è riscita ad un banalizzazione del testo."[21] Yet Livius may have had his reasons for foregoing some such phrase as murum dentium; words that escape through a barrier of teeth is after all a strange metaphor for rash speech, perhaps at home in Shakespeare's exuberance or among Donne's conceits[22], but, like Mnemosyne, unsuited for Livius' (as opposed to Homer's) epic style. Traina is right: Livius here and elsewhere sacrifices the vividness of the Greek, as does every Roman poet who imitates Homer. In this case, however, a shift in psychology as well as style renders the metaphor stranger for the tastes of Livius' time; in Homer, parts of the body and mind often react independently, with a will of their own, and their actions are often personified; the stomach is sometimes a creature of trouble, and words are often wingèd. In the world of this animism, the notion of words that flee and of teeth that block them loses some of its metaphorical quality; truth has not yet evolved into trope.[23] If Livius' verse lacks vividness in this instance and becomes "banal," it is as much the outlook of a later age that is being measured as a translator's abilities to match up to an original.

---

[21] Traina, Vortit 21.

[22] Donne ("The Ecstasy"): "Our eye-beams twisted, and did thread/Our eye-beams upon one double string"

[23] I mean the distinction in the sense Vico gives it in his "Poetic Logic" (See The New Science of Giambattista Vico, trans. by T. G. Bergin and M. H. Fisch (Ithaca: Cornell U. Pr., 1970, esp. pp. 85-89). The same transformation can perhaps be found between the Homeric and Ennian (or any Roman poet's;) Mars and Vulcan (See Annales 17 and 487 V.); for Homer, the phenomena of war and fire are fully explained as the appearance and work of a god; the Greek analysis of cause and effect, in both physical and social realms, that intervened between Homer and Ennius, turned the god's appearance into a figure of speech for a phenomenon understood more naturally as the result of observable causes.

Livius' translation of a second metaphor provides a good introduction to his stylistc imitation and transformation of Homeric verse, in this instance its formulaic quality. Regardless of what Livius and his contemporaries understood about the conditions of oral composition, Homer's repetitions of epithets, phrases, and entire scenes and speeches must have stood out as one of his salient characteristics, and every translator has had to determine to what extent verbatim repetitions are to be reproduced. An assessment of what Livius did with Homer's various types of formulae must remain largely hypothetical, but there are some clues to be gathered, the first in fr. 30:

igitur demum Ulixi cor frixit prae pavore

The line's Homeric model appears several times in the Odyssey:

καὶ τότ' Ὀδυσσῆος λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ
(5. 297 et al.)

Immediately, in the way of epithets, one notices the loss of the epithet φίλον ; perhaps Livius was as baffled by the adjective's range as we are. There is, however, perhaps evidence of an altogether different response to the formulaic in the way that Livius substitutes the metaphor of a heart that turns cold with fear for Homer's image of knees and heart slackening. According to Traina, neither Livius nor any Roman poet after him could have carried the metaphor of loosened knees into Latin: "Livio senti la metafora greca aliena dalla lingua latina."[24] Virgil writes extemplo Aeneae solvuntur frigore membra (Aen. 1. 92, the line which occasioned the transmission of Livius' fragment in Servius Auctus' commentary), but Traina argues that here the "alien" image is "temperata dal più generico membra e specificata dall'aggiunta di frigore." In the end, however, Traina's argument that genua solvuntur would have been beyond the pale is unconvincing. It might be argued that γόνυ and genu mean something different in their respective contexts, that in Homer the knees were understood to mean strength in general, or the linchpin of bodily strength,

[24] Traina, Vortit 19.

whereas no such association occurred to the Romans. Latin writers, however, also show knees trembling and collapsing from fear-- it is actually not so much a bold metaphor or a unique idiom as a description of what knees annoyingly do in terrifying situations.

This observation, that fear can noticeably strike the knees, brings me closer to my point about Livius and formulaic verse. The description of fear by its effect upon the knees is appropriate for someone on his feet, when the weight of the body is making demands; there are visible signs then as well, since the knees begin to shake. In two of the instances, however, in which Homer's formulaic verse describes fear, it refers to Odysseus when he is swimming. If Livius was translating one of these two occurrences (and Büchner argues, for reasons unrelated to my argument, that fr. 30 best renders 5. 297 [25]), the metaphor of knees that slacken may have seemed inappropriate, not because it was alien to the Latin language, but because the image does not particularly suit a swimmer. Homer's use of this formulaic line here is analogous to his calling Achilles "swift" when he is sitting in his tent, or to his calling Odysseus "shining" after he has spent five days in salt water. Oral composition, with the aid and ornament of formulaic verse, produced such dislocations. The translator of a more literate age must decide whether to reproduce this formulaic nature in general, as well as those instances where a formula appears to prevail over circumstance, as in the case of a swimmer's fear described by its effect on his knees. Fr. 30 suggests that Livius adapted the formulaic in Homer according to his own critical standards; neither Livius' particular enterprise of developing a thoroughly Latin idiom nor the ancient practice of aemulatio encouraged a literal rendition of such distinctive features in Homer.

Fr. 15 provides further evidence for Livius' avoidance of repetitious elements characteristic of oral composition. Nausicaa is planning for Odysseus his entry into town:

---

[25] Büchner, "Livius" 59: "Der Formelvers kommt bei Homer zum ersten Male beim Seesturm 5. 297 vor. Auf diese Situation scheint er am besten zu passen. Livius verinnerlicht, lässt den Helden nicht die Fassung verlieren und wahrt sein Heldenbild mit dem entschuldigenen tum demum."

ἔνθα καθεζόμενος μεῖναι χρόνον, εἰς ὅ κεν ἡμεῖς 295
ἄστυδε ἔλθωμεν καὶ ἱκώμεθα δώματα πατρός.
αὐτὰρ ἐπὴν ἡμέας ἔλπῃ ποτὶ δώματ' ἀφῖχθαι,

Od. 6. 295-7

Livius reduces this to:

ibi manens sedeto donicum videbis

me carpento vehentem domum venisse

It is possible that the next line in the Odusia read something like, "then, when you see that I have arrived at home," corresponding to Homer's second line (296), but it is more likely that Livius omitted it, with videbis corresponding to Homer's concluding ἔλπῃ. Traina notes Livius' role as an interpreter of Homer: Livius "rivive con plastica concretezza la scena omerica" by substituting a seeing for a thinking Odysseus and by adding the cart that Odysseus would be able to spot at a distance.[26] This alone, however, does not account for the omission of line 296. Although neither line 296 nor 297 is formulaic, lines so very similar to each other are a common feature in Homer's poetry, and are apparently an instance of epic fullness that Livius has chosen to disregard. One wonders if he would have included any of the longer repetitions frequent in Homer, such as the lengthy word-for-word repetition of an order when the order is being carried out. In all likelihood Livius' translation was substantially shorter than the Odyssey, not because Livius omitted any episodes, but because different aesthetic standards favored the omission of such lengthy repetitions.

Livius' response to Homeric epithets will conclude my discussion of the formulaic and repetitious in Homer. It is a consistent response throughout the fragments: Livius frequently omits the Homeric adjective. In fr. 30 above, the heart is no longer φίλον; Nausicaa, εὐώπιδα in Homer (6. 142), becomes simply virginem in fr. 14; in fr. 19, Hermes and Apollo lose their epithets, ἐριούνης and ἑκαέργας respectively; the gold in fr. 6 is no longer καλήν. There are further examples, too

[26] Traina, Vortit 25-6.

many in the few remaining fragments to account for them by surmising their inclusion in the missing lines that preceded or followed each fragment. As Mariotti and H. Fränkel have noted, the missing adjectives are largely standing or "fixed" epithets, those which characteristically belong to the thing modified and are not determined by the particular circumstances in which they appear. In Homer such epithets were useful both as an aid in oral composition and as an attractive ornament that lent an essential dignity to its bearer. Their absence in Livius has been ascribed by Fränkel to the poverty of his literary medium: "die homerischen Beiwörter [haben] Livius unüberwindliche Schwierigkeiten bereitet."[27] Yet it is hard to see how this applies to φίλον and κολῇ in particular, and even Homer's compound epithets might have been rendered, if not with a neologism, at least with a substitute (i.e., versutum, fr. 1), if Livius had been concerned to reproduce this aspect of epic style. More likely their exclusion was an artistic judgment on Livius' part, reflecting a more general criterion with regard to the formulaic in Homer's poetry. He had no use for standing epithets, either as an aid to composition or as a device to lend dignity to his subject (he had other devices, as will be seen); furthermore, their consistent translation into Latin would have clashed with the desire to choose adjectives for their specific relevance to a scene, just as the image of knees giving way in fear may have clashed with Livius' sense of aquatic terror.

H. Fränkel's remark on the relationship of epithets and patronymic address in the Odusia is instructive, but also betrays an insensitivity to stylistic effects that have their expressive power rooted in a Latin tradition, rather than in Homer: "Wenn Livius gelegentlich gegen sein Original einem Namen den des Vaters oder der Mutter beigibt, so bietet diese würdigere Form der Bezeichnung nur einen unvollkommenen Ausgleich für die Beiwörter, die er anderwärts unterdrückte."[28] Fränkel is right to identify patronymics as a

---

[27] H. Fränkel, "Griechische"(supra., n. 13) 303.

[28] H. Fränkel, "Griechische" 305.

salient feature of Livius' style. Actually, only in one fragment does Livius use a patronymic proper, when he translates Odysseus' name with Laertie noster (fr. 4). Elsewhere he is more periphrastic, employing the formula "son/daughter of X," such as pater noster, Saturni filie (fr. 2) for Homer's ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη. Similarly, ἑκαέργος Ἀπόλλων is rendered filius Latonas in fr.19. The most elaborate re-working is found in fr. 21, where Homer's simple Μουσ' ἐδίδαξε is expanded to diva Monetas filia docuit. Other patronymic variations on the original are the product of contaminatio:

Apud nympham Atlantis filiam Calypsonem

fr. 13

This is a neat conflation of Ἀτλάντος θυγάτηρ (Od. 1.52 et al.) with νύμφης ἐν μεγάροισι Καλυψοῦς (Od. 4. 557 et al.), apud translating ἐν μεγάροισι, with all other words accounted for. In rendering πότνια Ἥρη (Od. 4. 513) with sancta puer Saturni filia regina (fr. 12), Livius has borrowed most of a line from the Iliad: Ἥρη πρέσβα θεά, θυγάτηρ μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο (5. 721).

Fränkel's suggestion that the patronymics are particularly a response to Homer's epithets is also persuasive. Both features lend a dignity to the verse: the longer the title, however it be lengthened, the more weight to its wearer. Fr. 19 especially supports the connection between epithets and patronymics: filius Latonas renders ἑκαέργος Ἀπόλλων. Fränkel's judgment, however, that Livius' patronymics were an inadequate compensation for epithets, assumes that literal fidelity to its original is the best yardstick by which to measure Livius' translation. Fidelity to Latin idioms of style, however, or at least a style that has its roots in Latin idioms, seems to have been of greater import to Livius--hence the heavy use of patronymics. There is no evidence that a style rich in ornamental epithets characterized any dignified Latin literature or speech of Livius' day; certainly there would have been few existing equivalents to Homer's lively array of

standing epithets, and even the frequent use of the equivalents themselves would, in the absence of a native resonance, have seemed a squandering of verse. Livius' patronymics, on the other hand, have echoes in two linguistic customs. Knoche associates the dignity of patronymics with the senatorial style; in official speeches a man was referred to by both his own name, by his father's name, and by his important official functions.[29] G. Williams, remarking on Saturnian epitaphs, provides another context: "The ancient Roman custom was to set a man's titulus (his name and, perhaps, a mention of important offices) over his grave."[30] It is no wonder, then, that Livius not only followed the Greek when Homer used patronymics (see esp. fr. 12 above), but also broadened their duty in Latin to replace Homeric epithets without sacrificing the epithet's dignity of address.

Archaisms are a second noticeable stylistic feature of the fragments.[31] According to Waszink, "the first reason for the systematic reception of archaisms into his adaptation of the poem was the wish to convey to his Roman hearers and readers the impression which the original text had made on himself."[32] Certainly Homer's Greek struck Livius and other native Greek speakers of his time as antiquated, calling for numerous γλῶσσαι in the commentaries; for that matter, Homer's language was archaic even for his original audiences, since the conservative nature of formulaic composition preserved forms and vocabulary foreign to 8th century Greek. It is also true that Livius was consciously archaizing in his work. Waszink's explanation for Livius' archaisms, however, like Fränkel's evaluation of his patronymics, projects a foreign intent upon the Odusia (Waszink's Livius in fact sounds very much like Mathew Arnold's ideal critic of

---

[29] Knoche, "Aneignung" 333.

[30] G. Williams, "The Genesis of Poetry in Rome," in CHCL,II: 57.

[31] Archaisms in the Odusia, however, may not have been as prominent as their frequency in the fragments suggests, since many of the remaining verses have been transmitted by grammarians illustrating archaic Latin morphology.

[32] Waszink, "Tradition" 24.

translation[33]). If Livius was trying to reproduce impressions from the original (the rapidity of narrative, for instance), he did a miserable job. He is so far off, in fact, that one has to doubt whether fidelity to impressions of the original was a concern of his at all.

Ed. Fraenkel's assessment of Livius' archaisms seems more accurate than Waszink's: for Fraenkel, their significance lies not so much in the reproduction of an impression left by Homer as in the creation of a Latin epic style: "Immer wieder zeigt es sich, wie Livius bemüht ist gerade mit Hilfe hochaltertümlichen Sprachgutes seinem Epos Würde und Distanz zu geben, Distanz nicht nur von der Alltagsrede, sondern auch vom Stil minder feierlicher poetischer Gattungen."[34] The most frequent archaism preserved is the genitive ending of -as, appearing three times: Latonas (fr. 19), Monetas (fr. 21), and escas (fr. 31). Palmer concurs with Fraenkel in assessing the importance of this archaism:

> This was an archaism even in Andronicus' time, for elsewhere he uses -ai, as does even the archaizing Senatus Consultum de Bacchanalibus. What is significant is that of the genitives in -as quoted by Priscian (I. 198f.) three come from the Odyssey of Andronicus, two from the Bellum Poenicum of Naevius, and one from the Annales of Ennius. Now all these come from the genre of epic. . ."[35]

Other examples of archaisms in the Odusia unique to epic are dextrabus (fr. 29), nequinont (fr. 11; also in the Annales), and the adverb quamde (fr. 18), also used by Ennius and Lucretius. Their confinement to epic is a safe argument ex silentio; the grammarians who cite these grammatical peculiarities had drama in their purview as well as epic and yet quote no examples of these archaisms from any plays.

---

[33] Mathew Arnold, "On Translating Homer," On the Classical Tradition, ed. R. H. Super (Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1960) 99.

[34] Ed. Fraenkel, "Livius" 601. Waszink ("Tradition" 24) does not contest Fraenkel's analysis, but simply assumes that his own suggestions are compatible with it.

[35] Palmer 97.

Livius' archaisms, then, as well as his patronymics, are elements in an epic style determined not so much by their proximity to Homer as by their distance from other Latin genres and the language of everyday life. As Fraenkel points out, a stylistic division between genres was inherited from Greek literature. In Greek literature, however, the differences in style were in part an extension of the particular dialects in which a genre first flourished; Roman writers had no such ready-made poetic distinctions, and it was in an effort to establish some of these distinctions in Latin that Livius must have felt he could exercise his creativity. This is not to say that Livius worked in a literary vacuum; in the discussion of patronymics above, inscriptions and senatorial speeches were indicated as one possible source of language suitable for epic. Palmer notes that in their search for archaic coloring the poets drew largely on the language of religion and law.[36] Here at least was an existing destinction between linguistic registers-- it had not yet been cast, however, into the conventions of poetic genres. In achieving the effect they wanted, the early poets were especially reliant on their own judgment, forging a new style by using various mixtures of old forms and old words as well as novel compound words and foreign words. Livius' mixture may have soon alienated others, but he was nonetheless the first to grapple with the problem of creating a Latin style that would lend a lengthy epic dignity and remoteness.

In considering the Odusia in the context of later Roman literature, as I will now do, one is easily misled by the testimony of later Roman men of letters. I will first review several ancient opinions of Livius' verse, considering what they imply as well as what they express; I will then discuss what was undoubtably the biggest stumbling block for later writers, the Odusia's meter. Other prominent features of his verse, however, lived on in later Latin; a consideration of these will lead to a discussion of whether his translation

---

[36] Palmer 100.

displays the traits that Otis, Leeman, and G. Williams have found characteristic of Roman literature, as outlined in the Introduction.

Ennius' opinion of Livius' epic verse can be surmised from a proem that began Bk. 7 of the Annales; the fragments come to us already partially interpreted by Cicero (Brutus 71), who cites with approval Ennius' evaluation of nostri veteres versus. .

quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant

cum neque Musarum scopulos . . . .

. . . . nec dicti studiosus quisquam erat ante hunc

ROL 232-4

Cicero continues: "ait ipse de se nec mentitur in gloriando; sic enim sese res habet, nam et Odyssia Latina est sic tamquam opus aliquod Daedali. . ." It is Cicero who directs Ennius' boast specifically against Livius' translation; Ennius, if Vahlen and Skutsch have reconstructed the proem correctly, was probably more concerned to discredit Naevius and his Bellum Poenicum. Yet Livius and Naevius share the characteristics here being belittled; Fauni vatesque canebant ("Faunus representing the primitive and uncivilized past"--Skutsch, 371) is especially appropriate for their Saturnian verse (see below, p. 21), and Musarum is tempting as a contrast to Camena, which was Naevius' term as well for the Muse.[37] Declaring himself the first Roman poet dicti studiosus, Ennius would have us believe that earlier Roman poets do not count; he apparently owes them nothing, declaring instead his origins in a Greek source. Cicero agrees with Ennius' estimate of himself, and after comparing the Odusia to the sculpture of Daedalus, adds that Livius' plays are not worth a second reading.

In comparing Livius to Daedalus, Cicero reveals his critical standards; for eyes grown accustomed to Hellenic polish, these early productions appeared lifeless, crude, and

---

[37] See Otto Skutsch, ed. The Annals of Q. Ennius (New York: Oxford UP, 1985) 373, n. 4: "Naevius, although he addressed his goddesses as novem Iovis concordes filiae sorores, probably called them Camenae, as appears from line 2 of his epitaph: flerent divae Camenae Naevium poetam.

unfinished. Yet two things must be noted in assessing how important Livius' translation was: first, there is no suggestion in Ennius or Cicero that the Odusia was thought less of because it was "merely" a translation, no sense that a nation's literature could only truly begin when someone tried something original. That the Romans considered the Odusia in the first instance as a Latin creation should serve to caution against critique that evaluates the work primarily by the yardstick of fidelity to the Greek. Secondly, Cicero's discussion implicitly gives the Odusia a part in the development of Latin literature: the comparison to Daedalus is made after Cicero has established that all of the arts, specifically sculpture, painting, and writing, must necessarily evolve from crude beginnings: "nihil est enim simul et inventum et perfectum."

Horace's criticism is more explicit:

> non equidem insector delendave carmina Livi
> esse reor, memini quae plagosum mihi parvo
> Orbilium dictare; sed emendata videri
> pulchraque et exactis minimum distantia miror;
> inter quae verbum emicuit si forte decorum, et
> si versus paulo concinnior unus et alter,
> iniuste totum ducit venditque poema.
>
> Epist. 2.1. 69-75

Horace displays here some of his famous moderation: he would not want to see Livius' poem destroyed, merely set in a critical perspective that would recognize its (massive) faults and occasional, fortuitous virtues; granted there are sterling lines here and there, but that does not make the whole a success.[38] Horace, however, is not only criticizing Livius' verse, but also those who praise it; he is in conflict, if not with prevailing opinion, at least

[38] It ought to be noted that by exactis in line 72 Horace is not referring to the "finish" of the poem's Greek original, but to a polished and perfected Latin verse like his own (exegi monumentum. . .).

with a certain popularity enjoyed by the poem. Ennius, Cicero, and Horace would have us believe that Livius, if he was important at all, was only so as a stepping-stool to their own verse. Evidently, however, there were many readers in Horace's time who regarded the work as an achievement and a source of pleasure in its own right. For many a Roman reader (who, as a rule, generally responded positively to anything ancient) Livius' archaic rhythms, forms, and phrases, with their reminiscences of Roman legal and religious traditions, were elements in an entirely plausible epic style.

In Livius' epic style, the greatest stumbling block for later writers and the antiquarian's chief delight must have been its meter. Although Ennius, at least in the remaining fragments, makes no mention of his Latin predecessors' meter, his remark about "verses that Faunus and the prophets used to sing" very likely refers to Saturnians.[39] Horace supports this equation of Saturnians with crude and rustic composition (Epist. 2.1.156-9):

> Graecia capta ferum victorem cepit et artis
> intulit agresti Latio. sic horridus ille
> defluxit numerus Saturnius, et grave virus
> munditiae pepulere;

Williams defends Livius and Naevius for writing in Saturnians: "The choice of that metre for epic must have been forced on them by Roman conditions. . ."[40] Whatever Williams may mean by "Roman conditions" (expectations of the audience?), they did not stop Livius from composing other Latin verse "with an astonishing mastery of [Greek metrical] techniques,"[41] or prevent Ennius from using hexameters

---

[39] See O. Skutsch, Annals 371: ". . . native oracles, though no examples in Saturnian verse have survived, are likely to have been cast in some sort of rhythmical form resembling the Saturnaian."

[40] G. Williams, "Genesis" 59.

[41] G. Williams, "Genesis" 57.

shortly after Naevius composed his epic in Saturnians; constraint, therefore, will not excuse Livius' choice of Saturnians.

Let us assume, however, that Livius, just as he composed his plays in Greek meter, could have composed his translation in Latin hexameters if he had so chosen. What may have attracted him to Saturnians? First, consistency may have commended it; it appears that Livius' challenge was to rely on Homer only for the plot, and otherwise to write latine (in contrast to Ennius' epic style; see Chapter II). Yet the meter must have had more than consistency with a project to recommend it: Saturnians, like the archaisms and patronymics, undoubtably had associations that suited the tone Livius wanted. Unfortunately, these associations must largely be surmised, since the origins and history of Saturnian verse are obscure and its employment before Livius sketchy. G. Williams argues tentatively for the existence of a Saturnian epic balladry before Livius; according to Knoche, the meter was, "wie man sicher vermuten darf, ein Versmass der Carmina, d. h. der Orakelverse, Zauberlieder, Sakrallieder u. dgl., also der Gebete und Beschwörungen, durch die man die unheimlichen göttlichen Geister bannen und beschwichtigen oder gewinnen wollte."[42] By using this same meter, Livius "legt den epischen Ton im Lateinischen von vorneherein fest auf eine fast priesterliche Ebene."[43] It is perhaps impossible to decide between these differently envisioned pasts for the meter, although Knoche's explanation is more attractive for attributing Livius' choice of meter to an aesthetic judgment rather than to the predetermination of a genre we are uncertain ever existed.[44] Whether used chiefly in epitaphs, legal and religious carmina, or heroic lays,

---

[42] Knoche, "Aneignung" 326.

[43] Knoche, "Aneignung" 327.

[44] Knoche's conjecture is perhaps also more consistent with Ennius' reference to earlier poets as vates (214 V.), since the term is associated more with religion than entertainment; until the Romans borrowed poeta from the Greeks, there was no other word for poet. This would argue against the existence of a well-developed tradition of Saturnian storytelling.

however, the meter undoubtably lent a solemn tone to a composition, and it seems clear from other stylictic features of the Odusia that Livius wanted this tone especially to dominate in his style.

It is not difficult to see why Ennius' experiment with Latin hexameters proved more seminal than the Saturnians of Livius and Naevius. Meter clearly plays a prescriptive role in the tone of a poem, and determines other stylistic features as well.[45] Livius may have been content with the range that Saturnians allowed, but for later poets the verse, "with its jerky combination of iambic and trochaic rhythms that broke each line into predictable halves,"[46] must have seemed a like stranglehold on narrative flow and modulations of tone. It is hard to imagine a gently humorous scene, for instance, like Venus' seduction of Vulcan in Aeneid 8, written in Saturnians. Granted, we will never know how the meter might have developed if adopted by gifted writers and cultivated for many generations; its range no doubt would have expanded, as did that of Latin hexameter between Ennius and Ovid. There would have been no sense, however, in fighting against the predominant tone of a meter, especially when the solemnity for which Saturnians were obviously suited could be achieved by other devices (such as formulae and archaisms) that, unlike meter, could be employed in degree as occasion demanded.

Other features of Livius' epic style had a more promising future: "He . . . legislated for all later Latin poetry by the way in which he used archaisms as one element in the creation of a specifically poetic language," writes G. Williams.[47] Palmer, in a discussion of the salient characteristics of Virgil's epic style, identifies patronymics as "a

---

[45] For example, the length of the Saturnian line, which was on the average several syllables shorter than a hexameter line, may have played a role in Livius' omission of many Homeric epithets. Certainly Livius was not adverse to taking more than one line to say what Homer kept to one hexameter, but to find himself continually coming up short and needing a fraction of another line to keep pace with Homer's narrative would have encouraged the exclusion of an epithet.

[46] G. Williams, "Genesis" 59.

[47] G. Williams, "Genesis" 58.

feature of Latin epic style from Livius Andronicus on."[48] If Horace had any objection to these two features in Livius' poetry, it could only have been to their immoderate frequency.

There remains to be considered whether Livius' translation shares the distinguishing features of later Roman poetry as identified in my Introduction (pp. v-vii)--prominent sound-effects and what Otis called the subjective viewpoint. On account of the brevity of the fragments, it would be hard to argue for or against Otis' thesis in Livius' case; Otis does not base his conclusions on isolated stylistic traits, but from a viewpoint that reveals a sense of self (cf. Ennius' horse-simile, p.58). Other critics, however, have found in the Odusia instances of pathos absent from the original; Mariotti argues that Livius heightens the emotion of Eumaeus' remark to the disguised Odysseus:

neque tamen te oblitus sum, Laertie noster

fr. 4

This translates Homer's

ἀλλά μ' Ὀδυσσῆος πόθος αἴνυται οἰχομένοιο

Od. 14. 144

In this case the apostrophe of Laertie noster, absent in Homer, intensifies the dramatic irony of the speech.[49] Elsewhere Livius appears to have traded description for emotion: his Eurylochus describes the scouting band's arrival at Circe's home:

Topper citi ad aedis venimus Circae

fr. 24

This translates Homer's

εὕρομεν ἐνβήσσῃσι τετυγμένα δώματα καλὰ

Od. 10. 252

---

[48] Palmer 113.

[49] Scevola Mariotti, Livio Andronico e la Traduzione Artistica (Milan: Pubbl. dell' Univ. di Urbino, 1952) 49-50. Büchner ("Livius" 53-4), although he argues that fr. 4 is more likely an rendition of Od. 1. 65, says that in any case a Sentimentalisierung is involved in the direct address to Odysseus.

Livius makes no mention of the glen, nor does he describe the house; instead he begins with the pleonastic topper citi, dramatizing the journey and perhaps, as Mariotti suggests, adding pathos by emphasizing the eager movement that leads only to tragedy.[50] Emotion also supplants description in a fragment discussed earlier:

igitur demum Ulixi cor frixit prae pavore

fr. 30

καὶ τότ' Ὀδυσσῆος λύτο γούνατα καὶ φίλον ἦτορ

Od. 5. 297 et al.

For Mariotti, Livius increases the pathos of the line with the vigorous sound of the phrase frixit prae pavore; the sound is impressive, but Mariotti's judgment is impressionistic; Büchner, in identifying divergent treatments of emotion, is more persuasive: "Die pathologischen Symptome der Angst, die Homer gibt, werden von Livius zudem als innerer Vorgang--man merkt ihm also doch wohl aüsserlich nichts an wie Kniezittern--dargestellt."[51]

Livius' inclination to exaggerate emotional elements is perhaps most noticeable in fr. 18, the longest fragment preserved. The son of Alcinous has suggested that the Phaeaecians invite Odysseus to compete in their athletic contests, although the wanderer has clearly been battered by many misfortunes:

namque nullum peius macerat humanum
quamde mare saevom: vires cui sunt magnae,
topper confringent inportunae undae

fr. 18

οὐ γὰρ ἐγώ γέ τί φημι κακώτερον ἄλλο θαλάσσης
ἄνδρα γε συγχεῦαι, εἰ καὶ μάλα καρτερὸς εἴη

Od. 8. 138-9

---

[50] Mariotti 49.

[51] Büchner, "Livius" 59.

Whereas Homer describes the destructive power of the sea with συγχεῦαι alone, Livius, lenghtening the description and dividing it into two periods, uses both macerat and confringent. The ocean, unmodified in Homer, is saevom in Livius' version, the waves importunae, and their destruction topper. Mariotti assesses the alterations:

> La traduzione ha espressioni più calcate e colori più cupi dell' originale; è più impressionante e più patetica. Il lettore di Andronico era, per così dire, invitato più recisamente del lettore di Omero a commuoversi per la paurosa sorte dell' eroe. Siamo ormai in una atmosfera letteraria diversa da quella del modello.[52]

The different literary atmosphere that Mariotti refers to is not one created by the Latin language and unique to it, but rather the atmosphere of Alexandria. In truth, there seems to be little in these instances of heightened pathos that is uniquely Roman; the expression of emotion in fr. 30 (see Büchner's observation above) comes closest to what Otis perceived as a distinguishing characteristic of Roman literature.

Characteristically Roman, however, is the prominence of sound effects in the expressive power of Livius' translation; although a pronounced interest in sound effects was characteristic of Roman literature throughout its history, G. Williams finds it especially noticeable in early Roman poetry:

> The most immediately striking characteristic of early Roman poetry is the preponderance of linguistic devices which concern the sound of words; the noise-level-- to put it so crudely--of much early poetry is high, and other effects are subordinated to those figures like assonance, alliteration, and onomatopoeia."[53]

The first line of the Odusia helps substantiate some of these claims:

---

[52] Mariotti 47-8.

[53] G. Williams, The Nature of Roman Poetry (Oxford: Oxford UP,1970) 180.

Virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum

There are as many p's in the first verse of the Odyssey as there are m's in Livius' rendition, yet the Latin version's alliteration is more prominent. First, the Saturnian line is on the average shorter than the hexameter line, in this case four syllables shorter. Livius' alliteration, however, gains emphasis in conjunction with homoioteleuton and the near repetition of virum in versutum. These two words, in turn, although arranged much like their Greek counterparts (ἄνδρα ... πολύτροπον) span the entire verse, and provide a sense of closure lacking in the first line of the original, which continues with the beginning of a relative clause. Insece may even be a species of onomatopoeia, the sound imitated in this instance being Homer's ἔννεπε.

Livius' sound-schemes, if no Virgilian paragraph, were not limited to one line, as fr. 18 shows:

namque nullum peius macerat humanum
quamde mare saevom; vires cui sunt magnae
topper confringent inportunae undae

Alliteration is prominent, especially of m, which has run rampant in the first three cola. Equally striking is the appropriately relentless and rhyming sound of inportunae undae. A comparison with Catullus' tunditur unda sets the polished sound of Sapphics alongside the roughness of the Saturnians; it is as if a raw material had been refined.

Alliteration is also prominent in fr. 4, neque tamen te oblitus sum Laertie noster, while fr. 20 contains a use of internal rhyme reminiscent of fr. 1: nexebant multa inter se flexu nodorum dubio. Here the prominent positions at the beginning of each colon contain rhyming syllables, and the whole ends with the alliteration of accented syllables.

A pattern of sound (meter aside) encompasses more than one line in fr. 15 as well :

ibi manens sedeto donicum videbis
me carpento vehentem domum venisse

The first colon in each line corresponds to the other, participle answering participle and carpento recalling the sound of sedeto. The second cola are not so subtly repetitious; if Livius employed such sound effects repeatedly, it is not hard to understand why Horace's fine ear found him crude--such lines have a stiff, liturgical quality even for the modern reader.

Fr. 6 is closer to incantation than narrative:

argenteo polubro, aureo eglutro

Here sound has prevailed over syntax. The original is not without music, but the function of each object involved in the Homeric washing of hands is made clear by the grammar:

καλῇ χρυσείῃ ὑπὲρ ἀργυρέοιο λέβητος

Od. 1.137

The syntax of Livius line is open to argument.

There is another aspect to Livius' fascination with sound. Earlier in this chapter it was seen how Livius might have been drawn to the names Camena and Moneta by their similarity to carmen and monere. The archaic insece in the first line of the epic might have been attractive for its similarity to ἔννεπε of the Odyssey's first line. One could attribute such correspondences to the ancients' love of etymological connections, real or fanciful, and consider that Livius is engaged in the word-play that Palmer calls characteristic of Latin literature (see p.viii). Traina notes that with inportunae (fr. 18) Livius is playing off the word's derivation from portus and the adjective's technical meaning referring to anything that keeps the sailors away from port.[54] Traina, however, considers this word-play to be indicative of an Alexandrian grammarian's verbal sensibility. Yet perhaps both Palmer and Traina are misleading with their notion of verbal play, especially with regard to Livius' choice of proper names. Livius, in drawing upon ancient Latin religious language for elements of his style, and in using a meter that perhaps had its roots

[54] Traina, Vortit 23-4.

in ritual , was engaging a tradition in which words retained some of their primitive relationship with the thing spoken; the word was part of the reality it signified, and the proper sequence of words and the proper naming of divinities exercised a power over the speaker's environment. When words are attributed this degree of reality and share in the identity of what they express, it is not hard to see how similar sounds would suggest similar natures. Considered in the light of this tradition, the relation of Moneta to monere, for instance, may depend less on bookish word-play than on the sense that, because the sounds are similar, so are the things they signify. The stylistic impression would vary accordingly: instead of reflecting a grammarian's learnedness oriented toward Alexandria and its standards, Livius' word-play may have suggested to the Roman reader an entirely traditional use of Latin words.

I have largely refrained from evaluating Livius' translation in terms of fidelity to the original text; Livius wanted to tell Homer's story, but gave himself the challenge of not just saying it latine, but Romane as well. Nonetheless, a general comparison with Homer provides a good opportunity to step back and sum up the style and stature of the Odusia.

Mathew Arnold found there to be four qualities which eminently distinguish Homer: he is rapid, he is plain and direct in his syntax and in his words, he is plain and direct in the substance of his thought, and he is noble.[55] Livius is not rapid, at least not with that flowing rapidity which characterizes Homer. Livius may have been less circumstantial and less repetitive, but such brevity as his leads to compression, the opposite of narrative speed. The very choice of Saturnians dealt a death blow to rapidity, as did Livius' concern with impressive sound; the two together tend to bind the verses in self-referential clusters instead of stringing them along. Arnold found Pope's couplets to restrict Homer in much the same way.

---

[55] M. Arnold 102.

The paucity of remaining text hinders especially our judgment in determining whether Livius was as plain and direct as Homer in syntax or thought. There are no examples, but hardly room for examples, of tortured conceits or elaborate antitheses such as Arnold criticized in many translations of Homer (and which are present in Ennius' renditions of Greek tragedy). There are indications, however, that Livius did take his eye off the object, but more in the interests of his ear and heart than his intellect. An example of syntax becoming clouded by sound was found in fr. 26--argenteo polubro aureo eglutro. Elsewhere the Homeric "object" is conveyed through a medium of emotional interpretation; the heightened pathos of his description of the sea's destructive power in fr. 18 is the best example of this.

Such a stylistic alteration may be a step toward what Schiller called the sentimental mode, but it is a small step. Many of the fragments give rather the impression that Livius' style was in many ways more direct than later Latin epic; Virgil has many a line less direct than fragments 8 (...matrem procitum plurimi venerunt) and 17 (simul ac lacrimas de ore noegeo detersit), and the striving for emotional effect in fr. 18 is modest in comparison with what Statius would have done with the scene. Of course Livius' directness is in a large part a borrowed virtue (although in one fragment Livius has apparently followed a scholiast's gloss on an unclear phrase in Homer[56]). In general one gets the impression that the story was told directly, with the outlines of the action clearly presented.

Of the four qualities Arnold found preeminent in Homer, nobility seems to be the one Livius most strove for and attained. An insistence on this quality, at the expense of other virtues of epic style, risks monotony, and it is doubtful that Livius (if one can can judge from the few fragments, our sense of the Saturnian meter, and the references of other

---

[56] H. Fränkel, "Griechische" 306. Livius translates ταρφὲ' ἀμείβομένω (Od. 8. 239) with nexebant multa inter se flexu nodorum dubio (fr. 20), the first colon of which follows the scholiast's πυκνῶς πλέκοντες εἰς ἀλλήλους quite closely.

Roman writers[57]) altogether avoided this danger. Yet here too in his preference Livius is characteristically Roman; Virgil's epic style is only monotonous in the tone of our own ponderous recitation, but he too shares the Roman taste for grandeur, and the Latin epic hexameter is on the whole weightier than the Greek.[58] Later writers of Latin epic, although they abandoned Odusia's meter and refined its sound, nonetheless retained two other mainstays of its nobility, archaisms and patronymics. Clearly the Odusia was not the work of a hack, a teacher without a text, or the product of a minor talent, owing any value it has or ever had to the curiosity of grammarians; it was rather an important piece of literature, not only establishing some of the stylistic traits of Latin epic, but providing Livius' Roman contemporaries with an impressive monument in their own language.

---

[57] Here again, however, caution is suggested by the cause for the transmission of a number of the fragments, i. e., the archaisms they contain; perhaps the fragments are not representative of Livius' range.

[58] There are a number of reasons for this gravity, not the least of which are two which characterize the language more immediately than the poet: first, the greater density of consonants in Latin encourages spondaic feet, which in turn lend a verse heft. Secondly, Latin lacks the Greek particle, and with it one of the means by which to vary tone, give a sense of personal gesture, and establish, often in the space of a single syllable, a host of dramatic relationships among phrases and thoughts; particles provide a suppleness that tend to inhibit a monopoly of one tone. In the end, however, the increased gravity of the Latin hexameter must be attributed to aesthetic pleasure, or the meter would not have flourished.

Chapter II:
Ennius and Homer

Although it is estimated that 14/15 of the Annales has been lost to us, the verse that does remain offers ample scope for a study of the work's relation to Homeric epic. Ennius' uses Homer in a variety of ways, and it is the purpose of this chapter to examine a diversity of (though by no means all) Homeric reminiscences in the Annales: its epithets, formulae, Homerisms, and borrowed scenes and similes. The comparison of Ennius' similes and longer descriptions with their Homeric models constitutes the second part of this chapter (pp.52-75); considerations of the characteristic sensibilities of the two writers and of their languages accompany my discussion of these lengthier passages. In the first part I will rely on studies of the work's briefer Homeric correspondences of phrasing, formulae and morphology.[1] What I hope to provide by my own discussion of such phenomena is a sort of unified field theory, whereby the diverse elements of Homeric appropriation can be seen to cooperate in the work's aesthetic design, although sometimes in harmony with Latin as Ennius received it, sometimes violently at variance with it, and

[1] Much valuable material for a comparison of the two writers can be found in F. Kunz, Die älteste römische Epik in ihren Verhältnisse zu Homer, and in H. von Kameke, Ennius und Homer: Versuch einer Analyse der Annalenfragmente, diss., U. Leipzig, 1925, (Weida in Thüringen: Thomas and Hubert, 1926). Kunz's work often ends with a list; v. Kameke is more discursive and critical. O. Skutsch's "Index Locorum" in his edition of the Annales (pp. 833-5) will reveal many Homeric correspondences I have not considered in this chapter. Unless otherwise mentioned, the text of the Annales used is Vahlen's second edition (1928); the numeration of this edition (abbreviated "V") is followed by the corresponding numeration of Warmington's edition of the Annales in Remains of Old Latin (= ROL).

sometimes shaping it for the future. I will also argue that Ennius' conception of himself as the alter Homerus, expressed in the famous dream narrated near the beginning of the Annales, should be considered as an element of Ennius' aesthetic design for Homer, and not primarily as a Pythagorean writer's confession of his personal beliefs.

Ennius' aesthetic ruse of a born-again Homer was perhaps successful enough to hinder the later assessment of the debt he owes to Alexandrian poetry and the literary culture of his time, and Gratwick, in his article on Ennius, is probably justified in entitling a section, "Ennius the Hellenistic Poet."[2] Yet not only is the ruse itself worth study, but there are several respects in which Ennius does indeed by-pass the tradition, and rather than receiving his Homer trickled down through other confreres in imitation and allusion, relates directly to the Homeric text. That Ennius, in this backward look and highly self-conscious employment of another text, is exhibiting Hellenistic tendencies cannot be gainsaid, but this trait need not obscure Ennius' direct and idiomatic use of Homer. Nor should the fact that Ennius wrote in Latin be overlooked when comparing him to Greek writers; as will be seen, the conditions of composition in Latin play a major role in determining the character of Ennius' borrowings.

Just as the first line of Livius' Odusia characterized several features of his translation, the first line of the Annales provides a window into Ennius' use of Homer. In light of the attention that the first lines of epics receive from their creators, it is not fanciful to conceive of the line as part of a stylistic overture in which the major features of Ennius' confrontation with Homer and previous Roman poets are embodied:

Musae quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum

1 V=ROL 1

---

[2] A.S. Gratwick, "Ennius' Annales," CHCL, II, 66-75. Cf. also Ziegler, Das hellenistische Epos, VII, (Appendix) "Ennius als hellenistischer Epiker."

Of course an invocation to the Muses does not specifically recall Homer, or even epic; Hesiod's Works and Days begins with a direct address as well, the first word of which is Μοῦσαι. Even considered in isolation from the rest of the verse, however, Ennius' Musae tells us something important about his work, not by singling out any one Greek author for special reference, but by claiming that the work's poetic heritage lies in the Greek tradition. Livius had tried to exploit the resources of language indigenous to Latin to create an epic style; his substitution of Camena for Μοῦσα (p.4) reflected this attempt to draw from the deep but narrow tradition of carmina and Saturnian verse. Ennius' verse is alive to this indigenous tradition as well, as some examples below will show, but by addressing the Greek divinities in the first line the poet firmly links his work to an established tradition which has a full resevoir of epic conventions for both style and conception. With hindsight we tend to take for granted a great deal of continuity between Greek and Roman literature, and the Roman reliance on Greek culture was perhaps inevitable. During the first acts of grafting, however, the relationship could not have been so self-evident (witness the Saturnian Odusia and Bellum Poenicum), and Ennius played an important role in creating the terms of a bilingual transmission of genre.[3] What I have called Ennius' ruse is in a large part the inadmission, at selective points, of bilingualism and a language barrier; here his invocation of the Muses disavows any break in the tradition of poetry--the Muses operate for Latin verse as well as Greek.

The remainder of the first line, however, indicates that it is specifically Homeric epic to which Ennius wants to graft his work. Homer is recalled in several ways. Surely epic is intended as Ennius identifies and distinguishes his Muses as the ones based on Mt.

---

[3] Robert Brooks, in Ennius and Roman Tragedy, (Salem: Ayer Company Pub., 1984), has some interesting remarks on Ennius' important role in the history of literature: "Ennius mediated between two cultures, and in his work expressed consciously and for the first time the possibilities of a derivative literature (1-2). . .He shaped Latin as a derivative literature, and in this sense Ennius was the ancestor of us all" (31). Implicit in Brook's evaluation is the great difference for imitation a different language makes; Hellenistic literature is also self-conscious and derivative.

Olympus, in contrast to the didactic Muses on Hesiod's Helicon. The reference to the location of the Muses has a model in a line from the Iliad:

ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι Ὀλύμπια δώματ' ἔχουσαι

2.484; 16.112

The difference between the two poets' location of the Muses should not be overlooked. Ennius, it is safe to argue, is making a statement when he mentions Olympus; the mountain has a programmatic function.[4] Homer's geography, on the other hand, is more descriptive and ornamental than distinguishing; it is like being told that ships are things which sail the seas. A characteristic difference in style is thus revealed in the first line; although Ennius allows formulaic verse a greater role in his style than Livius likely allowed (pp.11-12), he shares with the latter an aesthetic that demanded words and phrases be determined specifically by their narrative (and not primarily metrical) context.

Nor does Ennius' location of the Muses on Olympus merely identify his heritage and genre; it prepares the reader even more specifically for an important feature of Ennius' epic, namely, divine action in vivid anthropomorphic terms. To begin, for instance, with "Muses, sing for me the great deeds of our fathers," a natural enough beginning with similarities to Apollonius' opening line to the Argonautica, would miss the opportunity to assume a whole cast of Homeric gods that can help move a plot along and give it weight. This is done in Ennius' first line; the Muses are not vague, ethereal sources of inspiration, but rather dancing girls (pedibus. . .pulsatis), performing at the center for Homeric divinities.[5] Their audience, the pantheon of gods interested in human action, is thus

[4] I cannot agree with O. Skutsch's commentary on magnum. . . Olympum: "Deliberate placing of [the Muses] on Mt. Olympus, to make them appear Homeric rather than Hesiodic, would be a subtlety not to be expected from the man who first introduced them in Rome." Skutsch himself gives Ennius credit for much more subtle allusions.

[5] The picture of gods brought to mind most immediately is the memorable one that appears at the end of Book I of the Iliad; the two reminiscences of 1.604 and 1.530 make the association.

conjured up unobtrusively, assumed in a relative clause before it might even be argued into existence.

If the location of the Muses on Olympus looks to Il. 2.484, the structure of the sentence is more reminiscent of Il.1.604:

Μουσάων θ', αἳ ἄειδον ἀμειβόμεναι ὀπὶ καλῇ

This is a sign that Ennius' appropriation of Homer will be eclectic, characterized by the contaminatio that Livius was also seen to practice (p. 14). Contaminatio is still more apparent in the phrase magnum pulsatis Olympum, which closely corresponds to μέγαν δ' ἐλέλιξεν Ὄλυμπον (Il.1.530). In Homer, however, the verb's subject is Zeus, who in giving an awesome nod to the gentle Thetis shakes the divine fundament. The critic's next step is naturally to inquire whether this substitution of the Muses for Zeus has any special significance. Is poetry being perhaps credited with the power of divinity and exalted to a loftier role? I doubt whether the allusion is so controlled.[6] Enough is accomplished by the first verse in establishing the poem's connections to an existing epic tradition, and thereby assuming both its divine machinery and its fund of epic mannerisms.

For all the first line's reminiscences of a Greek verse, something distinctively Roman emerges; the sound and imagery of pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum set us on Italian soil as surely as Livius' Camena. This can be appreciated by comparing the line to Hesiod's picture of the Muses dancing on Mt. Helicon:

καί τε περὶ κρήνην ἰοειδέα πόσσ' ἁπαλοῖσιν
ὀρχεῦνται καὶ βωμὸν ἐρισθενέος Κρονίωνος

Theog. 3-4

[6] Such an interpretation would impute a conception of divinity to the text foreign to either Homeric or Roman religious conceptions. The association of poetry, or human imaginative powers, with divine powers depends on an analogy of creation (cf. Coleridge on "primary" and "secondary" imagination in Biographia Literaria, Chapter XIII). In Roman religio the relationship between god and man was not so much between creator and created, as between patron and client, bound together by established rules. This conception of religion cannot underpin an association of Zeus or Juppiter's power with that of the Muses.

There is no sense of ἀπαλοῖσιν in Ennius' line, whose Muses are characterized rather by the heavy sound-effects created by the interwoven alliteration of p's and m's, and portrayed with a vigorous image echoed later in Horace's nunc pede libero/pulsanda tellus. The epithet magnum is also appropriate for the sound; it remained a Roman favorite, and is indicative of what epic meant for the Romans.[7] Homer, says Arnold (see above,p. 28),is rapid and clear, as well as noble; Ennius' borrowing of Homeric elements, however, both here and elsewhere, is discriminating, and favors the qualities in Homer that will lend his own work the weighty dignity deemed worthy of his Roman subject, while neglecting other salient Homeric qualities. This, then, is the final feature of Ennius' Homeric appropriation as found foreshadowed in the first line: Ennius is selective according to his own aesthetic criteria of the style suitable for epic. He does not seemed concerned, for example, to reproduce the rapidity so characteristic of Homeric verse.

The epithet magnum provides a suitable transition from an examination of the first line to the subject of formulaic verse. μέγαν is a standing epithet for Ὄλυμπον in Homer; it is clear, then, that Ennius did not steer clear of formulaic adjectives in rendering a Homeric phrase, in contrast to what I hypothesized for Livius' translation. If forms of magnus, altus, and omnis were the only sort of adjectives Ennius retained when rendering a Homeric phrase, it might well be argued that he was indulging in all-purpose Roman favorites, merely encouraged by Homer.[8] A sampling from Kunz's list of noun-epithet

---

[7] Cf. W. Y. Sellar, The Roman Poets of the Republic, (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1863), 18: "There is no feeling so characteristic of the works of Roman genius as the sense of majesty. This feeling is called forth by the idea or appearance of strength, stability, order, or immensity; and by whatever impresses the imagination as the symbol of power and authority, whether in the aspect of nature, or the works, actions, and institutions of man."

[8] See n. 7.

correspondences between Ennius and Homer, however, shows a wider range of borrowings[9]:

somno leni	≈	μαλακῷ ὕπνῳ
veter. . . Priamus	≈	γέρων Πρίαμος
densis . . . pinnis	≈	πτερὰ πυκνά
concava specus	≈	σπέος κοῖλον, σπέος γλαφυρόν
manu magna	≈	χειρὶ μεγάλῃ
crateris auratis	≈	χρυσέου κρητῆρος

Some of these adjectives are natural candidates for epic: veter, for instance, the already mentioned magna, and auratis, are all traditional traits of epic greatness. Concava, on the other hand, conjures up no epic world per se; further, given the bland results of the combination concava specus, it is unlikely that Ennius was drawn by the phrase's sheer expressive power. Such instances, therefore, give the impression that Ennius was indeed part of a tradition larger than himself, and one which influenced his writing even to the point of determining what adjective goes with what noun. This continuity of course, is an illusion, merely providing what F. Skutsch calls a "homerische Kolorit."[10] Nonetheless, standing epithets on Homeric patterns must have been a fairly consistent feature throughout the Annales, since few of the passages that do remain were selected by ancient writers to illustrate such formulaic correspondences.

Here again it should not be assumed that Ennius made no attempt to discriminate among and then assimilate Homeric phrasings and formulae into the mixture of devices that lend the work dignity. Some of the artistic concerns that shaped Ennius' appropriation of Homer will become evident from the following discussions of 1) the phrases that border a

---

[9] Kunz 19-20.

[10] Franz Skutsch, "Ennius," RE, Vol. 5 (1905): 2611.

speech, 2) the various titles for Zeus, 3) Ennian compounds formed on an Homeric model, and finally 4) Ennius' fondness for doublets (e.g., malaque et bona).

1) Twice in the fragments is a speech begun with Olli respondit (33 and 119 V. =ROL 31 and124), corresponding to Homer's τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' . Likewise, Haec ecfatus (47 and 59 V.= ROL 44 and 55) twice ends a speech, and corresponds to ὣς ἔφατ (or ὣς φάτο and ὣς φάμενος). Regardless of the Homeric quality of the content of the speeches framed by these recurrent phrases, to begin and end them with such notable Homeric tags places them in a distinctly epic framework and gives the whole speech an epic coloring. Homer's formulae for the same function of framing speeches might be called organic, arising from the conditions of composition and audience expectations; Ennius' "formulae" might be called strategic in this instance, chosen for their ability to project the illusion that the poetic voice, even when not directly imitating Homer, is Homeric.

A look at the entire line in which the recurrent phrases mentioned occur reveals that Homeric correspondences were not blindly inserted for automatic epic flavor:

Olli respondit rex Albai Longai

33 V.=31 ROL

Olli respondit suavis sonus Egeriai

119 V.=124 ROL

The most obvious indication that the appropriated Homeric formula was not an isolated stylistic element but rather an effect harmonizing with the passage's general style is the number of archaisms clustered around it. Both olli and the genitive ending -ai are on Palmer's list of "the most important morphological archaisms of early Latin poetic diction."[11] The solemnity of the former fragment, compounded by its unmixed spondees (which are the reason for its transmission) is particularly suitable for its regal subject. Fr.

[11] Palmer 98.

119, along with the archaisms already mentioned, contains the periphrasis of suavis sonus Egeriai, "die deutlich an Βίη Ἡρακληείη, ἱερὴ ἰὼς Τηλεμάχοιο und dergleichen erinnert."[12] The Homeric formulae of olli respondit, then, support the general tone of the passage as created by other Homeric elements, the rhythm, and indigenous sources of solemnity.

2) As one would expect from the preceding discussion, a good number of Homer's stylistic traits and phrases are clustered around Homer's divine machinery, further evidence of Ennius' artistic dicrimination in borrowing from Homer.[13] Both the solemnity of the subject matter (at least as Ennius conceives it [14]) and its thoroughly Homeric origins call for Homeric style. Ennius' translation of Il. 8.31,

O genitor noster Saturnie, maxime divum

456 V.= ROL Sp? 8

is probably his most ad verbum rendition of any Homeric line:

ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη, ὔπτατε κρειόντων

Here the genitive plural ending -um is archaic;[15] it also appears in the variety of Ennian versions for πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε, most faithfully rendered by patrem divomque hominumque (581 V.= ROL 448). The duplication of -que also ought to be pointed out; although it is a feature that becomes idiomatic to Latin epic, it was not a

---

[12] F. Skutsch 2611.

[13] See v. Kameke, pp. 42-43: "Ennius. . . zeichnete seine Menschen nicht mit festen Epithetis aus. . . ; . . .bei den Göttern hat er einen Anlauf dazu genommen"(42). She notes the same feature in Naevius' epic: "Naevius scheint den Menschen gar keine Epitheta gegeben zu haben, sie dagegen bei den Göttern bis zu Unübersichtlichkeit gehäuft zu haben"(43).

[14] see Sellar, p. 101: "Yet how great is the difference between the life-like representation of the eager, capricious , and passionate deities of Homer's Olympus and that outline which may still be traced in Ennius. . . of the gods assembled, like a grave council of state, to deliberate on the destiny of Rome."

[15] Palmer 98.

construction current in Ennius' time, and he clearly employs it in imitation of Homer's τε . . . τε.

Elsewhere Juppiter receives the titles divum pater atque hominum rex (175 V.=ROL 207) and divumque hominumque pater rex (the peculiar word-order of the latter cannot be attributed to meter, as its scansion is the same as fr. 175; in its cleverness it is more Hellenistic than Homeric). Again the context helps reveal more about Ennius' appropriation of Homer than lists of isolated correspondences; the former phrase is coupled with another Homeric reminiscence, and is, like the opening line of the Annales, a miniature instance of contaminatio:

> Tum cum corde suo divum pater atque hominum rex
> effatur (175-6 V.=ROL 207-8)

cum corde suo. . . pater. . ./effatur is clearly inspired by Homer's Κρονίων . . . προτὶ ὃν μυθήσατο θυμόν (Il. 17.441-2). Also like the first line, however, is Ennius' reinterpretation of Homer in line 175: Warmington notes that "'cum corde suo effatur' can hardly mean 'converses with his own heart,'" the meaning of its Homeric model.[16] An idiom appropriate for Homeric psychology is thus slightly altered to suit its new Latin context.

3) The same consistency of style and subject matter discussed in 1) and 2) above can be found in two of Ennius' coinages of compound words:

> Contremuit templum magnum Iovis altitonantis
> (541 V.=ROL Sp? 11)
>
> Iuppiter hic risit tempestatesque serenae
> riserunt omnes risu Iovis omnipotentis
> (457-8 V.= ROL 450-1)

[16] Warmington (Vol. 1), 77, note d; he translates cum corde suo by "with all his heart."

Iovis altitonantis, a suitable close to a grand-sounding verse, corresponds to Homer's Ζεὺς ὑψιβρεμέτης (Il. 1.354 et al.); Iovis omnipotentis recalls Ζεὺς ὑπερμένης. Homer also presents us with a smiling Zeus, parallel to Iuppiter. . .risit:

ὣς φάτο, μείδησεν δὲ πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶντε
(Il. 5.426)

More significant than this further instance of contaminatio, however, is the context in which altitonantis and omnipotentis are used. Although metrically identical, they are by no means interchangeable; rather, each is oriented to the specific circumstance: a thundering god is appropriate for the action of contremuit, while omnipotentis is more fitting for a clear-sky god whose action rules the action of everything else (to his risit everything else responds: riserunt omnes). Thus, although Ennius turns to Homer for his picture of Juppiter and takes a cue from Homer's compound epithets, he is once again more similar to Livius in his manner of deploying such adjectives: they are "scene-specific" rather than fixed epithets. As will be seen in the second part of this chapter (pp. 54-6), aesthetic standards are at work here which guide the composition of Ennius' similes as well; both epithets and similes have a more direct bearing on the narrative than their counterparts in Homer.

4) Kunz lists a dozen pairs of "typische Wortverbindungen. . . in denen conträre oder synonyme Begriffe verknüpft sind," each closely corresponding to a pair in Homer;[17] among these doublets are the following phrases:

malaque et bona	≈	κακόν τ' ἀγαθόν τε
noctesque diesque	≈	νύκτας τε καὶ ἤματα
muros urbemque	≈	πόλιος καὶ τείχεος
clamque palamque	≈	ἠὲ αμφαδὸν ἠὲ κρυφηδόν

[17] Kunz 18.

si vivimus sive morimur ≈ ἤ ἀπολέσθαι ἠὲ βιῶναι

That Ennius had Homer's combinations in mind and valued their reminiscences seems quite likely. Ennius' manner of connecting these words into pairs is also Homeric, both in its variety and in the specific use of copulatives, with -que et, -que. . . -que, and -que corresponding to τε και, τε... τε, and και. The variety of connectives renders this mannerism of doublets adaptable to the demands of meter, while the mannerism itself is another species of "epic fullness," and is more vivid than the abstractions that could logically replace most of these pairs (e.g., noctesque diesque = "always").

In a discussion of early Roman tragedy E. Fraenkel notes that several stylistic traits of Roman tragedy are common earlier in both Greek tragedy and in early Latin carmina.[18] In such cases, arguing the influence of Greek literature would be an instance of over-determination; it would perhaps be better to understand the similarities in terms of a Roman predisposition, if not out-right independence. The doublets of the Annales must be considered with the same caution in mind. Although with examples from Roman tragedy in mind, Fraenkel points out that this same fullness of expression is a prominent feature in carmina.[19] He cites the fetial formula arce et urbe (cf. Ennius' muros urbemque) and the lustration prayer handed down by Cato, which exibits a very great density of such word-pairs, including sive circumagi sive circumferenda, precor quaesoque, visos invisosque, and viduertatem vastudinemque; as with Ennius' examples, there are both synonyms and antonyms. Just as Livius in his use of patronymics drew on the dignity of old saturnian and senatorial phrases (pp.14-5), Ennius can draw on the solemnity associated with such ancient carmina by recalling their style of couplets, at the same time that he draws on

[18] E. Fraenkel, Plautinisches in Plautus (Berlin: Weidmann, 1922) 358-9.

[19] E. Fraenkel, Plautinisches 360. G. Williams ("Genesis" [in CHCL,II] 55) also notes the prominence of this figure in early Latin (See Introduction, p.vii --Wiilliams uses the term "polar expressions," which only covers Kunz's "conträre Begriffe").

Homer for their content. In such an instance there is a happy compatibility between indigenous patterns of speech and the influence of a distant literary model.[20]

It should not be assumed from the last example that Ennius was always concerned to couch his Homeric mannerisms in familiar settings or to borrow only where Latin seemed predisposed towards a certain feature of Homeric style; the discussion of the formulaic frame for speeches (discussed in section 1 above) indicates much the opposite, that Ennius was rather concerned to trumpet his connections with Homer. This will become still more clear in what follows, where further mannerisms, including his notorious Grecisms will be discussed, after which the aesthetic function of Ennius' dream can be considered.

> Eine ausserordentlich geschickte Mischung von Archaismen, kühnen Neologismen und Graecismen-- so habe ich die Sprache der Aeneis charakterisiert, und diese Charakteristik kann man auch auf die Annalen anwenden; nur wird man das lobende Beiwort wegzulassen haben und für Graecismen im ganzen Homerismen setzen dürfen.[21]

As F. Skutsch's somewhat disparaging characterization suggests, the topic of Ennius' epic diction tends to elicit strong opinions from scholars of the subject; above all, the poet's Grecisms draw fire, directed either at Ennius for lapses in taste, or at editors and critics who attribute certain monstra to a serious work like the Annales (the work which brought us o Tite tute Tati etc.) Before I focus on several of these Grecisms, a few preliminary remarks are in order. First, I agree with F. Skutsch's and Catone's

---

[20] It is interesting to note that the unmetrical (though by no means unrhythmical) lustration prayer recommended by Cato employs only the connective -que. Both Ennius' variety of connectives as well as the terms paired, then, implicate Homer's text.

[21] F. Skutsch 2624.

substitution of the word "Homerism" for "Grecism,"[22] although W. Kroll argues otherwise in his essay, "Die Dichtersprache': "Als ein deutliches Anzeichen des hellenischen Einflusses führt die Dichtersprache eine Reihe von Gräzismen mit, die sich allmählich vermehren."[23] All of the examples of Ennian Grecisms which he provides, however, he himself traces to a Homeric source. Perhaps he has in mind a preceding comment about the learned character of Alexandrian poetry, "die manchmal ausser entlegenen Stoffen auch entlegene Worte aufsuchte. . . [D]ie ganze Richtung dieser Glossenjäger hat. . . auch [die Römer] etwas beeinflusst."[24] This cannot be refuted, but the difference in the respective stages of Hellenistic poetry and early Roman epic must be kept in mind. For Hellenistic poets the search for strange and exotic words can be attributed to a delight in learnéd fancy; early Roman poets, on the other hand, sought out archaisms, neologisms, and Grecisms to create the elevated style demanded by the tragic and epic genres. In the one case the strange word is an ornament, in the other a building block. Secondly, these strange words and constructions can perform a double duty, not only adding to a poet's expressive range but also rendering the language more tractable for scansion; endo and indu- for in and in- are the most obvious examples of this from the Annales. The trick, of course, is to adopt the usage into the general style so that it does not advertise its metrical convenience. Finally, as F. Skutsch points out, the boundaries between neologisms, archaisms, and Homerisms are not rigidly defined; the former of the two, for instance, might be encouraged by a usage in Homer. Ennius' compound words are a good example, as they are often formed on a Homeric epithet: besides altitonantis and altisonantis, already mentioned, there are suaviloquenti (303 V.= ROL 300) patterned on

---

[22] N. Catone, Grammatica Enniana (Florence: Vallecchi, 1964) 112.

[23] W. Kroll, Studien zum Verständnis der Römischen Literatur (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1924) 249.

[24] Kroll 248.

ἡδυεπής, and altivolantum (81 V.=ROL 84) on ὑψιπετήεις.[25] Since compound formation is an Indo-European feature, however, this is not properly a Homerism.[26]

Several of Ennius' Homerisms became well established in Latin poetic diction. An example of this is his use of the neuter plural adjective in an adverbial sense, identified as a Grecism by both Kroll and Catone;[27] they cite, among several other examples, multa manus ad caeli caerula templa /tendebam (49-50 V.= ROL 46-7). This line has its closest Homeric model in Il. 1.351:

πολλὰ δε μητρὶ φίλῃ ἠρήσατο χεῖρας ὀρεγνύς; the Homeric reminiscences that accompany the construction of multa also point beyond Alexandria as the inspiration for such syntax. The Greek accusative also first appears in the Annales, although it is represented with certainty only by perculsi pectora Poeni (311 V.=ROL sp?4).[28]

F. Skutsch is alone in criticizing Ennius for dia dearum (22 V.=ROL 21), which is, in Catone's words, "un omerismo senz' altro" patterned on δῖα θεάων;[29] Skutsch finds it "weder lautlich noch. . . syntaktisch ganz verständlich."[30] Ennius was fond of this locution, however, and several other examples are attested--sancta dearum, magna dearum,

---

[25] F. Skutsch 2626.

[26] C.J. Armstrong, De epithetis compositis apud Epicos Latinos, Abstract in Harvard St Clas Phil, 47 (1936): 209-11.

[27] Kroll 249; Catone 112.

[28] E. A. Hahn, "The Origin of the Greek Accusative," TAPA 91 (1960): 223-4.

[29] Catone 112.

[30] F. Skutsch 2625. Skutsch has a point: what does it mean? Radiance and divinity, both possibly attributed by dius, are both probably meant, giving the word the same range as Homer's δῖος; it is "un aggettivo di grado positivo." In sense, the phrase probably amounts to little more than a periphrasis for "shining goddess;" in Ennius the phrase is used of Venus as she appears to Aeneas: Constitit inde loci propter sos dia dearum (cf. Warmington, I, 11).

and magnus Titanum. It is interesting that the mannerism is reserved for the gods, as the only beings worthy of such linguistic distortions.

Ausonius is the sole source for several peculiar instances of word-shortenings in Ennius (574-7 V.=ROL Sp?33-36). We cannot place them with any certainty in the Annales (Warmington suggests the Satires as another possibility) but when Ausonius asks, "Unde Rudinus ait divum domus altisonum cael et cuius de more quod adstruit endo suam do?" we can at least answer him: "In Homer's fashion." The shortening of domum to do has a direct model in the Homeric phrase Διὸς ποτὶ Χαλκοβατὲς δῶ ; cael for caelum and gau for gaudium[32] have no semantic analogy in Homer, but the pattern is represented in other forms, such as κρῖ for κριθή. An argument for their inclusion in the Annales is strengthened by the compound word and the archaism (altisonum, endo) which accompany these little morphological shockers; such a grouping of mannerisms (see above, p. 39) is not unlike Ennius at his most epic.[33]

Ennius' use of a genitive ending patterned on the Homeric -οιο (e.g. μεγάλοιο Κρόνοιο) in Mettoeoque Fufetioeo (126 V.= ROL 139) was "another shortlived aberration," according to Palmer;[34] "dass es sich nicht um einen römischen Namen handelt, ist wenigstens eine gewisse Entschuldigung," F. Skutsch offers.[35] Catone, however, believes the form is a dative with origins in earlier Latin (cf. the dative numasioi in the Praeneste fibula inscription).[36]

---

[32] It is perhaps significant that all three shortenings involve the frequently neglected m.

[33] If the shortened forms belong to the Satires, who could Ennius be ridiculing but himself?

[34] Palmer 101.

[35] F. Skutsch 2625.

[36] Catone 66.

"Nicht minder krass. . . ist der Gebrauch des sus für das Possessivum suus:"[37]

Postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliquit

(149 V. =ROL 154)

In this line sis is substituted for suis. Ennius, so far as we can determine, found no such shortened form of the reflexive-possessive adjective in existing Latin; sis and parallel forms, however, did exist as archaic forms for the demonstrative pronoun (i.e., sis equalling eis). Ennius avails himself of these pronouns on a number of occasions.[38] His slippery step from sis for eis to sis for suis was probably taken with an eye on Homer's ὅς , which can be both a demonstrative pronoun and possessive adjective.

Perhaps the most notorious instance of a Homerism is found in 609 V.=ROL Sp?13:

. . . saxo cere comminuit brum

"Dass [fr. 609 V.] von Ennius sein soll, daran ist nur merkwürdig, dass das jemals hat glauben können," writes Leo;[39] Gratwick suggests that it is someone's schoolmasterly joke, and Jocelyn adds that the fragment "has no place in scientific editions of the Annales."[40] In contrast to these repudiations, Servius (to Aen. 1.412) simply pans the line while attributing it to Ennius, comparing it unfavorably to Virgil's circum dea fudit (1.412) and septem subiecta trioni (Georgics 3.381): "hoc [Virgil's tmesis] tolerabile est in sermone

---

[37] F. Skutsch 2625.

[38] (e.g., 98 V.=ROL 105 has sum for eum; see also the line quoted in footnote 30. E. M. Steuart, in The Annals of Quintus Ennius (New York: Georg Olms, 1976) has a note on the feature, p. 105. O. Skutsch (Annals, p. 64) notes that Ennius used this highly archaic alternative for the pronoun only in the accusative case.

[39] Friedrich Leo, Geschichte der Römischen Literatur (Berlin: Weidmann, 1913)182.

[40] Gratwick 70; H. D. Jocelyn, "The Poems of Quintus Ennius," ANRW Vol. I,2, ed. by H. Temporini (New York: Walter De Gruyer, 1972): 1019.

conposito, ceterum in simplici nimis est asperum."[41] Acceptable to Servius, therefore, would have been the securely attested de me hortatur (381 V.= ROL 366), located in a larger fragment which is not transmitted in illustration of this construction. Jocelyn calls de me hortatur an archaism, however, rather than a Homerism, citing ancient prayer formulae handed down by Festus, ob vos sacro and sub vos placo;[42] here again, as with the doublets discussed earlier (p.41), there is a fortunate harmony of associations. Such a harmony is absent in the instance of cere comminuit brum, which sooner alienates with its strangeness than it recalls religious language. Yet the alienation may be just what Ennius wanted.

"Man wird nicht leugnen können, dass in diesen Dingen Ennius zugleich geschmacklos und gewalttätig verfahren ist."[43] F. Skutsch's omission of the adverbial neuter accusative and the Greek accusative from his discussion suggests that the assurance of his criticism relies in part upon the hindsight knowledge that many of Ennius' Homerisms were linguistic mules, without progeny in later Roman epic. Were not such syntactical Homerisms as the adverbial accusative, not to mention the use of hexameter itself, at least as violent to Latin as the substitution of do for domum? Granted, however, that Ennius over-boldly altered the language of the tribe, there are several mitigating circumstances which, if they do not excuse his lapses of taste or ingratiate them to our sensibilities, at least help to explain them. One was his misunderstanding of Homer's poetic diction. Ennius was most likely unaware of the long oral tradition productive of the

[41] Vahlen (p.113) quotes several other grammarians who comment on cere comminuit brum; two of them group it with the still more iconoclastic tmesis of Massilitanas ("bottles?" cf. Warmington's note, p.464-5) in 609 V.= ROL sp? 44: Massali portabant iuvenes ad litora tanas. Neither grammarian, however, attributes this line to Ennius, and Vahlen's case for doing so is weak. On the other hand, Warmington's suggestion that cere comminuit brum occurred in Ennius' Satires, a suggestion which at least acknowledges Servius' clear attribution of the phrase to Ennius, does not account for the critical tone of Servius, which a more ludic context for the line would not have provoked.

[42] Jocelyn, "The Poems" 1019.

[43] F. Skutsch 2625.

many varied forms in Homer's poetry, and imagined that he was taking no more liberty than Homer when he shortened domum and varied suis.[44] Secondly, Ennius' Homerisms lose some of their exceptionality if one considers the importance of genre distinctions in the ancient world. There were partial language barriers between each genre, in the face of which the language barrier took on a less than absolute quality. In connection with this, the greater artificiality of ancient poetic diction formed a context in which Ennius' Homerisms could not be condemned out of hand simply because they violated the one true idiom of the Latin language. As a third explanation of how Ennius' Homerisms could have slipped past the censor of good taste, I cite the relatively unstandardized nature of the Latin literary language in Ennius' time; in its relation to classical Latin it is like the English language before the advent of dictionaries and grammars in the18th century. The boisterous word-play and linguistic exuberance of Plautus and Shakespeare reflect and were encouraged by the comparatively uninhibited state of their languages, and both of these authors provide a better parallel to the freedom of Ennius' Homerisms than Joyce's lonely "splitting of the etym" in Finnegans Wake. The same unpolished and uninhibited state of Latin literature that encouraged the bold and successful experiment of an epic in hexameter is also partly responsible for Ennius' less popular innovations.

Yet all three explanations may miss the point. Ennius, after all, was not attempting to create a Latin epic style that would establish a standard and become the basis for epic to come. He was not classicizing when he turned to Homer, merely searching for a style that would do the job of glorifying the greatness of Rome and her leaders. The uniqueness of the attempt is in fact proclaimed at the work's beginning: Lucretius, Virgil, and Horace all boasted about being the first Romans in their specific field, but Ennius does them one better; he is not just first in Latin, he is Homer himself, whose soul transmigrated to Ennius

---

[44] Palmer 101: "Homer had preserved an ancient word δῶ, which to eyes of later generations looked like a shortened form of δῶμα ."

via a peacock. This is revealed to Ennius, the narrator, in a dream, which he recounts for us before the narrative proper begins.[45]

Ennius' dream was famous among subsequent Roman men of letters, and their approach to it has determined our basic approach and generally stifled the dream's aesthetic function in the Annales.[46] Cicero has characters in his dialogues quote from Ennius' dream to illustrate epistemological arguments (Ac. II.51, 88). Lucretius (I.116-26) is naturally interested in the dream as a vehicle of doctrine, since the notion of the transmigration of souls, apparently at the core of the dream, conflicts with Lucretius' atomistic conception of the soul, and could encourage the fears that plague mankind. A scholiast on Persius 6.9-11 gives us an outline of the dream to which the most reliable fragments closely conform:

> Ennius. . . in Annalium suorum principio. . . dicit se vidisse in somnis Homerum dicentem fuisse quondam pavonem et ex eo translatam in se animam esse secundum Pythagorae philosophi definitionem.

The reference to Pythagoras here and in Persius 6.11 gives further emphasis to the dream as a statement of beliefs. In line with this ancient approach to the dream, Vahlen, Warmington, and O. Skutsch (but not Steuart, 22.) have attributed two didactic-sounding fragments (10-14 V.=ROL 7-12) to the dream as part of Homer's teachings, although the location of these fragments within Ennius' works is unspecified by Varro, their transmitter.

---

[45] The literature on Ennius' dream is extensive, most of it concerned with a reconstruction of its outlines based on the confusing testimonia and references in later Roman literature (see O. Skutsch, The Annals, pp. 147-153, for the numerous references to the dream; See also Werner Suerbaum, Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter (Hildesheim: Georg Olms,1968), 46-113, for a discussion and bibliography of the dream). I have nothing new to add to the dream's reconstruction, but believe that, in the debate over details (as important as they are), the dream's basic aesthetic function in the Annales has been neglected.

[46] Robert Brooks (esp. pp. 9-19) is an exception, although he leans toward biography with his interest in what the dream reveals about Ennius' conception of himself as a poet: "[Ennius] uses the Pythagorean journey as a device [emphasis mine] at once convenient and meaningful--yet no more than accessory to his great self-conception as the creator of a new epic poetry"(17).

It seems better to approach the scene in a different way and ask 1) what business Homer has at the beginning of the Annales, Ennius' epic of Rome, and b) what Pythagoras and a peacock are doing there with him. Clearly Homer's appearance at the beginning of the poem serves to alert the reader to his importance for the work. The dream is another poetic device used by Ennius to bring Homer's text into direct dialogue with his own; it complements and strengthens the verbal correspondences. Earlier I argued that Ennius, by beginning and ending a speech with Homeric formulae, could lend Homeric color to its contents; the appearance of Homer has a similar strategy behind it, only it is the entire work which is informed by Homer's presence, since we are to conceive of the narrator as in some way Homer himself. Set in such a context of inspiration, Homeric features become a manifestation of Homer's presence, rather than being simply a series of allusions to an alien tradition.

What about the peacock? First, Homer's metempsychosis into Ennius' body establishes his presence more firmly than a mere dream appearance. If Homer is going to insist on transmigration, however, he had better back it up with some philosophy; hence the attention to Pythagoras and the peacock (no flight of fancy this dream). Yet I would argue that metempsychosis has further rhetorical value; the fluidity of barriers between individuals helps suggest the fluidity of barriers between languages as well, and plays a part in authorizing some of the liberties Ennius took with the Latin language. Gratwick writes, "[his] Greek 'epicisms' suggest that Ennius thought of Latin as a much corrupted Greek dialect. . ."[47] According to my interpretation, however, Ennius is more self-conscious in his appropriation of Homer, an appropriation which he must make plausible within the aesthetic enclosure of his epic world. To lift both the dream and the verbal reminiscences out of this enclosure, judging the one as the poet's eccentric creed and

---

[47] Gratwick 70.

judging the other against the future of Latin epic diction, is to obscure their idiomatic and mutually supportive function in the Annales.

Part II: Scenes and Similes

In the remainder of this chapter I will consider in detail three Ennian imitations of Homer-- the horse simile (514-18 V.), the storm-simile (443-5 V.), and the tree-cutting scene (187-91 V.); for further illustration of the Ennian simile I have also included some discussion of a simile with no Homeric parallel (83-88, describing the Aventine auspices). The chapter concludes with an examination of the relationship between sound-effects and subjectivity in Ennius' imitations, where I have found fragments from Ennius' tragedies to be useful.

Modern critics are in debt to Macrobius, who in comparing Virgil to Ennius and Homer in the Saturnalia provides the only extant versions for several of the lengthier passages in the Annales. Macrobius' understanding of imitation, however, is somewhat limited; he introduces his discussion of Virgil's debt to other poets in the following manner:

> Sunt quaedam apud Vergilium quae ab Homero creditur transtulisse; sed ea docebo a nostris auctoribus sumpta, qui priores haec ab Homero in carmina sua transtulerant. (Sat. 6.3.1)

It is another instance in which ancient criticism seems inadequate to the task of interpreting ancient literature.[48] It is not so much Macrobius' characterization of the Roman poets' adaptations with the word transferre that appears simple--the word is not limited to close translation-- as his rigid chronological notion of influence. In the passages quoted by Macrobius, Virgil clearly has both Ennius and Homer in mind, revising Ennius not merely on his own authority but on Homer's as well. Elsewhere Macrobius calls an Ennian simile

[48] See Introduction, p. v.

a Homerica descriptio equi (Sat. 6.3.7), overlooking the context of the description, the fact of its being a simile. He thereby obscures one of the determining factors in Ennius' divergence from Homer, as the following discussion will show.

ὡς δ' ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος, ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτνῃ,
δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θείῃ πεδίοιο κροαίνων,
εἰωθὼς λούεσθαι ἐϋρρεῖος ποταμοῖο,
κυδιόων· ὑψοῦ δὲ κάρη ἔχει, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται
ὤμοις ἀΐσσονται· ὁ δ' ἀγλαΐηφι πεποιθώς,
ῥίμφα ἑ γοῦνα φέρει μετά τ' ἤθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων·

Il. 6.506-11, 15.263-8

Et tum sicut equus qui de praesepibus fartus
Vincla suis magnis animis abrupit et inde
Fert sese campi per caerula laetaque prata,
Celso pectore saepe iubam quassat simul altam,
Spiritus ex anima calida spumas agit albas

514-18 V.= ROL 517-21

If one leaves aside for the moment arrangement and syntax, Ennius' most obvious variation is his omission of most of two lines in Homer, where the horse is pictured bathing in a sweet-flowing river and galloping to familiar pastures where the other horses (mares, Virgil dramatizes) are grazing. Ennius makes no mention of either destination, and per caerula laetaque prata is only a rough equivalent. These changes and others to be mentioned are involved with two different conceptions of a simile's role in relation to the narrative action.

In a Homeric simile the reader often finds himself far afield from the narrative action. Lesky elaborates on this frequent phenomenon:

> Diese Gleichnisse sind nicht nur um eines Tertium comparationis willen da, sie schaffen vielfältige Beziehungen, erhellen eine Menge von Einzelzügen und geben Ereignisse und Gestalten Dichte und Farbe. Sie haben darüber hinaus ihr eigenes Leben und legen in echt griechischer Sehweise das Wesentliche an den Dingen frei.[49]

This is not to say that apart from some definite points of comparison between the simile and the main action (i.e., the tertium comparationis), the bulk of the Homeric simile has no relevance to the setting. It is true that some features of the simile point more clearly at the main action, but these points of comparison are themselves illuminated by the fullness of description that rounds the simile out; even the scholastic term which Lesky mentions is somewhat misleading, suggesting that the abstract overlapping of the two actions is foremost in Homer's mind. For Homer, "das Wesentliche" is not the abstrac - tion, but the action.

Our knowledge of oral-composition can also help in understanding the nature of the Homeric simile. Just as some epithets are more or less "appropriate" (M. Parry would say "meaningful" and stress "less") for their specific circumstances, so can the terms of a simile's significance vary depending on context. The horse-simile in question occurs twice in Homer, illuminating both Paris and Hector in turn, the former as he runs down through the city from Helen's bed, proud in his shiny armor, the latter after Apollo breathes new strength into him for further fighting. In each case speed is a prominent feature of both the main action and the simile. Although both men are eager, the eagerness of Paris finds its reflection more in the delight and pride of the horse than in its strength and energy, which better characterize Hector. In neither case, however, are the horse's social instincts and bathing in a clear stream particularly appropriate for either narrative situation; the spirit and

---

[49] Albin Lesky, Geschichte der Griechischen Literatur (bern: Francke, 1971) 85-86.

speed of the horse are further illuminated when we know the objects of its desire, but these destinations bear little resemblance to the battlefield. The tempting correlation, that the return of each brother into action is like the horse's return to the herd, does not stand up: Paris has his moments, but lacks a soldierly solidarity, while Hector had never left his comrades and was merely inspired to fight harder.

None of the narrative in which Ennius' simile was embedded remains. Röser argues that the setting was similar to the Paris-version in Bk. 6, and cites Vergil's parallel simile (11. 492-5: alta decurrens.... arce) in conjunction with "die Konstanz der antiken Motivübernahme...."[50] He further supports his conjecture about the passage's context by citing the opinions of scholiasts, who gave priority to the simile's first setting and in doing so may have influenced Ennius' understanding of the text. Willcock argues more persuasively, in light of oral-composition, that in the case of the two Homeric similes "[I]t is incorrect to assume that one of the passages must be an imitation of the other...."[51] One could say with less precision than Röser but with greater certainty that Ennius' simile describes an enthusiastic warrior rushing into battle.

Although Ennius' simile certainly has no allegorical relationship to the main action, the warrior is never far from the narrator's mind. A different standard of association is at play, one that would be violated by the detailed destinations of Homer's horse. It is true that the attraction of the caerula laetaque prata is emphasized, but while the prata is not a battlefield and the horse not necessarily a war-horse, a campus is not inapposite to a battle scene. Not just the images, however, distinguish Ennius' style of simile from Homer's, but the syntax as well. In Homer's version there are several full stops (after κυδιόων and ἀίσσονται), after which he continues to describe the

---

[50] Wolfgang Röser, Ennius, Euripides und Homer (Würzburg-Aumühle: Konrad Triltsch Verlag, 1939) 40.

[51] Homer, The Iliad of Homer I-XII, ed. M. M. Willcock (London: St Martin's Pr., 1978), 250 (commentary on 6.506-11).

horse, unworried by its syntactic distance from the main action. Lesky independently identifies this feature of the Homeric simile: "In ihrer sprachlichen Form, die so gerne von Vergleichsatz zum selbständigen übergeht, wird diese Doppelheit ihrer Bedeutung sinnfällig."[52] Ennius' version is compressed, an effect achieved especially by the asyndeton of the last two lines; it is as if he is loath to begin an explicitly independent construction, or to seem expansive by the use of connectives.

Röser traces still further connections between Ennius' simile and narrative, after noting that the phrase magnus animus "ist ein in der ganzen lateinischen Literature nur Menschen zukommendes Attribut," although animus with another epithet is frequently used in connection with animals.[53] From this he draws the conclusion: "Kann bei Homer der Vergleich aus sich heraus Einzelzüge entwickeln, die ohne Beziehung zu der zur Erzählung stehen, so erhielt umgekehrt bei Ennius der Vergleich einen Zug, der mit dem reinen Vergleich nichts zu tun hat, sondern der Erzählung angehört."[54]

In making the preceding distinctions one is not isolating any characteristically Ennian or even Roman feature in Ennius' simile. Referring to Homer's "pittoreske Elemente ohne unmittlebare Beziehung zum tertium comparationis ," v. Albrecht notes that in leaving such features aside Ennius is following Alexandrian theory and practice.[55] What Lesky writes of Apollonius' similes, that ""ihr freies Eigenleben, das wir aus Homer kennen, zugunsten einer grösseren Handlungsbezogenheit eingeschränkt [ist], characterizes Ennius' similes as well.[56]

---

[52] Lesky 84.

[53] Röser 41. O. Skutsch is less categorical: ". . . magnus animus is not normally ascribed to animals." (The Annals, p. 685)

[54] Röser 41.

[55] Michael von Albrecht, "Ein Pferdegleichnis bei Ennius," Hermes 97 (1969): 337-8.

[56] Lesky 824.

Thus far I have focused on the similes as figures; the substance of each simile, its picture of the horse, also rewards comparison. A bald summation of the action reveals immediately why the similes leave such a different impression. Homer's version, also one line longer, is filled with motion and variety: the horse is fed, breaks away, runs away thundering, accustomed to bathe, and exulting; he holds his head high, his mane flies, he is sure of his strength and he gallops. Ennius' horse is fed, breaks loose, runs, shakes his mane, and foams. It is not merely the wealth of activity which distinguishes Homer's horse from Ennius', however, but the organization of the action as well. Homer's organization is by no means haphazard; the last line, for instance, is well suited to close the simile, providing the sharpest possible contrast to the stalled horse that began it. There is nonetheless no single vantage point, logical or visual, from which the horse is viewed throughout and around which the detail is organized. Although in a strict grammatical sense the horse is heading for favorite pastures, the river is pictured as his first destination, and we see him there often (ἐϊωθῶς) before he gallops to the pastures. Consider the different vantage points from which the horse is viewed: Homer first presents his location, then his mood, then his destination, his mood again, his body, his mood, and then another destination. The details are selective and support the picture of speed and high-spirits in contrast to confinement, but we are also presented with a day in the life of a stud-horse; ἐϊωθῶς and ἧθεα in particular help open this picture up to an objective pattern of behavior that is presented along with the dramatic breakaway.

In contrast, Ennius has organized his detail with one progression of events in mind, and the horse itself steps consistently into sharper focus. The passage is organized around the experience of a viewer sensitive to logical sequence. The horse runs from the stable to the field in which we see him. The event progresses clearly in one direction, emphasized by the shift from perfect to present tense and further clarified by inde and simul. More striking, however, is the focus into which the horse runs. In the field he has already reached his destination; he is still running, but the attractive description of the field

forestalls any thought of a goal external to the scene. Closer still is the picture of the last two lines, with its focus on the flying mane and finally on his nostrils with their white foam.

An interesting parallel to Ennius' sequential stream-lining of the horse-simile can be found in the opening lines of his Medea (Sc. 246-54 V.= ROL, Sc. 253-61), where he rearranges the order of the nurse's wishes; Euripides had her lament first that the Argonauts ever arrived in Colchis, and then that the Argo had ever been built to take them there. F. Skutsch and Jocelyn ascribe Ennius' alteration of the nurse's speech (in a more logical, if less emotional sequence of expression, she laments the construction of the ship before she laments its voyage), to his adoption of Hellenistic rhetorical standards of exposition, which the ὕστερον πρότερον of Euripides' version violated.[57] Given the nature of the education that most Roman poets received and the value placed upon learnedness (dicti studiosus Ennius describes himself), the conception of poetry as orienting itself around rhetorical rules and incorporating the caveats of scholiasts is not implausible. Ennius' arrangement of detail' however, and his focus owe as much to a subjective perspective as they do to the handbooks. In Homer's simile the experience of the horse is foremost; in Ennius', the action of the horse is more noticeably mediated through the experience of an observer. This sense is also strengthened by Ennius' choice of adjectives, especially caerula, laeta, calida, and albas, which v. Albrecht characterizes as having "Stimmungswerte, die einen neuen Ton ins Epos bringen." [58] These adjectives stand in contrast to Homer's participles and adjectives, which keep specific characteristics of the horse " eng mit der Aktion verbunden,"[59] lending further strength to the impression that Homer's horse is more independent of the perceiver.

---

[57] F. Skutsch 2596; H. D. Jocelyn, ed. The Tragedies of Quintus Ennius (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967) 351.

[58] v. Albrecht, "Pferdegleichnis" 339.

[59] v. Albrecht, "Pferdegleichnis" 338.

Rather than characterizing each description by the shaping vision of the perceiver, Röser and v. Albrecht find Ennius' simile more subjective in its focus on the horse's psychology. According to Röser, "[d]ie Elemente magnis animis- laeta- spiritus-quassat ergeben wieder den Eindruck der Pathetisierung, die auf einer Beseelung, einem Sichhineindenken in das lebendige Wesen beruht."[60] V. Albrecht cautions, however, that "das Seelische" is also present in Homer, especially in πεποιθώς and κυδιόω. Again he identifies the significant differences by employing grammatical distinctions, with Goethe's support, whose characterization of Latin as a substantive (and "befehlshaberische") language and Greek as a verbal language v. Albrecht quotes at length in a note.[61] It is not Ennius' references to the horse's moods that distinguishes his horse from Homer's, v. Albrecht argues, but his use of substantives in doing so; "Bei Homer ist das Seelische partizipial der Hauptbewegung zugeordnet, bei Ennius nominal selbstverständigt."[62] The result is a "psychologische Abstraktion," and it is this substantive abstraction which he calls a specifically Roman feature.

One would perhaps not agree so readily with v. Albrecht's conclusions based on parts of speech if two other phrases did not also lift the horse's spirit into prominence. The first involves what v. Albrecht identifies as another Roman feature, the word-architecture of the phrase vincla suis magnis animis abrupit. In Homer the comparable phrase is the rapid δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας. Ennius' arrangement makes a miniature drama of the event by the separation of object and verb (which is more definitive because finite), a word-order which graphically portrays the tension and emphasizes the horse's magni animi. With anima calida, finally, Ennius is using an expression that can be traced to ancient theories of temperament, or "humours," thus implicating, if only indirectly, a whole complex of

---

[60] Röser 43.

[61] v. Albrecht, "Pferdegleichnis" 338, n.7.

[62] v. Albrecht, "Pferdegleichnis" 338.

psychologizing.[63] Homer's simile ends with a horse galloping into the distance--appropriately, since speed was a leading point of comparison; Ennius closes with nostrils foaming from a fiery temper. Indirectly we know that the horse is at a gallop, but the closing image itself is more expressive of the animal energy that horses have come to symbolize, an energy that was in all probability more appropriate for Ennius' warrior than speed would have been. With its anthropomorphic phrases magnis animis and ex anima calida, Ennius' simile is more a description of a related phenomenon than an independent action that illuminates the narrative with fortuitous parallels, however aptly chosen.

Consideration of another Ennian simile based upon Homer will support the preceding distinctions, as well as open new considerations:

> Concurrunt veluti venti quom spiritus Austri
> imbricitor Aquiloque suo cum flamine contra
> indu mari magno fluctus extollere certant.
>
> RQL 430-32 = 443-5 V.

This simile is not as neatly aligned as the horse-simile with any one version in Homer, who employs a variety of storm-similes to illustrate human behavior. In content Ennius' version is closest to a simile used in depicting the panic and inner turmoil of the Achaians after a bad day of fighting without Achilles:

> ὡς δ' ἄνεμοι δύο πόντον ὀρίνετον ἰχθυόεντα,
> Βορέης καὶ Ζέφυρος, τώ τε Θρῄκηθεν ἄητον,
> ἐλθόντ' ἐξαπίνης· ἄμυδις δέ τε κῦμα κελαινὸν
> κυρθύεται, πολλὸν δὲ παρὲξ ἅλα φῦκος ἔχευεν·
> ὣς ἐδαΐζετο θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν Ἀχαιῶν.
>
> (Il. 9.4-8)

This simile and the one by Ennius have in common the two winds that are both mentioned by name, the ocean with an epithet, and towering waves. Columna has pointed out,

---

[63] v. Albrecht, "Pferdegleichnis"338, n. 4, credits Columna with this observation.

however, that Ennius simile looks to Il. 16.765-8 as well:

> Ὡς δ' Εὖρός τε Νότος τ' ἐριδαίνετον ἀλλήλοιιν
> οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃς βαθέην πελεμιζέμεν ὕλην,
> φηγόν τε μελίην τε τανύφλοιόν τε κράνειαν,
> αἵ τε πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἔβαλον τανυήκεας ὄζους

The contaminatio here involves not so much content as syntax--extollere certant is patterned on ἐριδαίνετον...πελεμιζέμεν -- and context. The storm-simile of Iliad 16 illustrates action in battle (centered around the corpse of Kebriones), not the minds of men. Although once again the narrative action that Ennius' simile illustrates has not survived, the verb concurrunt and the subject matter of Bk. 17 of the Annales strongly suggest a battle-attack for the simile's setting, and not an attack of doubt such as Il. 9.4-8 portrays.[64]

Ennius' storm-simile, in its relationship to the main action, again recalls Hellenistic theory and practice. Its bearing on the main action is more direct than Homer's on a number of points. Once again the syntax is characteristic; Ennius' simile is one closely knit construction, whereas both of its models in Homer show a tendency toward independent description. Ennius' major point of comparison is made more explicit by the location of concurrunt.; it belongs to the narrative action and yet is placed in the line alone before veluti. The simile is thereby specifically concentrated on this single aspect of the action.

Ennius further meshes his simile with the narrative action (as expressed by concurrunt) by altering the direction of Homer's winds. In both of the Homeric similes quoted above, as well as in a third storm-simile (Il. 11.305-6), Homer describes storms that are stirred up by winds from contiguous quarters of the compass: north and west wind arise, east and south, or west and south. The results are tumultuous but not so neatly reflective of a head-on charge as Ennius' clashing of winds from opposite quarters of the

---

64 Warmington identifies the main action as a cavalry charge in the Third Macedonian War; another fragment from Bk. 17 (ROL 429= 439 V) supports this conjecture: It eques et plausu cava concutit ungula terram.

sky.[65] His direct opposition of north and south winds is also emphasized by contra, in place of which Ennius might easily have modified flamine with an adjective (although magnus, for Ennius what ingens was for Virgil, an ubiquitous favorite, has been pre-empted for mari in the next line). As for descriptive independence, although imbricitor and flamine have no allegorical relation to the main text, clearly they are not characterized by the same degree of independence and indirectness as ἰχθυόεντα (9.4) and φῦκος, "seaweed"(9.7).

Ennius' greater emphasis on opposing forces not only reflects a different style of writing, but of fighting as well; Homeric battle, at least as represented by the action which forms the settings for the storm-similes in Bks. 11 and 16, is not a cavalry or infantry charge from opposites sides of a field. Instead, we must often picture a melee without drawn lines (as in the fight for the body of Kebriones) or the rampage of an aristocratic hero (such as Hector's rout of the Achaians in Bk. 11). Ennius, on the other hand, very likely has in mind the carefully choreographed attack of men en masse that characterized warfare in his day and at the time of the dramatic action. As was the case with the horse-simile, Homer and Ennius have a different conception of the main action to which differences in their similes can be traced. In this case, however, the alterations are due more to cultural differences in warfare than differing psychological perspectives.

The last line of Ennius' storm simile--

Indu mari magno fluctus extollere certant

deserves closer attention for its clustering of various poetic mannerisms. Indu, as was mentioned earlier, is an archaic form, perhaps encouraged by the variety of Homeric forms for the same prepositions. Mari magno, although it has no strict Homeric parallel, recalls epithetical phrases, and specifically πόντον ... ἰχθυόεντα (above, Il. 9.4). Ennius' epithet, however, not only accords with Hellenistic standards of association in

[65] O. Skutsch concurs: "Ennius, illustrating the movement of the two armies against each other, replaces the north-west [wind] by the south." (The Annals, pp. 593-4)

contrast to Homer's "fishy," but also caters to his general taste in adjectives; the phrase magnis animis in the horse-simile occasions v. Albrecht's observation that Ennius "verwendet zur Erhohung- im Unterschied zu Homer- weniger qualitativ als quantitative steigernde Adjective."[66] Lastly, extollere certant shows Homeric influence of another sort; Kroll identifies it as a Grecism, categorizing it as "die Ausdehnung des Gebrauches des Infinitiv auf Verben."[67] Ennius bequeathed this use of certare with an infinitive to later Roman poets, although in classical prose usage it is customarily followed by cum, de, or a final subjunctive.

The archaism, the Homeric phrase, and the Homerism in this last line suggest one more difference between Ennius' simile and Homer's. H. Fränkel argues that similes in the Iliad diverge noticeably, both in style and content, from the narrative in which they are embedded; he characterizes their nature and purpose thus: "die zahlreiche Gleichnisse [geben] Einblicke in das natürliche Weltbild...das von dem künstlichen der Erzählung sharf absticht... Hier ist man nicht altertümelnd und nicht vornehm."[68] Although Fränkel may draw the distinction between the freer composition of the similes (and speeches) and the "spröde verhaltene Erzählung" too sharply, it is safe to say that in Ennius no comparable relationship between a formal narrative and cotidian similes can be found. The epic mannerisms of the storm-simile (which also include the compound imbricitcr) suggest the opposite, that his similes are excursions of the highest style, such as one would expect in connection with Ennius' appropriation of Homer as I earlier depicted it (p. 39). What Homer in language plainer than usual drew from the everyday world in the interests of variety and illustration Ennius in finest epic diction drew from Homer in the interest of elevation. In this case, however, it is elevation purchased at the expense of

---

[66] v. Albrecht, "Pferdegleichnis" 339.

[67] Kroll 250-51.

[68] H. Fränkel, Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums (Munich: Beck, 1962) 44.

illumination. The failure of Ennius' storm-simile to do both is due to an unfortunate combination of a Homeric simile and Hellenistic standards of conformity; nature, instead of illuminating the main action by virtue of of its greater familiarity to the audience, is altered to conform to the cavalry charge of the narrative, so that Ennius' winds meet in a diametric opposition that is more schematically correct than vividly apparent. Homer's similes are the result of a fresh look at the world; still cast in the age-old conventions of oral-poetry, they are yet harbingers of the coming lyric voice more suited to express individual experience. Ennius' storm-simile, on the other hand, augurs the opposite, a literature whose reference points are found not so much in the world of the senses as in the literary world of one's predecessors.

Ennius' horse-simile shows that Homer and Hellenistic standards are not always parents to failure. His finest extant simile, however, is something uniquely Roman, and has no Homeric parallel; it describes the crowd that waits anxiously as Romulus and Remus take the auspices to determine which of them will rule:

> Omnibus cura viris uter esset induperator.
> expectant, veluti consul cum mittere signum
> volt omnes avidi spectant ad carceris oras,
> quam mox emittat pictis e faucibus currus:
> sic exspectabat populus atque ore timebat,
> rebus utri magni victoria sit data regni.
>
> 83-88 V. = ROL 87-92

This simile has the same degree of direct bearing on the main action as the two previously discussed, if it is not still more direct, since the major element of comparison is not expressed in different terms at all. Whereas in the horse-simile an essential identity between martial fury and equine energy was suggested by magnis animis and ex anima calida, here crowd is expressly compared with crowd, both of them silent and awaiting a signum. The simile is also verbally interwoven with the narrative by the repetition

expectant-spectant-exspectabat.[69] Yet the simile is richer than either the horse- or storm-simile. It shares with the former an ability to render an action more vivid by means of an action better known or more easily imagined, but it operates on two other levels as well. Most immediately, it describes something Roman with something Roman, and with a social and political specificity perhaps unparalled in ancient similes (the Aeneid's opening simile, I.148-153, is impressive and political, but not nearly so overtly and concretely Roman). It also establishes an intriguing historical irony, as the splendor and power of urban Rome in Ennius' day is juxtaposed with its rustic origins.[70] The relationship between the simile and the main action is thus much more complex than the unilateral illustration of the text by the simile; each action illuminates the other, and both together create an image of Rome in which victory and command are the prominent features.

Another passage from the Annales handed down by Macrobius because it stands between Virgil and Homer is the famous tree-felling scene, which, excepting alliterative lines remembered for ridicule, is probably the most often quoted passage from Ennius' poetry. Perhaps its appeal stems from its ability to capture the solemn tones of old Republican Rome while at the same time sounding a note of the future. As I will show, this sense of poetry to come is suggested in spite of Virgil's own re-working of the passage (Aen. 6. 179-82), which in its refinement of sound and rhythm would have us think of Ennius' version as rugged and monotonous.

Homer's tree-felling description is found in Il. 23. 114-122:

---

[69] See v. Kameke 19-20.

[70] Later Roman poets were fond of similar juxtapositions; cf. Aeneid 8.99-100, 347-8; Propertius 4.1.1-38, 4.4.3-14.

οἱ δ' ἴσαν ὑλοτόμους πελέκεας ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες
σειράς τ' εὐπλέκτους· πρὸ δ' ἅρ' οὐρῆες κίον αὐτῶν.
πολλὰ δ' ἄναντα κάταντα πάραντά τε δόχμιά τ' ἦλθον·
ἀλλ' ὅτε δὴ κνημοὺς προσέβαν πολυπίδακος Ἴδης,
αὐτίκ' ἄρα δρῦς ὑψικόμους ταναήκεϊ χαλκῷ
τάμνον ἐπειγόμενοι· ταὶ δὲ μεγάλα κτυπέουσαι
πῖπτον· τὰς μὲν ἔπειτα διαπλήσσοντες Ἀχαιοὶ
ἔκδεον ἡμιόνων· ταὶ δὲ χθόνα ποσσὶ δατεῦντο
ἐλδόμεναι πεδίοιο διὰ ῥωπήϊα πυκνά.

Il.23. 114-122

Ennius renders this as follows:

> Incedunt arbusta per alta, securibus caedunt,
> percellunt magnas quercus, exciditur ilex,
> fraxinus frangitur atque abies consternitur alta,
> pinus proceras pervortunt: omne sonabat
> arbustum fremitu silvai frondosai.

ROL 181-5= 187-191

Both pairs of similes discussed earlier prepare one for the differences between these tree-cutting scenes. Homer presents an action in its entirety; we see the men prepare to depart, depart,travel to their destination, arrive at where they chop, fell, and split wood, load up, and head back. As with his description of the horse and the storm, once Homer starts a scene he gives the impression that the action itself, and not the art of the poet, determines the scope of the description. This impression is strengthened by the consistency of detail and attention: nothing is singled out for emphasis. This consistency, what Auerbach calls "uniform illumination," is a large part of Homer's objectivity, just as, conversely, emphasis and an uncommon concentration upon one aspect of an act can inject the subjective voice into a scene and call attention to its creator.

Ennius' description, if we can trust Macrobius to have quoted all the verse relevant to Homer's version, is not merely condensed, but centered on one act among the many presented by Homer, the act of felling trees. A short introduction locates the men in the

woods and sets them chopping; this is followed by the felling of five different trees to Homer's one.

Although both critics fail to draw conclusions suggested by the scene's context, Gratwick and Williams provide informative readings of this passage, and are both alert to the human qualities of Ennius' trees. Williams writes:

> [E]ach tree has its own special verb to describe its felling, sometimes with alliteration and always with some effect of assonance. The effect is to personalize the fate of each type of tree, to express in the exuberance of verbal effects the destruction of a great wood as something to be felt, emotionally perceived by the reader.[71]

Adjectives play a determining role in this effect. Except for frondosai, they are all of a kind: alta, magnas, alta again, proceras, and omne insistently bring the quality of greatness to the fore. Homer's oaks are of course ὑψικόμους , but that is formulaic and an essential element of oaks, and not a characteristic emphasized for a particular passage.

The last phrase of Ennius' scene injects a further element of pathos absent from Homer's version:

omne sonabat

arbustum fremitu silvai frondosai

Steuart, although missing the significance of Ennius' word-choice, nonetheless draws attention to an easily over-looked feature of the passage: " Unless we assume it for the last line of the passage, it is difficult to see any distinction between arbustum and silvai."[72] Perhaps there is no established distinction outside this last line, but in this context the distinction is clearly between a whole (omne/. . .arbustum) which responds at the felling of

---

[71] G. Williams, Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry (Oxford: Oxford UP, 1968) 263.

[72] Steuart 143.

a part (silvai). This introduces the notion of a community alongside the picture of great individual trees. Gratwick arrives at this notion from a different direction: "fremitus is not the sound of trees crashing to the ground... but the more continuous murmuring rustle of the leaves of the forest, commenting, as it were, on the destruction of the great lords of their community."[73]

My earlier discussion of similes demonstrated that some of the most significant differences between the similes of Homer and Ennius concerned the thematic relevance of their descriptions. Ennius' reluctance to stray from the narrative suggests that the same standard of association might also inform this scene in (or "of") the woods. In both Ennius and Homer the wood is cut to cremate fallen warriors (Ennius' warriors have fallen in the battle of Heraclea).[74] In Homer, the question of the scene's narrative function does not arise; the funeral rites call for wood, and the description of lumbering is simply part of the narrative. Ennius, on the other hand, focuses on one aspect of the process, and fashions what is more a dramatic ecphrasis than a uniform progression of narrative. He then joins this description to its episode by thematic ties. To do this, he first limits his description to the felling of trees; splitting and loading them on mules, for instance, would destroy their association with fallen warriors. The trees are then personalized futher with the attention they receive from verb and adjective, as I described above with Williams' help. The true success of Ennius' scene, however, is its ability not only to inject pathos into the narrative, but to link both battle and funeral together in one vision. This it does by having thematic connections both with the battle that preceded it and the funeral that must have followed it: the former is mirrored in the individualized destruction of specific trees, and the latter in the

---

[73] Gratwick 71.

[74] After the battle of Heraclea Ennius has Pyrrhus make what Steuart calls "the most famous single speech preseved from Ennius" (p. 143). She goes on to identify the occasion of the speech as the embassy of Fabricius to negotiate for the ransom of prisoners taken at Heraclea; this then suggests another facet to Ennius' borrowing from Homer, since the Achaians in Bk 23 gathered wood just before the ransoming of Hector in Bk 24.

larger wood that keens a response. Individual heroism is thus set in a communal context, and different aspects of warfare are brought together in unusual proximity. This is not to suggest that Homer lacked such a vision of warfare and knew no pathos in connection with it; in fact, the tension between glory and loss is central to the Iliad.[75] Characteristically, however, Homer contrives the juxtaposition of warrior and community by narrative action, as in the meeting of Hector and Andromache, for instance, or Achilles and Priam. Instead of narrative confrontation, Ennius has ingeniously arranged a potentially objective scene so that it reflects and emotionally colors the narrative events that it links.

It is perhaps now easier to see why Ennius' tree-cutting scene reminds one of Virgil, apart from the latter's own rendition. Virgil in his Eclogues is credited with the discovery of a spiritual landscape, but Ennius has taken an important step in that direction. Even more than the Eclogues, however, Ennius' tree-felling scene recalls the Georgics, perhaps because on the surface it too is more business-like than bucolic, and in reality more substance than a setting for something else. Natural description into which a human pathos has been injected and which maintains multiple thematic ties to other parts of the poem, elements which characterize Ennius' passage, is the stuff that the Georgics are made of. A major difference in the use of such a technique is that thematic relevance in the Georgics is a much more complex issue, without the clear reference points that Ennius' annalistically arranged subject matter provided him.

There is another sense in which Ennius' text is more internally oriented than Homer's narrative patterned on an objective event. Williams refers to the passage's

---

[75] See Seth Schein, The Mortal Hero (Berkeley: U of California P, 1984) 68-72, esp. 71: "The human situation in the Iliad might well be called tragic, because the very activity--killing--that confers honor and glory necessarily involves the death not only of other warriors who live and die by the same values as their conquerers, but eventually, in most cases, also of the conquerors themselves. Thus, the same action is creative or fruitful and at the same time both destructive and self-destructive." See also C.W. Macleod, "Homer on Poetry and the Poetry of Homer," Collected Essays (Oxford: Clarendon Pr., 1983) 2.

"sonority and complication" and "an exuberance of verbal effects."[76] One need not deny Homer's artistry or overlook the jingling ἄνεντα κάτεντα παρεντά τε and the onomatopoeic enjambment of κτυπέουσα / πίτνον to affirm the greater attention given to arrangement and verbal effects in Ennius' passage. Instead of a series of actions equal in import and described in a steady progression from beginning to end, Ennius' scene is framed between an introduction that swiftly locates the action and a generalizing conclusion (in which the tense-shift of sonabat plays a role). Arbusta in the first line and arbustum in the last further serve to frame the passage. More elaborate, however, is the patterning that characterizes the description of the individual trees at the passage's core, which is organized around an elaborate chiasmus. In the sequence of verbs percellunt-exciditur-frangitur-consternitur-pervortunt, plural active verbs frame singular passive verbs. This chiasmus itself, however, is framed within another chiasmus keyed on parts of speech, the verb-adjective-noun sequence of percellunt magnas quercus at the beginning of the "catalogue" being the reverse of pinus proceras pervortunt at its end.[77] This elaborate arrangement, in conjunction with the rhythm of accumulated phrases, assonance, alliteration (c, q, and x in 182, f and a in 183, p in 184) and the slow and sonorous spondees of silvai frondosai, is on quite a different order from the passage's Homeric model.[78]

---

[76] Williams, Tradition 263.

[77] Few rhetorical devices employed by later writers were unknown to Homer, but to base word-play on such grammatical distinctions would seem to require a conceptualization of language that developed only later when required for accurate philosophical debate (cf. Aristotle's Categories).

[78] Martitz, in Ennius: Entretiens sur l'antiquite classique, t.17 ed. by O Skutsch (Geneva: Foundation Hardt, 1972) finds the passage's accumulation of phrases to be a Roman trait and compairs Ennius with Plautus in this respect (p. 265). Perhaps a more telling comparison for this feature would once again be with the lustration-prayer quoted by Cato (e.g., de agri. 141.2: calamitates intemperiasque prohibessis defendas averruncesque).

The preceding passage's heavy reliance on sound effects and formal abstraction for expressive power is matched by numerous passages from Ennius' adaptations of Greek tragedy. His versions have frequently been maligned as rhetorical shadows of original poetry. F. Skutsch characterizes the plays as "meist nüchtern-allgemeine...gegenüber der sinnlich-kräftigen Ausdrucksweise des Griechen."[79] Gratwick, noting that two of the major features of Roman tragedy are the "cultivation of rhetoric" and the "stimulation not of the intellect but the emotions," refers (in remarks occasioned by ROL sc. 262-3) to Ennius' "contrived assonance and alliteration of the Latin, and the regrettable exaggeration....absent from the original. All these traits are characteristic not only of Ennius but all the Roman dramatists."[80] In the last century such judgments were supported by a general preference for the cultural accomplishments of Hellas over those of Rome. Today it is the prevailing poetics which often hinders a critical assessment of much Roman poetry. Modern sensibilities have been educated by a poetics which places a premium on visual clarity. Its most influential champions are found in Pound and Eliot, who, in a reaction against the smooth music and comfortable cliché of post-Victorian literature, cultivated precise and often striking visual images that Pound called the "luminous detail," something he found in relatively few ancient writers, with Sappho, Catullus, and Martial among the exceptions.

Williams, in his discussion of "Observation, Description and Imagination" in Roman poetry, notes that the Roman "tendency to allow stylistic interests to take precedence over precision of visual expression" is in part due to a "lack of interest in immediate observation;" instead they "interpose between their own vision and the real world the already existing descriptions of earlier writers."[81] Auerbach writes of a similar

---

[79] F. Skutsch 2596.

[80] Gratwick 130,134-5.

[81] Williams, Tradition 636.

distance between Roman literature and what he calls "concrete reality." His analysis of the prose of Gregory of Tours provides the occasion for the following remarks:

> Gregory's literary Latin not only is decadent grammatically and syntactically, it is used in his work to an end for which, originally or at least in its heyday, it seemed little suited--that is, to imitate concrete reality. For the literary Latin, and especially the literary prose, of the golden age is an almost excessively organizing language, in which the material and sensory side of the facts is rather viewed and ordered from above than vividly presented in its materiality and sensoriness.[82]

William's "real world" and Auerbach's "concrete reality," while they serve to draw distinctions with which I am in agreement, perhaps reveal epistemological presumptions ultimately inimical to most Roman poetry. At any rate, unless one judges an increase in rhetorical techniques, especially those concerning sound, to be an a priori descent, one is still left with the task of assessing what Ennius has gained and lost in each individual passage translated from the Greek. A few examples will show that the individual results of a common tendency can vary widely in their success.

Ennius frequently introduces an antithesis where there was none in the Greek or highlights one that was latent in the original. On several occasions he has done so at the expense of drama (if one can judge from other fragments and assumptions involving the original) ; when Ennius' Medea, for instance, hints at revenge, her words seem more determined by the elaborate antitheses than by the "reality" of the plot:

> mihi maerores illi luctum, exitium illi exilium mihi

As illi refers to Creon (the subject of preceding lines), when the dust of sound and figure clears, it appears that "Ennius has substituted vagueness and confusion for dramatic

---

[82] Erich Auerbach, Mimesis trans. by W. R. Trask (Princeton: Princeton UP, 1953) 89.

irony."[83] Perhaps equally costly is the antithesis between amoris and honoris in ROL sc. 286:

Tu me amoris magis quam honoris servavisti gratia.

In the accusation that Jason makes against Medea, it makes little sense to contrast actions based on amoris and and those based on honoris: no one, certainly not Euripides' Jason, would have demanded that Medea do something for the sake of honoris; the Greek Jason merely argues that it was Aphrodite rather than a personal esteem that led Medea to save him (a weak enough argument).[84] Again, word-play and the autonomous attraction of a sententia may have caused Ennius to lose sight of the plot. The antithetical cast of Agamemnon's rebuttal to Menelaus in Iphigenia (ROL sc. 232-4), on the other hand, is merely a concentrated expression of antithetical character that Euripides himself had given to the brothers' speeches.[85] A subtler instance of an added antithesis, coupled with sound effects, alters the sensibility of a line from Euripides' Hecuba (760):

ὁρᾷς νέκρον τόνδ' οὖ καταστάζω δάκρυ;

Ennius has:

Vide hunc meae in quem lacrumae guttatim cadunt

ROL sc. 213

---

[83] Jocelyn, Tragedies 368. See Jocelyn 366-8 for a closer discussion of the fragment and its Greek model. ROL sc. 280 takes its cue from Euripides' Medea 399-400.

[84] See Gratwick 136: "honoris is Ennius' addition, for the sake of a jingle; it is in fact illogical, for honos, the reward of a public man, is irrelevant here." Possession of the entire drama might make us change our minds, however; Ennius, like Ovid, might show enough dramatic subtlety to convince us that Jason, and not the playwright, is the one who has lost sight of things. The rhetorical arguments of Euripides' Jason are also sometimes less than convincing.

[85] Ennius' version runs:

Ego proiector quod tu peccas? Tu delinquis, ego arguor?
Pro malefactis Helena redeat, virgo pereat innocens?
Tua reconcilietur uxor, mea necetur filia?

Although there is no such cluster of antitheses in Euripides' version, they occur throughout: cf. 384, 401, 396-7, 482-4, 494.

Traina's remarks on the line are worth quoting:

> Il verso euripideo è semplice e solenne, statuario come il gruppo della Pietà cristiana: ogni particolare è subordinato a questa visione d'insieme. In latino i due protagonisti, la madre e il figlio, perdono rilievo, questo per la soppressione di νέκρον, quella perché viene solo indirettamente evocata dal possessivo meae."[86]

Ennius' version has lost some of the original's stark intensity, but his juxtaposition of hunc and meae is perhaps more expressive of a real mother's emotions: the painful word "corpse" is avoided with hunc, and the bond between mother and son is suggested by the word-order.

I will not further digress by considering all the instances in the tragedies in which Röser and Traina have found an added Pathetisierung, or where others have found "ein mächtiger Ausdruck des Euripides durch eine klingende Figur ersetzt wird."[87] In closing, however, a connection might be made between two apparently unrelated characterizations of Roman literature discussed in the Introduction (pp. v-vi). Otis viewed subjectivity as the distinguishing feature of Roman literature, while Leeman, in many points seconded by G.Williams, noted its penchant for rhetorical effect, primarily in the repetition of sound, sense, and pattern. The conjunction of both features as identified above in contrast to Homer suggests the connection between sound effect and figure on the one hand and an increased subjectivity on the other. Although neither is by any means a necessary or sufficient condition of the other, a relationship becomes apparent if one considers that sound-effect and pattern are the essence of music, the least representational of the arts. The direct source of such elements in art is not an external object or train of events (except in the

---

[86] Traina 137. R. Brooks, no unsympathetic critic of Ennius' dramas, remained unimpressed by the sound as well: "Hecuba's tears were not intended to tinkle on Polydorus' corpse, however well-intentioned the image" (p.184). If one considers the sound and image apart from dramatic context, however, "tinkle" seems somewhat demeaning for a line not unworthy of Virgil.

[87] Leo 191.

most blatantly onomatopoeic phrases), but the poet's self. Subjectivity, such as characterized the horse-simile both in its viewer-oriented arrangement and its portrayal of emotion, is not the necessary result, but a concern for sound and figure can draw the poet from the external world and plant him at the center of his own, in which the word does not so much rely on its ability to refer to an object as on its place in a pattern determined by the poet. Ennius' tree-felling scene is a good example; there sound-effect and pattern (such as chiasmus) do not so much render the woods more striking and concrete (as sounds sometimes can, e.g., Pound's "petals on a wet, black bough") as they establish a sense of enclosure, a self-referential system. Ennius' textually-oriented similes also point in this direction. The connection with subjectivity is twofold: first, the poet need not, in Arnold's phrase, keep his eye firmly on the object, but relies, in the extent to which his verse is musical, on patterns of his own creation. Secondly, when fidelity to visual perceptions and an objective train of events recedes in importance, in their place the shapes of the mind and its emotions can more readily be introduced.

Chapter III:
Lucretius and Homer

Homer's role in De Rerum Natura is not nearly so prominent as it was in the Annales. In Lucretius there is no insistence on the importance of Homer, nothing like Ennius' frequent phrase-borrowings, his Homerisms, and his self-image as the alter Homerus; the Homeric phrases are few, especially considering the number of lines that remain in comparison to the Annales. Yet Homer is present in style, in content, and in person. In this chapter I will consider first the figure of Homer in De Rerum Natura, and follow with a few remarks on Lucretius' diction and formulaic verse as they relate to the Homeric poems. I will then examine a variety of Homeric passages and reminiscences in Lucretius, and consider not only where Lucretius followed Homer, in his descriptions of divine space and thunder, for instance, but also where he recalls scenes in Homer only to discredit the unphilosophical outlook that they express and encourage.

The double-natured reception of the Homeric in Lucretius reflects in part the double-nature of DRN. The tension in the work between philosophy and poetry is not merely an abstract issue of a genre's capacity to traffic in both image and concept, the worlds of both logic and imagination; it is personalized by Lucretius' specific poetic and philosophical models. Epicureanism was the ancient school least favorable to poetry; its founder, in fact "was notoriously hostile to poetry," (cf. D.L. 10.13).[1] This, however, does not seem to have inhibited Lucretius; where he breaks from his master in the matter of

[1] E.J. Kenney, ed., Lucretius: De Rerum Natura: III (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971) 14.

poetry, he does so boldly, proud of the whole tradition and accepting the specialness of poetic inspiration. It is in this context of a poetic calling that Homer is an important figure in DRN; he is mentioned in the work not because he is the poetic model on which Lucretius relied most, but because he stands at the head of a tradition, a tradition which had its own authorities, Epicurus not among them. Homer's supremacy within the poetic tradition is acknowledged in the second of the two appearances of his name in DRN. In an argument on the universality of death (framed as an imaginary speech, 3.1025-52), Epicurus appears as the crown of creation, humanity's ipse(1042): even he had to die. Homer, however, is portrayed as supreme in his own realm: envision among the dead, Lucretius says (1037-8),

> . . . Heliconiadum comites, quorum unus Homerus
> sceptra potitus.

Ennius, it was shown earlier, wanted to graft his epic specifically to Homer's epic, and the appearance of Homer in the Annales helped to establish a sense of continuity between Ennian and Homeric epic. The Homer in DRN is, in contrast, a figurehead for a whole tradition (quorum unus) of serious poetry to which Lucretius wants to link his work, rather than a single, critical model for composition and reference.

Ennius and Homer appear together in Bk. I of DRN, and both poets are praised for qualities that Lucretius also envisions for his own work, originality and lasting fame: Ennius it was who

> . . . primus amoeno
> detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam,
> per gentis Italas hominum quae clara clueret;
>
> 1.117-9

In the same passage Homer is referred to as semper florentis (124).[2] In such phrases Lucretius speaks as a poet about fellow poets, his ancestors in poetic glory. Yet these

[2] For similar claims made by Lucretius about his own poetry, see 1.28, where he asks Venus to grant his verse aeternum. . . leporem, and 1.926-930.

compliments in Bk I, which do not strike me as insincere or ironic, are delivered in passing, occasioned only by criticism leveled at the content of what Ennius and (as will be shown below) Homer wrote. Lucretius' ability to revere and criticize these poets in the same breath is thus in part a function of his ability to separate style from content, poetic inspiration from results; that Homer leaves much to be desired when his picture of the world is measured against Epicurean doctrine by no means diminishes his stature as a poet, or the stature of poetry in general. Lucretius would thus not have understood Jerome's problem with Cicero.

The discussion of Homeric diction and formulaic phrases in Lucretius can be brief. As to diction, Lucretius simply had no need to look to Homer to create a register suitable for didactic epos; the patrii sermonis egestas was a problem for philosophical discourse, but not for epic style. For this the Annales provided the most important model, with its archaizing diction and morphology, its tmesis, compound words, periphrases, and metrical variations for the same word.[3] Ennius thus played the role for Lucretius that Homer played for Ennius. In drawing on Ennius, however, Lucretius was bound at times to draw on Homer as well. This explains such usages as suaviloquenti, indu, and dius (for "divine"); when they appear in DRN, one feels certain that Lucretius is looking to Ennius and not back to Homer, who was Ennius' model for these usages (see pp.44-45).[4]

---

[3] Some of G. Townend's caution in the study of Cicero's verse models must be applied to the study of Lucretius as well: ". . . a few odd lines from such writers as Accius. . . indicate only how much heroic and didactic verse from a crucial formative period has been lost to us." G. B. Townend, "The Poems," in Cicero, ed. T.A. Dorey (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965) 124.

[4] Indu is used throughout DRN; for dius as "divine" see Bailey's note on 1.22; suaviloquenti, which Ennius (ROL 300= 303V.) formed on the pattern of Homer's ἡδυεπής (Il. 1.248), is in Lucretius (1.945) used in connection with honey (1.947). This perhaps reflects Homer directly as well as Ennius, since in Homer ἡδυεπὴς appears in conjunction with μέλιτος γλυκίων (Il. 1.249).

Although not concerned with Homeric influence, J. D. Minyard has shown how prevalent phrase, verse, and passage formulae are in DRN.[5] The content of these formulae frequently carries no epic associations (id quoque enim, for example, necessest [see Bailey, Comm. 1.146] and nam quodcumque suis mutatum finibus exit [1.670= 1.792=2.753=3.519]). Lucretius' subject matter of course limits the relevance of many of Homer's formulae; a large majority of phrases in Homer, formulaic or not, just have no place in DRN; even such familiar formulae as τὸν δ' ἠμείβετ' and ὣς φάμενος, which Ennius also found useful and rendered with olli respondit and haec ecfatus (see p.38), are irrelevant for a work with almost no dialogue. Nor, with the one exception already mentioned, are the phrases and scenes characteristic of Homer's divine machinery, which played a large part in Ennius' creation of an epic style, very useful for Lucretius' message. Whereas Ennius tried to create the illusion in the Annales of an omnipresent Homer (see p.51), in DRN the same use of Homer would have ubiquitously introduced associations irrelevant to the argument; Homeric allusions were for Lucretius a two-edged sword, and are either carefully controlled, as later discussion will show, or largely avoided.

Yet in a sense Lucretius' formulaic verse was a means by which he could both avoid unwanted associations with Homeric epic and at the same time lend his work an ubiquitous epic grandeur. This was possible so long as the Lucretian formulae had no specific Homeric associations; their content had to be Lucretian, suitable for his teachings.[6] It is fair to ask, however, if repetition itself, without Homeric content, has anything Homeric or even epic about it. I think it does. All genres have standard phrasings, but not

---

[5] J. D. Minyard, Mode and Value in the De Rerum Natura: A Study in Lucretius' Metrical Language (Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner Verlag, 1978).

[6] Although Homeric heroes inhabit a different sphere altogether from Lucretius' hero, one Homeric phrase does suit Epicurus: ad caelum gloria fertur(6.8). The same passage praising Epicurus' service to mankind contains another Homeric reminiscence, mortalibus aegris (6.1) rendering δειλοῖσι βροτοῖσι (Od.11.19).

on the order of the repetitions found in epic, Roman as well as Homeric. More difficult to determine is whether Lucretius, in his use of formulae, has taken his cue from Ennius or Homer. Repetitions of lines and phrases must have been common enough throughout the Annales, but we cannot be sure about longer repetitions; we do not have any examples of formulaic scenes from Ennius, and it is very possible that he did not follow Homer this far. Lucretius, however, repeats several lengthy passages verbatim, with none of the variatio that characterizes the reappearance of a scene in Virgil's epic (e.g., Aen. 6. 179-82 and 11. 134-8). The associations of such repetitions, it seems to me, can only be Homeric, regardless of their didactic content.

To say that a phrase or technique has Homeric (or generally epic) associations is not to deny it other meanings and functions in Lucretius' text; the example of Homer's formulaic verse also authorizes a style appropriate for a philosophical poem but in conflict with the poetic sensibility of Lucretius' times. W. S. Maguinness writes: "One of the conditions imposed by the need for clarity was a greater acceptance of repetition than was considered elegant by most writers and comparative neglect of the conventional virtue of varietas."[7] Formulaic verse thus both sets Lucretius' poetry apart (a basic function of epic mannerisms), and allows for clarity, since accurate repetitions are given precedence over approximate variations.[8] Lucretius was not shy of idiosyncrasy, but here his divergence from contemporary norms of repetition finds a sanction in Homer, and a potentially estranging demand of philosophy is satisfied with a dignifying poetic technique.

In turning now to Homeric passages in Lucretius, one finds that here also the desire for accuracy and clarity is involved. Sellar made a telling comparison of the two writers

---

[7] W. S. Maguinness, "The Language of Lucretius," in Lucretius, ed. by D. R. Dudley (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1965) 73. See also Cyril Bailey, ed. Titi Lucreti Cari de Rerum Natura, 3 vols. (Oxford: Clarendon, 1947) 156.

[8] Kenney, in the introduction to his edition of DRN III (pp. 22-23), also attributes Lucretius' morphological variations and archaic endings to the poet's desire for clarity, overlooking the epic tone that Lucretius could not have ignored.

when he referred to Lucretius' "clear representation of outward things--a faculty in which he is equalled or surpassed by Homer alone among all the writers of antiquity."[9] For G. Williams, Lucretius is the exception to the general Roman disregard of visual accuracy, and has "an unparalled talent for describing observed phenomena in verse."[10] Not suprisingly, two of the passages Lucretius borrows from Homer illustrate natural phenomena. The first illustrates how objects can appear to be at rest even though their components never cease moving: from high on a hill the maneuvers of a legion in mock battle appear merely as an even sheen on the still plain. Part of the action when seen up close is taken from Homer's description of troops preparing for battle:

αἴγλη δ' οὐρανὸν ἷκε, γέλασσε δὲ πᾶσα περὶ χθὼν
χαλκοῦ ὑπὸ στεροπῆς· ὑπὸ δὲ κτύπος ὦρνυτο ποσσὶν
ἀνδρῶν·

Il. 19.362-4

Lucretius has:

> fulgor ibi ad caelum se tollit, totaque circum
> aere renidescit tellus, subterque virum vi
> excitur pedibus sonitus. . .
>
> (2.325-7)

The correspondence is close throughout, but what most suggests that Homer's text as well as personal observation lies behind this description is renidescit, which, since its base renideo means both to shine and to smile, maintains the metaphor of Homer's verb while incorporating the gleam of στεροπῆς, otherwise untranslated. It is instructive to follow Lucretius further as his description departs from Homer (327-8):

---

[9] W. Y. Sellar, Roman Poets of the Republic (Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1863) 211, referred to by Townend, p.104.

[10] G. Williams, Tradition 635; see also 663-668.

. . . clamoreque montes

icti reiectant voces ad sidera mundi

Lucretius may be the exception among Roman poets for the sharp eye he keeps on his object, but he is nonetheless susceptible to the charms of music; here, where Homer's influence ceases, sound predominates, especially in icti reiectant voces, while the exaggeration of ad sidera mundi adds little to a description of daytime maneuvers. [11]

A second example shows Lucretius looking, not suprisingly, to a Homeric simile as a model for a description of a natural phenomenon. Lucretius illustrates with an event closer to home how a bolt of lighning in a moist cloud produces thunder :

ut calidis candens ferrum e fornacibus olim

stridit, ubi in gelidum propere demersimus imbrem.

Homer before him had also gone to the blacksmith's shop for a parallel to the equally distant act of blinding a giant's eye with a red-hot olive stake:

ὡς δ' ὅτ' ἀνὴρ χαλκεὺς πέλεκυν μέγαν ἠὲ σκέπαρνον
εἰν ὕδατι ψυχρῷ βάπτῃ μεγάλα ἰάχοντα
φαρμάσσων· τὸ γὰρ αὖτε σιδήρου γε κράτος ἐστίν·

Od. 9.391-3

At the heart of each poet's illustration is the sound, stridit and ἰάχοντα, but in their description of this phenomenon characteristic differences of the two poets appear. Homer is circumstantially thorough in his simile; he identifies the tool-- "an ax, or an adze"-- and glosses the act of tempering metal with its purpose: τὸ γὰρ αὖτε σιδήρου γε κράτος ἐστίν. Lucretius makes Homer's implied antithesis between hot and cold overt, by adding calidis candens, and he shows a greater interest in sound effects, with the pronounced alliteration of c's and f's in the first line and

[11] See G. Williams, Tradition 667: ". . . there is always in [Lucretius'] descriptions a danger that, despite his unparalled visual accuracy of perception, the sound will drown the impressions of sight."

the enjambment of the crucial word. Both poets were perhaps interested in the onomatopoeic s's of φαρμάσσων and demersimus.

Both imitations discussed above show that Lucretius, in contrast to Ennius, is concerned primarily with Homer's powers of description, and not with the introduction of epic style and theme. In the second example, Polyphemus and Odysseus have no place in Lucretius; Homer has merely provided a useful image, in this case a simile, whose original setting is irrelevant. In the case of the first description, Lucretius, while culling an image from Homer, may also have engaged an epic theme , but his treatment re-evaluates it. Battle is of course central to the Iliad, and the description of troop movements in 19.362-4 precedes the crucial, long-awaited return of Achilles to battle; it is vital action. Lucretius not only makes the description ancillary to atomic theory, he puts it in a perspective that makes the maneuvers seem ultimately insignificant. First, the description is coupled with another illustration, one of sheep playing on a distant hillside. Secondly, Lucretius follows his important-sounding description of maneuvers close-up with a view of the action from the distance:

> et tamen est quidam locus altis montibus inde
> stare videntur et in campis consistere fulgor.

'Yet from a certain spot high in the hills, they seem to stand still, a single gleam settled on the fields.' These two lines might stand as a schematic representation of Lucretius' whole attitude towards the world of epic, or the Epicurean view of "the world" in general , whereby the turmoil below is reduced to a glimmer by the lofty heights of philosophy.[12]

In his lengthiest and best-known imitation of Homer, Lucretius is again attracted by the image and not epic associations. It is an image this time not of a natural but of a

---

[12] That this is not just allegorizing Lucretius can be seen from the proemium to Bk 2, where the connection is specifically made between physical distance (in the examples of a sinking ship,1-4, and more importantly, the belli certamina magna,5-6) and philosophical distance, "despicere unde queas. . ."

supernatural phenomenon, what Epicurus called the μετακόσμια, Cicero the intermundia, and commentators "the abode of the gods." Homer called it Olympus:

> Οὔλυμπόνδ', ὅθι φασὶ θεῶν ἕδος ἀσφαλὲς αἰεὶ
> ἔμμεναι· οὔτ' ἀνέμοισι τινάσσεται οὔτε ποτ' ὄμβρῳ
> δεύεται οὔτε χιὼν ἐπιπίλναται, ἀλλὰ μάλ' αἴθρη
> πέπταται ἀνέφελος, λευκὴ δ' ἐπιδέδρομεν αἴγλη·
>
> Od. 6.42-45

Lucretius turns to this passage in the paean to Epicurus that opens Bk. 3; it helps him describe the vision of peace unveiled by his master's philosophy:

> apparet divum numen sedesque quietae
> quas neque concutiunt venti nec nubila nimbis
> aspergunt neque nix acri concreta pruina
> cana cadens violat semperque innubilus aether
> integit, et large diffuso lumine ridet.
>
> 3.18-24

Discussion of this passage can be divided into two parts, a comparison of it line by line with Homer, and a consideration of the respective function of each passage in its context. The commentators have focused on the former approach, which will concern me first. The best analysis of the passage phrase by phrase is provided by D. West, who addresses Farrington's criticism that Lucretius mars the simplicity and clarity of Homer's version.[13] There is no question that Homer's description is more straightforward, and Farrington is right in identifying Lucretius' lengthened description of snow (20-21) and the metaphors of violat and ridet as Lucretius' major alterations and complications of Homer's passage; for Farrington, however, each alteration is an unmitigated failure to attain the standard of the

[13] David West, The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius (Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1969) 31-33; see also B. Farrington, Primum Graius Homo (Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1927) 33.

original. West more sensibly examines the alterations in terms of Lucretius' own aims and interests;[14] it can be seen that Lucretius is not really clouding his description with figures and irrelevant associations. As for the metaphors, West notes with reference to Homer's ἐπιδέδρομεν that "[i]f light has feet, the aether can surely have a face."[15] Granted, however, that nothing in Homer approaches the tone of violat, this metaphor is not a gratuitous, indiscriminate instance of anthropomorphizing, but bound up with Lucretius' picture of the gods and his atomic theory. His interest in physical phenomena leads him to gloss the simple χιὼν with nix acri concreta pruina, which, as Bailey notes, looks to Epicurus' explanation for snow in D.L.10.107; Lucretius then visualizes "what is concreta bombarding the intangibly delicate abode of the gods,"[16] a visualization which then finds a suitable expression in violat. It introduces a moralizing absent in Homer, but Lucretius cannot help but be polemical in his portrayal of the gods, since his whole work is an attempt to show men how to correct their thoughts and approximate the divine calm mediated by the philosophy of Epicurus. The rendering of ἀσφαλὲς by quietae likewise reflects Lucretius' Epicurean conception of divinity, stressing not just a freedom from mortal shock, but a freedom from all commotion whatsoever.

As one would expect from previous remarks about early Roman poetry's love of sound-effects, there is more word-music in Lucretius here than in Homer (but see below, p. 91); as in Ennius' tree-felling scene, alliteration is more prominent than in the original (especially the n's and c's throughout ll. 19-21). In Ennius, however, the pattern of sound and figure took priority over visual impression; in Lucretius, as Williams has demonstrated, it is at least a fair contest, with sound only on occasion threatening to hinder

---

[14] Kenney, Bk III, p. 20, stresses the need for a similar type of criticism: "Any attempt to describe and evaluate Lucretius' poetry should begin by considering ends and means." Kenney, however, is trying to protect Lucretius from the telos of Virgil, not the model of Homer.

[15] West 32.

[16] West 33. West refers to the portrayal of divine untouchability in 5.150-4.

clarity. Earlier it was noted that in Lucretius' description of army maneuvers the sound effects were most obvious where he left off following Homer (p. 82). In his description of divine space Lucretius follows Homer image by image through the scene, and so maintains an impression of clarity. Within this larger progression, however, Lucretius diverges in detail and emphasis. Above, the divergences of the metaphor violat and the gloss on the formation of snow were seen to be harmonious with Lucretius' philosophical convictions, which they served to express rather than to cloud. Here too, however, it would be one-sided to see only the philosopher in these alterations: the Roman poet with his attraction to sound is also in evidence, something both "scientific" glosses make clear: nec nubila nimbis/aspergunt and nix acri concreta pruina/cana cadens cannot just be ascribed to Lucretius' "fanatical intellectuality" (West, 32). Each is a miniature ecphrasis centered around the expressive power of its sound; certainly cana cadens is not an addition prompted by Epicurean commitment.

Two other features of the passage indicate that a close reading of Homer lies behind the text. Bailey notes innubilis as a "fine Lucretian ἅπ. λεγ., translating Homer's ἀνέφελος."[17] Both Farrington and West refer to rhythmical similarities, West noting that "the run-on lines correspond to the shape of the Greek."[18] Both aspergunt and integit correspond to identical enjambments in Greek, δεύεται and πέπταται, and each version has a third verbal enjambment (the weaker violat and ἔμμεναι). It ought to be mentioned however, that enjambment in general was more common in what Kenney calls Lucretius' pathetic style, as opposed to his expository

---

[17] Bailey 991.

[18] West 30.

style, and that the former characterizes the proemia.[19] Lucretius could thus follow Homer closely here and be consistent in style.

The context of the passage and the question of Homer's general relevance for this context remain to be discussed. Once again it is clear that Lucretius is less concerned to import an epic grandeur to his work with specific allusions to Homeric than to follow and vary a memorable and suitable description that happened to be embedded in Homeric epic. The last thing Lucretius wants to do with this scene is to introduce Homer's divine machinery, with all its meddling, capricious gods. He accomplishes a disassociation in a number of ways. The significance of quietae has already been mentioned; Homeric gods are excluded by this adjective. The phrase divum numen also contributes to a conception of divinity different from the plastic forms that enliven Homeric narrative. Kenney notes that numen is an abstract conception in Republican times, adding that it is somewhat paradoxical in conjunction with apparet.[20] The two words together, however, perhaps best characterize the differences in context, which are aptly described by Wormell:

> . . . the majestic peace of the setting is but the outward manifestation of the majesty and peace of mind of its inhabitants. . .. This is not merely an imaginary picture of the heavenly places but a revelation; the divina voluptas and horror [3.28-29] which seize Lucretius are in the context part of the sense of awe in the presence of the supernatural, and this is the language of mysticism.[21]

Apparet divum numen, then, accomplishes a transformation of narrative action in Homer into a metaphor (apparet) for a mental state (numen). This greatly altered

---

[19] Kenney, Bk III, 24. He refers to Bailey's summarization (120-23) of Büchner's Beobachtungen über Vers und Gedankengang bei Lukrez (Hermes Einzelschriften,1, 1936).

[20] Kenney, Bk III, p. 78, comm. on line18.

[21] Wormell 45. Kenney concurs, and quotes Ernout-Robin: "l'apparition a quelque chose de miraculeux."

framework for the scene leaves the epic associations of the gods conveniently outside the Epicurean picture of peace. It is a highly skillful revision; Lucretius has taken a passage seemingly permeated with an alien conception of divinity and, retaining its original sequence of images and much of their clarity, employs it to portray a vision central to his philosophy.[22]

In the three pairs of passages discussed above, Lucretius can be seen turning to Homer as a model for description, using Homer's descriptions for his own purposes, but not concerned in the first instance to contradict him. There are several reminiscences of Homer, however, which form the polemical counterpart to Lucretius' own opinions, and it is to these borrowings that I now turn.

As a step in his argument that all things are created without the interference of the gods, Lucretius argues that there are fixed limits and material preconditions for every created thing: if this is not the case, he says, why does not nature produce giants and men who live for centuries:

> . . . cur homines tantos natura parare
> non potuit, pedibus qui pontum per vada possent
> transire et magnos manibus divellere montis
> multaque vivendo vitalia vincere saecla

The phrase magnos manibus divellere montis looks, as Bailey notes, to Homer's description of Polyphemus (Od. 9.481):

ἦκε δ' ἀποῤῥήξας κορυφὴν ὄρεος μεγάλοιο

[22] Kenney perhaps overlooks the real significance of the passage in his estimation of Lucretius' philosophy and its weaknesses: "When man," he asks, "has cast out the fear of death--if he can--what is he left with? This question Lucretius makes no real attempt to answer. . . " "[W]hat life might be like for mankind if the battle [against ignorance and error] were ever to be won he does not tell us and perhaps could not imagine." (Bk III, p. 33). Yet the vision in the proemium to Bk 3 (ll.14-30) serves quite well as a positive goal, and promises more than merely a "cautious and muted happiness;" visions, however, best persuade those who have had them.

The conflict here between epic and Epicurean is typical of the work's broader criticism of superstition and religion in general. Not only philosophical positions (such as reincarnation, à la Ennius) but numerous naive beliefs are potential obstructions to the acquisition of peace, since assumptions on which fears can breed can underly even an innocuous- seeming tale. Lucretius does not think we are afraid of Polyphemus; he is afraid that even the most untroubled belief in the giant, the naive granting of reality to legend and myth, will involve a person in misconceptions of the physical world that render him vulnerable to the deeper fears that truly plague people.

Homer's figure of the Chimaera is likewise censored, as a violation of the foedus naturae certum (5.924; on the Chimaera and natural law, see also 2.705-10):

> qui fieri potuit, triplici cum corpore ut una
> prima leo, postrema draco, media ipsa, Chimaera
> ore foras acrem flaret de corpore flammam?
>
> 5.904-6

Lines 905 and 906 are a close translation of Il. 6.181-2:

> πρόσθε λέων, ὄπιθεν δὲ δράκων, μέσση δε Χίμαιρα
> δεινὸν ἀποπνείουσα πυρὸς μένος αἰθομένοιο

The only alteration Lucretius has made in line 905 is the addition of ipsa, which amounts to a gloss for Romans on the Grecism Chimaera, and means something like "from which the creature gets her name."[23] In line 906 the exhalation of fierce flame is retained (flaret rendering ἀποπνείουσα, acrem δεινὸν, and flammam πυρὸς), while the periphrasis of μένος and the epithet αἰθομένοιο are dropped in favor of ore foras and de corpore. At first sight these substitutions seem weak by comparison, but, just as I shall show with regard to several of Cicero's alterations of Homer, they are called for

[23] See Alessandro Ronconi, Interpreti Latini di Omero (Torino: Bottega D'Erasmo, 1973) 32, and Bailey's commentary.

by the argument. In the lines immediately preceding those quoted, Lucretius establishes that lions, like all flesh and blood, are burnt by fire:

> flamma quidem vero cum corpora fulva leonum
> tam soleat torrere atque urere. . .
>
> 901-902

The use of the same words (flamma, corpora) in the last line of Lucretius' translation leads the unsuspecting Homer into a trap, underlining his contradiction of natural law; the ex ore stresses that it is specifically the lion's section of the creature, according to Homer (προσθε λεων), that is engaged in fire-breathing.

Homer is again a reference point for Lucretius' debunking of Hades, accounts of whose inhabitants and their torments are acceptable only as allegorizations of the living (3. 978-1023): hic Acherusia fit stultorum denique vita (1023). The punishments of Tantalus, Tityos, Sisyphus, and the Danaids are reviewed by Lucretius and given their true significance. Homer is not the pattern for all this: the Danaids do not figure at all in Odysseus' trip to the Underworld, and Lucretius makes use of a different legend of Tantalus. The descriptions, however, of Tityos and Sisyphus look to Homer. There is, as Kenney notes, some sarcasm involved in the treatment of the former. In Homer, the size of the giant is stated flatly:

> καὶ Τιτυὸν εἶδον Γαίης ἐρικυδέος υἱὸν
> κείμενον ἐν δαπέδῳ· ὁ δ' ἐπ' ἐννέα κεῖτο πέλεθρα
>
> Od. 11.576-7

Lucretius does not directly refute the size, but rather grants the possibility of still larger and clearly absurd, mock-epic dimensions before he objects to the story on the grounds that no matter how large the body, it could not supply liver forever to the birds that picked at it:

> quamlibet immani proiectu corporis exstet,
> qui non sola novem dispessis iugera membris
> obtineat, sed qui terrai totius orbem,

non tamen aeternum poterit perferre dolorem

nec praebere cibum proprio de corpore semper.

3.987-90

Since Lucretius has earlier in the work refuted the existence of giants, this allowance of a still larger Tityos than Homer envisioned is clearly an ironic condescension to ignorance.

Lucretius' description of Sisyphus relates somewhat differently to the original, since, after finishing with Tityos, he is less concerned to discredit the original than to use it as an allegory: Sisyphus in vita quoque nobis ante oculos est (3.995). It is the ambition for political power that Sisyphus and his rock represent:

hoc est adverso nixantem trudere monte

saxum quod tamen e summo iam vertice rursum

volvitur et plani raptim petit aequora campi.

3.1000-2

This description corresponds closely to Homer's:

λᾶαν ἄνω ὤθεσκε ποτὶ λόφον· ἀλλ' ὅτε μέλλοι
ἄκρον ὑπερβαλέειν, τότ' ἀποστρέψασκε κραταιίς·
αὖτις ἔπειτα πέδονδε κυλίνδετο λᾶας ἀναιδής.

Od. 11.596-8

Allegorized, Homer need not be satirized; Lucretius follows him here much as he did in the vivid descriptions I considered earlier. Usually it is the Roman version that provokes a discussion of music, but in this case sound as well as image make the Greek passage memorable, and no doubt tempted Lucretius to try his hand at coupling the stone's motion with sound.[24] Kenney notes the maximum five dactyls and the three feminine caesuras

[24] The same motion in Pope's exemplification of description by sound:" When Ajax strives some rock's vast weight to throw,/ The line too labors, and the words move slow." ("Essay on Criticism," 370-1)

that depict the Greek stone's roll downhill, an event that in Latin is more alliterative but more restrained metrically; it is not true, however, that "Homer's verse makes no attempt to reproduce Sisyphus' upward progress;"[25] Stanford's assessment of line 596 seems more accurate: "the assonance of α, repetition of αν, ω-ω hiatus, combine to give an impression of heavy effort."[26] Lucretius instead emphasizes effort with the meter, the heavily spondaic line 1000 being followed by the enjambed spondee saxum.

In the case of his description of the Chimaera, Lucretius' main alterations were involved in philosophical revision; here it seems that only poetic aemulatio is at work, in aesthetic freedom from the argument. Yet the description is not as free-floating as it might seem. Earlier Lucretius was seen to anthropomorphize Homer with violat; similarly, petit for κυλίνδετο in the last line of the passage. This variation, however, also connects the stone's fate with that of the politician, who has just been described twice with the same verb:

> qui petere a populo fascis saevasque securis
> imbibit et semper victus tristisque recedit,
> nam petere imperium. . .

Thus Lucretius has the politician as well as the stone in mind in his imitation of Homer, just as he had the stone in mind (recedit) in his description of the politician. Further, in rendering the simple πέδονδε with plani. . . aequora campi, Lucretius is perhaps refers to a social position, in contrast to Homer's purely geographical designation.[27]

---

[25] Kenney, Bk III, 227, comm. on ll.1000-2.

[26] Homer, The Odyssey: I-XII, ed. W.B. Stanford (London: Macmillan, 1974) 403.

[27] See D. West 102: "The rock makes for the level plain, plani petit aequora campi; and in electoral terms the candidate goes down to the Campus Martius to stand for election again, descendat in Campum petitor (Horace Odes 3.1.11)"

Elsewhere in DRN it is Homeric wealth, not Homeric mythology, which is treated as foolishness. It is not so much the decadence of luxury that Lucretius laments as the turmoil of acquisition that precedes the displays of wealth; he perceives Phaeacian splendor in the light of Roman history, where the connections between wealth and war were obvious.[28] Lucretius argues that the needs of human nature are quite simple; we can be happy

> si non aurea sunt iuvenum simulacra per aedes
> lampadas igniferas manibus retinentia dextris,
> lumina nocturnis epulis ut suppeditentur,
> nec domus argento fulget auroque renidet
> nec citharae reboant laqueata aurataque templa
>
> 2.24-28

The first three lines follow Odysseus' description of Alcinous' palace quite closely:

> χρύσειοι δ' ἄρα κοῦροι ἐϋδμήτων ἐπὶ βωμῶν
> ἕστασαν αἰθομένας δαΐδας μετὰ χερσὶν ἔχοντες,
> φαίνοντες νύκτας κατὰ δώματα δαιτυμόνεσσι.
>
> Od. 7.100-2

Lucretius seems careful to render each image, with Homer's κατὰ δῶμα shifted, but rendered by per aedes in the first line. Lines 27-28, although not following any one line of Homer, also reflect his description of the palace: the piling up of precious metals in the Latin-- argento. . .auroque/. . .aurata-- has a parallel in the Greek, where Odysseus describes the outside of the palace (89-91):

---

[28] See Sallust, Bellum Catilinae, 10.

Although one associates these metals with glitter and reflection, Homer does not specifically mention light in this description. Lucretius, however, dovetails his last two lines into the description of banquet-illumination by maintaining the emphasis on light, with fulget and renidet. This emphasis on light is not haphazard, nor does it merely reflect Lucretius' penchant for brilliant visual images. Rather, the whole proemium is structured around light and darkness, and the difference between physical and philosophical light. This latter contrast is specifically drawn in the conclusion to the proemium:

> hunc igitur terrorem animi tenebrasque necessest
> non radii solis neque lucida tela diei
> discutiant, sed naturae species ratioque.
>
> 59-61

These same lines are found three other times in DRN (1.146-8, 3.91-3, 6.39-41), once before this scene, so that the reader is made sensitive to the metaphors of true and false illumination. The connection between the banquet-light and the discredited light of the sun is drawn more clearly in an intervening passage, in which the glitter of gold and regal splendor are seen incapable of dispelling the dark fears from human lives (48-54). In such a context, then, Lucretius' emphasis on light in his description of the banquet-hall with all its gold and silver is more than a vivid depiction of wealth and decadence, it is tantamount to philosophical criticism.[29] The more light there is, the more a sense of unreality is given to the scene. Lucretius' imitation of Homer is thus seen to be quite purposeful: where Homer's description focused on the lighting of the banquet, Lucretius followed him closely (24-26); where Homer was concerned with precious metals alone (7. 88-91), Lucretius added the light demanded by the scene's new function in the proemium.

Before I conclude with a general assessment of Homer's role in DRN, a few remarks on epic style have some bearing on the current consideration of Lucretius' revision

---

[29] The reboant of line 28 also supports the impression of mere surface at this banquet.

of Homer. As mentioned above, the Homeric reminiscences in Lucretius' language are best seen as indirect borrowings, elements that had been naturalized for Latin epic largely by the efforts of Ennius. The same holds true where Lucretius uses epic diction in mockery: Ennius generally hands him the ammunition, not Homer. Yet, even apart from a few instances which do appear to look straight to Homer's text, satire involving epic style is merely another aspect of the same critique which occasioned the borrowings above, as the examples below will show.

Lucretius' satirical imitations of language are not limited to epic; Wormell has noted the satirical use of Greek terms in the anatomy of sexual passion in Bk. 4, 1160-69, where "Lucretius exploits a wide range of Greek terms of endearment as an effective deflation of Catullus and his asso– ciates. . ."[30] As Kenney shows also in connection with the diatribe on love, Lucretius can employ subtler linguistic means to deflate the love of traditional love poetry.[31] Lucretius shows a similar range in his parody of epic style. A. Dalzell notes a short example:[32]

. . .et humanum longe praesentit odorem
Romulidarum arcis servator candidus anser.

4.682-3

With its patronymic and and much-promising words leading up to "goose," the line does seem an instance of turning "an epic phrase to mock-heroic effect." It is an isolated instance, however, and although, as Bailey suggests, "it might well come from Ennius,"[33] it apparently aims at nothing more than a touch of humor in the midst of an argument on the different olfactory senses of various creatures. More significant for Lucretius' message is

---

[30] Wormell 57.

[31] E.J. Kenney, "Doctus Lucretius," Mnemosyne 4.23: 380-85.

[32] Alexander Dalzell, "Lucretius," in CHCL,II, 224.

[33] Bailey, III, 1262.

the cluster of epic mannerisms used for parody at the beginning of Bk. 5, which Kenney notes in passing and which C.D.N. Costa catalogues.[34] In the proemium to this book Lucretius extols Epicurus as a far greater benefactor to mankind than Hercules, whose exploits merely ridded the world of beasts that we would generally have had the power and good sense to avoid:

> quid Nemeaeus enim nobis nunc magnus hiatus
> ille leonis obesset et horrens Arcadius sus?
> denique quid Cretae taurus Lernaeaque pestis
> hydra venenatis posset vallata colubris?
> quidve tripectora tergemini vis Geryonai[?]
>
> 5.24-28

In Costa's words, "the mannered hypallage is part of the mock-inflated flavour of the passage and reflects Homeric phrases like Γοργείη κεφαλὴ δεινοῖο πελώρου (Il. 5.741)..."[35] He suggests that the ending Arcadius sus may also have a deflating effect, notes the ἅπαξ λεγόμενον of tripectora, probably a Lucretian coinage, and the elaborate periphrasis of the phrase tripectora tergemini vis Geryonai, which is reminiscent of the Homeric use of ὅς + the genitive. Each of these mannerisms, as Costa cautions, is used elsewhere by Lucretius with no parody intended, but here, in conjunction with the overt criticism of the epic stature attributed to these creatures, the epic mannerisms are converted for the moment into tools of parody. Homer may not be the direct source for these mannerisms, but he is implicated in the error they satirize, the epic representation of mythological monsters, and, as seen above, he came under direct criticism with regard to the monstrosities of Polyphemus, the Chimaera, and Tityos.

---

[34] Kenney, "Doctus" 380; Lucretius, De Rerum Natura V, ed. C. D. N. Costa (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1984) 52.

[35] Costa 52.

Although, as mentioned, Lucretius frequently uses hypallage with no intended parody (see Bailey, Vol. I,144), another example alerts us to a second cluster of epicisms that, once again by their density and their context, are transformed and employed to deflate epic pretensions. In this case the attack seems unprovoked, coming where, for the logical purposes of his argument, no associations with epic seem necessary. Lucretius wants to establish that there are only two components of the universe, matter and the void (1.445-6), and refutes the claims that time (459) and the deeds of mankind are also elemental constituents of reality. The significance of his quarrel with the latter of these two pretenders is revealed in his telling phrase for human events, res gestae (478): the awkward argument involving the distinction between essential properties and "accidents" (449-58) primarily serves to diminish the stature of traditional heroic achievements, which, for many a noble Roman, were the ultimate reality. For an example of res gestae which really do not exist, as matter and void do, but are accidents, Lucretius does not turn to Roman history (which would have rendered his "Memmius" unreceptive to the argument), but rather to Homeric epic, the epitome of world-glorification.

Lucretius demotes the heroic world in illustrating the argument that without space and matter human events could not occur:

> denique materies si rerum nulla fuisset
> nec locus ac spatium, res in quo quaeque geruntur,
> numquam Tyndaridis forma conflatus amore
> ignis Alexandri Phrygio sub pectore gliscens
> clara accendisset saevi certamina belli,
> nec clam durateus Troianis Pergama partu
> inflammasset equus nocturno Graiugenarum.
>
> 1.471-7

Besides the hypallage of Phrygio sub pectore, other signals of high style are the patronymic Tyndaridis and the compound Graiugenarum; these latter two features are further

emphasized by their appearance a few lines earlier in a shorter version of the same insubstantial event: Tyndaridem raptam belloque subactas/Troiugenas gentis. Durateus, modifying equus as it does, is perhaps a direct rendering of Homer's δουράτεον...ἵππον (Od. 8.512). Bailey thus misses the point when he calls durateus, apparently coined by Lucretius, "a gratuitous use of a Greek word, not made necessary by the patrii sermonis egestas; he could have used ligneus."[36] If the word does not specifically recall Homer, as the subject matter in general does, it at least alerts the reader to a style of some pretense. What makes the passage unambiguous satire is the content "ennobled" by these traditional epic features: sexual passion and warfare count for little in DRN. Epic in this case is parodied for the credence it lends, not to mythological subjects, but to errant behavior.

It has been useful to discuss Lucretius' borrowings by making a distinction between imitation on the one hand and critique on the other, but it would be a mistake to make this division sharply and take it as an indication of a strong ambivalence. Lucretius was not greatly concerned either to associate or to dissociate himself from Homer per se in the specific imitations discussed; on occasion Lucretius simply found Homer's clarity attractive, or the notoriety of his creations useful as a locus classicus of common error. Perhaps the imitation of the Phaiacian banquet shows the unconcerted and unprogrammatic nature of his Homeric borrowings, since the scene critiqued is not so much a Homeric ideal as a description of an opulent culture Odysseus crosses in his travels. Even the perversion of epic style for the purpose of ridiculing a traditional epic theme is a sporadic technique to deflate an error in thought, and not serious criticism of the genre; Lucretius' own high tone relies on the mannerisms he parodies.

---

[36] Bailey, II, 680.

I think the most interesting insight to emerge from a study of Lucretius' imitation of Homer concerns the skill and artistry with which Lucretius adapts the original for his own purposes. Kenney's view that "a thorough examination of Lucretius' style. . .would show that the poet and craftsman is consistently in evidence throughout the entire poem"[37] is in fact borne out by the narrower study of this one aspect of the poet's artistry, the incorporation of another poetic text. For the slowness of critics to recognize Lucretius' artistry Kenney blames "certain inherited and unexamined assumptions, themselves based on metaphors of doubtful legitimacy, about development and decay in poetry and poetic style."[38] A different assumption has hindered the assessment of Lucretius' imitations of Homer; whereas Kenney identifies a bias that arises from Augustan standards, Lucretius is also harmed from the other direction, when his imitations are judged solely by their means to live up to an original perfection which is Homer, when additions are gratuitous and alterations mean descent; Farrington's failure to appreciate Lucretius' borrowings stems from such a bias. The Homeric imitations discussed in this chapter show Lucretius not trying to out-do Homer, but creatively employing him in the design of his own text, in various and sometimes ingenious ways. Lucretius' description of divine space is only the most impressive example of his skill in adapting another text (pp. 84-7); not only are particulars of the description altered for an Epicurean setting (quietae, violat), but the whole is transformed into a vision with an effect and significance far different from the "original's." The description of the banquet-hall shows a similar creativity (pp. 93-4); Lucretius' emphasis on light is not an isolated variation in the ecphrasis of an aemulator, but a stratagem to undermine the value of wealth by linking its description to the proemium's judgmental imagery of light, false light, and darkness. Less dramatic

---

[37] Kenney, "Doctus" 391.

[38] Kenney, "Doctus" 391. See also pp. 22-3 of his edition of Bk III for more on the bias of metaphor. See also Maguinness, p. 79, for an interesting discussion of Lucretius and "the sterilization of Latin poetry by the chilling effects of Augustan perfec - tionism."

alterations, but still indicative of the author's active imagination and independent purpose, are the metaphor petit that further links the description of Sisyphus' stone with the restless aspirations of the office-seeker it allegorizes, and, in a more expository context, the emphasis on the Chimaera's mouth and corporality in general (ore foras, de corpore), which serve in their setting to point an absurdity. These instances, along with the passages written in a mock-epic style, belie the traditional image of a writer who gets carried away with purple passages before lapsing into unpoetic stretches of philosophizing; the Homeric imitations show a writer with a sure control of his medium and with a constant awareness of his message, and confirm Kenney's appraisal of Lucretius' literary artistry.

Chapter IV:
Cicero's Translations of Homer

Cicero's translations of Homer come late in his long career as a translator: together with the translated passages of the Attic tragedians, they were, by all indications, specifically written to meet the needs of the philosophical works of the 40's, where all of them are found.[1] As literary products they are overshadowed by his early translation of Aratus' Phaenomena, which had the status of an independent work (Cicero calls it mea Prognostica) and played a role in the development of Latin verse.[2] To call the Aratea and the Homeric passages both translations is therefore to obscure some fundamental differences between them, differences which are reflected in Cicero's own conception of the respective compositions: he is the author of the Aratea, while Homer is the author of the later compositions. The difference in attribution is perhaps analogous (qualitative judgments aside) to that between Pound's "Homage to Sextus Propertius" and Lattimore's translations of Homer.

---

[1] See J. Tolkiehn, Homer und die römische Poesie (Leipzig: Dieterich'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1900) 88-9, on the probable genesis of Cicero's Homer translations. The only ground for assuming larger blocks of translated verse which formed a pool for the extant selections is Plutarch's statement in Cicero, 40.3, that Cicero, to amuse himself under Caesar's dictatorship, composed upwards of 500 verses a night; perhaps he diverted himself with translation one evening. The discussion of the individual passages below, however, reveals that they are frequently adapted for their context. See also K. Büchner, RE VII A,1 (Stuttgart: Metzler, 1939), 1257.

[2] In De Nat. Deorum, 2.104, a dramatis persona refers to the verse as te admodum adulescentulo conversa. For an estimation of the importance of the Aratea for Latin literature, see G. B. Townend, "The Poems," in T.A. Dorey, Cicero (London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1965), 112-17,124-129; he discusses the dating of the work pp.113-14, arguing the likelihood of Cicero's having revised part of poem c. 60 B.C.

Accordingly, Cicero's translations of Homer, unlike Livius' Odusia and Ennius' borrowings, have little or no significance for the development of Latin literature; nor do they reveal, as Lucretius' Homeric imitations did, the workings of a poetic imagination. They are interesting, however, for several reasons. First, these 9 passages, comprising 53 verses altogether, constitute the largest body of Homeric verse in translation that remains from Republican Rome. The fragments of the Odusia have been discussed in Chapter I. In Sulla's time, a Gnaius Matius published a translation of the Iliad, apparently in its entirety, of which eight lines remain; not quite two remain from the Iliad of Matius' contemporary, Ninius Crassus.[3] The fragments of all three translations owe their transmission primarily to a grammarian's interest in their morphological and syntactical peculiarities. Cicero's versions, on the other hand, illustrate ideas, and are therefore lengthier and more coherent. As was the case with Ennius' appropriation of Homer, entire scenes and speeches can be compared to their original without resorting to the sleuth-work required to assess the literary significance of a work that has left only a trail of odd inflections. Furthermore, Cicero's translations of Homer, although offering only disconnected threads of Homeric narrative, are not at all fragmentary in nature: of each passage we have just what Cicero wanted us to have. Except for the two lines on fate (Büchner 31= Od. 18.136-7) transmitted by Augustine's De Civ. Dei (5.8), and three lines from the lost De Gloria transmitted by Gellius (discussed below), each Homeric passage has a context, and many of Cicero's alterations of Homer can be traced to prose argument that surrounds each passage . It is appropriate, therefore to begin this chapter with a brief dicussion of the role that verse-quotations in general played in Cicero's philosophical essays. Then I will show how the argument of the philosophical host-text occasioned alterations in the translations of Homer, and will close with a discussion of Cicero's longest Homeric passage and its distinctive Roman features.

---

[3] See Büchner's Fragmenta , pp. 61-2 and p. 65. Büchner's numbering has been used throughout.

Cicero himself, eager as perhaps no other Roman writer to explore the subject of his own achievements, provides a starting point for a discussion of his use of verse-quotations. In Tusc. 2.26 he (or a thinly disguised persona) refers to his translations and, in the process, his quotations of other Roman poets as an ornamental device: verti enim multa de Graecis, ne quo ornamento in hoc genere disputationis careret Latina oratio; when native writers fail to supply a treatise's need for ornament, Cicero turns to Greek poetry.[4] There are several aspects to verse's ornamental function:"[e]in Zitat kann aus dem urbanen Gespräch entspringen und die Atmosphäre heiterer Kommunikation herstellen. . . Die längeren Zitate aus Dichtungen verleihen der Darstellung Glanz."[5] Verse as an ornament is also a concession to an audience's limited tolerance for the rigors of philosophical argument; Cicero quotes verse for the same reason Lucretius says he composes it, to sweeten exposition with its charms. Predictably, in his use of verse as an ornament Cicero is following a Greek example: he identifies two lecturers in Athens, Dionysius the Stoic and Philo, head of the sceptic Academy, as practitioners of the technique of interspersing philosophy with poetry. The former he criticizes, however, for the ineptitude of his

---

[4] Behind Cicero's explanation for the Greek poetry he quotes is the unspoken assumption that it will be translated first. There cannot have been a tradition strong enough to have dictated translation (Quintilian might also have said interpretatio tota nostra est) but Cicero's sense of consistency demanded it: to say something in Latin rather than Greek was one of Cicero's primary reasons for writing his philosophical works. In "Greek poetry in Cicero's prose writing," YCIS 13 (1973), 65. H. D. Jocelyn's explanation for translated verse seems unnecessarily roundabout; he first grafts Cicero's treatises onto the tradition of oratory, and then draws the conclusion: "This oratorical mode manifests itself most obviously in the conscious avoidance, whenever possible, of Greek words and phrases and of literal quotations of Greek authors." The stylistic differences between Cicero's speeches and his philosophical writings, as described by M. v. Albrecht in "M. Tullius Cicero," RE Suppl. 13 (Munich: Alfred Druckenmüller, 1973), p. 1242, suggest caution in drawing parallels between them.

[5] v. Albrecht, "Cicero" 1297.

selections, which in comparison to Philo's were indiscriminately chosen and poorly recited (2.26).[6]

Cicero's criticism of Dionysius' citations suggests that the ornamental value of poetry is only one of the factors involved in its selection; verse can also lend an argument from auctoritas.[7] To choose from among Cicero's translations of Homer, passages that well illustrate this function of verse are Büchner 28, 29, and 30 (each discussed below). If in his stylistic use of verse as ornamentation Cicero had his clearest models in the lectures of Hellenistic philosophers, the use of verse to lend auctoritas to an argument finds its best model in Aristotle's writings, primarily in the Ethics and Politics.[8] Aristotle provided more than simply examples for the use of verse in philosophical discourse; indirectly, his epistemology made provisions for the philosophical validity of poetic authority. Many proofs, including those of the most basic truths of a science, rest upon statements that cannot be demonstrably proven but must be agreed upon by the wisest, the most, or the most of the wisest people (Topica 100b-101a). In the absence of poll-takers, poetry, since it was popular in its appeal and not generally associated with the sectarian interests of philosophy, was a natural means of establishing for an argument what "the wisest" thought about an issue; it provided both a slice of life as it incontrovertibly is, and

---

[6] It is no wonder that the target of Cicero's criticism was a Stoic. Jocelyn notes that the Stoics, of all the ancient schools, were fondest of quoting verse when arguing; this proclivity, he goes on to say, is also evident in the Stoic personages of Cicero's dialogues ("Greek poetry"67-69).

[7] v. Albrecht 1253.

[8] In Aristotle's exoteric works, which Cicero found quite elegant and used as the model for his style in De Oratore (see Ad fam. 1.9.23) and for his introductions in De Re Publica (Ad Att. 4.16.2) , verse may have been more prevalent than in the remaining esoteric treatises; the three quotations of verse in Περὶ Ποιητῶν , fr. 8 (W. D. Ross, Fragmenta Selecta), are not selected by Aristotle to illustrate his opinion, but intimately connected with Homer's biography, much like the verse in Suetonius.

yet was purged of irrelevance and unclarity (Poetics 1451b).[9] Quotations of poetry are obviously more appropriate for the less technical treatises such as the Ethics and Politics, whose subject matters do not admit of the same conceptual rigor as the treatises on logic and physics. Bk 1 of the Politics is especially interlarded with poetry; a quotation from Homer, for instance, supports Aristotle's famous definition of man as a political animal (1253a; Il. 9.63). Similarly, Cicero employs the Sirens' song to support the argument that man has a strong, innate love of knowledge (De Fin. 5.48-9).

There is another side to the use of poetry as an indicator of popular opinion. Cicero frequently quotes poetry to condemn the attitude that it represents and, more importantly, fosters. Such a case is his longest translation of Homer (Bü. 23=Il. 2.299-330), a passage he quotes to discredit Chalchas' divination of Troy's destruction from the omen of the snake and the sparrows it devours. Other Homeric embodiments of faulty reasoning concern augury (Bü. 26) and fate (Bü. 31); his two longest translations from Aeschylus (Bü. 33) and Sophocles (Bü. 34) also serve as examples of pernicious influences on emotional control. This critical stance toward poetry is obviously reminiscent of Plato. Poetry, especially the poetry of Homer, still functions as the mouthpiece of popular opinion, but in such instances it is inimical to the aims of philosophy, and presents a kind of alternate folk wisdom against which the philosopher must aggressively stake his claim. Behind this criticism of poetry lie two assumptions characteristic of Plato, that wisdom is not popular, and that exposure to or engagement in the mimesis of emotion warps the mind and renders it less accessible to reason; it was this latter assumption that Aristotle countered with his notion of catharsis. Cicero sounds like Socrates of the Republic when, after his translations of Sophocles and Aeschylus, he asks: Sed videsne, poetae quid mali adferant?

[9] It is easy to see why Aristotle found verse more suitable for the practical sciences of ethics and politics, which do not admit of the logical exactitude and abstraction appropriate to the theoretical works.

(Tusc. 2.27).[10] Despite these similarities with Plato, one senses that Cicero is assuming an attitude, and lacks the censor's commitment to expurgation. Cicero's troubling to translate long passages of pernicious verse into a language that would otherwise be innocent of it, and his pride in doing so, give the impression that he "doth protest too much."

A milder if somewhat condescending form of censorship is allegorization. There are signs of this in Cicero's translations of Homer, the most obvious example of which I will analyze shortly; first, a few remarks about the tendency to allegorize are prompted by Alessandro Ronconi's discussion of the subject in connection with Cicero's translations of Homer.[11] He argues that several of Cicero's divergences from Homer's text (Bü. 25,29 and 30) consist in the expression of Stoic attitudes absent in the original, and notes that it was the Stoics themselves who most assiduously allegorized Homer for their own purposes. They were not the exclusive practitioners of the art; Cicero is in the company of Seneca, Quintilian, Gellius, and several scholiasts when he finds that the categories of oratorical style are embodied in Homeric characters: Nestor, Menelaus, and Odysseus, for instance, represent in their speech the styles of suavitas, brevitas, and vis respectively (Brut. 40, 50).[12] Although this is hardly rigorous allegory, it tends in that direction because Homer is portrayed less as a source for examples than as a self-conscious illustrator of a science. Stoics, however, perhaps more rigorous than the other ancient schools in the application of categories to experience, seem to have been especially fond of finding their doctrine presaged and exemplified by ancient poets, "ut etiam veterrimi poetae," says an Epicurean, "qui haec [Stoic teachings] ne suspicati quidem sunt, Stoici

---

[10] Homer is also criticized in Tusc. 1.65, De Nat. De. 2.70, and De Re Pub. 2.19.

[11] A. Ronconi, Interpreti Latini di Homero (Torino: Bottega D'Erasmo, 1973) 42-3.

[12] Ronconi 42.

fuisse videantur."[13] Cicero on one occasion quarrels with an opinion which the Stoics were fond of confirming with a quotation of Homer (Tr. 31), but says nothing against the practice of reading one's own system of distinctions back in time onto an innocent text.[14] Although Cicero was not so doctrinaire, nor so committed to Homer's infallibility, that he always cared to superimpose a correct meaning on otherwise unregenerate passages, in mediating Homer through Latin he had a different opportunity to alter and misread him, as the following discussion of specific examples will show.

Perhaps Cicero's translation of the Sirens' song is the best antidote for the assumption that translation is an acute form of literary criticism; here one finds the same impartiality one would expect to find in an oration.[15] The translated passage appears in the context of an argument demonstrating that man has an innate desire for knowledge (innatus in nobis cognitionis amor et scientiae--De Fin. 5.48); Homer, according to Cicero, realized this and fashioned the tale of the Sirens, who were able to attract men with their irresistible promise of knowledge. Thus they sing to the thirsty Ulysses:

> O decus Argolicum, quin puppim flectis, Ulixes,
> auribus ut nostros possis agnoscere cantus?
> nam nemo haec unquam est transvectus caerula cursu,
> quin prius adstiterit vocum dulcedine captus,
> post, variis avido satiatus pectore Musis,

---

[13] Quoted by Ranconi, 45. See also W.B. Stanford, The Ulysses Theme (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963) 121: "Through their ingenious use of allegorical interpretation the Odyssey became a kind of Stoic Pilgrim's Progress."

[14] Augustine (De Civ. Dei, 5.8) transmits two lines of Homer translated by Cicero in De Fat., in which Cicero quarreled with the Stoics views on determination.

[15] To be dramatically accurate, one must attribute this translation to Piso, who is delineating the position of the "Old Academy" of Antiochus. The question then arises whether the "slant" of the translation is due to Cicero's own interpretation of Homer's passage, or to an interpretation of Homer dramatically consistent with the character who is speaking. Since I do not credit Cicero's dialogues with enough dramatic integrity to admit of the latter possibility, I have chosen to call the translation and interpretation "Cicero's."

doctior ad patrias lapsus pervenerit oras.

nos grave certamen belli clademque tenemus,

Graecia quam Troiae divino numine vexit,

omniaque e latis rerum vestigia terris.

30 Bü. (De Fin. 5.49)

When compared with the Homeric passage out of context, Cicero's emphasis on the seductive power of knowledge per se is evident but not glaring:

" Δεῦρ' ἄγ' ἰών, πολύαιν' Ὀδυσεῦ, μέγα κῦδος Ἀχαιῶν,
νῆα κατάστησον, ἵνα νωϊτέρην ὄπ' ἀκούσῃς.
οὐ γάρ πώ τις τῇδε παρήλασε νηὶ μελαίνῃ,
πρίν γ' ἡμέων μελίγηρυν ἀπὸ στομάτων ὄπ' ἀκοῦσαι,
ἀλλ' ὅ γε τερψάμενος νεῖται καὶ πλείονα εἰδώς.
ἴδμεν γάρ τοι πάνθ' ὅσ' ἐνὶ Τροίῃ εὐρείῃ
Ἀργεῖοι Τρῶές τε θεῶν ἰότητι μόγησαν
ἴδμεν δ' ὅσσα γένηται ἐπὶ χθονὶ πουλυβοτείρῃ."

Od. 12. 184-191

It is not difficult to see how Cicero, and perhaps interpreters before him, came to identify the Sirens' attraction with wisdom. Homer uses a form of εἴδω three times: the Sirens promise Odysseus that he will leave them knowing more (πλείονα εἰδώς , 188), knowing all about the struggle between the Achaians and Trorans (ἴδμεν , 189), as well as everything else that happens on the nourishing earth (191). They are addressing their song here to a man who in the third line of the epic is described, πολλῶν δ' ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω. "As Homer describes the incident, the attractions of the Sirens were primarily intellectual."[16] Another critic connects the episode with a whole body of myths, including Genesis, in which the hero is tempted by knowledge.[17] The knowledge that Cicero has in mind, however, when he illustrates it with Ulysses' attraction to the Sirens is not the same as the knowledge of Homeric heroes.

---

16 Stanford, Ulysses 77-78.

17 Gabriel Germain, "The Sirens and the Temptation of Knowledge," trans. by George Steiner, Homer: A Collection of Critical Views, ed. G. Steiner and Robert Fagles (Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, 1962) 92-93.

For Cicero, knowledge comes from contemplation and study; it is a science that finds truth hidden down abstruse paths of logic and hidden beneath appearances, and its acquisition requires insight and penetration. For Homer, on the other hand, knowledge is characterized more by multitude than by depth. Nestor is wise because he is old and has seen and done many things; the Muses are invoked to give facts, not insight; Odysseus is πολύτροπος, having seen the cities of many men. In fact, it is just this sort of knowledge, the love of which is especially exhibited by Odysseus when he is curious to explore the cave of Polyphemus, that Cicero belittles as a shallow semblance of the real virtue: "Atque omnia quidem scire cuiuscumque modi sint curiosorum. . . " (De Fin. 5.49). There is in his translation of the Sirens' song a reflection of his different conception of knowledge, in the phrase rerum vestigia, where the notion of tracking is involved. In Homer's phrase, ὅσσα γένηται ἐπὶ χθονί, the emphasis is rather on human events and happenings.[18] Cicero's Sirens are philosophers, Homer's are historians with a rare gift of captivating their audience.

In a discussion of Odysseus' later characterization as a restless seeker of knowledge and experience (Dante's esperïenza and canoscenza, Inf. 26.116,120), Ernst Bloch writes, "There is warrant for neither Faust nor Columbus in the Homeric Odysseus, or in subsequent Hellenistic and Roman versions."[19] Yet intellectual developments between Homeric and Hellenistic times may have in fact prepared the way for such a transformation. The knowledge that captivates Cicero's Ulysses results from the

---

[18] A subtler reflection of differing conceptions of knowledge can perhaps be seen in Cicero's rendering of πλείονα εἰδώς by doctior, where v. Albrecht's observations (p.) about Ennius' adjectival transformations of Homer's verbal descriptions are relevant. Homer's participial construction suggests an activity, of the sort that would attract Odysseus as an appealing experience; doctior, on the other hand, places the emphasis on a resultant state of the subject. Furthermore, εἰδώς means more in Homer than intellectual cognition, sometimes connoting a skill, sometimes a disposition or turn of mind; thus, Hector knows μάχας (Il. 7.237), Polyphemus ἀθεμίστια (Od. 9.189, cf. Stanford's commentary, 354), and Odysseus simply πλείονα.

[19] Ernst Bloch, "Odysseus Did Not Die in Ithaca," trans. by Hanna Loewy and G. Steiner, in Homer: A Collection of Critical Essays, 83.

exploration of predetermined eternal truths, something already there that must be tracked. It is a smaller step from this sort of hunt to a quest or quixotic calling than from the Homeric hero's desire for new experience. Odysseus may be the sort of person to "try anything once," but that can be traced more to what one critic has called his "capacity for experience" than an attraction to an ever-receding goal that draws one forward with partial, and therefore provocative attainments of a whole. There was, then, a figure between the Homeric and the Faustian Odysseus, who might be called the Stoic Odysseus.[20]

Cicero's translation itself, however, does not alter the sense of the Homeric text as much as does Cicero's accompanying exposition of the episode's significance. In the translation, the sensual attraction and seductive power of the Sirens are acknowledged in the phrase vocum dulcedine captus, where captus has no parallel in the Greek. Ronconi notes, however, an interesting qualification of such pleasure in Cicero's version, where the sweetness of the song is subordinated to a resultant knowledge: "[L]a dolcezza del canto attrae in un primo momento (prius) e induce l'eroe a fermarsi, la dottrina è un aquisto successivo (post) che rimane all'eroe e lo accompagna in patria quando l'infatuazione musica è finita (satiatus)."[21] Furthermore, in praising Odysseus' desire to hear the Sirens sing, Cicero makes no mention of the bones that rot on their beach, and discounts the sensual charm of their song:

> Neque enim vocum suavitate videntur aut novitate quadam et
> varietate cantandi revocare eos solitae qui praetervehebantur, sed
> quia multa se scire profitebantur. . . (5. 49)

It cannot be argued that Cicero is concerned only with the motivation of Odysseus and not with realities unknown to the hero: as Homer portrays him, all Odysseus knows of the Sirens is what Circe had told him before he left Aiaia, and in her briefing there is no talk of

---

[20] Cf. Ronconi, 48-49.

[21] Ronconi 67. Ronconi is describing a sceme of knowledge resembling the Symposium's portrayal of the path to the truth by way of beauty.

knowledge, only of magical beauty and danger (12.39-54). In Homer, the fulfillment of the desire the Sirens provoke means destruction; for Cicero, what they offer is worth forsaking house and home for. For his own purposes of illustration, Cicero chose to ignore the inappropriate aspects of the temptation and focused on the song itself, which in isolation lends itself to a philosophical advertisement unwarranted by the Homeric narrative.[22]

Cicero's portrayal of Ulysses as a seeker of wisdom[23] is perhaps related to two errors he makes when attributing Homeric speeches to their speakers. Both occur in De Divinatione, in which Cicero's argument is hostile to divination; belief in divination, therefore, would not characterize the wise man as Cicero envisioned him. He translates, however, a 30-line speech by Odysseus, who quells a wholesale defection of Achaian regulars by reminding them of a prophecy that was being fulfilled: κεῖνος τὼς ἀγόρευε τὰ δὴ νῦν πάντα τελεῖται (Il. 2.330; the passage is discussed in more detail below, p. 122). To preserve Ulysses' image as a wise man Cicero might have argued that the wily commander was merely manipulating the masses with their own superstitions, employing, in fact, religion as Cicero himself would. Instead he remembers the speech as spoken by Agamemnon, his memory perhaps misled by his general conceptions of the two Greek leaders. Likewise, a mention of Zeus' thundrous, right-hand approval (Il.9.236), in Homer spoken by Odysseus as a member of the embassy to Achilles, is attributed by Cicero to Ajax (De Div. 2.82; Bü. 26), again allowing Ulysses to remain untainted by associations with wrong opinion (Ajax, whom we see in Sophocles whipping a sheep he thinks is Odysseus, apparently had nothing to lose by such a remark).

---

[22] Both Germain (above, n. 18) and Stanford (Ulysses 78, 124) follow Cicero in ignoring Circe's description of the Sirens, and thus themselves are practicing an unwitting allegorization in the interests of the contemporary concern with the quest for knowledge. Germain's argument adds a further dimension to allegory: he wonders if Homer himself may not have "forgotten" the significance of the knowledge-myth he narrates.

[23] Ronconi (p. 48) also cites Tusc. 5.8 in this regard: heroicis aetatibus Ulixem et Nestorem accepimus et fuisse te habitos esse sapientes.

A third error in attribution is all that has preserved one of Cicero's Homeric translations, which was embedded in the lost De Gloria: the mistake caught Gellius' attention, and he quotes the translated passage when discussion in the Noctes Atticae rolls around to literary bloopers (15.6.3). In this instance, however, Cicero's false attribution significantly alters the sense of the passage.[24] In Homer it is Hector who says:

> 'ἀνδρὸς μὲν τόδε σῆμα πάλαι κατατεθνηῶτος,
> ὅν ποτ' ἀριστεύοντα κατέκτανε φαίδιμος Ἕκτωρ.'
> ὥς ποτέ τις ἐρέει· τὸ δ' ἐμὸν κλέος οὔ ποτ' ὀλεῖται."
>
> Il. 7.89 -91

Hector is envisioning the burial mound of the Greek fighter whom the Achaians are going to send against him in single combat. When Cicero has Ajax speak these lines (Bü. 25),

> Hic situs est vitae iam pridem lumina linquens
> qui quondam Hectoreo perculsus concidit ense.'
> fabitur haec aliquis, mea semper gloria vivet.

he imagines a passerby of his own burial mound, and speaks as the vanquished instead of the victor. Most immediately, this alteration lessens the impact and even the sense of the passage. Only Hector's name will be on the lips of those who pass by Ajax's tomb; to draw from this the emphatic conclusion, mea semper gloria vivet, requires a somewhat beef-witted hero. Perhaps Cicero felt the awkwardness of such a claim without realizing it was of his own making; at any rate, he has weakened the prominence of Hector in his version by reducing him from a proud subject to an adjective in a passive construction.

---

[24] Cicero's alteration may have some bearing on Cicero's practice of composing his treatises. Jocelyn ("Greek poetry" 76-7) argues that most of Cicero's direct quotations of Greek literature were taken from the philosophical source Cicero happened to be using at the time; the misattributed verse he ascribes to careless copying. Yet in the case of Bü. 25, the misattribution so changes the sense of the passage that the quotation would probably no longer be useful for the argument of the (hypothetical) Greek text. We must assume, then, either a misquotation in the Greek original, or grant Cicero a greater independence in his composition.

Ronconi argues that whatever plausibility Ajax's hopes for immortality have is based upon a conception of glory different from that of a Homeric hero: "quelle che vive è ora la gloria nel senso stoico, che supera le contingenze umane."[25] Losers are indispensable for the heroism of the Iliad and they are often portrayed with great compassion, but they cannot console themselves with transcendent glory independent of victory and defeat in battle. Both Homer and Cicero end their passages with an antithetical point that reveals their differences. In each version undying fame is asserted in contrast to a death. Hector, however, contrasts his undying fame to the death of his victim, while Ajax contrasts his eternal glory to his own physical death.[26]

Ronconi finds that Stoic argument has done still greater "violenza" to the next passage under consideration; it is part of an argument in which Odysseus tries to persuade Achilles to refrain from battle for a day, and thereby grant a breather to the exhausted troops in general. Cicero, however, is closer to Homer than Ronconi thinks, and his divergences are more predictable than violent.

In Homer, Odysseus' speech is the clever piece of work one would expect from the master of mediation, and the delicate situation is one that calls for his touch. Achilles has just emerged from his tent ready to fight again, and assembles the Achaians to urge them on to battle (19.40-46). Agamemnon speaks in response, and the two are reconciled. The importance of the event for all but Achilles is the reconciliation itself (74-75). Achilles, however, is bent on battle, or more specifically, personal revenge; his behavior on return is, in fact, no more communal-minded than his departure. Agamemnon and Odysseus both suggest an end to the fighting that day, since the Achaians are already weary of it, and need food (perhaps they are also interested in a feast as a confirmation of reconciliation;

---

[25] Ronconi 46.

[26] Ronconi 46.

Agamemnon particularly associates the dinner as an opportunity to honor Achilles with gifts of honor and make good for his own earlier delusion, 19.138); [27] they cannot get through to Achilles, however, who can think only of Patroklos and murderous revenge (205-214). It is in the context of these remarks by Achilles, revealing his obsession with the corpse of his friend (esp. 210-13), that Odysseus' speech must be understood, especially the lines in question:

> λίην γὰρ πολλοὶ καὶ ἐπήτριμοι ἤματα πάντα
> πίπτουσιν· πότε κέν τις ἀναπνεύσειε πόνοιο;
> ἀλλὰ χρὴ τὸν μὲν καταθάπτειν ὅς κε θάνῃσι,
> μηλέα θυμὸν ἔχοντας, ἐπ' ἤματι δακρύσαντας·

Il. 19.226-9

This is a dangerous approach, to be critical of another's grief, but that is how one must understand Odysseus' remarks about burial. Of course he does not come out and rebuke Achilles directly, or mention the name of Patroklos; the statement that it is necessary for them to bury the dead, steeling their hearts and weeping but for a day, is generalized (although not so much as Cicero's, as I will show); it is necessary to bury "whoever may happen to die," ὅς κε θάνῃσι. Perhaps it is this cautious approach of Odysseus', and his skill in couching this single personal criticism between concerns of a more neutral, practical nature, that has misled Ronconi to makethe following statement:

> [M]entre l'Ulisse omerico chiede che un giorno sia dedicato al pianto
> e non al combattimento, l'Ulisse ciceroniano vuole por fine al pianto

[27] The whole scene is enacted with the deft ethopoeia that Homer was known for. Agamemnon cannot help but suggest to Achilles what he as the commander thinks it is right to do, and each of his conciliatory speeches closes with this concern. Yet his mode of persuasion is hopelessly awkward and oblique: "Rush into battle," he tells Achilles, "or if you wish, stay here and receive gifts"(139-144). Earlier (68-73) he had counseled: "Drive the Achaians into battle, if you can. . . although I think they would like a rest." The same surreptitious tack, the concealment of his own will, characterizes his disastrous "testing-the-waters" speech in Bk II, when he suggests they all take to the ships.

subito dopo il primo giorno, cioè consente il lutto purchè sia limitato
a un giorno solo.[28]

It is clear from what I have said above that Odysseus is not asking for a day in which all can mourn, and that Cicero is correct in taking the remark as a call to curb grief. Here is Cicero's version (Bü. 29):

Namque nimis multos atque omni luce cadentis
cernimus, ut nemo possit maerore vacare.
Quo magis est aequum tumulis mandare peremptos
firmo animo et luctum lacrimis finire diurnis.

However Stoic the argument these lines are enlisted to illustrate, in this instance Cicero has done no real violence to the text to make it fit. The major alteration for the sake of the philosophical argument (that humans possess the ability to limit their grief) is merely one of emphasis. Homer's Odysseus suggests nothing so clear and "directive" as luctum. . . finire, in which the construction (aequum est + infinitive) stresses the aspect of reproval just where it is most necessary to conceal judgement; ἐπ' ἦμαι δακρύσαντας implies much the same advice that the Stoic Ulysses gives, but the phrase has drifted from the judgemental construction, χρὴ τὸν ... καταθάπτειν, to more descriptive statement, with the notion of self-restraint appearing in the unemphatic yet crucial ἐπ' ἦμαι . Cicero could not employ any such subtleties in his version, since without the context of Achilles' remarks about Patroklos, one would not know in just what direction Odysseus' advice was aimed (witness Ronconi's remark above). The emphasis of luctum. . . finire, then, provides in quotable form what Homer developed with careful drama.

So much in defense of Cicero's interpretation of the passage; other features of the translation deserving consideration remain. In Chapter II (pp.57, 61) discussed Ennius' tendency to give his similes a greater coherence as a logical and syntactical unit, as well as a

---

[28] Ronconi 50.

closer correspondence to the narrative, than his Homeric model. Some of the same forces appear to be at work in Cicero's passage, which is knit together in hypotactic fashion, in contrast to Homer's paratactic arrangement. Cicero explicitly draws the result (ut. . .) from the fact that men fall in battle continually: no one is free from grief. In Greek, the same thought, that everyone has lost a friend but has to go on fighting as usual (which in this instance means to cease fighting) is expressed with a rhetorical device, πότε κέν τις ἀναπνεύσειε πόνου; this rhetorical question has an unambiguous answer, but does not connect the train of thought as tightly as a result clause. Cicero then follows his result clause with a conclusion that is specifically expressed as one, with the connective quo, "therefore. . . " Again, Homer's conclusion is the same, but it is connected as an adversative thought, adversative, moreover, not to a clearly stated thought, but to one merely suggested by the rhetorical question: "We cannot give in to grief forever (or who would ever rest from vengeance?), but must. . . "

Parataxis is often considered the hallmark of a language in a relatively early stage of development.[29] It is also characteristic of everyday speech, however, and I think the Homeric passage in question owes its leaps of logic more to the mind of Odysseus than the mind of Homer. The logic is by no means clear upon first reading, even in context, whereas the parataxis of Homer's narrative is usually not so baffling. Odysseus, on the other hand, has good reason to be a little less than perfectly clear, while Cicero had every reason to avoid drama and define the argument.

Until now I have glossed over the difference between ἀναπνεύσειε πόνοιο and maerore vacare, since Cicero's translation of the Greek does not affect the general argument of the passage. Whether πόνοιο refers to the toil of battle (Monro) or the fasting

[29] The hypotactic timeo ne dicat, for example, developed from the paratactic timeo. ne dicat!

that continuous battle demands (Leaf), the point is that all have suffered losses.[30] In either case, however, Homer imagines the objective results of behavior like Achilles'-- weariness in battle, and, as Odysseus suggests later in the speech (232), less effectual fighting. Cicero, on the other hand, focuses on the mental result, the emotion of grief, in keeping with the psychological orientation of his argument. Vacare is also appropriate for a Stoic argument, expressing, like ἀταραξία, an absence as an ideal.

There are other instances of emphasized emotion which bring to mind a previously discussed trait of Livius and Ennius. Rather than being automatically assigned to the Roman penchant for rhetoric and pathos, however, they must be examined individually and in context. As in the instance of maerore above, there may be factors for Cicero's subjectivity other than the one of a national propensity. A comparison of one of Cicero's Homeric translations with lines from Ennius' Medea will show the importance of context in judging the variations from the original.

Before he trades gold for bronze and occasions Homer's celebrated appraisal of the act (Il. 6.234-236), Glaucus tells Diomedes the story of Bellerophon. Cicero translates the following two lines:

ἤτοι ὁ καὶ πεδίον τὸ Ἀλήϊον οἶος ἀλᾶτο
ὃν θυμὸν κατέδων, πάτον ἀνθρώπων ἀλεείνων

Il. 6.201-2

qui miser in campis maerens errabat Aleis
ipse suum cor edens, hominum vestigia vitans.

Bü. 24; Tusc. 3.63

Except for miser and maerens, this is a close translation, even in its phrasing and rhythm. The parallelism is especially notable in the second verse of each passage, balanced by two

[30] This is not strictly true. Odysseus, however, is being the politic man, and wants to de-emphasize the young hero's exceptionality in the interest of the common cause.

participles in identical positions, the first of which is followed by a masculine caesura; edens even duplicates the sound of its cognate in Greek. The word order of campis. . . Aleis is more characteristic of Latin than Greek, and by placing ipse (= οἷος; see OLD, ipse, 7) in the second line Cicero has introduced a mild antithesis into the balanced verse-halves, Bellerophon's solitude being more graphically paired off against hominum vestigia. The addition of miser and maerens, however, constitutes the greatest variation of the passage. This looks on the surface very much like an Ennian alteration of two verses in the Medea of Euripides, in which the nurse responds to a servant puzzled by her solitary talking:

ὥσθ' ἱμερός μ' ὑπῆλθε γῆ τε κοὐρανῷ
λέξαι μολούσῃ δεῦρο δεσποίνης τύχας

Med. 57-8

> Cupido cepit miseram nunc me proloqui
> caelo atque terrae Medeai miserias.
>
> 257 V.=ROL 264-5

Cicero was aware of the similarity, as this quotation from Ennius accompanies his description of Bellerophon. Both Latin passages establish a connection between grief and solitude that is appropriate for Cicero's argument. In Ennius, however, one sees a spelling-out of emotion characteristic of his dramatic technique. Cicero's insistence on the sorrow of Bellerophon, on the other hand, neatly joins the quotation to the surrounding prose, in which the words luctus, maeror, and dolor abound. Translation, then, presents a unique opportunity for the writer seeking to ornament his prose with verse; the authority and the philosophical "innocence" of poetry remain, and yet, under cover of the freedom that aemulatio encouraged, the verse could be doctored for the argument. For Cicero,

Greek verse was tractable in a way Roman verse was not; the latter could merely be taken out of context.[31]

The same concern for relevance and quotability has left its mark on another passage (Bü. 28; Tusc. 3.18), taken from a speech in which Achilles rejects Ajax's plea for reconciliation:

> corque meum penitus turgescit tristibus iris,
>
> cum decore atque omni me orbatum laude recordor.

Homer has:

> ἀλλά μοι οἰδάνεται κραδίη χόλῳ, ὁππότε κείνων
> μνήσομαι, ὥς μ' ἀσύφηλον ἐν Ἀργείοισιν ἔρεξεν
> Ἀτρεΐδης, ὡς εἴ τ' ἀτίμητον μετανάστην.
>
> Il. 9.646-8

The passage is quoted by Cicero for its metaphor of a mind swollen with anger. The Greek would have also served this purpose, as it did for Dionysius of Heraclea, whose argument comparing anger to a physical swelling Cicero recapitulates.[32] The main alteration of the first line is the addition of tristibus which, along with penitus, emphasizes the severity of Achilles' anger; this is not present in Homer's lines, and did not need to be, since the hero's black mood is dramatically revealed by the whole book. Compression for the sake of quotability is more apparent, however, in Cicero's second line, which is condensed from two lines of Homer. For Cicero, Achilles' reference to Agamemnon and the other Argives is irrelevant; their inclusion would detract from the generality of the argument, and shift attention away from the mental condition of the subject. Thus, instead of referring to the man who humiliated him and the men who witnessed it, Cicero's

[31] In disregarding context, Cicero is certainly no exception. As mentioned earlier in connection with Macrobius (p.53), literary context was neglected in general by ancient critics; it was eclipsed by an overriding concern for style and sententia. Even Longinus is concerned with the quotable sublime.

[32] Cicero introduces his quotation: "Itaque non inscite Heracleotes Dionysius ad ea disputat, quae apud Homerum Achilles queritur hoc, ut opinor, modo:"

Achilles describes his condition with his self at the center. A further step is taken away from Homer's social specificity with the metaphor of orbatum. Homer's Achilles also compared his condition to another's, if more overtly, in the simile ὡς δέ τις ἀτίμητον μετανάστην. Μετανάστην may be a strong word, and very expressive of Achilles' bitterness, but it is not by nature an emotional word. It is also oriented towards the polis and the world of status, keeping the emotion closely bound with the events that caused it. Orbatus, on the other hand, is not only an emotion-laden word, but ignores status as well, focusing on the feeling of loss rather than social standing.[33] Its particular relevance for a mental condition over a social one helps slant the concerns of the passage away from narrative towards psychology and the concerns of the the Tusculans.

Several critics find Cicero's alterations of Homer in this passage reflective of his own experiences. Traina, for instance, observes that the loss of decus and laus reflects Cicero's status at the time he was writing; it was Cicero's personal associations with the quotation that led him to remove the specific characters and circumstances in Homer's lines and render the passage gnomic. [34] He might have suggested the personal significance of orbatus as well, since Cicero says he wrote philosophy to forget the death of his daughter.[35] Ronconi argues that Ajax's boast of eternal glory (Bü. 25) reflects the hopes of the fallen Republican vis-à-vis Anthony.[36] Both Traina and Atzert, however, associate this passage and the sorrows of Bellerophon with the peripety of Cicero's exile. Atzert finds still closer connections between Cicero and Bellerophon: "Hi quoque versus non tam

---

[33] decus and laus work best as lost "children," although orbatus can mean "orpaned" as well.

[34] Traina, Vortit Barbare 81-82.

[35] The connection of Tullia's death and political misfortune to his philosophical essays is made in Acad. I.11: "nunc vero et fortunae gravissimo percussus vulnere et administratione rei publicae liberatus doloris medicinam a philosphia peto . . ."

[36] Ronconi 45-46.

in Bellerophontem, quam in ipsum redundant. Fuit enim Cicero in campis Aleis h.e. in Cilicia (Herodot VI,95) pro consule, quod ei munus non attulerat, sed necessitas."[37]

It is impossible to prove what associations were or were not in Cicero's mind when he translated; even Atzert's linking of the Aleian fields with Cilicia is not far-fetched, given the ability of cultured Romans to make such associations.[38] My discussion above, however, shows that some of Cicero's most noticeable alterations of Homer are determined by their context; there is less need to surmise the mind of the author when the mind of the text is clear. If Cicero's versions express a subjectivity absent in Homer and also have a personal relevance, they do so indirectly, as part-and-parcel of treatises concerned with topics relevant to Cicero's own experience of grief and glory.

Cicero's longest translation of Homer remains to be discussed (earlier it was merely touched upon in connection with Cicero's image of Odysseus, when I suggested that the attribution of this speech to Agamemnon may have been influenced by Cicero's own conception of Homeric ethos, according to which Odysseus would not be the sort of man to trust in omens). It is not only the passage's length that makes it particularly valuable in judging Cicero as a translator of Homer, but the absence of any of the tampering for the sake of context that marks most of the shorter passages discussed earlier. The speech by Odysseus recalling Calchas' interpretation of an omen illustrates, for Cicero, an absurdity just as it stands;[39] the alterations, therefore, can be ascribed to Cicero's own poetic and

---

[37] Carolus Atzert, De Cicerone Interprete Graecorum (Göttingen: Huthiana, 1908) 39.

[38] Cicero's letters show his fondness and talent for finding literary parallels to characterize individuals and situations. Clodia, for instance, is the "cow-eyed Hera." Suetonius' biographies of the emperors show how adept educated Romans were in applying Homeric verse to specific circumstances.

[39] Cicero argues that such divination cannot provide knowledge, on account of the indeterminacy of the natural signs upon which it is based. How can10 sparrows necessarily refer to10 years?

rhetorical tastes. The note of pride that introduces the translation also suggest that Cicero, though disapproving of the contents, regards the verse as a chance to show his skill.

τλῆτε, φίλοι, καὶ μείνατ' ἐπὶ χρόνον, ὄφρα δαῶμεν
ἢ ἐτεὸν Κάλχας μαντεύεται, ἦε καὶ οὐκί.
εὖ γὰρ δὴ τόδε ἴδμεν ἐνὶ φρεσίν, ἐστὲ δὲ πάντες
μάρτυροι, οὓς μὴ κῆρες ἔβαν θανάτοιο φέρουσαι·
χθιζά τε καὶ πρωΐζ', ὅτ' ἐς Αὐλίδα νῆες Ἀχαιῶν
ἠγερέθοντο κακὰ Πριάμῳ καὶ Τρωσὶ φέρουσαι,
ἡμεῖς δ' ἀμφὶ περὶ κρήνην ἱεροὺς κατὰ βωμοὺς
ἕρδομεν ἀθανάτοισι τελήεσσας ἑκατόμβας,
καλῇ ὑπὸ πλατανίστῳ, ὅθεν ῥέεν ἀγλαὸν ὕδωρ·
ἔνθ' ἐφάνη μέγα σῆμα· δράκων ἐπὶ νῶτα δαφοινός,
σμερδαλέος, τόν ῥ' αὐτὸς Ὀλύμπιος ἦκε φόωσδε,
βωμοῦ ὑπαίξας πρός ῥα πλατάνιστον ὄρουσεν.
ἔνθα δ' ἔσαν στρουθοῖο νεοσσοί, νήπια τέκνα,
ὄζῳ ἐπ' ἀκροτάτῳ, πετάλοις ὑποπεπτηῶτες,
ὀκτώ, ἀτὰρ μήτηρ ἐνάτη ἦν, ἣ τέκε τέκνα.
ἔνθ' ὅ γε τοὺς ἐλεεινὰ κατήσθιε τετριγῶτας·
μήτηρ δ' ἀμφιποτᾶτο ὀδυρομένη φίλα τέκνα·
τὴν δ' ἐλελιξάμενος πτέρυγος λάβεν ἀμφιαχυῖαν.
αὐτὰρ ἐπεὶ κατὰ τέκνα φαγε στρουθοῖο καὶ αὐτήν,
τὸν μὲν ἀρίζηλον θῆκεν θεός, ὅς περ ἔφηνε·
λᾶαν γάρ μιν ἔθηκε Κρόνου πάϊς ἀγκυλομήτεω·
ἡμεῖς δ' ἑσταότες θαυμάζομεν οἷον ἐτύχθη.
ὡς οὖν δεινὰ πέλωρα θεῶν εἰσῆλθ' ἑκατόμβας,
Κάλχας δ' αὐτίκ' ἔπειτα θεοπροπέων ἀγόρευε·
'τίπτ' ἄνεῳ ἐγένεσθε, κάρη κομόωντες Ἀχαιοί;
ἡμῖν μὲν τόδ' ἔφηνε τέρας μέγα μητίετα Ζεύς,
ὄψιμον, ὀψιτέλεστον, ὅου κλέος οὔ ποτ' ὀλεῖται.
ὡς οὗτος κατὰ τέκνα φαγε στρουθοῖο καὶ αὐτήν,
ὀκτώ, ἀτὰρ μήτηρ ἐνάτη ἦν, ἣ τέκε τέκνα,
ὡς ἡμεῖς τοσσαῦτ' ἔτεα πτολεμίζομεν αὖθι,
τῷ δεκάτῳ δὲ πόλιν αἱρήσομεν εὐρυάγυιαν.'

Il. 2. 299-330

ferte, viri, et duros animo tolerate labores,
auguris ut nostri Calchantis fata queamus
scire, ratosne habeant an vanos pectoris orsus.
namque omnes memori portentum mente retentant,
qui non funestis liquerunt lumina fatis.
Argolicis primum ut vestita est classibus Aulis,
quae Priamo cladem et Troiae pestemque ferebant,
nos circum latices gelidos fumantibus aris
aurigeris divom placantes numina tauris
sub platano umbrifera, fons unde emanat aquai,
vidimus inmani specie tortuque draconem
terribilem, Iovis ut pulsu penetraret ab ara;
qui platani in ramo foliorum tegmine saeptos
corripuit pullos; quos cum consumeret octo,
nona super tremulo genetrix clangore volabat,
cui ferus inmani laniavit viscera morsu.
hunc, ubi tam teneros volucris matremque peremit,
qui luci ediderat genitor Saturnius idem
abdidit et duro formavit tegmine saxi.

nos autem timidi stantes mirabile monstrum
vidimus in mediis divom versarier aris.
tum Calchas haec est fidenti voce locutus:
'quidnam torpentes subito obstupuistis, Achivi?
nobis haec portenta deum dedit ipse creator
tarda et sera nimis, sed fama ac laude perenni.
nam quot avis taetro mactatas dente videtis,
tot nos ad Troiam belli exanclabimus annos;
quae decumo cadet et poena satiabit Achivos.'
Edidit haec Calchas; quae iam matura videtis.

Bü. 23; De Div. 2.63

Several critics have discussed this passage, each taking a different approach. Atzert treats the passage as versified oratory. He traces most of Cicero's divergences from Homer to rhetorical theory, and provides quotations from Cicero's rhetorical treatises to explain each alteration. On one occasion this is instructive. He notes that Cicero has rendered Homer's λέξις εἰρομένη with a more subordinating style; the events in Homer's progression ἔνθ' ἐφάνη (308), ἔνθα δ' ἔσαν (311), and ἔνθ' ὅ γε (314), for example, are placed in larger grammatical units. Atzert comments: "Oratores sic non loquuntur [ut Homeros]. Quapropter substituit interpres λέξιν κατεστραμμένην, qua fit, ut singulae sententiolae una periculo comprehendantur."[40] Yet there is perhaps in Atzert's approach a characteristically German respect for the boundaries of a profession ; Cicero took his poetry seriously, if not everyone else did, and composed, here as in his earlier poetry, with an eye more on Roman poetic tradition than on the rhetorical handbooks.

The passage's allegiances to earlier Roman poetry are demonstrated by Herbert Ahrens' line-by-line analysis of the passage.[41] His demonstration of an epic idiom throughout also throws into question an aesthetic standard that Traina attributes to the verse. Summarily put by Traina, "Da traduttore artista , Cicerone sacrifica la

[40] Atzert 27.

[41] Herbert Ahrens, "Cicero als Übersetzer Epischer und Tragischer Dichtung der Griechen," diss., Universität Hamburg, 1961. The other passages are from Sophocles' Trachiniae and the lost Prometheus Δεσμώτης of Aechylus.

corrispondenza letterale dei particolari all'equilibrio dell' insieme: cambiando l'ordine degli addendi, la somma non cambia."[42] The sum, for Traina, is dictated by Homer, and Cicero's epic mannerisms are specific responses to individual mannerisms and usages in the Greek; the chiastic alliteration of funestis liquerunt lumina fatis(5), for instance, retains the poetic "patina" of the epic formula οὓς μὴ κῆρες ἔβαν θανατοιο φέρουσαι (302), the archaic genitive aquai(10) is an equivalent for the archaic imperfect ῥέεν (307), and the archaic form exanclabimus(27) is called for by the standing epithet εὐρυάγυιαν (329).[43] Yet in light of the passage's epic idiom throughout, as demonstrated by Ahrens, this argues too close a correspondence, a too atomistic determination of the Latin by the Greek. Traina's approach, however, has the virtue of closely comparing Greek to Latin and assessing the alterations, and my discussion follows his lead in this regard, especially in the attempt to characterize the different treatment of emotion in each version.

The comments of Atzert and Traina on the phrases avis taetro mactatas dente (26) and poena satiabit Achivos(28) are characteristic of their respective interests. Each phrase translates a more matter of fact expression in Homer. In the case of the first, instead of portraying birds slaughtered by the snake's gruesome tooth, the Greek (ll.326-7) reads more like an official body count; there is no attempt by Homer to bring the slaughter to mind again, or to reveal a new side to it--Calchas' words in these two lines are nearly the same as those used earlier by Odysseus (317, 313). The numbers, clearly, are the crucial fact in terms of the narrative, and not the fate of the birds. Similarly, Cicero's satiabit injects a note of emotion and motivation where the Greek stated flatly that in the tenth year πόλιν αἱρήσομεν (329). Atzert relates these alterations to a peroration in

---

[42] Traina 74.

[43] Traina 73-75.

which the speaker seeks to move the emotions with thoughts of greed and revenge.[44] But Calchas' speech is six lines long: divisions in terms of a long speech are totally out of place. Traina more persuasively argues that something typically Roman is occurring in the second to last line when "[l]a pacata predizione diviene in latino ira e passione di nemico."[45]

Traina's attribution of a greater pathos to the Latin description of the omen itself, however, raises some questions. Ahrens says just the opposite, that it is Homer's description that has the true pathos. There are real and characteristic differences between the two passages, but the word "pathos" does not help to characterize them in this case. Ahrens is right; Homer's portrayal of the bird slaughter is pitiful: the nestlings are huddled in fright (ὑποπεπτηῶτες ,312), are swallowed twittering (τετριγῶτας , 314), the mother laments their death (ὀδυρομένη φίλα τέκνα , 315), and is herself captured in her distraught commotion (ἀμφιαχυῖαν , 316). The scene is portrayed with a pathos that is unusual in Homer. This is not without purpose, however; nor can the pathos be attributed solely to a sensitive absorption in the drama among the animals. Although the birds in this omen are, strictly interpreted, "years," they are also Troy, whose destruction is here presaged and compressed into a scene. The omen thus functions something like a simile in its ability to illustrate an action from a different perspective; also like a simile, it can permit itself a voice uncharacteristic of the dryer narrative voice (see p.63).

Here at the beginning of the epic the tragic dimension of Troy's eventual destruction is introduced, much as in Bk. 3 the causes of the war are recapitulated in a second seduction of Helen.

In Cicero's version there are a few instances of an emotional exaggeration, such as where Cicero focuses on the kill: cui ferus inmani laniavit viscera morsu(16). Traina

---

[44] Atzert 29. He quotes orat. part. 95.

[45] Traina 77.

comments: "Qui l'eccesso del pathos distrugge l'evidenza, perché la sproporzione fra le due bestie non sopporta tanta truculenza d'immagini."[46] Perhaps the best indication of Cicero's interest in the pathetic aspect of the event is the phrase tam teneros volucris. . . peremit: in Homer, there is no tenderness or emotion shown apart from the initial decription of the portent; the pathos is bound up with the action. Cicero's tam teneros, as well as the phrase taetro mactatas dente discussed earlier, both following the initial description of the portent, unhinge the emotion from the action and make it a concern common to the whole passage. In the actual description of the portent, however, Cicero's terribilem simply renders σμερδαλέος , tremulo. . . clangore is a conflation of δδυρομένη and ἀμφιαχυῖαν , and saeptos is actually less expressive of emotion than ὑποπεπτηῶτες .; it is not therefore the presence of pathos which distinguishes Cicero from Homer, but the manner of its presentation.

The difference noted earlier between Cicero's periodic style and Homer's λέξις εἰρομένη also plays a role in their differing presentations of emotion. In Homer the events unroll one-by-one, giving us the sense that we are watching them as they happen. This in turn lends a sense of objectivity to the scene. In Cicero, the action is arranged and subordinated, becoming part of a system more noticeably dependent on the speaker. The emotion expressed, therefore, gives the impression of being more overlaid than inherent, a product of the shaping narrator. The role of the observer is also emphasized by the grammatical dependence of the action upon vidimus. . . (11).[47]

Traina, who characterizes Homer's version as more dramatic ("in senso etimologico") than Cicero's, points to a further grammatical distinction, Homer's greater

---

[46] Traina 76.

[47] The emphasis placed on the observer with vidimus may be the indirect result of an attempt by Cicero to romanize the portent; Jocelyn refers to the Roman emphasis on visual observation in Roman rites, p.106. See Traina, pp. 72-74, for discussions on other aspects of this religious romanization.

reliance on verbs.[48] The conflation of tremulo. . . clangore mentioned above, is the best example of this. He also notes ὑπαΐξας, rendered by pulso, and the unrendered ἐλελιζάμενος and τετριγῶτας. This verbal orientation of the Greek version also supports the impression of an event in process, rather than one considered and retold.

Traina's assessment of these grammatical distinctions corroborates a general observation made by v. Albrecht in his own assessment of the same grammatical characteristics in the horse-similes of Homer and Ennius (p.59); in Ennius' adjectives v. Albrecht saw evidence of an emotive mediation, "eine atmosphärische Wirkung," and in Ennius' "nominal" description of the horse he saw a Latin trait more expressive of psychological abstractions than Homer's more verbally-oriented description. The characterization need not be so subtle in Cicero's version, where emotional reactions and the subjective response of the audience is emphasized in the number of ways mentioned above.

One further emphasis on audience-reaction is underpinned by an antithesis (a prominent figure in the passage, as will be seen). When Cicero renders ἡμεῖς δ' ἑστάότες θαμβήσομεν (320) by timidi stantes. . . vidimus, he is apparently giving no greater attention to the Achaian response than Homer: Cicero has simply altered suprise (θαυμάζομεν) to alarm (timidi). Although the description of Calchas' response, fidenti voce, has no counterpart in Homer, it can be extrapolated from Calchas' speech (which begins, "Why so quiet, Achaians?"). Cicero, however, has created with these small changes an antithesis between timidi and fidenti, and thus brings the respective responses of both troops and seer to the fore; as in the translations of the Sirens' song (p. 111) and Odysseus' advice to Achilles (p. 116), interpretation (in this case by means of a figure) glosses or substitutes for drama.

---

[48] Traina 75-6.

There is another antithesis created by Cicero, this one more central to the passage and another reason why the kill described is less dramatic than Homer's version. Traina, as quoted above, touched on the ludicrous disparity between snake and bird in line 16, cui ferus immani laniavit viscera morsu. This line is only part of Cicero's attempt to heighten the drama by the wrong means, the creation of an explicit antithesis between ferocious predator and helpless prey. The contrast is of course part of the drama as Homer presents it, but it too is expressed more in the action than in a blatant juxtaposition of two qualities. Cicero's snake is twice inmanis(11,16); the closest Homer gets to any mention of size is in the phrase μέγα σῆμα (307), where μέγα may simply refer to its importance. Also without precedence in Homer is the pointed juxtaposition of ferus and teneros(16-17).

There are, finally, two other examples of antithesis, showing that Ennius was not the only Roman who was fond of introducing the figure when rendering Greek verse. One of the instances in Cicero adds little to his verse: he renders τὸν μὲν ἀοῖζηλον θῆκεν θεός, ὃς περ ἔφην ἔνε (318) with qui luci ediderat genitor Saturnius idem/abdidit, where idem and the similar- sounding verbs serve to point the contrast. In Cicero's favor it might be argued that the figure emphasizes the omnipotence of Juppiter, who controlled both the appearance and disappearance of the prodigy. More poetic, although also lacking a larger dramatic function, is the slightly veiled antithesis in line 8: nos circum latices gelidos fumantibus aris. "Cicero hat das Epitheton gelidos hier. . . in bewusster Absicht als Antithese zu dem Epitheton fumantibus, dem der Begriff des Feuers immanent ist, gestellt."[49] Ahrens comments that antithesis and parallelism belong more to artistic prose than poetry. As the passage by Cicero shows, however, antitheses can occur on different levels of visibility and association; there are oppositions of ideas, and oppositions of images, and a preponderance of one or the other in a figure, coupled with such other devices as sound and word-position, can change its stylistic character radically. Cicero's gelidos fumantibus, it can be argued, is a poetic sort of antithesis; it is sensory,

---

[49] Ahrens 34.

and involves both touch and sight, and although hot and cold, clear and smoky may have little to do with the narrative, their opposition to each other draws their respective qualities to the fore and makes the scene more vivid. Given its liberties of word-order, Latin is well-suited for such a device, and Cicero's phrase presages the artful verbal juxtapositions that are a common feature in Horace's Odes: tenues grandia(1.6.9), virenti canities(1.9.18), and dulcia barbare(1.13.14) are just a few examples from Book 1.

It is clear from Cicero's longest Homeric passage that the meeting of the two writers in Cicero's translation had little impact on Latin verse. Perhaps the verse remained obscure; verses from De Gloria fell into Gellius' purview, but scattered as they are through the philosophical treatises, they must have remained islands in waters seldom sailed by other poets in antiquity. Such neglect was no tragedy, however; Cicero writes on a stylistic plain suitable for epic, but the epic flavor is largely an inheritance, with no apparent expansion of technique or diction under the influence of the Greek text. The verse is exceptional neither for its ability to capture Homer's style nor for an independent sensibility It is, however, a competent re-working of a scene for Roman poetic tastes, with plenty of sound effects, especially alliteration (Namque omnes memori portentum mente retentant(4) is almost monotonous; pulsu penetraret ab ara(12) and torpentes subito obstupuistis, Achivi?(23) are better, the former for its vigor, and the latter for its almost derisive tone of reproval, appropriate for the haughtiness of a high seer). The antitheses added to the Latin prodigy are also to Roman tastes, if one can judge from Ennius (especially in his versions of Greek tragedy, p.73), Lucretius (calidis candens. . ./gelidum, p.82), and another instance in Cicero, in his portrayal of Bellerophon (p. 117). Finally, the increased focus on emotions and psychology in Cicero's portrayal of the snake-attack and its audience is reminiscent of Ennius' horse-simile (p. 59) and wood-cutting scene (pp. 67-8).

It is tempting to see the same psychologizing trend and emotional emphasis in Cicero's shorter translations. There, however, the alterations were seen to be more closely

related to the prose arguments for which the verse was composed: the additions of miser and maerens in Bü. 24 (p.117),for instance,the emphasis of maerore and luctum in Bü. 29 (p.115),and the inward focus of the suffering Achilles in Bü. 28 are attributable to the verse's working relationship with the topic of discussion in the third book of the Tusculans; such alterations are more adaptations for an argument than independent reflections of the subjective twist the Romans often gave Greek models.

Conclusion

The confrontation between Homer and Republican poetry has been useful in a number of ways. First, it has in many instances provided a window into the workings of poetic imagination, since a poet's shaping of one discrete part of his experience can be comprehended more immediately than something so general as his shaping of landscape, for example. Lucretius' imitation of Homer proved to be the most interesting study in this regard. One of his most impressive uses of Homeric text is his reworking and selective translation of Phaeacian splendor in the proem to DRN, Bk. 2 (see pp. 93-4); by its location in a scheme of imagery active especially in the proem but also throughout the work, the brilliance of Homer's precious metals is seen to shine with a false light that is in truth darkness (a judgment all the more effective because unobtrusive). No less skillful is Lucretius' transformation of Homer's description of Mt. Olympus, which he tailors for his own vision of mental peace (pp.84-8). Other borrowings set in a more expository context (the decriptions of the Chimaera, pp.89-90, and troop maneuvers, p.83), suggest that Lucretius' artistry is more pervasive than he is sometimes given credit for.

Much of Lucretius' skill in rendering Homer is revealed only when the borrowed passage is taken in context. Ennius' imitations of Homer, then, since they are so fragmentary, can do no more than hint at the range of his artistry. The tree-felling scene, however, is an indication that Ennius, at least on occasion, is no less adept than Lucretius in adapting a Homeric passage for his own purposes. In Homer the wood-gathering scene is narrative action, a straightforward description of how a crew found, cut, split, and

delivered the wood needed to cremate Achaian dead. Ennius transforms the scene by drastically reducing the action and then personalizing the forest, so that the falling trees and murmuring woods have a thematic relevance both to the battle that must have preceded the wood-cutting and to the funeral that must have followed (pp.65-9); it is not so much a logging operation as a vision of the narrative action from a different perspective.

Cicero also shows skill in adapting Homeric passages for their new context, and he shares with Lucretius a readiness to subordinate Homer to a philosophical position. To illustrate that solitude is often sought by troubled souls Bellerophon becomes miser and maerens (p.117), and the Sirens, to show how men by nature have a healthy desire for knowledge, are transformed from deadly temptresses into teachers at a Platonic waystation (pp.107-10). In Cicero's case, however, the divergences are not part of an artistic scheme effected through images (as with Lucretius), but a straightforward revision of Homeric sentiments and style that renders the passages more suitable for Cicero's argument.

There is a second way, however, in which the study of Homeric passages in Republican poetry has proven to be fruitful, apart from the insight it provides into individual authors and specific scenes. Brooks Otis, in the article summarized in my Introduction, laments that "singularly little attention has been paid to the broader problem of Latin literature or even of Latin poetry as a whole," and that the generalizations about a uniquely Roman perspective have been "impressionistic and scattered and mainly subordinated to the detailed treatment of individual authors."[1] This broader project of restoring Roman literature demands a critical approach alive to its virtues, and not just those of its Greek models. Homer has been helpful in three areas of inquiry that strike me as vital to such a restoration: 1) the uniqueness of Latin literature, 2) the Roman origins of Latin literature (especially epic style), and 3) the dynamics of literary influence in the ancient world.

---

[1] Otis 187.

Otis called the Romans' subjective (or introspective) approach the feature that most distinguished their literary art from the Greeks'; others (especially Mariotti, Traina, and Röser) have noted a "Pathetisierung" in Roman models of Greek versions. Instances of heightened pathos and an emphasis on the emotional aspect of an action are clearly evident in the Odusia (pp.23-5), in both Ennius' epic and his tragedies, and in Cicero's translations of Homer: it is clearly a Roman propensity. To characterize Latin literature by this propensity alone, however, can be misleading; first, it was also an Alexandrian trait to emphasize emotion; heightened pathos alone, then, suggests nothing unique about Latin literature. Secondly, the explicit striving for emotional effect is often a hallmark of decadence; its appearance in Roman renditions of Homer is not necessarily flattering. The value of Otis' characterization lies in its recognition that with Roman poetry something new entered literature, in conjunction with which pathos could take on new meaning and be transformed into Virgil's lacrimae rerum. The evidence for this new subjective viewpoint in the Homeric borrowings surveyed is not great, but nonetheless convincing in two passages that remain from the Annales. In Ennius' horse-simile, not only is the psychology of the horse emphasized, but the description was centered in a viewer's experience (pp.57-60); in the tree-cutting description, Homer's narrative objectivity likewise recedes as Ennius turns inward for the scene's effects.

It is the prominence of sound effects and pattern in Ennius' tree-felling scene that suggests a connection between a subjective viewpoint and the devices of rhetoric (especially those that concern sound) that Leeman finds so characteristic of Latin literature (p.v). Certainly the sound effects have been increased in the Republican poets' imitations of Homer; Livius' description of the ocean's destructive power (p.26), Ennius' tree-cutting scene, and Lucretius' divine space (p.85) are only the most obvious instances in which alliteration, rhyme, and onomatopoeia are more prominent than in Homer. Antitheses figure more in Cicero's translations of Homer than in the original (pp.127-8); Ennius is also fond of an antithetical style, although his translations of Greek tragedy show this more

than do his Homeric passages (p.73). Although the prominence of sound and figure is not a necessary condition for the subjective viewpoint, the elaborate chiasmus of word order and voice in the tree-cutting scene, along with the other devices of sound just mentioned, shows how these devices can encourage and serve to express subjectivity; the more musical the art, the more inward the sources of inspiration (pp.76-7).

That Otis should limit his inquiry to Latin literature after 60 BC is understandable, since the presence or absence of a subjective viewpoint cannot easily be determined from fragments. Yet this limitation not only suggests that the early poets are uncreative copyists in the thrall of Greek literature, but also is detrimental to an assessment of late Republican and Augustan literature, which gets cast in an unrealistic dichotomy: either it is dependent on a Greek model, or shows a burst of creativity and a novel sensibility which have no heritage. Yet the resonance of Roman grandeur achieved by historical irony in Ennius' description of the auspices (p.65) and the mixture of pathos, natural description, and word music in the tree-cutting scene suggest that Virgil's artistic advancement over earlier Roman poets may lie more in his consistency and proportion than in imaginative technique. In the end fragments must frustrate, but if we cannot reconstruct with any satisfaction what is lost, our understanding of Roman literature will at least profit from a more accurate estimation of the damage.

Many later poetic mannerisms can be traced to their source in Livius and Ennius, and through them to still earlier documents. A determination of such sources not only reveals something about a poet's creative appropriation of a language's resources, but can help us develop a sense of Latin poetic registers and revive the associations that accompanied the use of certain words, forms, and phrases. The Odusia is particularly instructive in exploring the Latin origins of epic style, since Livius draws heavily on the indigenous resources of Latin to create his solemn style, often avoiding Homeric stylistic traits that he clearly could have duplicated; patronymics, I have argued with U. Knoche's help (above, pp.13-4), replace Homer's epithets not because Livius is baffled by Greek

compound words, but because patronymics had a resonance in the Latin language which Homeric epithets did not. Archaisms are the other notable stylistic feature of Livius' translation which he bequeathed to later writers of epic (pp.15-7, and Ed. Fraenkel, "Livius" 604-6). His use of Saturnians, however, was seen to be a major factor in limiting his direct influence upon later writers (pp.20-2); it was Ennius who formulates the hexameter phrases and naturalized the Homeric expressions that frequently appear in later epic.

Finally, the study of Homer's role in Republican epic poetry reveals more personal currents of poetic influence. For exploring the relationship of the Roman poets to Homer and to each other, Harold Bloom's theories on poetic influence are suggestive. Although much of Bloom's literary theory is either inaccesible in general or irrelevant to the Classics[2], his thesis that a ("strong") poet's relationship to the works of his predecessors is characterized by a struggle for legitimacy, and that influence is as much a threat to a poetic identity as it is a source of strength, helps explain the apparent incongruity that Livius, the translator of Homer, is less faithful to the Greek than Ennius, creator of a Roman epic. Ennius' epic, by its very subject matter, involves a large degree of independence from Homer; the maxuma facta patrum and their annalistic arrangement are secure from Homer's reach. Since no degree of reliance on Homer, therefore, can overshadow the unique accomplishment of his own work, Ennius can borrow freely from Homer and employ him creatively in the ways considered above. Livius, on the other hand, is bound to Homer's narrative; the majority of the Odusia's content and arrangement is a given. His creativity is accordingly focused more narrowly on diction and points of style, where a stylistic reliance on Homer such as Ennius' would preclude originality and stifle Livius' attempt to fashion an independent epic style idiomatic to the Latin language.

---

[2] Bloom would agree that his theories are not as relevant for ancient poetry as for modern; with regard to American poets he writes in A Map of Misreading (p. 24): "Our greater emphasis on originality has produced inversely a more malevolent anxiety of influence. . ."

For Bloom, the anxiety of influence reveals itself in a variety of poetic stratagems, designed (often unconsciously) to combat "belatedness" and establish a poet's priority over his predecessors. No psychoanalytic interpretation of tropes is needed, however, to reveal an attempt by Ennius to displace earlier epic; the Annales is openly polemical about its priority: nec dicti studiosus quisquam erat ante hunc (p.18). Homer himself is enlisted in Ennius' attempt to relegate earlier Latin epic to pre-history; not only is anything Saturnian consigned to a primitive era before the Homeric hexameter established its Jovian hegemony, but by means of his dream of Homer Ennius also creates the allusion that he is closer to the true springs of poetry. Lucretius then "misreads" Ennius, attributing his dream, which functions in the Annales primarily as literary allusion (see pp.50-2), to foolish doctrine; he, Lucretius, in fact, will write epic as it should be written, appropriating the style of his great predecessors but employing it at last for a worthwhile purpose (pp.76-8).

Much more about might be said about the dynamics of influence among Republican poets (there is, for instance, the broadside delivered from Naevius' tomb: obliti sunt Romae loquier lingua latina).[3] I merely suggest in closing that an awareness of these currents of influence, such as are revealed by Homeric borrowings and references, can help post-Virgilian readers appreciate Republican epic. For in the end it was Virgil who succeeded in supplanting his predecessors, and without the sense that the Annales and De Rerum Natura were once the new creations of the latest poets, we are too apt to relegate them both to the role of mere harbingers of the Virgilian καιρός .

[3] W. Suerbaum's Untersuchung zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter provides much of the background for a more complete investigation.

Bibliography

Ahrens, Herbert. Cicero als Übersetzer epischer und tragischer Dichtung der Griechen. Diss. U Hamburg, 1961.

Albrecht, Michael von. "M. Tullius Cicero." RE, Suppl. 13. Munich: Alfred Druckenmüller, 1973. 1237-1347.

---. "Ein Pferdegleichnis bei Ennius." Hermes 97 (1969): 333-45.

Arnold, Matthew. "On Translating Homer." On the Classical Tradition, ed. R. H. Super. Ann Arbor: U of Michigan P, 1960. 97-216.

Atti del I Congresso Internazionale di Studi Ciceroniani, Roma,1959. 2 vols. Roma: Centro di Studi Ciceroniana Editore, 1961.

Atzert, Carolus. De Cicerone Interprete Graecorum. Gottingen: Huthiana, 1908.

Auerbach, Erich. Mimesis. trans. William R. Trask. Princeton: Princeton UP, 1953.

Bailey, Cyril, ed. Titi Lucreti Cari De Rerum Natura. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1947.

Bloom, Harold. The Anxiety of Influence. New York: Oxford UP, 1973.

---. A Map of Misreading. New York: Oxford UP, 1975.

Brooks, Robert A. Ennius and Roman Tragedy. Salem, N. H.: Ayer, 1984.

Büchner, Karl, ed. Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum Epicorum et Lyricorum Praeter Ennium et Lucilium. Leipzig: Teubner, 1982.

---. "Livius Andronicus und die erste künstlerische Übersetzung der Europäischen Kultur." Symbolae Osloenses 54 (1979): 37-70.

---. :M. Tullius Cicero." RE. Vol. 7A, Part 1. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1939: 827-1274.

The Cambridge History of Modern Literature: Vol. 2, Latin Literature. ed. E. J. Kenney. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.

Carratello, Ugo. Livio Andronico. Rome: Cadmo, 1979.

Catone, N. Grammatica Enniana. Florence: Vallecchi, 1964.

Costa, C. D. N., ed. Lucretius: De Rerum Natura V. New York: Oxford UP, 1984.

Dorey, T. A., ed. Cicero. London: Routlidge & Kegan Paul, 1965.

Dudley, D. R., ed. Lucretius. London: Routlidge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

Ewbank, W. W. The Poems of Cicero. London: Univ. of London Pr., 1933.

Farrington, B. Primum Graius Homo. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1927.

Fraenkel, Edmund. "Livius." RE, Suppl. 5. Stuttgart: Metzler,1931: 598-607.

---. Plautinisches im Plautus. Berlin: Weidmann, 1922.

Fränkel, Hermann. Dichtung und Philosophie des frühen Griechentums. Munich: Beck, 1962.

---. "Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen." Hermes 67 (1932): 303-311.

Hahn, E. A. "The Origin of the Greek Accusative." TAPA 91 (1960): 222-238.

Jocelyn, H. D. "Greek Poetry in Cicero's Prose Writings." Yale Classical Studies 23 (1973): 61-111.

---. "The Poems of Quintus Ennius." ANRW. Vol. 1.2 ed. H. Temporini. New York: Walter De Gruyer, 1972. 987-1026.

---, ed. The Tragedies of Ennius. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1967.

Kaimio, Jorma. The Romans and the Greek Language. Commentationes Humanarum Litterarum, 64 (1979). Helsinki: Societas Scientiarum Litterarum.

Kameke, Hanny von. Ennius und Homer: Versuch einer Analyse der Annalenfragmente. Diss. U Leipzig, 1925. Weida in Thüringen: Thomas & Hubert, 1926.

Kennedy, George. Classical Rhetoric and its Christian and Secular Tradition from Ancient to Modern Times. Chapel Hill: U of North Carolina P, 1980.

Kenney, E. J. "Doctus Lucretius." Mnemosyne 4.23 (1970):366-92.

---, ed. Lucretius: De Rerum Natura, Bk III. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1971.

Knoche, Ulrich. "Über die Aneignung griechischer Poesie im älteren Rom." Gymnasium 65.4-5 (1958): 321-41.

---. Review of Morel's Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum. In Gnomon 4 (1928): 687-97.

Kroll, W. Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1924.

Kunz, Franz. Die älteste römische Epik in ihren Verhältnisse zu Homer. Wien- Meidling: Rollinger and Moessmer, 1890.

Leeman, A. D. Orationis Ratio. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1963.

Leo, Friedrich. Geschichte der römischen Literatur. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913.

Lesky, Albin. Geschichte der griechischen Literatur. Bern: Francke, 1971.

Macleod, Colin. Collected Essays. New York: Oxford UP, 1983.

Mariotti, Scevola. Livio Andronico e la Traduzione Artistica. Milan: Univ. di Urbino, 1952.

Minyard, J. D. Mode and Value in the De Rerum Natura: A Study in Lucretius' Metrical Language. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1978.

Norden, Eduard. Aus altrömischen Priesterbüchern. Lund: C. W. K. Glerrup, 1939.

Otis, Brooks. "The Uniqueness of Latin Literature." Arion 6 (1967): 185-206.

Palmer, L. R. The Latin Language. London: Faber and Faber, 1954.

Parry, Adam. "Language and Characterization in Homer." Harvard Studies in Classical Philology 76 (1972): 1-22.

Ronconi, Alessandro. "Antiche traduzioni latine da Omero." In Filologia e linguistica. Rome: Ateneo, 1968: 109-126.

--- Interpreti latini di Omero. Torino: Bottega D'Erasmo, 1973.

Röser, Wolfgang. Ennius, Euripides und Homer. Würzburg-Aumühle: Konrad Triltsch, 1939.

Russell, D. A. Criticism in Antiquity. Berkeley: U of California P, 1981.

Schanz, Martin and Carl Hosius. Geschichte der römischen Literature, I. Teil: Die Römische Literature in der Zeit der Republik. Munich: Beck, 1927.

Schein, Seth L. The Mortal Hero: A Introduction to Homer's Iliad. Berkeley: U of California P, 1984.

Sellar, W. Y. The Roman Poets of the Republic. Edinburgh: Edmonston and Douglas, 1863.

Skutsch, Franz. "Ennius." RE, 5. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1905: 2589-2628.

Skutsch, Otto, ed. The Annals of Q. Ennius. New York: Oxford UP, 1985.

---, ed. Ennius. Entretiens sur l'antiquite classique, t. 14. Geneva: Foundation Hardt, 1972.

Stanford, W. B., ed. The Odyssey of Homer. Vol. 1 (Bks. 1-12). London: Macmillan, 1974.

---. The Ulysses Theme. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1963.

Steiner, George and Robert Fagles. Homer: A Collection of Critical Essays. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall, 1962.

Steuart, Ethel Mary. The Annals of Quintus Ennius. New York: Georg Olms, 1976 (Reprint of 1925 ed., Cambridge UP).

Tolkiehn, J. Homer und die römische Poesie. Leipzig: Dieterich, 1900.

Townend, G. B. "The Poems." Cicero. Ed. T. A. Dorey. London: Routlidge and Kegan Paul, 1965.

Traglia, Antonio. La lingua di Cicerone Poeta. Bari: Adriatica Editrice, 1950.

---, ed. M. Tulli Ciceronis Poetica Fragmenta. Rome: Arnoldi Mondadori, 1963.

Traina, Alfonso. Vortit barbare. Roma: Edizione dell'Ateneo, 1970.

Vahlen, Iohannes. Ennianae Poesis Reliquiae. 2nd ed. Amsterdam: Hakkert, 1967 (reprint of 1928 ed., Teubner).

Verrusio, Maria. Livio Andronico e la sua traduzione dell' Odissea omerica. Philologica 6. Rome: Bretschneider, 1977.

Warmington, E. H., ed. and trans. Remains of Old Latin. 4 vols. Cambridge: Harvard UP, 1936 (vol. 2), 1979 (vol. 1, revised).

Waszink, J. H. "Camena." Classica et Mediaevalia 17 (1956): 139-148.

---. "Tradition and Personal Achievement in Early Latin Literature." Mnemosyne 13.4 (1960): 16-33.

---. "Zum Anfangsstadium der römischen Literatur." ANRW. ed. H. Temporini. Berlin: 1972.

West, David. The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius. Edinburgh: Edinburgh UP, 1969.

Wigodsky, Michael. Vergil and Early Latin Poetry. Hermes Einzelschriften 24. Wiesbaden: Franz Steiner, 1972.

Willcock, M. M., ed. The Iliad of Homer I-XII. London: St. Martin's P, 1978.

Williams, Gordon. "The Genesis of Poetry in Rome." Cambridge History of Classical Literature, ed E. J. Kenney. Cambridge: Cambridge UP, 1982.

---. The Nature of Roman Poetry. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1970.

---. Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry. Oxford: Oxford UP, 1968.