

TIMPANARO AND THE TEXT OF ENNIUS*

Almost forty years on from its year of initial publication, Otto Skutsch's edition of the *Annales*¹ remains, as Sebastiano Timpanaro predicted it would², the standard edition of Ennius' poem. While older and newer *Annales* certainly have much to offer³, it is Skutsch that most scholars and students pick up when they want to read Ennian epic; and it is Skutsch that recently reappeared – «as he surely had to»⁴ – in the pages of Sander Goldberg and Gesine Manuwald's 'Loeb' Ennius⁵.

Yet no edition remains standard forever⁶, and there is, I think, in these days of growing interest in Ennian poetry⁷, a growing dissatisfaction with many aspects of what Skutsch created⁸. It is inevitable, then, and even likely

* This paper was written for, and presented at, a conference in Pisa honouring the centenary of Sebastiano Timpanaro. I am grateful to Alessandro Russo and Anna Zago for organizing that event and including me; to the audience in Pisa for their questions and suggestions; and to RPL's referees, Jackie Elliott, and (once again) Alessandro Russo for the generous attention that they paid the following pages in draft. This work was supported by UKRI EP/X022102/1.

1. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Edited with Introduction and Commentary by O. Skutsch, Oxford 1985.

2. S. Timpanaro, *Nuovi contributi di filologia e storia della lingua latina*, Bologna 1994, p. 202.

3. Older: *I frammenti degli Annali*, editi e illustrati da L. Valmaggli, Torino 1900; *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*, iteratis curis recensuit I. Vahlen, Lipsiae 1903; *The Annals of Q. Ennius*, Edited by E.M. Steuart, Cambridge 1925; *Remains of Old Latin, I. Ennius, Caecilius*, Edited and Translated by E.H. Warmington, Cambridge (Mass.) 1935. Newer: *Q. Ennio. Annali. Commentari*, I-V, a cura di E. Flores *et alii*, Napoli 2000-2009.

4. C. Whitton, *Latin Literature, Subject Reviews*, «Greece & Rome» 66, 2019, pp. 118-26: 119.

5. *Fragmentary Republican Latin*, I-II, Edited and Translated by S.M. Goldberg and G. Manuwald, Cambridge (Mass.)-London 2018.

6. Least of all an edition of a poem whose remains are so few and broken as those of the *Annales* (cf. S. Goldberg, *Gli Annales di Ennio a cura di Enrico Flores*, «Paideia» 64, 2009, pp. 637-55: 638).

7. There has been an explosion of research on Ennius since roughly 2010. Some standout contributions: V. Fabrizi, *Mores veteresque novosque: Rappresentazioni del passato e del presente di Roma negli Annales di Ennio*, Pisa 2012; J. Elliott, *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales*, Cambridge 2013; C. Damon-J. Farrell (eds.), *Ennius' Annals: Poetry and History*, Cambridge 2020. Cf. two volumes on the verge of being published: J. Hill-C.W. Marshall (eds.), *Ennius beyond Epic*, Cambridge, forthcoming; and S. La Barbera-J. Nethercut (eds.), *The Oxford Handbook of Ennius*, Oxford, forthcoming.

8. In anglophone scholarship, today's dissatisfaction with Skutsch's Ennius tends to be predicated directly on the important criticisms made in Elliott, *Ennius* cit.; cf. Damon-Farrell, *op. cit.*, pp. 1 f., and many of the chapters therein; J. Nethercut, *Ennius Noster: Lucretius and the Annales*, Oxford 2020, p. 1; J. Hill, *True Friendship: Ennius and Other Poets in Catullus 116*, «Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.» 151, 2021, pp. 155-84: 175 n. 92.

to happen in my own lifetime, that a new edition of Ennius' poem will appear to usurp Skutsch's throne. This paper is written with that future edition in mind. My protagonist is Timpanaro; and my basic argument is that his *scritti enniani* will be of importance – even of central importance – in improving upon Skutsch's *Annales*.

From the late 1940s to the late 1990s, Timpanaro published a series of studies on Ennius, which typically bore titles of a modesty that underrated their significance – *Noterelle enniane*, *Due note enniane*, and so on⁹. These *scritti* are a storehouse of good suggestions about the text of Ennius – about what readings to preserve, what conjectures to accept¹⁰. And it would certainly be possible to offer a kind of collection of Timpanaro's Greatest Hits. But here I want to focus instead on methodology. My argument will have two parts. First, through a discussion of his extended, amicably polemical dialogue with Otto Skutsch, and paying particular attention to *ann.* 209 Sk., I am going to sketch a methodological principle that seems to me to underlie Timpanaro's «scattered studies on Ennius»¹¹. Second, I will focus on one tricky hexameter, *ann.* 579 Sk., a verse which, to my knowledge, Timpanaro never discussed in print¹², but which his writings can nonetheless help us to understand. I will be suggesting, then, that the lessons of Timpanaro's *scritti enniani* are transferable: offering a kind of *clarum ... lumen*, they allow us to work through numerous textual problems within the Ennian corpus, especially as those problems appear in today's standard edition of the *Annales*.

I. TIMPANARO VS SKUTSCH

Sebastiano Timpanaro, as is well known¹³, began his philological career with a series of four publications on Ennius, written, quite explicitly, to

9. Many of these studies are collected and often deeply reworked in the following volumes: S. Timpanaro, *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina*, Roma 1978; Id., *Nuovi contributi di filologia e storia della lingua latina*, Bologna 1994; Id., *Contributi di filologia greca e latina*, a cura di E. Narducci, con la collaborazione di P. Carrara, G. Ramires, e A. Russo, Firenze 2005.

10. A point that Alessandro Russo has already begun to prove: A. Russo, *Nota a Enn. ann. 12 Sg. Sk. (con un'appendice sull'Euhemerus)*, in *Doctissimus antiquitatis perscrutator: Studi latini in onore di Mario De Nonno*, a cura di P. d'Alessandro e A. Luceri («RPL Quaderni» 2), Roma 2024, pp. 16-26; Id., *The Reception of Ennius' Saturae and Varia in Antiquity*, in Hill-Marshall, *op. cit.*

11. S. Timpanaro, *Otto Skutsch's Ennius*, in *Vir Bonus Discendi Peritus: Studies in Celebration of Otto Skutsch's Eightieth Birthday*, Edited by N. Horsfall, London 1988, pp. 1-5: 3.

12. Save a one-sentence mention of Mariotti's reconstruction of this verse at S. Timpanaro, *Forschungsbericht: Ennius*, «Anz. Alt.» 5, 1952, pp. 195-212: 203.

13. For valuable recent treatments of Timpanaro and Skutsch, see M. De Nonno, *Timpana-*

prepare the way for his own edition of that poet¹⁴. In the spring of the year in which the last of these preparatory publications appeared¹⁵, he discovered that Otto Skutsch, a man nearly two decades his senior, was already far along with his own edition of Ennius. Famously, and regrettably¹⁶, this discovery led the young scholar to (eventually) abandon his plan: Timpanaro would not bring his *edizione critica* to completion, he would not compete directly with Skutsch. But there was another, more positive consequence of this 1948 discovery: Timpanaro and Skutsch, by any account two of the most accomplished Latinists of the twentieth century, quickly entered into a more than four-decade-long dialogue¹⁷ concerning, in effect, the question of how to edit the ruins of Ennius – what to do with the mess of problems attendant to such a difficult, fragmentary corpus.

Played out in a mass of private correspondence and public scholarship¹⁸, this dialogue is marked by one central issue: the viability of Otto Skutsch's infamous 'rules'. Already in the 1940s, Skutsch had committed himself to the idea that, in introducing the Greek hexameter to the Latin language, Ennius, himself a grammarian (Suet. *gramm.* 1, 2), was «*a priori* likely to have acted deliberately and according to rules» of a metrical, prosodic, and grammatical nature¹⁹. The existence of these rules, thought Skutsch, could be established by observing certain patterns within the fragments of the *Annales*, and these rules could then, in turn, be used to edit the fragments anew,

ro tra filologia e storia della lingua latina, in *Sebastiano Timpanaro e la cultura del secondo Novecento*, a cura di E. Ghidetti e A. Pagnini, Roma 2005, pp. 101-21: 119 f.; and T. Geue, *Major Corrections: An Intellectual Biography of Sebastiano Timpanaro*, London-New York 2025, pp. 60-94.

14. *Per una nuova edizione critica di Ennio*, I, II, III, and IV, «Studi it. di filol. class.» 21, 1946, pp. 41-81; 22, 1947, pp. 33-77 and 179-207; 23, 1948, pp. 5-58.

15. For the timing, see Timpanaro, *Otto Skutsch's Ennius* cit., p. 2, which can now be corroborated with Timpanaro's own correspondence: *Sebastiano Timpanaro-Scevola Mariotti. Carteggio (1944-1999)*, a cura di P. Parroni con la collaborazione di G. Donati e G. Piras, Pisa 2023, pp. 105 and 141 f.

16. As De Nonno, *op. cit.*, p. 120, was right to suggest, Timpanaro himself grew to regret this decision (Parroni, *op. cit.*, p. 1145).

17. Correspondence between them begins in 1948 and, after the elder scholar's death in 1990, Timpanaro still has Skutsch on the mind when he writes about Ennius «Che cosa direbbe il mio Skutsch, se fosse ancora tra i vivi e potesse leggere queste mie prolisse pagine?» (Timpanaro, *Contributi di filologia greca e latina* cit., p. 228).

18. The private correspondence is now housed at the Biblioteca della Scuola Normale Superiore (I sincerely hope that, following the superb model of Parroni, *op. cit.*, this correspondence will eventually be published). The relevant public scholarship is cited in the notes of this article.

19. O. Skutsch, *Studia Enniana*, London 1968, p. 113.

each and every exception explained or removed through analogical reasoning.

Let me provide an example of the making and exercising of just one of these rules. Skutsch observed, correctly, that final -s usually does not 'make position' in what remains of the *Annales* (for instance, we have *victūs fatetur* at *ann.* 513 Sk.). So, he established his 'rule': Ennius does not admit lengthening due to final -s (except in one extraordinary circumstance, when he is dealing with a tricky proper name, *Cethegūs Marcus* at *ann.* 305 Sk., and his hand is apparently forced)²⁰. Skutsch then used this rule (among many others²¹) to decide what can and cannot appear in the *Annales*. For instance, the quotation from Nonius, *pulvīs fulva volat* (315 *ann.* Sk.), is genuinely and entirely Ennian and not an exception to the rule because the -i in *pulvīs* was, according to Skutsch, originally long by nature²². Cicero's quotation from the proem of *Annales* VII, on the other hand, *nec dicti studiosūs quisquam erat ante hunc* (209 *ann.* Sk.) – this is not fully Ennian, because *studiosīs* without a doubt breaks the rule: according to Skutsch, the last syllable of this word simply «cannot» be made long by position in the *Annales*²³. The two words, *quisquam erat*, therefore, are Cicero's, not Ennius'; the rule «prove[s]» that this is the case²⁴.

Skutsch's scholarship on Ennius – principally, his collected *Studia Enniana* and his commentary on the *Annales* – is replete, as I say, with arguments and reasoning of this kind: rules are established, rules are enforced. For fifty years, Sebastiano Timpanaro would have none of it: from his review of Skutsch's first *Enniana* in 1952 to the posthumous publication of his *Contri-*

20. See Skutsch, *Studia Enniana* cit., pp. 32 f., and *The Annals* cit., p. 56.

21. Some of Skutsch's other rules and norms for the *Annales*: a mute consonant with a liquid consonant does not lengthen the preceding syllable, except in Greek words and tribrach words (*Studia Enniana* cit., pp. 112-18; *The Annals* cit., pp. 55 f.); Ennius only lengthens a short syllable if it is the last syllable of a word which consists of or ends in three short syllables, e.g. in *populūs* but not in *doctus* (*Studia Enniana* cit., p. 21; *The Annals* cit., p. 58); «iambic shortening [...] is not admitted in the *Annales*» (*The Annals* cit., pp. 59 f.); elision is «very rare» and avoided (*The Annals* cit., p. 52, on which more below); and -ai for -ae only appears at line-end (*The Annals* cit., p. 61).

22. *Studia Enniana* cit., p. 32; *The Prosody of pulvis*, «Glotta» 49, 1971, pp. 142 f.; *The Annals* cit., pp. 56 and 494. It is worth pointing out that «highly implausibl[e]» is how two recent classical linguists have characterized Skutsch's theory regarding the length of -i in *pulvis* (R. Thompson-N. Zair, 'Irrational Lengthening' in *Virgil*, «Mnemosyne» 73, 2020, pp. 577-608: 587 n. 31). Already in 1972, Timpanaro and Mariotti had privately anticipated this critique (see Parroni, *op. cit.*, p. 1026).

23. *Studia Enniana* cit., p. 32.

24. *The Annals* cit., p. 374.

buti di filologia greca e latina in 2005²⁵, he repeated refutation after refutation²⁶, criticisms which, frustratingly, the older scholar simply never fully addressed or accommodated²⁷. Spread throughout this half-century of scholarship, Timpanaro makes, I think, three central and recurring criticisms of Skutsch's rules:

1) the remains of Ennius' *Annales* are scanty in the extreme (only around 430 complete hexameters of the original 18 books are extant); it makes no sense to establish rigid rules on such a weak foundation²⁸;

2) no other Greek or Latin hexametrical poet observes all the rules that Skutsch establishes; it is *a priori* unlikely that Ennius was stricter than, e.g., Callimachus or Virgil²⁹;

3) it is *a posteriori* the case that Ennius' epic poetry displays extreme metrical, prosodic, and grammatical freedom: anomaly and exceptions to every rule run rampant, no matter which edition we read. To tame this anomaly through analogical reasoning is to let abstraction trample over empirical data³⁰.

These are powerful criticisms of Skutsch's method. What they urge – and I would say, in fact, what they logically require – is that the editor of Ennius should not think in terms of rigid, abstract rules, but of flexible, empirically observable tendencies³¹. These tendencies can, and in fact should, factor into the editor's editorial process; but they can hardly be given priority – they ought to be balanced against every other relevant piece of empirical data³². So, to return to the famous proem of *Annales* VII: in evaluating

25. Respectively, *Forschungsbericht* cit. and *Contributi di filologia greca e latina* cit.

26. After Skutsch's death, in fact, Timpanaro seems not to have wanted to argue directly against these rules: *Due note enniane* («Riv. di filol. e istr. class.» 114, 1986, pp. 5-47, reprinted in *Nuovi contributi* cit., pp. 165-202) is his last – and in a certain sense his most vigorous and useful – such refutation. Following this article, Timpanaro tends to refer his reader back to the criticisms he has already made.

27. «Famously obstinate» is how Tom Geue, with considerable justification, has recently characterized Skutsch (*op. cit.*, p. 81).

28. *Forschungsbericht* cit., p. 207; *Review of Studia Enniana*, «Gnomon» 42, 1970, pp. 354-64: 361; *Nuovi contributi* cit., p. 175; *Otto Skutsch's Ennius* cit., p. 4.

29. *Forschungsbericht* cit., p. 207; *Review* cit., p. 361; *Nuovi contributi* cit., pp. 174 f. and 180 f.

30. *Review* cit., p. 361; *Contributi* cit., p. 647; *Nuovi contributi* cit., pp. 170 n. 9 and 176; *Otto Skutsch's Ennius* cit., p. 4.

31. Cf. S. Timpanaro, *Sul materialismo*, Pisa 1970, p. 186. Excellent contextualizing of this in Geue, *op. cit.*, Chapter 2.

32. Cf. Timpanaro, *Contributi* cit., p. 679: analogy should not be the «unico stimolo al congetturare»; it should rather have a supporting role, confirming or guaranteeing – not stimulating – a conjecture.

whether or not *quisquam erat* at *ann.* 209 Sk. belongs to Cicero, Timpanaro wants us to weigh Ennius' tendency not to allow final -s to 'make position' against at least three other relevant facts³³:

1) Ennius' tendency is demonstrably neither constant nor governed by the rigid limitations which Skutsch imposes upon it: final -s certainly does lengthen a preceding short vowel elsewhere in the meagre remains of the *Annales*, probably in *pulvīs fulva volat* (*ann.* 315 Sk.), argues Timpanaro³⁴, and certainly in *Cethegūs Marcus* (*ann.* 305 Sk.), a name which, *pace* Skutsch, is not particularly difficult to fit into a hexameter. Indeed, if Ennius were really so averse to having final -s lengthen a short syllable, he simply could have changed, *additur orator Cornelius suaviloquenti / ōrē Cē|thēgūs | Mārāis Tū|ditano collega* (*ann.* 304 f. Sk.) to *additur orator Cornelius suaviloquenti / līnguā | Mārāis Cē|thēgūs Tū|ditano collega*³⁵. In other words, we cannot explain away the prosody of *ann.* 305 Sk. by pointing to «the [supposed] difficulty of accommodating the names»³⁶. And since Ennius felt free to write *Cethegūs Marcus*, it stands to reason that he was likewise willing to write *studiosūs quisquam*;

2) if we were to find them in, quite literally, any other Latin hexametrical poet, including those writing in Ennius' immediate wake³⁷, we would consider *nec dicti studiosūs quisquam erat* a fine hexametrical sequence;

3) Ennius uses the phrase *nec ... quisquam* on another occasion within the *Annales*, indeed almost certainly within this same proem: at *ann.* 211 Sk., he writes exactly *nec quisquam*³⁸. These words fit their context very well.

33. Timpanaro discusses this issue at least at *Forschungsbericht* cit., p. 207; *Review* cit., pp. 361 f.; *Nuovi contributi* cit., pp. 179 f. n. 30; and *Contributi di filologia greca e latina* cit., p. 201 n. 8.

34. *Review* cit., pp. 361 f. Timpanaro quickly tired of this particular debate (Parroni, *op. cit.*, pp. 1001, 1024, 1026) and even (seemingly without being very convinced) partially concedes the point to Skutsch in public (*Nuovi contributi* cit., p. 179). But see n. 22 above.

35. With the conjunction of *loqui* and *lingua* in my hypothetical *suaviloquenti lingua*, cf. Ennius' *non si lingua loqui saperet eqs.*, *ann.* 469 Sk. And note that, *contra* Skutsch, recent scholarship has shown that Ennius is very much in control of his art at *ann.* 305 Sk. (S. Goldberg, *Epic in Republican Roman*, New York-Oxford 1995, pp. 94 f.; D. Tomasco in Flores, *op. cit.*, IV, pp. 69-83; and I. Gildenhard, *The Annalist Before the Annalists: Ennius and his Annales*, in *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*, ed. by U. Eigler et alii, Darmstadt 2003, pp. 93-114).

36. *The Annals* cit., p. 56.

37. For instance, we find final -s 'making position' at *Acc. carm. fr. 1 Maia nemūs retinens*, Lucil. 1060 *unūs consterni*, etc.

38. *Ann.* 211 Sk. is attached to the proem of *Annales* VII by conjecture, but, as Timpanaro recognized (*Review* cit., p. 362) and every modern editor of Ennius has agreed, it is very likely that the fragment belongs there. The arguments for this attribution include: (1) Festus explicitly places the fragment in *Annales* VII; (2) the fragment seems, like the other likely remains

And to add a fourth and final fact of my own: in the hundreds of pages of Cicero that survive, it is only in the particular hexametrical series at *Brut.* 71, when Ennius is certainly being quoted, that the precise conjunction, *quisquam erat*, appears. In other words, this particular phrase, which Skutsch attributes to Cicero, is demonstrably not Ciceronian³⁹. Skutsch's analogical reasoning here becomes self-defeating.

I think there are now two conclusions that we can draw. First: Skutsch was probably wrong to excise *quisquam erat* from the text of the *Annales*. Downgraded, as it must be, from its status as a rigid rule, Ennius' tendency to avoid lengthening with a final -s simply cannot, in the case of *ann.* 209 Sk., balance the counterevidence: final -s elsewhere 'makes position' in the *Annales*; the words of this particular fragment scan as a regular hexametrical sequence; they fit the context of Ennius' proem; and they are atypical of Ciceronian prose, about which we are, of course, extremely well informed. As Timpanaro put it some 70 years ago, «it is only the desire to establish Skutsch's rule at any price that could tempt one to attribute *quisquam erat* to Cicero and not to Ennius»⁴⁰. Skutsch's correction is both overschematic and undermotivated.

As for the second conclusion: in thinking through Timpanaro's criticism of Skutsch, I think we have landed on what we can fairly call a methodological principle: Timpanaro's belief, to borrow an aphorism dear to his teacher Pasquali, that «tous les cas sont spéciaux»⁴¹. That is to say: every fragment of Ennius presents its own particular host of problems, is shaped by its own particular mess of influences. The task of the editor of Ennius,

of the proem to that book (*ann.* 206-10 Sk.), to be programmatic and hellenizing (Ennius here defends and justifies his hellenized learning); (3) with its mention of an epiphanic dream, the fragment seems to allude back to the epiphanic dream of the proem to *Annales* I; and (4) the language of the fragment is consonant with what we find in *ann.* 206-10 (*neque ... nec ... quisquam* [*ann.* 208 f. Sk.] ~ *nec quisquam* [*ann.* 211 Sk.]; *dicti studiosus* [*ann.* 209 Sk.] ~ *discere* [*ann.* 212 Sk.]; *Musarum* [*ann.* 208 Sk.] ~ *sophia* [*ann.* 211 Sk.]). All of this is circumstantial, and points (2) and (3) are both statements of interpretation, not fact, but they are defensible and well-grounded interpretations. The case for attribution is very strong.

39. According to a search on the Packard Humanities Institute's Latin Texts database, in any case.

40. I adapt *Forschungsbericht* cit., p. 207: «nur der Wunsch, die Regel auf jeden Preis aufzustellen, dazu verleiten kann *quisquam* Cicero statt Ennius zuzuteilen».

41. The phrase belongs to Bidez. Pasquali learns it from Dain (see G. Pasquali, *Storia della tradizione e critica del testo*, Firenze 1952, p. 480); Timpanaro learns it from Pasquali (see S. Timpanaro, *Il lapsus freudiano: Psicanalisi e critica testuale*, Firenze 1974, p. 72 [Id., *Il lapsus freudiano* [...], Nuova ed. a cura di F. Stok, Torino 2002, p. 70]). On how Timpanaro derives his anti-Skutschian «anomalismo» from Pasquali's historicism, see De Nonno, *op. cit.*, p. 119.

therefore, is to attend to the manifold particulars of every given case, weighing empirical datum against empirical datum, thinking, once again, in terms of flexible tendencies, not of flattening, abstract rules.

That, in brief, is the Pasqualian method given to us by Timpanaro's *scritti enniani*: «every case is special». Now I turn to the second part of my paper, in which I attend to the many particular problems of *ann. 579 Sk.*, a fragment which Timpanaro never publicly discussed but which, as I have said, the *lumen* of his method can help us in any case to understand.

II. ANN. 579 SK. IS SPECIAL

The hexameter that Skutsch calls *ann. 579* is preserved in a corrupt state in only one source, Consentius' *De barbarismis et metaplasmis*. The earliest witnesses to this text are Basel, Universitätsbibliothek, F III 15d, which is called B, and Munich, Bayerische Staatsbibliothek, Clm 14666, which is called M; I reproduce their relevant readings⁴²:

B, f. 14r: et Ennius 'huic statuam statui maiorum orbatu[r] [correctione in margine adscripta, morbo] athenis' per metaplasmm quoque et hic dempsit literam r;

M, f. 51v: et Ennius 'huic statuam statui maiorum & obatu athenis' et hic quoque per metaplasmm dempsit litteram r.

Skutsch, who reasonably follows earlier editors and attributes the line to the *Annales*⁴³, chooses to print essentially what B offers, obelizing the one word which is certainly corrupt:

42. A photo of the relevant page in B can be found here: <https://www.e-codices.ch/en/ubb/F-III-0015d/14r>; and a photo of the relevant page in M here: <https://www.digitale-sammlungen.de/de/view/bsb00082357?page=108,109>. See the apparatus of Mari's critical edition for a fuller report (*Consentius' De barbarismis et metaplasmis*, Critical Edition, Translation, and Commentary, Edited by T. Mari, Oxford 2021, p. 96).

43. We should in the first place assume that a hexameter attributed to Ennius without poem-title belongs to the *Annales*, considering the relative fame of that poem and its considerable length: that is a hallowed principle within Ennian studies, which still seems to me a reasonable initial assumption; and, in the case of this fragment, I see no good reason to depart from it. Note, on the other hand, that S. Mariotti, *Lezioni su Ennio*, Pesaro 1951, p. 102 (= Id., *Lezioni su Ennio*, Seconda edizione accresciuta, Urbino 1991, p. 66), followed by W. Suerbaum, *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius*, Hildesheim 1968, pp. 246 f., attributes the line to Ennius' *Scipio*; Timpanaro disagrees with Mariotti in private (Parroni, *op. cit.*, p. 209). On the thorny issue of attributing Ennian first-person fragments, see now J. Elliott, *Ille ego: Ennian First Persons in Epic and beyond*, in Hill-Marshall, *op. cit.*

huic statuum statui maiorum †orbatu† athenis.

The editors of the new Loeb, for their part, reprint Skutsch's text, announcing that the line is «hopelessly corrupt»⁴⁴; and other anglophone scholars, influenced by Skutsch's massive *auctoritas*, have tended to feel the same way⁴⁵.

All the way back in 1951, however, Scevola Mariotti had proposed a reconstruction of this fragment that had won wide assent in the days before Skutsch's influence⁴⁶ and that still, in Italy, seems widely viewed with favour⁴⁷. Mariotti reconstructed the line as follows⁴⁸:

huic statuum statui maiorem etiam, arbitro, ahenis.

The strengths of this reconstruction are very clear. Palaeographically, it is faultless. The slight corruption of *maiorem* and *ahenis* to *maiorum* and *athenis* is more than plausible; Pasquale Massimo Pinto, in fact, has recently shown that the latter mistake – an obvious instance of banalization – certainly occurs in some manuscripts of Lucretius at V 1294 (*versaque in obprobrium species est falcis a h e n a e*)⁴⁹. M's superscript ampersand (= *et*), moreover, is an easy

44. Goldberg and Manuwald, *op. cit.*, I, p. 419 n. 1.

45. See, for instance, M. Lowrie, *Writing, Performance, and Authority in Augustan Rome*, Oxford 2009, p. 31 n. 28, and N. Goldschmidt, *Textual Monuments*, «Class. Philol.» 112, 2017, pp. 368-83: 373 n. 27. I know of two recent anglophone attempts to reconstruct the line: E. Kraggerud, *Critica: Textual Issues in Horace, Ennius, Vergil, and Other Authors*, New York 2020, pp. 187 f., and Mari, *op. cit.*, pp. 299 f. Both Kraggerud and Mari predicate their arguments for what is and what is not acceptable in Ennian prosody on the basis of Skutsch's *auctoritas*; for this, and for other reasons, as will be clear below (nn. 51 and 52), neither of their reconstructions seems to me well founded.

46. Suerbaum, *op. cit.*, pp. 246 f.; M. Bettini, *Studi e note su Ennio*, Pisa 1979, p. 167; A. Lunelli, *Postille inedite di Vahlen alla seconda edizione di Ennio, I-II*, «Riv. di filol. e istr. class.» 108, 1980, pp. 55-84: 83 n. 4.

47. A. Traglia, *Poeti arcaici latini*, Torino 1986, pp. 494 f.; F. Stok, *Percorsi dell'esegesi virgiliana. Due ricerche sull'Eneide*, Pisa 1988, pp. 43 f.; Flores, *op. cit.*, III, p. 58; P.M. Pinto, *Monumenti d'autore e storie di testi (Isocrate, Ennio, Orazio)*, «Philologus» 154, 2010, pp. 25-39: 29-34.

48. Mariotti, *op. cit.*, p. 102 (= p. 66). Very interestingly, the recent publication of the correspondence between Mariotti and Timpanaro allows us to see that, while the reconstruction is certainly Mariotti's, there was a certain degree of collaboration in its creation: a veritable drama, progressing from aporia to jubilant confidence, can be traced in a flurry of letters from May to October 1948 (see Parroni, *op. cit.*, pp. 122 f., 126, 169, 170, 173, 177, 180, 184 f., 187, 192, 198, 199, 202 f., 206 f., 209 f., 212, 215). It should also be said that Mariotti and Timpanaro are building on earlier suggestions: Lachmann apparently first suggested *maiorem* and *ahenis* (*Lucretii de rerum natura libri VI*, Berlin 1850, p. 416). Philology is a communal endeavour.

49. Pinto, *op. cit.*, p. 33.

corruption of an ampersand-with-titulus (= *etiam*)⁵⁰. And the conjecture, *arbitro*, can be justified on at least two accounts. For one thing, this verb form, which is attested in early Latin poetry⁵¹, is palaeographically very close to *orbaturo/obatur*⁵². For another, Consentius guarantees that Ennius' hexameter originally contained an instance of metaplasm – that, at some point in this verse, Ennius left out the letter *r*⁵³. Given that metaplasm is by definition a defamiliarizing trope, one which makes language non-standard, it seems probable that this trope occurred within, and in fact helped to cause, the verse's most obviously corrupt word, *orbaturo/obatur*. The word *arbitro*, a known, but hardly widespread, metaplasmic form for *arbitror*, simply and convincingly accommodates this probability⁵⁴.

So, Mariotti's reconstruction is extremely plausible from a mechanical

50. Cf. Mariotti's suggestion at Parroni, *op. cit.*, 199.

51. See, for instance, Plaut. *Merc.* 902 and, at least in the text of Questa, *Bacch.* 552 (*Titus Maccius Plautus Bacchides*, a cura di C. Questa, Urbino 2008). Note that Ennius uses the standard form of the verb at *trag.* fr. 164 Manuwald *benefacta male locata malefacta arbitror*. That *arbitro* is an attested republican verb form helps to make it a more convincing correction of the paradosis than *obatur*, an unattested form which Mari, *op. cit.*, p. 300, suggests as a «possibility».

52. Pinto, *op. cit.*, p. 33, nicely proposes that the corruption began with *a-* being miscopied as *o-*. Pace Kraggerud, *op. cit.*, pp. 187 f.: *arbitro* is certainly not «far from the paradosis» (whether *orabatur* or *obatur*), let alone «unbelievably far» from it; nor does Mariotti suggest that *statui* is an infinitive. Kraggerud's reconstruction is well refuted at Mari, *op. cit.*, p. 300.

53. On the basis of style, too, I suspect that *r* was likely left out specifically at the end of the word. Read the following sentences from Consentius, whose «dicendi genus», as Keil pointed out, is «exquisitum et artificiosum et a vulgari grammaticorum consuetudine diuersum» (*Grammatici Latini*, V, Lipsiae 1868, p. 333): *poetae faciunt metaplasmos cum ipsi iam scripturam corruptam relinquunt, ut est 'reliquias Danaum' et 'tanton me crimine dignum duxisti': addidit enim unam litteram, ϑ, per metaplasmm, item contra . . . sicut Lucilius 'atque ore corrupto': dempsit enim unam litteram, ϑ, per metaplasmm; et Ennius: [ann. 579 Sk.] et hic quoque per metaplasmm dempsit litteram ϑ* (Consent. *gramm.* 25 f. Mari). We have four examples of metaplasm in two pairs, the first pair from Virgil, the second pair from early Latin poetry. Consentius would therefore seem to be composing with a stylish kind of parallelism in mind. Now note that in examples one and three (that is, in the first example of each pair), metaplasm occurs in the middle of the relevant word (*reliquias* ~ *corrupto*), and note likewise that in example two (that is, in the second example of the first pair), metaplasm occurs at word-end (*tanton*). It therefore seems appropriate that in example four (that is, in the second example of the second pair) metaplasm should likewise occur at word-end. Mariotti's conjecture *arbitro* thus completes Consentius' balanced pattern: (1a) Virgil, middle-word-metaplasm (*reliquias*); (1b) Virgil, word-end-metaplasm (*tanton*); (2a) early Latin, middle-word-metaplasm (*corrupto*); (2b) early Latin, word-end-metaplasm (*arbitro*). *Exquisitum* indeed.

54. *Enn. trag.* fr. 64 Manuwald *constitit, credo, Scamander; arbores uento uacant*, also offers a nice parallel for Ennius' use of a paratactic first-person verb of thinking, as Mariotti knew (Parroni, *op. cit.*, p. 199). Such asides are more typical of comedy, however: n. 79 below.

point of view. Its plausibility – indeed its probability – is buttressed by the fact that this reconstruction provides us with a typically Ennian statement: *huic statuam statui maiorem etiam, arbitro, ahenis*, «For this man, I have made a statue even greater, I think, than those of bronze». As he often does elsewhere, Ennius here seems to speak in his own voice and boast about the supremacy of his own poetic accomplishment. We could compare, of course, the fragment from *Annales* VII that we were thinking about earlier, in which the poet claims that no one was *dicti studiosus* before him (*ann.* 209 Sk.)⁵⁵. But the particular form of the boast here seems to me in fact more typically Ennian than the boast we get in *Annales* VII. For throughout his corpus, precisely as he does in Mariotti's *ann.* 579 Sk., Ennius invokes the monumental materiality of his verse – he conceptualizes his text as a transcendent public *monumentum*. This motif is prominent in the epigrams, where Ennian poetry is explicitly a public painting⁵⁶; in the *Scipio*, where Ennian poetry is implicitly more substantial than built structures of the republican city⁵⁷; and in the proem of *Annales* XVI, where Ennian poetry seems to be a monument more enduring than «statues and sepulchres», *statuasque sepulcraque* (*ann.* 404 Sk.)⁵⁸. Mariotti's reconstruction of *ann.* 579 Sk.

55. And compare that fragment's *hunc* with *ann.* 579 Sk.'s *huic*; Flores reasonably interprets the latter demonstrative as likewise meaning *me* (*op. cit.*, III, p. 59).

56. Enn. *fig. var.* 15 f. (*epigr.* I) V² *aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam: / hic vestrum pinxit maxima facta patrum*. For the preservation of *pinxit* as against Victorinus' conjecture *panxit*, see Timpanaro, *Per una nuova edizione*, I cit., pp. 62 f.; Id., *Contributi* cit., pp. 668 f.; Bettini, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-84; A.M. Morelli, *L'epigramma latino prima di Catullo*, Cassino 2000, pp. 41 f., and now J. Hill, *Ennius pinxit, or What a Difference a Letter makes (Epigr. IV)*, «Mnemosyne», forthcoming.

57. Enn. *fig. var.* 1 f. = *Scip. fr.* I Russo *quantam statuam faciet populus Romanus, quantam columnam, / quae res tuas gestas loquatur?* (cf. Lowrie, *op. cit.*, p. 31; Goldschmidt, *art. cit.*, pp. 372 f.; on this fragment more generally, see Quinto Ennio. *Le opere minori. Introduzione, edizione critica dei frammenti e commento*, I, a cura di A. Russo, Pisa 2007, pp. 211-17).

58. This reading believes, with the *communis opinio*, that *ann.* 404 f. and 406 Sk. belong within the same proem and are closely related: *longinqua dies ... aetas* (*ann.* 406 Sk.) will destroy *statuasque sepulcraque*, but not presumably Ennius' monumental poetry (cf. Mariotti, *op. cit.*, pp. 101 f. [= p. 66] and 114 [= p. 73]; Suerbaum, *op. cit.*, pp. 151-65; Skutsch, *The Annales* cit., pp. 568 f.; Fabrizi, *op. cit.*, pp. 23-25). Though not certain, that belief nevertheless seems to me sound: Plin. *nat.* VII 101 guarantees that *Annales* XVI contained some sort of proem; *ann.* 404 f. and 406 Sk. are both explicitly attributed to that book by their quoting sources (Macr. *Sat.* VI 1, 17; Gell. IX 14, 5); and, read individually and together, those fragments contain the sort of statements that we would expect to find in a programmatic passage of classical poetry generally (cf. the passages cited at R.G.M. Nisbet-N. Rudd, *A Commentary on Horace, Odes, Book III*, Oxford 2004, p. 365) and indeed, on the basis of his other boastful statements (e.g. *ann.* 12 f. and 206-10 Sk.; *fig. var.* 15 f. and 17 f. [*epigr.* I and II] V²), in an Ennian proem specifically. Hor. *carm.* IV 8, 13-20 is relevant here, too: when Horace thinks of monuments more enduring than *marmora*,

is therefore, from a conceptual standpoint, extremely apt: it matches a tendency of the Ennian corpus⁵⁹.

And I can offer at least one more argument for the conceptual plausibility of this reconstruction: as Mariotti himself pointed out in 1951, the typically Ennian claim of *ann.* 579 Sk. seems to provide the specific inspiration for one of Horace's most famous statements: with Mariotti's *ann.* 579 Sk. *huic statuum statui maiorem etiam, arbitro, ahenis*, «For this man, I have made a statue even greater, I think, than those of bronze», compare Hor. *carm.* III 30, 1 *exegi monumentum aere perennius*, «I have made a monument more enduring than bronze». Horace borrows Ennius' particular boast and syntax (note, in each case, the perfect verb paired with a comparative); and it is likely, as Denis Feeney and Philip Hardie have suggested, that he even acknowledges this borrowing with a pun (*per-Ennius*)⁶⁰.

Those are a few good arguments for the probability of Mariotti's reconstruction. It simply and plausibly corrects the problems apparent in *ann.* 579 Sk. as transmitted. It then provides us with an extremely typical (not to mention attractive) line of Ennian poetry, which seems to have had a demonstrable influence on a rather Ennian moment in the later Latin tradition. Of course, no reconstruction can ever be certain; but in the land of probabilities in which philology dwells, we can't get much better than this.

What, then, is Skutsch's problem? Why does he reject Mariotti's reconstruction? And why do Goldberg and Manuwald announce that the hexameter is «hopelessly corrupt»? The answer is simple: Mariotti's reconstruction contains three instances of elision, and therefore breaks one of Skutsch's rules. For «elision», according to Skutsch, «is very rare in the *Annales*»; and

he thinks of Ennius and, at least in part, his *Annales* (S. Goldberg, *Scipio invicte! Ennius and the Poetry of Praise*, in Hill-Marshall, *op. cit.*).

59. Note further, on the concept of the monumental materiality of Ennius' poetry, that if the scholarship is right that *Annales* XV foregrounded the foundation of Nobilior's *aedes Herculis Musarum*, then an equivalence between that temple and Ennius' poem was certainly thereby established (for balanced discussion and bibliography: Goldberg and Manuwald, *op. cit.*, I, pp. 104 f.; on Nobilior's «highly innovative» temple itself, see A. Russell, *The Politics of Public Space in Republican Rome*, Cambridge 2015, pp. 139-45).

60. D. Feeney, *Mea tempora: Patterning of Time in the Metamorphoses*, in *Ovidian Transformations. Essays on the Metamorphoses and its Reception*, Edited by P. Hardie, A. Barchiesi, and S. Hinds, Cambridge 1999, pp. 13-30: 17 n. 7; P. Hardie, *Poets, Patrons, Rulers: The Ennian Traditions*, in *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*, Edited by W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers, Cambridge 2007, pp. 129-44: 139. The likelihood of this pun is increased by the fact that *perennius* is a *hapax legomenon*: that word, peculiar and striking, sticks out (a reader is encouraged to ask: why this particular word?).

conjectures that introduce this feature into the text are consequently *a priori* «unconvincing» and «not acceptable»: they simply «cannot be right» – that is the rule⁶¹. On one occasion, Skutsch becomes so confident in the existence of this rule that he uses it to deny, not just to doubt, the attribution of a hexameter to Ennius: *ann.* 625 V.² *O multum ante alias infelix littera theta*, in large part because it features two instances of elision, becomes *spuria* 10 Sk.⁶². Such is the strength of the rule.

Here is where I think Timpanaro can help. The lesson we learned from his *scritti enniani* in Part I of this paper should incline us to view with strong suspicion the *a-priori*-rigidity of Skutsch's position. To pronounce that Mariotti's reconstruction «cannot be right» simply because it includes three instances of elision is to fail to attend to the particularities of the case; it is to think in flattening rules, rather than flexible tendencies. When we consider *ann.* 579 Sk. as a particular case with its own particular problems and influences, Skutsch's categorical objection becomes very weak. Timpanaro's method, in other words, can help us to save Mariotti's reconstruction and understand what Ennius probably wrote. Let me spend the rest of this paper defending that proposition, through, first, a discussion of elision in the *Annales* and, next, a consideration of Ennian style.

Now, it is true – on any account of the text of Ennius – that there are far fewer elisions in this poem than in, say, Ennian tragedy⁶³. So, Skutsch has observed a genuine tendency, which we cannot simply brush aside. But to talk of Ennius' general «avoidance of elision» in the *Annales*, as Skutsch does⁶⁴, or even to say that elision is «very rare» in the ruins of this poem is a touch misleading. Here are the facts. There are at least 107 instances of elision in the 623 extant hexameters of the *Annales*⁶⁵; since around 200 of these

61. The quotations come from Skutsch, *The Annals* cit., pp. 52, 668, 719, and 528, respectively. Cf. p. 772: conjectures with two elisions are «not encouraging», those with three are not even worth mentioning.

62. See Skutsch, *The Annals* cit., p. 790.

63. In the first 100 lines of Ennian tragedy in the edition of Jocelyn (*The Tragedies of Ennius*, the Fragments Edited with an Introduction and Commentary by H.D. Jocelyn, Cambridge 1967), I count around 100 instances of elision. This rate seems roughly to cohere with the rates we generally see in republican drama (J. Soubiran, *L'élision dans la poésie latine*, Paris 1966, pp. 565-68).

64. *The Annals* cit., p. 52.

65. *Annales* I (*ann.* 1-112 Sk.): 10, 28, 41, 63, 73, 82, 94; *Annales* II-VI (*ann.* 113-205 Sk.): 114, 118, 123, 128, 131 (*bis*), 143, 153, 155 (*ter*), 160, 163, 167, 173, 177, 180, 181, 182, 183, 186, 187, 189, 191, 195, 201, 203, 205; *Annales* VII-VIII (*ann.* 206-97 Sk.): 206, 209 (*bis*), 227, 232, 236, 238, 246, 251, 255, 256, 260, 261, 262, 265, 272, 274, 284, 297; *Annales* IX-XVIII (*ann.* 298-441 Sk.): 307 (*bis*), 314, 316, 317, 322,

hexameters are incomplete, ranging from one word to five feet, we can say that there is roughly one elision in every five lines of this epic (= a rate of 20%). Ennius, then, elides about as often as, e.g., Horace does in his *Epistles* and Ovid does in his *Metamorphoses*⁶⁶; his practice is thus not particularly unique or surprising for a poet writing non-dramatic Latin poetry. Just as Horace and Ovid, moreover, Ennius feels free to elide much more often than just once every five lines. There are 11 verses that have more than one instance of elision in the *Annales* (*ann.* 131, 155, 209, 307, 334, 362, 387, 412, 550, 576, 583 Sk.)⁶⁷, and at least one of these verses, like Mariotti's reconstructed *ann.* 579 Sk., has three elisions (*augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est, ann.* 155 Sk.)⁶⁸, and another perhaps ought to have the same number (*pendent peniculamenta unum ad quemque pedum <usque>, ann.* 362 Sk.)⁶⁹. This is important: Mariotti isn't conjecturing without precedent; threefold elision

323, 334 (*bis*), 337, 358, 361, 362 (*bis*, [perhaps *ter*]), 369, 371, 373, 374, 387 (*bis*), 399, 412 (*bis*), 416, 419, 420, 422; *Incertae* (*ann.* 442–623 Sk.): 455, 463, 466, 468, 476, 481, 494, 495, 497, 499, 507, 514, 534, 550 (*bis*), 560, 568, 576 (*bis*), 578, ?579 (*ter?*), 583 (*bis*), 584, 590, 591, 606. There are at least three more possible instances, at *ann.* 9, 10, and 321 Sk. Note that I include instances of prodelision in my reckoning (cf. n. 68 below).

66. Soubiran, *op. cit.*, p. 605; cf. E.G. Sturtevant-R.G. Kent, *Elision and Hiatus in Latin Prose and Verse*, «Trans. Amer. Philol. Assoc.» 46, 1915, pp. 129–55: 148. There is useful discussion of interpreting such statistics at *Ciris, a poem attributed to Vergil*, ed. with an Introduction and Commentary by R.O.A.M. Lyne, Cambridge 1978, pp. 16 f.

67. Note *ann.* 583 Sk. *decretum est stare <et fossari> corpora telis*. The second elision is conjectural, though the conjecture does indeed seem certain (Skutsch, *The Annals* cit., p. 723).

68. One of the elisions in *ann.* 155 Sk. is an instance of 'prodelision' or 'aphaeresis'. G. Pezzini (*Terence and the Verb 'To Be' in Latin*, Oxford 2015, pp. 101–5 and *passim*) has recently argued that, in terms of linguistic truth, 'prodelision' is a misnomer: *-st* and *-s* are clitics, not genuine instances of elision. Pezzini's distinction is convincing, but I doubt that Ennius will have been aware of it: Quintilian, at any rate, who tends to give voice to fairly traditional Roman opinions, understood prodelision as a type of elision (*inst.* IX 4, 109; cf. *inst.* IX 4, 33 f. and 36), and from Ennius onwards, Latin poets tend to use elision and prodelision at roughly similar rates – for instance, I count 17 instances of prodelision as against 19 instances of elision involving *-m* in what remains of the *Annales*. Ennius thus likely either thought of prodelision as a variety of elision or at least viewed the two phenomena as analogous. As to the latter possibility: Pezzini has demonstrated that prodelision «had a marked stylistic value, which was probably colloquial and poetic at the same time» (*op. cit.*, pp. 235 f.); much the same could be said about the stylistic value of elision proper. In terms of literary criticism, if not linguistics, therefore, the traditional, Quintilianic practice of treating, e.g. *august' augurio* and *Roma 'st* as two instantiations of the same phenomenon still seems to me reasonable.

69. *Usque* is another one of Timpanaro's good conjectures (defended at *Per una nuova edizione*, II cit., p. 43 n. 2; restated at *Per una nuova edizione*, IV cit., p. 18, and *Contributi* cit., p. 649). Skutsch briskly rejects it as impossible in his commentary (*The Annals* cit., p. 528) but oddly accepts it into his critical apparatus all the same; Flores, *op. cit.*, III, p. 20, incorporates it into his text.

occurs in our meagre remains of the *Annales*, just as it occurs, not all that infrequently, in hexameters outside of these fragments, even in poems whose regular rate of elision is likewise roughly 20%⁷⁰.

It is also important that, in this mass of Ennian data, we can identify an interpretable pattern: namely, that elision accumulates in passages of direct speech. So, as against the mere two elisions in the 20-line narrative of the augury of Romulus and Remus (*ann.* 72-91 Sk.), the three elisions in the 19-line «Good Companion» passage (*ann.* 268-86 Sk.), and the zero elisions in the eight lines of continuous battle-narrative in *Annales* XV (*ann.* 391-98 Sk.), there are three elisions in the two-line and two-word speech of Pyrrhus (*ann.* 180-82 Sk.), three elisions in the two lines spoken by Camillus or – more probably⁷¹ – Ennius at *ann.* 154 f. Sk., and two elisions in the three lines spoken by Antiochus in *Annales* XIII (*ann.* 371-73 Sk.)⁷². In other words, there is plenty of elision in direct speech, but not very much in straight narrative, a contrast which makes an obvious suggestion: Ennius does not avoid elision in any general sense in his poem; his tendency is rather to vary its application, reining in when employing the steady and stately narrative style of the majority of our fragments, using it with considerable

70. In Horace's *Epistles*, I find five hexameters that have three or more instances of elision: I 1, 11; I 7, 57; I 18, 76; II 1, 46; II 1, 114. And a quick look at the first book of Ovid's *Metamorphoses* turns up one instance (I 478): a poet who elides in 20% of his hexameters can still elide three times in one hexameter. In fact, there is no inevitable relationship between a poet's total rate of elision and the frequency with which they elide multiple times in one verse. So, Virgil's total rate of elision in *Aeneid* I is 42% (W. Ott, *Metrische Analysen zu Vergil, Aeneis Buch I*, Tübingen 1973, p. 23), which is more than double Horace's rate of 20% in *Epistles* I; yet the instances of threefold elision are identical in both texts: there are two instances in the 756 lines of *Aeneid* I (*Aen.* I 389 and I 626) and two instances in the first 756 lines of *Epistles* I (I 1, 11 and I 7, 57).

71. Though many scholars, influenced by Skutsch, *The Annals* cit., pp. 314-16, want Camillus to be the speaker, that attribution involves, among other things, ignoring the testimony of Varro (*rust.* III 1, 2; cf. Goldberg-Manuwald, *op. cit.*, I, p. 191 n. 1). For discussion: P. Magno, *Ennio nel 'De re rustica' di Varrone*, «Latomus» 65, 2006, pp. 75-82: 77-80; Elliott, *Ennius* cit., pp. 65 and 272-74; P. Esposito-E. Flores, in Flores, *op. cit.*, IV, pp. 449-51.

72. There is only one elision (*vestigar' et at ann.* 41 Sk.) in the 15 lines of Ilia's famous speech (*ann.* 36-50), but this supports my argument: for that speech in fact consists almost entirely of narrative. The four elisions in Pyrrhus' 8-line speech at *ann.* 183-90 Sk. likewise corroborate the tendency I am here describing, as does the fact that the majority of fragments of speech from the *Annales* that contain at least two complete hexameters also contain at least one instance of elision (beyond *ann.* 36-50, 154 f., 180-82, and 371-73 Sk., cf. *ann.* 94 f., 183-90, 191-94, 337-39, and 494 f. Sk.; only *ann.* 106-9, 363-65, and 382 f. Sk. are extended fragments of speech which do not contain elision, and the tone of the latter two is palpably austere and stately: elision would detract from that effect). On speech in the *Annales*, see J. Elliott, *The Voice of Ennius' Annales*, in Fitzgerald-Gowers, *op. cit.*, pp. 38-54.

freedom in passages of direct speech, whether they are heightened with emotion or chatty and colloquial⁷³. It seems to be the case, then (although it would take another article to demonstrate this entirely), that Ennius' style in passages of direct speech at times (often?) integrates his stricter narrative style with the looser *sermo* that he employs in tragedy and *Saturae*⁷⁴. Ennius *multiformis*, good Hellenistic poet that he is, mixes his genres, blending the tragic and the satiric into moments of epic speech⁷⁵.

This, of course, is extremely relevant to the matter at hand. In Mariotti's reconstruction, *ann.* 579 Sk. is a line of direct speech, spoken by the poet *in propria persona*: here boastfully, ludically, somewhat sheepishly, Ennius claims he is extraordinarily excellent. On the basis of the empirical evidence we have just reviewed, this is the sort of context in which we would expect Ennius to start accumulating his elisions, to start sounding a bit less epic. And in fact we have already seen elisions accumulate in a similar context: look again at *ann.* 209 Sk. *nec dicti studiosus quisqu' erat ant' hunc*. Balancing the grand pomposity of his claim to scholarly primacy, Ennius here playfully brings his artificial epic style⁷⁶ into contact with everyday speech (for elision was a regular feature of spoken Latin)⁷⁷. The very same thing – or at least, a very similar thing – is happening in *ann.* 579 Sk.: Ennius makes an over-the-top boast, one which is even more pompous than that of *ann.* 209 Sk., and proceeds to balance, almost to subvert, the pomposity of this boast and the grandeur of his opening words⁷⁸, with a heap of colloquialisms: not just two elisions, but three. And note, too, the paratactic verbal aside of the verse's

73. Cf. Damon-Farrell, *op. cit.*, p. 17, speaking of the *Annales*: «Ennius' style [...] is, in any case, hardly a single style without variation».

74. For the rate of elision in Ennian tragedy, cf. n. 63 above; the rate of elision in Ennian satire, as it appears in Russo, *Quinto Ennio* *cit.*, is around 50% (15 instances over 32 verses, 9 of which verses are incomplete). For the rate and use of elision as importantly informative of the style of a poem, see Lyne, *op. cit.*, p. 16, and Soubiran, *op. cit.*, *passim*.

75. On Ennius as a 'Hellenistic poet', see the bibliography at J. Elliott, *Early Latin Poetry*, Leiden-Boston 2022, p. 71 n. 306.

76. With its final long syllable, *studiosūs* is here a learned poeticism, which matches Ennius' boast: just as *dicti studiosūs* translates a Greek word (φιλόλογος: Mariotti, *op. cit.*, p. 104 [= p. 67]; Skutsch, *Studia Enniana*, pp. 6 f.), so *dicti studiosūs* translates Greek metrical practice (in which σ of course 'makes position').

77. Sturtevant-Kent, *art. cit.*, pp. 129-32; cf. A.M. Riggsby, *Elision and Hiatus in Latin Prose*, «Class. Ant.» 10, 1991, pp. 328-43.

78. Compare Ennius' *huic statuam statui / maiorem etiam, arbitro, ahenis*, with the opening line of the 'Epitaph for Naevius', *immortales mortales / si foret fas flere* (v. 1), or one of Naevius' own lines, *virum praetor advenit / auspicat auspicium* (Naev. *carm. frg.* 39 Blänsdorf²). With its in-your-face, alliterative, hemistich-consuming *figura etymologica*, the first half of En-

second half (*arbitro*) and the particular metaplasmic form of that verb – these are features of spoken Latin (or at least of Plautine Latin⁷⁹) that Ennius is playfully mixing into his elevated speech⁸⁰.

We can perhaps find one more parallel for the playfully elevated *sermo* of *ann.* 579 Sk. in yet another important fragment, one which we have already met (*ann.* 154 f. Sk.):

septingenti sunt, paulo plus aut minus, anni
augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est

(seven centuries – give or take a bit – have passed
since by august augury glorious Rome was founded).

To be sure, unlike *ann.* 209 and 579 Sk., there is no explicit boast here. But if Ennius is indeed the speaker (as Varro *rust.* III 1, 2 implies), then a plausible suggestion presents itself: in emphasizing Rome's impressive antiquity («it's seven hundred years old!»), the poet implicitly vaunts the enormity of his historical-poetic *labor* («I've written about all of this!»)⁸¹. The style and tone

nius' hexameter apes an older and grander epic style, which the second half in turn dampens. On Ennius' reception of Saturnian verse, see Goldberg, *Epic cit.*, pp. 92-95.

79. For verbal asides in Plautus, see *Aul.* 110, 306 and 404; *Capt.* 197 and 889; *Cas.* 455; *Merc.* 645, etc. (cf. *arbitror* as a verbal aside at Catull. 39, 8); for *arbitro*, see n. 51 above; for the colloquial tone of another metaplasmic form, which Virgil borrows from Ennius, see R.G. Austin on *viden* at *Aen.* VI 770 (*Aeneidos, liber sextus*, Oxford 1977).

80. It is possible that the final -o of *arbitro* is here short and likewise partially reflects spoken Latin. Cretic words ending in -ō sometimes become dactyls in first-century poetry *metri causa*, perhaps encouraged by the habits of ordinary speech (see *nesciō*, Catull. 85, 2; *Polliō*, Verg. *eccl.* 3, 84; *dixerō*, Hor. *sat.* I 4, 104; *desinō*, Tib. II 6, 41 with R. Coleman, *Poetic Diction, Poetic Discourse and Poetic Register*, «Proc. British Acad.» 93, pp. 21-93: 38); and, as Skutsch (*The Annals cit.*, p. 60) points out, there are already present within Ennius' poem comparable instances of shortening (*sicuti* at *ann.* 522, 549 Sk.; and *vidēn* at *ann.* 622 Sk.; cf. n. 79 above). If *arbitrō* is indeed possible, then the adonic of *ann.* 579 Sk. is metrically identical to the adonic of *ann.* 181 Sk. (*ārbītr(ō) āhēnīs ~ ōptūm(ē) Ōlūmpī*), a further point in the reconstruction's favour. But if we should instead assume *ārbītr(ō) āhēnīs*, then there exist closely comparable instances of cretic elision in second-century epic and satire: e.g., *māxīm(ē) Āthēnaē* (*Acc. carm. fig.* 3, 1) and *āspēr(ī) Āthōnēs* (Lucil. 113); and perhaps even in Ennian epic: *dēbil(ō) hōmō* (*Enn. ann.* 321 Sk.). Whatever the value of -o, the conjecture is metrically and stylistically safe.

81. In this light, Flores' choice (*op. cit.*, III, p. 38) to set the fragment at the very end of *Annales XVIII* has a certain appeal, though another possibility is the proem to *Annales XVI* (cf. Steuart, *op. cit.*, p. 223), where Ennius perhaps presented himself as a *senex* worn away by «the vastness of Rome's story» (P. Glauthier, *Hybrid Ennius: Cultural and Poetic Multiplicity*, in Damon-Farrell, *op. cit.*, pp. 25-44: 43). Probably, given this lack of attributive probability, it is best to set the lines among the fragments *incertae sedis* (so, Vahlen, *op. cit.*, p. 91, and Steuart, *op. cit.*, p. 79); the same goes for *ann.* 579 Sk. Cf. Timpanaro's important principle: «In una nuova

of the fragment, which scholars have oddly neglected⁸², would seem to support such speculation. Just as in *ann.* 579 Sk., we have here a mixture of registers: there is stylistic grandeur to match the grandeur of Rome (note the *figura etymologica* of *ann.* 155 Sk.⁸³; the stately spondees of *ann.* 154 Sk.⁸⁴; the ‘framing’ hyperbaton of that same hexameter, which imitates Homeric *epos*)⁸⁵; but Ennius once again tempers his elevated tone with a touch of playful informality: the adverb *paulo*⁸⁶, the disarmingly prosaic qualification *plus aut minus*⁸⁷, and especially all those elisions in *august’ augurio postqu’ incluta condita Roma ’st*⁸⁸. In other words, we have here another grand statement, quickly brought down to earth by Ennius – the former peacock (*ann.* 11 Sk.), the exhausted racehorse (*ann.* 522 f. Sk.), the boastful poet who never takes himself too seriously⁸⁹.

edizione ai frammenti tramandati dalle fonti senza indicazione di libro o di tragedia dovrà essere assegnata una collocazione precisa soltanto quando essa sia veramente probabile, non soltanto possibile» (*Per una nuova edizione*, IV cit., p. 15).

82. I only know the brief remarks by Esposito-Flores in Flores, *op. cit.*, IV, p. 451.

83. Not every instance of *figura etymologica* is solemn or grand, to be sure, but in this case, *augusto augurio* constitutes a hemistich and consequently, like *hic statuam statui* (*ann.* 579 Sk.), invokes Saturnian poetry (cf. n. 78 above).

84. Similar is *ann.* 72 Sk., the weighty opening verse of the famous augury passage, to which *ann.* 154 f. Sk. in fact refers: *sēptīngēntī sūnt, paulō plus aut mīnus, ānnī ~ cūrāntēs māgnā cūm cūrā tūm cūpīentēs*.

85. C. Conrad, *Traditional Patterns of Word-Order in Latin Epic from Ennius to Vergil*, «Harvard Stud. Class. Philol.» 69, 1965, pp. 195-258: 227, who rightly compares Ennius’ *sēptīngēntī sūnt, paulo plus aut minus, ānnī* with Homer’s ἐννέα δὴ βεβῆσσι Διὸς μεγάλου ἐνιαυτοί (*Il.* II 134). Appreciate, too, that Ennius’ elevated hyperbaton is also iconic: a duration of seven centuries is represented by a sense unit prolonged over a seven-word verse.

86. See A. Cucchiarelli on *paulo* in the Augustan age (*A Commentary on Virgil’s Eclogues*, Oxford 2023, p. 205); and note that, in the Republic, the word was already prosaic: it appears only here in second-century epic and twice in republican tragedy; but six times in Lucilius, nine times in comedy (seven times in Plautus, twice in Afranius), and extremely often in republican prose. Lucretius, too, uses it frequently (16 times), but only in his expository passages.

87. «Prosaic» is Skutch’s apt word (*The Annals* cit., p. 315). In republican poetry, *plus aut minus* and analogous phrases (e.g., *plus minusve, minus aut plus*) appear here, five times in comedy, and once in an expository passage of Lucretius.

88. I am not assuming that every instance of elision in Ennius is chatty: that is obviously not true and cf. Soubiran, *op. cit.*, pp. 613-46, for discussion of the various emotions and experiences that elision can express. But in passages of speech, where there are other informal notes and no indication of, for instance, agitation or bereavement, the accumulation of elision does indeed seem particularly to effect a loosening and lowering of tone (with the elisions in *ann.* 154 f., 209, and 579 Sk., contrast, e.g., Andromache’s words at *trag.* fr. 23, 12 Manuwald *vid’ ego t’ adstant’ ope barbarica*).

89. Cf. Glauthier, *art. cit.*, p. 34: perhaps «the original Ennius, with his raucous squawks and

In Mariotti's reconstruction, then, *ann.* 579 Sk. contains a kind of internal stylistic coherence that plausibly and closely matches what we see in other fragments of direct speech: much like *ann.* 209 and 154 f. Sk., this hexameter is playfully pompous, elevated without being too self-serious. The elisions help to achieve that effect. But, perhaps more importantly, thus reconstructed, *ann.* 579 Sk. coheres with a demonstrable tendency of Ennius' epic style: namely, and simply, that elisions tend to accumulate in passages of direct speech – that Ennius likes to introduce extra-generic features into the texture of his spoken hexameters (perhaps especially those spoken *in propria persona*). And so, remembering the words I said earlier in defense of Mariotti, we can now say that there are (1) mechanical, (2) conceptual, and (3) stylistic reasons for accepting the probability of this particular reconstruction, arguments which, I think, cumulatively counter Skutsch's *a priori* objection. Absolute certainty, of course, is out of reach, but Mariotti's reconstruction certainly can be right, and in fact it probably is.

But let me conclude. That is a very specific argument I have just offered, without much explicit discussion of Sebastiano Timpanaro; but I hope that it conveys, all the same, a general point about the significance of his *scritti enniani*. One of the major tasks that awaits my generation of Ennian scholars is the eventual creation of a new edition of the *Annales*, an edition good enough to match and even surpass Skutsch's considerable achievement. Creating this edition will involve thinking carefully through *ann.* 209 Sk., *ann.* 579 Sk., and hundreds of other fragments with their own particular problems. Not only do the writings of Timpanaro speak intelligently and convincingly on many of these very fragments, but they also articulate a flexible, empirical method that will help us go beyond Skutsch. Timpanaro will help us on our path⁹⁰.

JESSE HILL
University of Edinburgh

★

dazzling colors, more closely resembled a character out of a Plautine comedy than the author of a sermon about Epicurean physics».

90. I close with an allusion to Timpanaro's own closural words: «La mia attività di studioso va declinando; ma vorrei che a studiosi giovani ciò che sono venuto scrivendo nel corso di parecchi decenni fosse di qualche utilità, per andare avanti, s'intende, sulla loro strada» (*Nuovi studi sul nostro Ottocento*, Pisa 1995, p. xix; the emphasis is Timpanaro's). I owe my knowledge of this passage to Alessandro Russo.

Questo contributo si propone di dimostrare che gli scritti di Sebastiano Timpanaro saranno di importanza centrale per gli editori futuri degli *Annales* di Ennio. Prendendo come casi di studio *ann.* 209 e 579 Sk., il lavoro offre inoltre alcune riflessioni sullo stile del poema.

This essay aims to show that the writings of Sebastiano Timpanaro will be of central importance to future editors of Ennius' Annales. It makes this argument with specific reference to ann. 209 and 579 Sk., and also offers some thoughts on the style of Ennius' poem.