

Parts of these lines are already preserved in frr. 17, 18 etc. (*Ox. Pap.* L, p. 109), but in the first half of vv. 82–3 [υκυ μοις α κ] and [τε κοματα τ] are missing, and fr. 62 would fit well.

The identification of fr. 62 here seems confirmed by PJP2, who comments: ‘Your placing seems all the more plausible, because with a now informed eye I think I could now see a low trace before mu in line 1, suitable for the foot of hypsilon, and a hairline horizontal at the beginning of 2, suitable for the top of tau.’

**Fr. 69 (scholia)**

] . . . . . [   
 ]ργος ολι . [   
 ]πων και [   
 ]απεδω . [

This note might refer to *Id.* 24.130–1:

οὐ ποκα κλᾶρον ἅπαντα καὶ οἰνόπεδον μέγα Τυδεύς  
ναῖε παρ’ Ἀδρήστοιο λαβὼν ἱππῆλατον Ἄργος . . .

Line 2 of the fragment would have the name Argos, line 3 an explanation of its epithet, line 4 a part of the verb ἀποδίδωμι (e.g. ]ἀπέδωκ[ε) in the course of the explanation how Adrastus was a benefactor to Tydeus (ἀποδίδωμι is often used in later Greek of bestowing or awarding).<sup>11</sup> No trace of *Id.* 24 has otherwise been found in this papyrus to date.

*University of California, Berkeley*

A. W. BULLOCH

<sup>11</sup> I do not understand line 2 ολι if the gap after the iota is correctly read. It should perhaps be noted that *Id.* 25.230 ends with the phrase *σαρκὸς ὀλιθεν*.

BOOK VI OF ENNIUS' *ANNALS*

The contents of the sixth book of Ennius' *Annals* have recently become a matter of dispute. Ever since Columna's edition (1585) it had been assumed that the book was entirely given over to the story of the war against king Pyrrhus (followed perhaps by mention of some events of the next few years; so my commentary, Oxford, 1985, p. 329). That view was based on the anecdote told by Quintilian 6.3.6, that Cicero, asked to say something *de Sexto Annali*, a witness in a law case, replied: '*Quis potis ingentis oras euoluere belli*'. It seems as good as certain that this was the first line of Book VI<sup>1</sup>, and *belli* was taken by all as referring to the Pyrrhus war. According to Dr T. Cornell, however,<sup>2</sup> 'unrolling the mighty scroll of war' means that the poet is now going to describe warfare on the grand scale, thus setting the sequence of the third Samnite War, the Pyrrhus War, and (the first and) the second Punic War against the minor wars described in the first five books.<sup>3</sup> I doubt if Ennius would have felt that

<sup>1</sup> It is not the first line in Virgil's imitation, *Aen.* 9.528, but is adapted in the beginning of Lucretius' Book V, and Cicero is most likely to have quoted a line which, as the first of Book VI, would most easily come to him and be recognized by his audience.

<sup>2</sup> *JRS* 76 (1986), 248ff.

<sup>3</sup> It is true that in 7.29.1 Livy writes: *maiora iam hinc bella* (note the plural!)...*dicentur. namque eo anno* (343 B.C.) *contra Samnites. . . mota arma; Samnitium bellum ancipiti Marte gestum Pyrrhus hostis, Pyrrhum Poeni secuti*. This, however, refers to the first Samnite war, and Dr Cornell is not inclined to include that war in Book VI, which would mean that even the Latin war, with the execution of the younger Manlius (340 B.C.; my V i), would have to be accommodated there.

the early Latin war with the story of Lake Regillus, the capture of Veii, the Allia, the fall of Rome to the Gauls, and the second Samnite war (the Caudine forks!) were minor wars; but I am certain that *bellum* in the singular, except in contrast to the notion of *pax*, cannot refer to war in a general sense, covering a plurality of wars.

Dr Cornell combines that interpretation, which I cannot possibly accept, with a theory about the difference in the number of quotations drawn from individual books, which again I find utterly unconvincing. Observing correctly that Books VI, VII and VIII are represented by more fragments than any others (apart from I and XVI, to which special considerations apply) he believes that, side by side with the generally accepted grouping in three books, there existed another in which five books belonged together.<sup>4</sup> It is, however, impossible to understand why Ennius should have chosen to have a major break before Book VI, when the great divide, as shown by the proem of Book VII, was to follow at the end of the same book; nor can such an intention on the part of the poet have influenced the number of quotations drawn from Book VI. The obvious explanation is that the great wars fought against foreign enemies on Italian soil seemed the most important and were of the greatest interest to Roman readers. They probably were the books most intensively studied at school and hence most frequently quoted not only by lovers of poetry but also by grammarians, who, notwithstanding their well-known tendency to comb through first books more thoroughly than through later ones, would nevertheless, when wishing to give linguistic examples, think particularly of the books they knew best.

His interpretation of *belli* enables Dr Cornell to include more than the Pyrrhus War in Book VI, but his main reason for doing so is his belief that Ennius could not have given the prayer of *deuotio*, which is attested by Nonius, 150.5, for Book VI (208–10 Vah., 191–4 Sk.), to the third Decius ‘devoting’ himself at Ausculum. Again I cannot agree with him at all. Cicero in two passages seems to say that the third Decius Mus died in a *deuotio* at Ausculum: *fin.* 2.61 *P. Decius... cum se deuouerat... quod quidem eius factum nisi esset iure laudatum, non esset imitatus quarto suo consulatu filius, neque porro ex eo natus cum Pyrrho bellum gerens consul cecidisset in proelio seque e continenti genere tertiam uictimam rei publicae praeuisset*; *Tusc.* 1.89 *non cum Latinis decertans pater Decius, cum Etruscis filius, cum Pyrrho nepos se hostium telis obiecissent*. Dr Cornell correctly points out that elsewhere (*Sest.* 48; *off.* 1.61; 3.16; *sen.* 75; *parad.* 12) Cicero speaks only of two *deuotiones*, and that in referring to the third Decius he does not use the verb *deuouere* or the noun *deuotio*. The end of *fin.* 2.61, however, and the same phrase used for all three Decii in *Tusc.* 1.89 make it plain that Cicero, if he did not definitely mean a *deuotio*, was certainly hedging. Knowing different versions of what happened at Ausculum he would not decide whether Decius died fighting in the ordinary way or in a *deuotio*, however close he comes to suggesting the latter.

And different versions of what happened at Ausculum certainly did exist. If no report of a *deuotio* there had come down, why does Dio Cassius 40.43 (Zonaras 8.5) tell us that a *deuotio* was intended but not carried out? In the circumstances it seems impossible to deny the existence of a story according to which the third Decius died in the same way as his father and grandfather. The most probable theory of what happened in fact and what happened in the transmission is that given in my commentary, p. 354: a *deuotio* was intended at Ausculum but failed; the consul possibly

<sup>4</sup> He compares the *Aeneid*, which, apart from the obvious division into the Odyssean half, I–VI, and the Iliadic half, VII–XII, can be considered as consisting of three parts, the tragedy of Dido, the Roman centre, and the tragedy of Turnus. But that is a totally different matter, and it certainly has not influenced the number of quotations drawn from the different books.

remained alive (if he is identical with the *consul suffectus* of 265 B.C.; see Broughton *MRR* i.202 n. 2). Livy and the majority of historians eliminated that somewhat embarrassing story, Livy perhaps transferring the detail of what happened when a *deuotio* failed from here to his account of the successful *deuotio* of the first Decius (8.10.12ff.); others transformed it into a *deuotio* intended but not carried out; and a third version, followed by Ennius and known from him to Cicero (Niebuhr, *RG* iii. 592), reported it as actually having taken place. Dr Cornell finds it impossible to imagine that Ennius highlighted 'the embarrassing (and perhaps even faintly comic) affair at Ausculum'. Ennius, however, need not have seen it in that light. Not even Livy, to judge from *Periocha* xiii, nor Dionysius 20.3.7, makes Ausculum a Roman defeat, and the change of fortune which made Ausculum proverbial as a battle in which the conquered became conquerors (Festus, p. 214 L.) may according to Ennius have been brought about by the *deuotio* of Decius.

This, then, is how the matter stands: only violation of Latin idiom makes it possible to read *belli* as referring to a plurality of wars, and nothing forbids us to assume that the prayer attested for Book VI by Nonius was spoken at Ausculum.

A further point telling against Dr Cornell's thesis that the prayer was spoken by the second Decius, and that therefore the third Samnite war was included in Book VI, is less strong but perhaps deserves mention. Livy 8.9.6ff. gives it to the first Decius, and there is its natural place. Admittedly that *deuotio* may not be historical (no detail of the first Latin war is reliable)<sup>5</sup> but may have been invented on the model of the *deuotio* at Sentinum. However, it is so well established in the tradition (it is basic to Accius' play *Aeneadae uel Decius*; see 15 R.) that it must have been canonized already in Ennius' day. Why then should Ennius go into such detail in the story of the second *deuotio*? It is easy to see, on the other hand, why he should have done so in the case of the third: he tried to lend it weight and credibility by detailed treatment because he either invented it,<sup>6</sup> or was supporting an obscure variant.

University College London

O. SKUTSCH

<sup>5</sup> Mommsen, *RG* i.355 n. (*Hist. of Rome* i.759ff. n.).

<sup>6</sup> So R. Martina, *Quad. dell' Ist. di fil. class. dell' Univ. di Trieste*, II (Rome, 1979), 61ff., 72f.; but see my commentary, p. 354 n. 7.

#### ENNIUS, *ANNALS* VI: A REPLY

Together with the majority of modern commentators, Professor Skutsch believes that the '*devotio*' prayer in lines 191–4 of Ennius' *Annals* was spoken by the consul P. Decius Mus before the battle of Ausculum in 279 B.C. This seems to me unlikely for several reasons, and I am still not persuaded after reading his note (above).

The first point to make about the supposed *devotio* at Ausculum is that it is not recorded in the sources. There is no mention of it in the lengthy accounts of Plutarch and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in the *Periochae* or in any of the other sources based on Livy.<sup>1</sup> According to a bizarre story in Cassius Dio (fr. 43, with Zonaras 8.5), the consuls announced before the battle that they had no intention of staging a *devotio*, in spite of rumours which had been circulating among the soldiers and which had even

<sup>1</sup> Plut. *Pyrrhus* 21.7–15; Dion. Hal. 20.1–3; Liv. *Per.* 13; Oros. 4.1.19–22, etc. The sources are assembled and discussed in M. R. Torelli (ed.), *Rerum Romanarum fontes ab anno ccxcii ad annum cclxv a.Ch.n.* (Pisa, 1978), 164–74. The article of G. Stievano, 'La supposta *devotio* di P. Decio Mure nel 279 a.C.', *Epigraphica* 13 (1951), 3–23, is still worth consulting.

reached the ears of Pyrrhus. Whatever the origin of this version, its basic message is clear: the consul did not devote himself.

We now come to Cicero. He twice says that Decius died at Ausculum fighting for the Republic, but he does not say that he performed a *devotio* (*Fin.* 2.61; *Tusc.* 1.89; quoted above by Skutsch). Cicero's testimony is clear, and it is incorrect to say that he is 'hedging'. When speaking of formal acts of *devotio*, Cicero refers only to the first two Decii (in no fewer than four passages: *Sest.* 48; *Off.* 1.61; 3.16; *Sen.* 75). When he mentions the three Decii he is careful to choose words which are appropriate to each case. What he plainly says is that all three died in battle, but that only the first two devoted themselves. Cicero's version is therefore totally different from that of Skutsch, who believes that all three devoted themselves but that (probably) only the first two died in battle (cf. his Commentary, p. 353).

We certainly cannot infer from Cicero that the third Decius survived the battle of Ausculum. The notion that he lived on depends on a statement of Ps. Aurelius Victor (*de viris illustribus* 36.1), a highly unreliable authority, who says that a Decius Mus was sent to crush the revolt of Volsinii (265–4 B.C.). Broughton includes him as a possible *consul suffectus* in 265 B.C., but notes that this was not recorded in the *Fasti Capitolini*.<sup>2</sup> The version of the *de viris illustribus* is an alternative to the standard tradition, according to which Volsinii was defeated and sacked by M. Fulvius Flaccus (cos. 264). According to T. P. Wiseman, the deviant version was invented by a malicious historian who wished to deprive the Fulvii of the credit for the victory.<sup>3</sup> However that may be, the Fulvian tradition is undoubtedly the correct one, because it is confirmed by a contemporary document. In 1961 excavations at the Sant' Omobono site in Rome unearthed part of Fulvius Flaccus' triumphal monument, together with an inscription: *M. Folv[i]o(s). Q. f. cos[ol.] d[ed]et. Volsi[n]io. cap[ito]*.<sup>4</sup> In view of this evidence the historical credentials of Ps. Victor's Decius Mus look decidedly shaky. Even if a Decius Mus (Ps. Victor gives no *praenomen*!) was active in the 260s, we are under no obligation to identify him with the consul of 279. There is no reason, then, to question Cicero's statement that the latter was killed at Ausculum.

It remains a striking but probably genuine coincidence that the three Decii, father, son and grandson, all fought and died as consuls in great battles. In the circumstances one might have expected the third Decius to have followed the example of his forebears and to have devoted himself. This expectation clearly lies behind Dio's peculiar account, which seeks to explain why a *devotio* did not take place. In spite of the sources it is still possible that Decius did follow the family tradition and actually performed a *devotio* at Ausculum; but if so it did not produce the desired result (i.e. a Roman victory). That would explain why the *devotio*, if it happened, was not publicised after the event, and why it did not pass into the historical tradition.

Pyrrhus won the battle; of that there can be no doubt. The facts were recorded by two excellent contemporary historians, Hieronymus and Timaeus, and subsequently by Fabius Pictor, who would not only have read them but would also have met and spoken to survivors of the battle. Ennius presumably read these sources, and he must

<sup>2</sup> *MRR* i.202, referring to A. Degrassi, *Inscr. Ital.* XIII.1.115.

<sup>3</sup> 'Monuments and Roman Annalists', in I. S. Moxon, J. D. Smart, A. J. Woodman (edd.), *Past Perspectives* (Cambridge, 1986), 87–100; esp. 95–9.

<sup>4</sup> L. Mercando, G. Ioppolo, A. Degrassi, *Bull. Com.* 79 (1963–4), 34f.; cf. M. Torelli, *Quad. Ist. Topogr., Univ. di Roma* 5 (1968), 71–5; *Roma medio-republicana* (Exhibition catalogue, Rome, 1973), 103; Wiseman, art. cit. (n. 3), 95.

have known that a *devotio*, if performed, had been a failure.<sup>5</sup> For these reasons I consider it unlikely that lines 191–4 of the *Annals* refer to the battle of Ausculum. It is more probable that they were part of a description of one of the earlier and better attested *devotiones* – either that at Vesperis (340 B.C.) or that at Sentinum (295).

This interpretation is usually ruled out by commentators (including Skutsch) because of line 164: *quis potis ingentis oras evolvere belli*. Two assumptions are made about this line: first that it introduced an account of the Pyrrhic War, and secondly that it was the first line of book VI (to which the *devotio* fragment belongs). But both assumptions are fragile. The line is normally taken to mean ‘who can unroll this great war from end to end?’ (thus Warmington). But there is no earthly reason why the great war in question should be that against Pyrrhus. The reference could be to any great war, for example the Third Samnite War, the climax of which was the battle of Sentinum and the *devotio* of the second Decius.

I argued in my review article, however, that the line does not refer to a specific war, but rather to war in an abstract sense. The poet is introducing the theme of war, at a point in the narrative where warfare on the grand scale is about to begin. He is ‘unrolling the mighty scroll of war’, just as Virgil does at *Aen.* 9.526, the beginning of Turnus’ *aristeia*. I admit that I am taking *bellum* in the singular to refer to war in a general sense, but I make no apology for this, since I do not believe that it is a ‘violation of Latin idiom’. For parallels I would merely cite Lucretius 5.1289–1308, where *bellum* is used in this sense five times in twenty lines.

But let us suppose, for the sake of argument, that the traditional interpretation is correct, and that Ennius’ line introduced the Pyrrhic War. What are the grounds for supposing that it was the first line of the book? According to Quintilian (6.3.86) Cicero once recited it when challenged by an opposing advocate to say something about a witness named Sextus Annalis. The joke is that Cicero chose to understand the statement *dic, M. Tulli, si quid potes de Sexto Annali* as ‘say something if you can, M. Tullius, from the sixth [book of the] Annal[s]’. A nice point is that it would not have been necessary for a listener to recognise the quotation in order to understand the joke; it simply had to sound like Ennius. Any line from book VI would have sufficed to bring the house down (it *is* quite a good joke). There is a reasonable chance, but obviously no guarantee, that it was the first line of the book. Many people, if asked to cite some lines of *Richard III*, would offer

Now is the winter of our discontent  
Made glorious summer by this sun of York;

But how many of us, if asked to quote from *Hamlet*, would answer

‘Who’s there?’ – ‘Nay, answer me: stand, and unfold yourself.’?

University College London

T. J. CORNELL

<sup>5</sup> The same point applies *a fortiori* if Decius had attempted a *devotio* and survived; in that case he really would have been a *ridiculus Mus*, hardly a fit subject for epic treatment in the *Annals*.