

## THE FRAGMENTS OF FURIUS ANTIAS

Between Ennius and Vergil the Latin epic hexameter underwent dramatic changes in both prosody and diction.<sup>1</sup> The precise history of these changes remains obscure, although it is clear from Catullan spondaizantes and Lucretian archaisms, from variation in the use of enjambment and the history of Hermann's bridge, that the versatile and expressive instrument the hexameter was to become in Vergil's hands was not the result of linear development. In fact, despite the pivotal role often assigned to Cicero,<sup>2</sup> in many ways the last one hundred years of the Republic is better characterized as a period of poetic variety and innovation than one of linear progress toward classical perfection. The fragments of Furius Antias can shed light on this period of change. They show remarkable prosodic characteristics and verbal finesse, and they appear to have influenced both Vergil and Ovid. Although they are not numerous enough to allow us to rewrite the history of the Latin hexameter in any

<sup>1</sup> The discussions are many and they are in general agreement. For this paper the primary secondary sources have been: G. B. Townend, 'The Poems', in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Cicero* (New York, 1965), 124–5; W. W. Ewbank, *The Poems of Cicero* (New York and London, 1978); O. Skutsch, *The Annals of Q. Ennius* (Oxford, 1985); C. Bailey, *Titus Lucretius Carus De Rerum Natura Libri Sex* (Oxford, 1947); G. E. Duckworth, *Vergil and Classical Hexameter Poetry* (Ann Arbor, 1969); E. Courtney, *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* (Oxford, 1993); K. Buchner, *RE* VII. A. 1 1265–6, s.v. 'Tullius'; A. S. Gratwick, 'Ennius' *Annales*', in *Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Cambridge, 1982), vol. 2, pt. 1, 66–75; and S. M. Goldberg, *Epic in Republican Rome* (Oxford, 1995). These works are cited by author only in the notes that follow. The specific features of prosody and diction relevant to Furius are discussed below.

<sup>2</sup> Büchner gives a detailed analysis of Cicero's advances in ten categories and concludes, 'Nimmt man alles zusammen so wird C. zu einer wichtigen Brücke zu den Augusteern' (1266). Traglia, *La Lingua di Cicerone Poeta* (Bari, 1950), 159–233 makes even more vigorous claims for Cicero's importance. Townend, 124 says, 'Cicero's importance as a poet, then, is to be sought, if anywhere, in the part he played in the development of Latin poetical technique'. He goes on to specify Cicero's advances over Ennius as the increased proportion of dactyls, the regularization of the third foot caesura, avoidance of complete coincidence of ictus and accent in the first four feet of the hexameter with regular coincidence in the cadence, and refinement in elision. An appreciative view of Cicero's technical importance may be found in T. Peck, 'Cicero's Hexameters', *TAPA* 28 (1897), 60–74; and a less enthusiastic verdict on him as a 'versifier' in W. W. Merrill, 'The Metrical Technique of Lucretius and Cicero', *Cal. Publ. in Cl. Phil.* 7.10 (1924), 305–6. Duckworth cites with approval Büchner and Townend, and considers Cicero 'a kind of milestone', 43. Courtney, 149–52, avoids any general qualitative judgement of Cicero as a poet and tries to balance an appreciation of Cicero's place in the development of the hexameter with attention to his technical defects in suppleness and variety. He credits Cicero with having 'moved forward from the archaic mould still retained by Lucretius towards the Vergilian norm of regularizing caesura and line end' (150), and with introducing two adjective, two noun lines which created the possibility of neoteric word-patterning. Already in 1921, however, W. A. Merrill in 'Lucretius and Cicero's Verse', *University of California Publications in Classical Philology* 5 (1921), 144 had cautioned, 'It is not probable that the youthful Cicero all alone modified the heavy hexameter of Ennius and Lucilius; it is a more rational view to suppose that the teaching grammarians in the schools brought about a gradual change, and that a slow improvement in technique and vocabulary would be apparent to us if the lost work of the period after Ennius had survived'. For Cicero's contributions to epic diction, see W. Allen, Jr., 'O fortunatam natam...', *TAPA* 87 (1956), 141–3; M. Wigodsky, *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* 24 (Wiesbaden, 1972), 109–14; and Goldberg, 135–57.

precise detailed way, nor to conclude that specific innovations and modifications usually thought to be Ciceronian should be reassigned to Furius, still their poetic virtues are such that they should not be overlooked in our general assessment of this period. In fact, they are an important part of the evidence for believing that before Cicero's *Aratea* (c. 86 B.C.)<sup>3</sup> the epic tradition in Rome offered its poets choices as well as opportunities in a context of rich prosodic and verbal experiment and innovation.

After discussion of Furius' identity and date, this essay will have two parts. In the first, I will use general description and arguments from probability to place Furius' fragments in the context of the Ennian hexameter and the innovations of the late Republic. It will appear that, although we cannot be certain about specific details, the general effect of these lines associates them with the experiments and modifications of Cicero and the generations that followed him, not with the norms of Ennian epic. In the second, through detailed comment on the individual verses I will call attention both to the special qualities of Furius' metre and diction and to his apparent influence on other poets. It will be seen that almost all the specific details of Furius' metre and diction are at home in the classical hexameter as represented by Vergil<sup>4</sup> and that he is capable of some striking poetic effects. Furthermore, it is the case that Vergil and Ovid knew Furius' lines, used them and even corrected them.<sup>5</sup> The general historical context, the details of interpretive analysis, and the evidence of influence are all necessary parts of the picture I am trying to draw. For Furius' prosodic achievement is inseparable from his position in the history of the hexameter; his verbal finesse in individual lines is further evidence for this generally high level of poetic craftsmanship; and the attention paid to him by later poets is the final witness of his importance in the history of the Latin hexameter. It is the compound effect of all these features which suggests that his role in developing the resources of the classical hexameter was more important than we have hitherto suspected.

## I. FURIUS ANTIAS: IDENTITY AND DATE

According to Aulus Gellius (*Att. Noct.* 18.11) the *grammaticus* Caesellius Vindex criticized several verses of the poet Furius for their neologisms. Were it not for Gellius' defence of this poet, adding some neologisms of his own (*crispicans nitefacit*),<sup>6</sup> we would not have the six fragments, each a complete hexameter line, which represent Furius' achievement. In fact, this Furius is known to us only through this passage in Gellius, whose *titulus* identifies him as Furius Antias. Another Furius, possibly the same man, appears in the report of Cicero (*Brutus* 132) that Catulus

<sup>3</sup> The date of Cicero's *Aratea* is uncertain. It appears to be an early work and Cicero himself says he was *admodum adulescentulus* when he produced his translation (*de nat. de.* 2.41.104). In part because of some errors in understanding the Greek, it is generally placed before Cicero's trip to Greece (79–7 B.C.), around 86 B.C. See the discussion by Ewbank 22–4. Cicero's other poems appear to be much later: *de Cons.*, 60 B.C.; *Marius* prob. after the *de Cons.*; *de temp. meis* c. 55 B.C.; and perhaps a revised edition of the *Prognostica* in 60 B.C.

<sup>4</sup> While I do believe that the Vergilian hexameter in its full range of contexts and effects displays a flexibility and power not found before or after, I am not arguing that Furius is creating or progressing to a fixed entity called the 'Vergilian hexameter'. The point is rather that the effects he does achieve are part of the Vergilian repertoire, which is to say that he helped create the range of norms and variations which allowed Vergil to create the effects that suited him.

<sup>5</sup> This is not to say that Furius was a great poet in theme, scope or imagination, only that his technical accomplishments did not go unnoticed by and were not useless to Vergil and Ovid.

<sup>6</sup> See L. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (London, 1988), 160.

dedicated his book on his consulship to a certain A. Furius. A third Furius cited by Macrobius is probably to be identified with Furius Bibaculus and certainly distinguished from Furius Antias and A. Furius.

The major reason for distinguishing Furius Antias from Macrobius' Furius is style. The poetry cited by Macrobius from Furius' *Annales* shows a relatively high degree of enjambment and certain Ennian characteristics, both of which are lacking in the end-stopped lines of Furius Antias.<sup>7</sup> A secondary consideration depends upon the common identification of Macrobius' Furius with Furius Bibaculus. This identification is built up by joining various hexameter fragments: the verses of a certain Furius Alpinus mentioned by Horace at *Serm.* 1.10.36 and identified by Porphyrio as 'Cornelius'; the verse of a Furius mocked by Horace, *Serm.* 2.5.40, and identified by Ps.-Acro (ad loc.) as Furius Vivaculus, thought to be Bibaculus, 'quendam poetam Gallum', author of 'pragmatia belli Gallici'; the hexameter fragment cited by the scholiast to Verg. *Aen.* 9.379 from 'annales belli Gallici'. The common threads that join these Furii are the connection with Gaul and annalistic epics. If the lines in Macrobius are by the neoteric Furius Bibaculus, it would follow from the evidence of Tacitus that we are dealing with a poet who lived long enough to play Catullus to Augustus' Caesar: 'carmina Bibaculi et Catulli referta contumeliis Caesarum leguntur, sed ipse divus Iulius, ipse divus Augustus et tulere ista et reliquere', Tac. *Ann.* 4.34. Since Furius Bibaculus also refers to Valerius Cato as being 'ad summam... senectam' (fr. 1.8, Courtney), and since Cato was born about 90 B.C., it follows that the 'contumelia Caesaris' must have been written about 20 B.C., and probably by a man younger than Cato. This means that despite Jerome's date for Bibaculus' birth, 103 B.C., it is a reasonable estimate that Furius Bibaculus was born sometime about 80 B.C. or later,<sup>8</sup> and this means that he cannot be Furius Antias. The reason is that Furius Antias is called *vetus poeta* by Gellius (18.11.2), a term which should make him a contemporary of Catullus (b. c.150), not a contemporary of Catullus.<sup>9</sup> This is, however, only a secondary argument because,

<sup>7</sup> See, for example, fr. 8 (Courtney): 'ille gravi subito devictus vulnere habenas | misit equi lapsusque in humum defluxit et armis | reddidit aeratis sonatum' (Macrobius *Sat.* 6.4.10). Of the fourteen lines and partial lines cited by Macrobius eight are enjambed. Skutsch, *RE* VII 322, seems to be the first to have distinguished Furius Antias and Macrobius' Furius on grounds that Furius Antias shows no Ennian imitation and no enjambment; see also Holford-Strevens (n. 6), 160 n. 89. H. Bardon, *La Littérature latine inconnue* (Paris, 1952), 179–81, goes furthest in identifying the features that will concern this essay: 'l'art maniéré, mais raffiné, des *neoterioi*, l'allitération *virescit vulnere virtus* combine avec ces recherches quelque raideur héritée des anciens épiques' (180).

<sup>8</sup> I follow the reasoning of Courtney 193 and 198–9.

<sup>9</sup> Based on a search of the PHI CD ROM #5.3 by Musaios 1.0c, we can say that Gellius uses the term *vetus* for his Roman 'ancestors' and for Pindar and Ennius, but for no poet later than those in the list of erotic poets at *Att. Noct.* 19.10: *versus cecinit Valeri Aeditui, veteris poetae, item Porcii Licini et Q. Catuli*. Unfortunately, we know nothing about Valerius Aedituus beyond this reference and the two epigrams totalling ten lines which Gellius cites. It may be significant that of the three poets listed he alone gets the designation 'vetus poeta'. Gellius' usage with respect to poets would seem, then, to place Furius Antias in the generation of Catullus, or before, which makes him likely to be the A. Furius to whom Catullus dedicated the book on his consulship. However, in referring to prose writers Gellius places both Cicero (12.13.17 and 13.17.2) and Varro (2.20 pr.; 7.5.10; and 13.17.2) among the *veteres* (cp. 3.16.19 and 18.7.8). This means that Furius Antias, if he is not A. Furius (fl. c. 100), could be a poet roughly of Cicero's generation. In any event, nothing suggests that poets of the generation of Catullus and Lucretius, the generation to which M. Furius Bibaculus belonged, would have been called *vetus* by Gellius. On Gellius' typical faults, see L. Holford-Strevens, *Aulus Gellius* (London, 1988), 47–58 and 227–35: they include a certain licence in his *mise en scène*, which may be more verisimilar than historically accurate, and some peculiar errors in names, usually of *praenomina*. No grounds have ever been given to dispute his identification of Furius Antias.

even if we do not identify Macrobius' Furius with Furius Bibaculus,<sup>10</sup> we still must account for the difference in style.

The identification of Furius Antias with the A. Furius of Cicero's *Brutus* is attractive and universally accepted. The dedication to him of Catulus' book places his *floruit* at about 100 B.C. (in any event, before Catulus' suicide in 87 B.C.). This would agree with Gellius' use of *vetus poeta*. The fact that he too was a poet and that Cicero knew of his poetry, as well as the fact of his friendship with Catulus, himself a cultured man and amateur poet, all increase the likelihood that we are speaking of the same person. In the world of the late Republican cultured elite, it would not be surprising to find that Furius Antias as well as Archias kept company with Catulus and that Cicero knew both of his poetry and of his friendship.<sup>11</sup>

For the purpose of this essay, however, it is sufficient to recognize only that Furius Antias was writing poetry before or while Cicero was writing. If he is the same as A. Furius, *poeta, familiaris Catuli*, then his priority to Cicero can be secured by Cicero himself, who was merely six years old when Catulus probably wrote his consular memoirs and in any case was only nineteen at the time of Catulus' suicide. If, on the other hand, Furius Antias is not the same as Cicero's A. Furius, we have only Gellius' term, *vetus poeta*, to guide us, and in that regard we must note that Furius Antias was not of Catullus' generation and that it is unlikely but not inconceivable that he was of the generation of Cicero and Varro.

## II. THE GENERAL CHARACTERISTICS OF FURIUS' HEXAMETER TECHNIQUE

I cite the surviving fragments of Furius Antias from Courtney:

- fr. 1: sanguine diluitur tellus, cava terra lutescit = \_ oo | \_ oo \_ | \_ \_ || oo | \_ o | o \_ x;  
 fr. 2: omnia noctescunt tenebris caliginis atrae = \_ oo | \_ \_ \_ || oo | \_ \_ oo | \_ \_;  
 fr. 3: increscunt animi, virescit vulnere virtus = \_ \_ | oo || \_ \_ | \_ oo | \_ \_;  
 fr. 4: sicut fulca levis volitat super aequora classis = \_ \_ | o ||<sup>12</sup> o \_ | oo \_ || oo | oo | \_ \_ x;  
 fr. 5: spiritus Eurorum viridis cum purpurat undas = \_ oo | \_ \_ \_ || oo | \_ | \_ oo | \_ \_;  
 fr. 6: quo magis in patriis possint opulescere campis = \_ oo | \_ oo \_ | \_ \_ || oo | oo | \_ \_.

<sup>10</sup> Neither the identification of Macrobius' Furius with Furius Bibaculus nor the distinction between Furius Bibaculus and Furius Antias is, of course, universally accepted, and the discussion is cluttered with doubts about the other Furii. J. Perret, *Horace* (Paris, 1959), 57–8, identified Macrobius' Furius with Furius Antias as part of a strategy to claim that Horace admired the neoterics: the epic Furius is not the neoteric Furius and, therefore, the Furius Horace disdains is not the neoteric Furius Bibaculus. His reviewer, R. T. Bruère, *CPh* 56 (1961), 122 agreed on the grounds that there was 'nothing neoteric about' the lines in Macrobius (cp. Bardon (n. 7), above). H. Lucas, on the other hand, in 'Die Annalen des Furius Antias', *Philologus* 92 (1937–8), 344–8, joins Macrobius' Furius with Furius Antias and Furius Bibaculus, claiming but not demonstrating 'die natürliche Auffassung' between the verses, but still distinguishing them from the object of Horace's disdain: his reason is that Horace would not condemn a poet Vergil imitated. The essay offers a handy review of the debate, taking it back to Emil Baehrens. See most recently the citations and argument in Courtney, 195–200. The evidence and further bibliography are reviewed with some skepticism that Ps.-Acro's identification is correct by Wigodsky (n. 2), 148–50.

<sup>11</sup> The epigrams of Catulus are discussed by D. O. Ross, Jr., *Style and Tradition in Catullus* (Cambridge, MA, 1969), 144–7, who claims that they show little evidence of 'neoteric' attention to metrical detail. They receive a more appreciative review by Conte (n. 40), 138–9, who emphasizes Catulus' prominence in the cultural landscape. Conte, 110, accepts the identification of A. Furius and Furius Antias, as do all other scholars. The reference to A. Furius in Cicero is: '... ex eo libro, quem de consulatu et de rebus gestis suis conscriptum molli et Xenophonteo genere sermonis misit ad A. Furium poetam familiarem suum...', *Brutus* 132.

<sup>12</sup> On the placement of this caesura, see the discussion of the fragment below.

Reading these fragments, one does not have the impression of being in the world of Ennian hexameters. The sample is not large enough to determine precisely Furios' style, but one can speak of the general impact made by these lines and one can also specify exactly the *unlikelihood* of finding their specific characteristics in six random lines from Ennius. This means that, although we cannot come to any specific conclusions about particular Furian features, we can say that the cumulative effect of these lines is that of a careful, general attention to prosodic modifications that move away from certain Ennian norms. Statistical probability<sup>13</sup> gives us the numbers: Ennius has non-classical endings in 25 % of his lines,<sup>14</sup> has spondees in the first foot about 60 % of the time,<sup>15</sup> and allows a weak caesura in the third foot 10 % of the time.<sup>16</sup> This contrasts with Cicero's practice: classical endings consistently after the *Aratea*, first foot spondees 30 % of the time, and weak caesura in the third foot 4 %.<sup>17</sup> The probability, then, of finding the characteristics of Furios' lines in six random lines from Ennius is: for all classical endings, .178; for a first foot dactyl at least two times out of six,<sup>18</sup> .179; and for no 3-weak caesura, .53. The probability, therefore, of finding six random lines in Ennius that display all these characteristics is .017 or less than one in fifty. On the other hand, the probability of finding the same characteristics in Cicero is: for classical endings, 1.00; for first foot dactyls in Furios' proportions, .58; and for no 3-weak caesura, .735; this computes to a probability of .423, or more than twice in every five samples of six random lines. The difference is striking,<sup>19</sup> and, although we acknowledge that this does not prove that Furios was, like Cicero, experimenting with the elimination of the 3-weak caesura,<sup>20</sup> it does show a general trend which becomes more striking as other distinctly classical features are computed. We may add the probability of finding noun-adjective separation,<sup>21</sup> which distinguishes Cicero, Catullus and Vergil from Ennius. Furios has three examples in

<sup>13</sup> Probabilities for binomial distributions can be calculated according to the formula discussed and given in F. Mosteller and R. E. K. Rourke, *Sturdy Statistics: Nonparametrics and Order Statistics* (Reading, MA, 1973) 24–5, or it may be roughly determined by reference to the chart on p. 319. I have used the rough determination because there is no need in this argument for fastidious accuracy.

<sup>14</sup> Defined as endings which are neither disyllabic word preceded by a dactylic word or word-ending nor trisyllabic word preceded by a trochaic word or word-ending. Percentage from Skutsch, 49. My sources, cited by author only, are listed in note 1. I have not checked the figures myself nor have I sought to reconcile the small differences that sometimes appear between the statistics of different researchers. The reason is simply that agreement is close enough for the general picture I am trying to draw.

<sup>15</sup> Skutsch, 48.

<sup>16</sup> Ewbank, 42. These three criteria are selected because it is a necessary characteristic of a binomial experiment that the outcomes of each trial be independent of one another. One could not, for instance, maintain that observing or breaching Hermann's bridge was entirely independent of classical line ending.

<sup>17</sup> Ewbank 60–4, 45, and 42.

<sup>18</sup> The odds of finding a dactyl exactly twice out of six is .138, but this is not a useful figure because I am not trying to measure the probability of finding these characteristics in exactly Furios' proportion, but the odds of finding Ennian lines which display a similar attention to what became the classical norm; in this instance, a lighter opening foot.

<sup>19</sup> It is the difference, not the probability figure, which is significant. Theoretically, by specifying enough variables one could arrive at the statistical probability that only the lines under consideration have all the features specified. In that event, however, it would be equally unlikely to find the lines in Ennius or in Vergil.

<sup>20</sup> Since Ennius allows a three-weak only 10.6 % of the time, we would expect that random samples of six lines from Ennius would lack 3-weak almost half the time. The statistics do not speak to particulars, but to general trends and to the unlikelihood of finding such a collection of characteristics before the experiments of the last century of the Republic.

<sup>21</sup> See Ross, *op. cit.* 132–7 for the neoteric emphasis on *Sperrung* (that is, the adjective at major caesura and the noun at line end (or in penultimate position)) and the typical neoteric

six lines, which has a probability in Ennius of about .06 and makes the probability of finding in Ennius six random lines meeting the three metrical criteria and this feature of word order about .0012 or about 1 in 1000, while its probability in Cicero's *Aratea* is .456, which changes the overall probability for the same criteria to .193 or one in every five samples.<sup>22</sup>

Another way of trying to evaluate the general place of these lines in the development of the hexameter is to chart the general characteristics they display against percentages for the same features in Ennius, Cicero, Lucretius, Catullus and Vergil (see Table 1).<sup>23</sup>

We see that Furius' technique generally has more in common with the poets of the last century of the Republic than with Ennius. Sometimes he seems to anticipate the directions to be taken by the next generation of poets (observance of Hermann's bridge), sometimes the directions to be taken by Vergil (the elimination of homodyne fourth followed by caesura). It is only in his apparent preference for a diaeresis after the fifth foot (in all but fragment 1), and his relatively low percentage of fourth foot spondees (50 %, as against Ennius c. 65 %, Cicero 84 %, Catullus 84 % and Vergil 75 %)<sup>24</sup> that Furius seems to show a preference that later poets including Cicero regularly modified. On the other hand, these lines surpass Cicero in their metrical and rhythmic variety and complexity. This and other matters of aesthetic quality can be taken up in a closer look at the individual fragments.

First, however, once we have our bearings in terms of percentages and probabilities, we should note the other ways in which Furius' fragments share the aesthetic values of the Republican and classical hexameter. They show no return to the scansion of cretics as dactyls (such as we find in Plautus), no iambic shortening, and no interest in archaic words or forms.<sup>25</sup> There is no suppression of final -s before consonants,<sup>26</sup> no extended alliterative play (except for fr. 3, on which see below) or use of ritual formulae, and no expressions calqued from Homer.<sup>27</sup> The penthemimeral caesura is regular, and is followed by a hephthemimeral caesura in five of the six lines. This creates a noticeably consistent and classical conflict between ictus and accent in the first four feet and an invariable coincidence in the last two. And, finally, there is no

word-positions. The word-order patterns 'most indicative of neoteric innovation' (132), also phrased 'significant word order' (133), are: ...A/...S, .../A...S, ...A/...S..., and A.../...S. See also the remarks of T. E. V. Pearce, 'The enclosing word order in the Latin Hexameter I', *CQ* 16 (1966), 140-71, at 165-6 and 'The enclosing word order in the Latin Hexameter II', *CQ* 16 (1966), 298-320, at 299.

<sup>22</sup> In both the number of noun-adjective groups and their division Furius conforms to the Vergilian model: in Ennius 331 groups in 623 lines, separated eighty-eight times; Vergil has 407 groups in 500 random lines separated 207 times (Skutsch, 67); Furius has 5 groups in 6 lines separated three times. By my own quick count I find 246 separations in the 572 complete lines of *Aratea* (including fragments) printed in Ewbank. This feature is thought to be an identifiably Ciceronian feature (see Pearce, *CQ* 16 [1966], 298 and Courtney, 151). H. Patzer, 'Zum Sprachstil des neoterischen Hexameters', *MH* 12 (1955), 77-95 shows that one significant difference between Ennius and Catullus is the larger number of adjectives in Catullus.

<sup>23</sup> It would be a mistake to try to work these percentages into the probability statistics above. One would run into conflicts with the second requirement of binomial distributions: the outcomes of the trials must be independent of one another.

<sup>24</sup> Figures from Skutsch, 48, with Cicero added from Ewbank, 47.

<sup>25</sup> It is not relevant that they are cited for their neologisms; cp. Ennius' *altivolantum* (*Ann.* 76, Skutsch), a neologism of an identifiably archaic stripe (Lucretius adopted it: *D.R.N.* 5.433).

<sup>26</sup> Ennius suppresses final -s once in every five lines: Skutsch, 56.

<sup>27</sup> See Gratwick, 68-9, for a brief summary of Ennian characteristics. Skutsch, of course, goes into much greater detail.

Table 1.

|  | Ennius | Cicero | Lucretius | Catullus    | Vergil          | Furius           |
|--|--------|--------|-----------|-------------|-----------------|------------------|
| Penthemimeral Caesura <sup>a</sup>               | 88     | 74     | 85        | 91          | 85              | 100              |
| End-stopped lines <sup>b</sup>                   | < 80   | 80     | 72        | (no figure) | 40              | 100 <sup>c</sup> |
| Spondaic first foot <sup>d</sup>                 | 60     | 35     | 29        | 36          | 40 <sup>e</sup> | 33               |
| Self-contained dactyl in first foot <sup>f</sup> | 16     | 22     | 31        | 31          | 33              | 67               |
| Spondaic fifth foot <sup>g</sup>                 | 2      | 0.2    | 4.3       | 7           | 0.2             | none             |
| Homodyne fourth followed by caesura <sup>h</sup> | 22     | 40     | 38        | 53          | 17.7            | 17 <sup>i</sup>  |
| Breaching Hermann's bridge <sup>j</sup>          | 4      | 0      | 1         | 0           | 3.3             | 0                |

<sup>a</sup> The figure for Cicero is derived from Ewbank 42; Merrill, *UCPCPh* 7 (1924), 293, gives the percentage of penthemimeral caesura in Cicero's *Aratea* as 88.6 and is my source for Lucretius; Merrill *UCPCPh* 7 (1924) 221, gives the figure for Vergil; Goldberg, 92, gives the figure for Ennius; Skutsch, 46, gives rounded figures in general agreement. In Furius the penthemimeral is not always the major caesura: see the discussion below.

<sup>b</sup> Ewbank 57 discusses Cicero and Vergil; Bailey 121 provides the basis for the figure for Lucretius; for Ennius I have no percentage, but Courtney 151 establishes the general pattern when he notes that 'a higher proportion of his [Cicero's] lines become end-stopped'. Skutsch notes that Vergil has a greater frequency of enjambment than Ennius. See also the discussion of Büchner 1263–5. There is general agreement about the increase in end-stopped lines, although there is certain to be disagreement about how to distinguish an enjambment from a 'light pause'.

<sup>c</sup> I do not mean that Furius' clauses must needs end with line end, since it is possible that any of Furius' clauses that end the line may have in fact continued into the next line. I mean that the line end coincides with an apparently closed syntax. This is important because the metrical unit is reinforcing the appearance of closure and is, therefore, used as an independent and manipulable expressive entity. The continuation of an apparently closed syntactic structure (e.g. 'labor omnia vicit | improbus', *Georgics* 1.145–6) has the force in both prose and poetry of an appended proposition (in the example cited: 'labor overcame everything, and it was *improbus*', not 'an *improbus labor* overcame everything').

<sup>d</sup> Ennius and Vergil are cited in Skutsch, 48; Cicero, Catullus and Vergil are given in Ewbank, 45. Merrill, *UCPCPh* 7 (1924), 227 gives the figures for Lucretius. A spondaic word is found in the first foot at the following rate: Ennius 20%; Lucretius 4%; Catullus 5%; Vergil 3% (figured from numbers in Skutsch, 48 and Merrill, op. cit., 228). In Furius we find one in six lines, or 17%. Although Cicero is sometimes credited with decreasing the number of spondees per verse, this is not altogether true. As Skutsch, 48, points out, 'The Ennian hexameter is only slightly less dactylic than the Virgilian'. The figures from Duckworth are: Ennius 67% spondees, Cicero 63%, Lucretius 56%, Catullus 63% and Vergil 63%. For Furius the percentage is 38% spondees.

<sup>e</sup> Townend, 127, notes that Vergil's archaizing imitations of Ennius make his practice in this regard less radical than that of Cicero. One should note, however, that the expressive effects that Vergil attains depend upon the norm achieved by Cicero and others.

<sup>f</sup> Bailey 110. These figures here include openings like that of Furius fr. 6: *quo magis*. The single dactylic word also increases in frequency from 9.8% in Ennius to 11.3% in Cicero, 17.5% in Lucretius, and 19.9% in Vergil; it begins 50% of Furius' lines. The dactylic first foot has a varying frequency: Ennius 40%, Cicero 65%, Catullus 65% and Vergil 60%: Ewbank, 45, and Skutsch, 48. The figure for Catullus is my own.

<sup>g</sup> All figures from Duckworth 'Table I'; Skutsch, 51, gives similar figures for Ennius and Vergil; Ewbank, 60, gives figures for Ennius, Lucretius, Catullus and Cicero.

<sup>h</sup> Bailey, 112. My own count for Catullus. The figures for homodyne fourth with or without caesura are: Cicero 45%, Lucretius 48%, Catullus 60%, Vergil 38% (Duckworth 'Table II').

<sup>i</sup> Cp. Matius who shows homodyne fourth with caesura in four of seven hexameter fragments (excluding fr. 5, Courtney, since it offers no evidence), and homodyne fourth without caesura in a fifth, if we disallow caesura between preposition and object (fr. 8).

<sup>j</sup> Figures for Ennius, Vergil and Lucretius in Skutsch, 47; Skutsch notes that Cicero and Catullus are more Greek in their observance of Hermann's bridge, apparently a late republican experiment that did not suit Vergil, see Courtney, 151. The count for Catullus is my own.

elision in these lines. Granted that Ennius has a penthemimeral caesura in 88 % of his lines and that elision in the *Annales* is remarkably infrequent (once in five lines),<sup>28</sup> Furius' apparent acceptance of these norms forms part of the general picture of his care and ability.

When these descriptive observations are added to the statistics above, they reinforce the mathematical probability that Furius Antias was not a follower of Ennian norms. Although we cannot say with any certainty that Furius looked forward to Vergil in fourth-foot homodyne or that he was part of the late Republican experiments in observing Hermann's bridge, we can say with *relative* certainty that these lines show a consistent tendency to move away from Ennian standards in exactly the directions that other poets in the late Republic would also take. Such experimentation is consistent with the range of developments in the period in which he lived and wrote: this includes hexameter styles as diverse as Ennianizing Matius<sup>29</sup> and innovating Cicero, as well as the metrical and verbal experiments of Laevius and later the diversity of style in Lucretius and Catullus. But Furius is different from Matius and Lucretius precisely in that he is more similar to Cicero and Catullus. His verses, although they precede the experiments of Cicero, anticipate them and are more at home in the world of late Republican verse than in the world of pre-Ciceronian hexameter as we have been told to imagine it.<sup>30</sup>

### III. FURIUS' FRAGMENTS

A close look at Furius' technique in the individual fragments will confirm the impression that he was moving away from Ennian norms for effective poetic reasons. Both in his handling of the metre and in his word choice, collocation, and placement he shows considerable finesse and ability. The fact that he seldom varies from what would become the standard diction of the classical period<sup>31</sup> is further evidence of the direction his verse was taking. In fact, it seems clear that Vergil, and after him Ovid, knew and used Furius and that we can identify what amount to instances of *imitatio*

<sup>28</sup> Skutsch, 46 and 52.

<sup>29</sup> For Cn. Matius, see Courtney, 99–106. Examples of non-Furian hexameters include fr. 1: 'corpora Graiorum maerebat mandier igni' (homodyne fourth, archaic infinitive, heavy alliteration), fr. 2: 'obsceni interpretes funestique ominis auctor' (spondees, no caesura after 3 strong, elision); and fr. 3: 'dum dat vincendi praepes Victoria palmam' (spondees; etymologizing and heavy alliteration).

<sup>30</sup> 'After the death of Lucilius the satirist in 103 B.C. there seems to have been a virtual vacuum in Roman poetry; although Accius, born in 170 B.C., survived long enough to converse with the young Cicero in the early eighties. We have a few odd lines of the Homeric translations of Matius and Ninnius, and of the short poems of Laevius—none, in any case, capable of impressing following generations with their importance': Townend, 110. See the brief discussion of H. Bardon, *La littérature latine inconnue* (Paris, 1952), 178–81 and M. Wigodsky, *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*, *Hermes Einzelschriften* 24 (Wiesbaden, 1972), 98–101. Townend, 124, is wisely cautious of precise evaluation of Cicero's place: 'An estimate of his achievement in this field is made the more difficult by our relative ignorance of what was written by other poets before Cicero'. More extreme is the judgment of G. B. Conte, *Latin Literature: A History* (Baltimore and London, 1994), J. B. Solodow (tr.), 110: 'In the period that extends from the age of the Scipios to the age of Caesar, epic writing appears, on the basis of the very few fragments left, to be completely dominated by the example of Ennius'. He further says of the new schools of poetry that they 'regard this genre [epic] as a static survival, dusty and empty'. This essay challenges both generalities.

<sup>31</sup> I use Vergil as my main example of this standard diction because he offers a sufficient number of epic verses and sufficient variety of subject matter to test Furius' diction. As it turns out, further citations from other authors would only be redundant: Furius' diction is not just classical but Vergilian.



*cum aemulatione*.<sup>32</sup> Consequently, I have suggested parallels when they seemed appropriate, but the general argument depends more upon the cumulative impact of the following details than on any particular instance, which might be argued away as insignificant or fortuitous.

What follows takes the form of citations with brief commentary. Underlined words are those that appear in parallel citations; and, in parallel citations, # indicates line end.

**fr. 1:** sanguine diluitur tellus, cava terra lutescit.

*Metre:* The rhythm is regular with regard to 3-strong caesura; in fact, as mentioned above, every fragment has a caesura at 3-strong.<sup>33</sup> This regularity of caesura, however, is complemented by a certain variety in the formal rhythmic articulation. In fragments 1 and 4, for instance, the 3-strong caesura exists but is not the major caesura. When the lines contain two clauses (here and in fr. 3), the clause end coincides with a major caesura. In this line, however, that caesura is not 3-strong. Furius maintains a 3-strong caesura, while the clauses separate at 4-strong. Since the first foot is a self-contained dactylic word,<sup>34</sup> the diaeresis creates from 2-strong to 4-strong a repetition of the opening rhythm of a hexameter from beginning to 3-strong, in this case enhanced by the second foot dactyl ( \_ oo \_ | oo \_ ||). This rhythmic unit has the effect of setting *sanguine* off from the rest of its clause and so of calling attention to the possible *apo koinou* construction: *sanguine* may be taken with both *diluitur tellus* and *cava terra lutescit*. The use of a first foot diaeresis plus 4-strong to implant an opening rhythm on feet 2–4a is repeated with less emphasis in fragments 2, 4 and 5; but it is an effect commonly used by Vergil, sometimes with great expressive power: compare *Aeneid* 1.3, ‘litora—multum ille et terris | iactatus et alto’, where the line with its jerky and conflicted movement seems to begin a second time, appropriately, with *mult(um) ille*, a spondaic foot which includes two word beginnings with two accents.<sup>35</sup> Furius’ line end is a version of Cicero’s second conformation according to Courtney ( \_ \_ oo \_ | o | o \_ o ),<sup>36</sup> but with the addition of the caesura at 4-strong, Furius avoids fourth foot homodyny.

*Diction:* The language is classical. Blood on the earth is, of course, common in descriptions of battle; brutal examples would be *Aen.* 9.333 and 12.340. While there is nothing artful about the order of *cava terra*, the ‘hollow earth’ is not otiose: it refers to the earth as a receptacle (Courtney) as well as to the uncertain surface of what should be *terra firma*. *cava ... terra* at *Aen.* 12.893 emphasizes the hollowness of the earth in which one is buried. *Diluere* is not particularly common in Vergil, but it is

<sup>32</sup> Further checks of Catullus, Tibullus, Propertius and Lucan failed to produce any convincing parallels.

<sup>33</sup> We may note that in comparison with Lucretius, Cicero shows an increase in the number of lines with only 3-strong and 4-strong caesura; Furius in these fragments has the same high percentage as Cicero (fragments 1, 2, 5, 6). The figures come from W. A. Merrill, *UCPCPh* 7 (1924), 293–306. He notes that Lucretius and Cicero both have 2-strong, 3-strong and 4-strong about one-third of the time, but that Cicero has 3-strong and 4-strong over 50% of the time while Lucretius has those caesurae only about 12%. He has excluded as a separate category the sequence 2-weak, 3-strong, 4-strong, which is found in Furius fragment 4.

<sup>34</sup> This occurs in 67% of Furius’ lines. According to Bailey, 110, the self-contained dactylic first foot increases from 14.5% in Ennius to over 30% in Lucretius and Vergil.

<sup>35</sup> Other instances from Vergil are too numerous to need citation.

<sup>36</sup> Courtney, 150. See below on fr. 3 for an example of Cicero’s first conformation. There is no representative of the third conformation ( oo \_ | oo \_ o | o \_ o ).

not avoided: cf. *Georgics*, 1.326 and 344. *Lutescere*, the neologism for which this line is cited, is not found in Vergil, and even *lutum* is absent,<sup>37</sup> but the effect Furius seeks depends upon the stem of this verb: just as the ground is washed with blood, the line echoes with mud, 'diluitur tellus...lutescit'. In fact, the phonetic resposion of the line is rich and subtle; compare the archaic resposion of *virescit volnere virtus*, below fr. 3.

*Influence*: Vergil offers a fine compression of Furius' line in *Aen.* 12.691, '#*sanguine terra madet*'. Vergil completes his content by 3-strong, while Furius continues to 4-strong for his first clause. Vergil also modifies (or corrects) the neologism, *lutescit*, to which Caesellius Vindex objected, and he eliminates the redundancy of *tellus...terra*. Ovid, perhaps combining Vergil with Furius, has *sanguine quo late tellus madefacta tepebat*, *Met.* 5.76. Elsewhere, Ovid rings other changes on the form: *sanguine terram* # *immauisse*, *Met.* 1.157–8; *sanguine terra rubet*, *Fast.* 2.212.

**fr. 2: *omnia noctescunt tenebris caliginis atrae*.**

*Metre*: Courtney notes that the typical rhythmic conformations of Cicero create fourth foot homodiny and that this 'gives the hexameters of Lucretius and Catullus as well as Cicero the characteristic thumping rhythm which Vergil learnt to use with discretion; this effect is accentuated by Cicero's strong preference for a spondee in the fourth foot'. Furius' lines have fewer fourth foot spondees (50%) than either Ennius (about 60%) or Vergil (75%). Here, he combines his fourth foot spondee with the 4-strong caesura to create conflict in the fourth foot and avoid the 'thumping rhythm' remarked on by Courtney. As a result, coincidence of ictus and accent goes back to the fourth foot only once, fr. 3, which is an arguably self-conscious and archaic verse (see further below).

*Diction*: The words and phrases here are Vergilian (except *noctescunt*—only in Furius and in Gellius' discussion). Night and shadows occur together, of course, as a commonplace. In Vergil, 'et obtenta densentur nocte tenebrae' (*Geo.* 1.248) repeats Furius' verbal order of night and shadows. This is, in fact, the preferred order for these substantives (see *Geo.* 3.401, *Aen.* 3.195, 5.11, and 8.255; only *Aen.* 8.658 sets the order as *tenebris...noctis*). 'conditur in tenebras altum caligine caelum' (*Aen.* 11.187) repeats Furius' association of *tenebrae* and *caligo* and keeps the words in the same order. 'caligo atra' is found only here before Vergil, *Aen.* 9.36 and 11.876 (*caligine...atra* #; note *atram* # ...*caligine nubem*, *Geo.* 2.309); cp. *caligine caeca*, *Aen.* 8.253 (note *caeca caligine*, *Aen.* 3.203). Ennius has both 'caligo caeca' and 'atra nox'. The adjective in *caliginis atrae* might appear both otiose and unexceptionally placed except that *caliginis* is often paired with an adjective which specifies the effect of the fog (e.g., blindness, *caeca caligo*, Cic. *Arat.* 345, cp. Verg. *Aen.* 3.203, or obscurity 'aram...obscura caligine tectam', Cic. *Arat.* 193–4). In fact, the term *caligo* seems often to have attracted epexegetical or intensifying adjectives, and here the line is constructed so as to move from the presence of all detail (*omnia*) through the growth of night (*noctescunt*) with its shadowy and lengthening obscurity (*tenebris caliginis*) to the absence of all detail (*atrae*). Thus the word placement is expressive; for, one may claim that the effect of the line depends precisely upon the passing from view of *omnia* and the appearance of *atrae*.<sup>38</sup>

<sup>37</sup> In fact, the word is rare in all the Augustan poets, being found only at Tibullus 1.1.40; 1.8.52; and Ovid, *Fasti* 3.760.

<sup>38</sup> Similar postponements of *ater* to emphasize the dark result of the action can be found in Vergil; see *Aen.* 6.272, 'nox abstulit atra colorem', see also 10.664.

*Influence:* In another apparent compression with modification of the verb, Vergil writes 'tenebris nigrescunt omnia circum.#' (*Aen.* 11.824). The imitation is unmistakable since Vergil reverses Furius' word order, moves the phrase to line end (with the addition of *circum*), and compresses *noctescunt* and *atrae* into *nigrescunt*. Ovid seems to offer another variation in 'tenebrisque teguntur # omnia' (*Fast.* 4.489–90), returning *omnia* back to line beginning, where it was in Furius' line, but keeping Vergil's reversal of the words and concepts.

**fr. 3:** increscunt animi, virescit volnere virtus.

*Metre:* As in fragment 1, the main clauses break the line in a common classical pattern at a major caesura; this time, however, it is 3-strong.<sup>39</sup> Looking to Cicero's practice, we see that this fragment represents a variation on the first Ciceronian conformation listed by Courtney (oo \_ oo | \_ oo | \_ o), and as such it represents the only example of fourth foot homodyny in the fragments. The spondaic opening was reduced from 60% in Ennius to 40% in Vergil, but here the spondees, together with other effects of the diction, are arguably imitative of archaic expression.

*Diction:* The hint of congeries, and the repetitions of 'cr-sc-r-sc' and especially the pattern of *virescit volnere virtus* recall the archaic manner. One may compare Cato, *pro Rhod:* *animus excellere atque superbiam atque ferociam augescere atque crescere*. The association of *vires*, *vulnera*, and *virtus* seems like a common-place of old Roman virtue, and the prominent alliterative form, uncommon in these fragments,<sup>40</sup> is meant to sound 'Ennian'. Cp. 'viri varia validis... viribus luctunt', *Ann.* 9.298 Skutsch. In Vergil, similar phonetic resources serve a similar expressive purpose. Thus, at *Aen.* 12.529, Vergil glosses, 'nunc totis in vulnera viribus itur' (*Aen.* 12.528) with *antiqua sonantem*. Cp. Ovid who joins *virtus antiqua* and *vires* at *Met.* 11.343. Furius' particular collocation of these three elements, however, is not Vergilian nor is it necessary to imagine that Vergil ever has Furius' verses in mind—the appropriate gloss for both is *antiqua sonans*. Nevertheless, Vergil's variations allow us to see the associative complex more fully: *Aen.* 8.441 brings together *vir* and *viribus*; *Aen.* 1.566, 4.3 and 8.500 join *vir* and *virtus* (cp. *antiquam virtutem* and *animos virilis* at *Aen.* 3.342); *Aen.* 7.257–8 joins *virtus* and *vires*; *Aen.* 5.433 joins *viri* and *vulnera*; and *Aen.* 3.242 and 12.720 join *vis* and *vulnera* (which are opposed at *Aen.* 10.857). Thus, while Vergil works with all elements of a complex larger than that expressed in the Furius fragment, namely *vir*, *virtus*, *vires*, and *vulnera*, he regularly joins only two elements of this complex at a time. The one possible exception is the haunting and foreboding lines which begin *Aen.* 4: 'vulnus alit venis, et caeco carpitur igni || multa viri virtus animo...' (2–3), but here the effect is modified by *venis*—as if a formula of archaic virtue and manliness were about to get caught up in erotic wounds and elegiac fires.

*Influence:* Again we find what appears to be an echo of Furius in 'tum magis increscunt animis discordibus irae' (*Aen.* 9.688). While keeping Furius' order for *increscere* and *animus*, Vergil avoids the opening spondee and increases the number of dactyls with *tum magis*. By changing the construction, he seems this time to correct Furius' usage (*animi* do not increase, but in the *animus* the feelings of *irae* do), not his verb. Vergil avoids the neologism, *virescere*.

<sup>39</sup> Cp. 'cedant arma togae, concedant laurea laudi', Cicero fr. 12 Courtney = 16 M = 11 B, and 'praevious Aurorae, solis noctisque satelles', Cicero fr. 1.1.

<sup>40</sup> Cp. fr. 6 where the alliteration of 'p' is fairly unobtrusive and fr. 1 above for richer effects. For Cicero's use of alliteration, see Bailey, 146–50.

fr. 4: *sicut fulca levis volitat super aequora classis*.

*Metre*: This is the only example in Furius' fragments of a first foot spondaic word. The frequency of such an opening fell from 14% in Ennius to 10% in Cicero's *Aratea* to 5.2% overall in Cicero to 4% in Catullus and Lucretius and rose slightly to 5.5% in Vergil.<sup>41</sup> It is striking, however, that this first foot spondee sets up a line in which all the rest of the feet are dactyls as the words describe the swift movement of the fleet. Although the line shows a three-strong caesura, it is most accurately represented as having a two-weak caesura and a four-strong caesura: '*sicut fulca | levis volitat | super aequora classis*' = \_ \_ \_ o | o \_ oo \_ | oo \_ oo \_ o. In this way the verb in enclitic position marks *levis* as predicative (surely Furius was not distinguishing a *levis fulca* from a heavier one; it is the fleet that flies lightly over the water like a bird; cp. Vergil's parallel cited below). Consequently, the first rhythmic unit (up to 2-weak) extends with a light syllable the heavy spondaic opening of the line; the second unit (from 2-weak to 4-strong) is maximally dactylic and the third effectively adds two light syllables to the pattern of the second unit: o + o \_ oo \_ + o: the three rhythmic units get progressively lighter. The 'heavy' spondee in the first foot, therefore, serves to contrast with, and so to emphasize, the increasing lightness (note *levis*) of the whole line.<sup>42</sup> The caesura at 3-strong, to judge from Vergil's practice, is a phantom caesura: it maintains the impression that the metre is regular, which it is, while the rhythm is really in motion. *levis* is, therefore, artfully placed; in fact, the word names the very quality which the lightness of the line (excluding its first foot spondee) imitates.

*Diction*: Everything in the line is in keeping with Vergilian standards: *sicut* is found once in Vergil, at line beginning, *Aen.* 8.22; *fulca* (presumably the neologism that attracted Gellius' attention; see Courtney for justification) is an emendation for *fulica*, a bird that appears in a line that echoes the phonetics of this line: 'in sicco ludunt fulicae,' *Geo.* 1.363; *levis* is appropriately placed for its predicative emphasis both at the caesura and before the verb (see *Aen.* 5.819 above; also *Geo.* 2.451). Vergil prefers *volat* as the finite verb but uses the iterative *volitare* in both infinitive and participle forms. *super aequora* has the ring of the beginning to a Vergilian cadence (and '*super \_ oo | \_ x*' is very common), but the exact phrase '*super aequora/e classis*' does not in fact appear in Vergil. On the other hand, the cadence *aequora/e classem/is/es* is found at *Aen.* 1.128, 3.403, 5.843, and 5.862.

*Influence*: The closest parallel in Vergil is '*caeruleo per summa levis volat aequora curru*' (*Aen.* 5.819). If it seems slight, that is because of the classical nature of Furius' line. Nevertheless, Vergil avoids Furius' opening spondee again, but this time does not increase the number of dactyls. He also shortens (corrects?) the verb. Vergil's ablative of means, *curru*, corresponds in function and placement to Furius' subject, *classis*. Ovid again seems to have a reminiscence in '*profugaeque per aequora classe*' (*Met.* 13.627), a line which keeps Vergil's ablative while returning to Furius' *classis* and wittily returns Vergil's *per* to its original position before *aequora* by identifying it as part of Furius' *super*.

<sup>41</sup> Ewbank, 45, for Cicero and Catullus; Bailey, 110, for Ennius, Cicero, Lucretius and Vergil; Skutsch, 48, offers similar figures.

<sup>42</sup> If this is correct, then it is inaccurate to consider this fragment an example of the kind of first foot spondee avoided by later poets. It is being used for a precise effect: to set off the otherwise completely dactylic hexameter.

## fr. 5: spiritus Eurorum viridis cum purpurat undas.

*Metre:* The metre of this line is completely in keeping with classical norms, including both the dactylic first foot and the fourth foot spondee. One may note among many instances of a similar cadence in Vergil ‘murmurat unda’ at *Aen.* 10.212 and ‘Aquilonibus asperat undas’ at *Aen.* 3.285.

*Diction:* The winds breathe often enough in Vergil (e.g. *Geo.* 2.316 and *Aen.* 4.562); he has *Boreae...spiritus* at *Aen.* 12.365, and he has the plural of Eurus at *Geo.* 4.192; but not the breath of Eurus or the Euri. The metaphorical connection between wind (*ἄνεμος*) and breath (*animus*) was well known<sup>43</sup> and the exploitation of that connection goes back to Ennius, who has ‘Concurrent veluti venti, cum spiritus Austri,’ *Ann.* 443–5. The metaphor is used twice by Cicero: *Arat.* 101, ‘viribus erumpit qua summi<s> spiritus Austri’, and 184, ‘Aram, quam flatu permulcet spiritus Austri’. Vergil seems to have extended the metaphor at *Ecl.* 5.82: *sibilus Austri*. The emphatic position of *viridis* at 3-strong is paralleled nine times in Vergil. Here it is separated from *undas* for two reasons: so that the verb *purpurat* may designate a change in the colour of *viridis* (‘purpurat undas viridis’ might suggest that the waves are in some sense still greenish even though they have been made purple)<sup>44</sup> and so that the line may compose a colour-rich tableau, of a type favoured by Roman practice as far back as Ennius (cp. *Ann.* 11.361). The literary skill here is, however, even richer than this. While *purpurat undas* recalls Homer’s ἄλα πορφύρεην and πορφύρεον κύμα (Vergil writes, ‘in mare purpureum’, *Geo.* 4.373), Furius seems to join the Homeric verb πορφύρειν, which originally referred to the sea’s surging billows, with its later Hellenistic assimilation to the colour of the dye πορφύρα. Catullus similarly juxtaposes billowing waves and *purpureus* in 64.274–5: ‘[undas quae] post vento crescente magis magis increbrescent | purpureaque procul nantes ab luce refulgent’. This suggests a very self-conscious literary effect, especially when we note that *viridis* primarily means ‘thriving, vigorous’. Furius has imagined simultaneously the vigorous waves being ruffled and swollen (an ‘original’ meaning) and the greenish sea being shadowed with purple (a later ‘metaphorical’ meaning). While the juxtaposition of green and red with regard to the sea is first found in Timotheus, *PMG* 791.32–3, it is noteworthy that Aulus Gellius records a discussion in which Fronto convinces Favorinus that Latin is especially superior to Greek in nuancing the colours red and green (*Att. Noct.* 2.26). In this fragment it seems that only the verb which Caesilius Vindex complains about, *purpurat*, is un-Vergilian, and that may be in part determined by Vergil’s symbolic use of colours, especially of purple; in part by Furius’ stunning exhaustion of the literary potential of *purpurat*.

*Influence:* There is no Vergilian parallel for this remarkable line. A partial parallel in Ovid composes a more extravagant colour-rich tableau which combines the blood and *tellus* of Furius’ fragment 1 with the colours of this fragment: ‘expulit ipse cruor, rubefactaque sanguine tellus # purpureum viridi genuit de caespite florem’ (*Met.* 13.394–5). Another example, which reverses the order of *Eurus*, *viridis*, and *purpurat*, plays with some of same ideas: ‘nam modo purpureo vires capit Eurus ab ortu’ (*Tr.* 1.2.27).

<sup>43</sup> See the record of ancient etymology in Robert Maltby, *A Lexicon of Ancient Etymologies* (Leeds, 1991), 36, s.v.

<sup>44</sup> The principle here is the corollary to that by which *atrae* was postponed above.

**fr. 6:** quo magis in patriis possint opulescere campis

*Metre:* In both fragments 2 and 6 Furius varies the Ciceronian preferences for line conformation as specified by Courtney by lengthening the penultimate word to four or five syllables. In both cases, one result of this is to avoid fourth foot homodyny. Looking back on the metrical practice of these six lines one should note that the conformation of each individual line is unique, and the conformation of line end is also unique if we allow that fr. 3 has two major caesurae while fr. 5 has only the expected 3-strong.

*Diction:* Word placement is Vergilian. *quo magis* is always found at line beginning; *patriis* is appropriately placed before 3-strong (see for examples, *Ecl.* 4.17, *Aen.* 4.598, 10.198, 10.558). Similarly, a form of *posse* plus the infinitive is common between 3-strong and the 6th foot (for examples, *Geo.* 2.226, *Aen.* 1.368, 3.378, 12.771), and *campis* is a familiar dissyllable at line end (for examples, *Geo.* 4.186, *Aen.* 11.450). Word choice is also Vergilian, with the exception of *opulescere*, the neologism that attracted censure. Word combination is classical, although Vergil never chooses to refer to *patrius campus* in either the singular or plural; he preferred *finis* and *arva*. The separation of noun and adjective here (as well as in fragments 4 and 5) is not only fully classical, but is demonstrably not the Ennian norm.<sup>45</sup> Our sense of the unexceptional nature of this line is perhaps conditioned by the many times Catullus, Vergil, and Ovid have written similar lines with adjective and noun in similar position and have used these very words.

*Influence:* I find no close parallel in Vergil or Ovid.

*Conclusion*

We have only six lines of Furius, but we can be fairly sure that our results are not predetermined by the sample. Since Gellius cites these lines for their neologisms, other factors like rhythm and word placement are random. In fact, the one measure that might be affected by the principle of selection is Furius' handling of noun-adjective groups: Since the neologisms are, with one exception, verbs of at least three syllables, one would expect that the opportunity for noun-adjective groups has been diminished. And, in fact, there is no instance of two adjectives and two nouns in a single line, and therefore no instance of the *abAB* or *abBA* patterns so sought after by later poets.<sup>46</sup> However, two striking facts counter the potential for this bias in the sample: Furius' lines, as noted above, have a higher percentage of separated noun-adjective groups than Vergil, and Furius' placement of the adjectives is generally artful: they conform to the neoteric positions around the caesura in fragments 4, 5, and 6 (fr. 4:

<sup>45</sup> The figures are cited above, n. 21; the percentages are as follows: separation in Ennius occurs in 14% of his lines and accounts for 36% of the noun-adjective groups; in Vergil 41% of the lines and 51% of the groups; for Furius 50% of the lines and 60% of the groups.

<sup>46</sup> Fragment 4 is instructive. If Vergil had Furius in mind, he dropped the comparison (*sicut fulca*—perhaps as an unhappy or colloquial syncope) and added two adjectives with the result that he had a line of the pattern *ab V BA* in which the position of the verb was taken by *levis volat*: 'caeruleo (a) per summa (b) levis volat (V) aequora (B) curru (A)'. Equally instructive is a line from Cicero: 'caprigeni pecoris custos de gurgite vasto' (*Prognostica*, fr. 9, Ewbank). Had Cicero sought *Sperrung*, he could easily have written 'caprigeni custos pecoris de gurgite vasto' or even 'caprigeni vasto pecoris de gurgite custos'. This seems to confirm Courtney's observation, 151, that Cicero's 'plethora of adjectives' created the opportunity for neoteric *Sperrung*, not the technique. The basic study of word order remains C. Conrad, 'Traditional patterns of word order in Latin epic from Ennius to Vergil', *HSCP* 69 (1965), 195–258.

...levis | ...classis; fr. 5: ...|viridis...undas; fr. 6: ...in patriis | ...campis)<sup>47</sup> and participate in expressive effects in all cases but one (fr. 1: *cava terra*).

The sample, of course, entails limitations. We cannot tell anything about periodic structure or metrical variety within a connected passage, two matters which are very important in establishing the differences between Catullus and Vergil, nor can we ever say that Furius' style in general avoided or pursued any particular effect. Nevertheless, we can say he shows such remarkable expressive strengths that, were it not for Gellius' designation of him as a *vetus poeta*, one might be tempted to wonder which came first: 'tenebrisque teguntur omnia' or 'omnia noctescunt tenebris' or 'tenebris nigrescunt omnia'. His experiments in metre and with neologisms place him comfortably in the company of Cicero and Laevius, just as they help us to assess more accurately the experiments and variety of that period. This means that Cicero wrote not just at the beginning of a period of experimentation, but in all probability in the midst of that experimentation. Furius' fragments were part of that history, and the cumulative effect of his prosodic ability, his verbal finesse and the attention paid by later poets makes a compelling argument that he was a poet of some skill who played his part in the movement away from Ennian norms.

### Coda

If the view of Furius presented here is correct, then the pivotal role of Cicero's contributions has been skewed.<sup>48</sup> This is the understandable result of the disproportionate number of Ciceronian verses among the scant remains of epic hexameter verse after Ennius and before Lucretius and Catullus as well as of Cicero's prominence and self-promotion. He himself took some pride in his poetic efforts as part of his legacy as a man of letters.<sup>49</sup> Strong opinions about the man as an orator and politician, the criticisms and mockery of his enemies and later critics,<sup>50</sup> his own pride in his accomplishments<sup>51</sup> and the report by Plutarch that early he had a reputation as 'the best poet in Rome as well as the best orator' (*Cicero* 2.4) may help to prejudice our view.<sup>52</sup>

Furthermore, the fact that as Cicero's metrical skills developed he himself tended to emphasize more the verse unit and its dactylic metre while creating the possibility of variety and tension in the articulation of the rhythm may be taken as evidence that he was experimenting and innovating.<sup>53</sup> Thus, while the relatively early *Aratea* shows regularized caesura and disyllabic or trisyllabic line-end, it still allows both the

<sup>47</sup> See above, note 14. See Conrad 208–9 for the frequency of ...A/...S in Ennius (n. 56), Cicero, Lucretius III, Catullus 64 and Vergil, *Aeneid* 8. Ennius has the lowest frequency; there is an increase in Lucretius, and a significant increase over Lucretius in Cicero, Catullus, and Vergil. Conrad offers no figures for .../A... S.

<sup>48</sup> On Cicero's general significance, see above n. 2.

<sup>49</sup> See *Phil.* 2.20: 'Nec vero tibi de versibus plura respondebo: tantum dicam breviter, te neque illos neque ullas omnino litteras nosse; me nec rei publicae nec amicis umquam defuisse, et tamen omni genere monumentorum meorum perfecisse operis subsicivis ut meae vigiliae meaeque litterae et iuventuti utilitatis et nomini Romano laudis aliquid adferrent'. See also the defensive responses to his critics at *In Pis.* 74 and *De Off.* 1.77. It is arguable that in his 'nostra quaedam Aratea' he intended to win new poetic territory for Latin; see *Div.* 2.14 and Townend, 117. See also the discussion of Courtney, 149.

<sup>50</sup> Especially the *Invectiva in Ciceronem*, but also Seneca, *Controv.* 3. praef.; Martial 2.89.3; Tacitus, *Dialogus* 21.6; Quintilian 9.4.41 and 11.1.24; and Juvenal 10.122.

<sup>51</sup> See *Att.* 2.3.4 and *De Div.* 1.17.

<sup>52</sup> For the social, rather than aesthetic, context of criticism against Cicero's verse, see the argument of Goldberg, 148–54.

<sup>53</sup> The evidence is cited and discussed in Courtney, 150–2, and Townend, 124–8.

spondaic fifth foot<sup>54</sup> and the trochaic caesura in the fourth.<sup>55</sup> After the *Aratea*, Cicero seems to reject both.<sup>56</sup> As a deliberate policy, this would serve to emphasize the dactylic cadence, which Cicero often does by taking coincidence back to the fourth foot.<sup>57</sup> In keeping with such an intention, Cicero further emphasized the cadence by reducing the fifth foot diaeresis, and disallowing elision or punctuation within the fifth and sixth foot. Similarly, the increase in end-stopped lines emphasizes the hexameter unit, while the decrease in first foot spondees emphasizes the dactylic rhythm at line beginning.<sup>58</sup> Thus, Cicero appears to have attended to beginnings (i.e. initial dactyls), middles (the number of dactyls in a line), and ends (coincidence of ictus and accent in the cadence, end-stopped lines, avoidance of elision and punctuation in the cadence) in his attention to hexameter rhythm.

All in all, as a descriptive overview of Cicero's practice, this picture is not inaccurate. But the evidence does not necessarily demonstrate Ciceronian innovation in all these regards. One must remember two other facts: first, that even in his earliest work Cicero's practices were already close to Vergil's<sup>59</sup>—which suggests that the hexameter had already moved away from Ennian norms—and, second, that an individual's development is a matter separate from the ongoing experiments in the more general development of a genre. It may have taken Cicero some time to realize the advantages of a first foot dactyl or of avoiding a fifth foot diaeresis; it may have taken time to develop the skill necessary to achieve the effects he desired. Most importantly, in a period of experiment and innovation, the virtues of what was to become the classical hexameter were not yet fully apparent. The more 'archaic' practice of Lucretius as well as fluctuations in fourth foot homodyny, observance of Hermann's bridge, and spondiazontes, all suggest that the late Republic offered its poets choices and opportunities, including opportunities for experiment. In this essay I have tried to suggest that Furius was one of the poets of the late Republic who worked with skill and finesse and in so doing helped increase the choices Vergil would have when it was his turn to explore and create the expressive power, flexibility, and potential of the Latin hexameter.<sup>60</sup>

Ohio State University

W. W. BATSTONE

<sup>54</sup> I refer to the statistical norm and historical tendency, not to an absolute prohibition or avoidance. The spondaic fifth is, in fact, used by Vergil more often than by Cicero, because the norm against which Vergil writes, having been established by poets like Cicero, allowed Vergil to use the fifth foot spondee for expressive purposes. For Vergilian exceptions to the classical norms, see L. P. Wilkinson, 'The Augustan rules for dactylic verse', *CQ* 34 (1940), 30–43, at 33 n. 4.

<sup>55</sup> Percentages of trochaic fourth foot caesura for Ennius, Cicero, Lucretius, and Vergil can be found in Bailey, 112. For avoidance of this caesura, see Courtney, 151.

<sup>56</sup> As always, figures are a problem. While Townend, 127, notes the absence of post-*Aratea* spondaic fifths and Courtney, 151, notes the absence of both the spondaic fifth and the trochaic fourth, one must note that there is, in fact, only one spondaic hexameter in the *Aratea* and only two trochaic fourth caesuras.

<sup>57</sup> In this practice he corresponds to the practice of Lucretius and Catullus but not to the more refined practice of Vergil. The fourth foot weak caesura, while virtually guaranteeing fourth foot coincidence, meant that the word following must have either the shape 'o \_ o' or 'o \_ oo' in order to guarantee fifth foot coincidence. Apparently, given his desire for a vigorous cadence, it was too high a price to pay for an easy fourth foot coincidence.

<sup>58</sup> Cicero's allowance of the first foot spondee develops from one line in two in the *Aratea* to one line in four in the *Marius*. The figures are from Büchner, 1260–1. See Townend, 120–2, on the difficulty of dating the *Marius*. Büchner reports (following Guendel) that the range of spondees drops from 2.55 per verse in *Aratea* to 2.06 in *De Cons*.

<sup>59</sup> See the statistics of Ewbank on the favoured patterns for dactyl and spondee in the first four feet, 46–8; Townend, 126, refers to 'the advances already achieved by Cicero, if not before'.

<sup>60</sup> I would like to thank my colleague Dr J. Reed for his careful reading of an early version of my argument, the editors of *CQ* for their thoughtful advice, and the anonymous readers of *CQ* for invaluable suggestions. One of them is responsible for pointing out the Ovidian allusions.