ENNIUS AND THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE *ANNALES*

Ennius' *Annales*, which is preserved only in fragments, was hugely influential on Roman literature and culture. This book explores the genesis, in the ancient sources for Ennius' epic and in modern scholar ship, of the accounts of the *Annales* with which we operate today. A series of appendixes detail each source's contribution to our record of the poem, and are used to consider how the interests and working methods of the principal sources shape the modern view of the poem and to re examine the limits imposed and the possibilities offered by this ancient evidence. Dr Elliott challenges standard views of the poem, such as its use of time and the disposition of the gods within it. She argues that the manifest impact of the *Annales* on the collective Roman psyche results from its innovative promotion of a vision of Rome as the primary focus of the cosmos in all its aspects.

JACKIE ELLIOTT is an Assistant Professor in Classics at the University of Colorado at Boulder. She works primarily on Roman literary history and the interaction of the epic and historiographical traditions at Rome. She has received fellowships from the American Academy in Rome and the Loeb Foundation.

ENNIUS AND THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE *ANNALES*

JACKIE ELLIOTT
University of Colorado at Boulder

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

University Printing House, Cambridge CB2 8BS, United Kingdom

Published in the United States of America by Cambridge University Press, New York

Cambridge University Press is part of the University of Cambridge.

It furthers the University's mission by disseminating knowledge in the pursuit of education, learning, and research at the highest international levels of excellence.

www.cambridge.org
Information on this title: www.cambridge.org/9781107027480

First published 2013

Printed in the United Kingdom by CPI Group Ltd, Croydon CR0 4YY

A catalogue record for this publication is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data
Elliott, Jackie, 1973
Ennius and the architecture of the Annales / Jackie Elliott.
p. cm.
Includes bibliographical references and index.
ISBN 978-1-107-02748-0
1. Ennius, Quintus Annales. 2. Ennius, Quintus Criticism and interpretation.
3. Historical poetry, Latin History and criticism. 4. Rome In literature. I. Title.
PA6382.E44 2013
871′.0109 dc23
2012035449

ISBN 978-1-107-02748-0 Hardback

Contents

Tables

Abbreviations

A	Astbury, R. (ed.) (2002) *M. Terentius Varronis Saturarum Menippearum Fragmenta.* 2nd edn. Munich
Arn.	von Arnim, H. (ed.) (1903–24) *Stoicorum veterum fragmenta* (4 vols.). Leipzig
B	Barchiesi, M. (ed.) (1962) *Nevio Epico: storia, interpretazione, edizione critica dei frammenti del primo epos latino.* Padua
Bl.	Blänsdorf, J. (ed.) (2011) *Fragmenta Poetarum Latinorum.* 4th edn. Berlin
Br.	Bremer, F. P. (ed.) (1896) *Iurisprudentiae Antehadrianae quae supersunt* (3 vols.). Leipzig
C	Courtney, E. (ed.) (2003) *The Fragmentary Latin Poets* 2nd edn. Oxford
c.	Century
c.	Approximate
Ca.	Cardauns, B. (ed.) (1976) *M. Terentius Varro* Antiquitates Rerum Divinarum (2 vols.). Mainz
CGL	Loewe, G. *et al.* (eds.) (1888–1923) *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum* (7 vols.). Leipzig
D-K	Diels, H. and W. Kranz (eds.) (1957) *Die Fragmente der Varsokratiker*. 8th edn. Hamburg
dC	della Casa, A. (ed.) (1969) *Il* Dubius Sermo *di Plinio*. Genoa
FGrHist	Jacoby, F. (ed.) (1923–57) *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Leiden
Fl.	Flores, E. *et al.* (eds.) (2000–9) *Quinto Ennio. Annali* (5 vols.). Naples
Fun.	Funaioli, G. (ed.) (1907) *Grammaticae Romanae fragmenta*. Leipzig. Repr. Stuttgart 1969
G	Grilli, A. (1962) *M. Tulli Ciceronis* Hortensius. Varese

GLK	Keil, K. and H. Hagen (eds.) (1855–80) *Grammatici Latini* (8 vols.). Leipzig
Iord.	Iordan, H. (ed.) (1967) *M. Catonis Praeter librum* De Re Rustica *quae exstant*. Stuttgart. Repr. of orig. 1860 edn
J	Jocelyn, H. D. (ed.) (1967) *The Tragedies of Ennius: The Fragments.* Cambridge
K	Kaster, R. A. (ed.) (2011) *Macrobius, Saturnalia* (3 vols.). Cambridge, MA
M	Marx, F. (ed.) (1904–5) *C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae*. Leipzig
Ma.	Marshall, P. K. (ed.) (1990) *A. Gellii Noctes Atticae*. Repr. with corr. Leipzig
Mal.	Malcovati, E. (ed.) (1955) *Oratorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. 2nd edn. Torino
Maur.	Maurenbrecher, B. (1891) *C. Sallustii Crispi Historiarum Reliquiae*. Stuttgart. Repr. Stuttgart 1966
Mi.	Mirsch, P. (1882) *De M. Terenti Varronis* Antiquitatum Rerum Humanarum *libri xxv*. Leipzig
Mo.	Monda, S. (ed.) (2004) *Titus Maccius Plautus.*Vidularia *et deperditarum fabularum fragmenta*. Sarsina
P	Peter, H. W. G. (ed.) (1906–14) *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*. edn. 2. Leipzig. Repr. Stuttgart 1967, 1993
R	Ribbeck, O. (ed.) (1897–8), *Scaenicae Romanorum poesis fragmenta*. edn. 2. Leipzig
RLM	Halm, K. (ed.) (1863) *Rhetores Latini minores*. Leipzig
S	Strzelecki, W. (ed.) (1959) *Gn. Naevii Belli Punici carminis quae supersunt*. Breslau
Se.	Semi, F. (ed.) (1965) *M. Terentius Varro* (4 vols.). Venice
Sk.	Skutsch, O. (1985) *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford
Th.	Thilo, G. and H. Hagen (eds.) (1881–1902) *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii* (3 vols.). Leipzig. Repr. Hildesheim 1986
V	Vahlen, J. (ed.) (1903) *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*. 2nd edn. Leipzig. Repr. Leipzig 1928, Amsterdam 1967
W	Warmington, E. H. (ed.) (1935–6) *Remains of Old Latin* (4 vols.). Cambridge, MA
West	West, M. L. (ed.) (1989) *Iambi et elegi Graeci ante Alexandrum cantati*. edn. 2. Oxford

Acknowledgements

I undertook this project under the direction of Jim Zetzel, access to whose view of Roman literary history is possibly the single most intellectually formative experience I have had. In Spring 2004, he taught a seminar on Ennius, which was the greatest external impetus this project received and which provoked me to form the views that inform Chapter 1 in particular. I should say in his defence that I have no reason to think that he approves either of the proposals I make there or of any of the other hypotheses of this project. I admire and am grateful for the standard of scholarship he set for me at the outset of my studies, and I do not believe that this project could have been conceived without the stimulus that his model provided; but I am not under the illusion that I shall ever be able to meet such a standard, let alone that I come anywhere near to approaching it in this project.

The dissertation in which this project originates barely scratched the surface of the issues central to the project as it now stands: the question of how the sources for our fragments have directed their modern interpretation and the related issue of how we understand the function of genre in defining the enterprise that the *Annales* constituted. For the ability to develop those themes I am endebted to fellowships from the American Academy at Rome (2007–8) and from the Loeb Foundation (Fall 2008); to the National Endowment for the Humanities, which partially funded the American Academy fellowship; and to the Department of Classics and the College of Arts and Sciences at the University of Colorado at Boulder for allowing me to accept these fellowships in sequence. A grant from the University's Graduate Council of Arts and Humanities funded travel to and from Rome in 2008, and a grant from the Dean's Fund for Excellence allowed me to return to Rome in Summer 2010 to complete the catalogue of sources. These fellowships and grants gave me the time and the resources radically to overhaul an awkward and intellectually inchoate dissertation. I am besides this grateful to the University of Colorado's Eugene M. Kayden Research Grant and to Columbia University's Lodge Fund, which jointly bore the

cost of printing the Appendixes on the sources on pp. 348–558 of the present volume.

I have a keenly felt debt to those scholars on whose time I had no call but who graciously read the project for me at my petition and greatly promoted its development: Chris Kraus and Chris Pelling read the manuscript in its entirety, and their comments pushed me in productive directions, informed my further exploration and steered me away from pitfalls; Cambridge's anonymous reader encouraged me to think through areas of weakness; Tony Woodman read the introduction and persuaded me to clarify many points; Sander Goldberg read Chapter 1 and offered conversation, advice and encouragement, for which I am most grateful; Bob Kaster read Chapter 2 on the Vergiliocentric sources and returned helpful comments, as did Alison Keith. On the basis of my offering at a conference in Manchester in 2007 and the paper that followed (Elliott 2010: 148–61), Tim Cornell and Michael Maas gave encouragement to my then incipient thoughts about the connection between universal history and Ennius' *Annales*, emboldening me to pursue the idea in the context of the book. My senior colleagues in Latin Literature at Boulder, Peter Knox and Carole Newlands, giants in my admiration and my gratitude, not only read usefully but waited and coaxed kindly while I took an inordinately long time to formulate my views and present them to the press – as did Gareth Williams, whose unfailing faith in me has meant a great deal. None of them, needless to say, is responsible for those products of my indiscipline and stubbornness that remain. I am also grateful to the eight motivated, capable and industrious participants of my Spring 2011 seminar on universal history: Reina Callier, Jen Greenberg, Ellen Honeycutt, Emily Miller, Ian Oliver, Mitch Pentzer, Sarah Teets and Courtney Tobin. They challenged my ideas and engaged productively over vast quantities of difficult material, showing no signs of tiring over the course of the long CU semester. Their stimulating company and conversation provided real support to my articulation of the argument of Chapter 5.

The time I spent finalising this project has, for reasons not entirely unconnected with it, been difficult, and this book would not have been finished without the support of friends and family. The list of names I give here does nothing to speak the gratitude I owe them: first, my parents, Michael and Margaret Elliott, my strongest allies and defenders, and my sister, Julie, whose good sense and compassion are a model I can only hope to aspire to. There is a sense in which the dedication of this book properly belongs to them, since, without them, I would certainly not have managed it. Others too: Emma Satyamurti, Tyler Lansford (to whom the idea for this

volume's cover illustration is due) and Douglas Arbuthnot, *animae quales neque candidiores/terra tulit, neque quis me sit devinctior alter* (Hor. *Serm.* 1.5.41–2); Amanda Smith, who confounded my expectations of the limits on one person's ability to understand and communicate with another; Jenn Wert, Lisa Jo Landsberg and Tam Spielman, whose grace, patience and strength have shown me the way; Nancy Schmidt, my brave, enduring and beloved mother-in-law; Mike Johnson (*amicus certus in re incerta cernitur*; Enn. 351 J); Federica Ciccolella; Leah Haenselman; Rachel Doriese; and finally, my grandmother, Julie Ponetz, who continues to form and strengthen me long after her own life is over.

This book is dedicated to my companion of twelve years and eventual husband, who brought me from childhood to maturity and who, for as long as I let him, stood by me as though there were no other cause on this earth. Being witness and student to his discipline, imagination, competence and integrity as an individual and as an educator has been one of the profound blessings of my life. This dedication is by no means the return he would have wanted on the years we shared, neither is it the one I would have wished to make.

Introduction

In this book, I examine how our modern accounts of Ennius' *Annales* have originated. I have sought to analyse, first, the consequences of how ancient sources transmit the fragments to us; and, second, the causes (where I thought I could discern them) and the consequences of editors' decisions, especially those of Otto Skutsch, whose work represents perhaps the principal point of access to the *Annales* today, at any rate for the world of Anglophone scholarship. I have not sought to carry out editorial work myself, and this study has nothing at all to add in terms of textual criticism: for the fragments and their immediate contexts, I rely fully on the text as Skutsch established it,[1] with occasional glances across to the more recent Italian edition of Enrico Flores and his co-editors.[2] Likewise, for the quotation-contexts of the fragments, I rely on the standard editions of the quoting authors. While thus relying on their work, I have availed myself of freedoms that editors themselves have not always chosen to exercise: in particular, the freedom to consider at leisure and to articulate the nature of editorial choices; and the freedom to entertain competing constructions of the evidence, where – whatever doubts and limiting considerations they may entertain along the way – editors of fragments are eventually constrained by the nature of their task to privilege a single coherent account.[3]

[1] Unless otherwise specified, it is to Skutsch's 1985 Oxford edition of the *Annales* that all line-numbers refer.

[2] Flores *et al.*, Vols. 1–5 (2000–8) represent the most recent editorial work on the *Annales*. The editors present their work as a revision of Skutsch, in which they correct philological errors, flaws of textual criticism and inaccurately cited sources and scholarly attributions. They describe themselves as in the main relying on Skutsch and on other earlier editors for the basic evidence but as re-thinking both readings and the ordering of fragments. See pp. 1–2 of their introduction (Vol. 1). Rev. Goldberg 2009: 637–55.

[3] Stephens 2002: 67–88 well describes how editors of fragments in particular have traditionally used a laconic style and professional terminology that tends to represent their carefully measured conclusions

Many of the observations and hypotheses of this study have their basis in a catalogue I made of the fragments of the *Annales*, re-organised according to their sources, in chronological order according to the date of the source (or as near to it as our imperfect knowledge allows). These sources, which today constitute our sole means of access to the poem, number 46 and range in date from the first century BCE (with, among others, Varro and Cicero) to the eighth century CE (with, for example, Paulus) and very occasionally beyond.[4] The catalogue frees the fragments from the organisational principles of modern editors – principles which represent an already mapped trajectory through the poem's scattered remains, conveying the editor's insight and erudition but, by the same token, and necessarily, representing a set of preconceptions about what the text might have looked like, that I found it helpful to work without. The catalogue, by contrast, makes the ancient evidence available in a form that offers no direction as to where the lines belong in the text, beyond what the sources themselves offer in terms of book-numbers. This leaves readers free to come to their own conclusions about the fragments' interrelationship and to observe the forces promoting their survival. The format makes the influence of individual sources on our record more visible than they usually are, by revealing to the simple glance which sources are responsible for the survival of the greatest numbers of fragments and by making everything that a given source has to say in quoting the *Annales* available in one location. The catalogue is available in the form of Appendix 5 at the end of the present volume pp. 348–558), and I hope that it will serve as a resource for those wishing to engage with the fragments of the *Annales* via a medium more neutral than a fully-fledged edition, regardless of how they view the arguments between these covers.

Readers of this study will notice that my approach to the *Annales* differs substantially from that of Skutsch in terms of interests pursued,

as final (especially to a readership that does not fully share the editor's own technical skills) and to render increasingly obscure the provisional nature of even those decisions an editor ultimately chooses to take. Recent editors, however, in a modern and more elastic coda to the venerable tradition of *prolegomena*, are in increasing numbers publishing monograph-length explanations of their editorial choices; e.g. Zetzel 2005; Heyworth 2007; and Kaster 2010.

[4] The tally of 46 separates Augustine from Cicero, even though it is clear that Augustine's quotations derive directly from texts of Cicero. Likewise, it separates Paulus from Festus (not to mention various ps.-Proban authors from each other). It includes all sources that provide material attributed to the *Annales* in Skutsch's edition, however little (the *Glossarium Philoxenum*, the *Commenta Bernensia in Lucanum* and the Renaissance scholars G. Valla and H. Columna, who provide at best a single line of obscure origin, stand at the low ebb); and excludes sources that provide us exclusively with lines that Skutsch has included in his edition but placed among the *operis incerti fragmenta* or the *dubia*. It also includes Persius and his scholiast (counted together as a single source) – even though it cannot be ascertained that the one line of direct quotation they appear to transmit (*Op. inc.* ii) belongs to the *Annales*; for, besides this line, they provide precious, if still difficult, evidence about the proem to the *Annales*.

methodology and conclusions about the text. In fact, some of the preoccupations of this study were generated by my response to his articulation of the poem and the questions with which it left me. It therefore seems to me useful in the course of this Introduction to define my approach to the text in contradistinction to his. Indeed, throughout the study, where it is clear to me that my views are conceived in response to his, I have thought it best to note this. The risk of doing so is that my work may sometimes appear polemical; the risk of not doing so is that I obscure a significant dynamic of this study and leave it to my readers themselves to figure out the details of my position *vis-à-vis* Skutsch. Skutsch himself often preferred to avoid mentioning the work of other scholars where he disagreed with them.[5] There is gentility in this approach,[6] and it yields a kind of shorthand that some readers may appreciate, but the result is also cryptic, the more so as time passes, and in my search to understand the genesis of his views on the poem I found it frustrating to have to trace by effort, or be left to come across by chance, the intersection of his thoughts with those of others. It is not least this that motivated me to adopt a different course. I hope that the disagreements that inevitably result from differences in approach and in scholarly history and context will not be construed as disrespect or ingratitude, even where I have been direct in stating them. Those differences, as I understand them, lie chiefly in that I have tried to apply to the interpretation of the *Annales* as a whole some of the advances the twentieth century saw both in the understanding of ancient historiography and in the development of reception theory and the study of fragments. For the rest, I am keenly aware that I am dependent on Skutsch not only in the normal sense, for access to the text of the *Annales*, but also because his work was a stimulus to mine in a way that no other edition could have been. I have read his edition far more often and more thoroughly than I have read any other.

Skutsch was, to begin with, a textual critic of distinction, and he usefully extended his work on the text of the fragments of the *Annales* to the contexts in which they are found. This work was abetted by his interest in questions of prosody, and here both the strength and the weakness of the thorough

[5] Examples of this are his insistence on the structural articulation of the books of the *Annales* in triads (Skutsch 1985: 5–6), in clear but unstated opposition to the view of his father, Franz Skutch (F. Skutsch 1905: 2610); and the omission of H. Fuchs' name from Skutsch's discussion of the history of the Pythagoreanism of the proem (Skutsch 1959: 114–16), noticed by Suerbaum 1968: 88, n. 273: 'Die These [von H. Fuchs, dessen Name aber absichtlich von O. Skutsch nicht genannt wird] . . .' Even as Skutsch refers back to Suerbaum's 1968 discussion in his 1985 edition (p. 149), he continues to omit Fuchs' name. For notice of this practice of Skutsch's, see also Goldberg 2009: 637.

[6] For full and sympathetic description of Skutsch's character, see Goold 1994: 473–89. Horsfall 1988 (unpaginated) gives a bibliography of Skutsch, supplemented at Horsfall 1988: ix.

systematisation that characterises Skutsch's work become evident: for he formulated a system of metrical rules specific to the *Annales* and subsequently used these rules to support his textual conjectures, postulating that Ennius adhered strictly to the norms as he, Skutsch, elaborated them.[7] Sebastiano Timpanaro, one of the few scholars who dedicated a similar amount of attention to the text as did Skutsch and was capable of judging and countering his prescriptions, warned early on that Ennius' practice was likely to have involved more variation than Skutsch allowed for.[8] Comparative philology and etymology were major preoccupations, and Skutsch does a great deal to illuminate the linguistic forms that surface in the fragments. Finally, Skutsch was interested in Ennius as a source for Roman history. His edition is notable for what Flores *et al.* term its *spessore storico*[9]: he is more committed than any other editor has been to finding historical referents for the fragments, which he does by postulating parallels between extant fragments of the *Annales* and the works of those historians who cover comparable periods of Roman history, principally Polybius and Livy. On all this territory his work is unrivalled, and those seeking guidance in these terms would be hard pressed to find a more careful and learned guide.

Skutsch's work shaped my inquiry principally by making me aware of questions about the text that he did not tackle. First is the question to which I have already drawn attention, namely, of how the sources for the fragments direct our readings of the text through the principles of selection that they employ and through their particular biases and interests. In accordance with the principles of the scholarly tradition in which he worked,[10] Skutsch treats the sources as essentially transparent and equivalent to one another in value, and his task as the methodologically uncomplicated one of compilation and historical investigation. Indentation and italicisation alone formally distinguish material offered by sources not purporting to quote the *Annales* directly, such as Lucretius, *DRN* 1.120–27 (Skutsch's frg. 1.iv),

[7] Cf. Jocelyn 1991: 748.

[8] Timpanaro 1988: 5. For further summary assessment of Skutsch's editorial activity, see Flores 2000: 7–9; also Goldberg 2009: 637–8.

[9] Flores *et al.* 2006: 415.

[10] Cf. Breed and Rossi 2006: 398, n. 2: 'The famous dedication to the shades of Franz Skutsch, Fraenkel, Lindsay, and Housman speaks eloquently of how Otto Skutsch wished *The* Annals *of Q. Ennius* to be seen in the light of the history of classical scholarship.' For an illuminating description of Skutsch's scholarly trajectory, his character and his working methods, see Horsfall 1991: 103–7. Horsfall suggests that Skutsch does not properly belong to the tradition of Bentley and Housman but rather, despite his training, to the Italian tradition represented by Timpanaro, Mariotti, Traina and Tandoi, because his interests lie principally in linguistics, prosody and metrics.

Propertius 3.3.8 (his frg. XIV.x) and Cicero, *Prov. Cons.* 20 (his frg. XVI.viii) from lines expressly quoted under Ennius' name or judged by the editor to belong to the *Annales*.[11] Identical formal markers are used to set off the evidence of Servius ad *Aen.* 1.20 and *Aen.* 1.281 or of Macrobius at *Sat.* 6.2.32 (= frgs. VIII.xv, VIII.xvi and XV.iv), yet their evidence is arguably of a very different status from that of Lucretius, Propertius and Cicero. It is in general clear that Skutsch did not consider it part of his editorial brief to provide guidance as to how one might differentiate among sources or evaluate the evidence on offer. Skutsch's edition was published late enough, in 1985, to have taken on board at least some modern work on the methodological complications of dealing with fragments;[12] but Skutsch worked on his edition for almost fifty years before he saw its publication,[13] and throughout he remained committed to the working practices of his youth. As a result, his edition was, so to speak, born old.[14] This is true both in respect of its approach to the relationship between the fragments and their sources and with regard to the understanding of ancient historiography, in which the twentieth century saw highly relevant advances.

Many of the pages that follow are concerned with how the nature of our evidence affects our interpretation of the text: Chapter 1 introduces in a general way the question of the evidence and of what, on the basis of the ancient evidence, we can say we reliably know about different aspects of the text (such as the implications of its title, the use of time in the poem and the distribution of divine intervention in the narrative); Chapters 2 and 3 are

[11] On the tendentiousness of the first of these re-writings, see Volk 2002: 105–7; on the tendentiousness of the last, see Zetzel 2007: 1–16.

[12] E.g. Brunt's important article, 'On historical fragments and epitomes' (Brunt 1980a). Since that time, awareness of the study of fragments as an exercise in indirect observation has flourished, and I have benefited a great deal from explorations of the hazards of working with fragments, particularly of the historiographical tradition. I have especially profited from the many valuable contributions in Most 1997; Toher 1989: 159–72; Lenfant 1999: 103–21, on what our impressions of Herodotus would be if he had survived only in the quotations of later authors (cf. Kannicht in Most 1997: 67–77, Dover 2000: xvii–xix and Mastronarde 2009: 63–76, with his Appendix at *ibid.* 461–96, for experiments in the reconstruction of extant Greek dramatic works from their indirect traditions); also Pelling 2000: 171–90; and Dover, Arnott, Henderson and Storey in Harvey and Wilkins 2000. I have found Katherine Clarke's work on Posidonius and Strabo and Liv Yarrow's 2006 study, which deals with a range of fragmentary authors dating to the end of the Republic, particularly stimulating, not least because of the overlap in their work between concerns about dealing with fragmentary authors and concerns about the interpretation of works that are in one sense or another universalising.

[13] Skutsch's edition (originally to be a complete edition of the fragments of Ennius) was commissioned by Oxford University Press in 1939, at Eduard Fraenkel's suggestion (Jocelyn 1991: 748). The work seems to have been essentially complete by 1971 (*ibid.*: 749).

[14] The phrase (quoted by Flores 2000: 7) 'nata già vecchia' was used by Timpanaro of Vahlen's second (1903) edition. The description applies equally well to Skutsch's edition, likewise published at the close of a scholarly career.

wholly dedicated to analysing those sources that account for the greatest number of surviving lines and that have had the most profound impact on modern interpretations of the poem and the modern understanding of its place in literary history.

It should be said at the outset that, where Skutsch for his part aims to be encyclopaedic, even taking into account authors such as Lucretius and Propertius who (as noted above) make no claim to cite Ennius directly, this study is consciously far from comprehensive in its coverage of the ancient evidence for the text. Among those authors who quote the fragments of the *Annales* directly and who are my primary focus, I have in the body of this study concentrated on those who seem to me the most complex and influential, while neglecting others – although in Appendix 5 I summarise each of them and occasionally have something further to say. I have, however, on the whole excluded from discussion the reception of Ennius in authors who had full access to his work and who developed articulated conceptions of him but who generate no fragments as such. This set of authors is legion: it includes Lucretius, Propertius, Livy, Vergil, Ovid, Lucan, Silius and the post-Vergilian tradition generally; and each of these has something different to tell us about what the *Annales* meant from a different perspective and to a different generation of readers. All these authors have indeed had a hand in determining how the fragments of the *Annales* are edited and read, and study of them in these terms is indeed highly germane to the project I have undertaken here, which views all our access to the *Annales* essentially as reception and is concerned to describe the terms in which that reception operates.[15] Some readers will therefore feel their marginalisation as a serious limitation. Yet the coherence of the present study rests in part on the distinction between those authors who provide direct access to the text today by openly quoting the *Annales* and those who engage with the work more indirectly. Cicero belongs to both categories, but I have included him here by virtue of his participation in the first. If I were to include any one author who belonged to the second category alone, there would be no rationale for excluding any other author of that group. This is not to say that more general points about the reception of the *Annales* will not occasionally serve as a complement to the more particular focus I employ, and in the argument of Chapter 5 in particular the reception

[15] The ancient reception of the *Annales* in particular has attracted increasing attention in recent years, and Prinzen 1998, Fantham 2006: 549–68; Goldberg 2006: 427–47; Zetzel 2007: 1–16 all precede me in articulating and exploring this interest. See further the material listed in n. 16 (p. 7). Prinzen is synthetic, but his interest is in explicit ancient verdicts on Ennius rather than in the interpretative consequences of how the fragments reach us (my main thrust).

of the *Annales* in epic and historiography will have a significant if general presence; but it is not my purpose at any point in this study to deal with the complex literary agendas of authors alluding to the *Annales*.[16] Instead, I aim to come to grips with our most direct evidence for the text: to understand how it frames our view of the poem, where its limitations lie and to consider whether that evidence admits of viable and attractive possibilities of reconstruction and interpretation, beyond those promoted in editions and interpretative work to date.

After the ancient evidence, the second area in which my approach and assumptions, and consequently my findings, are different from Skutsch's is the understanding of the poem's historiographical aspect. Skutsch takes a strongly positivist approach. In the effort to arrive at a definitive picture, he matches fragments with events known from the pages of the prose historians on the basis of what are often very slight hints or similarities in wording (see his commentary, *passim*). To him, the loss of Ennius represents above all a loss of a source for the facts of the Roman past.[17] Where the order of his presentation of the fragments differs from that of J. Vahlen's edition (Leipzig 1903), it is often where he has newly identified a historical referent and consequently relocates the fragment at that point in the narrative where he judges its chronological place to have been; for among the convictions that govern his view of the poem is the idea that events are narrated quite strictly in chronological order (an assumption generated in part by the poem's title and by assumptions of its primitive nature, the latter born not least from vested first-century assessments of the poem;[18] but one also generally typical of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century editors, regardless of which work they were reconstructing).[19] Skutsch's approach is thus to stretch any shred of positive evidence to the limits of its capacity in the effort

[16] Among the interest today in the partial and refracted images that survive in later authors invested in re-working their predecessors for their own immediate purposes (in the wake of Hinds 1998 and Kerkhecker and Schwindt 2001), there has been a considerable amount of attention to Ennius in particular: see e.g Hinds 1998: 52–74; Kerkhecker 2001: 39–95; Casali 2006: 569–93; Cole 2006: 531–48; Fantham 2006: 549–68; Goldberg 2006: 427–47; Casali 2007: 103–28; Gildenhard 2007: 73–102; Zetzel 2007: 1–16; Hardie 2007: 129–44; Houghton 2007: 145–58; Elliott 2008: 241–72; Elliott 2009a: 531–41; Elliott 2009b: 650–3.

[17] See, again, the commentary *passim*, with particular instances at p. 348 (the sequence of negotiations between Heraclea and Ausculum) and p. 444 (the disposition of the Roman army at Cannae) of Skutsch's Ennius as a 'witness' (p. 348) to history, a reliable retailer of historical detail. For the most general statement of Skutsch's view of Ennius as an historian of quasi-pragmatic stamp, see the introduction to his inaugural lecture at University College, London, delivered in 1951 (Skutsch 1968: 1–2) partially quoted in Ch. 1, n. 82, p. 43.

[18] Cf. Hinds 1998: 52–74.

[19] See W. Strzelecki's and H. T. Rowell's re-organisation of the fragments of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, which had formerly been subjected to strict chronological assumptions (Strzelecki 1935; Rowell 1947:

to locate as many of the fragments as possible within the matrix of our existing historical knowledge, and his methodical working practices and erudition mean that he made considerable advances in these terms. His work is appreciated not least for the guidance he thus provides in suggesting what our decontextualised and often incoherent fragments describe.

In assessing what we can say we reliably know about the reference of the fragments and their organisation, I have adopted almost the opposite brief from Skutsch: that is, to err on the side of scepticism. The motivation for this lies not least in observing the generic conventions highlighted (as I see it) by our sources, together with the role these conventions play in determining the terms in which Ennius describes historical persons and events. These conventions defy our ability to distinguish the description of one battle from the description of another and make problematic the assumption that any given descriptive detail is a unique identifier or relates to any given historical particularity.

The aim of my study of the sources is in part to trace the contours of our ignorance by highlighting the isolation of the historical moments and the partiality of the sources from which our knowledge of the text emerges. Hand in hand with this goes the task of considering which principles have guided reconstructions to date and the question of what makes a given principle a good guide. I have mentioned above some of the larger claims I make, regarding the use of time in the epic (complex, within a generally chronological framework) and the role of the gods (significant actors throughout). The real motivation for such claims lies not exclusively in the evidence of the fragments; for, broken as it is, that evidence is equally capable of supporting radically different accounts of the narrative. The motivation lies instead in the conceptual framework the reader adopts for his or her vision of the work. I have tried in particular to think about how the poem positioned itself in respect of the various genres with which it engaged and to read the fragments in the light of their literary historical situation, as best we can appreciate it. The question of the poem's relationship to literary, and in particular historiographical, tradition is thus a central preoccupation of this study.

The question of genre turns out to overlap with the question of sources in multiple ways, because our sense of the poem's relationship to the various genres we understand as relevant is in significant part the product of how our evidence about the text reaches us. This is most strikingly true of our

21–46). Their work is based on nothing more radical than recourse to the ancient evidence. More recently, Katherine Clarke has shown a similar set of assumptions to have been at work in Kidd's reconstruction of Posidonius' *Histories* (Clarke 1999a: 154–92, with her Appendixes A and B).

perspective on the poem's position in the epic tradition. The detailed information on Ennius' relationship to Vergil and Homer that reaches us via Macrobius – who alone is responsible for the survival of more than 10 per cent of our extant lines – has largely determined our sense of the place of the *Annales* in the epic tradition. Had Book 6 of the *Saturnalia* not survived, Ennius' use of the Greek hexameter would still define him as a point of transition between the epic traditions of Greece and Rome. Far more obscure to us, however, would be the mechanics of Ennius' relationship to Homer and Vergil, the detail and consistency with which he replicated Homer on both small and large scale and was in turn replicated by Vergil; and it is our knowledge of this aspect of his text that does most today to substantiate and explain the literary historical rank that antiquity attributed to Ennius. I have used the collective term 'Vergiliocentric' to refer to that set of sources that quotes the *Annales* in explanation of Vergil's language and motifs, of which Macrobius is the principal representative. The Vergiliocentrics represent by far the most impressive coherent body of sources for the text. As a body, they are articulate (they quote in sense-units) and persuasive, and this means that their influence on our sense of the *Annales* is perhaps even more powerful than is implied by the already hefty 20 per cent of our record they statistically represent. Chapter 2 is dedicated to exploring the weight within the overall record and the anatomy of these sources and to detailing the interpretative consequences of their intervention.

The snapshot offered by the Vergiliocentric sources is the broadest and most detailed view of the poem we have, and the result is that it holds a quasi-monopoly on posterity's sense of how the *Annales* mattered in literary history. To suggest that this effect is disproportionate would be to have in view an aim that is both practically and theoretically impossible: it would be to imagine possible an unbiased form of access to a pristine text, untouched by readers, and in particular by Vergil and by the ancient scholarly tradition on his works. The publication of the *Aeneid* wrought a colossal change in the fortunes of the *Annales*, to the extent that, from our vantage-point in history, it constitutes the crucial point of interference both in the transmission and the reception of the *Annales*. By dwelling on that moment of intervention, I have sought, among other things, to privilege an awareness that the reading of the *Annales* yielded by the Vergiliocentrics, however valuable, is, like any other, both limited and contingent. For all its impact today, the Vergiliocentric sources' tacit explanation for Ennius' ancient literary rank necessarily represents a distortion of the *Annales* from the viewpoint of its original audience, because it is clearly a view from a post-Vergilian retrospect.

There are only four pre-Vergilian sources for the *Annales*, but these four include by far the richest of all, Cicero, who is single-handedly responsible for the survival of 15 per cent of today's fragments of the *Annales*. None of Cicero's quotations give us any sense at all of the macroscopic engagement with Homer that the Vergiliocentrics consistently reveal; instead, this reader's interest in the text is time and again an interest in its value as a document of Rome's past and as a testament to her core identity. This if anything is what unifies Cicero's quite various and at times even contradictory articulations of what the *Annales* amounted to, which shift dramatically among Cicero's various texts and speakers. To the extent that Cicero is a representative reader, it was for their description of Rome's past and present, and their revelation thereby of Rome's enduring character, that the *Annales* mattered to its ancient audience, until it was subsumed by the *Aeneid*; for after the publication of the *Aeneid* there is scarcely any sign at all of interest in the *Annales* as a work of history.[20] Chapter 3 examines the full spectrum of Cicero's approaches to the *Annales*, in order to arrive at as complete an account as possible of how the *Annales* functioned as historiography at essentially the earliest moment at which we can access the ancient reading of the text. Overall, the intricacy and variety of views on offer in this single, complex reader highlight the hazards of operating with too monolithic a concept of what it meant for the *Annales* to have represented 'history'. Chapter 3 also explores our other three opportunities for a pre-Vergilian glimpse of the *Annales*: those offered by Varro, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* – if that is in fact a source – and the author of the *Bellum Hispaniense*.

Chapters 2 and 3 thus focus primarily on our most substantial and coherent sources and on the generic traits enmeshed in the type of evidence they provide. These chapters are framed by two that aim first to contextualise and then to extrapolate from the argument they (Chapters 2 and 3) make. Chapter 1 introduces the issues of genre and of historiography by looking at the poem's relationship to the annalistic tradition, which the work's title and the use of consular dating, just occasionally evident in the fragments, invites us to read as relevant. I argue first in Chapter 1 that the chronological progression routinely inferred from the title is, in any strict sense, *a priori* unlikely in a poem written in macroscopic as well as microscopic imitation of Homer. That imitation implies episodic construction and the use of flashback, whether through ecphrasis or through the use of multiple

[20] Gellius can read for content or at least sense; and a reader of Orosius of the fifth or sixth century CE added in supralinear form Ennian descriptions of or comments on the events Orosius narrates. See Appendix Tables A5.10 and A5.42, respectively, pp. 413–27 and pp. 553–4, for further details.

speakers who, with their capacity to reach forward and back in time, serve to dislocate narative from its chronological place. The fragments for their part bear out the use of all of these features: the large-scale fragments all constitute episodes, in a manner familiar in the Roman tradition – perhaps not coincidentally so – from Livy; and there are clearly multiple speakers.[21] Furthermore, in describing Rome's expansion, the poem necessarily deals with a multiplicity of locations and so of time-frames.[22] I argue that the allusion to the annalistic tradition made by the title and by the gestures towards consular dating is significant not because it has anything to tell us about the poem's organisation and formal features but simply in that it designates the contents of the poem – which in form and subject-matter and allusive range far outstrip traditional *annales* – as the local history of Rome. The function of the references to *annales* was to re-designate the far-flung cultural, literary and geographic worlds the poem comprised as properly Rome's local domain. It is the very complexity and range of the epic that makes the insistence of the title on this world as Rome's private affair so crucial. In making this claim in Chapter 1, I slightly anticipate the argument of Chapter 5, on the work's relationship to universal history.

Chapters 1–3 thus examine separately the annalistic and Homeric aspects of the poem and the pre-Vergilian view, in particular as it offers access to the text's role as historiography in the ancient world. Chapter 4 amalgamates the results: it explores the co-existence of these generic traits in the same work and the consequences for interpreting the whole. Among the range of perspectives on offer among Cicero's readings, his awareness of the rhetorical shaping of the past has a significant presence. This accords well with those aspects of ancient historiography brought to our attention by such scholars as T. P. Wiseman, A. J. Woodman and J. Marincola.[23] It also gives the intensely Homerising aspects of the *Annales* brought to our attention by the Vergiliocentric sources a possible historiographical function in a manner that our sources, which segregate the evidence, tend to conceal. The ancient understanding of Homeric poetry as both the origin of subsequent historiography and as itself a vehicle for historical knowledge in its most prestigious form provides relevant background here. Where earlier scholars saw a dichotomy between the Homerising or 'mythological' earlier section of the *Annales* and the later more properly

[21] For the complexities they introduce into the use of time, one need only think of Ilia (although I will discuss further evidence); no scholar postulates that the poet put a separate, authorial narrative of her rape into competition with her own account. For discussion, with reference to further bibliography, see Elliott 2007: 46–50.

[22] Cf. Clarke 1999b: 156 on Polybius, Posidonius and Trogus.

[23] Wiseman 1979; Woodman 1988; Marincola 1997; and Marincola 1999: 281–324.

historical or annalistic sections,[24] I argue that the Homeric cast to Ennius' narrative is key to the nature of its historiographical endeavour.

The hexameter together with the Greek and specifically Homerising word-forms and narrative patterns elevate the story of Rome's past by setting it in a literary context that equated it with the arch-narratives of Greece's history, as has always been seen, but it also had more specific consequences. For example, the gods' presence throughout the narrative and their supervision of its unfolding events were the natural concomitant of a Homerising mode of narration, one that dignified the story by making it the focus of divine attention and suggesting that providence had guided the City's course from its origins to the present day. It is this transformation of the past, distant or recent or even practically contemporary, from the mundane to the heroic, that was epic's traditional task and prerogative. As Denis Feeney has argued, we can rely on the idea that Lucan was the first poet to divorce the gods from hexametric epic because of the shock his act generated in the ancient critical response to his work.[25] There is, furthermore, no reason to think that Ennius would have removed the gods from the later books of his narrative any more than he eliminated the Homerising details of expression or the hexameter itself.[26] The larger history of the genre, together with the forms of language and verse which Ennius adopted, thus directs us to construe the surviving evidence about the intrusion of the gods into Ennius' narrative as belonging to the whole, not confined to an introductory, pre-historical section. The prose historians – naturally polemical given their attempt to claim from epic some of its traditional prerogative over national history – presented epic poets as given to exaggeration and as trespassing into the realm of fantasy, and the inclusion of the gods in epic narrative served them as a means of doing so. This has in the past been among the factors persuading scholars that, if the *Annales* were to be understood as a serious historiographical endeavour, the participation of the gods throughout could not

[24] The latter typically from Book 6 on, since with the war against Pyrrhus the past entered living memory. See e.g. Gratwick 1982: 62 (discussed on pp. 43–5). Suerbaum's opposition of an 'eher mythischer Teil' and a 'rein historischer Teil' in his comments, recorded in Wülfing-von Martitz 1972: 187, is also representative of this view. Cf. also Skutsch's approach to the 'historicity' of the text (pp. 7–8, with n. 17) and Norden and Fraenkel, as quoted in n. 3 to Chapter 4 (p. 199).

[25] '[T]he quintessence of the epic effect *qua* epic was felt to be located in the mythic elements which were imposed upon the 'facts' of history and tradition – from which one receives the first explanation of the paralysis of ancient critics when faced with the *Bellum Civile* of Lucan' (Feeney 1991: 45). The issue of the absence of divine characters from Lucan's work is explored in detail *ibid.*: 269–85.

[26] There are 11 surviving fragments (14 lines) that uncontroversially describe the actions or constitute the speech of Homeric-style anthropomorphic divine characters intervening in the narrative of the *Annales*. Of these, two single lines (*Ann.* 18 and 19) are placed by their sources in Book 1; one 2-line fragment (*Ann.* 54–5) is located by its source in Book 6. The other fragments are with varying degrees of hesitation placed by modern editors (both Skutsch and Flores *et al.*) in Book 1 or else relegated to the *sed. inc.* See Tables A2.1–2 (pp. 304–6) and pp. 45–50 and 263–9, for further details.

be contemplated. But from epic's internal perspective the representation of divine involvement was an entirely legitimate tool for communicating underlying realities about historical, including recent historical, subject-matter and surrendered no ground in terms of epic's established claim to control the highest form of truth about the past. The function of epic had traditionally been to transform the audience's sense of the significance of their past, the past that informed their present understanding of themselves as a nation. It was precisely because this was Ennius' historiographical aim that the traditions of epic in their full array were so well suited to his task. Their ability to explain, albeit in non-rational terms, the role Romans saw themselves increasingly taking on in the world, has much to do with why the epic was so long able to stand its ground against its rationalising prose competitors.

While Chapter 4 thus attempts to make sense of the combination in one poem of generic traits that both the ancient sources and modern scholars have tended to treat as separate and unrelated, Chapter 5 offers a more specific and a more speculative hypothesis regarding the effects of hybridising the annalistic tradition's Romanocentric perspective with Greek epic and historiographical motifs and with the wider geographical horizons permitted by Rome's conquests in Ennius' day. I propose that one way to make sense of Ennius' impact on Roman historical thought (rather than on poetic idiom) is to understand that his particular amalgamation of genres and poetic techniques yielded a work that tacitly presented itself as the verse equivalent of a universal history: the kind of work that purports to tell the whole of history – or all of history that matters or that is needed to make sense of its audience's experience.[27] It is uncontroversial that, as Rome's empire expanded, the idea that world affairs could only or could best be understood from a Romanocentric perspective becomes increasingly popular in the public discourse of the City, in literature of all forms, in epigraphy, in numismatics and in art.[28] In this, we witness a radical shift in the way Romans conceived of themselves and of the City's place in the world as they knew it. In terms of literature, universalism's famous first self-advertising appearance at Rome is in Polybius' *Histories*.[29] Ennius' generic allegiances virtually guarantee that he would not have made any comparable explicit

[27] Universal history is distinguished by the range of its possible definitions. For some of these, see Sacks 1981: 96–121; Alonso-Núñez 1990: 173 (strict definition; cf. Clarke 1999b: 250); Yarrow 2006: 124–33; Marincola 2007b: 171–9; Liddel 2010: 15–16; also Fear *et al.* 2010: 1–13. Momigliano 1987: 31–57 and Alonso-Núñez 1990: 173–92 discuss the development of this type of historical writing.

[28] See e.g. Yarrow 2010: 131–47 and Edwards and Woolf 2003: 1–21.

[29] Polyb. 1.1.5–6, 1.2.7–8, 1.3.3–6, 3.1.4. For discussion of Polybius as a universal historian, see e.g. Sacks 1981: 96–121; Henderson 2001: 29–49; Hartog 2010: 30–40.

statement to the effect that he was writing a universal history, as was common practice among the self-proclaimed universal historians writing in prose. Yet in elevating a particular sequence of action to one that carries implications for all of humanity, epic arguably owns its own traditional brand of universalising.[30] Besides that, I argue, we see Ennius in particular putting into effect a series of poetic strategies that amount to an effective vehicle for introducing universalising thought, with its array of schematisations, into the Roman historiographical tradition – far more effective, in fact, than are the conscientious attempts to understand and explain evolving historical realities that characterise the work of those with any degree of allegiance to the analytic tradition.

Key here is the notion that universal history, in one of its principal manifestations,[31] asks its audience to see history as unfolding according to an overarching principle or pattern that, once grasped, allows the subject to select the telling and determinative events of the past and even to have a sense of history's future course. In modelling his description of the Roman past after the pre-existing patterns of Greek literature, Ennius created a sense both that history was cyclical, and so in some measure predetermined, and that Roman history had developed the capacity to stand for those earlier histories, which were now revealed as mere prototypes for the story Ennius had to tell. For, in addition to depicting the literal expansion of Rome's horizons, first over Italy and then reaching gradually towards the limits of the known world, Ennius, in superimposing the events and characters of Roman history onto Greek 'equivalents', tacitly suggested that Rome's history subsumed the history of other places and times. Its events were already famous because they had previously been incorporated (so Ennius' presentation suggested) in the master-narratives of Greece's sophisticated literature; and by the same token Ennius' Roman history had the capacity to reflect multiple moments of the past and so removed the need for other narratives. The work thus encompassed far more than its literal subject-matter, impressive as that alone was, and reflected a world enlarged far beyond the limits of the purview of traditional *annales*. At the same time, the work's nods to the annalistic tradition stated, in emphatically Roman terms, Rome's absolute dominance over and centrality to this multi-layered, re-conceptualised story of the past. Indeed, the label '*annales*' defined

[30] Cf. e.g. Hardie 1986: 382, with further bibliography.

[31] Universal historians have been usefully divided into those whose approach is quantitative, who aim to catalogue all known places and peoples, and those whose approach is qualitative, in whose view a single principle suffices to explain the course of history; see Sacks 1981: 96–121. It is to the latter category that I am likening the *Annales*.

relevance to Rome as the exclusive criterion admitting any given piece of information – or indeed literary technique or any other aspect of the poem – to the work. The form of universality I shall be arguing for has been termed 'focalised universality' by Katherine Clarke and Liv Yarrow[32]: in such a conception, all individual places and events comprised in a larger whole are related, by practical means or in conceptual terms, to a focal point that ultimately is what lends them their coherence.

Among the debts I incurred in elaborating this project (besides the principal one to Skutsch that I have already discussed), one which will soon be evident is that to Ingo Gildenhard's article, 'The "annalist" before the annalists: Ennius and his *Annales*'.[33] Gildenhard and I share a point of departure in questioning Skutsch's characterisation of the *Annales* as 'annalistic', but thereafter our aims diverge significantly, in a way worth noting here because it highlights a difference between this study and the direction of much recent scholarship on the *Annales*. Gildenhard's article represents, among other things, a significant contribution to the recent and innovative body of work on how the socio-historical circumstances of second-century Roman literary production circumscribed literature's contemporary social and political function.[34] A central question in such discussion is that of how it was possible for poetry to have a role in public discourse at Rome, largely controlled as that was by the social and political elite, and what it was that enabled the poet to establish a voice of authority,[35] given the need to navigate a course complicated by the material facts of social and political power, including poetic patronage.[36] The limited evidence in which I deal – strictly, the fragments, the sources and the literary–historical

[32] Clarke 1999a: 210–28, 45, 89, with her n. 26; Clarke 1999b: 268, 264; Yarrow 2010: 132–6.

[33] Gildenhard 2003: 93–114. For my debt to this article, see also n. 105 of Chapter 1 (p. 52).

[34] This body of work is represented as far as Ennius is concerned by Goldberg 1989: 274–61, *id.* 1995: 111–34, *id.* 2006: 427–47; cf. *id.* 2005: 22–8; Habinek 1998: esp. 3–14, 34–45, 50–56, 123–5; Sciarrino 2004: 45–56; Rüpke 2006: 489–512, esp. 508–12; Sciarrino 2006: 449–69; cf. also Wiseman 2006: 513–29 and the summary at Breed and Rossi 2006: 402–11. Goldberg is, as always, particularly strong on the issue of how we acquire and treat our evidence for debating these questions; see esp. Goldberg 1995: 113–34 and Goldberg 2006: 433–6, 445–7. The intellectual origins of much of this work lie in the scholarship of E. Flaig, K.-J. Hölkeskamp, M. Jehne and J. Rüpke. For further studies of both literary patronage and Ennius in particular, and of the relationship between poetry and patronage more broadly, see Gildenhard 2003: 109, n. 56.

[35] Gildenhard for his part argues that 'Ennius shrewdly dissociates himself from . . . problematic (since highly political) [religious, legal and moral] forms of power [such as that wielded by the Roman elite in their roles as priests, as participants in the political life of the City, including its rituals, and as historiographers] by resolutely situating his authority *as author* in the sphere of the aesthetic' (2003: 103–4).

[36] For early articulations of the more popular position in the modern debate on the relationship of Ennius to political figures of his day, see Badian 1972: 171–2, 183–7 and Jocelyn 1972: 993–5. Martina 1979: 13–74 articulates an extreme view, summed up in the description of Ennius as *poeta cliens* in the title of his article – that is, a poet fully in collusion with the political and social interests of powerful

relationships that we can disengage from these – give me access to the first-century BCE and subsequent reception of the *Annales* but not to the second century except by way of speculative retrojection. In Chapter 5, I engage to some extent in such speculative retrojection, and it is there that those who seek a contribution to this recent debate can (at best) look. There, my analysis of how the poem re-calibrates its audience's sense of Rome's place in space and in history intersects obliquely with the conversation about the socio-cultural role of the *Annales* and their position in the discourse of the day. In that context, I step far enough back from the details of the text and its reception to take some account of both the historical and the literary historical developments against which the epic was written, developments to which the fragments in various ways direct me. There is, however, no point at which I give attention to the state of internal affairs at Rome, to which the fragments only rarely give access (see, very briefly, pp. 274–5), and then only ambiguously so.[37] The debate on the socio-cultural function of the *Annales* takes place, then, largely with the use of resources beyond those with which I work.

It will by now be clear that my account of the *Annales* differs from established accounts, such as those of Skutsch, Jocelyn Gratwick and Conte,[38] including in respect of what may be termed the text's objective attributes (the poem's overall economy and use of time are examples). What matters, however, is not so much whether my suggestions for what the text might have looked like provide a better or more viable description of the original poem than do those with which we typically work – something we will presumably never know – but whether, on the basis of the available evidence, they provide an account at least as viable. It is this point, that of the vulnerability and provisional nature of even the best-established accounts of the text, that I seek to privilege – together with the idea that even those features which appear to the best effect in our record (for example, the poem's place in the epic tradition) are the contingent products of limited historical moments. In a case like that of the *Annales*, where so much of our narrative of subsequent literary history rests on what we make of this originary moment, it is especially dangerous to operate with an orthodoxy. The more our understanding of the development of Roman literary history is

Roman patrons. This position is adopted *passim* by Skutsch and shared at least to some extent by Gildenhard (see esp. 2003: 105). Goldberg, rightly in my view, for the reasons he himself gives, takes a strong stance against the position (see Goldberg 1995: 113–34; cf. Gruen 1990: 106–22).

[37] The fragment that most frequently comes into play in the debate on Ennian poetry and patronage is *Ann.* 268–86 (the 'good companion'); see e.g. Badian 1972: 171–87; Jocelyn 1972: 993–4; Gruen 1990: 111–13; Goldberg 1995: 120–4; Habinek 1998: 50–4; Gildenhard 2003: 109–11; Sciarrino 2006: 464–5; Hardie 2007: 132–6. As the discussions cited illustrate, the fragment has been marshalled by both sides of the debate on Ennius and patronage. I discuss the fragment in the context of a different argument at the end of Chapter 4 (pp. 228–31).

[38] Skutsch 1968; Jocelyn 1972: 987–1026; Gratwick 1982: 60–76; Skutsch 1985; Conte 1986.

determined by our sense of the *Annales*, the more important it is to test the limits of our knowledge and the foundations we take to be secure. Anyone who deals with fragments is acutely aware that engagement with them constitutes nothing other than the exploration of possibilities; and yet, because this specialised work is typically done by highly experienced and authoritative professionals, readers less immediately invested in the fragments are frequently in the position of accepting the editor's suggestions as something akin to necessary truth.[39] This study will have served its purpose if to any extent it promotes the open toleration of ambiguity among the community of interpreters who have a stake in what we find to say about the fragments of Ennius' *Annales*.

[39] Cf. Stephens 2002: 86, 84.

CHAPTER 1

Ennius and the annalistic tradition at Rome

INTRODUCTION

Already to readers as early as Lucilius (343 M) and Varro (*Men.* 398 A), Ennius' epic was known as the *Annales*.[1] The name was associated in legend with the calendrical record instituted at Rome by Numa, and the form has been deemed to be one of great antiquity: we hear of *annales* kept by the *pontifex maximus* as a record of events *ab initio rerum Romanarum* ('since the Roman state came into existence', Cic. *De or.* 2.52); and the term *annales pontificum maximorum* heads the list of historiographical works Cicero names at *Leg.* 1.6.[2] The early literary texts of the local historiographical tradition, such as Fabius Pictor's '*graeci annales*', as Cicero terms them (*Div.* 1.21.43),

[1] Both fragments are quoted in n. 1 to Chapter. 3, p. 135. The only hint of an alternative title is at Diomedes (*GLK* 1.484, quoted in n. 6, p. 19): *Romanis*; *Romais,* corr. Reifferscheid 157; but the word is hopelessly corrupt. Friedrich Leo denies that *Romais* (*vel sim.*) could have been coined by Ennius and insists that the single word *Annales* supplied Ennius with the representative designation he sought (Leo 1913: 163, n.1). Skutsch agrees: he sees *Romais* as a late invention, perhaps based on Statius' *Thebais* (Skutsch 1985: 7). See Northwood 2007: 97–9 on the meaning of the word *annales,* with specific reference to Ennius' use of it as title *ibid.* 98, n. 6. G. Forsythe suggests in passing that '*Annales* was probably not the original title of the poem' and so should not be construed as implying that Ennius wrote 'a strictly annalistic account' (Forsythe 1994: 49). I will in this chapter agree with this conclusion – not, however, by suggesting that we have reason to think that the original title was other than *Annales* but rather by questioning our understanding of the implications of the term in Ennius' day and re-thinking their possible range.

[2] Bruce Frier traces both the evolution in the nineteenth century of the *liber annalis* theory, initially elaborated by Theodor Mommsen and taking hold within two generations of his work, and its debunking in the middle of the twentieth century, by Crake 1940: 375–86, F. Jacoby and G. Perl (Frier 1999: 10–13). The theory posited a pre-literary work, assembled in the fourth century BCE by Roman *pontifices*, variously envisioned as recording or inventing Roman history. It was understood that their work subsequently served as a basis for and an explanation of early works of the annalistic tradition at Rome, such as those of Fabius Pictor, Cincius Alimentus, etc. Cicero (*Leg.* 1.6) and Quintilian (*Inst. Or.* 10.2.7) refer to primitive and little-admired pontifical *annales* of paltry substance and style; see pp. 32–3 on the tendentiousness of these witnesses' arguments and the lack of evidence for their access to such documents.

and the works of Cassius Hemina, Calpurnius Piso and others, also frequently share the designation *annales* in ancient references to them.[3]

The relationship between pre-Ennian *annales*, in the form of the priestly chronicle, and the epic Ennius composed under that title, has typically been taken to be more or less self-evident by those scholars through whose work the poem is most regularly read. Thus, Otto Skutsch, today the most influential editor of the fragments, writes:

> Ennius called his poem *Annales*, taking the title from the priestly records, and he followed these records also in writing *praescriptis consulum nominibus* (Serv. *Aen*. 1.373); see lines 290, 304 5, 324, and 329. Line 153 records an eclipse in words very similar to the *tabula pontificum*. The *Annales Maximi* may even have put into the poet's mind the original idea of recording all Roman history in verse.[4]

This passage promotes the assumption that, in writing his epic, Ennius took direction from the priestly records in choosing his title and in at least three important respects besides[5]: in the use of eponymous consular dating, a hallmark of the local tradition of public record-keeping at Rome – and thus, generally, in the way time was both described and organised in the epic; (at least partially or on occasion) in its literary style (cf. 'in words very similar to the *tabula pontificum*'); and in its overall scope.[6]

[3] See *ibid*. for how the use of the title for works of Roman historiography developed; and, for broad and narrow uses of the term *annales* to designate different areas of the Roman historiographical tradition, see Northwood 2007: 97–9.

[4] Skutsch 1985: 6–7. This passage effectively converts the more tentative speculations of (Franz) Skutsch 1905: 2603 into 'fact'. For a similar sense of the character and evolution of the work, see Jocelyn 1972: 1008–9; Gratwick 1982: 64; O'Neal 1988: 35–8; and Beck and Walter 2001: esp. 40–1. For comment on the passage quoted from Skutsch, see Rüpke 1995b: 200, n. 82, and Gildenhard 2003: 94–5. Rüpke suggests that the title *Annales* could be of Ennius' own forging. Gildenhard draws special attention to the significance of the argument for the late date of the *Annales Maximi* for our reconstruction of the evolution of the *Annales*: that is, that '[t]he overall design of Ennius' epic has no obvious 'model' in Rome's memorial culture' in the manner posited by Skutsch. For my debt to Gildenhard, see the Introduction, pp. 15–16.

[5] On the general principle that it is dangerous to assume too much too readily on the basis of a title, see Brunt 1980a: 486, who cites Theopompus' and Trogus' so-called *Philippica* as instances of the potentially misleading nature of titles.

[6] For ancient support of his view that the poem was at any rate analogous to (if not necessarily based on) the priestly record, Skutsch might have adduced Diom. *Art. gr*. 3 'De poematibus: de specie poematos communis' (*GLK* 1.484): *epos Latinum primus digne scripsit is qui res Romanorum decem et octo conplexus est libris, qui et* Annales *inscribuntur, quod singulorum fere annorum actus contineant, sicut publici annales, quos pontifices scribaeque conficiunt, vel* Romais [Romanis, *corr. Reifferscheid*], *quod Romanorum res gestas declarant*. (Skutsch mentions the passage in the same paragraph as that from which the words quoted above are taken, but only to point to the apparent alternative title *Romais* offered there; see n. 1, p. 18.) Diomedes' source for this information is, however, essentially obscure to us. D'Anna thinks that 'con ogni probabilità' the praise of Ennius here goes back to Varro, which would make it an authoritative note indeed (d'Anna 1983: 61). Yet the grounds given for the title could

It is the purpose of this chapter to examine the basis for such reasoning and to take issue with it; to consider how it has affected assessments of the poem; and, on the basis of the same ancient evidence as scholars have traditionally used, to suggest some alternative conceptions of the poem's organisation and use of time. The basic question is that of the poem's relationship to the annalistic tradition, which the title invites us to decipher, but which is fraught by our ignorance of the pre-Ennian annalistic tradition (cf. n. 2 p. 18). To begin with, to try to explain a text to which we wish we had greater access by means of a document or set of documents to which we have essentially no reliable access is to seek *ignotum per ignotius*.[7] It is, on the one hand, not especially controversial that some poorly attested and hence elusive form of *annales* pre-existed Ennius' epic;[8] but to extrapolate from its putative character to the aesthetics and organisation of the *Annales* is clearly hazardous,[9]

have been inserted at any point in the history of scholarship on the poem, and by Diomedes' day no one had had access to the full poem for generations. The possibility that the words represent Diomedes' own suggestion (or that of someone with as little direct contact with the poem or with the early chronicle) means that they offer small guarantee of the original function or reference of the title. On the reasons for distrusting the phrase, see also Wiseman 2006: 526.

[7] Cf. Perl's objection to the use of the *liber annalis* theory as an explanation of annalistic historiography, especially Fabius Pictor: that it serves no useful purpose to attempt to 'explain' known literary works by positing hypothetical similar, earlier works, since such an attempt results only in a deferral of the same problems to the posited earlier work(s) (Perl 1964a: 188–9 and esp. Perl 1964b: 213).

[8] Frier 1999: 83–159; Oakley 1997: 24–7, esp. p. 26 with n. 23 there. Frier's scepticism in suggesting that our accounts of the priestly chronicle derive from sources essentially ignorant of it thus stops short of denying all historical validity to the stories that reach us (Frier 1999: 176–8 and *passim*). In terms of our ancient sources, Cic. *Leg.* 1.6 (quoted on p. 32) is here relevant: the temporal *post* in the phrase there, *post annales pontificum maximorum*, implies that all the authors Cicero subsequently names (Fabius Pictor, Cato, as well as authors such as Calpurnius Piso quite directly associated with the prose annalistic tradition) are both later than and in some sense dependent on the *annales pontificum maximorum*.

[9] Even as regards the prose historiographical tradition, the transference of the qualities of the pontifical *annales*, as best we understand them through our slanted media (see further pp. 23–30), to other 'annalistic' works is merely putative, for our picture of early 'annalistic' historiographical style is mostly a product of inference. It is not even clear whether Roman historiographers writing before Ennius presented their work in a year-by-year fashion; F. Walbank has indeed argued that Fabius probably by and large used an annalistic chronological framework (Walbank 1945: 15–18), cf. Bömer 1953–4: 198–203, 208, Northwood 2007: 97–114; but M. Gelzer, seconded by D. Timpe, argues to the contrary (Gelzer 1933: 129–32; Gelzer 1934: 48–50; Gelzer 1954: 342–8; and Timpe 1972: 952–3); see also Rüpke 1995a: esp. 200, where Ennius is designated 'der erste sichere Annalist' on the grounds of his 'annalistic' organisation of time, at any rate from the third century on. Rüpke bases his claim on *Ann.* 290 and 304–6, but see pp. 52–3 and 54–7 for a discussion of this evidence and its interpretation. The writers who are known to have used a year-by-year format, L. Cassius Hemina, L. Calpurnius Piso and Cn. Gellius, all wrote later than Ennius; see Rawson 1976 on these 'first Latin annalists', and on the great differences that existed in their approaches to their commonly termed 'annalistic' writing. Piso was possibly 'the first historian to provide a full annalistic framework' (*ibid.* 704). To extrapolate from so scant a knowledge as we have of the pontifical record to the stylistic and organisational character of Ennius' work is surely even more fraught with problems.

much as the desire to grasp the origins of our target-text makes it tempting to do so.[10]

Besides this, the ready assumption of a straightforward chronology, today a recognised pitfall for editors of fragmentary works,[11] ought in itself to provoke suspicion. In the case of the *Annales*, there is little to promote such an assumption besides the (poorly understood) implications of the title, supported by the rare gestures towards consular dating, the latter complicated even by the little we can see of their artistic use in context (see pp. 52–8). The remains of the poem for their part advertise with absolute consistency and boldness their affiliation to Homeric epic. Such ancestry speaks of episodic construction and the frequent use of flashback, both readily identifiable features of the *Annales* themselves, and thus points away from linear chronology.[12] The implications of this strong relationship to Homeric epic for the structure of the poem thus make it problematic to describe the organisation of the *Annales* primarily with reference to the pre-literary Roman record – whose traces in the poem, in so far as we are able to identify them, are far fewer. Had we no other reason to think of the *Annales* as a complex poetic experiment,[13] the blending of traits of the Homeric tradition with those of the poem's putative annalistic predecessor would alone suffice as a reason not to anchor our understanding of its style and organisation too confidently in any single model.

It is worth bearing in mind that the poem is the first securely historical Latin work of any kind to bear the name *Annales* as its attested title.[14] Its remains are substantial in comparison with those of earlier and contemporary competing forms of *annales* (that is, the postulated pontifical record and Fabius Pictor's '*graeci annales*'). In this sense, Ennius' work represents the starting-point in our evidence for understanding the term, even though the hybrid nature of Ennius' *Annales* complicates the matter greatly.

[10] The temptation is visible, for example, in Skutsch's use, in the passage quoted on p. 19, of the terms 'priestly records', '*tabula pontificum*' and '*Annales Maximi*', since it confuses three different if overlapping concepts, none of which is in any obvious way suited to explaining the poem as it emerges from the surviving fragments.

[11] See n. 19 of the Introduction, pp. 7–8. Much of what Clarke observes about the scholarly treatment of Posidonius is equally applicable to the *Annales* (Clarke 1999a: 154–8).

[12] For the use of time in the *Iliad*, see Taplin 1992: 14–19, 22–6, 30–1, 144–52, 159–60, 188, 252, 282–3, 286–7.

[13] Ennius' generic innovativeness does not lack recognition; see e.g. Krevans 1993: 257–71 for Ennius's use at *Ann*. 34–50 not only of tragic elements but of the traditions of foundation-legends and of heroic genealogies; and Wülfing-von Martitz 1972: 253–89 on Hellenistic aspects of the *Annales*; on the latter, see also Jocelyn 1972: 1015–17; Skutsch 1985: 428; 450, 592, 593, 609, 623, 644–5, 648, 670, 674, 685, 693; Mariotti 1991: 42, 67–9, 81–3.

[14] Gelzer 1934: 46; Cornell 1996b: 98; cf. Rüpke, as cited in n. 4, p. 19.

My argument will suggest that the relevance of the poem's title lies not in a reference to its organisation or stylistic character but rather in its probable allusion to the work's public function at Rome. This function, it has already been suggested,[15] was parallel if not identical to the public function of the priestly record, and it introduced a note of palpable local difference from the traditionally public function of Greek hexametric epic. By the same token, the title referred, I will suggest, to the poem's function as an ethical guide to its audience.[16] This function again has some background in Homeric epic but here at Rome has a more specific local analogy in the ethical guidance offered by the accumulated record of past experience and observance warded by the priests. In a sense, however, what matters most to my argument is simply the fact that the title, however precisely construed, advertises the poem's exclusively Romanocentric perspective. The arresting presentation of that perspective via Ennius' successful new use of Homerising techniques catapulted Roman concerns and historical material from a humble and outlying region of limited literary and historiographical ambition to the grandest arena of literary productivity and historical significance. The title and the other sporadic gestures towards the annalistic tradition remained crucial, however, to anchor the past, now presented in a radically different light, to the Rome that insiders and outsiders had heretofore known. By this extraordinary hybridisation of Roman *annales* with Homeric verse, Ennius presented Roman history as of exclusive cultural significance and gave it a powerful means to match itself successfully against those other accounts of the history of Rome (or indeed of other places) with which it put itself or was subsequently placed in competition.

In the pages below, I will discuss the reasons for de-coupling our understanding of the economy of the poem from the debate about the pontifical chronicle in any of its phases. I will examine the origins of our sense of 'annalistic' style in ancient assessments of it, and I will observe the sorts of effects the now traditional understanding of Ennius' relationship to the

[15] Cf. Jocelyn 1972: 989, 1007–11. Gildenhard 2003: 93–114 does not explicitly draw a parallel but discusses both the relationship of the epic to the priestly record and the nature of the epic's public voice and function.

[16] Readings of the *Annales* as a source of ethical guidance exist at e.g. Conte 1986: 143–6, who makes a specific link between 'the Latin epic norm' and annalistic historiography: each establishes that their 'contents should . . . be identified with the supremacy of the state as an embodiment of the public good, with the acceptance of divine will as providential guidance'; Ennius' *Annales* function as 'an edifying declaration' and 'a model capable of conditioning human events and their interpretation' (1986: 144); cf. Gruen 1990: 106–23; Goldberg 1995: 111–34; Conte 1994a: 83; Henderson 1998: 165; and Keith 2000: 5–6. Evidence for similar ancient readings of the poem exists primarily in Cicero; see Chapter 3, esp. pp. 164–78.

annalistic tradition has had on modern accounts of various aspects of the poem, including its political character, its approach to historicity and the related question of its presentation of the gods. In taking stock of different possible ways in which time is organised in the poem, I will examine precisely those fragments Skutsch cites above in support of the idea of a direct line of descent from the pontifical chronicle to the epic. Finally, I will consider what sorts of narrative choices and authorial control other fragments suggest.

ENNIUS' EPIC AND THE PONTIFICAL RECORD

The most frequently cited piece of evidence supporting a link between Ennius' *Annales* and the priestly record is Cic. *Rep*. 1.25.[17] Cicero here testifies that Ennius' epic and the *Annales Maximi* report the very same eclipse:[18]

> id autem [*sc. solem lunae oppositu solere deficere*] postea ne nostrum quidem Ennium fugit; qui ut scribit, anno quinquagesimo CCC fere post Romam conditam 'Nonis Iunis soli luna obstitit et nox' [*Ann*. 153]. atque hac in re tanta inest ratio atque sollertia, ut ex hoc die quem apud Ennium et in maximis annalibus consignatum videmus superiores solis defectiones repu tatae sint usque ad illam quae Nonis Quinctilibus fuit regnante Romulo; quibus quidem Romulum tenebris etiam si natura ad humanum exitum abripuit, virtus tamen dicitur in caelum sustinuisse.
>
> Later on, our own Ennius too was well aware of this [that the sun is eclipsed when the moon blocks it]; and as he writes, in about the 350th year after the foundation of Rome, 'on the Nones [5th] of June, the moon and night obscured the sun'.[19] And in this matter there is such expert reckoning that, from this day which we see recorded in Ennius and in the *Annales Maximi*, earlier eclipses of the sun have been retroactively calculated all the way back until the one which took place on the Nones [7th] of July in the reign of Romulus;[20] and in the darkness of that eclipse, though it may be that nature in the order of things bore him off to the end of his human existence, yet his worth, they say, raised him up to the skies.

[17] See e.g. Skutsch 1905: 2603–4; Leo 1913: 163, n. 2; and O'Neal 1988: 37.

[18] On this passage, see Frier 1999: 115–17 and Zetzel 1995: *ad loc*. Fuller context and discussion of Cicero's building of Ennius' authority in this passage can be found on pp. 172–5 of Chapter 3.

[19] 'The correct astronomical date is 21 June 400 BCE, 350 years after the Polybian date (used by C.) for the foundation of Rome, 751/0' (Zetzel 1999: 12, n. 37).

[20] Rawson suggests that the calculation back from Ennius and the *Annales Maximi* is due to Varro (Rawson 1972: 36).

The connection Cicero thus forges between the two texts is dogged with problems, however.

First is the now notorious issue of how we are to understand the relation of the *Annales Maximi*, the specific text Cicero cites as parallel to Ennius' epic in recording the eclipse, to the original pontifical record – that is, to a document that could have existed in Ennius' day. While there is considerable controversy over when and why the *Annales Maximi* were produced and over their relationship to the Roman historiographical tradition at its inception,[21] scholars today generally agree that they were a reconstructive work, the product either of vested political interests and/or of antiquarianism; on all hypotheses, the published version of the *Annales Maximi* is too late itself to have informed Ennius' poem.[22] Neither is it a necessary inference from what Cicero says here that he had himself seen the document(s) in question and that he was thus in a position to speak with authority on the question here at issue, that of a substantive or stylistic relationship between the epic and the priestly record, let alone the priestly record of the relevant date.[23]

We learn of the *Annales Maximi* only through late sources, themselves apparently confused or abbreviated, clearly only partially informed and

[21] See Rawson 1971: esp. 167–9 on the difficulties of taking too seriously the possibility that the *Annales Maximi*, as described by the commentator in the passage quoted on p. 25, were available to serve as a source for later Roman historians; cf. Gelzer 1934: 46–55 (not evident that the historians of Rome had any early records whatsoever at their disposal). For a still positive view of the survival in Livy of information from the pre-literary pontifical chronicle, see Oakley 1997: 24–7.

[22] One well-established view is that the *Annales Maximi* were the product of the 120s BCE and of the pontificate of P. Mucius Scaevola, an actor motivated by self-interested political considerations; see Frier 1999: 179–83 for a history of the origin of this view and an analysis of the sources supporting it. Jörg Rüpke is a more recent proponent (see Rüpke 1993: esp. 172–8); cf. Cornell 1996a. The cornerstone of the view, which originated with Mommsen, in the second (1857) edition of *Römische Geschichte*, vol. 2 (see Frier 1999: 12, n. 4 and 179–81), is Cic. *De or.* 2.52 (*usque ad P. Mucium pontificem maximum*). But that passage provides no evidence for Scaevola's positive responsibility for the 80-book *Annales Maximi*. This last work is itself not mentioned by Cicero at *De or.* 2.52–3 at all (although, as we have seen, at *Rep.* 1.25 Cicero does know of a work called *Annales Maximi*), but rather in the extended Servian commentary on *Aen.* 1.373. Frier, for his part, has argued that the *Annales Maximi* were an antiquarian work probably dating from the late Republic or the Augustan period (*ibid.* 179–200, esp. 194–200). This argument is countered by Forsythe 1994: 53–73, to whom Frier replies at pp. xvii–xviii of the Introduction to the 1999 edition of his book. See pp. xiii–xix of that Introduction for a description of and some reply to both positive and negative responses to his argument.

[23] The phrase *ex hoc die quem apud Ennium et in maximis annalibus consignatum videmus* only possibly suggests that Cicero had actually seen the *Annales Maximi*. For the general proposition that Cicero was in fact ignorant of any real pontifical material of a period relevant to Ennius (as also of its later history), see Frier 1999: 276–8. Frier argues there that Cicero, along with others, in an effort to explain the annalistic tradition as he, Cicero, knew it, is party to constructing the essentially artificial account of the chronicle that reaches us. It is from this artificial account that the assumption of a causal or derivative link from the chronicle to that tradition emanates. Rawson 1971: 166 implies otherwise, however.

probably interdependent.[24] One of our principal pieces of testimony comes from the extended version of the Servian commentary on *Aen.* 1.373 (*annales nostrorum . . . laborum*):[25]

> ita autem annales conficiebantur: tabulam dealbatam quotannis pontifex maximus habuit, in qua praescriptis consulum nominibus[26] et aliorum magistratuum digna memoratu notare consueverat domi militiaeque terra marique gesta per singulos dies. cuius diligentia annuos commentarios in octaginta libros veteres retulerunt, eosque a pontificibus maximis a quibus fiebant *Annales Maximos* appellarunt; unde quidem ideo dictum ab Aenea 'annales' aiunt, quod ipse religiosus sit et a poeta tum pontifex inducatur.
>
> This is how annals were put together: each year, the high priest kept a whitened account board, on which his custom was to make a day by day record of noteworthy achievements at home and abroad by land and sea, under the headings of the names of the consuls and other magistrates. As a result of [each successive] high priest's industry, men of old entered [these yearly memoranda] into eighty volumes, and they named them the *Annales Maximi* after the high priests who were their makers. So that's why they say Aeneas used that word, *annales*, because he is himself endowed with a religious aura and is being presented at this moment by the poet as a priest.

That the *Annales Maximi* were, according to the ancient commentator's understanding, a late product is here partially suggested by his apparent understanding (emerging from the words *cuius diligentia* . . . Annales Maximos *appellarunt*) that they were a later version of the original record, the product of *veteres* whose efforts were secondary to those of the high priests responsible for the chronicle in its original form.[27] The idea of a late date for the more

[24] See Frier 1999: 27–37 for discussion of the related sources on the *Annales Maximi*: DS *Aen.* 1.373, Macr. *Sat.* 3.2.17, Isid. *Orig.* 1.44.1–4, SHA *Tac.* 1.1, Paulus' abridgement of Festus (113 L) and Gell. *NA* 5.18. Frier argues for the common origin of all these passages in Book 4 of Verrius Flaccus' *De Significatu Verborum*.

[25] For the scholiastic additions to Servius that collectively go under the name Servius Danielis (henceforth DS), after their publication in 1600 by Pierre Daniel, see Barwick 1911; Goold 1970: 101–17; Murgia 1974: 257–77; and Zetzel 1981: 81–3; cf. Zetzel 2005: 2–9 (esp. 7), 75–8.

[26] It is this phrase that Skutsch quotes in the passage given on p. 19.

[27] So Frier 1999: 66–7, 181, 194: the *veteres* (a 'highly elastic literary term' [p. 194] typically referring to Republican authors but demonstrably extending beyond that) are so called from Servius' own standpoint and refer to persons working in the later Republican or early imperial period, immediately prior to Verrius Flaccus, whom Frier believes to be the only surviving ancient authority to have consulted the edition at first hand. The distinction between the *veteres* who compiled the edition and the high priests who made the original record had earlier been made by Hulleman 1855: 52–3, cited by Frier *ibid.* 181, n. 7. R.M. Ogilvie, however, objects to Frier's view on the grounds that Servius' usage of *veteres* is not distinguishable from Livy's and could thus refer to writers of the early Republican period (Ogilvie 1981: 200). R. Drews argues that there is no evidence that the *Annales Maximi* were consulted at any point after 90 BCE, and so is essentially in agreement with Ogilvie that the *veteres* could be of earlier date than Frier would have them be (Drews 1988: 289–99). Neither Drews nor Ogilvie, however, argue specifically against the Hulleman–Frier distinction between the producers of

elaborate version of the chronicle is confirmed by Dionysius of Halicarnassus, on whose evidence even Polybius, writing a full generation or more after Ennius, sought evidence for the date of Rome specifically ἐπὶ τοῦ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι κειμένου πίνακος ('on the tablet kept in the possession of the high priests', *AR* 1.74.3).[28] At best, it would thus appear, Ennius and his contemporaries may have had access to pre-literary tablets and not to any narrative form of the chronicle.[29] The common record of the eclipse in Ennius and the *Annales Maximi* noted by Cicero (*Rep.* 1.25) suggests only that Ennius had some interest in alluding, perhaps in a general way and perhaps only sporadically, to the subject-matter of the local annalistic tradition at Rome, however that was represented in his day. But any more specific relationship between the text Cicero refers to as the *Annales Maximi* and Ennius' epic is difficult to countenance in chronological terms, if he intends the same text as modern scholars refer to by that title; and here at least, Cicero has nothing to say about a relationship in terms of anything other than subject-matter, and even of that he is witness only to a single instance.

If, however, we are to take seriously Cicero's implication of a parallel between the two texts, we ought to consider the possibility, given their relative dating, that Ennius' epic itself influenced the *Annales Maximi*, rather than vice versa. The idea that the *Annales Maximi* were subject to influence by earlier literature is evident already in antiquity: Gellius tells the story of some Etruscan soothsayers who chose to vent their hatred of Rome by knowingly giving false advice about the placement of a statue that had been struck by lightning, so as to prevent the Romans who had consulted them from properly expiating the prodigy (*NA* 4.5).[30] The episode concludes thus:

> tum igitur quod in Etruscos aruspices male consulentis animadversum vindicatumque fuerat, versus hic scite factus cantatusque esse a pueris urbe tota fertur:
>
> malum consilium consultori pessimum est.

the original record and the compilers of the more elaborate edition; and, if a date as late as Frier's cannot be shown to be uncontroversially the case, neither is there any evidence that would place a narrative version of the chronicle anywhere close to contemporary with Ennius.

[28] Despite Dionysius' statement here, it is doubtful whether authoritative information about the date of the foundation of Rome was really to be had from the chronicle: had such existed in the third or second centuries, the ancient controversy long surrounding that date could scarcely have existed (Perl 1964b: 18, n. 55). Also, even though Dionysius' πίναξ sounds like the tabular *annales* of the *pontifex maximus*, the word could conceivably refer instead to the Capitoline Fasti (Gelzer 1934: 52–3). At any rate, on Dionysius' account, it was not to any fuller historical record that Polybius turned. The probable implication for us is that he had none such available.

[29] Cf. Gelzer 1934.

[30] The passage is discussed in its relation to the *Annales Maximi* as they reach us via Verrius Flaccus by Frier 1999: 55–64.

> ea historia de aruspicibus ac de versu isto senario scripta est in *Annalibus Maximis*, libro undecimo, et in Verri Flacci libro primo *Rerum Memoria Dignarum*. videtur autem versus hic de Graeco illo Hesiodi versu expressus:
>
> ἡ δὲ κακὴ βουλὴ τῷ βουλεύσαντι κακίστη.
>
> Then indeed, since punishment and vengeance had been exacted from the Etruscan soothsayers for their mischievous advice, this verse, so they say, was wittily contrived and chanted by children throughout the entire city:
>
> bad counsel turns out worst for the counsellor.
>
> This story about the soothsayers and that senarius was recorded in the eleventh book of the *Annales Maximi* and in the first book of Verrius Flaccus' *Res Memoria Dignae*. Yet the verse seems to have been translated from that Greek line of Hesiod's:
>
> bad counsel turns out worst for the counsellor.

The '*historia*' thus referred to is clearly of some narrative complexity. It would be circular, in the course of an argument about the nature of Ennius' position in the annalistic tradition at Rome, to suggest that therefore it must post-date Ennius' *Annales*; but, in combination with the now uncontroversially late date of (the main text we now know as) the *Annales Maximi*, that complexity is easier to read as a result of Ennius' achievement than as a factor contributing to or enabling the epic, especially when no source suggests that in the relevant period the pontifical *annales* in any manner resembled a narrative history. Such a reading positions Ennius' epic as an early version of complex narrative *annales* that on its own merits acquired the power to determine something of the texture of the later annalistic tradition. In this context, it is perhaps worth noting that, in alluding to the joint report, Cicero gives Ennius priority, quoting him alone and giving him primary credit for accurate knowledge and recording of the eclipse. Of course, none of this eliminates the possibility that Ennius alluded to or was inspired by earlier, pre-literary manifestations of the pontifical chronicle;[31] but even Cicero at *Rep*. 1.25, the ancient authority principally responsible for the notion of a link between Ennius' text and the priests' product, supplies no evidence for such a process.

Gellius' report at *NA* 4.5 makes plainer than almost any other piece of evidence that the *Annales Maximi*, as he knew (of?) them, constituted what

[31] Cf. Wiseman's argument: 'What I think we have to infer is a complex process of mutual borrowing and mutual influence among the poets, the prose-writers and the *pontifices* [that is, among all types of author to which *annales* in any form are attributed], lasting from at least the third century BC to the time of Augustus. The 80 books of the new pontiff's chronicle [Wiseman accepts Frier's suggestion of a very late, Augustan date for the *Annales Maximi*; see n. 22, p. 24] will have contained a vast amount of stuff taken from literary sources, but those sources themselves may well have been influenced by the chronicle in its earlier manifestations' (Wiseman 2002: 361); cf. Gildenhard 2003: 95.

was recognisably a narrative history. By contrast, the single piece of evidence that at least potentially comes close to being contemporary with Ennius suggests a far more rudimentary document, quite different in nature from the text Gellius implies at *NA* 4.5.[32] Our source here is Cato, whom we read via Gellius' report at *NA* 2.28.6. Cato is openly hostile to the priestly record he speaks of. He is our oldest witness to the *tabula* proper (or indeed to any form of the pontifical record),[33] and his testimony is, like Cicero's at *Rep*. 1.25, regularly used to construct a relationship both in subject-matter and in style between the pontifical *annales* and Ennius' epic.[34] Cato is here himself the object of Gellius' reproof because of his lack of interest in eclipses. Gellius writes:

> verba Catonis ex *Originum* quarto haec sunt: non lubet scribere quod in tabula apud pontificem maximum est, quotiens annona cara, quotiens lunae aut solis lumine caligo aut quid obstiterit. (Peter, *HRR*, frg. 77. = *Orig*. 4.1 Chassignet.)
>
> Cato's words from the fourth book of the *Origines* are the following: 'I have no desire to write out the contents of the high priest's board, the frequency of corn shortages, how often an eclipse of the moon or of the sun occurred.'

Although Ennius gets no explicit mention here,[35] scholars have drawn attention to the undeniable similarity, in substance and language, between

[32] Arnaldo Momigliano emphasises this distance and sees the well-established idea of the re-working of the *annales* at the time of their publication – a re-working to which no source explicitly testifies – as pure conjecture prompted by nothing other than the need to explain the great difference between the early *tabula* as Cato has it and the pontifical chronicle as we hear of it through Gellius, Cicero, *De or*. 2.52, DS ad *Aen*. 1.373, etc. (Momigliano 1966: 59–60).

[33] The only other piece of evidence purporting to give evidence of the contents of the *tabula* proper is Di. Hal. *AR* 1.74.3 (already partially quoted above, p. 26): οὐ γὰρ ἠξίουν ὡς Πολύβιος ὁ Μεγαλοπολίτης τοσοῦτο μόνον εἰπεῖν, ὅτι κατὰ τὸ δεύτερον ἔτος τῆς ἑβδόμης ὀλυμπιάδος τὴν Ῥωμην ἐκτίσθαι πείθομαι, οὐδ' ἐπὶ τοῦ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι κειμένου πίνακος ἑνὸς καὶ μόνου τὴν πίστιν ἀβασάνιστον καταλιπεῖν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐπιλογισμούς, οἷς αὐτὸς προσεθέμην, εἰς μέσον ὑπευθύνους τοῖς βουληθεῖσιν ἐσομένους ἐξενεγκεῖν. This too may, like *NA* 2.28.6, go back to a second-century source (Rawson 1972: 36; Frier 1999: 111–14, 182–3).

[34] See e.g. Skutsch 1905: 2603–4; Leo 1913: 163, n. 2.

[35] Gary Forsythe suggests that the similarity of Cato's wording (as reported by Gellius) to Ennius' (as reported by Cicero) shows that Cato was including Ennius in his criticism (Forsythe 1994: 69–70); cf. Rüpke 1995b: 200, n. 82 etc. This depends on the idea that Cato understood his enterprise as generically comparable to Ennius'; cf. Forsythe's sentence, which I read concessively, 'Ennius did not write sober prosaic history but heroic history in the epic style, including all its attendant divine machinery' (*ibid*. 70). There is no question that Cato's and Ennius' texts were in competition with each other but, given that it is already an inference that Cato was referring to his Latin literary predecessors generally, rather than talking quite specifically about the *tabula*, it seems more likely that his target were works of greater formal similarity to his own than was the epic. Northwood 2007: 107, n. 37 cites Kornemann 1911: 256 as the origin of the view that Cato's target is unlikely to have been Ennius and that his scorn was more likely to be directed at Fabius Pictor, a view later to be supported by Walbank 1945: 17, Bömer 1953–4: 198–9, Beck and Walter 2001: 197 and Northwood (*loc. cit*.).

the last phrase of this report and the line Cicero quotes (*Rep*. 1.25, our sole source): *Nonis Iunis soli luna obstitit et nox* (*Ann*. 153).[36] The hostility of Cato's stance, itself presented via the further filter of Gellius' hostility to Cato, suggests that the summary of the contents of the *tabula* offers a simple caricature.[37] It is certainly not Cicero's intention to do the same to Ennius' *Annales* when he cites this line at *Rep*. 1.25, but the isolation in which *Ann*. 153 now stands combines with the similarity to the words of the pontifical *tabula* in Cato's scornful report to suggest a reductive version of the epic's style and contents. *Ann*. 153 comes from a zealous admirer of Ennius', but one with a momentarily extremely selective interest in the text, and it is not clear to what extent this particular piece of evidence is representative of the whole. At any rate, the other 622 securely attributed lines of Skutsch's edition of the *Annales* give a rather different sense of the poem's tenor and style from what we would have to imagine, had pontifical annals in anything like Cato's rendition been representative of the epic, at least in the uncomplicated way suggested by reference to the simple coincidence in language. The subjects Cato jeers at are for their part not otherwise represented in the extant lines of the *Annales*, so that it is on the combined evidence of *Rep*. 1.25 and Gell. 2.28.6 alone that confidence in the substantive allegiance between the *tabula* and the epic must rest. It remains possible that lines such as *Ann*. 153 imbued the text with the distinctive, austere tone of the *tabula*, as we might imagine it, in a manner somehow out of proportion to their actual representation in the text.[38]

It is a possibility, though one that the isolated parallel we have cannot single-handedly substantiate, that allusion to the *tabula* was applied with some sort of consistency in the poem. Given the mediating evidence of the rest of the surviving fragments, such allusion, I suggest, would need to be interpreted as part of an overall strategy that drew attention to the distance between the form of *annales* alluded to and their re-presentation in this new and startling context, where they were brought under pressure by multiple currents of foreign generic influence, generating, one might say, a form of

[36] Cf. Skutsch 1985: 313: '[a]ccording to Cicero the eclipse was also recorded in the *Annales Maximi*, and Cato's refusal to mention *quod in tabula apud pontificem maximum est* . . . (Gell. 2.28.6) shows how closely Ennius followed the official terminology.' Similarly Forsythe 1994: 69–70.

[37] Cf. Fornara 1983: 24 (less strong than what I suggest here).

[38] Cf. Gildenhard 2003: 98. Frier, citing McDonald 1957, describes a similar effect to the use of the annalistic form in the prose historiographical tradition: 'The [annalistic] form must therefore be understood as a sort of illusion, a counterpoint of restrained and ceremonious 'chronicle' information played off against more extended and elaborate narrative of wars or political events. The formal passages evoked the cadence and atmosphere of an officialdom, of government in its orderly operation' (Frier 1999: 273).

irony. Simple references to the parallel are misleading in failing to point this out.[39] Eponymous consular dating, which is regularly seen as another, perhaps the main, point of contact between the pontifical chronicle in any of its forms and Ennius' *Annales*, will be discussed below.

ANCIENT ASSESSMENT OF *ANNALES*: CONTENT, STYLE AND POWER TO EXPLAIN AND MOTIVATE

Cato is of course not the only party to complain about the historiographical inadequacy of pontifical *annales* – and of whatever poorly understood narrative relatives of theirs are part of his reference in the *Origines* 4 extract at Gell. *NA* 2.28.6 (on p. 28). The other surviving testimonies all come from writers who, to the extent that they were not downright hostile to the annalistic tradition, considered it outmoded and undesirable. In consequence, these authors – Sempronius Asellio, Cicero and Quintilian are the ones in question – view all the texts of the annalistic tradition as a undifferentiated set, making no attempt to differentiate among them. Indeed, the disdain these authors express for early Roman historiography as a whole is so profound that Cato himself tends to get mixed up with *annales*. In these authors' accounts, *annales* represent all that is inadequate in Roman historical writing. Their typically pejorative remarks tend to tar *annales* of any ilk (along with much else besides) with the same brush.

There are three well-known charges these authors level at *annales*: first, a charge of barrenness of content, second, a charge of desolate style, and finally a charge of lack of power to explain events and thus motivate the audience to action. The earliest charge, as we have already seen with Cato (pp. 28–9), concerns annalistic content: *annales* were nothing but a rote list of natural and supernatural occurrences; and the critics, of course, choose not to speak of any cogent principle of selection that would make sense of the list. Sempronius Asellio, who follows Cato chronologically (*fl. c.* 90 BCE), is perhaps the harshest surviving critic of annalistic historiography. In his remarks, the fullest set to survive, he criticises *annales* on the same grounds of content as Cato, but expands from there to talk especially about

[39] Momigliano, too, stresses the distance between both the form and the substance of Fabius Pictor's account of Roman history and the chronicle in the form in which it seems to have existed in his day (Momigliano 1966: 60). There is discussion of the limited role the *tabula* could have played in directly influencing any writers of early Roman historiography, including authors contemporary with Ennius, in Beck and Walter 2001: 32–7.

their lack of motivational power. His words survive once more through quotation by Gellius (*NA* 5.18.8–9):[40]

> 'verum inter eos', inquit, 'qui annales relinquere voluissent, et eos qui res gestas a Romanis perscribere conati essent, omnium rerum hoc interfuit. annales libri tantummodo quod factum quoque anno gestum sit, ea dem onstrabant, id est quasi qui diarium scribunt, quam Graeci *ἐφημέριδα* vocant. nobis non modo satis esse video, quod factum esset, id pronuntiare, sed etiam quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent demonstrare.' paulo post idem Asellio in eodem libro: 'nam neque alacriores', inquit, 'ad rem pub licam defendundam, neque segniores ad rem perperam faciundam annales libri commovere quicquam possunt. scribere autem bellum initum quo consule et quo confectum sit et quis triumphans introierit, et eo libro quae in bello gesta sint non praedicare aut interea quid senatus decreverit aut quae lex rogatiove lata sit neque quibus consiliis ea gesta sint iterare: id fabulas pueris est narrare, non historias scribere.'[41]
>
> 'But', he writes, 'the most significant difference between those who desired to bequeath annals to posterity and those who wanted to write up the achieve ments of the Roman people was the following: books of annals exclusively make clear what was achieved and in what year it was accomplished that is, as if their authors were writing a daily log, which the Greeks call a 'day by day journal'. My own feeling is that what makes an account satisfactory is not only advertisement of what happened but also assessment of the end to which and the motive for which things were done.' A little later in the same book, Asellio likewise says, 'Books of annals have no power at all to motivate people to be any the keener to defend the state nor any the slower to perpetrate crime. Noting down under which consul a war was begun and under which it was ended and who was granted an entry in triumph, yet in the same book to make no mention of what was achieved in that war, or of what the senate in the meantime decreed or what law or bill was passed, nor yet to articulate why all this was done: that's telling stories to children, not writing historical accounts.'

We will presently consider the question of what might motivate the second criticism, that of ineffectiveness in instructing the audience, which is unique to Asellio.

Cicero, the subsequent critic, also includes the content of *annales* in his reproof, but his principal concern is with style. His speaker, Antonius, is so eager to assert that nothing worthy has been accomplished in Roman historiography to date that he includes among those espousing, in his view, dire annalistic style not only Fabius Pictor but Cato himself – who,

[40] For the probable origin of the view in Polybius, see Kornemann 1911: 256; Walbank 1945: 15; and Frier 1999: 219, n. 53.

[41] For discussion, see Bömer 1953–4: 189–93; Frier 1999: 219–2; and Northwood 2007: 97–8.

if Gellius' quotation above is not misleading, would presumably have objected strenuously. At *De or.* 2.53, Antonius' claim is that writers of Roman history as a whole have to date simply catalogued raw historical data without any attempt at rhetorical elevation of the material and aiming solely at brevity. They modelled their writing, he says, on that of the *pontifex maximus*, whose style was the result of his procedure in compiling the *Annales Maximi*. By Antonius' account, that result amounted to nothing more than a morass of notes on events for indiscriminate publication to the population of Rome.[42] 'This monotonous narrative style', Antonius continues, 'many adopted; they have transmitted the bare memory of times, people, places and events, without any rhetorical ornament' (*De or.* 2.52).[43] Likewise, at *Leg.* 1.6,[44] style is the principal concern of Cicero's speaker, Atticus, and once again, the condemnation of Roman historiography is so broad that even Cato does not escape. As at *De or.* 2.52–4, the grounds for condemnation are historiography's origins in and stylistic alliance to the records of the priests. Cicero's Antonius continues:

> nam post annales pontificum maximorum, quibus nihil potest esse ieiu nius,[45] si aut ad Fabium aut ad eum qui tibi semper in ore est, Catonem, aut ad Pisonem aut ad Fannium aut ad Vennonium venias, quamquam ex his alius alio plus habet virium, tamen quid tam exile est quam isti omnes?[46]
>
> For after the annals of the high priests, and what could be more spiritless than they, if one turns to Fabius or to him who is constantly on your lips, Cato, or to Piso or Fannius or Vennonius, though one of these may chance to have more force than the next, yet what is more feeble than the sum of these?

The point is of course polemical: the speaker is asserting that, in terms of the writing of history, nothing ambitious had been written at Rome to rival the achievements of the Greeks, and that this constituted a failure of historiography demanding remedy by Cicero himself.[47] It serves Cicero's argument

[42] *De or.* 2.52: *res omnis singulorum annorum mandabat litteris pontifex maximus referebatque in album et proponebat tabulam domi, potestas ut esset populo cognoscendi, eique etiam nunc annales maximi nominantur.*

[43] *Hanc similitudinem scribendi multi secuti sunt, qui sine ullis ornamentis monumenta solum temporum, hominum, locorum gestarumque rerum reliquerunt.*

[44] The implications of the passage are discussed at Frier 1999: 73–5.

[45] *Ieiunius*, the word at issue here, is Ursinus' emendation for the transmitted *iucundius*, which is obviously wrong; see Frier 1999: 74–5, with his notes; also Zetzel 1999: 107, n. 1 and Dyck 2004: 75. This word feeds directly into modern scholarly assessments of the 'annalistic form'; e.g. 'It was jejune material, recurring monotonously and often tedious' (McDonald 1957: 156).

[46] Cp. Cicero's descriptions of Piso's *Annales* as *sane exiliter scriptos* (*Brut.* 106).

[47] Cf. the discussion of *De or.* 2.51–64 at Wiseman 1987: 244–6, as well as *ibid.* 246–7 on *Leg.* 1.6 itself. See also Fornara 1983: 17–24 on the distorting influence of the rhetorical theory of style on the respective responses of Di. Hal. (*De Thuc.* 5) and of Cicero (our passage) to Greek horographic and Roman annalistic records.

to imply (with *post*) that the *annales* of the priests were originary for all subsequent Roman historiography, since he wishes to suggest that they set a stylistic norm still in place in his own day. Given the polemic, it is unsurprising that scant interest in the real nature or history of the chronicle is evident in what he has to say. Once again, Fabius and Cato, for all their apparent efforts to differentiate themselves from previous and contemporary humdrum efforts at historical record-keeping,[48] do not escape the general condemnation.

Quintilian too, our other source on style, again speaks only of generic 'pontifical annals' and implies that there was nothing to them besides their primitivity:

> turpe etiam illud est, contentum esse id consequi quod imiteris. nam rursus quid erat futurum, si nemo plus effecisset eo quem sequebatur? nihil in poetis supra Livium Andronicum, nihil in historiis supra pontificum annales haberemus; ratibus adhuc navigeremus, non esset pictura nisi quae lineas modo extremas umbrae quam corpora in sole fecissent circumscriberet. (*Inst. Or.* 10.2.7)

> It is also disgraceful to be satisfied simply to attain the standard one is imitating. For again what would have happened if no one had achieved more than his chosen predecessor? We would have nothing among the poets to outdo Livius Andronicus, nothing in narratives of the past beyond the annals of the priests; we would still be sailing about on rafts, and painting would be nothing except tracing the outlines of the shadow which objects cast in the sun.

Quintilian's teleological argument requires him to present annals, again accepted as Roman historiography's point of origin, as primitive, and this undermines the sense that he is here giving a genuine assessment based on close inspection of an actual document or documents. As with Cicero,[49] there is little sign that Quintilian had direct personal access to or any real interest in pontifical annals.

The relation among the passages, and among the charges they put forward, suggests a continuum of polemic against annalistic style among critics who position themselves self-consciously outside the tradition.[50] In each case, beginning with the extract from the *Origines*, it is clear that the author has issues at stake that obstruct our view of the early annals they

[48] See Bömer 1953–4: 193–203 and Dillery 2002: 1–23; cf. Northwood 2007: 97–114.
[49] See n. 23, p. 24.
[50] Cf. Frier 1999: 220–1: Asellio 'picked up the Catonian type of raillery both at the chronicle and at the annalistic tradition through the chronicle.'

purport to present: Cato and Asellio are keen to assert the superiority of historiography as practised by them over the native tradition; Cicero and Quintilian argue the merits of advances in rhetorical practice and are eager to dissociate themselves from that polar opposite, of undeveloped style, that they identify with *annales* and annalistic practice. No representative of those unadulterated *annales* complained of by these critics survives.[51] That failure to survive seems to confirm the opinions of those condemning the works, and of course it seriously hampers efforts to understand the annalistic tradition from anything resembling an internal or sympathetic viewpoint. The effect is compounded by the fact that, while the title *Annales* enjoyed great popularity in Ennius' wake among a considerable range of diverse texts,[52] the term is only ever treated pejoratively in any ancient testimonial.

Of the criticisms under consideration, Asellio's is the most complex and extended; he alone explicitly levels the charge that *annales* lack motivational power. As a representative of the tradition of analytic historiography with roots in Thucydides' methodology, Asellio was right, I suggest, to feel threatened by annalistic procedure. Not only was annalistic historiography by definition the indigenous and therefore established mode of writing at Rome, where analytic historiography was a relatively recent foreign import; but it may be precisely because *annales* had peculiar and effective means of explaining the relationship between events and of motivating their audience to action – means very different from those on which the analytic tradition prided itself – that Asellio felt called on to take issue with them.

In an article of 2002,[53] T. P. Wiseman has suggested that prophecy and tales of wonder-working, the very type of story and of mindset from which the historians of the analytic tradition had since Thucydides wished to distance themselves, were in fact central and defining features of *annales*, whether written by priests, poets or historians. Two passages from Florus

[51] See Frier 1999: 176–200 on the inaccessibility of the early annalistic tradition. The earliest securely historical prose works of Roman history, Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus, are themselves not pure representatives of the annalistic tradition; see e.g. Gelzer 1933: 129 and Cornell 2010: 102–15. By the time we reach Livy and Tacitus, the amalgamation of the local annalistic tradition with other brands of historiography in a compromised annalistic structure is notorious; cf. Jacoby 1949; Ginsburg 1981: esp. 96–100; Frier 1999: 201–5; and Rich 2011.

[52] On the development of the use of this title in the Roman historiographical tradition, see Frier 1999: 216–19, with the suggestion that the growth in its popularity, visible especially in the period starting *c.* 135 BCE, was indeed due primarily to Ennius (*ibid.* 217, n. 48). Beyond the confines of that tradition, *Annales* are also attested for Accius, for Furius Bibaculus and for the Volusius of Catullus 36 – where, however, I suggest that it would be possible to read *annales* as a mocking insult, rather than (or as well as) an actual title. (On these further hexametric *Annales*, see also Chapter 4, n. 79, pp. 218–19.)

[53] Wiseman 2002: esp. 353–61. (Ennius, *Ann.* 15–16, with its reference to Anchises' power of prophecy, is adduced on 259.)

(1.10.3 and 1.6) nicely illustrate Wiseman's sense of *annales* and their ancient prerogative of inducing faith in what might otherwise have been considered incredible:[54]

> tunc illa Romana prodigia atque miracula, Horatius, Mucius, Cloelia; quae nisi in annalibus forent, hodie fabulae viderentur.
>
> At that time, all those portentous and amazing Roman happenings went on: Horatius, Mucius, Cloelia. Were they not on record in the annals, they would seem to us today sheer invention.
>
> hoc tunc Veii fuere. nunc fuisse quis meminit? quae reliquiae, quod vestig ium? laborat annalium fides, ut Veios fuisse credamus.
>
> That, in its day, was Veii. Who nowadays remembers that it once was? What remains, what trace of it is around? Our trust in annals has a hard task in seeing to it that we believe that Veii even existed.

Wiseman argues that, while the stories of the prodigious properly recorded in *annales* elicited scorn as the tradition came under increasing pressure from rationalistic trends in historiography – and indeed, as Frier points out, in Florus' remarks, too, irony is not missing – one significant original function of *annales* was to support belief in the gods' concern for mortals.[55] Wiseman cites Cicero, *Div.* 1.33 as evidence for that function:

> negemus omnia, comburamus annales, ficta haec dicamus, quidvis denique potius quam deos res humanas curare fateamur.
>
> Let's deny it all, let's burn the annals, let's say it's an invention anything at all rather than admit that the gods care about human affairs![56]

In demonstrating the gods' concern for mortals by means of the types of happenings they recorded, *annales*, in Wiseman's view, inculcated a vision of moral order and gave Romans a reason to listen and respond to moral exhortation; *annales* in whatever form were vehicles for the moral and political education of the Roman people.

Analytic historians since Thucydides had sedulously advertised their use of autopsy and primary source-material and their attention to cause and political motivation. These methods and concerns differentiated them from their poetic and prose predecessors and contemporaries and thus gave them a place of their own within recognised ancient literary and historiographical

[54] Both passages are also quoted by Frier 1999: 223–4.

[55] Cf. also Livy 43.13.2 (quoted on pp. 71–2), which also makes the communications of gods with Rome via prodigies central to *annales*.

[56] Transl. Wiseman 2002: 341. (This passage is equally quoted by Frier 1999: 222, in the course of an argument about how different authors consider the annalistic tradition.)

territory. In this sense, Asellio was doing no more than stating his allegiance to his chosen brand of historiography by expressing scepticism about the veracity of claims of supernatural happenings and of their relevance to historical developments, and by distancing his own work explicitly from records that made such claims.[57] That these claims were registered in *annales* as opposed to in poetry or other types of historiography, and thus that *annales* as opposed to other targets elicit Asellio's critical attention, is simply a reflection of the fact that, at Rome, *annales* constituted a form of competition that practitioners of analytic historiography needed to take seriously (just as Thucydides' primary targets were Homer and Herodotus).[58] Asellio, I suggest, took issue with *annales* on account of their power to motivate precisely because such texts were the ones which, in the Roman context, most effectively threatened analytic history on the territory on which it traditionally felt most at home: the inculcation in its audience of a vision of the workings of the world, albeit from a completely different angle from that typically presented by analytic history.

Asellio at any rate had good reason to feel threatened: annalistic history was in his day on the cusp of being able to remodel analytic history more or less to its own liking and from its peculiar, Romanocentric perspective. Frier notes that 'the time was fast approaching when the local history of Rome, the *annales*, would be amalgamated within the tradition of 'Great' historiography, for the simple reason that Roman history was identical with world history'.[59] The relationship between the two traditions was effectively consummated in the works of Livy and Tacitus, who both preferred to amalgamate the annalistic tradition's exclusive focus on Rome and its chronological framework with a rationalising approach and, above all, with a transformative sense of the significance to the world at large of what was being recorded.[60] However broad an alliance they formed with other, more intellectually ambitious forms of historiography, *annales* were to retain a dominant stake in Roman historiography for the foreseeable future, whether they surfaced via the dating-mechanism associated with them or via the habit retained from their practice of recording the types of natural and supernatural events associated with

[57] Frier suggests restoring the context of a fragment of Book 1 of Asellio (frg. 2A P), . . . *et quod bubo in* culmine *aedis Iovis sedens conspectus est*, to something along the lines of 'It is demeaning for an historian to interrupt his narrative because some trivial prodigy occurred, and because an owl was seen sitting on the roof of the Capitolium' (Frier 1999: 220–1).

[58] *HPW* 1.10.3–5 and 1.21; see Woodman 1988: 1–69; Fornara 1983: 8, 48, 97, 99–100; and Goldhill 2002: 31–44.

[59] Frier 1999: 218, who cites (*ibid.* n. 51) Jacoby 1949: 398, n. 56 and the 'prefaces' of Sisenna (frg. 1–4 P) and Tacitus (*Ann.* 1.1).

[60] Cf. n. 51, p. 34.

them; above all, however, their contribution was to insist that the *caput rerum*, the criterion determining whether or not a piece of information was worth recording, was nothing other than Rome.

Frier, in the quotation above, is talking about a point in time in the first century BCE, more or less at the end of (what we largely assume to be) the annalistic tradition proper, after which *annales* survived only in heavily adulterated forms. The argument of Chapter 5 will make the case that Ennius' incorporation of *annales*, in the sense of Romanocentric history, into an Homeric narrative already achieved something of the transition and offered just such a new perspective on the affairs of Rome. For now, my point is simply that we have no reason to accept uncritically any ancient assessment of *annales* even with regard to those hypothetical, prose representatives of the original form, whose remnants are so hard to trace,[61] much less with regard to the complex literary experiment represented by Ennius' epic.

It is noteworthy that in fact neither Cato nor Asellio nor Cicero nor Quintilian directly involves Ennius in their complaints about annalistic writing.[62] Perhaps because of the poem's generic dissimilarity from the works their criticism targeted (that is, those of the critics' more immediate, prose competitors), they either did not perceive a relationship between the pontifical chronicle and the epic like the one they are usually taken to imply between the chronicle and early works of prose historiography, or they did not think of that relationship as exercising a definitive influence on the overall effect of Ennius' work. It is therefore all the more striking that such characteristics as these authors attribute to 'annals' have come to be understood as the shared properties of any work that appropriated the name, including Ennius' epic.[63]

[61] See n. 9, p. 20. [62] Cf. n. 35, p. 28.

[63] These characteristics include '[exceedingly arid] style; function as public history; plethora of factual detail; eponymous form; narrowly Roman viewpoint; aristocratic bias; and quasi-religious perspective' (Frier 1999: 19–20, with regard to the respects in which scholars have understood Roman prose annalistic historiography to be linked to the pontifical chronicle). Some recent work, notably Gildenhard 2003, has begun tactfully to avoid such established assumptions about the epic as to all appearances emanate from the pejorative ancient assessments of *annales* discussed above. Nevertheless, some still highly authoritative descriptions of Ennius' epic make the poem sound strikingly like *annales* as their ancient critics have them. See e.g. Jocelyn 1972: 1008–9, quite explicitly on the basis of a putative substantive and stylistic link between Ennius' epic and the priestly records, and using reference to Cic. *Leg.* 1.6, *De or.* 2.51 and *Brut.* 106 to explain the sort of baldness characterising, as a mannerism, 'many an Ennian verse' (1972, with n. 219 there); often cited and used, as e.g. by Northwood 2007: 107. Not all the characteristics of annalistic texts, conventionally understood (as quoted from Frier), are objectionable: for example, their 'function as public history'. Frier's 'narrowly Roman viewpoint' might be taken to entail the strong Romanocentricity that is in my view probably the most important function of the reflexes of *annales* in Ennius' epic. I do not, however, follow (e.g.) Jocelyn (1972) or Conte 1986: 144 (cp. *ibid.* 74–5, 157, 163) in understanding a single point of view, that of the Roman state, as the only lens through which events were presented; see Elliott 2007.

The traditional understanding of what the title *Annales* implies, with which we began this chapter, rests ultimately on two things: first, the ancient verdicts just discussed and, second, the failure to survive of those pre-Livian works that adopted the title or that are otherwise associated with the annalistic tradition. Belief in significant formal resemblances between Ennius' epic and the annalistic tradition thus understood has arguably had a palpable effect on central modern assessments of Ennius' work in at least four major areas: its artistic character and design; its political perspective and the place of its ideology in the history of the texts of the epic tradition; the nature of its relationship to and of its depiction of actual historical events; and its presentation of the divine sphere and the relationship between gods and men. We will here pause briefly to summarise these aspects of the poem as thus presented in established scholarship on the *Annales*.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF ENNIUS' *ANNALES* IN THE ASSESSMENT OF MODERN SCHOLARS

The poem's economy

On the basis of a series of fragments to be examined below (identical with those cited by Otto Skutsch in his summary of the origin of the poem quoted on p. 19), Franz Skutsch believed that in composing the poem Ennius applied a principle of straightforward chronological progression in a manner that (despite what we see in Livy and Tacitus) from the outset put paid to the notion of an artistic design for the whole: 'Einen kunstvollen Gesamtplan kann man schon der annalistischen Abfolge wegen für das große Epos kaum voraussetzen.'[64] His son, Otto Skutsch, tacitly demurred when he described the structure of the *Annales* as, in Ennius' conception,

[64] Skutsch 1905: 2604. He continues: 'Diese aprioristische Annahme findet ihre Bestätitgung darin, daß der Dichter sein Werk stückweise ausgearbeitet und bei verhältnismäßig unbedeutenden Ereignissen seiner Zeit mit besonderer Breite verweilt hat.' (But see pp. 60–6, on narrative choices and authorial control.) It is a fairly widespread assumption that Ennius treated the *Annales*, understood as a narrative organised (if that is the right word) by chronological continuity alone, as simply extendible, and that the result in artistic terms was fairly grotesque. See e.g. Suerbaum's comments: 'Ennius . . . hat in einem kompositorischen Misgriff ein reihendes Epos geschrieben, das gewissermassen keine Mitte und kein Ende hatte (und von Ennius in der Tat offenbar mehrfach über das zunächst anscheinend den Abschluß bildende XV. Buch hinaus "verlängert" worden ist) und das bestenfalls aus Teileinheiten (z.B. Buch VII–IX, 1. und 2. Punischer Krieg) besteht' (from the discussion recorded at Wülfing-von Martitz 1972: 288; and 'Ennius himself treated the *Annales* as extendible' (Gratwick 1982: 66). Conington's comment, that Aeneas' characterisation of an account of his trials to date as *annales* . . . *nostrorum laborum* (*Aen.* I.373) suggests 'the notion of a minute and rather tedious narrative' (Conington and Nettleship 1883), provides an example of the application of a similar understanding of the term to a different narrative. Such impressions of the *de facto* design of an

initially five, then six, groups of three thematically related books ('triads'), and many scholars have subscribed to the (minimalist) view that some such organisational principle must have pertained;[65] as C. J. Classen points out, book-division and, beyond that, the postulated triadic organisation constitute something of an interpretation of the narrative material at hand and in themselves make the *Annales* something other than 'annalistic'.[66] Despite this, an assumption of strict 'annalistic' procedure governing the economy of the poem survived strongly enough in Otto Skutsch's view that he arranged the fragments, and defended the result, on the basis of that assumption.[67] Skutsch rarely faces how poorly a chronology as strict as he assumes fits with the idea that the poet had an overall artistic design;[68] he simply privileges the former idea over the latter, especially in matters of

'annalistic' text and the resulting effect on its audience has a history in Cicero's comment in his letter to L. Lucceius, *etenim ordo ipse annalium mediocriter nos retinet quasi enumeratione fastorum* (*Fam.* 5.12.5), cited by Frier 1999: 138.

[65] See Appendix Table A1.1 for triadic structure and Stadter 1972: 304–7 (Appendixes 1 and 2), with Chapter 4, pp. 213–15, for comparison with Livy. The thesis that the *Annales* were composed in triads is generally accepted (Leo 1913: 166–71; Skutsch 1968: 19–20; cf. 28, n. 4, Gratwick 1982: 60, Skutsch 1985: 5–6, though it was strongly rejected by F. Skutsch (Skutsch 1905: 2610). An alternative theory (Vahlen's) of hexads was also rejected by him (*loc. cit.*). Jocelyn, too, expresses the conviction that something other than mere chronological enumeration of events governed Ennius' narrative: 'Ennius did not relate events day by day as the pontiffs did [Serv. *Aen.* 1.373, . . . *per singulos dies* Jocelyn's n. 222 *ad loc.*] but treated military campaigns as wholes. . . His basic unit of composition was not the pontiff's whitened board but the Hellenistic book trade's average-lengthed papyrus roll' (Jocelyn 1972: 1009–10).

[66] Classen 1992: 133–4.

[67] Skutsch makes it a principle on which his text is constructed that the narrative was strictly chronological and inclusive; as a result, he insists on a continuous narrative sequence: e.g. 'Our skeleton story [of the first Punic War, posited by Skutsch, despite Cic. *Brut.* 76 (see n. 69), to acquit Ennius of "leaving a large factual and chronological gap in the narrative"] . . . is *a priori* more likely to have had its correct chronological place' (Skutsch 1985: 386); '[i]t is in fact unthinkable that the First Macedonian War, 217–205 BCE, was treated by Ennius either not at all or altogether outside its chronological context' (*ibid.* 496); 'although th[e] victory [at Beneventum in 275 BCE] would have made an effective conclusion to the book [i.e. Book 6] it seems probable that the poet mentioned some events of the next eleven years up to the outbreak of the First Punic War [i.e. the understood beginning of Book 7]' (*ibid.* 328–9); cp. '[p]resumably the story [i.e. the narrative of Book 12] went on until 193 BCE, so as to allow Book XIII to begin with the outbreak of the Syrian War' (*ibid.* 529); '[i]n mentioning in Book XIV Scipio's misfortune in 184 Ennius would have set aside chronological sequence' (*ibid.* 549), this last instance and its consequences for Skutsch's editorial activity noted also by Flores *et al.* 2006: 379. Classen points out that editors' beliefs about the possibility of chronological breaks in the narrative depend on their assumptions about the nature of the particular kind of historiography at work. Classen believes it likely that the *Annales* were punctuated by chronological caesurae, but acknowledges that the state of our knowledge of the text denies us any real access to where they were (Classen 1992: 133–4).

[68] The problem is no different from that which Livy faced, and it is at any rate conceivable that Ennius achieved a similar degree of success as did Livy, with perhaps similar means of achieving it: that is, episodic construction within a generally chronological framework. It is only the degree of rigidity Skutsch insists on for his inclusive annalistic structure and depends on for the details of his reconstruction (see nn. 67, 69 and 70) that is problematic.

detail, but uses the latter to supply his sense of the poem's large-scale architecture. In a brief moment in the introduction to his edition where he does bring the two ideas into conjunction, he makes the poet sound haphazard and a little cavalier: 'if . . . [Ennius] had mapped out the distribution of matter in the way we reconstruct it, a certain desultory manner, concentrating on some aspects and omitting or hardly mentioning others, would have enabled him to remain within the prearranged framework'.[69] The conceptual difficulty for an overall vision of the *Annales* resulting from presupposing *both* an unyielding 'annalistic' procedure *and* a master-plan is further visible in Skutsch's need to assume gigantic (and probably also widely varying) book-lengths.[70]

Politics and the Roman epic tradition

The tenor of the narrative and its political agenda are likewise, in the established modern account, significantly determined by the idea that Ennius' narrative came in a direct line of descent from the contemporary priestly chronicle (although in this case at least one other factor abets the resulting interpretation of the poem, as we shall see below). Thus for example, H.D. Jocelyn writes: 'Firm evidence about the precise contents of these [priestly] records in the early second century is scanty, but the stance from which they considered events, namely as to whether the gods of the state approved or disapproved, was certainly that adopted by Ennius'; even so, Jocelyn was immediately forced to qualify the last phrase with a footnote: '[Ennius] shuddered, however, at the burial alive of Minucia in 337.'[71] Such statements about the poem's politics are widely accepted,[72] but tend not to be provable on the basis of the fragments. They emerge instead from two sources: first, from a sense of those surrounding narrative

[69] Skutsch 1985: 6. 'omitting or hardly mentioning' refers to the controversy surrounding Cicero's *reliquisset* at *Brut.* 76 (see further pp. 60–1). For Skutsch's underlying reluctance to see Ennius selecting or manipulating his narrative material, see n. 67, p. 39. But his 'concentrating on some aspects and omitting or hardly mentioning others' must be right, on logistical grounds alone, and it furthermore fits with what we understand of his ambitions and his position in literary history; cf. '[o]ne of the most striking features of Hellenistic histories . . . is the way in which certain points in time were privileged in coverage over others' (Clarke 1999a: 154–5).

[70] Book 7 'may have run to a length of well over 2,000 lines', Vahlen's guess of 1,500–1,800 lines per book 'err[ing], if at all, on the side of caution' (Skutsch 1985: 369). Cp. Gratwick 1982: 60, subscribing to books of 1,000–1,700 lines each. Comparison with the 1,780 lines of Book 4 of Apollonius are, for Skutsch, grounds for ignoring Wilamowitz' and Timpanaro's warnings, duly reported by him (Skutsch 1985: 369), that more is assigned to Book 7 than any single book could possibly have contained.

[71] Jocelyn 1972: 1008. The reference to Minucia (*Ann.* 158) comes in his n. 204.

[72] For instances in more recent scholarship, see e.g. Conte 1994b: 449 and Keith 2000: 9–18.

traditions which are felt to be pertinent to the text as constructed by Ennius – hence the gesture towards the contemporary annalistic tradition, despite the limitations on our access to it and despite the unlikelihood that Ennius used it in any straightforward way. Other obviously relevant narrative traditions, such as that of Homeric poetry, suggest a rather different direction as regards the politics of the text.[73] Jocelyn's statement fails to take into account such aspects of the poem as, for example, that large proportions of it are composed of direct speech, which offers great opportunity for the introduction of points of view other than that of the Roman state, construed as a univocal monolith. Furthermore, the major surviving speeches are in the voice of women (Ilia) or enemies of the Roman state (Pyrrhus, Antiochus), and these characters are often presented with great sympathy and granted great eloquence.[74] Such elements of the poem, rescued from oblivion by their appeal to such informed readers as Cicero, arguably offer the possibility of less one-dimensional readings of the politics of the poem and surely deserve greater privilege in our major accounts of it.[75]

The second source from which readings such as Jocelyn's of the poem's political stance emerge is ancient readers, both early ones (again, crucially, Cicero), who knew the full text well but who also had vested interests in how its politics were read, and later ones, such as Augustine, who probably had no access to the original text and who accepted earlier readings of the fragments at face value.[76] It is an important fact about the poem that such readings of it existed and were persuasive and influential. They result from the treatment by Cicero and others of a small number of widely quoted fragments, notably *Ann.* 156, *moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque* ('by its laws of old and by its men the Roman state stands firm'), and *Ann.* 363, *unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem* ('one man alone, by delaying, righted our state').[77] These two fragments are already at a peak of popularity

[73] See Elliott 2007: 39, n. 6. [74] See Elliott 2007 for expansion of the argument sketched here.

[75] Sander Goldberg makes a point similar to the one developed here, although his grounds for doing so are different: 'Preoccupation with the historical and prosopographical evidence required to set the fragments of [Ennius'] epic in plausible sequence has encouraged scholars to assume and then to reconstruct a political agenda for the poet as well as for his poem. They call Ennius *poeta cliens* and interpret his epic as an instrument of Fulvian propaganda. This dark or at least demeaning approach to Rome's first major poet warrants review. The very point of his *Annals* is at issue, and so is the nature of its influence on the subsequent course of Latin literature' (Goldberg 1995: 114).

[76] For Augustine's total dependence on Cicero for his access to the *Annales*, see Skutsch 1985: 28–9 and 714, citing D. Ohlman, *De S. Aug. Dial.*, diss. Argentor. 1897, 60; as well as Appendix tables A5.3 on Cicero and A5.22 on Augustine as sources for the *Annales*.

[77] Conte quotes *Ann.* 513, *qui vincit non est victor nisi victus fatetur*, *Ann.* 574, *omnes mortales sese laudarier optant*, and *Ann.* 233, *fortibus est fortuna viris data*, as further examples, also comparing *Ann.* 259–60, *et rursus multae fortunae forte recumbunt:/haudquaquam quemquam semper fortuna secuta est*.

in antiquity, as the rate of their quotation shows, and they maintain that popularity among modern readers. In the form in which they survive, they have a marked aphoristic, even oracular, quality, which their sources are, for their own purposes, eager to promote;[78] and thus the lines come to seem absolute pronouncements, requiring acceptance without controversy. Never in antiquity and rarely enough even in modern scholarship is the fragments' decontextualised state, and its contribution to effecting the apparent aphorism, taken into account.[79] Yet there are a number of considerations that make it unlikely, on balance, that the tone associated with these fragments as we have them governed the poem altogether. Context would almost inevitably have interfered with the statements' demand for acceptance, since it is the vacuum in which the fragments exist that above all else, in isolating them, gives them their doctrinaire aura. (Were they pronounced by morally dubious characters? Did anyone get to gainsay the authority propounding them?) The fact that speech abounds in the poem (as is typical of epic poetry) makes it likely that statements or points of view were frequently contested. Moreover, on balance, the number of apparently aphoristic lines among those surviving is very few, while the remainder of fragments giving us narrative, speech and Homerising description creates a very different impression. Finally, Cicero, our principal source for the aphoristic lines and our principal authority for their absolutist interpretation, likewise supplies us with an abundance of fragments that contradict the idea that the poem's overarching tone was chauvinist and monolithic.

As the concentric circles widen from such central foci of scholarship about Ennius, the effects of 'annalistic' assumptions and their corollaries are only compounded. Gian Biagio Conte's influential account of Roman literary history picks up on elements present in the descriptions of the *Annales* by Skutsch and Jocelyn quoted above, when he writes that:

> the Latin epic norm [as represented by Naevius and Ennius] establishes that the substance of its contents should, in particular, be identified with the

[78] See further Chapter 3, pp. 164–5 on Cicero's use of *Ann.* 363–5.

[79] See, however, Conte: 'The fragmentary state of such lines from Naevius or Ennius, torn out of context – isolated relics of a narrative continuum – may certainly be supposed to have heightened their apophthegmatic resonance. There is a danger of attributing to these declarations a function they did not possess, that of being a verdict, a maxim that is always valid in its own right and can be applied as necessary.' Nevertheless, Conte immediately continues: '[But e]ven when full allowance has been made for this danger, they still display the morally binding tone that is used in announcing a general decision. This quality makes the author's assertion appear ineluctable and of permanent validity' (Conte 1986: 145). For a different approach to the problem, see Elliott 2007: 41–3.

> supremacy of the state as an embodiment of the public good, with the acceptance of divine will as providential guidance, and with the historical ratification of heroic action; thus it involves the careful preservation of these contents in the annalistic forms of historiography, authorized by the official institutions of Rome.[80]

Denis Feeney's 1989 review immediately challenged such a view of the *Annales*, which involved denying that the characters of the *Annales* were allowed any voice of their own that could complicate the status of an (assumed) dominant ideology.[81]

Ennius and historicity

Ideas of what an 'annalistic' text entailed also affect what scholars believe about the presentation of historical events in the *Annales*. Skutsch, for instance, has strong confidence in the value of the epic as an historical source,[82] and this is formative of his interpretation of the text (see the commentary *passim*). The issue tends to be bound up with how scholars imagine Ennius presented the interaction between the divine and the human worlds, because of the assumption that Ennius would not have allowed the gods to intrude into a narrative of historical events, especially recent ones, about which verifiable information was available (a common prejudice). Thus, Gratwick writes:

> it will have been [with Pyrrhus in Book 6] for the first time that Ennius had occasion for a more thoroughgoing 'annalistic' presentation in the manner of Naevius. Pyrrhus was one of the earliest figures about whom there was available relatively copious and reliable information, and Ennius presents him in a very magnanimous light.[83] With Pyrrhus, Ennius had reached a

[80] Conte 1986: 144; cf. *ibid.* 74–5, 157, 163. [81] Feeney 1989: 206–7.

[82] Skutsch speaks of the *Annales* as 'one of the oldest and most important sources of Roman history . . . [For his depiction of events in the fourth and third centuries] Ennius was able to draw on official Roman records, on the family traditions of the senatorial houses, and, for the third century certainly, also on the stories he had heard at home in Calabria from the old men who had fought against Rome under King Pyrrhus. Of the war against Hannibal he was an eye-witness. The eye of the poet was not on politics but on battles, and not on the logistics of war but on its glamour and horror, and on the valour and the varying fortunes of men. And yet, if we make due allowance for that, what would the historian not give for an entire copy of the *Annals*!' (Skutsch 1968: 1–2; cf. *ibid.* 9–14). He also refers to the epic as 'the oldest witness' to an historical event (Skutsch 1985: 348), and suggests that the congruence of Ennius with a given historiographical text, such as Polybius, will point us to 'the correct version' of a given historical event (e.g. *ibid.* 537). There are many reflexes of this bent throughout his edition. For similar views, see Duckett 1915: 33–6 and O'Neal 1988: 35–9.

[83] The 'and' in this sentence is presumably disjunctive, since Ennius reconfigures Pyrrhus along lines suggested by the Achilles of *Iliad* 24, resulting in a noble and heroised version of the man, precisely the focus of Cicero, our source for Pyrrhus' speech at *Ann.* 183–90 (see pp. 167–9). By 'copious and reliable information', Gratwick appears to refer to sources for history of a kind that would not have engaged in this kind of literary re-casting.

> point only just beyond living memory, and it is interesting that the gods still participated in this book in Homeric style; there is no certain sign of them later in the poem (175f. V [= 203 4 Sk.]).
>
> . . . [By Book 7 and the third triad] there was . . . ever less scope for pure fiction, and ever more need both for the historian's methods and acumen, and the diplomat's tact to avoid giving offence by omission and distortion.[84]

One of the implications of Gratwick's words is that the text was able to fulfil its most characteristic function as an accurate historical record only when it reached a point in history when historical sources would enable a detailed tracking of the 'facts'.[85] Gratwick himself well observes (in a footnote to his comment that Ennius 'presents [Pyrrhus] in a very magnanimous light') that Appius Claudius' speech dissuading the Romans from making peace with Pyrrhus (*Ann*. 199–200) is 'directly copied from Homer (*Il*. 24.[2]01)'. But this observation is undeservedly subordinated to the sense that Ennius must at root have been aiming at an accurate, historically informed presentation of Pyrrhus. Ancient readers knew better: at *Div*. 2.115, Cicero makes Ennius his benchmark for creative reconstruction of 'historical' figures, when he asks *Herodotum cur veraciorem ducam Ennio? Num minus ille potuit de Croeso quam de Pyrrho fingere Ennius?* ('Why should I think Herodotus any more liable to give a truthful account than Ennius? Was he any the less able to be inventive about Croesus than Ennius was about Pyrrhus?'). Gratwick suggests that Book 6 represents the last gasp of the prehistorical section of the *Annales*; and this is more or less how he accommodates the use of Homer as well as Macrobius' testimony to a soliloquy of Jupiter's in this book (*Ann*. 203–4). Yet sources of all sorts testify to the consistency of Ennius' Homerising language throughout the work.[86] That consistency of language surely speaks to a consistency in the presentation of the nature of the action of the poem and makes it *prima facie* unlikely that a palpable transition took place to a less mythologising and more 'annalistic' section, more inclined towards historical records and 'fact'.

[84] Gratwick 1982: 62.

[85] More reasonable would be the assertion that Ennius' method of charting time changed – or took for the first time a less amorphous shape – with the switch to a new era, in particular with the move to the history of the Republic at the beginning of Book 4; cf. 'traditional annalistic history has no era system for the time of the kings, and begins real, properly structured temporal history with the beginning of the Republic' (Feeney 2007: 175, citing Frier 1999: 204–5 and Kraus 1994a: 10, n. 44).

[86] See Chapter 2.

The gods in the Annales

It has thus been fairly common practice to divide the *Annales* into an early 'mythological' section, consisting of Books 1–3 (sometimes stretching to Books 1–5), and the subsequent 'historical' material.[87] That division tends to correspond, as already signalled, to another, between an initial part of the text to which the gods are believed appropriate and one to which they are not: hence Gratwick's mild surprise (in the passage cited on pp. 43–4) when Macrobius attests divine intervention in Book 6, and hence his implication that we should assume that from this point on the gods' participation will fade and/or disappear.[88] Skutsch, too, is uncomfortable with the idea of the gods obtruding into the 'historical' parts of the narrative, a discomfort clearly reflected in his text.[89] Some fragments relating to Homerising divine intervention are indeed placed early in the narrative by their sources: *Ann.* 18 (*transnavit cita per teneras caliginis auras*, '[she] quickly glided through the delicate breezes of the darkness') and *Ann.* 19 (*constitit inde loci propter sos dia dearum*, 'there beside them the divine goddess came to rest') belong uncontroversially to Book 1. Similarly, the vocatives of *Ann.* 60 (*Ilia, dia nepos, quas aerumnas tetulisti*, 'Ilia, descendant of divinity, what travails have you borne'), whose speaker may be Venus, place it fairly securely in a context belonging to Book 1, and Skutsch's attribution of *Ann.* 54–5 (*unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli/templa*, 'there will be one pre-eminent whom you shall bear to the azure precincts of the sky') to Book 1 is also reasonable. But it is telling that Skutsch attributes to Book 1 *Ann.* 53 (*respondit Iuno Saturnia, sancta dearum*, 'Saturnian Juno, sacred goddess, replied'), a line that is entirely generic and could belong anywhere in the narrative, on the grounds that '[t]he context . . . seems to be the council of the gods in this book'.[90] He concedes (only) the possibility that the line could alternatively have introduced the speech of Juno that Servius (ad *Aen.* 1.281) implies for Book 8 of the *Annales*, and that therefore the line may belong

[87] Skutsch and Gratwick's acquiescence in such a division is illustrated above. It also occurs with some frequency elsewhere, e.g. Rüpke 1995b: 201: 'annalistic' presentation of time was only possible from the third century on; and Suerbaum's opposition of an 'eher mythischer Teil' and a 'rein historische[r] Teil' in his comments recorded at Wülfing-von Martitz 1972: 287.

[88] Cf. Badian: 'I cannot see any clear evidence for a *concilium deorum* after the first one (concerning Romulus). I suspect the divine machinery tended to fade out in the events of Ennius' lifetime . . . the idea of Ennius awkwardly introducing divine colloquies into events of his own generation rests (I think) only on overinterpretation of a late (and demonstrably inaccurate source) [i.e. Servius ad *Aen.* 1.20 and 1.281, cf. *ibid.* 12.481].' Badian undermines Servius' testimony, which suggests that Juppiter gave a speech in Book 7 or 8 and that Juno appeared in Book 8, with the idea that these gods figured in dreams or in religious rites, rather than directly in the action of the narrative (Badian at Wülfing-von Martitz 1972: 286).

[89] See Appendix 2 for an overview of the fragments relevant to the discussion here.

[90] Skutsch 1985: 204.

among the *sed. inc.* Skutsch's grouping of *Ann.* 53 (and its like) to an accepted instance of divine involvement, such as the council, is understandable as an effort to make sense of what we have, but its effect is to circumscribe the number of moments at which the reader of his edition is aware of divine intervention, and thus, given the influence of Skutsch's work, is liable to limit the sorts of interpretation put forward of the nature of this poem and of its relationship to other epic texts.

There are 5 more equally generic unplaced fragments of the *Annales* that uncontroversially describe direct divine action or intervention: these are *Ann.* 444 (*o genitor noster, Saturnie, maxime divom*, 'o father ours, Saturnian one, greatest of the gods'); *Ann.* 445 (*optima caelicolum, Saturnia, magna dearum*, 'best of the heaven-dwellers, Saturnian one, great goddess'); *Ann.* 446–7 (*Iuppiter hic risit tempestatesque serenae/riserunt omnes risu Iovis omnipotentis*, 'Jupiter now laughed and the skies all laughed gladly with the laugh of almighty Jupiter'); *Ann.* 553 (*effudit voces proprio cum pectore sancto*, 'he poured forth words in the sacred space of his heart'); and *Ann.* 581 (*atque manu magna Romanos impulit amnis*, 'and with his mighty hand the river drove the Romans forward'). Skutsch suggests that the first 3 belong to Book 1, placing them under that suggested heading among the *sed. inc.* It is unclear, however, what differentiates these lines from the other 2 and what thus justifies the attribution, tentative as it is. Skutsch (*ad loc.*) suggests only that 'the subject matter points to the first Book, and the line [444] may well like 445 belong to the discussion of the twins' fate'; for *Ann.* 446–7, he suggests, pointing to *Aen.* 1.254–5, that '[t]he mythological scene would fit best into the first book'. But this reasoning is clearly circular, and the effect of the resulting presentation is to flesh out a picture of heavy involvement of divine action early in the narrative but not later. In fact, if anything distinguishes *Ann.* 444 and 445 from *Ann.* 553 and 581, it is simply that they describe gods in dialogue with each other. The presentation of the fragments thus tacitly supports not only Skutsch's general sense of heavy divine involvement (only) early in the text, but also his particular belief that a divine council took place in Book 1 and only in Book 1.[91] That more fragments testifying to divine involvement are attributed to Book 1 than to any other book does not by itself necessarily indicate a heavier concentration of divine action in that book, since we have over twice as many lines for Book 1 as for any other book of the *Annales*,[92] as well as because

[91] For his reasoning and bibliography, see *ibid.* 368.

[92] We have 112 lines for Book 1. Its closest competitors are Book 8 with 50 lines, Book 7 with 40 lines, Book 6 with 39 lines and Book 10 with 30 lines. All other books have fewer than 30 surviving lines.

the number of lines involved is in any case so small (of the 11 fragments in Appendix Table A2.1, only 3 are attributed by their sources to particular books: 2 to Book 1 and 1 to Book 6).

A similar pattern is evident for lines that seem to relate to Homerising anthropomorphic divinities or beings that can be assimilated to them but that need not immediately describe direct divine intervention. (Such lines are listed in Appendix Table A2.2) Of the 5 fragments attributed by their sources to particular books, 2, *Ann.* 27 (*qui caelum versat stellis fulgentibus aptum*, 'who causes the heavens fitted with the gleaming stars to revolve') and *Ann.* 58–9 (*te †saneneta precor, Venus, te genetrix patris nostri, ut me de caelo visas, cognata, parumper*, 'you †??? I call on, Venus, you, mother to my father, to look on me from the sky, for we are kin, for a short while') are given to Book 1; 1, *Ann.* 146 (*olli de caelo laevom dedit inclutus signum*, 'to him/her from the sky the illustrious one gave a sign on the left hand side') to Book 3; 1, *Ann.* 232 (*non semper vostra evortit: nunc Iuppiter hac stat*, 'not always does he overturn your fortunes: now Jupiter takes his stand on this side') to Book 7; and 1, *Ann.* 399–400 (*arcus ubi aspicitur, mortalibus quae perhibetur/<Iris>*, 'when the rainbow appears, which to mankind is known as Iris') to Book 15. Of the 11 fragments in this category unplaced by their sources, Skutsch attributes 4 to Book 1: *Ann.* 15–16 (*doctus†que Anchisesque Venus quem pulcra dearum/fari donavit, divinum pectus habere*, '. . . and learned . . . and Anchises, to whom Venus, fair goddess, granted prophecy and the gift of an inspired heart'), *Ann.* 23–4 (*Saturno/quem Caelus genuit*, 'to Saturn whom Sky begat'), *Ann.* 25 (*cum †suo obsidio magnus Titanus premebat*, 'Titan oppressed with siege') and *Ann.* 51 (*cenacula maxuma caeli*, 'the great halls of the sky'); and 1 to Book 2: *Ann.* 113 (*olli respondit suavis sonus Egeriai*, 'to him Egeria in her sweet tones made reply'); 1 other, *Ann.* 541 (*tum tonuit laevom bene tempestate serena*, 'then he thundered in favourable omen on the left from a clear sky'), he thinks 'would seem to belong to one of the first twelve books . . . and the most likely setting is a situation in the mythological period comparable to those described by Dion. Hal. 2.5.2. and 2.5.5 [Romulus or Ascanius asking for favourable signs from the gods]';[93] for none of the rest does he venture any attribution, nor does he further discuss how they might have been distributed through the narrative. The subject-matter of *Ann.* 113, which evidently represents authorial narrative, does indeed place it in an early part of the overall narrative; but there is no guarantee that the lines placed by Skutsch in Book 1 are not spoken by

[93] Skutsch 1985: 688–9.

characters of the poem, which would free up entirely the possibilities for their location in the text. And even though Skutsch may intend no positive representation when he groups together fragments such as *Ann.* 591 (*divomque hominumque pater, rex*, 'the father of both men and gods, the king') and 592 (*patrem divomque hominumque*, 'the father of both gods and men'), and again *Ann.* 553, *effudit voces proprio cum pectore sancto* ('he poured forth words in the sacred space of his heart'), *Ann.* 554, *contremuit templum magnum Iovis altitonantis* ('the great precinct of high-thundering Jupiter shook'), and *Ann.* 555–6, *qui fulmine claro/omnia per sonitus arcet, terram mare caelum* ('who with the clear sound of thunder keeps all things in their place, the earth, the sea and the sky'), the potential effect of his doing so is again to suggest that divine action took place in discrete and compartmentalised parts of the narrative. The discovery of the Herculaneum papyrus PHerc 21 containing parts of Book 6 of the *Annales* and its publication by Knut Kleve now allows us to see that *Ann.* 555–6 (as well as *Ann.* 469–70, not relevant to the argument here) belong in Book 6.[94] This, too, supports the idea of a more evenly distributed divine presence throughout the narrative (even if this fragment need not describe direct divine intervention). As pezzo 5, frg. 1, of the papyrus, which ends with the word *div*[.], so *divi*, *diva*, *divo*, or *dive*, leads Suerbaum to remark: 'Im weiteren Verlauf des Pyrrhos-Buches haben also Götter in der Einzahl oder Mehrzahl eine Rolle gespielt.'[95]

The positive evidence for divine involvement and its consistent distribution throughout the narrative is undeniably limited. There is the arrival through the air of a goddess (*Ann.* 18 and 19),[96] attested for Book 1 by DS and Festus. The supposition of a single council of the gods in Book 1 at which Romulus is deified is the result of conjectures arising from the indirect testimony of allusions or parodic imitations in Lucilius, Horace and Ovid (as mentioned this is the context that Skutsch chooses for *Ann.* 53).[97]

[94] Kleve 1990: 5–16, discussed by Suerbaum 1995: 31–52. [95] Suerbaum 1995: 40.

[96] Skutsch's presentation implies that this occurs before the departure from Troy, in a preliminary part of the narrative. Since we know from the sources only that it occurred in Book 1, it could have happened much later in the narrative, in Italy, and indeed up to two generations after Aeneas.

[97] Our evidence for Lucilius comes from Servius ad *Aen.* 10.104, '*accipite ergo animis*': *totus hic locus de primo Lucilii translatus est, ubi inducuntur dii habere concilium, et agere primo de interitu Lupi cuiusdam ducis in re publica, postea sententias dicere*; cf. frr. 4–54 M. There is no direct mention of Ennius, but parody is assumed. In particular, it is assumed that the fragment quoted by chance by the rhetorician Julius Rufinianus (as an illustration of epanalepsis; frg. 27–9 M) refers to the putative Ennian council: *vel<lem> concilio vestrum, quod dicitis olim, / caelicolae* <hic habitum, vellem> *adfuissemus priore/concilio* (Romulus is the conjectural speaker). The reference to 'the former council' is material for an argument

Otherwise, we have Macrobius' attestation of a soliloquy by Jupiter in Book 6 (= *Ann.* 203–4) and Servius' implications of divine intervention apparently in Books 7 and/or 8 (that is, the putative location of Ennius' narrative of the Second Punic War).[98] Priscian's notice that the lines *arcus ubi aspicitur, mortalibus quae perhibetur/<Iris>* (*Ann.* 399–400) belong to Book 15, i.e. to the narrative of very recent history, gives Skutsch pause, on the grounds that 'in the books dealing with contemporary history we have no other example of divine intervention', although he does ultimately accept Priscian's attestation and print the fragment as part of Book 15.[99]

Where as small a fraction of the text survives as does in the case of the *Annales*,[100] however, the positive evidence alone can provide no sound guide to the reconstruction of the whole. Other determinants are necessary; the need to make assumptions about the overall picture is unavoidable. In the past, these lay ready to hand in the form of the presupposition that Ennius would not have described the gods as intervening directly in events accessible through living experience or historical record, as we have seen through the examples of Gratwick and Skutsch. We have, however, learned to mistrust such a presupposition, not least through Denis Feeney's powerful argument that the gods' participation in historical, including recently historical, events was a normal and expected aspect of the epic, hexametric mode (until Lucan broke the taboo, which had previously been respected even, in his way, by Lucretius).[101] Once we dispense with the idea that divine involvement was limited to the description of pre-historical material, a different reconstructive principle is needed. One place to look for guidance as to the aspect of the whole would be in the generic affiliations inscribed into the *Annales* via Ennius' choice of metre and use of language, and in the narrative paraphernalia that, to the best of our knowledge, regularly accompanied them in his day. Doing so does not necessarily produce a more reliable assumption on which to base our reconstruction but has the advantage of being rooted in Ennius' formal choices as we witness them throughout the remaining fragments. The observable stylistic tendencies of the poem as a whole – that is,

against the occurrence of councils of the gods later in the *Annales* by Timpanaro 1978: 642 (cf. Skutsch 1985: 368). Hor. *C.* 3.3, Ov. *Met.* 14.806–17 and *Fast.* 2.485–90 are also often read as relevant to an Ennian original; see Pasquali 1964: 687; Feeney 1984; Conte 1986: 57–9; and Feeney 1991: 125–7.

[98] Serv. ad *Aen.* 1.20: *in Ennio enim inducitur Iuppiter promittens Romanis excidium Carthaginis*; ad *Aen.* 1.281: *quia bello Punico secundo, ut ait Ennius, placata Iuno coepit favere Romanis*; ad *Aen.* 12.841: *constat bello Punico secundo exoratam Iunonem*.

[99] Skutsch 1985: 562.

[100] Skutsch's estimates of book-sizes (see n. 70, p. 40) would put the percentage of surviving lines at 5.

[101] Feeney 1991: 250–2.

Ennius' impressively consistent Homerising – make the presence and participation of the gods part and parcel of his narrative, the natural concomitant to his formal choices. Ennius' adoption of a detailed Homerising manner means that the positive attestations of divine intervention and its distribution are surely only marginal support for the *prima facie* likelihood that the gods were involved throughout the action of the narrative. This understanding of the text also avoids the need to bundle surviving unplaced attestations to divine intervention in the early books of the epic, in a statistically improbable fashion.

The question of the role of the gods – unlike the closely enmeshed question of the nature of the *Annales* as historiography – is one area which scholars have tended to keep separate from their sense of what the title *Annales* entailed. Jocelyn, on the one hand, as we have seen above, thought that 'the stance from which [the priestly records] considered events, namely as to whether the gods of the state approved or disapproved, was certainly that adopted by Ennius . . .';[102] but this concerns perspective, not representation within the poem. What has not been suggested is the idea that Ennius might have effected a hybridisation between the gods as a natural attribute of a Homerising work and the gods in their relations with the Roman people as the central preoccupation of non-literary *annales*. If there is any consistency in what our sources tell us about the contents of *annales*, it is that such works functioned as channels of communication between the gods and Rome, and in particular as records of what the gods had, through various means, had to say to the people of Rome (cf. Cic. *Rep*. 1.25 and *De Div*. 1.33; Gell. *NA* 4.5; Cato, *Orig*. 4, as quoted by Gell. *NA* 2.28.6; DS *Aen*. 1.373; Macr. *Sat*. 3.2.17; Isid. *Orig*. 1.44.1–4; Wiseman 2002, as cited on pp. 34–5). Unconfirmed as a hypothesis linking the representation of Homerising anthropomorphic gods to 'annalistic' concern with Rome's relations with the gods must, given our evidence, remain, it represents a different way of making sense of how the traditions of *annales* and the conventions of epic were integrated by Ennius in a single, consistent work. To the extent that a reader finds that integration and consistency a plausible attribute of the *Annales* on the basis of its surviving remains, the hypothesis suggests another reason for betting, seeing as we are in the position of having to bet one way or the other, that the lines relating to divine intervention are tokens of the representation of the anthropomorphic divinities continuously carried through to the end of the story.

[102] Jocelyn 1972: 1008.

I have argued so far that, while the poem's title demands interpretation, the traditional modern understanding of the title's implications has yielded a view of the poem as (occasionally, if not thoroughly) stylistically arid and politically doctrinaire, with a quasi-rationalising approach to historiography, wedded to strict observance of chronology and of 'facts' in terms of the description of historical personalities, historical events and historical time (the latter characteristics in particular representing a reading of the poem that emerges more strongly from Skutsch's work than from anywhere else). I have suggested that this reading warrants interrogation, not least because it is the product of an understanding of the poem's relationship to the 'annalistic' pontifical chronicle that results from compromised ancient sources. This reading isolates the traits of the annalistic tradition in the epic from the poem's other aspects, most obviously its famous relationship to Homeric poetry.[103] In Chapter 2, we will consider how our sources for the poem have prompted this segregation of characteristics in the surviving record, before moving on in the later chapters to consider what an integrated appreciation of the different generic currents surfacing through the poem's surviving remains might further look like. For now, we return to the subject of the surviving internal evidence for Ennius' use of time, which will occupy us for the rest of this chapter, and in particular to the evidence for eponymous consular dating. This evidence has traditionally served as one of the principal means of establishing a relationship between Ennius' epic and the pre-existent annalistic tradition at Rome.[104] My argument will continue to suggest that that relationship is complex and obscure and that there are no straightforward conclusions about the poem's use of time to be drawn from those few lines that have been represented as vestiges of eponymous consular dating.

[103] Some scholarship sees a radical dichotomy of style within the *Annales*. Thus Brooks Otis: 'The discrepancy between the Homeric and the historical aspects of the *Annales* is glaring . . . There is no apparent effort to maintain any uniformity of style or content: myth and history, poetry and prose, the elevated and the pedestrian are not so much combined as baldly juxtaposed' (Otis 1964: 22, 23). Cf. Goldberg 1995: 77 on Otis' comparable response to Naevius, arguing that we should be suspicious of the idea of a radical dichotomy of style within a work that otherwise gives token of stylistic unity and seek instead to understand how poetic and historical narration were effected as part and parcel of the same process, expressed via an essentially homogeneous style.

[104] For the general principle, see Frier 1999: 138: 'The *ordo annalium* is the whole recurrent structure of annalistic histories, the elections and prodigy lists and so on, each component serving to disjoint the continuity of narrative. Within the annalistic tradition, this *ordo annalium* is associated in narrative with the assumption of eponymous office by the new consuls.' (For the history of claims specific to Ennius, see p. 19, with n. 4.)

EPONYMOUS CONSULAR DATING AND THE USE OF TIME IN ENNIUS' *ANNALES*

The claim that Ennius used the dating mechanism associated with the priestly chronicle (*praescriptis consulum nominibus*; DS *Aen.* 1.373) and organised time in a fashion analogous to the chronicle rests on four surviving fragments equivalent to 5 lines:[105] *Ann.* 290, 304–5, 324 and 329, to which *Ann.* 216 and 299 are sometimes added.[106] These fragments are few enough in number, even taking into account the scarcity of the poem's remains, and they exhaust the surviving evidence for eponymous dating. They are also dubious evidence for the idea that pontifical *annales* served at all straightforwardly as Ennius' model for method of dating and organisation.[107]

Only the first of the lines, *Ann.* 290, *Quintus pater quartum fit consul* ('Quintus the father is made consul for the fourth time' – a pun, as Norden noted),[108] looks like a simple date-marker, even if one that could function equally or also as a point of narrative. Frier points out that this line, which refers to 214 BCE (Skutsch; 217 BCE, Flores), is the first instance of the use of 'annalistic' dating in the poem we can trace. He suggests that, for reasons of poetic economy,[109] such dating was avoided in books prior to Book 8 (where *Ann.* 290 is located by the dating information it contains, in conjunction with the scholarly thinking that supplies Appendix Table A1.1). In a sense, Frier's suggestion is another reflex of the thesis that, with the onset of the narrative of a more accessible historical era, the tools of the historian were co-opted, those of the poet left aside.[110] However that may be, consular dating would at any rate only have been possible with the start of the narrative of the Republic – that is, from Book 4 on, if the traditional understanding of the material covered by each book is correct (see again

[105] My observations in this section owe much to Gildenhard's argument with regard esp. to *Ann.* 304–8, which he tackles with a view to criticising the same established view of the relationship of the poem to the priestly chronicle as I do (Gildenhard 2003: 97–102). My position with regard to the 'annalistic' qualities injected into the poem by the lines in question, i.e. that they are severely compromised as a result of Ennius' hellenising artistry, is not essentially different from his. Our arguments, however, tend ultimately in different directions. See further pp. 15–16 of the Introduction, with n. 33 there.

[106] Beck and Walter 2001: 41, incl. n. 64 there. The view that *Ann.* 216 was a chronological reference in chronicle-style goes back at least to Norden (Norden 1915: 71), though he later abandoned this view of the line in favour of an argument against Ennian authorship altogether (Gercke and Norden 1927: 16).

[107] Cf. Gildenhard 2003: 102.

[108] Norden 1954: 17; cf. the interest of the source, Gell., *NA* 10.1, in the form of the numeral.

[109] Frier 1999: 140, 259. [110] Cf. pp. 43–5.

Appendix Table A1.1). Ennius began in the first three books with a different mechanism (or different mechanisms) for marking the passage of time. Either there was a radical shift in his method with the birth of the consulship (or at the point where historical records of consulships became accessible to the poet); or else something of the method(s) with which he began the work survived into the later books.

As regards *Ann.* 324,[111] *Graecia Sulpicio sorti data, Gallia Cottae* ('Greece fell by lot to Sulpicius, Gaul to Cotta'), and *Ann.* 329, *egregie cordatus homo, catus Aelius Sextus* ('the outstandingly sagacious man, sharp Aelius Sextus'), it is far from evident that they are date-markers. Furthermore, Skutsch points out that *Ann.* 324 contains an 'inaccuracy': *Italia* was the province given to Cotta.[112] That Ennius was capable of such a 'slip' suggests that his attention was not devoted to record-keeping in the way that the stories of fairly immediate descent from the chronicle imply. G. Jackson well points out the alliteration and assonance that underlined the parallelism between parisyllabic *Graecia* and *Gallia* (not to mention the second term's metrical convenience over *Italia*):[113] artistry takes precedence, this line suggests, over factual accuracy or questions of date.

Likewise, *Ann.* 216, *Appius indixit Carthaginiensibus bellum* ('Appius declared war on the Carthaginians') and *Ann.* 299, *Livius inde redit magno mactatus triumpho* ('Livius returned thence magnified by a great triumph'), offer no direct evidence for a dating-system. Scholars typically treat these lines as evidence of a pedestrian 'chronicle style' (also associated with Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*)[114] and for that reason construe them too as representative of an association between the chronicle and Ennius' epic and so indicative of probable 'annalistic' dating.[115] Yet the source for *Ann.*

[111] Neither this line nor *Ann.* 216 are attributed by their sole sources (Isid. *Orig.* 1.36.3 and Cic. *Inv.* 27, respectively) to Ennius. For the doxography of their insertion into the *Annales*, see Flores *et al.* 2006: 152 and Flores *et al.* 2002: 202–4. Although Skutsch's arguments for Ennian authorship of *Ann.* 216 in particular are acceptable, it is noteworthy that 2 out of the 5 lines regularly cited as evidence of kinship between the epic and the chronicle are attributed to the *Annales* only by modern conjecture. As regards *Ann.* 324, Skutsch argues that an early author is expected between Lucilius and Terence and that 'the subject matter points straight to the *Annals*' (Skutsch 1985: 500). I accept the first point, but the second is an example of circular reasoning, especially pernicious in that there is so little evidence for the point which Skutsch is using this line to support.

[112] Skutsch 1985: 500. See Goldberg 1995: 116–17 for discussion of the aesthetic merits of the line (and of why it should not be used to make a case for seeing the *Annales* as a vehicle of political partisanship).

[113] Flores *et al.* 2006: 156–7. See also *ibid.* 165–7 Jackson on *Ann.* 329.

[114] See Altheim in Pöschl 1969: 340–66.

[115] See e.g. Norden 1954: 16; Beck and Walter 2001: 46. *Ann.* 324 has also frequently been characterised as illustrative of 'annalistic' style; see Flores *et al.* 2006: 154. Rüpke argues similarly of *Ann.* 290, 304–6, with 324 and 329 cited as comparanda (Rüpke 1995b: 200–01, incl. his n. 83); he does, however caution against imagining that Ennius assembled his entire work in 'annalistic' fashion.

216, Cicero, quotes it in the course of parsing literary *narratio* (that is, *narratio* 'which is spoken and written to give pleasure and to provide helpful practice'), as an instance of *historia*.[116] He has thus selected the line precisely because it is a simple statement of fact. This makes it an easy target, out of context as it is, for pegging as 'annalistic', since Asellio in particular directs us to understand *annales* as mere logs of historical fact (see pp. 30–1 and 34–7). At the same time, Cicero's use of the line suggests that, for him, its narrative function was paramount over the function as a dating-mechanism attributed to it in modern times.[117] Even if these exiguous decontextualised remains do not in fact deceive, and Ennius, perhaps like Naevius, occasionally imitated a register found in official state language, there is small reason either to construe such a style as antithetical to poetry or to literary language in general,[118] or to associate it strongly with the priestly chronicle (as opposed to the inscriptional, antiquarian and literary material which is the only surviving evidence that such a style existed in Ennius' day).[119] There is certainly very little here to secure a theory of 'annalistic' use of time in Ennius' intensely Homerising epic.

The final fragment is more complex, and its full 5 lines are all crucial to Cicero (our source)'s argument.[120] Cicero's quotation, at *Brut*. 58–9, reads as follows:[121]

[116] Cic. *Inv*. 1.27: *narratio est rerum gestarum aut ut gestarum expositio. narrationum tria genera sunt . . . tertium genus [narrationis] est remotum a civilibus causis, quod delectationis causa non inutili cum exercitatione dicitur et scribitur. eius partes duae sunt, quarum altera in negotiis, altera in personis maxime versatur . . . [prior] tres habet partes: fabulam, historiam, argumentum. fabula est in qua nec verae, nec veri similes res continentur . . . historia est gesta res, ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota, quod genus [*Ann. *216]. argumentum est ficta res, quae tamen fieri potuit. . .*

[117] Cf. Flores *et al.* 2002: 203. Tomasco there cites Norden 1915: 71–2 as a scholar for whom the line's function as a chronological referent was of primary importance.

[118] See Goldberg 1995: 76–82. Goldberg charts and assesses the scholarly history of the idea of a 'chronicle style' in Naevius and argues effectively against pressing a strong distinction between such a style and poetic elaboration. With regard to Livy, Pinsent presents the 'chronicle' style as the historians' proper vehicle for 'certain types of historical notice' and suggests that 'they cast into it materials which they derived from other sources than the Annals [of the priests], and even that which they invented' (Pinsent 1959: 82). Jackson offers an excellent aesthetic appreciation of the poetic qualities of both *Ann*. 216 and *Ann*. 299 (Flores *et al.* 2002: 204–5 and Flores *et al.* 2006: 51–1).

[119] See Leo 1913: 80–1; Fraenkel 1935: 638–9; McDonald 1957: 155–75; Pinsent 1959: 81–5; and again Goldberg 1995: 76–82.

[120] Cf. Gildenhard 2003: 98–100, for insistence on reading the full five lines of the fragment, not isolating the first three, as is typically done by those using the line as evidence of routine consular dating. The lines are also discussed at Fränkel 1935: 64–6 and Goldberg 1995: 94–5. Frier points out that the use here of *praenomen*, *nomen*, paternal *praenomen*, and *cognomen*, duplicates the pattern found on the earliest Roman sarcophagi we know (Frier 1999: 140, with his n. 9).

[121] Cf. Prinzen 1998: 163–5 for a discussion of Cicero's use of Ennius here.

> Est igitur sic apud [Ennium] in nono ut opinor annali:
>
> additur orator Cornelius suaviloquenti
> ore Cethegus Marcus Tuditano collega
> Marci filius. is dictus popularibus ollis,
> qui tum vivebant homines atque aevom agitabant,
> flos delibatus populi Suadaique medulla. [*Ann.* 304 8]
>
> Et oratorem appellat et suaviloquentiam tribuit . . . sed ea laus eloquentiae certe maxima 'is dictus ollis popularibus. . .'; probe vero; ut enim hominis decus ingenium, sic ingeni ipsius lumen est eloquentia, qua virum excellen tem praeclare tum illi homines florem populi esse dixerunt.
>
> So there is the following notice in [Ennius], in the ninth book, I think it is, of the *Annals*:
>
> 'Joined as colleague to Tuditanus is the sweet voiced speaker Marcus Cornelius Cethegus, the son of Marcus. He was pronounced by his fellows of that era the men who were then alive and living out their years to be the choicest flower of the people and the very soul of Persuasion.'
>
> He both calls him an orator and he attributes sweetness of speech to him . . . but it is, for sure, when he says 'he was pronounced by his fellows of that era . . .' that he pays the greatest compliment to his eloquence. And that is very fitting; for as a man's finest glory is his intellectual capacity, so the very acme of his mind is his eloquence, on account of which the men of that day at that time said, most excellently, that that outstanding man was 'the very flower of the people'.

The reference to Cethegus and Tuditanus tells us that the year in question in this fragment is 204 BCE.[122] At the time Ennius wrote the lines, barely thirty years had elapsed since those dates, and so the expressions 'his fellows of that era' and 'the men who were then alive and living out their years' have occasioned considerable scholarly comment. Hermann Fränkel thought that Ennius intended by his emphasis to represent the judgment of Cethegus' oratorical skills by his contemporaries as antiquated, the irruption of Greek learning into Rome in the intervening thirty years having made all the difference.[123] Skutsch, however, points out that Cicero betrays no sense that the compliment to Cethegus is in any way barbed, as Fränkel would have it:[124] *orator . . . suaviloquenti/ore* is not qualified, and it issues from the narrative voice itself. Skutsch's own suggestion is that the explanation lay simply in Ennius' nostalgic old age: 'Perhaps we need no explanation of the somewhat surprising *qui tum vivebant*, etc. other than that Ennius, writing Book IX when he was well over sixty, felt old and

[122] Skutsch 1985: 481–2. [123] Fränkel 1935: 64–6, cited by Skutsch. [124] Cf. Prinzen 1998: 165.

remembered with regret the generation which was leading Rome when he arrived there, and whose main representatives had now passed away.'[125] Following Skutsch's line of reasoning in his response to Fränkel, I would argue that Cicero's lines suggest that the compliment in the expressions *flos . . . populi* and *Suadai . . . medulla* had everything to do with the excellent judgement of Cethegus' 'ancient' contemporaries;[126] Cicero selects not just the compliments themselves but the whole lines which dwell so emphatically on the antiquity of those originators of the judgement, and he himself repeats Ennius' emphasis in his own words, *tum illi homines* (no doubt wishing that his own contemporaries could attain the same insight in appreciating oratory). While the self-serving nature of Cicero's appraisal is evident,[127] it seems unlikely that he would have presented his immediate audience, who knew the full text, with a reading wholly unlikely to convince. Rather, he knew how to capitalise on the veneration due to a judgement originated by 'ancients' – men who were indeed so from Cicero's historical perspective *and* already presented as such in the *Annales*, despite their real temporal proximity to the moment at which Ennius wrote. That the compliment was so emphatically attributed to men of 'an earlier' generation – even if, for the original audience, that, in historical terms, only meant the immediately preceding one – is part of its value; the 'antiquity' of those to whom the compliment is attributed is felt to be at the root of the right-mindedness and delicacy of the compliment itself. There is a feeling towards past generations reminiscent of that in the famous Homeric expressions contrasting the strength of epic heroes with that of 'men such as they are now'[128] – only with a substitution of values, the political skill of the orator replacing brute strength.[129] The parallel is abetted by vocabulary such as *ollis* and the Graecising compound *suaviloquenti*,

[125] Skutsch 1985: 482.

[126] Cf. the two extant examples of Ennius' use of *antiquus* in the *Annales*: *moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque* (*Ann*. 156) and . . . *suavis homo* . . . *scitus* . . . *multa tenens antiqua* (*Ann*. 282); both express an unequivocal good.

[127] Cf. the passage immediately following (*Brut*. 60), in which Cicero's interest is on the temporal relationship of the consulship of Cethegus and Tuditanus, during which Cato was quaestor, to his own. His focus as a whole in the passage is on oratory, and the strong implication is that his own position in the line of great Roman orators was the culminating one.

[128] As e.g. at *Il*. 12.447–9 and 20.285–7, examples borrowed from Goldberg 1995: 106–7 (not on the passage under consideration here). Goldberg's argument there likewise suggests that the evocation of Homeric-style heroes in Ennius does not serve to 'foster such distance between them and his readers. Just the opposite. Describing the tribune at Ambracia like Ajax at the ships equates the Roman soldier and the epic hero. In the present passage, Ennius has deliberately done what he can to obscure the distance between the legendary past and contemporary reality . . .'

[129] See Mariotti 1991: 111–14 for *sapientia* as a cardinal value in the *Annales*.

which recalls similar formations in Homer,[130] as well as by the Homeric redundancy of the phrase *qui tum vivebant homines atque aevom agitabant*.[131] By means of these Homerising linguistic moves and phrase-structures, the poet creates an archaic patina for Cethegus and his generation. The shift in temporal perspective these lines effect shows Ennius subordinating his own particular historical situation and that of his immediate audience in relation to his subject-matter and instead privileging the perspective of future generations – not without benefit to Ennius' more immediate audience. For them, an ennobling view was on offer of those generations to whom they were most closely allied (hence, practically, of themselves): the poem allowed them a glimpse of themselves from the point of view of their future descendants as they read the *Annales*. The lines may also constitute a reference to local Roman practice and so constitute a reminder of Rome's all-importance as presented in this text; but, as regards the use of time in the poem, it is the shift in temporal perspective they offer that is the lines' most remarkable characteristic.

A further example of such a shift can perhaps be supplied from *Ann.* 403, *quippe vetusta virum non est satis bella moveri* ('yet it is by no means sufficient that [only] the antique among men's wars be told'), a line firmly attested for Book 16 of the *Annals* by Festus and regularly construed by editors as part of a proem to that book. On the grounds that Ennius speaks of Cethegus' generation at *Ann.* 308 as men of a former age, Skutsch takes it as unsurprising that the poet designates the subject-matter of (presumably) Books 7–15 – which, according to standard conjecture (see Appendix Table A1.1), represent the time-period *c.* 264–189 BCE – as *vetusta . . . bella*.[132] But the reasons Skutsch had adduced for the reference in Book 9 (*Ann.* 304–8) to the end of the third century as to a bygone era – that is, personal nostalgia – can hardly be relevant to the motivation for *vetusta* here. Friedrich Leo wanted to see in *vetusta* a contrast not to the immediately preceding books, as Skutsch supposes, but a general contrast between mythical wars of an earlier heroic age and historical wars, such as in his view constituted the bulk of the poem's subject-matter.[133] Skutsch dismisses this, firmly believing in a new start at the beginning of Book 16, and a contrast between the new material begun there and what immediately precedes. But Leo is surely right that *vetustus* both archaises and heroises the noun to which it is applied

[130] *Ibid.* (See Skutsch 1985: 359 on *bellipotentes* at *Ann.* 198 for the origin of such Latin compounds before Ennius, in Naevius and Plautus.)

[131] Noted by Gildenhard 2003: 99.

[132] Skutsch 1985: 267 on *Ann.* 403, *vetusta*.

[133] Leo 1913: 171 (in reliance on that sense of a dichotomy in the text between the mythical and the historical, noted, e.g, in n. 87, p. 45, above).

(*OLD* 3), just as Skutsch is right about the specific reference of *bella* in *Ann.* 403, as well as about the parallel to the attitude towards the past represented by *Ann.* 304–8. The presentation of the events of the second half of the third century and of the beginning of the second was – surprisingly and daringly – of events of a distant, mythical, glorious past.[134]

HISTORIA AND *ANNALES*

Perhaps such archaising as both *Ann.* 304–8 and *Ann.* 403 effect is related to the definition of *annales* given by Servius proper (ad *Aen.* 1.373, *annales nostrorum . . . temporum*): Servius suggests that the term *annales* properly describes those times *quae aetas nostra non novit*:

> historia est eorum temporum quae vel vidimus vel videre potuimus, dicta ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱστορεῖν, id est videre; annales vero sunt eorum temporum quae aetas nostra non novit; unde Livius ex annalibus et historia constat. haec tamen confunduntur licenter, ut hoc loco pro 'historia' inquit 'annales'.
>
> 'History' concerns those periods to which we ourselves have personally been witness or which we could have witnessed; it is named from the Greek ἱστορεῖν, that is, to see [with your own eyes]. But 'annals' concern those periods of which our own generation has no experience. In consequence, Livy consists of both 'annals' and 'history'. But the two easily get mixed up, just as right here he says 'annals' when he means 'history'.

Servius' report suggests that Aeneas' use of the word *annales* to refer to his own lived experience was odd and, strictly speaking, inappropriate to the circumstances, because *annales* properly referred to the account of periods of time no longer accessible to direct, personal experience. Some others in antiquity agreed:[135] thus the definition of the difference between *historia* and *annales* offered as a first, plausible possibility by Aulus Gellius, a definition available to him not through common report but through Verrius Flaccus' lexicographical work, the *De Significatu Verborum* (late

[134] With the final phrase of Book 2 of his *Annals*, *dum vetera extollimus recentium incuriosi*, Tacitus perhaps articulates something of the sentiment which inspired such moves on Ennius' part; cf. *qua gloria aequabat se Tiberius priscis imperatoribus*, likewise at Tac. *Ann.* 2.88: even then, and even in Tacitus' own (or Tacitus' Tiberius') hands, recent history could occasionally rise (if surely with a tinge of Tacitean irony) to be tantamount to the noble past.

[135] There was clearly much confusion in antiquity as to the distinction between the terms. Cornell suggests that for much of their history they were simply interchangeable (Cornell 1996a: 98); cf. Servius' coda in the passage on *Aen.* 1.373 quoted above: *haec tamen confunduntur licenter, ut hoc loco pro 'historia' inquit 'annales'*.

first century BCE/early first century CE).[136] Gellius goes on to reject that view on his own account in favour of a different definition apparently more current in the second century CE (cf. *soliti sumus* and the other present tenses of *NA* 5.18.3–7).[137] This second definition formally subordinates *annales* to *historia* and makes the distinguishing feature of *annales* the rather humdrum one of narration in a scrupulous year-by-year format (*observato cuiusque anni ordine*) rather than of proper contents.

Perhaps this second definition according to procedure through the narrative was reproduced by Sempronius Asellio, as an introduction to his own, polemical distinction between the 'what' narrated by *annales* and the 'why' and 'to what effect' that he claimed as the preserve of analytic history; for Gellius asserts that, before launching into that definition, Asellio gave a Latin gloss on the Greek term ἐφημερίς, likewise based on a structuring unit of time, and a parallel is clearly intended between the reference of the two terms. We might thus think that this second definition was current at any rate in Asellio's day (early first century BCE). The availability of the Servian view in Verrius Flaccus' day, together with the abundance of antiquarian material in the *De Significatu Verborum*, may likewise give us a degree of confidence in the antiquity of the Servian definition (the one based on proper subject-matter), although its pre-first century BCE lineage must remain uncertain.

If Servius' Verrian-era distinction was operative in Ennius' day, the poet's use of the term *annales* effected for his readers a shift similar to that by which Vergil's Aeneas gave the commentators on the *Aeneid* pause and likewise to that which *Ann.* 304–8 bring about. By the first century BCE, that distinction was certainly operative. The poem was then at the height of influence on poets and prose writers alike, so that, at (what appears from our persective as) the most active moment of its reception history, the

[136] *NA* 5.18.1–2: *historiam ab annalibus quidam differre eo putant, quod, cum utrumque sit rerum gestarum narratio, earum tamen proprie rerum sit historia, quibus rebus gerendis interfuerit is qui narret; eamque esse opinionem quorundam Verrius Flaccus refert in libro* De Significatu Verborum *quarto. ac se quidem dubitare super ea re dicit, posse autem videri putat nonnihil esse rationis in ea opinione, quod historia Graece significet rerum cognitionem praesentium*. Cf. also the (probably interdependent) sources cited in n. 24, p. 25.

[137] *NA* 5.18.3–7: *sed nos audire soliti sumus annales omnino id esse quod historiae sint, historias non omnino esse id quod annales sint: sicuti, quod est homo, id necessario animal est; quod est animal, non id necesse est hominem esse. ita historias quidem esse aiunt rerum gestarum vel expositionem vel demonstrationem vel quo alio nomine id dicendum est, annales vero esse, cum res gestae plurium annorum observato cuiusque anni ordine deinceps componuntur. cum vero non per annos, sed per dies singulos res gestae scribuntur, ea historia Graeco vocabulo* ἐφημερίς *dicitur, cuius Latinum interpretamentum scriptum est in libro Semproni Asellionis primo, ex quo libro plura verba ascripsimus, ut simul, ibidem quid ipse inter res gestas et annales esse dixerit ostenderemus*. (For the subsequent quotation from Asellio, see p. 31.)

Servian/Verrian-era definition was well positioned to influence readers' interpretation of the title. For those readers, at least, the title thus read would abet the effects of Ennius' Homerising and his other archaising (as well as occasionally genuinely archaic) use of language,[138] further colouring his re-description of what was still then not-so-ancient history. By standard calculations (see again Appendix Table A1.1), two-thirds of the poem (Books 7–18) concerned the events of Ennius' own lifetime. In the poem's representation, these appeared as the time-hallowed events of the nation's legendary past, equivalent in value to the feats of the heroes of Greek literature. We know as much from *Ann.* 391–8 in Book 15,[139] where a Roman tribune is described in terms that make him tantamount to the Homeric Ajax of *Il.* 16.102–11,[140] and from Macrobius' testimony (*Sat.* 6.2.32) that in Book 15 Ennius represented two Istrians in a manner that later gave Vergil his Pandarus and Bitias (*Aen.* 9.672–90), and which we therefore know were closely related to the Homeric Polypoites and Leontes of *Il.* 12.127–95. *Ann.* 304–8 and *Ann.* 403 give us a further sense of how else the effect might have been achieved. It cannot conclusively be proved that the title added to that effect for the poem's original audience (any more than it can for any other function we may posit), since we have no direct information about its interpretation for the first century of its existence. At the earliest point at which we have access to any ancient evidence for the poem, that is, principally with Varro and Cicero in the first century BCE, the Servian definition was available to readers to contribute to the sense of the venerable antiquity of this record of the nation's past.

THE SHAPE AND PACE OF THE *ANNALES*: NARRATIVE CHOICES AND AUTHORIAL CONTROL

Along with the scarcity of simple date-markers and the poet's control of temporal perspective goes the fact that the proportions and pace of the narrative of the *Annales*, to the extent that we have access to them, are among the poem's most surprising characteristics.[141] Two notorious ancient

[138] On Ennius' archaisms and archaising, see pp. 93–9 of Chapter 2, with nn. 61 and 53 there.

[139] On the book-number, on which the manuscripts of Macrobius are divided between XII and XV, see Chapter 5, n. 176, p. 284. According to standard calculations, Book 12 described events of 196–5 BCE, Book 15 events of *c.* 189–7 BCE.

[140] The testimony of the source, Macr. *Sat.* 6.3.2–4, confirms what would have been a ready assumption in any case, that the modelling on Homer was patent to the ancient reader (see pp. 84–6 of Chapter 2). For discussion of this Ennian passage and its epic relatives, see Williams 1968: 687–9; Skutsch 1985: 556–9; and Goldberg 1995: 87–8.

[141] Cf. Clarke 1999a, as quoted in n. 69, p. 40.

remarks concerning Ennius' motives and procedure survive: Cicero, *Brut.* 76, on Ennius' treatment of the First Punic War, and Pliny the Elder, *NH* 7.101, on Ennius' motive for 'adding' Book 16 of the *Annales*. At *Brut.* 76, Cicero has: *qui* [sc. *Ennius*] *si illum* [sc. *Naevium*] *ut simulat contemneret, non omnia bella persequens primum illud Punicum . . . reliquisset. sed ipse dicit cur id faciat. 'scripsere' inquit 'alii rem/vorsibus . . .* [*Ann.* 206–7] ('if he [Ennius] really despised him [Naevius] as he pretends to do, he would not, when he set forth all the wars, have neglected the famous First Punic War. But he himself says why he does this: 'others have told of the matter in poetic verse . . .'). Scholars have always disagreed about what precisely *reliquisset* implies (cursory treatment of the First Punic War or total omission), but in fact either possibility is sufficient to serve as supporting evidence for what is in any case the only logical possibility, given the stretch of past time that the poet had undertaken to narrate:[142] that Ennius was highly selective in what he treated and controlled the length at which he treated it without any influence from the relative historical consequence, as analytic historiography would have measured it, of the events in question. While *persequens* for its part implies something of a methodical progression, the point of emphasis in Cicero's sentence, the neglect (privileged by the poet's special remark) of a major historical event, confirms the irregularity of the narrative proportions and introduces the sensible idea that a variety of factors, including ones determined by the poet's literary ambitions, went into forming the shape of the narrative overall.

That idea is confirmed by Pliny's notice (*NH* 7.101) that personal admiration served as Ennius' motive in writing and design. Pliny begins a discussion of various kinds of exceptional human achievements (*NH* 7.100–29) with Cato and Scipio Aemilianus, but then goes on to sift through 'the tales of the poets' (*poetica . . . fabulositas*, *NH* 7.101) in search of 'the man who showed himself most capable of bravery of all' (*fortitudo in quo maxime exstiterit*, *ibid.*). As a first instance in this section of his list, Pliny writes: *Q. Ennius T. Caecilium Teucrum fratremque eius praecipue miratus librum* XVI *adiecit* ('Q. Ennius added the sixteenth book on account of his extraordinary admiration for T. Caecilius Teucer and his brother' = *Ann.* XVI.vi). His testimony has proved puzzling, because the Caecilii have left no discernible trace on the prose historical record.[143] Pliny in fact distinguishes sharply between, on the one hand, the Caecilii (and the examples to follow them),

[142] It is the insistence on even-handed year-by-year treatment that creates the supposition of the excessively hefty book-sizes of which Ennius has been suspected; see n. 70, p. 40.

[143] See Skutsch 1985: 570; Flores *et al.* 2006: 408–9.

whom he classes as the legendary products of poetry and, on the other, Cato and Scipio, who immediately precede the latter in Pliny's list. This makes it clear enough that there was no surviving trace of the Caecilii, other than in Ennius, as early as Pliny's day. The explanation in personal and biographical terms may not appeal to formally minded readers, and there is little reason to accept it; what *NH* 7.101 proves, however, is that there were so few explanations available in Pliny's day for the presence of the Caecilii in the text that it was plausible to adduce the poet's personal admiration for two of his own contemporaries as the motivation for their inclusion. Neither is this instance unparalleled: Cicero at *Brut.* 60 testifies to Ennius glorifying another individual, M. Cornelius Cethegus, of whom no other record survived even the yet shorter interval to Cicero's day.[144]

One reason why the implications of Pliny's phrase *poetica . . . fabulositas* – that is, that Pliny thought of the Caecilii as beyond the confines of history, perhaps even a poetic invention – have proved unwelcome to scholars is that Book 16, according to the usual reconstruction (Appendix Table A1.1), contained an account of the events of *c.* 177 BCE – well within Cato's and Ennius' own lifetimes, and thus just as historically accessible to the poet as Cato himself. The surrounding context gives us no sense of how Pliny might have come by his information about Ennius' motives,[145] of how much of the book was concerned with the brothers,[146] or, crucially, of what exactly Pliny meant by *adiecit*. The verb has done a considerable amount to support the idea of Ennius as *poeta cliens*,[147] for it has been read as denoting that Book 16 represented a fresh start (the beginning of a new triad) after the poem's supposed original culmination with the triumph of Fulvius Nobilior, Ennius' patron, as it is commonly assumed.[148] Pliny's *adiecit* has also colluded with the traditional sense of what annalistic procedure

[144] Cicero's context is quoted discussed on pp. 156–61 of Chapter 3.

[145] Skutsch plausibly enough suggests Varro as the source of information that the poet had himself offered in the proem to the book (Skutsch 1985: 569, perhaps on analogy with the information about *Ann.* 268–86 [the 'good companion'] given by Gell. *NA* 12.4.5; see Chapter 4, pp. 228–32, with n. 112 there, for discussion). Some caution is in order, however, since we have little to inform us about Pliny as a student of or purveyor of information about the *Annales*.

[146] F. Skutsch sees Book 16 as solely concerned with the exploits of these heroic Caecilii. In his view, the Istrian War had already been described in Book 15; Book 16, in exclusive focus on the Caecilius brothers (whom he identifies with the heroic Istrians referred to at Macr. *Sat.* 6.2.32), was then annexed to this (Skutsch 1905: 2609). See *contra* O. Skutsch 1985: 558–9 (following Bergk and Vahlen): Macrobius' 'Istrians' are only auxiliaries to Ambracia in Book 15 of the *Annals*; their nationality is coincidental.

[147] See n. 36, pp. 15–16 and n. 75, p. 41.

[148] The assumption is based on the (late) evidence of Cic. *Arch.* 27, cf. *Tusc. Disp.* 1.3, *Brut.* 79. See Vahlen 1903: xiii-xv; Badian 1972: 154, 183–95; Gruen 1990: 106, 113–18, 120, 121–22; and Goldberg 1995: 112–15.

regularly entailed to produce the idea that Ennius treated the *Annales* as simply extendible (see n. 64, p. 38). Such an idea can neither be proven nor disproven, given the limitations on our access to the poem, but it is perhaps worth noting the slenderness of the evidence on which it rests; *adiecit* could, in a weak sense, convey as little as that Ennius 'went on to write' the sixteenth book.[149] The most startling piece of information Pliny conveys remains Ennius' strong focus on two individuals otherwise lost to history.

It is besides this clear that episodes that in a balanced analytic account of the overall trajectory of Roman history would have only a minor place are allotted considerable attention. For example, if the traditional construction of the text (as represented by Appendix Table A1.1) is roughly right, the Istrian Wars of *c.* 177 BCE are told in far more detail, proportionately, than is the war against Antiochus or than are either of the Punic Wars.[150] The surviving fragments show that the text's highlights included the description of an historically mysterious tribune (*Ann.* 391–8). The source, Macrobius (*Sat.* 6.3.3), names the tribune as Caelius (or C. Aelius), but this only deepens the mystery of the character's historical identity.[151] Pliny's Caecilii Teucri clearly fit into the same category. Other examples of the phenomenon include the likewise historically mysterious Istrians to whose prominent and valourised role Macrobius (*Sat.* 6.2.32) testifies (*Ann.* XV.iv); and the 'good companion' episode of *Ann.* 268–86.[152] Only exceptionally can surviving fragments referring to individuals firmly established in our

[149] Cf. Zetzel 2007: 13–14, disputing the idea of the three-book supplement.

[150] Skutsch 1905: 2608–9 is an example of the consternation that this has caused in its day; cf. Jocelyn 1972: 1006.

[151] Merula conjectured C. Aelius for Caelius, in an attempt to find a referent for the individual in question, which his conjecture enabled him to find at Livy. 41.4.3 (see Skutsch 1985: 557–9). There is no reason to suspect Macrobius' text unsound. (Of the manuscripts, A reads *celi*, the rest *caelii*. Willis and Kaster accept Merula's conjecture.) None of the actions of Livy's T. and C. Aelius are in any way comparable to those of Ennius' man, and there is no reason to associate them, other than the similarity between the names. In a separate attempt to find an identity for Caelius, C. Cichorius (following Müller 1884: 179–80) argues that the Caelius of Lucil. 1079, *ut semel in Caeli pugnas te invadere vidi*, is a reference to the Caelius of *Ann.* 391–8. To Cichorius, the fame with which Ennius endowed these wars and this Caelius, in his view (as in mine) an unknown quantity selected by the poet for heroisation, suggested to him that Lucilius used the term 'Caeli pugnae' in a generalised sense to refer to Istrian campaigns of later years also, in particular that of C. Sempronius Tuditanus in 129 BCE (Cichorius 1908: 187–91). This is cited and accepted in general terms by Skutsch 1985: 558–9. For the general point I am making here, cf. Cichorius on Lucilius' choice of the term *Caeli pugnae* as, in Cichorius' own hypothesis, a general laudatory term for 'Istrian Wars': 'Auffallen muss dabei nur, daß Lucilius hier gerade als Muster ein so wenig bedeutsames Ereignis aus einem doch ziemlich unwichtigen istrischen Kriege wählt, wo ihm so viele weit glänzendere Beispiele zur Verfügung gestanden hätten' (Cichorius 1908: 188).

[152] For the realisation that this episode does not fit the cast expected of an 'historical' work, see e.g. the comments of Leo 1913: 168 and Cichorius' discussion, written at Norden's request and printed by Norden's choice in preference to his own argument: 'dem ganzen Bilde dieses Vertrauten nach wird

historical record match, in length and prominence in our record of the *Annales*, those referring to the historically elusive.[153] This is especially striking in the case of the later books: from Book 12 on, the only lines to survive in reference to known historical quantities are *Ann.* 363–5, on Fabius Maximus 'Cunctator' and the references to Bradylis and Epulo in Book 16 (*Ann.* 407 and 408, respectively). Besides this, we know only that Lepidus and Fulvius Nobilior were also subjects (cf. *Ann.* XVI.viii), even if no identifiable fragments about them survive.

It is not that this situation reflects the original. Books 12–18 are, with the exception of Book 16, exceptionally poorly represented, while the tribune and the Istrians are the product of a strong bias of our sources; they reach us exclusively via Macrobius on account of the closeness with which these episodes are modelled on Homer and have passages of Vergil modelled on them.[154] Macrobius' responsibility for the transmission of this material is sufficient to account for the fact that the surviving record is rich in Homerising material and also throughout poor in historical characters; and this raises the question of whether the modelling on Homer was less striking in Ennius' descriptions of known historical quantities. If so, there might be some logic to that: we might postulate, for example, that the heroism of the otherwise unknown characters had to be constructed more or less exclusively via modelling on literary precedent, whereas the famous actors on the stage of history came supplied with other resources for the telling of their stories. But the evidence is too sparse to allow us to judge, and it remains noteworthy that our variously motivated sources collectively more often felt they had reason to incorporate into their own texts

es sich hierbei nicht um irgend etwas Militärisches, für den Verlauf der Schlacht Bedeutsames, sondern eher um irgend etwas Persönliches, Privates handeln' (Norden 1915: 136). O. Skutsch follows Cichorius in locating this passage at the battle of Cannae itself, on the basis of Gellius' identification of Cn. Servilius, consul of 217 BCE and supporter of Paulus at Cannae. In Cichorius–Skutsch's argument, *inter pugnas* at *Ann.* 286 thus locates the passage at one of the interstices of Cannae itself. If these scholars are right, it is only all the stranger, on Skutsch's view of the historicity of the *Annales* (see n. 82, p. 43), that Ennius should interrupt a consequential historical narrative to describe the 'friend' of Servilius in so full a fashion. Almost perversely, the length of the digression and the switch of subject it entailed in themselves become arguments that the battle into which this excursus was inserted must have been of major historical consequence: 'Von vorherein dürfte klar sein, daß der Abschnitt aus dem Berichte über eine der großen wichtigen Entscheidungsschlachten herrühren wird, wenn der Dichter einer solchen nebensächlichen Episode daraus eine so breite Behandlung zuteil werden lässt' (*ibid.*).

[153] Famously, those involving Pyrrhus (esp. *Ann.* 183–90); but for explicit mention of Hannibal we have only *Ann.* 371–3, of M. Fulvius Nobilior only the testimony of *Ann.* XV.i (and it is not clear that its testimony refers to the *Annales* rather than Ennius' *Ambracia*). Cicero (*Brut.* 60) testifies to the fact that M. Cornelius Cethegus (*Ann.* 304–8) was even in his day unknown, except through Ennius' record (see again Chapter 3, pp. 156–61).

[154] See Chapter 2, pp. 82–6.

fragments describing otherwise unknown individuals than well-known ones. This includes such extensive and knowledgeable quoters as Cicero, who selects what in various contexts he feels to be the epic's highlights.

Whether Ennius used standard and consistent dates and chronology, even for crucial events, also remains fundamentally mysterious.[155] Our only evidence for the dates Ennius assigned to the foundation of Rome is a fragment whose primary source is Varro (*RR* 3.1.2): *septingenti sunt, paulo post aut minus, anni/augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est* (*Ann.* 154–5, 'it is seven hundred years, more or less, since renowned Rome was founded under prospering augury'). In general, scholars have wanted to make Ennius an adherent of Eratosthenes' date of 1184 BCE for the Fall of Troy and hence to see the lines as spoken by a hypothetical Ennian Camillus, thus placing the utterance *c.* 390 BCE.[156] Varro, however, who knew the text, betrays no hint that the lines came from a speech. His introductory words (*in hoc nunc denique est, ut dici possit, non cum Ennius scripsit, 'septingenti sunt . . .'*) instead assume that the statement issues from the authorial voice; hence, precisely, his grounds for quarrelling with Ennius about the foundation-date.[157] If the lines are read as coming from a narrative voice situated in Ennius' day, the implication is that the *Annales* placed the foundation of Rome towards the beginning of the ninth century BCE.[158] Feeney well emphasises how mysterious Ennius' use of the seven-hundred-year period really is and makes the powerful point that its best explanation may lie in the numinous associations of the number seven hundred, a number repeatedly used to describe the life-span of a city.[159] If this is right, it again casts the principal concern of the *Annales* as the promotion of an ideology about Rome, rather than a repository of carefully conserved facts about the past.

There are clear dangers in trying to draw conclusions from material as lacunose as the remains of the *Annales*: while I have argued that there are no grounds for the sort of confidence in Ennius' use of time and narrative space that have held sway among scholars, the severely compromised state of our

[155] Cf. Feeney 2007: 100–1, with his nn. 189–190.

[156] See Skutsch 1968: 12–13; Gratwick 1982: 61; Skutsch 1985: 314–16; and Cornell 1986: 247.

[157] Livy, *Praef.* 4, *res est praeterea et immensi operis, ut quae supra septingentesimum annum repetatur* could be read as restating and confirming Varro's 'correction' of Ennius; cf. Feeney 2007: 101.

[158] We know that a foundation date in the ninth century pre-existed Ennius by two generations: a date equivalent to 814/13 BCE had been given for Rome's foundation by Timaeus of Tauromenium (*ibid.*). Timaeus' date itself is strictly too late for Ennius (*c.* 880 would be closer to 700 years before he wrote), though Ennius, with *paulo plus aut minus*, emphasises the fact that he is speaking in round numbers.

[159] Feeney, 2007: 101. That itself, then, is also the best argument for associating *Ann.* 154–5 with the Gallic sack (or with another moment at which the City, in Ennius' account, faced annihilation).

evidence is also liable to exaggerate the degree to which the allotment of time appears capricious.[160] And yet, it is surely worth noting, as far as the testimonies of Cicero and Pliny are concerned that, tendentious and limited as their notices are, they nevertheless show that readers who knew the *Annales* well (in Cicero's case; better than we do, in Pliny's) found it plausible to describe the design of the poem as they understood it as the creation of a freewheeling poet who took decisions not evidently bound by loyalty to any tradition but apportioning space to material entirely at his own discretion.[161] Still more important is the fact that our sense of what is capricious is informed by our expectations, as created primarily by our sense of a given work's generic parameters: the scholarly consternation cited in some of the footnotes above is the result of the assumption that the *Annales*, as an 'historical' account, were based on historical records of the priests and followed the historiographical procedures that was felt to imply; and hence that there were legitimate and informative parallels to be made with prose and analytic (or at least rationalising) historians such as Polybius and Livy. In fact, the fragments and testimonia as we have them have to be subjected to a fairly Procrustean approach to persuade them to co-operate with such an assumption. To the extent, however, that a reader bears in mind the work's constantly advertised relationship to Homer, s/he will be less surprised to see episodic construction highlighting moments of no causal importance to constitutional or military historical developments and will more readily integrate into his/her sense of the text the focus on moments of local and emotional importance, such as *Ann.* 391–8 (the centurion), *Ann.* XV.iv (the Istrians) and *Ann.* 268–86 (the 'good companion') provide. The function of these episodes is both to map Rome onto Greece and to illustrate Roman society's character and virtues, in the manner familiar from Livy's 'exemplary' history. In a work where such motives take precedence over historical accuracy or the charting of causality, it is no surprise that chronological sequence is observed no more rigorously than it is in any other text of the Graeco-Roman epic tradition.

[160] Cf. Frier's discussion of the dangers of assuming that the outlines of Fabius Pictor's narrative are discernible from a remaining record as fragmentary as his (Frier 1999: 255–8).

[161] We might suspect these notices of being to some extent responsible for the history of more or less arbitrary personal or whimsical motives ascribed to the poet in his design and selection of material. Thus Leo: 'Mit dem tarentinischen Kriege beginnt für Ennius zwar noch nicht die Reminiszenz, aber das persönliche Interesse an den heimatlichen Erinnerungen . . .' (Leo 1913: 168); cf. Jocelyn 1972: 1006 and Skutsch 1985: 570. There is precedent for such a procedure on the part of a poet in Ephorus' Cymocentricity (as noted in antiquity). Yet, despite Ennius' apparent tendency for autobiography (cf. e.g. *Ann.* 11, 12–13; 522–3, with Cic. *Sen.* 14; *Ann.* 525; also *Ann.* 268–86, with Gell. 12.4), Ennius' poem had no (surviving) ancient reputation for exaggerated personal or local interests.

THE ANCIENT EVIDENCE FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OF MATERIAL INTO THE BOOKS OF THE *ANNALES*

Nearly half of our extant lines of the *Annales* (267 out of 623) are attributed by their sources to a particular book, but very rarely do these uncontroversially allocated lines also contain an identifiable historical reference. The reason for this pattern is that the sources that regularly provide book-numbers are grammarians, encyclopaedists and antiquarians (Festus, Charisius, Macrobius, Nonius, Priscian, etc.; see Appendix Table A3.1) and, with the exception of Macrobius, usually have no interest in quoting sense-units. Their focus is limited to unusual or archaic items of vocabulary, uses of gender, or word-forms, and they have no interest in – and themselves often no access to – context or even sentence structure or basic meaning. Therefore, the book-numbers they supply tend to be of little practical use. Macrobius for his part tends to supply lines that imitate Homeric formula; see Chapter 2, pp. 84–99). These are liable to recur within the poem, and the particular instances quoted could belong anywhere; they cannot help define the shape of the narrative. Were a book-number not attested for them, they would belong firmly among the *sed. inc*. Sources such as Cicero, who quote fragments of sufficient size and of such a kind as to give us identifiable events, tend not to quote book-numbers.[162]

Thus, *Ann*. 166, *nomine Burrus uti memorant a stirpe supremo* ('Pyrrhus by name, as they say, of most exalted lineage'), which is placed by one of its less lacunose sources, Nonius, in a particular book, is a rarity: it gives us an opportunity to locate Ennius' narration of an historical event, in this case Pyrrhus' arrival on the Italian scene, in that book.[163] Even here there is a problem, though: Nonius attributes *Ann*. 166 to Book 5, but Skutsch objects, on the grounds that 'the preceding line [*Ann*. 165, *navos repertus homo, Graio patre, Graius homo, rex*, 'an energetic man was found, of a Greek parentage, a Greek man, a king'], which is quoted from Book VI,

[162] See the Introduction to the appendix Table A5.3 on Cicero.

[163] Other fragments associated with Pyrrhus, and so possibly belonging to the same book, are: *Ann*. 167, *aio te Aeacida Romanos vincere posse*; 180–82, *qui antehac/invicti fuere viri, pater optume Olympi,/hos ego vi pugna vici victusque sum ab isdem* – if Ennian at all; 183–90, Pyrrhus' famous speech, *nec mi aurum posco . . .*; 197–8, *stolidum genus Aeacidarum:/bellipotentes sunt magis quam sapientipotentes*; 199–200, *quo vobis mentes, rectae quae stare solebant/antehac, dementes sese flexere †via*; and conjecturally also *Ann*. 202, *orator sine pace redit regique refert rem*, which we don't reliably know to come from the Pyrrhus-context. Conversely, fragments placed by their sources in Book 6 but which alone could have any number of referents can now – again conjecturally, but also fairly reasonably – be associated with Pyrrhus: thus *Ann*. 165, *navos repertus homo, Graio patre, Graius homo, rex*, and 191–4, *divi hoc audite parumper:/ut pro Romano populo prognariter armis/certando prudens animam de corpore mitto/<sic>*.

clearly introduces Pyrrhus for the first time';[164] the two lines were first paired by Scaliger.[165] But even if the two lines do have the same referent in Pyrrhus, which is fundamentally only an informed and reasonably plausible guess, that does not necessitate their collocation (Skutsch sees them as literally adjacent or as separated by one other line, while Flores actually prints them as part of the same fragment). Skutsch states that *Ann.* 165 describes Pyrrhus, 'an energetic man', as the answer to the prayers of the people of Tarentum. Even if he is right, and even if the siege of Tarentum was properly described in Book 6, it might be worth considering the possibility that *Ann.* 166 was spoken either by the epic narrator or by an internal speaker offering advance warning and creating a sense of foreboding as to the threat implied by a man of Pyrrhus' stature as described in *Ann.* 166 before throwing out Nonius' evidence. The description of the war with Pyrrhus in Book 6 is today one of the most widely accepted points of reference for the organisation of the *Annales*, but even this rests on evidence that is not entirely secure.[166]

The other fragments for which a book-number is attested and which have unique referents that allow us with some degree of certainty to determine their context are these: for Book 1, *Ann.* 12–13, *latos <per> populos res atque poemata nostra/. . . <clara> cluebunt* ('far and wide among the peoples the subject of my song will win a brilliant name'), which, as proem-material, is of no help; *Ann.* 58–9, (Ilia's [?] prayer to Venus), and probably *Ann.* 92, *Iuppiter ut muro fretus magis quamde manu sim* ('. . . Jupiter . . . that I place my trust more in the wall than in strength of hand'); for Book 3, *Ann.* 138, *Tarquinio dedit imperium simul et sola regni* ('. . . bestowed on Tarquin rule and the power of kingship'); for Book 7, *Ann.* 227–8, *qua Galli furtim noctu summa arcis adorti/moenia concubia vigilesque repente cruentant* ('where the Gauls stealthily, at the time of night when sleep falls on men, attacked the high citadel and of a sudden stained with blood walls and watchers'), though this is probably spoken not at the time of the attack but from a later vantage point in the text;[167] for Book 12, *Ann.* 363–6, *unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem./noenum rumores ponebat ante salutem./ergo postque magisque viri nunc gloria claret* ('one man single-handedly, by delaying, saved our state. He did not place popular opinion before the common good. For that reason, the man's glory shines forth the

[164] Skutsch 1985: 332. [165] Flores *et al.* 2002: 107.
[166] Cf. Fantham 2006: 549–68, esp. 553–5, for a view of the arrangement of Book 6 differing in some respects from the standard editors'.
[167] See Skutsch 1985: 405.

more as time passes'), perhaps also speech referring back; for Book 13, *Ann.* 371–3, *Hannibal audaci cum pectore de me hortatur/ne bellum faciam, quem credidit esse meum cor/suasorem summum et studiosum robore belli* ('Hannibal of bold spirit urges me not to make war – he whom my heart had judged to be war's greatest advocate and enthusiast in his valour'); for Book 15, *Ann.* 391–8 (the heroic tribune); for Book 16, perhaps *Ann.* 407, *primus senex Bradylis regimen, bellique peritus* ('. . . the eminent elderly Bradylis . . . rule, and skilled in war')[168] and *Ann.* 408, *quos ubi rex Epulo spexit de cotibus celsis* ('when king Epulo spied them from the lofty cliff'); also, for Book 9, *Ann.* 304–8 (M. Cornelius Cethegus), which is a real rarity in being both specifically dateable and placeable – ironically enough, given the ways it seems to play with time.[169] These are the very few and weak footholds that the sources supply for re-constructing the basic shape of the *Annales*. They give us no stricter sense of chronological progression through the narrative than we would naturally assume, simply on the basis of the fact that the work is a product of the ancient world rather than of post-modern literature. Again, there is no need to assume chronological progression any stricter than what we see in Homeric epic. The usual reconstruction of the organisational frame of the *Annales* (as summarised in Appendix Table A1.1) may largely be right in terms of skeletal structure, but it cannot be taken as a description of narrative economy except on the largest scale, and even then it is fairly hypothetical.

LIVY AS A *COMPARANDUM* FOR NARRATIVE ECONOMY

The few pieces of information we have about the distribution of material suggest that Ennius, like Livy,[170] covered progressively fewer years as the

[168] The corruption of the line and its syntactically inchoate state, as presented by its source, Festus, impede translation; see Skutsch 1985: 571.

[169] Other fragments provide only illusory possibilities of definite historical reference: despite the mention of Romulus in *Ann.* 105–9, the occasion on which these lines were spoken is quite unsure; see Skutsch 1985: 256–7. Likewise, the reference of *Ann.* 123, *hic occasus datus est, at Horatius inclutus saltu*, despite the name given, is unclear. *Saltu* points to Horatius Cocles with his leap into the Tiber, but Skutsch is unsure whether to trust the source, Festus', book-number (2); for him, trusting the source would imply that the reference was to the last Horatius in the fight of the triplets (see *ibid.* 274–6).

[170] Only the initial book of the *AUC* (which is implicitly differentiated at 2.1.1 from all of the rest of the narrative), on the preliminaries to the foundation of the City, the foundation and the regal period, contains material spanning a few hundred years. After that, the books of the first decade all cover between ten and forty years (with, overall, progressively fewer years covered; Book 5 is an exception). Thereafter, all books cover between one and (unusually) four years.

narrative approached contemporary events. However little the distribution suggested by Appendix Table A1.1 is assured, it is certain that the pace of the narrative at the end of the *Annales* was slow. *Ann.* 391–8 (the heroic tribune), which belongs to Book 15, refers to events no earlier than 189–187 BCE, while *Ann.* 408, *quos ubi rex Epulo spexit de cotibus celsis*, securely attributed by its source to Book 16, probably allows us to situate that book's narrative around 178/177 BCE. No fragments subsequent to this are dateable. By the end of the narrative, the pace may have been as slow as one year per book, as Appendix Table A1.1 postulates, but was potentially no slower than the pace of Book 6 (roughly ten years per book). In Ennius' case, however, the mere 18 books of the *Annales*, as compared to the (minimally)[171] 142 books of *AUC*, will have made the epic's evidently significant changes in scale and pace especially conspicuous.

Here too, the similarity between the texts really works to point up an essential difference between them: if we assume that traditional reconstructions of the basic outline of the *Annales* (Appendix Table A1.1) are to be trusted,[172] Ennius gives equal attention to the regal period and the early Republican period prior to Pyrrhus (two books on each); for Livy the period of the early Republic is, relatively, of far greater interest and is covered at a much slower pace (ten times slower).[173] Livy's allocation of narrative space is typically explained as a function of his 'annalistic' approach, the year-by-year form being understood as a token of political allegiance to the Republican system of government. Ennius' relative lack of investment in the early republic *vis-à-vis* the regal period distinguishes the shape of his narrative from that of other texts associated with the annalistic tradition and suggests an alternative ideological bent, itself at odds with typical expectations of 'annalistic' texts. His haste to reach his own present day – and to bring to light its significance and its underlying glory with the help of a relatively rapidly narrated past – is in reality far greater than Livy's and

[171] See Kraus 1994a: 4, n. 15.

[172] These reconstructions, however, are based (if not explicitly) on putative analogies with prose historiographical works dealing with the same periods, used to supplement the very sparse indications of distribution supplied by the ancient sources. (See again Appendix Tables A3.1–A3.3 for comparison of distribution based on ancient evidence with distribution suggested by modern conjecture, discussed above.)

[173] Leo makes this point and illustrates the disparity by giving the ratios for the relative amounts of time spent on the regal period (conceived as *c.* 600 years, roughly equivalent to 1100–510 BCE – though see p. 65, with nn. 156–159 there, on the lack of clarity surrounding Ennius' foundation-date) and the early Republican era (conceived as *c.* 200+ years, roughly equivalent to 510–300 BCE): Ennius 2:2 (Books 2–3: 4–5); Livy 1:10 (Books 1: 2–11); Dionysios 3:14 (Books 2–4: 5–18) (Leo 1913: 168, n. 2).

seems crucially determinative of the shape of the narrative as best we can grasp it.[174]

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION: THE FUNCTIONS OF THE TITLE?

We have, in fact, very little ancient evidence indeed either for the real organisation of the text or for what Ennius' inherited concept of 'annalistic' writing may have been, whether in terms of style or in terms of function. On the basis of the evidence, it is perilous to assume that the relationship between Ennius and the earlier annalistic tradition, in whatever primitive form it existed, implies anything transparent, definitive or accessible about the poem's economy. The basic idea that the text proceeded in chronological sequence and sometimes gave dates using names of consuls, thus alluding to the principles (as we understand them) of the annalistic tradition, is unobjectionable, but it is also not very informative, and it does not securely give us access to any fundamental principle of design. Play with time was an established feature of hexametric epic from the earliest known days of the tradition, and this, in combination with fragments like *Ann.* 304–8 and 403, might even suggest that there was a certain irony to the title by which the epic was known – if, that is, the word *annales* had in the relevant era as strong implications of uncomplicated chronology as has often been supposed.

Two passages suggest that, in the first century BCE, the word *annales* imported connotations of a general public function and grafted a degree of whatever pontifical authority was associated with the *tabula* onto texts with which it was associated. The first such passage is from Livy. In his apology for an extended report on portents for the year *AUC* 585 (169 BCE), Livy famously writes:

> non sum nescius, ab eadem neglegentia qua nihil deos portendere vulgo nunc credant, neque nuntiari admodum ulla prodigia in publicum neque in annales referri. ceterum et mihi vetustas res scribenti nescio quo pacto antiquus fit animus et quaedam religio tenet, quae illi prudentissimi viri

[174] Ennius' haste to reach his own present day is comparable to that Livy ascribes to his readers (*Praef.* 4), presumably because both the poet and Livy's readers are optimistic about it, whereas Livy's own claimed reluctance to make haste (*Praef.* 5) is the result of a more troubled assessment of the present and a zeal for the *mores* of the past. Even Livy's claim turns out to be somewhat disingenuous, however, since he, too, though less markedly than Ennius, covers the distant past at a far more rapid rate than the present (Kraus 1994a: 24–5, with further bibliography in n. 105 there).

> publice suscipienda censuerint, ea pro indignis habere quae in meos annales referam. (43.13.2)[175]
>
> I am well aware that, out of the same disregard that causes people today commonly to think that the gods have nothing to say about the future, no portents at all are announced officially or reported in public records. But for my part, as I write of ancient events, somehow my mind turns old fashioned, and a sort of awe keeps me from treating as unworthy to be reported in my own account of times long since past the kinds of occurrences that the judicious men of former times thought should be taken up in public view.

Livy's language creates a mesh of the notions of bygone and venerable antiquity (*vetustas res*, *antiquus*, *illi*, arguably *annales* itself; see pp. 58–9), practical wisdom (*prudentissimi viri*, *censuerint*) and affairs essentially beyond the ken of mankind (*religio*, supported by *nescio quo pacto* and *quaedam*). The sense that Livy conveys is that contact with the past through his writing prompted in him the feeling that annalistic notices (as he knew them) ought to be granted a reverence respectful of the fact that their significance might not be fully apprehensible from the more typical contemporary perspective, given the prejudices of the 'modern' mind. Similar, overall, seems to have been the effect of the term *annales* for those readers of the *Aeneid* represented by DS, who read Vergil as wishing to exploit the pontifical associations of the word to enhance the standing of Aeneas: for them, the term imported a sense of *religio* that naturally clung to a narrative whose significance a typical contemporary consciousness could only dimly apprehend (cf. *unde quidem ideo dictum ab Aenea 'annales' aiunt, quod ipse religiosus sit et a poeta tum pontifex inducatur*; quoted in full on p. 25). We have no evidence to confirm whether these connotations pertained to the word *annales* in Ennius' day, although it has reasonably been suspected that they did: scholars have argued that Ennius' title appropriated a form of final authority for the contents it covered, hinted at the relevance to them of a sort of awe associated with the sacral aspects of the priestly record, and made clear the public function of the text it headed.[176] This seems to me plausible,

[175] This passage is discussed by Frier 1999: 274, for whom it 'is . . . indicative of . . . [Livy's] scrupulous sense of the identity of annalistic historiography. *Antiquus fit animus* speaks to the illusion [of history] created by austere and formal schemes of narrative' (cf. n. 38, p. 29), as well as by Levene 1993: 22–4, 115–16; Feldherr 1998: 66; and Sailor 2006: 353–7.

[176] Cf. '[t]he thesis that the title *Annales* will have alluded to the priestly chronicle remains plausible – it is an inspired choice on Ennius' part since it charges the historical time that unfolds in his epic with religious connotations' (Gildenhard 2003: 97). Cf. Beck and Walter, who argue that Ennius, an outsider to Rome whose writings, unlike those of the historiographers of senatorial rank, were not automatically endowed with the authority of their author's high social status, capitalised on the associations of the title and the inclusion of 'annalistic' formal and stylistic elements to furnish the

although the lack of contemporary evidence makes it impossible to confirm. My own suggestion is that the title pre-conditioned the audience to expect a record of events that time had already hallowed (as implied by Livy 43.13.2). This is no more surely founded than are the guesses just mentioned, except that *Ann.* 304–8 and 403 suggest how the poem might have played into these expectations.

At the most basic level, it is likely that the work's vestigial formal resemblances to the pontifical chronicle, along with the allusion effected by the title, constituted an advertisement of the work's affiliation to the local tradition of record-keeping at Rome in terms of its subject-matter and its exclusive focus on the City.[177] To my mind, that affiliation does not imply the adoption of a consistent point of view in the poem, especially because Ennius amalgamated it with the use of other major traditions of poetry and historiography, which were committed to no such loyalty, and whose very integration (arguably) involved inserting different perspectives into the fabric of the poem. It performs a vital function, however, in advertising up front the absolute Romanocentricity of this account. Thus to emphasise the connection to local Roman historiography was crucial precisely because of the degree of pressure to which Ennius' co-option of other, foreign poetic and historiographical traditions subjects the annalistic element of his work.

In the following chapters I explore those other traditions in turn, together with the sources that control our understanding of their role in the poem. In the case of the annalistic tradition's function in the epic, as we have seen, the situation is characterised by the absence of interested ancient sources capable of providing reliable and verifiable information about the subject. With the epic tradition, virtually the opposite situation pertains: a full fifth of our extant lines of the *Annales* are generated by sources which quite explicitly construct an epic genealogy running from Homer through Ennius to Vergil. The danger here is not of overstating or misinterpreting a limited set of information but of allowing the wealth of information to blind us to the manifest bias of this powerful and persuasive set of post-Vergilian readers. In Chapter 3, we shall tackle the single most influential reader of Ennius' *Annales*, Cicero, along with the three other pre-Vergilian sources. Cicero's presentation of the poem as a primarily historiographical endeavour will lead into an exploration, in Chapter 4, of the intersection, in the

work with extra-textual authority (Beck and Walter 2001: 41). (Gildenhard disagrees with the positive side of Beck and Walter's argument, insisting that Ennius 'emphasized his *literary*, rather than his social authority vis à vis his audience' [2003: 102]).

[177] Cf. Feeney 2007: 20 on how Apollodorus' use of Athenian archonship-dating signals the function of Athens as the real unifying thread in Apollodorus' work.

Annales, of poetry and historiography. In Chapter 5, we will explore the relationship between Ennius' *Annales* and universal history, which was soon to make its official debut at Rome in the form of Polybius' *Histories*. It is here that my emphasis on the title's function as advertising the Romanocentricity of Ennius' account will come into its own. My contention will be that, by hybridising the annalistic focus on Rome with a Homerising manner of expression, Ennius found the cultural clout and the explanatory power – albeit not rationalising explanatory power – of the more ambitious forms of prose historiography; and that, as a result, he was able to communicate earlier than any other interpreter of Rome the idea that the City's history was to have significance for, or was even to be ultimately identical with, world history.

CHAPTER 2

The Vergiliocentric sources and the question of the evidence: Ennius and the epic tradition of Greece and Rome

INTRODUCTION: THE QUESTION OF THE EVIDENCE

One of the most immediately striking and thoroughly documented aspects of Ennius' *Annales* is the presence throughout the poem of elements that put into literary action the poet's introductory claim of re-possessing Homer's spirit,[1] even as he introduces quite foreign subject-matter. As is well known, Ennius engaged the material of the Homeric texts in a wide variety of ways from the microscopic to the macroscopic, adapting the metre,[2] 'translating' specific oral formulaic phrases or inventing analogous versions thereof, as well as producing versions of extended Homeric episodes and using them, strikingly, in a culturally alien context to describe the events and actors of Roman history.[3]

[1] Our most direct evidence for the claim comes from the scholia to Persius and from 'Porphyrio' on Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.51 (see Appendix Tables A5.41 and A5.26). For Cicero's notion of the existence of a parallel between Homer and Ennius, see Cic. *Or.* 109, with Prinzen 1998: 182–4.

[2] Isid. *Orig.* 1.39.6: *hexametros autem Latinos primum fecisse Ennius traditur; eosque 'longos' vocant.* 'The single most important clue to [Ennius'] attitude is his dismissal of the Saturnian in favour of the Greek hexameter, scanned according to principles which at the time were novel, and couched in language which began the process of the alienation of poetry from the usage of ordinary men' (Newman 1967: 65).

[3] F. Skutsch provides a fairly full list of Ennian expressions deriving from Homeric formula, generic (e.g. battle-) scenes, particular extended scenes and extended similes, both ones similar and ones dissimilar in detail to Homeric examples (Skutsch 1905: 2610–11). He cites Columna (whose 1585 edition is the first to specialise in Ennius-fragments alone) as having made most observations to date relating to Ennius' small- and large-scale uses of Homer. See also Kameke 1926; Newman 1967: 72–4 (on Homerising in the context of Ennius as a Hellenistic poet); Ingalls 1971: 235–6; Jocelyn 1972: 1013–15; Moskalew 1982: 55–7 (on repetition as an aspect of Ennius' Homerising technique rather than specific instances of imitation); Skutsch 1985: index locorum, *s.v.* 'Homer' (where references to the *Iliad* more than double the references to the *Odyssey*); Goldberg 1995: 86–90; and Wills 1996: index, *s.v.* Ennius.

The texts principally responsible for our awareness of the extent and variety of Ennius' engagement with Homer are Book 6 of Macrobius' *Saturnalia*, Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid* and the occasionally learned additions to that commentary provided by DS;[4] also, Ps.-Probus and those other marginal annotators of the text of Vergil whose work we find in the Scholia Veronensia and Bernensia. In the discussion below, I shall call such sources 'Vergiliocentric', because they quote Ennius as a result of their inquiry into the history of Vergil's use of language, choice of characters and articulation of scenes, etc. (first and foremost in the *Aeneid*); and I shall initially focus on Macrobius as the single most concentrated and extended Vergiliocentric source.

Because Vergil is these sources' primary interest, our knowledge of the relationship between Homeric epic and the *Annales* is not essentially separable from our knowledge of the relationship between the *Aeneid* and the *Annales*: the former is passed on largely as a by-product of the Vergiliocentric sources' interest in the latter. Even where these sources do nothing explicitly to signal Homer's presence, the material they transmit tends to be of a kind that so evidently replicates Homeric forms of language or compositional techniques, as well as specific Homeric motifs, that Homer's involvement is often obvious. That is not true in the same way of fragments of the *Annales* that derive from non-Vergiliocentric sources. The Graecising and Homerising detail of the language is indeed consistent among all the fragments from whatever source, but the information provided by non-Vergiliocentric sources about Ennius' place in the epic tradition is roughly equivalent to what is given to us by the knowledge that he wrote in hexameter. The Vergiliocentric sources are different in that it is they who quite consistently and almost exclusively show us the mechanics of Ennius' place in the epic tradition: that is, the close replication of specific Homeric modes of expression, episodes and techniques, as subsequently privileged by Vergil's apparently consistent co-option of specifically Ennian versions of the same, and by the Vergiliocentric sources' notice thereof. Without these sources' evidence we should be virtually ignorant of what appears today as one of the principal characteristics of the poem and one that has a great deal to tell us about its style and organisation. The same set of characteristics has real potential, as well as clear pitfalls, as an interpretative key to surviving passages of the poem. This chapter examines how the Vergiliocentric sources' presentation and organisation of their material serve both to limit and to inform our sense of how the epic tradition at Rome was constructed.

[4] For DS, see Chapter 1, n. 25 and Chapter 2, n. 78 (pp. 25 and 104).

Since our information about Ennius' Homerising emerges from a particular set of sources with a specific interest, we witness the question of the evidence confronting the question of interpretation particularly squarely in this area.[5] The modern reader's sensitivity to the presence of Homer in Ennius may partly be due to the fact that no other poetic predecessor of Ennius, survives as well or is familiar to any comparable degree, and this circumstance may combine with the isolation of many fragments whose context is obscure to thrust their Homeric nature into possibly unwarranted prominence – although there is plenty of evidence of early awareness of Ennius' Homerising available to reassure modern readers that their own sensitivity to it is not entirely out of key with the ancient readers' experience of the *Annales*.[6] It is more seriously compounded, however, by the fact that around 21 per cent of the total of Skutsch's securely attributed lines of the *Annales* (131 out of 623) are provided by Vergiliocentric sources.[7] These

[5] Cf. Clarke 1999a: 134 on the influence of Athenaeus' 'gastronomic preoccupations' on the sense of Posidonius' *Histories* that emerges from his text.

[6] Examples of ancient awareness of specific ways in which Ennius' practice paralleled that of Homer include Gellius, *NA* 13.21.14: . . . *contra vero idem Ennius in annali duodevicesimo 'aere fulva'* [*Ann.* 440] *dixit, non 'fulvo', non ob id solum quod Homerus ἠέρα βαθεῖαν dicit, sed quod hic sonus, opinor, vocalior est visus et amoenior*; *Brev. Expos.* Verg. *G.* 2.43: *'(non mihi si) linguae': Homericus sensus Graeci poetae, sicut et Ennius: 'non si lingua loqui saperet quibus ora decem sint/in me, tum ferro cor sit pectusque revinctum'* [*Ann.* 469–70]; Ps.-Probus, *G.* 2.506: *'Sarrano dormiat ostro': Tyriam purpuram vult intellegi Sarranum ostrum. Tyron enim Sarram appellatam Homerus docet, quem etiam Ennius sequitur auctorem cum dicit 'Poenos Sarra oriundos'* [*Ann.* 472]; Nonius 211.10: *lapides et feminino genere dici possunt ut apud Ennium 'tanto sublatae sunt/a<u>gmine tunc lapides'* [*Ann.* 566–7], *ad Homeri similitudinem, qui genere feminino lapides posuit*. Such evidence confirms that Ennius' Homerising remained a significant factor in the experience of his audience, even after other poets habituated later audiences to the originally unique experience of hearing hexameter in Latin.

[7] The figure 131 takes into account only those fragments that are cited by Macrobius, Servius and DS explicitly because of their relationship to Vergil (see Appendix Tables A5.24, A5.23 and A5.35 for fuller documentation than I provide here). The argument below will suggest that other fragments overtly quoted for other, more minute, technical reasons further abet the construction of the Homer–Ennius–Vergil genealogy, more or less in a supporting capacity, once the basic framework has been constructed for us by the principal Vergiliocentric sources. Macrobius in the *Saturnalia* gives us 38 fragments 65 lines directly in connection with Vergil's language (*Ann.* 20, 26, 27, 32, 33, 94–5, 143–4, 145, 151, 163, 169, 173–4, 175–9, 203–4, 205, 232, 233, 242, 258–60, 263, 266, 288, 311, 344–5, 348, 376, 379–80, 384, 391–8, 404–5, 411, 415–16, 417, 428, 431, 432–4, 453, 535–9). Except for *Ann.* 94–5, which is also quoted by DS, these fragments survive exclusively via Macrobius. Macrobius also transmits *Ann.* 142 and 227–8, but I omit these from the count because they are quoted for reasons more typical of the grammatical tradition rather than directly to explain the text of Vergil. Not counting the handful of lines for which Servius is a supplementary source, he, as sole or primary source, provides 23 fragments 26 lines of the *Annales* in explanation of Vergil's language (*Ann.* 52, 53, 110–11, 225–6, 442, 451, 483–4, 502, 518, 519, 524, 532, 534, 553, 569, 570, 601, 602, 603, 605, 606, 609, 622). For the majority of these (18 fragments 19 lines), Servius is in fact the sole source, and only two of the total (*Ann.* 553 and 570) are quoted in relation to the *Georgics* rather than the *Aeneid*. DS provides a separate 28 fragments (40 lines): *Ann.* 18, 28–9, 56, 61–2, 65, 121, 223–4, 299, 326–8, 370, 418, 425–6, 435–6, 446–7, 452, 458, 488–9, 504, 507, 513, 515–16, 528, 533, 555–6, 564–5, 568, 576, 607. DS is the sole source for all but 4 of these fragments (equivalent to 5 lines). 7 fragments (*Ann.* 18, 28–9, 223–4, 326–8, 418, 425–6, 435–6) are cited in

fragments are not infrequently among the more attractive and interpretable remains of the poem: because their sources aim to demonstrate the relationship of the quotations to phrases or passages of Vergil (and sometimes Homer), those quotations themselves constitute sense-units comparable to the Vergilian target-passages – unlike the material presented by writers of the lexicographical and encyclopaedic traditions, from which so large a bulk of our fragments otherwise derives. And the fragments from these Vergiliocentric sources fit readily into a generic framework about which we are well informed. Small wonder, then, if Ennius' position in the epic tradition is one of the clearest aspects of our image of him.

If our awareness of Ennius' role as a crucial hinge between the epic traditions of Greece and Rome is generally the product of early scholars' interest in explaining given features (especially but not limited to the language) of Vergil's *Aeneid*, it results in particular from a specific line of inquiry pursued with some consistency in *Saturnalia* 6, a text which alone is responsible for half of the output of the Vergiliocentric sources.[8] The speakers of *Sat*. 6 focus on the contribution of Vergil's Latin predecessors to his use of language. Below, we will explore Macrobius' own system for organising the lines, and we will notice that this author's quotations fall into rough categories which his headings only partially and tangentially describe. Macrobius predominantly quotes lines that reproduce those hallmarks of Homeric poetry we now know to be the product of oral formulaic composition, although he himself betrays no awareness of this fact. I call these lines in Ennius (and Vergil) 'quasi-formulaic', because they replicate in the new, written context the effects of Homeric formula. The Ennian lines are always quoted with their Vergilian descendants and sometimes with their Homeric forebears. But even where those forebears are not explicitly quoted, they are nevertheless frequently present to the reader, because of the closeness of Ennius' imitation of these familiar, repeated Homeric expressions.[9] Since such phrases are associated with no particular moment in the poem but are used to describe the background against which the significant action of the poem takes place (they describe the passing of time, scene-change, day-break or nightfall, etc.), and since Macrobius presents them to us with their Vergilian, Ennian, and (at least in ghost) Homeric versions neatly

relation to the *Georgics* rather than the *Aeneid*; *Ann*. 515–16 is quoted in relation to both the *Georgics* and the *Aeneid*, and DS is aware of the relevance to *Aen*. 12.657 of the Ennian language that he quotes in commenting on G. 4.188 (*Ann*. 435–6).

[8] I.e. more than 10 per cent (65/623) of the securely attributed lines of Ennius' *Annales*; for the citations, see n. 7.

[9] For discussion of the use of Homerising quasi-formulaic epithets in the *Aeneid* without reference to Ennius' role in the formation of that language, see Parry 1963: 29–36.

aligned, these lines tend to take on for the modern reader the quality of representatives of the genre of epic as a whole – all the more so because our information about the intermediate course of that tradition is largely limited to what Macrobius, supported by a few others, provides.

Because my approach focuses on the contingency and on the limitations of the particular type of information that we happen to have available, and on its effects on interpretation, I will characterise what emerges from the Vergiliocentric sources as a 'reading' or a moment in the reception of Ennius and Vergil:[10] that is, I will emphasise that our view of Ennius' role in the epic tradition at Rome is a view through the eyes of a particular set of post-Vergilian ancient readers, whose evidence has survived more or less by chance. Admittedly, part of that 'chance' is the publication of Vergil's *Aeneid*, which marks the crucial point of interference in both the transmission and in the reception of the *Annales*. The enduring interest the *Aeneid* generated presumably to some extent ensured the survival of at least some marginal texts concerned to explain its language – that is, of at least some Vergiliocentric sources for the *Annales*: it is true that far less (or indeed far more) of the *Annales* might have survived, were it not for the *Aeneid*.[11] But the publication of the *Aeneid* neither removes the importance of the *Annales* as a narrative of the Roman past in the pre-Vergilian era, nor does it explain the power of its hold on readers such as Cicero or Vergil in the first place. The view of Ennius and Roman literary tradition that emerges via the Vergiliocentric sources tells us simply that Vergil's co-option of the *Annales*, his latter-day inscription of Ennius into literary history, was apparently more immediately compelling than that of Livy, Lucretius or others, at least to those of his readers whom we read today.[12] Even so, it remains a snapshot from a particular point in time, not a universal truth.

[10] Cf. R. Tarrant's view of Vergilian biography as an aspect of Vergilian reception, introducing its own form of distortion into the reading of the text (Tarrant 1997: 57), and B. Graziosi's similar productive approach to Homer, again using biography as a form of literary criticism (Graziosi 2002).

[11] Cf. Baxandall 1985: 58–62, on the younger author's agency in the issue of intertextuality and its consequences for the work adapted. I owe this reference to Humphreys 1997: 221, n. 12, who herself terms the matter 'cannibalization' – aptly, I believe, for the case of Vergil's effect on Ennius too.

[12] The coincidence of formal features, as between the *Aeneid* and the *Annales*, predisposes sources to track related language. This explains why no fragments of the *Annales* survive through scholarly traditions anxious to give the history of the language of prose writers. It does not explain why essentially no fragments of the *Annales* are generated by readers interested in explaining the history of the *DRN*. This is instead presumably an accident of the fact that there survives (there existed?) very little by way of an ancient scholarly tradition on Lucretius (ctr. Vergil's immediate standing: see n. 15, p. 81). Instead of serving as an end in himself for a scholarly tradition of his own, Lucretius was simply a tool in the hands of those striving to explain the origin of Vergil's language (see n. 22, p. 83). On the coincidence of Ennian, Lucretian and Vergilian quasi-formulaic language, see further pp. 115–17.

Not only is the meat of our modern understanding of the poet's primary function in literary history contingent on the bias of a particular set of surviving sources, but their selectivity almost palpably limits our sense of Ennius' broader role in literary tradition at large. As I have suggested above, without the massive influx of information provided by *Saturnalia* 6 in particular, much of the intricacy and overall variety of Ennius' use of Homer would escape us, and we would be stripped of the greater part of our means for seeing how Ennius intervened in the epic tradition – that is, of what, in terms of his own poetic practice, the poet apparently meant by his claim that he was now the possessor of Homer's soul. But at the same time the vista on the epic tradition that opens up for us as a result of Macrobius' dedication to a particular line of inquiry sharpens our sense of what we are deprived of in other areas, where we have no comparable set of sources. If the Macrobian view of Ennius' role does nothing to illuminate other possible contributions his work made to the development of literary tradition, it should not obscure the real possibility of further such contributions. The richness and at the same time the evident partiality of what Macrobius discloses promote the probability of a far richer influx than we can discern both into hexametric poetry and into other genres, especially prose historiography. From the very little we can deduce independently, it seems likely that Livy, at least, had an active and complex engagement with Ennius on a level comparable to that of Vergil.[13] That engagement is much less visible to us than Vergil's engagement with Ennius is (thanks largely to Macrobius), but it was surely no less productive to Livy's immediate audience.[14] There surely exist other such limitations that we today no longer have the means to discern. These limitations, imposed by the Vergiliocentric sources' quasi-monopoly of our information about Ennius' role in literary history, in no way decrease the value of the Vergiliocentrics' information for us: indeed, given that the full text of the *Annales* eludes us, the post-Vergilian Ennius – that is, the reasons why Ennius continued to appear important to readers after the *Aeneid* had

[13] Livy has long struck scholars as far richer in Ennian material than we can reliably discern; see e.g. Hagen 1873: 271–3; Wölfflin 1895: 152; Morgan 1898: 61–6; Vahlen 1903: lx1 (who takes issue with Wölfflin and his student, Stacey); Lease 1903: 408–22; esp. 411–12; Lundström 1915: 1–24; Aly 1936: 1–50; and Ogilvie 1965: 120–2. Norden is sceptical: see Norden 1915: 54, n. 1, 157, cf. Norden 1927: 371; he attributes Livy's Ennianisms to his use of Ennianising predecessors in the prose annalistic tradition and so only indirectly to Ennius himself. Norden cites Stacey 1898: 17–33 as the first systematic attempt to trace Ennian phrases in Livy. For Sallust's engagement with Ennius, see Skard 1933: 1–83. Prose writers' chances of the formation around them of a tradition on their use of Ennius were compromised by the dissimilarity between the formal features of their accounts and those of the *Annales* (cf. n. 12).

[14] For two case-studies in Livy's still discernible use of Ennius, see Elliott 2009a: 531–41 and Elliott 2009b: 650–3.

usurped its place of honour in the school curriculum and in the culture at large – is surely one of the most desirable objects of inquiry for us.[15]

Although we will focus primarily on the sources' responsibility for our view of the epic tradition in the discussion below, the primary act, that is, Vergil's own centralisation of Ennius in that tradition as viewed from the perspective of the *Aeneid*, is one that deserves attention in its own right. In addition to discussing the effects of Vergil's choice of Ennian language for our interpretation of the *Annales*, we will explore below the effects of that choice for the *Aeneid*, since *Saturnalia* 6 in particular, supported by evidence from elsewhere, suggests that, while Vergil also had other options at his disposal, he chose with some consistency to deploy specifically Ennian versions of Homerising quasi-formula.[16]

In the following discussion, Ennius will turn out to have four roles in Vergil's use of language as understood by Macrobius and his allies. As noted above, Ennius is primarily quoted in this tradition as a source for (1) language imitating Homeric formula or (2) typical formal devices with core representative value for the genre of epic as a whole, as it emerges in the historical construction given it in the *Aeneid* (such as similes). In addition, Ennius sometimes serves in these sources' representation as (3) the model for a number of striking phrases associated with unique moments in both the *Annales* and the *Aeneid*.[17] Finally, Ennius is quoted (4) in explanation or justification of the language Vergil uses when that language is open to the criticism of being strange or difficult; the precedent of Ennius functioned as a means of making acceptable words or expressions that might otherwise puzzle or seem inappropriate to a 'modern' reader. Often, the features of language requiring explanation are Graecisms or archaisms. Since these features are part of the mechanics of reproducing Homerising style, the sources' search for these can only strengthen our sense of the predominance of this aspect of Ennius' poetic style. In exploring these uses of Ennius in the Vergiliocentric tradition, we will begin in each case by examining the bulk of the evidence in Macrobius and then seeing how it is supported or undermined by other texts both inside and outside that

[15] For the use of Vergil as a school text probably within his own lifetime, see Kaster 1995: 188–9; for his immediate and lasting broader cultural status, see Tarrant 1997: 56–7, 58–9 (citing Kaster).

[16] For those other options, see e.g. *Sat.* 6.1.31, which illustrates Vergil's use of quasi-formula coined (unless re-used) by Furius Bibaculus.

[17] Here, Conte's sense of 'exemplary model' is relevant, as opposed to his 'code model'. The latter term would instead be associated with the system of formulaic-style language and the language of similes as modelled on epic predecessors that the first and second of Macrobius' categories, in my schematisation, illustrate. (For Segal's summary of the concepts of 'exemplary model' and 'code model', see Conte 1986: 31.)

tradition. We will thus see in detail those types of Ennian language that consistently interest the Vergiliocentric sources as a group and make some effort at evaluating how representative those types of language are of the work as a whole. The narrower the categories of language in focus are, and the more consistently we see them pursued by this vocal group of sources, the more closely we will be able to define how these sources direct and limit modern interpretation of the *Annales*.

SATURNALIA 6: ORGANISATION AND CONTENT

The speakers of Book 6 of Macrobius' *Saturnalia* present blocks of quotations (single lines or full passages) of Vergil in conjunction with corresponding quotations from one or more predecessors. Each block is presented under a different heading. At *Sat.* 6.1, we find short and verbally close quotations, and it is here that Ennius' dominance among Vergil's early Latin predecessors is most pronounced.[18] *Sat.* 6.2 presents longer, more distant but still recognisable passages. At *Sat.* 6.3, we have imitations that strike contemporary readers as imitations of Homer but that in fact rely on Latin literary predecessors whose work by the fifth century CE had sunk into obscurity.[19] *Sat.* 6.4 illustrates Vergil's choice use of vocabulary drawn from early Latin poets. His borrowing of epithets in particular is shown at *Sat.* 6.5.[20] None of Macrobius' category-headings offers a theoretically sophisticated or, as it turns out, even particularly apt or complete description of the contents it covers. Beneath these headings are ranged collections of excerpts, culled from previous generations of pro- or anti-Vergilian critics, who were interested, for one reason or another, in illustrating Vergil's relationship to earlier poets, and among whose collections Macrobius switches in a strikingly unpredictable manner.[21] There remains, however, a loose coherence within the categories as Macrobius sets them out that can

[18] Cf. Elliott 2008: 242–6. [19] For the date of the *Saturnalia*, see Cameron 1966: 25–38.

[20] Macrobius' own descriptions of the sections of his text are: (1) *quos ab aliis traxit vel ex dimidio sui versus vel paene solidos* (*Sat.* 6.1.7, describing the examples given at *Sat.* 6.1.8–65). (2) *locos integros cum parva quadam immutatione translatos sensusve ita transcriptos ut unde essent eluceret, immutatos alios ut tamen origo eorum non ignoraretur* (*ibid.*, describing the examples given at *Sat.* 6.2). (3) *quaedam de his quae ab Homero sumpta sunt ostendam non ipsum ab Homero tulisse, sed prius alios inde sumpsisse, et hunc ab illis, quos sine dubio legerat, transtulisse* (*ibid.*, describing the examples given at *Sat.* 6.3). (4) The new speaker at *Sat.* 6.4.1 (Caecina) describes his endeavour as *ostendere hunc studiosissimum vatem* [*sc.* Vergilium] *et de singulis verbis veterum aptissime iudicasse et inseruisse electa operi suo verba, quae nobis nova videri facit incuria vetustatis*. (5) The subject of *Sat.* 6.5 is *epitheta apud Vergilium . . . quae ab ipso ficta creduntur, sed . . . a veteribus tracta* (both *simplicia* and *composita*). Alternative but consonant descriptions for (2) and (3) exist at *Sat.* 6.2.1 and 6.3.1.

[21] See Jocelyn 1964: 280–95; Jocelyn 1965: 126–44; and Skutsch 1985: 31–4.

sometimes be exploited, as can the presumably unintended relationships among the citations in different categories. All in all, *Saturnalia* 6 offers the most detailed and extended surviving portrayal of the epic tradition at Rome, as viewed from the vantage-point of at least one subsection of the scholarly tradition running through the fifth century. Ennius emerges from Macrobius' presentation as the most important original formulator of those Latin versions of the quintessential marks of Homeric epic that Vergil accepted and canonised by including them in the *Aeneid*.

Of the 21 Latin authors cited in explanation of Vergil's language in Book 6 of the *Saturnalia*, Ennius is the one who recurs most frequently (with Lucretius hard on his heels).[22] Ennius' leading role is further impressed on the reader by his absolute domination of the start of the list: at *Sat*. 6.1, the *Annales* head the list of 64 quotations with an unbroken run of 22, with a further 6 recurrences thereafter (and additionally one from the *Alexander*).[23] Moreover, there are occasions in *Saturnalia* 6 where Ennian involvement can be traced even where Macrobius himself fails to be explicit about it, as a result of information we have from other sources.[24]

[22] Overall in *Sat*. 6.1–5, Ennian epic and Lucretius are each quoted 40 times. Additionally, Ennian tragedy is quoted 8 times, and the *Scipio* 3 times. I have counted individual quotations separately, even when they are given under a single Vergilian lemma. On Ennius' role in the formation of Lucretius' language, i.e. his probable relevance to any and all instances where Lucretius is cited as Vergil's predecessor, see e.g. Wreschniok 1907; Merrill 1918b; Norden 1927: 369–72, esp. 371; Skutsch 1985: 12; Gale 1994: 106–9; Gale 2000: 68, n. 34, 239, n. 29; Kenney 2007: 96, cf. Murley 1947: 336–46; West 1969: 23–34; Gigon 1978: 167–96; Hardie 1986: 193–219; and Mayer 1990: 35–43. For the few instances where substantiated triangulation with Lucretius is possible, see pp. 115–17, below.

[23] Ennius' closest competitor in *Sat*. 6.1 is Lucretius, who is cited 15 times. Other authors lag far behind: Furius Bibaculus is cited 6 times, Accius 5 times, Lucilius, Catullus and Varius twice each, Naevius, Pacuvius and Sueius once each. In the other sections, the focus recedes from Ennius, sometimes considerably: at *Sat*. 6.2, Lucretius is quoted 14 times, Ennius' *Annales* only 3 times, with further mention (without direct quotation) of the Pandarus and Bitias episode of *Aen*. 9 being modelled on a passage of Ennius' Book 15 (*Sat*. 6.2.32); Ennian tragedy (the *Alexander* and the *Cresphontes*) is quoted 3 times, his *Scipio* once; Varius and Cicero are quoted twice, Accius once. The modelling of the storm and Jupiter's subsequent conversation with Venus in *Aen*. 1 on a passage of Book 1 of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* is also mentioned (*Sat*. 6.1.31; again, no direct quotation). At *Sat*. 6.3, Ennius is quoted twice, Furius Bibaculus and Hostius once each. At *Sat*. 6.4, Lucretius is quoted 8 times, Ennius' *Annales* 5 times, his tragedies twice, his *Scipio* once, Lucilius, Pomponius, Cicero, Sisenna and Varro twice each, Furius Bibaculus, Afranius, Cornificius, Julius, and Cato once each. At *Sat*. 6.5, the *Annales* are quoted only once, Ennian tragedy twice; Accius is quoted 5 times, Lucretius and Naevius 3 times, Egnatius twice, Afranius, Hostius, Livius Andronicus, Cornificius, Sueius, Laberius, and Pacuvius once each. Few quotations of Vergil's Latin literary predecessors occur after this point in *Sat*. 6. There is one final quotation of Ennius' *Annales* at *Sat*. 6.9.10.

[24] On instances of Ennius' provable relevance in cases where Furius and Hostius and not Ennius are cited by Macrobius, see pp. 85–6. On Macrobius' erratic working methods, which are probably representative of the tradition as a whole in which he worked, see Jocelyn and Skutsch as cited in n. 21, p. 82.

At its fullest, the scholarly tradition represented by Macrobius provides both the Homeric antecedent and the Vergilian descendant of the Ennian lines it supplies, and my discussion will begin there, from those passages where construction of the epic tradition at Rome is at its most explicit. It will subsequently radiate out to include passages that focus on specific relationships between the language of Vergil and Ennius alone but where the presence of Homer is nevertheless palpable in the background, and that therefore offer a more wide-angled view of the epic tradition than is apparent on the surface. That residual Homeric presence supports my earlier contention that Macrobius' quotations of Ennius tend by and large to be concentrated around his role in forging the language that was to typify the epic tradition as we know it from Vergil. This tends to be true regardless of Macrobius' particular focus within a section, which suggests in turn that construction of the epic tradition was a broad concern of the scholarly tradition on which Macrobius drew.

THE SOURCES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE EPIC TRADITION (I): LANGUAGE IMITATING HOMERIC FORMULA

Macrobius

At *Sat*. 6.3.1, Macrobius' speaker (Rufius[25] Albinus) says that he will provide quotations that illustrate how Vergil's use of Homer is frequently negotiated across formulations coined by his Latin literary predecessors:

> sunt quaedam apud Vergilium quae ab Homero creditur transtulisse, sed ea docebo a nostris auctoribus sumpta, qui priores haec ab Homero in carmina sua traxerant.
>
> There are certain [lines] in Vergil which people think he transferred from Homer, but I shall show that they were taken from [previous] Roman writers, who had earlier taken over these [lines] from Homer for their own poems.

In the quotations that follow, the dominance of Ennius is impressive. There are four triple-citations, two substantial, and two only one line long. The two substantial blocks give us two of our longer fragments of Ennius. The first describes the resilience under attack of the tribune, Caelius (or

[25] I am grateful to Bob Kaster for alerting me to the fact that Willis, in printing *Furius* not *Rufius* in his edition of the *Saturnalia*, ignores both the manuscripts and the prosopographical data.

C. Aelius; *Ann.* 391–8),[26] whose comparability to the Ajax of *Il.* 16.102–11 and the Turnus of *Aen.* 9.806–14 Macrobius makes explicit by quoting those passages on either side of the Ennian one (*Sat.* 6.3.2–4). The second is the stall-fed horse simile (*Ann.* 535–9) familiar from *Il.* 6.506–11 and *Aen.* 11.492–7 (*Sat.* 6.3.7–8).[27] Ennius is not presented by Macrobius as the Latin intermediary of the two one-line triple-citations, but in both cases relevant lines of Ennius survive from other sources, testament to the haphazard working practices of Macrobius and the tradition in which he worked.[28] Thus, at *Sat.* 6.3.4, Macrobius puts into relation the lines ἀσπὶς ἄρ' ἀσπίδ' ἔρειδε, κόρυς κόρυν, ἀνέρα δ'ἀνήρ (*Il.* 13.131), *pressatur pede pes, mucro mucrone, viro vir* (Furius Bibaculus, fr. 10 C), and *haeret pede pes densusque viro vir* (*Aen.* 10.361); yet the *Bellum Hispaniense* (31.7) also makes available to us Ennian *premitur pede pes atque armis arma teruntur* ('foot presses close with foot, and arms are ground by arms'. *Ann.* 584).[29] At *Sat.* 6.3.5, we find οὐδ' εἴ μοι δέκα μὲν γλῶσσαι δέκα δὲ στόματ' εἶεν (*Il.* 2.489), *non si mihi linguae/centum atque ora sient totidem vocesque liquatae* (Hostius, fr. 3 C), *non mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum* (*Aen.* 6.625), but not *non si lingua loqui saperet quibus, ora decem sint/in me, tum ferro cor sit pectusque revinctum* (*Ann.* 469–70, transmitted by the *Brevis Expositio* and the Scholia Bernensia on *G.* 2.43).[30] The evidence set out by the speaker at *Sat.* 6.3, supported by Vergilian scholia and by the author of the *Bellum Hispaniense*, thus positions Ennius squarely at the crucial intersection of the epic traditions of Greece and Rome. It is rather striking that lines transmitted by sources unconcerned with the construction of the epic tradition confirm the impression of Ennian centrality that emerges from the two longer preceding triple-citations. *Sat.* 6.3 as a whole well illustrates that, by the fifth century, the primary material that the scholarly tradition had available when it sought to explain Vergil's negotiation of Homer via early Latin poetry came from Ennius' *Annales*. What the passage as a whole presents is presumably a miniature and incoherent reflection of the collective published experience of the scholarly community immediately subsequent to the publication of the *Aeneid*, when the *Annales* were still vividly

[26] See n. 151 of Chapter 1, p. 63.

[27] For *Ann.* 535–9, see Kameke 1926: 25–8; Williams 1968: 695; Albrecht 1969: 333–45; Wülfing-von Martitz 1972: 267–70; Skutsch 1985: *ad loc.*; and Goldberg 1995: 86–7.

[28] See the citations in n. 21, p. 82.

[29] See Skutsch 1985: 724–6. In discussing the fragments supplied by the *Bell. Hisp.*, Norden notes (with regret) that they imply that battle-scenes were described in formulaic phrases (Norden 1915: 158).

[30] On this set of lines and their further relations, see Hinds 1998: 34–47.

present to the new text's readers. *Sat.* 6.3 shows why and how the *Annales* seemed historically important to the scholars of the post-Vergilian age.

Even where the focus is not, as at *Sat.* 6.3, Ennius' mediating role in the epic tradition as such, where Ennius surfaces, Macrobius can nevertheless sometimes not resist supplying the very obvious correlations in Homer, though the framing of the discussion makes them strictly irrelevant. For example, at *Sat.* 6.4.1, the new speaker (Caecina) announces his intention to illustrate Vergil's discrimination in selecting choice words of the ancient poets, which only contemporary ignorance, he says, makes seem new-fangled (see n. 20, p. 82, for his wording). It is thus for no apparent reason that the example of Vergil's use of Ennian language given at *Sat.* 6.4.6 includes an Homeric original:[31] *Ann.* 384, *horrescit telis exercitus asper utrimque* ('on both sides the armies bristled fiercely with spears') is quoted not only in conjunction with *Aen.* 11.601–2,[32] *tum ferreus hastis/horret ager* ('then the field bristled iron with spears') but also with *Il.* 13.339, ἔφριξεν δὲ μάχη φθισίμβροτος ἐγχείῃσι ('manslaughtering battle bristled with spears'). Other Ennian lines with different generic affiliations but a clear relationship in terms of language are also quoted there: *arma arrigunt, horrescunt tela* ('they raise their weapons, spears bristle', *Erechtheus* 143 J) and *sparsis hastis longis campus splendet et horret* ('they hurl their long spears and the field gleams and bristles', *Scipio* 14 V), but this does little to dispel the sense that the critical version of the expression is the one from the *Annales*, which heads the list of the three Ennian lines, and which the framing citations from the *Aeneid* and the *Iliad* draw into prominence. The manner in which the information is presented thus tends to privilege Ennius as epic poet and crucial intermediary in the epic tradition over different facets of his literary activity, even where his status as such is not explicitly being promoted.

Again, even in cases where Macrobius gives no Homeric precedent for an Ennian–Vergilian phrase, Homeric ancestry is nevertheless often clearly relevant. This is true particularly often at *Sat.* 6.1.8–65, where the list of quotations consists of lines the speaker (Rufius Albinus) describes as *quos ab aliis traxit vel ex dimidio sui versus vel paene solidos* ('those half- or virtually complete lines which he took over from others', *Sat.* 6.1.7). The description thus selects brevity and, as a concomitant, closeness of language, as the salient features of this list of borrowings. Ennius' adaptations or approximations of

[31] Except perhaps to the extent that the Homeric flavouring is what distinguishes the phrases; but the insertion of Homer here is unique in *Sat.* 6.4, even though there are other phrases with Greek and Homeric backgrounds (e.g. at *Sat.* 6.4.10, 14, 18, 19 and 20).

[32] Macrobius' text omits *late* after *tum* at *Aen.* 11.601.

Homeric formulaic phrases (his 'quasi-formulae') dominate this list, although the speaker's capacious description also allows room for other types of borrowing. It is in the first place impressive that so large a stock of Ennian material imitating Homeric formula was available from within the scholarly tradition on which Macrobius drew and suggests that this aspect of the *Annales* had from the earliest days of scholarship on the *Aeneid* drawn the attention of those seeking to explain Vergil's use of language.

For some of the lines Macrobius supplies at *Sat.* 6.1, it is not only the existence of a specific Homeric precedent that confirms their intended formulaic function, but also collateral evidence of repeated use of the phrase in the *Annales*, further supported by Vergil's evident recognition and adoption of the phrases to supply the effects of formula in the *Aeneid*. This is the case with the line supplied at *Sat.* 6.1.10:

> conciliumque vocat divum pater atque hominum rex [*Aen.* 10.2]
> Ennius in sexto:
> tum cum corde suo divum pater atque hominum rex effatur [*Ann.* 203 4]
>
> the father of the gods and king of men summons a council
> Ennius in Book 6:
> then to himself the father of the gods and king of men/speaks out

It is immediately apparent that the second half of these lines is a calque on the Homeric πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε ('the father of both men and gods', at, e.g., *Il.* 1.544, *Od.* 1.28, 18.137, etc.),[33] and, for the bracketed parts of the Ennian line, Homeric εἶπε πρὸς ὃν μεγαλήτορα θυμόν ('he said to himself', at e.g. *Il.* 11.403) is again obviously comparable, as is Ζεὺς . . . προτὶ ὃν μυθήσατο θυμὸν ('Zeus said to himself', *Il.* 17.200, 442; *Od.* 5.285, cf. 298).[34] Parallels to the repeated phrase above, available from elsewhere in the record, confirm the intended function of the line as a reproduction of Homeric formula: Varro, *LL* 5.65 supplies *divomque hominumque pater, rex* ('the father of both gods and men, the king', *Ann.* 591), while Cicero, *Nat. D.* 2.4 and 64 supplies *patrem divomque hominumque* ('the father of both gods and men', *Ann.* 592), and Gellius, *NA* 12.4 *leges divomque hominumque* ('the laws of both gods and men', *Ann.* 284). These repetitions cement the impression that Ennius created a thoughtful and attentive version of 'Homer' in Latin, while Vergil's subsequent repetitions of the phrase (*divum pater atque hominum rex* at *Aen.* 1.65, 2.648, 10.783, as well as 10.2) confirm his reading of the line as 'formula'. A further example of the phenomenon exists in *tollitur in caelum clamor* ('the shouting rose to the

[33] Cf. pp. 96–7, with n. 58.
[34] Both Homeric phrases are given with these citations at Skutsch 1985: 365.

sky', *Ann.* 428), supplied at *Sat.* 6.1.21, and in the comparable *clamor ad caelum volvendus per aethera vagit* ('the shouting sounds out, rolling up through the air to the sky', *Ann.* 545), provided by Varro, *LL* 7.104. These lines echo equally generic moments in Homer, such as σιδήρειος δ' ὀρυμαγδὸς/χάλκεον οὐρανὸν ἶκε δι' αἰθέρος ἀτρυγέτοιο ('the iron din reached the brazen sky through the barren ether', *Il.* 17.424–5), ἀϋτὴ οὐρανὸν ἶκεν ('the battle-cries reached the sky', *Il.* 2.153 and elsewhere) and ὦρτο δ'ἀϋτή ('the war-shouts rose up', *Il.* 12.377, 15.312, 20.374).[35] The Ennian phrases beget *Aen.* 11.745 and 12.462, which exactly reproduce *Ann.* 428 (quoted by Macrobius precisely to show its relation to *Aen.* 11.745). The same set of circumstances pertains to the line preserved at *Sat.* 6.1.50:

> tum gelidus toto manabat corpore sudor [*Aen.* 3.175]
> Ennius in sexto decimo:
> tunc timido manat ex omni corpore sudor [*Ann.* 417]

> then the freezing sweat poured from my entire body
> Ennius in Book 16:
> then sweat poured from every part of the frightened man's body

This line is at least notionally repeated in the phrase *totum sudor habet corpus* ('sweat covers his entire body') at *Ann.* 396 (part of the passage on the tribune 'Caelius/C. Aelius', *Ann.* 391–8, given by Macrobius at *Sat.* 6.3.3). Its evident model, quoted by Macrobius in the latter passage, is *Il.* 16.109–10: αἰεὶ δ' ἀργαλέῳ ἔχετ' ἄσθματι, κὰδ' δέ οἱ ἱδρὼς/πάντοθεν ἐκ μελέων πολὺς ἔρρεεν . . . ('he was constantly in the grip of painful gasping, and sweat ran down him in great quantity from all his limbs'). And the multiple re-formulations in the *Aeneid* compound the sense that we are dealing with what functioned in the Latin epic tradition (more than in Homer, since the line occurs only in a single memorable vignette in the *Iliad*) as a quasi-formulaic line:[36] *salsusque per artus sudor iit* ('the salt sweat ran over its limbs', *Aen.* 2.173–4, of the Palladium in Sinon's account; the epithet *salsus* also struck DS as Ennian);[37] *tum creber anhelitus artus/aridaque ora quatit, sudor fluit undique rivis* ('then quick panting shook their limbs and their parched mouths, and sweat flowed everywhere in streams', *Aen.* 5.200, of

[35] The Homeric lines are cited by Skutsch (1985: 589 and 693), though Skutsch sees *Il.* 17.424–5 as 'hardly a direct model'.

[36] Vergilian quasi-formulaic phrases are rarely repeated verbatim; see Elliott 2008: 244–5, with nn. 8 and 9 there. Further examples are given below.

[37] DS ad *Aen.* 2.173 (*salsus . . ./. . . sudor*): *Probo sane displicet* salsus sudor *et supervacue positum videtur. hoc autem Ennius de lamis dixit* [*Ann.* 370] (cf. Schol. Veron. ad *Aen.* 2.173; Vahlen 1903: 112).

Mnestheus' crew under the stress of the ship-race); *ossaque et artus/perfundit toto proruptus corpore sudor* ('sweat sprang from his whole body and drenched his limbs to the bone', *Aen.* 7.458–9, of Turnus under the influence of Allecto's maddening assault);[38] and *tum toto corpore sudor/ liquitur et piceum (nec respirare potestas)/flumen agit, fessos quatit aeger anhelitus artus* ('then from his entire body the sweat ran in a dark torrent, and he had no chance to breathe; hard gasping shook his exhausted limbs', *Aen.* 9.812–4, of Turnus under pressure in the Trojan camp) as well as *Aen.* 3.175, on which the Ennian line is quoted at *Sat.* 6.1.50.[39]

In cases where no specific Homeric precedent is available, Macrobius himself sometimes supplies all the evidence of repetition needed to suggest the intended quasi-formulaic function of a given phrase in the *Annales*. This is especially convincing where the lines relate to the passage of time, scene-change, or repeated action, and are thus analogous to Homeric formulaic expressions, such as those at *Sat.* 6.1.8–9.[40] Several examples also exist describing habitual epic action. For example, we have at *Sat.* 6.1.22:[41]

> quadrupedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum [*Aen.* 8.596]
> Ennius in sexto:
> explorant Numidae: totam quatit ungula terram [*Ann.* 242]
> idem in octavo:
> consequitur. summo sonitu quatit ungula terram [*Ann.* 263]
> idem in septimo decimo:
> it eques et plausu cava concutit ungula terram [*Ann.* 431]
>
> the hooves shake the dusty field with the din of galloping steeds
> Ennius in Book 6:
> the Numidians set out to explore: hooves shake the entire land
> Ennius again in Book 8:
> follows. The hooves shake the ground with massive din
> Ennius again in Book 17:
> the cavalry go forth, and the hollow hooves shake the land with their beating

[38] Conington and Nettleship ad *Aen.* 7.458–9 point out that the following line, *arma amens fremit, arma toro tectisque requirit* (*Aen.* 7.460), is also Ennian: cf. *balantum pecudes quatit, omnes arma requirunt* (*Ann.* 169).

[39] Hardie on *Aen.* 9.812–3 cites as related *Aen.* 3.175, 5.199–200, and 7.458–9 (Hardie 1994: 248); see further p. 116, with n. 119 there, on Lucretius' involvement. Hardie notices the relation of *piceum . . . flumen agit* to Hor. *Carm.* 1.21–2, *duces/non indecoro pulvere sordidos*, *Il.* 16.110, πολὺς ἔρρεεν, and Lucr. 6.256–8, *praeterea persaepe niger quoque per mare nimbus,/ut picis e caelo demissum flumen, in undas/sic cadit* . . . For the use of *agit*, he compares *undam/fumus agit* at *Aen.* 8.257–8 and *Pactolus aureas undas agens* at Varro, *Men.* 234 A; perhaps Ennius, *Ann.* 539, *spumas agit* (of a spirited horse frothing at the mouth in his course; see pp. 118–19), is also relevant.

[40] I have discussed this material and that considered below from *Sat.* 6.1.10, 17, 21, 22 and 24 at Elliott 2008: 241–8.

[41] See n. 52, p. 94, for the Homeric forebears to these lines.

Vergil's re-formulation at *Aen.* 11.875 (*quadripedumque putrem cursu quatit ungula campum*, 'the horses' hooves shook the dusty plain with their running') shows him again keen to capitalise on the potential of Ennius' coinages as viable imitations of Homeric formula. At *Sat.* 6.1.17, Macrobius gives:

> . . . summa nituntur opum vi [*Aen.* 12.552]
> Ennius in quarto:
> Romani scalis: summa nituntur opum vi [*Ann.* 151]
> et in sexto decimo:
> reges per regnum statuasque sepulcraque quaerunt,
> aedificant nomen, summa nituntur opum vi [*Ann.* 404 5]
>
> . . . [they] strive with the utmost might of their resources
> Ennius in Book 4:
> the Romans with the ladders: they strive with the utmost might of their resources
> and in Book 16:
> kings throughout their kingship seek statues and tombs, they build a name for themselves, they strive with the utmost might of their resources.

While the full Ennian phrase *summa nituntur opum vi* (*Ann.* 151 = 405, both from *Sat.* 6.1.17) does not occur in the *Aeneid* other than at 12.552, the resonant ending *opum vi* appears at *Aen.* 9.532.

The chance evidence of other sources again supports Macrobius' evidence for multiple re-use in the *Annales* of quasi-formulaic phrases with no specific Homeric precedent. As Macrobius points out at *Sat.* 6.1.51, *labitur uncta vadis abies* ('the oiled fir-wood glides through the waters', *Aen.* 8.91) is informed by *Ann.* 376, *labitur uncta carina, volat super impetus undas* ('the oiled keel glides on, the ship in its onward rush speeds over the waves'). Isidore (*Orig.* 19.1.22) complements this when, supplying the meaning of the word *celoces*, he gives *Ann.* 505, *labitur uncta carina per aequora cana celocis* ('the cutter's oiled keel glides over the white surface of the sea'). In Vergil, this becomes, besides *Aen.* 8.91, also *Aen.* 4.398, *natat uncta carina* ('the oiled keels take to the water'). But the Ennian background probably also makes possible the phrase at *Aen.* 10.687 used to describe Turnus' helpless journey on the ship to which the phantom of Aeneas has guided him, *labitur alta secans* ('[he/the ship] glides on, cutting through the deep'. The subject is not articulated; Juno and Turnus are the most recent subject and object). Vergil uses an ambiguity between ship and man elsewhere in Book 10, but here in particular it is the Ennian vocabulary in use that makes the unnamed

ship present to the audience.[42] This itself is therefore effectively a re-use of the familiar phrase, and it shows Vergil's expectation that the Ennian background would be familiar to his audience. At *Sat.* 6.1.14, we have *cum superum lumen nox intempesta teneret* ('when night in its gloom shrouded the light of day', *Ann.* 33). Ps.-Acro, commenting on Horace, *Ep.* 2.2.98, gives us *bellum aequis [de] manibus nox intempesta diremit* ('the gloom of night interrupted the battle when the odds were level', *Ann.* 160). The two in combination make clear that the phrase *nox intempesta* functioned as a repeated floscule in the *Annales*, and Vergil confirms that reading by his repetitions of the phrase at *Aen.* 3.587 and 12.846. The repetition sometimes requires that the epithet *intempesta*, properly of the dead of night,[43] be understood in a generalised sense, as indeed at *Ann.* 160, reflecting another aspect of the use of epithets in the Homeric poems.[44] It appears from such instances that Ennius recognised the function of formulaic phrases in supplying the descriptive background against which key events took place, and that he employed this as a principle that allowed him to expand his repertoire of formulaic-style phrases beyond the specific limits of the Homeric record as we have it. It thus looks as if Ennius, by using phrases analogous to but not based on specific instances of Homeric formula, created an extendible system of quasi-formula that was subsequently co-opted by Vergil in the *Aeneid*.

Where the telltale repetitions of quasi-formulaic phrases in the *Annales* themselves are absent from our record, the closeness of the Ennian phrases' rendering of the original Greek, coupled with the understanding of their function revealed by Vergil's re-use, often make transparent a line's imitation of Homeric formula.[45] This is the case with *concidit et sonitum simul insuper arma dederunt* ('he fell to the ground and in that moment his battle-gear clattered atop him', *Ann.* 411), quoted at *Sat.* 6.1.24, which reproduces δούπησεν δὲ πεσών, ἀράβησε δὲ τεύχε' ἐπ' αὐτῷ ('he clanged in his fall, and his battle-gear clattered about him', *Il.* 4.504, 5.42). Given the known instances of repetition of quasi-formulaic lines in the *Annales*, we can be reasonably confident that this line too was repeated elsewhere in the text, so that its repetition in the *Aeneid* signals Vergil's recognition of its intended effects in its original context and once again confirms an Ennian formulation as the authoritative Latin version of Homer from the new text's perspective. Vergil represents the line with *corruit in vulnus (sonitum super*

[42] See Harrison 1991: 235. [43] *TLL*, s.v. *intempestus*. [44] Cf. Parry 1971: 118–29.
[45] Cf. Wigodsky 1972: 46.

arma dederunt) ('he collapsed over his wound, and his arms rang out above him', *Aen.* 10.488) and echoes it more distantly but with close to identical rhythm in *substitit atque utero sonitum quater arma dederunt* ('it came to a halt and four times the arms rang out in its belly', at *Aen.* 2.243), and in the many somewhat similar versions at e.g. *Aen.* 9.667, 7.567, *G.* 3.83.

Similarly, *Ann.* 20 occurs only once in the extant fragments of the *Annales* but is twice re-used by Vergil. The line is given thus by Macrobius at *Sat.* 6.1.11:

> est locus, Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt [*Aen.* 1.530 = 3.163]
> Ennius in primo:
> est locus Hesperiam quam mortales perhibebant [*Ann.* 20]
>
> there is a place which the Greeks call by the name 'Hesperia'
> Ennius in Book 1:
> there is a place which mortals referred to as Hesperia

Macrobius' presentation of the line in relation to Vergil once more suggests its role in his construction of the Roman epic tradition. If *Ann.* 20 is not exactly formulaic, it nevertheless has a clear place in the construction of that tradition by virtue of its use of language that becomes quasi-prescriptive in the Roman tradition for the introduction of that Homerising feature, the ecphrasis.[46]

What we witness extensively in Macrobius can be traced, if in far smaller quantities, in material from other sources with no declared interest in literary history. *Ann.* 31 and 113 are transmitted by sources interested in verbal and stylistic peculiarities, especially archaisms; we shall look at these sources immediately below. Both lines contain floscules that effectively exhibit the traces of a style that imitates oral formula, that have palpable Homeric models and that are repeated both within the *Annales* and in the *Aeneid*, evidence of Vergil's confirmation of their intended formulaic function. These phenomena are exactly parallel to those we witnessed above with the material from Macrobius. Thus, Homeric τὸν δ' ἠμείβετο is reproduced in *olli respondit* ('to him s/he replied'), which occurs in both lines. This in turn is echoed by Vergil's *olli sedato respondit corde Latinus* ('to him Latinus in tranquil

[46] Skutsch 1985: 178 cites *Aen.* 7.563, *est locus Italiae medio sub montibus altis*. Examples in Ovid are supplied by Bömer 1957: 131, cited by Skutsch *loc. cit.* (*Fast.* 2.491, *est locus, antiqui Capreae dixere paludem*, which comes immediately in the wake of a densely Ennianising passage, and 4.337, *est locus, in Tiberim qua lubricus influit Almo*; *Met.* 1.568, *est nemus Haemoniae*, 2.195, *est locus, in geminos* . . . , 9.334, *est lacus*, 10.644, *est ager, indigenae Tamasenum nomine dicunt*, 15.332, *est locus Arcadiae, Pheneon dixere priores*). As Homeric models for the phrase Skutsch (*loc. cit.*) cites *Il.* 2.811, ἔστι δέ τις . . . κολώνη, 6.152, ἔστι πόλις, 13.32, ἔστι δέ τι σπέος; *Od.* 3.293, ἔστι δέ τις . . . πέτρη.

spirit replied', *Aen.* 12.18), a line which as a whole is seen as an imitation of *Ann.* 31 (in full: *olli respondit rex Albai Longai*, 'to him the king of Alba Longa replied').[47] We find other relatives in *olli subridens sedato pectore Turnus* ('smiling at him in tranquil spirit Turnus [replied]', *Aen.* 9.740), *olli subridens hominum sator atque deorum*, ('smiling at her the begetter of men and gods. . .', *Aen.* 1.254), and *olli subridens hominum rerumque repertor* ('smiling at her the author of men and of the universe [replied]', *Aen.* 12.829). Ennius' *respondit* is typically omitted from these lines and is arguably to be understood not only from the context but from the background of formulaic language evoked. The idea of a formula-like nexus is further supported by the existence in the background to *Aen.* 1.254 and 12.829 of Homeric μείδησεν δὲ πατὴρ ἀνδρῶν τε θεῶν τε ('the father of men and gods smiled', *Il.* 15.47).[48] DS furthermore reads in relation to *Aen.* 1.254 Ennius' *Iuppiter hic risit tempestatesque serenae/ riserunt omnes risu Iovis omnipotentis* ('Jupiter now laughed, and all the skies laughed clear in accord with the laugh of almighty Jupiter', *Ann.* 446–7), which are themselves formulaic-style lines (see further pp. 105–6).

When we turn to the sources for these lines, we can see that, though they have no overt interest in the history of the expressions Vergil uses, their more technical (metrical and linguistic) interests do in fact predispose them in favour of Homerising language. *Ann.* 31 (quoted above) circulates freely in the grammatical tradition as an example of a holospondaic line and of diairesis.[49] Its Homerising and archaising features draw no particular attention from its sources; they are, however, the clear concomitants of the imitation of Homer represented by the line's holospondaism. *Ann.* 113, which as a whole reads *olli respondit suavis sonus Egeriai* ('to him sweet-voiced Egeria replied'), is supplied by Varro (*LL* 7.42), who seeks to explain the archaism *olli* for *illi* along etymological lines.[50] The periphrastic phrase *suavis sonus Egeriai*, equivalent to Homeric periphrases such as βίη Ἡρακληείη,[51] the genitive in *–ai*, and the line-long introduction to speech the quotation represents, do as much as the feature Varro focuses on to inscribe the line into the Homerising tradition. In

[47] See Skutsch 1985: 190 and Paratore and Canali 1978: 210.

[48] Quoted by Austin 1971: 98, who also cites *Il.* 8.38 (τὴν δ'ἐπιμειδήσας), cf. 4.356, 10.400, *Od.* 22.371.

[49] Its sources are Atilius Fortunatianus, *Ars* 8.6 (*GLK* 6.284), Donatus, *Art. Gr.* 3.4 (*GLK* 4.396), cf. his derivative Pompeius (*GLK* 5.297), the Ars Anonyma Bernensis (*GLK* 8.94), as well as the 'Explanatio in Donatum' 2 (*GLK* 4.547–8) and the *De speciebus hexametri heroici* (*GLK* 6.636).

[50] The context in Varro reads as follows: *apud Ennium:* 'olli respondit suavis sonus Eg<e>riai.' *'olli' valet dictum 'illi' ab 'olla' et 'ollo', quod alterum comitiis cum recitatur a praecone dicitur 'olla centuria', non 'illa'; alterum apparet in funeribus indictivis, quo dicitur* 'ollus leto datus est', *quod Graecus dicit* λήθη, *id est oblivioni* (*LL* 7.42).

[51] Skutsch 1905: 2611.

both cases, the sources have specifically sought out features that produce a sense of the lines' antiquity analogous to Homer's own archaic (or more likely archaising) style and thus complementary to the conceit that we have here a new version of Homer; and at the same time the lines are replete with other features contributing to the same effect. Elsewhere, too, we will observe a similar clustering of Homerising elements in lines selected by sources with technical and grammatical interests. If the *Saturnalia* is primarily responsible for our sense of Ennius' position in the epic tradition, sources with an interest in verbal and stylistic archaism tend to complement that sense rather effectively.

Not altogether surprisingly, given the relation of the grammatical tradition at large to early scholarship on Homer and Vergil, some of the grammatical sources do in any case make explicit the relationship of the technical features they seek out in Ennius to instances of the same in other epic texts. As just mentioned, almost all the sources for *Ann.* 31 are interested in the fact that the line is holospondaic. One of them, the *De speciebus hexametri heroici* (*GLK* 6.636) creates an explicit link between Homer and Ennius in terms of this feature: *non ignoro autem apud Homerum XII pedes simplices in herois versibus inveniri et apud Ennium* ('I am well aware that examples of twelve spondees in lines of hexameter are to be found in Homer and in Ennius'). The note continues with reference to Vergil: *apud Vergilium quoque, ut non audeam dicere omnis, plerosque adfirmare possum* ('in Vergil too, though I couldn't say that all [species of hexameter the *spec. hexam.* has just described can be found], yet I can confirm that most are'). This hints at the idea that the scholarly tradition on metrics saw Ennius as the significant intermediary between Homer and Vergil in terms not just of the naturalisation of the hexameter to Latin but of its manipulation also.[52] Again, in both *Ann.* 31 and *Ann.* 113, the archaising *olli* with which the line begins is compounded by the line's later use of the archaising genitive termination *–ai*.[53] In quoting *Ann.* 31 (mistakenly

[52] Norden executes a similar manoeuvre in his appendix on the artistry of the Vergilian hexameter when he cites Ennius' quasi-formulaic lines *it eques et plausu cava concutit ungula terram* (*Ann.* 439 V 431 Sk.) and *consequitur, summo sonitu quatit ungula campum* (*Ann.* 277 V 263 Sk.) as imitations of the rhythm of the similar Homeric lines ῥίμφα ἑ γοῦνα φέρει μετὰ τ'ἤθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων (*Il.* 6.511 15.268) and ἵππων μ' ὠκυπόδων ἀμφὶ κτύπος οὔατα βάλλει (*Il.* 10.535). The Vergilian imitations of this line (*Aen.* 8.596 and 11.875) are well known (see pp. 89–90). Norden's understanding of the history of Vergil's use of the hexameter thus constructs a similar genealogy for Vergilian metrical technique as emerges from the *spec. hexam.* Norden posits knowledge on Ennius' part of early scholiasts' thesis that Homeric rhythm was mimetic of the action it described (Norden 1927: 419–20).

[53] On this termination, see Skutsch 1985: 61. The feminine genitive singular in *–ai* also appears in Ennian tragedy, but it appears with much greater frequency in the *Annales*. For the comparable epic practice of Livius Andronicus and Naevius, see Fraenkel 1931a: 604–7 and Mariotti 1991: 117–18.

attributed to Vergil), the Ars Anonyma Bernensis (*GLK* 8.94) focuses quite specifically on the genealogy of Vergil's use of that termination: *nomina feminina primae declinationis in* –a *desinentia, quae genetivum et dativum in* –ae *diphthongon terminant, apud veteres genetivum et dativum in* –ai *mittebant. inde in Virgilio legitur* olli respondit rex Albai Longai [*Ann.* 31], aulai medio [*Aen.* 3.354], pictai vestis [*Aen.* 9.26] ('Feminine nouns of the first declension ending in –*a*, which have as a genitive and dative termination the diphthong –*ae*, had a genitive and dative termination in –*ai* in ancient times. That's why one reads in Vergil 'to him the king of Alba Longa made reply', 'in the middle of the hall', and 'in his embroidered robe'.') The mis-attribution of *Ann.* 31 to Vergil dates from the time when, in the tradition on which the Ars Anon. Bern. drew, it served as an explanation for Vergil's use of –*ai* in the two phrases correctly quoted from the *Aeneid*. Besides serving the technical writers as an illustration of particular metrical features, *Ann.* 31 therefore also functions as a subsidiary building-block of the tradition on Vergil which makes Ennius his immediate and most significant Latin poetic predecessor.

Besides this, *Ann.* 31 and *Ann.* 113 are good illustrations of the interrelationship of Ennius' archaising and his use of morphological Graecisms.[54] D. A. Russell writes that linguistic archaism was 'an ingredient in Greek *mimesis* which was present only in a much weaker form in Latin . . . During the whole period in which Greek and Latin literature existed and developed side by side – say from 200 BC to AD 400 – Greek poets continued to write in their ancient dialects and with their ancient techniques, making no concession to linguistic changes, except at the very end of the period, when accentual rules began to be observed.'[55] Ennius, with little other than Greek poetic practice to look to, seems to have imitated archaism, including archaisms specific to Homer in the extant record, as an established aspect of Greek poeticism, in his effort to produce, in Latin, language that declared its own poetic nature and general affiliation to Greek precedent. Among the best-known and most striking examples is the imitation of the Homeric genitive ending in *Mettoeo Fufetioeo* at *Ann.* 120 and *endo suam do* at *Ann.* 587 (cf. *Od.* 1.176, ἡμέτερον δῶ).[56] Varro's selection of the line we

[54] Ennius' Graecisms are comprehensively listed at Skutsch 1985: 66–7. [55] Russell 1979: 3.

[56] On the latter, see Zetzel 1974: 137–40, understanding this feature as Hellenistic in ancestry (*contra* Goldberg 1995: 91–2). *Ann.* 120 is supplied by Quintil. 1.5.12, who grants poetic licence to Ennius for what he would otherwise regard as a solecism. The *popliosio* and *ualesiosio* of the Lapis Satricanus (*CIL* 2832a) from before 490 BCE make it possible that Ennius would have felt the –*oeo* terminations of

know as *Ann.* 113 is thus the product of an interest that, though technical and not looking overtly towards questions of literary tradition, was bound to direct his testimony towards lines that clearly manifested Ennius' recreation of the effects of Homeric poetry.

We see the same tendency to select strikingly Graecising material inside the more strictly Vergiliocentric tradition when a source looks to explain a particular feature of Vergil's language which it expects its audience to find bizarre. Thus, at *Sat.* 6.4.17–18, Ennius is put forward as the relevant point of entry of Greek vocabulary into the Latin poetic lexicon that Vergil subsequently culled:

> inseruit operi suo et Graeca verba, sed non primus hoc est ausus; auctorum enim veterum audaciam secutus est.
>
> . . . dependent lychni laquearibus aureis [*Aen.* 1.726]
>
> sicut Ennius in nono:
>
> lychnorum lumina bis sex [*Ann.* 311]

> He grafted into his work Greek words, too, though he was not the first to take this step; for he was following the lead of early writers.
>
> . . . lamps hang from the golden ceiling panels
>
> just as Ennius [has] in Book 9:
>
> twice six the glitter of lamps

Other uses of the *Annales* in the grammatical tradition again yield quotations rich in Homerising and archaising, in a manner not overtly predictable from the sources' expressed interests but nevertheless arguably resulting from the type of language they seek out. When Priscian supplies *o genitor noster Saturnie, maxime divom* ('o our father, Saturnian, greatest of the gods', *Ann.* 444), he is rather myopically focused on Ennius' use of *noster* as a vocative,[57] but it is the line's evident relations in Homer and Vergil that strike the reader interested in the line as part of a poem and a piece of literary history: *Ann.* 444 clearly reproduces Homeric ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε Κρονίδη, ὕπατε κρειόντων ('o our father, son of Cronus, highest of the ruling gods',

Ann. 120 to be genuine Latin archaisms as well as, more clearly, Homerisms. I am grateful to Jim Zetzel for pointing me to the Lapis Satricanus. *Ann.* 587 is supplied by a host of writers in the grammatical tradition looking to illustrate apocope (Charis. *GLK* 1.278; Diom. *GLK* 1.441; Mar. Victorin. *GLK* 6.56; Inc. *De Ult. Syll. GLK* 4.263; Consent. *De Barb. GLK* 5.388 [5 N]), as well as by Auson. *Technop.* 17).

[57] Priscian 17.200–1 (*GLK* 3.205): *vocativum tamen aliud pronomen in usu non habet nisi primitivum secundae personae et possessivum primae, quando ad id sermo dirigitur, id est quando secundae sociatur personae; licet enim etiam ad alienam possessionem dirigere sermonem, ut:* [*Ann.* 444]*, et 'Euandrie fili' vel 'Telamonie Aiax' – itaque quamvis quantum ad ipsam rerum naturam recte videatur posse dici 'o sue fili Euandri' et 'o sua uxor Euandri', ut si dicam 'Euandrie fili' et 'Euandria uxor', cum in hoc duae tertiae intellegantur personae possessoris et possessionis: usus tamen deficit, quomodo etiam apud Graecoso teste Apollonio σφέτερε, cum rationabiliter possit dici, in usu tamen non invenitur.*

Il. 8.31).[58] In turn, it begets *at vos o superi, et divum tu maxime rector/Iuppiter* ('but you, o gods above, and you, greatest ruler of the gods, Jupiter', *Aen.* 8.572), and *magne pater divum* ('great father of the gods', *Aen.* 9.495), once more signalling Vergil's integration into his own work of Ennius' transference of Homeric poetry to Rome. Priscian also supplies *optima caelicolum, Saturnia, magna dearum* ('best of the heaven-dwellers, Saturnian, great one among goddesses', *Ann.* 445), a more generalised echo of the same type of Homeric phrase as is *Ann.* 444.[59] The two lines are clearly related (hence Skutsch's juxtaposition of them) and part of a pattern of language forged to imitate formula. This time, the stylistic peculiarity that leads the grammarian to preserve the line is the direct consequence of Ennius' imitation of Homer: Priscian is here interested in Ennius' use of the positive degree of the adjective in place of the superlative, which the poet has taken over directly from Homer. *Ann.* 19, *constitit inde loci propter sos dia dearum* ('there the bright one among goddesses alighted next to them'), shares with *Ann.* 445 the Homerising use of the adjective (*dia dearum* translates Homeric δία θεάων, 'bright one among goddesses', *Il.* 5.381, 6.305, *Od.* 5.159, etc.; cp. also *pulcra dearum* 'lovely among goddesses', *Ann.* 15, *sancta dearum* 'holy among goddesses', *Ann.* 53; see further p. 132 with n. 155, below). This line is selected by Festus (386) not for that reason, however, but because of the archaising use of the pronoun (*sos* in place of *eos*), another of a range of archaisms Ennius regularly employs in the *Annales*.[60]

The stem *oll-* for *ill-* appears as a regular part of that archaising strategy.[61] Besides the two instances we have considered, it is found

[58] See Feeney 1991: 128 on the ambitions of Ennius' translation of Homer here.

[59] Priscian 17.66 (*GLK* 3.192): *nec solum per genera et personas et numeros et casus et tempora, quae maxime declinabilibus accidunt, de quibus supra ostendimus, solent auctores variare figuras, sed etiam per omnia unicuique partium orationis accidentia, ut puta nomini accidunt species, genus, numerus, figura, casus. per eos igitur quinque modos inveniuntur variationibus, id est* ἀλλοιότησιν, *usi auctores. per species, ut Ennius* [*Ann.* 445], *'magna' dixit pro 'maxima', positivum pro superlativo, cum apertissime superius 'optima caelicolum' dixisset*.

[60] On the occurrences of *sos* in the *Annales*, see Skutsch 1985: 64; *ibid.* 61–7 on a fuller range of Ennius' archaising language.

[61] That strategy also surfaces in the use of *quamde* for *quam*, at *Ann.* 92 and 122, both supplied by Festus 312–14, specifically on grounds of the archaism: quamde *pro* quam *usos esse antiquos* . . . (At *Ann.* 122, *quamde* is Ursinus' conjecture for *quandit † uas †*.) Also, in the use of *haece* for *haec*, at *Ann.* 268, and in the appearance of forms such as *horitatur* and *induperator* (both at *Ann.* 347). Skutsch 1985: 517 describes *horitatur* as 'a genuine archaic form', while *induperator* is 'invented by Ennius for the sake of metre'. Ennius' audience, however, would presumably have been unable to discern, so that each form for them contributed equally to Ennius' archaising programme. The indices of Skutsch, Vahlen and Jocelyn show that *horitatur* is found alongside both *hortantur* (*Ann.* 230) and *horitur* (*Ann.* 424) in the *Annales*. No such verb is found in the tragedies. *Induperator* is found at *Ann.* 78, 322, 347 and 577, along with the participle *induperans* at *Ann.* 412. In the tragedies, only *imperator* and *impero* appear (at 3 and 266 J respectively).

at *Ann.* 146,[62] 306,[63] 569 and 621. Though these lines are quoted to illustrate technical features of language, there are indications that they may derive from the exegetical tradition on Vergil or have parallel functions in that tradition. For example, *olli* occurs at *Ann.* 306, in the middle of the five-line fragment *Ann.* 304–8. We owe this fragment principally to Cicero (and Gellius, whose knowledge we can trace back via Seneca to Cicero; see n. 63 below), but at least part of it may have had the parallel function of explaining the history of Vergil's language: DS states that the expression *flos veterum* at *Aen.* 8.500 is *Ennianum*.[64] We may therefore surmise that it is related to, if it does not derive directly from, the expression *flos populi*, which survives in our record at *Ann.* 308. *Ann.* 569 (*olli cernebant magnis de rebus agentes*, 'they deliberated, treating of momentous affairs') for its part derives directly from the tradition on the *Aeneid* – that is, from Servius, for whom Vergil's use of the archaism *olli* at 11.236 (as presumably elsewhere) is a replica of Ennius' practice.[65] Finally, *Ann.* 621, *olli creterris ex auratis hauserunt* ('they quaffed their drink from gilded bowls'), is preserved in a third-century CE metrical work known as the *Fragmentum de metris* (*GLK* 6.615), where it had drawn interest as a spondiazon (cp. *Ann.* 31). There is no direct link to the tradition on Vergil, but, besides *ollis*, the hellenisation *creterris*, as well as the sense of the line, places it in the ambit of the Homeric works.[66]

It is worth bearing in mind that the writers of the grammatical tradition who sought out archaism will have selected extracts where it is more densely represented than elsewhere, and the vacuum of context surrounding lines thus quoted leads to a further imbalance in readers' resulting impression. While Homerising and archaising features are certainly present in the longer extant

Archaism in general is not quite as obtrusive a phenomenon of the *Annales* as Homerising is (probably because Macrobius pursues the latter so single-mindedly and at such length), but it is clearly part of a deliberate and consistent strategy in the epic, one that sets the work apart from Ennius' dramatic poetry, where it is not traceable, and one that is recognised and imitated by later hexametric poets wishing to signal their allegiance to the *Annales*.

[62] In this line, *olli* is J. Passerat's correction, printed by Skutsch, of the mss.' reading *olim* of Nonius 51.12.

[63] *Olim* has again here in the ms. tradition supplanted *ollis* at the end of *Ann.* 306. *Ollis*, carried as a variant, was subsequently inserted earlier in the line, yielding the unmetrical *is dictus ollis popularibus olim* in the mss. of Cicero and Gellius. (This line and its companions is supplied by Cic. *Brut.* 57–9 [cf. Cic. *Sen.* 50] and Gell. 12.2.3, who derives it via Seneca from Cicero; cf. also Quintil. 11.3.31, 2.15.4.) For the excellent reasons for accepting Merula's conjecture *popularibus ollis*, see Skutsch 1985: 483–4.

[64] The entry reads simply *'flos veterum': Ennianum.*

[65] Serv. *Aen.* 12.709 INTER SE COIISSE VIROS ET CERNERE FERRO; *vera et antiqua haec est lectio. nam Ennium secutus est qui ait 'olli cernebant magnis de rebus agentes'*. Cf. Serv. *Aen.* 11.236: *olli illi secundum Ennium.*

[66] *Creterris* is Clausen's well-reasoned conjecture for the problematic ms. reading (Clausen 1963: 85–7).

passages of the *Annales*, such as Ilia's dream (*Ann.* 34–50) and the augury of Romulus and Remus (*Ann.* 72–91), their effects are diluted in a larger context; had we more such material, Ennius' Homerising and archaising would stand less significantly in view, obscured by the range of language those passages demonstrate. As things stand, the Vergiliocentric and grammatical sources have the advantage in directing our sense of Ennian style and literary allegiance in the *Annales*, simply as a result of the proportion of the surviving material they supply. As the several examples above show, even narrowly focused sources for the *Annales* with no overt interest in literary history help construct the epic tradition as we know it.

What we have seen is that some of the more technical, less literary works of the ancient scholarly tradition tell the same story about the history of epic at Rome as does Macrobius. The similiarity between the literary historical stories told is explained by the more technical sources' interest not in poetic genealogy directly but in features of Ennian language (archaising and/or Hellenising word- or metrical-forms) that are either directly traceable to Homer or that are understood by the tradition as attempts to imitate him. Vergil's subsequent co-option of such forms and expressions is represented in the tradition as direct imitation of Ennius, through whom Homer is accessible to Vergil in a ready-made but also powerful historical Latin form, one that had stood the test of time and acquired a desirable resonance for Vergil's audience. The representation of Ennius as the crucial hinge in the epic tradition at Rome that emerges from Macrobius is thus filled out by a broader if less articulate base of sources working in related parts of the scholarly tradition.

Servius

If we look across to Servius, the situation is different from that in Macrobius in that the Ennian material he provides is sparser, more variable in kind and put to a greater variety of uses in relation to Vergil. We can see this because, in contrast to Macrobius, he goes at least some way in articulating in each individual case the relationship between the Ennian material he quotes and the Vergilian text. Servius supplies very little material from the *Annales*,[67] given its abundance in the tradition he worked in as witnessed through

[67] See n. 7, p. 77, and Appendix Table A5.23, detailing Servius' contribution to the transmission. This phenomenon is perhaps not entirely explained by Lloyd 1961: 291–341, esp. 291–9, who shows that Servius consistently cuts down on the Republican material that would have been found in Donatus – but less dramatically for Ennius (and Pacuvius and Terence) than for the other Republican epic poets and dramatists.

Macrobius (cf. the eight books *homoeon elenchon* assembled by one Octavius Avitus, mentioned in Suetonius' *Vita Vergilii* as transmitted by Donatus).[68] Of the 26 lines we owe exclusively or primarily to Servius, 5 consist of only one or two words,[69] and are hence short enough to be ambiguous and difficult to put to work. (By contrast, of the 68 lines Macrobius quotes, only 2 are less than a full hexameter, and even in those cases we are presented with coherent phrases.)[70] Other lines belong in later sections of this chapter, in that they represent similes (*Ann.* 601, *furentibus ventis*) or are used to explain idiosyncrasies of Vergilian language (*Ann.* 225–6, *postquam Discordia taetra* . . .); see pp. 121 and 132–3. There remains, however, a proportionally substantial body of material that is readily assimilable to the formulaic-style material deriving from Macrobius. It is this material that I shall focus on here, together with its effect on the modern construction of the text and its literary historical situation and agenda.

In a few cases, Servius simply tells us that the Vergilian language to which he points is Ennian. Because of the imprecision of his lemmas, there tends to be greater ambiguity about the exact Vergilian language in question,[71] and he does not, like Macrobius, write out the Ennian expressions themselves. In essence, however, what he does here is closely comparable to what Macrobius does at *Sat.* 6.1.8–65: he presents us with short phrases whose Ennian ancestry is their most noticeable characteristic. Examples are *Ann.* 532, *vortant crateras aenos* ('they drain bronze drinking-bowls'), from Servius' comment on *Aen.* 9.165 (163 in his text): *et est hemistichium Ennianum* ('this is an Ennian half-line'); and *Ann.* 605, *(quem) non virtutis egentem* ('whom all laden with courage . . .'), from Servius' comment on *Aen.* 11.27: *Ennii versus est* ('this is a line of Ennius").

On other occasions, Servius leaves literary history aside in favour of more technical interests characteristic of the grammarians whom we have touched on pp. 93–9. As with them, however, material that imitates Homeric formula readily emerges. For example, when, in commenting on *G.* 2.424, he supplies *Ann.* 553, *effudit voces proprio cum pectore sancto* ('he poured forth words from his sacred heart'), he has his eye exclusively

[68] Rostagni 1979: 106, ll. 209–10; cf. Norden 1927: 366.

[69] *Ann.* 52, *bipatentibus*; *Ann.* 442, *ei mihi* (see Elliott 2008: 252, with n. 28 there); *Ann.* 524, *Messapus*; *Ann.* 609, *Anionem*; *Ann.* 622, *viden* <*ut*>. This last, however, shows Vergil as an imitator of Ennian syllabic quantity. Servius ad *Aen.* 6.779 writes: '*–den' naturaliter longa est, brevem tamen eam posuit, secutus Ennium: et adeo eius est immutata natura ut iam ubique brevis inveniatur.*

[70] The lines in question are *Ann.* 233, *fortibus est fortuna viris data*; and *Ann.* 311, *lychnorum lumina bis sex.*

[71] Cf. Skutsch 1985: 40–42, 600.

on the use of *cum*; yet the line seems eminently formula-like in that it represents the introduction or closing of an address in which much of the line is taken up with a phrase characterising the speaker, as regularly in Homer (cf. e.g. *Ann.* 53, quoted on p. 132). As is to be expected in such a case, the second half of the line bears a formulaic-style relationship to the phrase *tuo cum flumine sancto* of *Ann.* 26, and the line is additionally Homerising in that it ought to be of a god; see n. 105, below. Similarly, with *Ann.* 569, *olli cernebant magnis de rebus agentes*, Servius is concerned exclusively with the use of the verb as related to the *cernere* of *Aen.* 12.709, but the line clearly archaises, as Servius himself knows (cf. p. 98, with n. 65 there), and is hard not to associate with a typical epic description of a council of gods or generals.

Above, we noticed that, in comparison to Macrobius, Servius is sometimes imprecise and ambiguous in drawing the language of the *Aeneid* and the *Annales* into relation. At other times, however, the format of his text and the variety of his interests allow him to be far fuller and more informative than is the other. Thus, on *Aen.* 10.396, the oddly grotesque *te decisa suum, Laride, dextera quaerit/semianimesque micant digiti ferrumque retractant* ('your right hand, shorn off, sought you, Larides, its master, and the half-lifeless fingers quivered and grasped after the sword', Servius comments: *Ennii est, ut 'oscitat in campis caput a cervice revulsum/semianimesque micant oculi lucemque requirunt', quem versum ita* [*ut fuit* DS] *transtulit ad suum carmen Varro Atacinus* ('this is Ennian, as is "the head torn from the neck gapes on the field, the half-living eyes glitter and seek out the light of day", [*Ann.* 483–4], a line which Varro Atacinus transferred thus [as it was *DS*] to his own work of poetry').[72] As we saw with many of the Macrobian examples, Servius here quotes no specific Homeric antecedent for the lines, but the presence of that antecedent is once more nevertheless still palpable and again constructs for the reader the familiar Homer–Ennius–Vergil genealogy. In their gruesomeness, the Ennian lines recall such Iliadic lines as λάκε δ' ὀστέα, τὼ δέ οἱ ὄσσε/πάρ ποσὶν αἱματόεντα χαμαί πέσον ἐν κονίῃσιν,/ἰδνώθη δὲ πεσών ('[Agamemnon's sword] reached [Peisander's skull-]bone, and his two eyes fell bloody on the ground by his feet in the dust, and he coiled up in pain as he fell', *Il.* 13.616–8).[73] While these lines are

[72] See n. 102, pp. 110–11, on how some of Vergil's boldest formulations turn out to be re-arrangements of less extraordinary Ennian expressions.

[73] For Skutsch, however, '[t]he only passage comparable is *Il.* 10.457 (*Od.* 22.329) φθεγγομένου δ' ἄρα τοῦ γε κάρη κονίῃσιν ἐμίχθη. But "he was still speaking when his head fell in the dust" is a long way from the κακοζηλία of *oscitat in campis* etc.' (Skutsch 1985: 644, n. 19). Courtney, commenting on Varro Atacinus' use of the line, suggests as a possible model Ap. Rhod. 4.1524–5 (the death of Mopsus

not formulaic as such, they nevertheless typify the *Iliad*, being inextricably associated with it, not through frequent repetition, like formulaic phrases, but because they are representative of the recurrent graphic descriptions of the violence of war which characterise the poem's steady awareness of the lot of humanity. Ennius' reproduction of an analogous description of violence represents an attempt to capture the spirit of the original, parallel to that effected by his reproducing the effects of formulaic verse. Besides this, Servius quotes *Ann.* 483–4 (or perhaps only *Ann.* 484, if we are to take his singular, *quem versum* seriously) not just as the original Ennius but also as Varro's verbatim re-use of Ennius (frg. 2 C) (unless unwarranted assimilation has occurred). In a sense, then, by virtue of having been repeated among different works of the pre-Vergilian Roman epic tradition, the line had already acquired its own sort of quasi-formulaic status for Vergil to exploit. Servius expresses no sophisticated appreciation of this, but the re-use of the line among poets of different generations is nevertheless the salient point he draws to his readers' attention, and thus he provides us with the material with which to build a genealogy of Roman epic.

When closely analogous Vergilian and Ennian phrases survive in the Vergiliocentric sources, there is arguably some plausibility, if also a risk, in positing a relationship based on the imitation of Homeric formula between them, even where there is no direct evidence for their repetition within either the *Aeneid* or the *Annales*. This is because the relationship between Ennius and Vergil as established by the Vergiliocentric sources consists to such a degree in the sharing of Homerising material that also imitates formula that, when lines originate with these sources, that in itself prompts confidence in their probable function in the *Annales*, especially when other factors are also present. For example, the line *funduntque elatis naribus lucem* ('and shed light from their raised up noses', *Ann.* 606) has no specific Homeric model,[74] is not

from a snake-bite): ἦ τέ οἱ ἤδη ὑπὸ χροῖ δύετο κῶμα/λυσιμελές, πολλὴ δὲ κατ' ὀφθαλμῶν χέετ' ἀχλύς. He continues 'But it looks much more like a death in battle (the context in Ennius and Vergil), and very probably belongs, as F. Skutsch thought, to the *Bellum Sequanicum*' (Courtney 2003: 238). It is the bias inherent in the sources that is the focus of my discussion that inclines Courtney to read the Latin line as more probably of origin in a Homerising battle-description than in the *Argonautica* and that inclines his audience to accept his reading as plausible. (I do not mean to imply that he or they are necessarily wrong to do so, for we cannot on the basis of the information we have know; only that their impetus comes not from the evidence of the text itself so much as from the way the text is presented to us in the sources.) Courtney also assumes the context in Ennius, which strictly speaking we cannot know, from the context in Vergil (see p. 111, with n. 103, and pp. 116–17, on Norden's methodology for reconstructing the *Annales*).

[74] Skutsch gives the first appearances of the horses of the Sun, assumed from Vergil to be the subject of the Ennian line also, as in the Homeric hymns: *Herm.* 69, *Dem.* 63, *Hel.* 9.15 (Skutsch 1985: 738). None of these lines, however, offers wording that could have served as a basis for Ennius' formulation. Skutsch (*loc. cit.*) gives the chariot as first mentioned in tragedy and e.g. at Ap. Rhod. 3.233, fiery steeds at Eur. *Iph. Aul.* 159, and steeds breathing fire at Pind. *Ol.* 7.71.

repeated in the extant record of the text and is not in any other way obviously imitative of formula. But this line is preserved principally in Servius, as a part of his comment on *Aen.* 12.115, *lucemque elatis naribus efflant*.[75] Not only does this line obviously echo *Ann.* 606, but it appears as part of a series of introductory formulaic-style lines that signal to Vergil's readers the start of a new episode:[76]

> postera vix summos spargebat lumine montis
> orta dies, cum primum alto se gurgite tollunt
> Solis equi lucemque elatis naribus efflant. [*Aen.* 12.113 5]
>
> The following day had barely dawned and begun to strew the mountains with light, at that time when first the horses of the Sun rise from the gulf and breathe forth brightness from their tilted noses.

The conjunction of these two factors suggests that Vergil is interpreting *Ann.* 606 as belonging to the stock of formulaic-style material available from Ennius.[77] Given the type of material he records, Servius' preservation of the line suggests that he too (and the readers he represents) were susceptible to such a reading, and the line's survival in a Vergiliocentric source may also direct modern interpretation of it, as it has done here. Arguably, the same has happened with the reading of *Ann.* 483–4 (*oscitat in campis caput*, etc.) I offer on pp. 101–2: the line originates in Servius (on *Aen.* 10.396), but has no especially close verbal model in Homer. With each layer of remove from Ennius, the danger of circularity in this interpretative procedure increases. The aim here is to expose to view the mechanism (that is, the situation within our sources) that generates that risk and makes it an inevitable part of our engagement with the fragments.

DS and the other Vergiliocentric sources

DS's motivation for quoting the *Annales* is distinct from that of both Macrobius and Servius, in that he shows a greater affinity with the lexicographical tradition and with those scholarly sources interested in the history, etymology and the definition, proper use, gender and case of given items of

[75] A corrupted version of the line also survives in Marius Victorinus (*GLK* 6.28).

[76] For these lines' quasi-formulaic character, cf. the facsimiles *postera iamque dies primo surgebat Eoo/umentemque Aurora polo dimoverat umbram*, *Aen.* 3.588–9; *postera Phoebea lustrabat lampade terras/umentemque Aurora polo dimoverat umbram*, *Aen.* 4.6–7; *et iam prima novo spargebat lumine terras/Tithoni croceum linquens Aurora cubile*, *Aen.* 4.584–5 9.459; *postera cum primo stellas Oriente fugarat/clara dies*, *Aen.* 5.42; *postera cum prima lustrabat lampade terras/orta dies*, *Aen.* 7.148–9, etc.

[77] Further adaptations exist at Ov. *Met.* 2.155, *Solis equi . . . hinnitibus auras flammiferis implent*; *Sil.* 5.56, *flammiferum tollentes aequore currum Solis equi sparsere diem*; and Ps.-Ovid, *Hal.* 77, *elatis rimantur naribus auras* (of dogs), all cited by Skutsch 1985: 737–8.

vocabulary and given usages.[78] Despite this, we find several instances of the stereotyped language of quasi-formula among DS's quotations of Ennius, even where the interests expressed are of this more technical kind. This suggests that, despite a slightly different (if still overlapping) set of interests, DS regularly draws on the same tradition of Ennian material as do Servius and Macrobius,[79] though perhaps from a different stock,[80] given the scarcity of overlap between what he and other sources cite (see Appendix Table A5.35 on DS as source).

For example, DS quotes the line *transnavit cita per teneras caliginis auras* ('she swam swiftly through the gentle breezes of the darkness', *Ann.* 18) as a parallel to the 'inappropriate' use at *G.* 4.59 of the term *nare* to describe movement through the air (of bees in the Vergilian text).[81] The line is obviously reminiscent of descriptions of the movements of Homeric gods (Skutsch thinks of Venus going to advise Aeneas and Anchises and compares the descent of Hermes through the darkness at *Il.* 24.340–2).[82] The tendency towards obviously Homerising lines can also be illustrated from *matronae moeros complent spectare faventes* ('women throng the walls in their eagerness to see', *Ann.* 418), quoted by DS on *G.* 1.18 and 4.230, both times to suggest an equivalence between *favere* and *velle* in Vergil's as in Ennius' usage. τειχοσκοπία, though not confined to hexametric poetry,[83] must in the hexametric and martial context of the *Annales* primarily recall *Il.* 3.121–244 and 22.460–5, and it is not surprising that Vahlen originally thought of Seleucus' siege of Pergamum in 190 BCE.[84] Again, DS quotes *qui fulmine claro/omnia per sonitus arcet, terram mare caelum* ('who with the clear sound

[78] The status of DS is not altogether clear. For the view of DS as 'a process, not a text' – that, is, an aggregate of ever-changing bundles of learning, rather than a single, coherent entity, see www.apaclassics.org/AnnualMeeting/04mtg/abstracts/zetzel.html; cf. Zetzel 2005: 2–9 (esp. 7), 75–8.

[79] E.g. all three draw to different extents on Donatus, although it is hard to trace Ennian material to any specific source.

[80] See pp. 99–100, with n. 68, on the volume of material available in antiquity.

[81] *Nare pro volare ut apud Ennium in primo 'transnavit cita per teneras caliginis auras'. proprietas tamen vocis aptior est natantibus quam volantibus.*

[82] Skutsch 1985: 176.

[83] Skutsch cites Hor. *Carm.* 3.2.6–12 (1985: 582). τειχοσκοπία and τειχοσκοπία-equivalents are also a topos of historiography from Thuc. 7.27–8 on; see e.g. Sall. *BJ* 69.

[84] Skutsch reports that Vahlen's original attribution of the line to a description of Pergamum was connected with Ursinus' conjecture *apud eundem Ennium in XIII* at DS *G.* 4.230; for the date of Seleucus' siege tallies with the traditional chronology established for Book 13 of the *Annales* (see Appendix Table A1.1). The manuscripts, however, read *apud eundem Ennium in XVI*, and by his second edition Vahlen had changed his mind. Skutsch remains attracted by Vahlen's original thought, though he thinks that there could have been τειχοσκοπίαι elsewhere in the *Annales* too, including in Book 16 (1985: 581–2). The recurrence of the Homeric motif seems entirely plausible and is connected with the formularity of the scene and the language in which it is expressed.

of thunder keeps all things in their place, the land, the sea and the sky', *Ann.* 555–6) only as a parallel to the use of *arceo* in the sense of *prohibeo* at *Aen.* 1.31; but again, in the hexametric context, the image of the Homeric Zeus with his frequent thunderbolt comes easily to mind. Although it would be unjustified to claim a strong relationship to formula, the earth, sky, sea trope is sufficiently common as to possess a sort of quasi-formulaic status of its own:[85] (thus, for example, the language of Latinus' oath to Aeneas at *Aen.* 12.197, '*haec eadem, Aenea, terram, mare, sidera, iuro* . . .' ['By these same powers I swear, the earth, the sea, the sky'], where the preceding description of Latinus' action, *suspiciens caelum* ['gazing up at the sky', *Aen.* 12.196] shows awareness of e.g. *Il.* 19.257, ἰδὼν εἰς οὐρανὸν εὐρύν ['looking up at the broad heavens'] of Agamemnon).[86]

DS quotes more than twice as many lines from the *Annales* as does Servius proper, and his quotations are usually sense-units and only rarely less than a line long; in general, DS is better informed than Servius about Ennius. In commenting on Jupiter's smile at *Aen.* 1.254, Servius knows only that it is the practice of poets to attribute the behaviour of the weather to the mood of gods, but DS can, under Ennius' name, quote *Iuppiter hic risit tempestatesque serenae/riserunt omnes risu Iovis omnipotentis* ('Jupiter now laughed, and all the skies laughed clear in accord with the laugh of almighty Jupiter', *Ann.* 446–7), a line generally reminiscent of the Homeric Zeus' attunement to the manifestations of nature (cf. e.g. *Il.* 1.530 and its Latin descendants at Catull. 64.204–6, Verg. *Aen.* 9.106 = 10.115, Hor. *C.* 3.1.5–8, etc.).[87] The Homerising compound *omnipotens*,[88] modelled after Greek παγκρατής,[89] contributes to the reader's sense of the line's quasi-formulaic function, because of its (subsequent) Latin as well as because of its Greek history. The adjective is used in the *Aeneid* twenty times in the nominative and twice in the genitive. Its formula-like use there is clear not only from its status as an epithet and its repetition in Vergil,[90] but also as a result of the coincidence of the phrase *at*

[85] See Hardie 1986: 293–335. [86] Cited by Paratore and Canali 1978: 222.

[87] On Zeus' nod, see Schwabl 1976: 22–30, cited by Skutsch 1985: 700.

[88] Cf. Chapter 1, p. 57, with n. 130 there.

[89] On the history of the word in Latin and the confinement of its Greek ancestor παγκρατής to poetry as opposed to ritual, see Fraenkel 1950: 779, n. 3 (cited by Skutsch 1985: 604), and Fraenkel 1922: 207–9.

[90] *Pater omnipotens* at *Aen.* 4.25, 6.592, 7.141, 7.770, 8.398, 10.100, 12.178, 3.251, all except the final instance in identical line-position; *Iuppiter omnipotens* at *Aen.* 2.689, 4.206, 5.687, 9.625. The two genitives occur in the formulation *omnipotentis Olympi* at *Aen.* 10.1 and 12.791. *Aen.* 10.1–2 (*panditur interea domus omnipotentis Olympi/conciliumque vocat divum pater atque hominum rex*) is both demonstrably Ennianising and clearly imitative of Homeric formula: see *Sat.* 6.1.10, where Macrobius cites *Ann.* 203–4 on *Aen.* 10.2 (see p. 87).

pater omnipotens in Vergil and Lucretius (*Aen.* 6.592 = Lucr. 5.399)[91] and its recurrence in Lucilius, Catullus, Ovid and Valerius Soranus.[92]

The value of DS as a source is also illustrated by the information he supplies ad *Aen.* 1.81. There, Servius merely helps his reader with Vergil's word order and supplies a parallel use of the phrase *in latus* from *Aeneid* 2. DS, by contrast, reports that some readers take the prepositional phrase as equivalent to a direct object (which, as regards Vergil's text, would require some re-arrangement of the overall syntax) and supplies, presumably as parallel, the Ennian hexameter *nam me gravis impetus Orci/percutit in latus* ('for death's harsh blow struck [me in] my side', *Ann.* 564–5). As regards the *Aeneid*, this perhaps tells us no more than that Vergil's expression *impulit in latus* (1.82) bears in terms of rhythm and phrasing the marks of Ennian *percutit in latus*. For the *Annales*, it potentially suggests a unique piece of information: Skutsch asserts that the words are spoken by a someone nearing death,[93] but other conceivable contexts include a dream (comparable to Aeneas' dream of Hector at *Aen.* 2.268–97) or a *nekyia* along the lines of *Odyssey* 11 and *Aeneid* 6, in which a living hero is told by a dead comrade of the vicissitudes that led to the latter's demise. If either of the latter two possibilities pertains, the line would imply an entire scene with evident kin in Homer and Vergil and thus constitute another element in the construction of the familiar Homer–Ennius–Vergil genealogy. There is a possibility here of overstating the implications of the evidence, but any of the three possibilities builds links to Homer and Vergil and illustrates the ready availability of Ennian Homerising material in the tradition in which DS worked. It is not least impressive that, as we have seen with other sources too, such material surfaces even where DS's expressed interests tend away from the literary and towards narrower scholarly concerns.

What we have witnessed as regards the emergence of formulaic-style material from our three main Vergiliocentric sources remains true of those that are statistically less significant sources for the *Annales*. Thus, when the Scholia Veronensia on *Aen.* 5.241 (*et pater ipse manu magna Portunus euntem impulit*, 'and with his massive hand father Portunus himself sped him/it on his/its way') supply us with *atque manu magna Romanos impulit amnis*

[91] One of Norden's principles for identifying the presence of Ennius in the background to a text, even where this presence could not be confirmed from the extant record, was the coincidence of phrases in the tell-tale texts of Vergil and Lucretius (see further pp. 115–17); also Plautus, Lucilius, Cicero and Livy (Norden 1927: 369). In his commentary on *Aen.* 6.592, *at pater omnipotens*, he therefore posits the presence of Ennius in that phrase. Skutsch demurs (Skutsch 1985: 604), but this aspect of Norden's methodology seems well founded and well applied by him.

[92] Skutsch 1985: 604.

[93] Skutsch 1985: 708. He thinks of someone suffering from a fatal illness, ruling out the possibility of a mortal wound on the basis of Lucil. 1314, *tum lateralis dolor, certissimus nuntius mortis*.

('and with his massive hand the river sped the Romans on', *Ann.* 581), the impression of formula is abetted by the partial precedent of *Il.* 15.694–5, τὸν δὲ Ζεὺς ὦσεν ὄπισθε/χειρὶ μάλα μεγάλῃ ('Zeus thrust him on from behind with his very great hand', of Hector driven on by Zeus in the attack on the ships).[94] Stephen Hinds has already discussed the role of *Ann.* 469–70,[95] which survive via the *Brevis Expositio* ad *G.* 2.43 (cf. Schol. Bern. *ibid.*), in constructing the genealogy of Roman epic.[96] With these latter two sources, the construction of that genealogy is once more as explicit as it was in parts of the *Saturnalia*, for they both specifically point to the Homeric precedent (even if they do not directly quote it).[97]

Vergiliocentric sources and the earlier Roman epic tradition

Just as the effort to reproduce Homeric style was not unique to Ennius among the early epic poets of Rome, so there is evidence, if far slighter in quantity than for the *Annales*, that Vergil also used others, and in particular Naevius, to mediate Homer; and that he was read as doing so by the scholarly tradition in a manner similar to what I have argued for Ennius himself. In the *Bellum Punicum*'s one surviving line of direct address, *summe deum regnator, quianam genus <od>isti?*[98] ('greatest ruler of the gods, why have you come to hate the race?' *BP* 15 B), we see Naevius formulating his own version of Homeric ὕπατε κρειόντων ('highest of the ruling gods'). At *BP* 12 B, Jupiter and Neptune share the terms of this address: *senex fretus pietati deum adlocutus/summi deum regis fratrem Neptunum/regnatorem marum* ('the old man, strong armed in his sense of right, addressed the god who was the brother of the highest king of the gods, Neptune, ruler of the sea'). The repetition of the

[94] Skutsch cites the Homeric line, as well as Ap. Rhod 2.599, δεξιτερῇ δὲ διαμπερὲς ὦσε φέρεσθαι, of Athena pushing the Argo through the Symplegades, and 4.1609–10, ὦς ὅγ' ἐπισχόμενος γλαφυρῆς ὁλκήιον Ἀργους/ἤγ' ἅλαδε προτέρωσε (Skutsch 1985: 721). He further notes Hor. 3.3.6, *magna manus Iovis*.

[95] *Ann.* 469–70: *non si lingua loqui saperet quibus, ora decem sint/in me, tum ferro cor sit pectusque revinctum.*

[96] Hinds 1998: 34–47.

[97] 'Brev. Expos.' *G.* 2.43: (*non, mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum . . .*): *LINGUAE Homericus sensus* [cf. *Il.* 2.488] *Graeci poetae, sicut et Ennius: 'non si lingua loqui saperet quibus ora decem sint in me, tum ferro cor sit pectusque revinctum'*; cf. Schol. Bern. *ibid.*: *NON MIHI et reliqua. Homericus sensus; sic etiam* (nam et *corr. Hagen*) *Ennius: 'ora decem'*.

[98] The corrupt second half of this line does not concern us for the purposes of this argument. The mss. read *quianam genus isti*, for which Scaliger (followed by Merula and Lindsay[2]) wrote *quianam genuisti* and Havet *quianam me genuisti* (adopted by Warmington). Bothe's *quianam ursisti?* found less assent. Strzelecki and Barchiesi print Leo's conjecture. All three suggestions are influenced by the sentiment of Venus' speech at *Aen.* 1.229–53; indeed, Leo is quite explicit about this: see Leo 1905: 47, n. 2. These reconstructions are thus arguably in some sense the product of the general activity of Vergiliocentric sources. (The source for this particular fragment, however, is Festus 306.)

terms of description in analogous circumstances at the start of an address suggests that Naevius, too, aimed to reproduce the hallmarks of oral formulaic style (without, of course, the knowledge to define them as such) that so strongly characterise Homeric verse.

The mere 60 or so extant fragments of the *Bellum Punicum* offer no further evidence for repetition. However, the echoes of Naevius in the *Aeneid*'s description of gods suggest Vergil's use of Naevius to mediate Homer – that is, to construct an epic tradition in which Naevius, too, held a significant place. In the same ways as for Ennius, if in far smaller quantities, hints of Vergil's readership's awareness of this move on his part survive. Thus, Macrobius (*Sat.* 6.5.8) has:

> quam pius arquitenens [*Aen.* 3.75]
> hoc epitheto usus est Naevius *Belli Punici* libro II:
> deinde pollens sagittis inclutus arquitenens
> sanctus Iove prognatus Pythius Apollo [*BP* 30 B][99]
>
> which the archer in his filial devotion
> Naevius used this epithet in the second book of the *Bellum Punicum*:
> then the one lordly with his arrows, the renowned archer, Jupiter's hallowed son, Pythian Apollo

Macrobius' reading of these Naevian lines as relevant to Vergil's use of the epithet *arquitenens* in the *Aeneid* suggests that Vergil read (or was read as accepting) Naevius' language as connoting traditional epic descriptions of the gods.

Besides *BP* 30 B, only one further fragment of the *Bellum Punicum* is transmitted in explanation of Vergil. *BP* 3 B, *postquam avem aspexit in templo Anchisa,/sacra in mensa Penatium ordine ponuntur;/immolabat auream victimam pulchram* ('after Anchises caught sight of a bird in the precinct, the sacred offerings were set out in due order on the table of the household gods; and he began to sacrifice a fine golden animal') survives through the commentators on *Ecl.* 6.31 and *Aen.* 2.687 (principally Ps.-Probus and the Scholia Veronensia), who seek to explain the extraordinary powers of speech and insight that the Vergilian Silenus and the Vergilian Anchises possess.[100] In tandem with the extract from the *BP*, the commentators

[99] The Macrobius-manuscript has *deinde* . . . *sanctusque Delphis* . . . Merula emended *deinde* to *dein*; Vahlen *sanctusque* to *sanctus*; and Buecheler *Delphis* to *Iove*. Warmington prints only Merula's emendation (*BP* 25–6 W). Barchiesi (above) prints all the emendations except Merula's.

[100] Ps.-Probus ad *Ecl.* 6.31 (Thilo-Hagen, vol. 3.2, p. 336): *cur ibi* [*Aen.* 6.724–6] *Anchisen facit disputantem quod hic Silenum deum, nisi quod poeta Ennius Anchisen augurium* [Sk.: *-ii* codd.] *ac*

quote Enn. *Ann.* 15–16 (see n. 100); and thus their explanations supply a detailed Roman history for the Vergilian Silenus' powers of song at *Ecl.* 6.31 and for the Anchises of *Aen.* 2.687. Besides this, the impressive *incedit* of *BP* 29 B, *prima incedit Cereris Proserpina puer* ('Ceres' daughter, Proserpina, advanced first') is reminiscent of Juno's memorable *incedo* of *Aen.* 1.46–7, *ast ego, quae divom incedo regina* ('but I, whose gait marks me queen of the gods . . .'); and this supplements the impression created by Macrobius that Vergil tapped into the fund of vocabulary established by the *Bellum Punicum* as familiar and as analogous to the resources offered by the Homeric tradition to poets working as its continuators. Were the pattern not so thoroughly in evidence in Ennius' case, however, it would be far harder to see its outline among the remains of Naevian epic.

What we have seen in terms of the sources so far is that, throughout a substantial section of *Saturnalia* 6, there is a real consistency to the tracking of a particular type of Ennian line, the imitation of Homeric formula in particular and of usually short and always recognisably Homeric language in general. The *Saturnalia*'s reading of what proved important about Ennius' language in the terms of subsequent literary history is supported by evidence from a number of other sources, some of whose interests have of their nature led them to select Homerising material, but a small number of whom supply such material even though no factor that would predispose them to do so is discernible. The latter point in particular urges the credibility of the literary historical story told, and in Chapter 4 we shall further explore the interpretative headway to be made by heeding the prompting of these persuasive sources. Immediately below, however, we shall pause over some further considerations that militate against allowing them unlimited sway: for the view of the text we have is inevitably filtered backwards through Vergil, and the effects of this in itself on modern readings of the *Annales* ought also to be taken into account. There is also an opportunity here to explore the effects for the *Aeneid* of Vergil's choice consistently to adopt the quasi-formulaic language of the *Annales*. Subsequently, we shall turn to further types of Ennian language to which the Vergiliocentric sources give us access.

per hoc divini quiddam habuisse praesumit sic 'doctus[que] Anchisesque Venus quem pulchra dearum/fari donavit, divinum pectus habere [*Ann.* 15–16]. Naevius *Belli Punici* libro tertio sic [*BP* frg. 3 B]. Schol. Veron. ad *Aen.* 2.687 (Thilo-Hagen, vol. 3.2, p. 427): *peritum multarum disciplinarum Anchisen fuisse <et divini quiddam habuisse probare po>ssunt Nae<vius et Ennius in* Ann. (Sk.)>, *qui ita de eo ait 'doctus Anchisa Venus quem pulcherrima div<um> fata docet . . . divinum ut pectus haberet'.*

Vergil, the sources and the scholars: the pitfalls and the promise of a post-Vergilian reading

Aside from the probable imbalance noted above in the nature of the information the Vergiliocentric sources and their kin present, another problem of interpretation results from the risk that post-Vergilian readers read the epic tradition in reverse: some phrases will strike them as quintessentially epic because of their familiarity from Vergil, who has borrowed them from Ennius. The risk is particularly great with quasi-formulaic phrases: when a line of the *Annales* is familiar from its quasi-formulaic use in the *Aeneid*, readers (that is, any post-Vergilian readers but perhaps especially ones who have only the de-contextualised fragments of the *Annales* available) are tempted to read that line as quasi-formulaic in the *Annales*, too, even where no specific evidence for its function as such exists. For example, *tractatus per aequora campi* ('dragged over the level surface of the plain', *Ann.* 124) is preserved exclusively at Ps.-Macr. *Exc. Bob.* 41 (*GLK* 5.651). None of its elements is repeated elsewhere in our record of the *Annales*, nor is there any particular precedent for it in Homer. Despite that, the phrase today reads easily as part of the quintessential epic tradition because of the familiarity of *aequore campi* of *Aen.* 7.781 and 12.710, as well as the *per aequora vect-* of *Aen.* 1.376, 3.325, 6.335, 6.392 and 7.228, with identical rhythm at line-end. It therefore potentially strikes post-Vergilian readers as more familiar than it may have been in a pre-Vergilian context.[101] *Nunc hostes vino domiti somnoque sepulti* ('now the enemy mastered by wine and buried in sleep', *Ann.* 288), which likewise has no history of repetition in the extant record of the text, yields a host of Vergilian descendants: *invadunt urbem somno vinoque sepultam* ('they enter the city buried in sleep and wine', *Aen.* 2.265), *expletus dapibus vinoque sepultus* ('sated by his feasting and buried in wine', *Aen.* 3.630), *custode sepulto* ('now the guard was buried', of the drugged Cerberus, at *Aen.* 6.424), *confectum curis somnoque gravatum* ('done in by cares and burdened by sleep', *Aen.* 6.520), *somno vinoque soluti* ('undone by sleep and wine', *Aen.* 9.189), *somno uinoque . . ./corpora fusa* ('bodies laid low . . . by sleep and wine', *ibid.* 316).[102] In these instances, it is primarily by virtue of their use in Vergil

[101] Catullus 101, . . . *multa per aequora vectus*, however, perhaps suggests that this particular expression was indeed an established idiom of Latin epic vocabulary. In the context of this poem and his work as a whole, it seems on balance more likely that Catullus was exploiting existing epic language to conjure up the vicissitudes of his personal odyssey rather than forging such vocabulary for the first time.

[102] On these lines and their relationship, see Berres' fascinating article of 1977, which points out that the most boldly metaphorical Vergilian expressions here, such as *vino sepultus* (*Aen.* 3.630) or *custode*

that the Ennian lines appear to us to have a formulaic function. Had we little other information about the use of quasi-formula in the *Annales* and its reception in other sources, there would be no way of gauging the probable relation between Vergil's reading and the situation in the original text. As it is, the use of *Ann.* 124 and 288 in the *Aeneid* coheres well with the picture of a general Ennian–Vergilian practice emerging from a variety of sources, so that the extrapolation to which we are tempted, that is, to assume that *Ann.* 124 and 288 were used repeatedly as quasi-formulae in the *Annales*, may not in fact be wrong. It remains, however, fundamentally circular to base on Vergilian (and Homeric) practice our ideas of how given lines of the *Annales* were used, however much our sources prompt us to do so. Above all, the danger lies in being tempted to extrapolate yet further from the Vergilian context, as Norden famously did in *Ennius und Vergilius* (1915), a practice in which Skutsch follows him.[103]

At *Sat.* 6.1.12, we find an Ennian–Vergilian phrase that has no obvious Homeric background and no recurrences either in the *Aeneid* or, so far as we can tell, in the *Annales*, but which, prompted by the bias of the source, scholars have found themselves tempted to reconstruct as part of the Homer–Ennius–Vergil genealogy:

> tuque o Thybri tuo genitor cum flumine sancto [*Aen.* 8.72]
>
> Ennius in primo:
>
> teque, pater Tiberine, tuo cum flumine sancto [*Ann.* 26]
>
> and you, O Tiber, father, with your sacred stream
>
> Ennius in Book 1:
>
> and you, father Tiber, with your sacred stream

The line is on the face of it not especially Homerising: both the adjectival form *Tiberinus* and the *cum* phrase hark back to Latin ritual language, as illustrated by an old prayer cited by Servius ad *Aen.* 8.72: *sic enim invocatur in precibus: 'adesto, Tiberine, cum tuis undis'* ('because that's how he is addressed in prayers: "Be present, Tiber, with your waves"'); cf. Serv. ad *Aen.* 8.31: *in sacris Tiberinus, in coenolexia Tiberis, in poemate Thybris vocatur* ('in ritual language [the river] is called "Tiberinus", in common parlance

sepulto (*Aen.* 6.424) are best comprehensible as abbreviations of an original *somno vinoque sepultam* (*Aen.* 2.265), itself an abbreviated and reversed but still highly recognisable form of Ennius' original *vino domiti somnoque sepulti* (*Ann.* 288).

[103] See Skutsch's commentary *passim*. Acceptance of Norden's methodology is explicit at Skutsch 1985: 777, cf. *ibid.* 402, together with the assumptions implicit, e.g., at *ibid.* 336 and 341, despite his awareness of the proper reservations expressed and illustrated by Wigodsky 1972: 46–54, 56–66.

"Tiberis", in poetry "Thybris"').[104] But two scholars have gone out of their way to suggest Homeric phrases against which we are to understand Ennius' formulation: M. Leumann suggests (Ξάνθου) βαθυδινήεντος, while H. B. Rosén suggests εὐρρεής of Homer's formula εὐρρεῖος ποταμοῖο (*Il.* 6.508, 14.433, 15.265, 21.1).[105] These suggestions are apt not because Ennius' *tuo cum flumine sancto* inherently cries out to be associated with Homeric language but because Vergil's re-use of the line, backed by the presentation in Macrobius, prompts that association.[106] In drawing potential Homeric background to attention, these scholars are answering the invitation of the Vergiliocentric sources to reconstruct the epic tradition around the quotations they transmit.

Again, such inferences are not necessarily mistaken. Often enough, a range of other factors, including the Homerising nature of individual items of vocabulary or word-uses in the lines quoted and these lines' surrounding context, does indeed confirm the Vergilian readings of Ennian lines that emerge from the Vergiliocentric sources.[107] At *Sat.* 6.1.8, at the head of Macrobius' list in Book 6, we find:

> vertitur interea caelum et ruit oceano nox [*Aen.* 2.250]
>
> Ennius libro sexto:
>
> vertitur interea caelum cum ingentibus signis [*Ann.* 205]
>
> in the meantime the heavens wheeled about and night sprang from ocean[108]
>
> Ennius in Book 6:
>
> in the meantime the heavens wheeled about with their massive constellations

[104] Both Servius passages are cited by Skutsch 1985: 185–6, who also suggests that Livy's *tum Cocles, 'Tiberine pater' inquit 'te sancte precor, haec arma et hunc militem propitio flumine accipias'* (2.10.11) may derive from Ennius.

[105] Leumann 1959: 138, n. 3; Rosén 1968: 376 (both cited by Skutsch 1985: 186). It is arguable in their favour that *Ann.* 553, *effudit voces proprio cum pectore sancto*, cited by Servius on *G.* 2.424, offers an echo in its second half that suggests formulaic language. The line ought to initiate a god's speech; elsewhere in the *Annales*, *sanctus* is only used of *pater Tiberinus* at *Ann.* 26, of Juno at *Ann.* 53, of the augural birds at *Ann.* 88 and of the Roman senate at *Ann.* 282; cf. also *cum corde suo* of Jupiter's soliloquy at *Ann.* 203. Skutsch suggests that *proprio cum pectore* [*loqui*] is equivalent to Homeric προτὶ ὃν μυθήσατο θυμόν (*Il.* 11.403 and elsewhere; Skutsch 1985: 365). *Ann.* 553 is thus potentially an appropriate quasi-formulaic counterpart to *Ann.* 26.

[106] On the function of *Ann.* 26 in the text, see further n. 142, p. 127.

[107] I have discussed the following evidence in the context of a related argument at Elliott 2008: 241–51.

[108] See Knox 1989: 265 on the sense of *Oceano*, with Mack 1980: 153–8 on the difficulties of the line.

As a marker of time- and scene-change, *Ann.* 205 is recognisably based on functionally similar lines of Homeric formula, but there is more that encourages us to read the line as a building-block of the epic tradition. The relation between *Ann.* 205 and the lines listed subsequently at *Sat.* 6.1.9 is constructed via rhythm, which is identical for the second halves, and via type, since these lines constitute typical formulaic-style descriptions of the progress of night:

> axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum [*Aen.* 4.482 = 6.797]
> Ennius in primo:
> qui caelum versat stellis fulgentibus aptum [*Ann.* 27]
> et in tertio:
> caelum prospexit stellis fulgentibus aptum [*Ann.* 145]
> in decimo:
> hinc nox processit stellis ardentibus apta [*Ann.* 348]
>
> he whirls about on his shoulder the skies fitted with the blazing stars
> Ennius in Book 1:
> who wheels about the heavens fitted with the gleaming stars
> and in Book 3:
> he gazed out at the heavens fitted with the gleaming stars
> and in Book 10:
> hence night came forth, fitted with the blazing stars

The affiliation to Homeric formula is additionally reinforced by other Homeric traits, such as the personification of *nox* at *Ann.* 348, but two external factors also contribute to how we read these lines and *Ann.* 205 in particular. First is the arrangement in Macrobius: the line occurs in sequence with *Ann.* 27, 145 and 248 at *Sat.* 6.1.9, which clearly imitate formula; as well as with *Ann.* 203–4 at *Sat.* 6.1.10 (see p. 87). This predisposes readers to assimilate its function within the text to what is evidently the case with its neighbours. The grouping together of lines imitating formula within Macrobius' larger categories arguably suggests that some ancient readers perceived Vergil's use of Ennian formula-like phrases as part of a consistent strategy on his part – whether those ancient readers are represented by Macrobius himself, if he is responsible for the gravitation of such instances towards each other in his text, or whether, as is more likely, they are represented by those of his sources whose more systematic groupings of such lines are now only dimly discernible in Macrobius' haphazard rendering.[109] By placing *Ann.* 205 amid a series of quasi-formulaic lines from both the *Annales* and the *Aeneid*, Macrobius increases the chances that

[109] See n. 21, p. 82, for bibliography on Macrobius' methods of working cf. n. 114, p. 115.

his readers will understand it, too, as similarly quasi-formulaic in function. Secondly, while Macrobius cites only one Vergilian line as informed by the series of Ennian lines given at 6.1.9, this line itself constitutes one of the few whole-line verbatim repetitions in the *Aeneid* (4.482 = 6.797), and the pair has a cousin in *nox umida donec/invertit caelum stellis ardentibus aptum* ('until damp night wheeled about the sky fitted with the blazing stars', *Aen.* 11.201–2). *Aen.* 2.250 and *Ann.* 205 constitute part of a quasi-formulaic nexus with these lines, which is further cemented by *Aen.* 2.8–9, *nox umida caelo/praecipitat* ('damp night tumbles headlong from the sky'); cf. related language such as *nox ruit* ('night rushes headlong') at *Aen.* 6.539 and 8.369. Again, the fact that Vergil's imitation of *Ann.* 205 is demonstrably quasi-formulaic encourages readers to interpret the Ennian line, too, as similarly quasi-formulaic.

The representation of Ennius' lines in Vergil and in Vergiliocentric sources as valid versions of Homer, authenticated by their re-use in the *Aeneid*, tends thus on the whole to be coherent, and hence both transparent as evidence of how the text was read by and after Vergil and at least plausible as a representation of how the lines from Vergiliocentric sources were intended to function in the Ennian original. Below, we shall return to the evidence of the Vergiliocentric sources to explore other modes in which Vergil chose to interact with the language of the *Annales*. First, though, a brief consideration of the effects for the *Aeneid* of Vergil's choice to co-opt Ennian formula-like language in particular.

Vergil's re-use of Ennian formulaic-style lines re-creates details of the narrative that will inevitably feel like a familiar part of the tradition to Vergil's immediate audience, readers aware of the *Annales*. Vergil could thus achieve the full effect of formula on the first occasion of his use of any phrase that had already served to replicate that function in Latin, whether or not a specific and recognisable Homeric formula lay behind it. There was economy in this, for it makes unnecessary precise, verbatim repetition within the *Aeneid*, a practice which in fact Vergil largely eschews (whether or not Ennius is involved).[110] Secondly, the antiquity of the Ennian phrases by Vergil's day also meant that these particular expressions had a history and therefore resonance within the Latin language that could readily be activated. It is arguable that their re-use in Latin is in effect analogous to the

[110] See Elliott 2008: 244, with n. 8 there.

centuries of re-use in active oral composition of the original Homeric formulae (cf. also Apollonius' re-use in literary epic of echoes of oral formulae). Above all, Vergil's re-use of the quasi-formulaic lines of the *Annales*, as seen in the examples above, served as a vehicle for expressing the relationship of the *Aeneid* to pre-existent epic tradition, epic tradition as now constructed in the new text: that is, with Ennius in the role of Homer. Vergil thus confirmed Ennius and the formulations of the *Annales* as central and originary from the perspective of the *Aeneid*. Macrobius' evidence makes it appear that Vergil made Ennian 'formula' the primary 'formula' of the *Aeneid*, and thus made Ennius the 'Roman Homer' in an active and technical sense, implicitly affirming and putting into action, in the text of the *Aeneid*, those claims that Ennius had so strikingly made at the start of the *Annales*.[111] In a secondary sense, too, however, by adopting the language in which Ennius had re-incarnated himself as the new Homer, Vergil also arrogated for himself some claim to the same status, without involving himself in Ennius' abrasive explicit aspirations.

The Vergiliocentric sources and Lucretius' use of quasi-formulaic language

We saw above that, after Ennius, Lucretius is the author most commonly cited in *Saturnalia* 6 as a source for Vergil's language. Many scholars, prompted by Lucretius' heavily archaising language, including his pervasive use of alliteration, and added to that his directly naming Ennius at *DRN* 1.117–26, have sensed that Lucretius co-opted Ennian language probably to an even greater extent than Vergil did.[112] The most famous product of this understanding is Norden's attempt to extrapolate (no longer extant fragments of) Ennius from the coincidence of Vergilian and Lucretian language.[113] Norden's methodology would allow us to postulate that any Lucretian quasi-formulaic lines that are also to be found in Vergil are Ennian in origin.[114] Yet neither Macrobius nor any other ancient source

[111] See p. 75 and n. 1 there. [112] For the statistics and bibliography, see n. 22, p. 83.

[113] See Norden 1927: 369–72, esp. 71 (cf. n. 91, p. 00). The fullest list of such coincidences is Merrill 1918: (cf. also Gigon 1978: 168–9.)

[114] Macrobius lists eleven examples of Lucretian language recurrent in the *Aeneid* (at *Sat*. 6.1.25, 27, 28, 30, 44 [where the relevance of a line of Furius Bibaculus is also signalled], 45, 46, 48 [two separate Vergilian lines indicated as originating from *DRN* 1.134–5], 49, 63) and five in the *Georgics* (at *Sat*. 6.26, 29, 47, 64, 65). Lucretius also figures large in the longer passages at *Sat*. 6.2: see *ibid*. 2–3, 4–5, 6, 7, 8–9, 10–11, 12, 13, 14, 15 and 29. As is typically the case wherever relevant material survives, our own resources allow us to see a great deal more of Vergil's re-use of Lucretius than Macrobius shows us. This confirms the sense generated by other evidence, too, of the haphazard approach to collection of material taken by Macrobius and the tradition in which he worked.

betrays any awareness of such a notion – not even in a passage such as *Sat.* 6.1, where such a point would have been highly relevant. No ancient source ever quotes Ennius directly in explanation of Lucretius' language (cf. n. 12, p. 79).

Modern scholars have to some extent been able to compensate: W. A. Merrill compiled 15 pages of (sometimes close, sometimes less close) similarities of phrase and vocabulary-item between Ennius and Lucretius.[115] Very occasionally, coincidence makes it possible to discern a longer borrowing, such as when an Ennian line Festus cites as an instance of the antique use of *sos* for *suos* (*Ann.* 137) turns up at *DRN* 3.1025, as part of Lucretius' commentary on the fact that all mortals must die;[116] or when the description of the Punic War at *DRN* 3.833–7 draws on extant Ennian language (esp. *Ann.* 309, which survives in several quotations in Cicero and in Festus, cf. *Ann.* 554, which survives via Varro; for specifics of the sources, see Skutsch 1985: 486–7 and 700–1).[117]

The occasions on which triangulation of surviving Ennian, Lucretian and Vergilian language is possible are almost as rare. Where it occurs, the language is quasi-formulaic, and in three out of six cases, the Ennian fragments are transmitted by Vergiliocentric sources, once again reinforced by the grammarians. One instance is found in the phrase *toto corpore sudor*,[118] and which, Hardie points out, ends a line at *DRN* 6.944.[119] Of the Lucretian formulaic language listed by Minyard in his Appendixes A and B,[120] besides the famous *hominum divumque voluptas* ('source of delight to men and gods', *DRN* 1.1, 6.94), most closely analogous to *divomque hominumque pater, rex* ('father and king to both gods and men', *Ann.* 591), there is also *et mollia membra* ('and . . . their soft limbs', *DRN* 4.789, 980), for which compare *et mollia crura* ('and . . . their soft legs') of *Ann.* 570, also of foals at Verg. *G.* 3.76; and *aequora ponti* (*DRN* 1.8, 2.772, 6.440; cf. *aequore ponti* at *DRN* 2.781, 6.628), cf. *aequora campi* ('the level surface of the plain', *Ann.* 124). *In aeris auras* ('into the breezes of the upper air', *DRN* 3.591, 4.693) is possibly influenced by (*per teneras*) *caliginis auras* ('through the gentle breezes of the darkness', *Ann.* 18).[121] Finally, (*fortis*) *equi vis* (*DRN* 3.8,

[115] Merrill 1918a: 249–64.
[116] The lines are discussed at Gigon 1978: 187–8 and Gale 2007: 63; see also Kenney 1971: 233.
[117] See Mayer 1990: 40; Gale 1994: 110–11.
[118] For discussion of the Homeric, Ennian and Vergilian instances of this phrase, see pp. 88–9.
[119] Hardie 1994: 248. [120] Minyard 1978: 103–72.
[121] For the sources (Vergiliocentric for *Ann.* 591 and 18), and the Vergilian equivalents to *Ann.* 591, *Ann.* 124 and *Ann.* 18, see pp. 87, 110 and 104.

764) has at least a distant analogue in (*Vestina*) *virum vis* (*Ann.* 229), in *equos vi* (*Ann.* 465) and in *aquae vis* (*Ann.* 482).[122] These instances, few as they are in number, corroborate (were it necessary) the essential validity of the soundest aspect of Norden's methodology.[123]

In the context of the present argument, the points to note are: (a) even here, it is the Vergiliocentric sources that allow us to establish a good half of the coincidences among Ennian, Lucretian and Vergilian quasi-formulaic language; more importantly, (b) we cannot claim that any particular bias of the ancient sources is responsible for the idea of the relationship between the *Annales* and the *DRN* in the same way that we can for the idea of a relationship between the *Annales* and the *Aeneid*. Our perception today of the relationship between the *Annales* and the *DRN* is the product of Lucretius' heavy imitation of Ennian word-forms and hexametric cadences (against the developing neoteric trend of his day), which we can match with the linguistic and metrical forms of the fragments of the *Annales* (see again n. 22, p. 83). The other significant source for that perception is Lucretius' own words at *DRN* 1.117–26, coupled with the testimonia of the scholiasts to Horace and Persius (see Appendix Tables A5.26 and A5.41). Of this evidence and its use in the reconstruction of the text there will be more to say in a different context in Chapter 5.

THE SOURCES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE EPIC TRADITION (2): SIMILES

For modern readers, the presence itself of the extended simile, in itself a conspicuously Homeric formal device, once again grafts the *Annales* firmly into the main branch of the epic tradition as we know it. With one principal exception – that at *Ann.* 79–81, preserved by Cicero (*Div.* 1.107–8) – the surviving extended similes of the *Annales* are the product of the Vergiliocentric sources, and in particular of *Sat.* 6. Supporting evidence then emerges from both Vergiliocentric and non-Vergiliocentric sources. The latter are represented by Nonius and Priscian who, despite their more technical interests, preserve Homerising similes well grafted into the epic tradition as presented by the Vergiliocentrics. Were the Macrobian material missing, however, we would find far less persuasive the much slighter indications elsewhere that

[122] *Ann.* 229 and 465 survive via the grammatical tradition; for the sources, see Skutsch 1985: 408, 624. *Ann.* 482 survives via an etymological note at Ps.-Macr. *Exc. Bob.* 5.651 and *Exc. Par.* 5.626; see *ibid.* 643.

[123] For the dangers of other parts of Norden's reconstructive procedure, see n. 103, p. 111; cf. n. 142, p. 127.

this device was a central means by which Ennius and in turn Vergil declared their affiliation to the particular version of the epic tradition that they helped constitute. From non-Vergiliocentric sources there also emerges some evidence that slightly qualifies the implications of the Vergiliocentric material: Cicero's simile at *Ann.* 79–81 (comparing the suspense of the crowd awaiting the auspicate of Romulus and Remus to that of a crowd waiting for the consul to give the sign for the start of a chariot-race) is thoroughly Romanised and has no evident Greek model – although Macrobius indirectly suggests an Odyssean one (see pp. 121–2, with n. 129). In a sense, then, this Ciceronian exception to the Vergiliocentric norm is one that proves the rule: when we move away from Vergiliocentric material, our picture of Ennian practice grows more nuanced. Moreover, Cicero's simile, with its muted Homeric elements, also receives some support from other non-Vergiliocentric sources, for Varro and Gellius produce similes that have no clear Homeric analogues.

As with the quasi-formulae, Macrobius can be explicit about the Homeric background of the related Ennian–Vergilian similes he charts and thus leave us in very little doubt as to how he read the history of the genre, even if that emerges from a more myopic interest in the history of given Vergilian language. So, for example, at *Sat.* 6.3.7–8, we find:

> Homerica descriptio est equi fugientis in haec verba:
> ὡς δ᾽ ὅτε τις στατὸς ἵππος ἀκοστήσας ἐπὶ φάτνῃ
> δεσμὸν ἀπορρήξας θείῃ πεδίοιο κροαίνων
> εἰωθὼς λούεσθαι εὐρρεῖος ποταμοῖο
> κυδιόων· ὑψοῦ δὲ κάρη ἔχει, ἀμφὶ δὲ χαῖται
> ὤμοις ἀίσσονται· ὁ δ᾽ ἀγλαίῃφι πεποιθώς
> ῥίμφα ἑ γοῦνα φέρει μετά τ᾽ ἤθεα καὶ νομὸν ἵππων.
> [*Il.* 6.506 11 = 15.263 8]
> Ennius hinc traxit:
> et tum sicut equus qui de praesepibus fartus
> vincla suis magnis animis abrupit, et inde
> fert sese campi per caerula laetaque prata
> celso pectore, saepe iubam quassat simul altam;
> spiritus ex anima calida spumas agit albas. [*Ann.* 535 9]
> Vergilius:
> qualis ubi abruptis fugit praesepia vinclis . . . [*Aen.* 11.492ff.]
> et cetera.

There is in Homer a description of a horse escaping, in the following words:

> As when a stalled horse, fed at the manger, breaks his halter and speeds
> luxuriating over the plain, his custom to wash in the fair flowing river,

exulting. He holds his head high, and his mane flows about his shoulders. He rejoices in his magnificence, and his legs bear him swiftly to the haunts and pasture ground of the mares.

From this passage Ennius extracted:

And then, just as a horse, fed full at the manger, in high spirits breaks his fetters, and then gallops through the dark green, fertile plain of the land in pride of heart, and often he shakes his mane high; the exhalation of his warm breath brings the white froth with it.

Vergil has:

As when, his bonds broken, [a horse] flees his stall etc.

These passages have a further relative at Ap. Rhod. 3.1259–6.[124] Its existence shows that the narrow Homer–Ennius–Vergil narrative that emerges from Macrobius is not the only possible story of the epic tradition to be told.

Where Macrobius fails to be explicit about the Homeric background, it often remains, as we also saw earlier, strongly implicit in what he presents for any reader acquainted with the relevant texts. In the case of the similes, the resemblance may be more distant than with the strictly formulaic-style lines, where there was often word-for-word similarity. At *Sat.* 6.1.21, Macrobius gives us:

diversi magno[125] ceu quondam turbine venti
confligunt Zephyrusque Notusque et laetus
Eois Eurus equis . . . [*Aen.* 2.416 8]

Ennius in septimo decimo:

concurrunt veluti venti cum spiritus Austri
imbricitor Aquiloque suo cum flamine contra
indu mari magno fluctus extollere certant [*Ann.* 432 4]

just as when at times opposing winds in a great storm clash together, the West wind and the South and the East wind, rejoicing in his eastern horses . . .

Ennius in Book 17:

they clash, as when the rainy gust of the South wind and, against him, the North with his blast strive to raise high the waves over the wide sea

Skutsch cites *Il.* 9.4–8 and 16.765–71 as the closest comparable Homeric passages, passages which are juxtaposed by Macrobius himself with *Aen.*

[124] For discussion of the Ennian passage and all its relatives, including Ap. Rhod. 3.1259–6, see Albrecht 1969: 333–45 and Wülfing-von Martitz 1972: 267–70, both cited by Skutsch 1985: 684.

[125] The established Vergilian text reads *adversi rupto*. Macrobius knows this when he quotes the passage at *Sat.* 5.13.14.

2.416–9 at *Sat.* 5.13.14.[126] He also comments that the simile at *Aen.* 10.355–61 is in some ways closer than that from *Aen.* 2 that Macrobius actually cites:[127]

> . . . certatur limine in ipso
> Ausoniae. magno discordes aethere venti
> proelia ceu tollunt animis et viribus aequis;
> non ipsi inter se, non nubila, non mare cedit;
> anceps pugna diu, stant obnixa omnia contra:
> haud aliter Troianae acies aciesque Latinae
> concurrunt, haeret pede pes densusque viro vir.

> . . . the fighting goes on at Italy's very threshold. They bring the battle to a pitch, as quarrelling winds with impressive blast do, their spirits and their strength well matched; they back down neither amongst themselves, nor do the clouds or the sea give way. The fight hangs long in the balance, while all stand struggling in opposition. In just that way did the Trojan ranks and the Latin clash, with foot pressing against foot, man jostling close against man.

As Skutsch notes, this passage ends with the Ennian *haeret pede pes*, etc. (cf. *Ann.* 584, quoted on p. 85), confirming the relevance of the *Annales* here. The multiplicity and interchangeability of the Vergilian similes leaning on Ennius that Skutsch observes is one manifestation of the fact that the kind of material the Vergiliocentric sources most commonly track is material that represents to the modern reader – primarily informed by just these sources, of course – the generic hallmarks of the epic tradition at Rome. Whatever new twists Vergil introduces into the basic motifs, the function of this language is fundamentally to remain recognisable wherever it re-surfaces as historically associated with the genre of epic at Rome.

Smaller-scale evidence from a variety of sources backs Macrobius' attestation to the centrality of the device, by confirming that sources of all sorts can come up with instances of Ennius' use of directly Homerising simile: even sources without any direct interest in pinpointing contact between the *Aeneid* and the *Annales* produce material from Ennian similes, if in minute

[126] Skutsch 1985: 593. The Iliadic passages read: ὡς δ᾽ ἄνεμοι δύο πόντον ὀρίνετον ἰχθυόεντα,/Βορρῆς καὶ Ζέφυρος, τώ τε Θρῄκηθεν ἄητον/ἐλθόντ᾽ ἐξαπίνης, ἄμυδις δέ τε κῦμα κελαινὸν/κορθύεται, πολλὸν δὲ παρὲξ ἅλα φῦκος ἔχευεν·/ὥς ἐδαΐζετο θυμὸς ἐνὶ στήθεσσιν Ἀχαιῶν (*Il.* 8.4–8); ὡς δ᾽ Εὖρός τε Νότος τ᾽ ἐριδαίνετον ἀλλήλοιιν/οὔρεος ἐν βήσσῃς βαθέῃ πελεμίζεμεν ὕλην,/φηγόν τε μελίην τε τανύφλοιόν τε κράνειαν,/αἵ τε πρὸς ἀλλήλας ἔβαλον τανυήκεας ὄζους/ἠχῇ θεσπεσίῃ, πάταγος δέ τε ἀγνυμενάων·/ὥς Τρῶες καὶ Ἀχαιοὶ ἐπ᾽ ἀλλήλοισι θορόντες/δῄουν (*Il.* 16.765–71).

[127] *ibid.*; Norden 1915: 159 had already made the observation, in the context of an argument that unites *Ann.* 432–4, 584, 480 and 483–4 in a conjectural context analogous to *Aen.* 10.354–98.

quantities. Once more in this material the construction of the epic tradition lies ready to hand. It is here too (as we saw in various instances above) often easy to supplement the Vergiliocentrics' suggestions for moments where direct contact between Ennius and Vergil takes place by culling material from non-Vergiliocentric sources. I begin with the material provided by the less hefty Vergiliocentric sources (those besides Macrobius) before moving to the wider evidence of sources from across the board.

The floscule *furentibus ventis* ('the winds raging', *Ann.* 601) is preserved by Servius on *Aen.* 1.51, *loca feta furentibus Austris* ('a place teeming with the raging South winds'). Although not in itself clearly a simile, the phrase would be quite at home in the same type of description as the related similes at *Ann.* 432–4 and *Aen.* 2.416–8 and 10.355–11, which we have just seen, and its existence suggests the recurrence of the storm-simile within the *Annales* themselves, as is true also of the *Aeneid* (cf. *Aen.* 12.365–70, 12.451–6, etc., besides the two examples already given).

The final indication of the use of simile provided by a Vergiliocentric source comes from the Scholia Bernensia on *G.* 1.512 (*ut cum carceribus sese effudere quadrigae*, 'as when chariots burst forth from the starting-gates', of war's frenzied onslaught). The scholia there quote *quom a carcere fusi/currus cum sonitu magno permittere certant* ('when, bursting from the starting-position, the chariots noisily vie to hurl', *Ann.* 463–4). While the quotation itself does not necessitate that these lines are part of a simile, the *cum* clause and the present tense of its verb at any rate allow for that possibility; and the possibility is promoted by the fact that *G.* 1.512 itself represents a simile. More particularly, *Ann.* 463–4 are reminiscent of the better-known Ennian simile describing the suspense of the crowd awaiting the outcome of the augury that is to decide whether Romulus or Remus is to rule Rome. Cicero (*Div.* 1.107–8) provides the full passage, from which I excerpt the simile:[128] *expectant veluti consul quom mittere signum/volt, omnes avidi spectant ad carceris oras/quam mox emittat pictos e faucibus currus* ('they waited as when the consul is about to give the sign, and all gaze eagerly at the barriers of the starting-posts, to see how soon he will release the bright chariots from their maw', *Ann.* 79–81). Although no specific Homeric analogue survives for *Ann.* 79–81, and although the heavy Romanisation of the lines is evident, the simile is not without connection to those texts of the epic tradition whose role the Vergiliocentrics emphasise. Vergil has comparable lines not only at *G.* 1.512

[128] The passage is also known to Gell. 7.6.9 and DS *Aen.* 1.273; cf. *CGL* 5.578.3 (Skutsch 1985: 221–2).

but also in the *Aeneid*: *non tam praecipites biiugo certamine campum/corripuere ruuntque effusi carcere currus* ('not so impetuously do chariots, in a contest over a team of horses, rush bursting from the starting-place and charge over the plain', *Aen.* 5.144–5, of the start of the ship-race); and on the latter Vergilian lines Macrobius, at *Sat.* 5.11.20, quotes *Od.* 13.81–3.[129] This suggests that the Homeric background was part of the constellation of information that the scholarly tradition possessed around the *Aeneid* passages and *Ann.* 79–81 and 463–4. Furthermore, the equation of ship and chariot re-surfaces in a line of the *Annales* that is cited by Quintilian (8.6.9) and subsequently circulates among authors of the grammatical tradition (Sacerd. [*GLK* 6.466], Charis. [*GLK* 1.272], Diom. [*GLK* 1.457]) as an instance of metaphor: *quomque gubernator magna contorsit equos vi* ('and when the helmsman forcefully reins round the horses', *Ann.* 465).[130] As with the winds' simile, it is thus evident that comparable descriptive language recurred within the *Annales* in imitation of Homer, before being co-opted by Vergil and re-circulated in the *Aeneid*.

The remaining indications of the use of simile in the *Annales* come from non-Vergiliocentric sources. Even here, where a source's main interest is in the rare or the uncharacteristic, there remains a possibility that such a source will disproportionately privilege the prominence of similes, since similes are rich in such material. In at least two cases, a strong and informative relationship to the *Aeneid* and/or Homeric texts exists.[131] Nonius 483.1 (*De mutatis declinationibus*) chooses to illustrate the use of *lacte* in the nominative by citing *et simul erubuit ceu lacte et purpura mixta* ('and at once s/he blushed, like milk and purple mixed', *Ann.* 361), which he says belongs to Book 11 of the *Annales*.[132] Despite Nonius' disengagement from the line's literary history, it clearly picks up on the simile at *Il.* 4.141–8, which compares Menelaus' thigh-wound to a lavish ivory ornament stained with purple dye: Ὡς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ φοίνικι μιήνῃ/Μῃονὶς ἠὲ Κάειρα, παρήιον ἔμμεναι ἵππων . . . ('as when a woman of Maeonia or Caeira stains a piece of ivory with purple dye to be a cheek-piece for horses . . .'). Vergil's subsequent re-negotiation of the line clearly derives from Homer via Ennius, since in the *Aeneid* it is again an Ennian blush that

[129] *Od.* 13.81–3: οἱ δ' ὥς ἐν πεδίῳ τετράοροι ἄρσενες ἵπποι,/πάντες ἀφορμηθέντες ὑπὸ πληγῇσιν ἱμάσθης,/ὑψόσ' ἀειρόμενοι ῥίμφα πρήσσουσι κέλευθα (description of the Phaeacian ship carrying Odysseus). *Sat.* 5.11.20 is cited by Williams 1960: ad *Aen.* 5.144. Skutsch further compares Hor. *Sat.* 1.1.114, *ut cum carceribus missos rapit ungula currus* (Skutsch 1985: 624).

[130] The line is not explicitly attributed to Ennius; see Skutsch 1985: 624–5 for the reasons for attribution to him and Flores *et al.* 2009: 106–7 for the full doxography.

[131] I have discussed this simile at Elliott 2007: 45–6.

[132] A small number of mss. offer the reading *Ennius lib. x*, as opposed to *xi*; see Skutsch 1985: 526.

the mixture of purple and white describes – although one that is to lead to all too many Homeric wounds:

> accepit vocem lacrimis Lavinia matris
> flagrantis perfusa genas, cui plurimus ignem
> subiecit rubor et calefacta per ora cucurrit.
> Indum sanguineo ueluti uiolauerit ostro
> si quis ebur, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa
> alba rosa, talis uirgo dabat ore colores. *Aen.* 12.64–9
>
> Lavinia greeted her mother's words with tears pouring down her blazing cheeks. A great blush set fire to her and ran over her face till it burned. Just as when someone stains Indian ivory with blood red dye, or when white lilies blush mixed with roses in plenty, such were the signs the girl's face gave.

The glimpse into the history of Vergilian similes Macrobius affords is thus usefully confirmed from outside the Vergiliocentric tradition.

The second instance of non-Vergiliocentric support of the Vergiliocentric picture of Ennian similes is provided by Priscian 9.50 (*GLK* 2.486). He quotes the following simile to illustrate an instance of the preterite forms of verbs ending in *–geo* preceded by a liquid:

> Cyclopis venter velut turserat alte
> carnibus humanis distentus [*Ann.* 319–20]
>
> just as once the Cyclops' belly had swollen huge, crammed with human flesh

Here we see Ennius departing from literal Homeric precedent only to draw directly on the Homeric narrative itself. This simile indicates its allegiance to Homeric epic quite as evidently as do Macrobius' similes, if by means other than immediate imitation. The non-Vergiliocentric source both confirms the thrust of the Vergiliocentrics' evidence, while enlarging our sense of the means by which Ennius promoted the sense of himself as Homer reincarnate.

There is also, however, evidence that Ennius strikes out from the Homeric repertoire in a more significant way either than *Ann.* 319–20 suggest or than merely by introducing culturally alien subject-matter, as we saw him do above with *Ann.* 79–81 and 463–4. Cicero provides us with some surprising information when he quotes the following fragment (*Sen.* 14):

> sua enim vitia insipientes et suam culpam in senectutem conferunt, quod non faciebat is cuius modo mentionem feci Ennius:
>
> > sicuti fortis equus, spatio qui saepe supremo
> > vicit Olympia, nunc senio confectus quiescit. [*Ann.* 522–3]

equi fortis et victoris senectuti comparat suam.

In their folly, [those who complain of old age] blame on old age their own faults, for which they are themselves responsible; but Ennius, whom I referred to just now, did no such thing:

> just like a brave horse, who often, straining in the final lap, won the Olympic race, and now, when old age takes its toll on him, takes his rest.

He thus compares his own seniority to that of a brave and victorious horse.

The Homerising of the simile itself is reinforced by Ennius' phrase *vicit Olympia*, a syntactical Graecism equivalent to νικᾶν Ὀλύμπια;[133] while the ageing horse is a theme common in earlier literature.[134] It is instead the profoundly un-Homeric use of the simile to move the usually self-effacing epic authorial persona front and centre stage that sets this simile apart. It is one indication of Ennius' highly idiosyncratic approach to the presentation of the first person, which is without parallel in either earlier or later epic; it is perhaps instead closer to the manner of Livy's mid-text proems as he discusses the progress of his long-term project in Books 6, 21, 31, etc.

Evidence for two more similes survives in non-Vergiliocentric sources. Both originate in Varro, one directly, and one indirectly via Gellius.[135] At *LL* 7.32, Varro is examining the evidence for the form *canes* as an alternative, archaic singular of *canis*.[136] He attributes the first line he quotes in support of the existence of such a form to Ennius: *tantidem quasi feta canes sine dentibus latrat* ('your/his/her bark is like that of a worn-out, toothless bitch', *Ann.* 542). Skutsch (1985: 690) interprets the line as 'a haughty answer to a threat', comparable to Diomedes' response to being wounded by Paris: οὐκ ἀλέγω, ὡς εἴ με γυνὴ βάλοι ἢ παῖς ἄφρων ('I heed it not, as if a woman had struck me, or a child in its immaturity', *Il.* 11.389). It is perhaps arguable that an interest in archaism has led Varro towards Homerising material, especially if we allow for the possibility that Ennius used archaism as a stylistic device or technique for characterisation to be infused into the narrative more heavily at chosen points, in accordance with the subject-matter and the effect the poet wished to convey; but overall it is perhaps more impressive that even such a myopic technical interest can produce a simile, and one that moreover quite separately prompts the memory of another Homeric

[133] Skutsch 1985: 674.

[134] Skutsch (*loc. cit.*) notes e.g. the ἵππος Ἰβύκειος (*Ibyc.* 7.5 ff. D) cited by Plato, *Parm.* 137[A]: ἤ μὰν τρομέω νιν (ἔρωτα) ἐπερχόμενον ὥστε φερέζυγος ἵππος ἀεθλοφόρος ποτὶ γήρᾳ ἀέκων σὺν ὄχεσφι θοοῖς ἅμιλλαν ἔβα, and the possibly derivative Soph. *El.* 25–7: ὥσπερ γὰρ ἵππος εὐγενής, κἂν ᾖ γέρων,/ἐν τοῖσι δεινοῖς θυμὸν οὐκ ἀπώλεσεν,/ἀλλ' ὀρθὸν οὗς ἵστησιν, ὡσαύτως δὲ σὺ . . .

[135] See Chapter 3, pp. 141–3 on the relationship between Varro and Gellius as sources for the *Annales*.

[136] See Skutsch 1985: 691 for discussion of the form.

moment, as in Skutsch's response. Gellius picks up a similarly technical interest of Varro's when, at 3.14, he describes and explains the difference, according to Varro, between the meaning of *dimidium* (half, strictly to be used only of one of the two parts resulting when a whole is halved) and *dimidiatum* (halved, only to be used of the whole which is divided in two). Gellius' first piece of evidence of correct usage is a line of Ennius' *Annales*, which he says was quoted by Varro himself as his authority for the proper use of the latter term: *sicuti siquis ferat vas vini dimidiatum* ('just as if someone were to bring a jar of wine from which half has been taken away', *Ann.* 549, at Gell. 3.14.5).[137] This simile, like that at *Ann.* 79–81, is unusual among Ennian similes in that it has no known Greek counterpart.[138] As with the formulaic phrases and as with *Ann.* 319–20 (the Cyclops-simile), we see the poet using original material to enlarge on a technique he found implicit in the Homeric style.

THE SOURCES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE EPIC TRADITION (3): UNIQUE PASSAGES

Where the Vergiliocentric sources are not tracking Vergil's co-option of Ennian renderings of those features of Homeric poetry that are the product of the oral tradition, they tend to pursue two other major interests. The first of these is illustration of Vergil's re-use of short, unique and highly memorable Ennian phrases that typically originate in speeches or constitute aphorisms or otherwise striking phrases. An instance is the familiar *unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem* ('one man alone by delaying saved our state', *Ann.* 363), which Macrobius quotes at *Sat.* 6.1.23 on Vergil's almost verbatim re-use at *Aen.* 6.846, although that is not by any means the only mention of it.[139] This particular line is so often quoted in ancient authors that it stands a better chance than most of being familiar enough to reproduce for a modern reader the effect that its recurrence in a new setting would have had for the ancient reader. In general, there is no palpable Homeric background to these lines; their language is original to Ennius and exclusive to Rome. Vergil adopts them for the speeches of characters of the *Aeneid* or else appropriates them for the Vergilian narrator himself, at

[137] 'From which half has been taken away' is Skutsch's translation (Skutsch 1985: 698).
[138] *ibid.* 697.
[139] *Ann.* 363 is clearly referred to by Cic. *Sen.* 10, cf. *Att.* 2.19; Livy 30.26.7–9, also 22.39.18, 44.22.10; Suet. *Tib.* 21; Verg. *Aen.* 6.845 and Serv. *ad loc.*; cf. Ov. *Fast.* 2.240, Sen. *Benef.* 4.27.2; also Polyb. 3.105.8, Plin. *NH* 22.10; cp. Sil. 6.609–16. These references and more are given by Skutsch 1985: 529.

moments designed for special prominence. This set of lines does not correspond to any of Macrobius' own groupings in the *Saturnalia*. Instead, they are largely interspersed among the predominantly formulaic-style lines of *Sat.* 6.1,[140] though examples also occur at *Sat.* 6.2.16, 18, 21 and 25 (to cite only instances from Ennius). In a sense, even though they share the external characteristics on which Macrobius is focused at *Sat.* 6.1 (i.e. half or virtually whole lines adopted by Vergil more or less verbatim; see p. 82, with n. 20 there), the two main types of line found there as I identify them are opposites of a sort: lines reproduced in imitation of formula are prominent in the audience's memory because of the frequency of their recurrence and as a result of their routine association with the text, whereas the set of lines now under consideration are noticeable to an audience because they are memorable in their own right and associated with a particular moment of the narrative. I would suggest that the scholarly tradition's notice of Vergil's use of marked and memorable instances of unique Ennian language, especially speech, also explains the presence of lines from Ennian tragedy intermingled with those from epic at *Sat.* 6.1–2 (see n. 140). Presumably it is because lines of tragic origin, too, fit under Macrobius' unsophisticated heading for *Sat.* 6.1 that he as organiser of his text finds the mix unproblematic.[141]

Macrobius points out three instances of unique speech from the *Annales* that are recapitulated in the *Aeneid*. The function of that speech is to mark

[140] Almost all the lines cited at *Sat.* 6.1, regardless of their author, are either imitations of formula or represent marked moments of address. Formulaic-style lines from Lucretius re-used by Vergil are presented at *Sat.* 6.1.25–30, 44–9, 63–5; ones from Furius Bibaculus at *Sat.* 6.1.31–4, 44; ones from Lucilius at *Sat.* 6.1.35, 43; ones from Sueius at *Sat.* 6.1.37; and (arguably) ones from Varius at *Sat.* 6.1.39–40. The works of the tragedians clearly served Vergil as a source for language by which to mark the speech of his characters with pathos or some form of depth: thus, at *Sat.* 6.1.36, we find an instance of the re-use of Pacuvius' language in the *Aeneid*; at *Sat.* 6.1.38, of the re-use of Naevian language; at *Sat.* 6.1.55–9, of the re-use of Accian language; at *Sat.* 6.1.60–1, of the re-use of Ennian tragic language. At *Sat.* 6.1.42–3, Macrobius points out that the language of the Parcae at *Ecl.* 4.46 re-uses the language of the Parcae from Catullus 64. In this last example, there is an element both of the imitation of formula and of recall of a particular moment in the relationship Macrobius points out. This 'mixed' relationship recurs in the re-use of Ennian tragic language pointed out at *Sat.* 6.1.61 and of Ennian epic at *Sat.* 6.1.53.

[141] For discussion (relevant to the argument here) of the function at *Aen.* 2.268–86, 6.494–527 and 7.286–322 of the mix of Ennian epic and Ennian tragic language to which *Sat.* 6.1–2, together with Serv. *Aen.* 2.274, alerts us, see Elliott 2007: 241–72. There I discuss three 'unique' Ennian passages (*Alex.* 69–71 J, *ibid.* 72–3 and *Ann.* 344–5) preserved at *Sat.* 6.2.18 and 25, and 6.1.60. The surrounding context of formula-like language in Macrobius informed my reading of the 'unique' Ennian speech-language in the context of the recurrence of that same formula-like language in the *Aeneid*. Although these passages have a place in my argument here, I leave them aside by reason of my earlier discussion of them.

ceremonial moments or moments of high tension. The first instance occurs at *Sat.* 6.1.13:[142]

> accipe daque fidem, sunt nobis fortia bello
> pectora . . . [*Aen.* 8.150 1]
> Ennius in primo:
> accipe daque fidem foedusque feri bene firmum [*Ann.* 32]
>
> give and receive this pledge, for we have hearts strong for war
> Ennius in Book 1:
> give and receive this pledge, and strike a properly lasting treaty

At *Sat.* 6.1.15, we find:

> tu tamen interea calido mihi sanguine poenas
> persolves . . . [*Aen.* 9.422 3]
> Ennius in primo:
> nec pol homo quisquam faciet impune animatus
> hoc nec tu, nam mi calido dabis sanguine poenas.[143] [*Ann.* 94 5]
>
> yet you meanwhile shall pay me the price with your warm blood

[142] The line quoted immediately preceding at *Sat.* 6.1.12 (*teque, pater Tiberine, tuo cum flumine sancto*, *Ann.* 26) was discussed on pp. 111–12. Norden believes that the sequence of quotation at Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.12–13 can help us reconstruct an Ennian episode, that of an address of Aeneas to the Tiber, followed by an encounter between Aeneas and the king of Alba Longa, analogous to Aeneas' prayer and his encounter with Latinus at *Aen.* 8.71–8 and 102–83. As we have seen above, *Ann.* 26 from *Sat.* 6.1.12 corresponds to *Aen.* 8.72, and *Ann.* 32 from *Sat.* 6.1.13 to *Aen.* 8.150. From this, Norden infers that the rest of the episode can be reconstructed from Vergil (Norden 1915: 161–2). Skutsch follows suit (Skutsch 1985: 184–5), organising two fragments placed by Macrobius in Book 1 (*Ann.* 27 and 33, from *Sat.* 6.1.9 and *ibid.* 14, respectively, discussed on pp. 113 and 91) as part of the scene, with additionally a further three from other sources (*Ann.* 28–9 from SD *G.* 3.35, *Ann.* 30 from Prisc. 2.337 and *Ann.* 31 from the grammatical tradition). The sources for the latter three do not provide book numbers; Skutsch assigns them to Book 1 on the basis of arguable points of contact with the subject-matter of the episode as understood from Vergil. In doing this, Skutsch thus pushes Norden's methodology even further than Norden had done. At the same time, he omits Norden's important *caveat* that similarity of wording is no guarantee of similarity of context (Norden 1915: 44, n. 1). The implication of Norden–Skutsch's use of *Ann.* 26 is that it is in fact a uniquely occurring line rather than a line that is repeated in imitation of formula (or else the correspondence to *Aen.* 8.72 could not be felt as significant enough to construct a unique episode around it); and in fact *Ann.* 26 is different from the other lines from *Sat.* 6.1 that I have reckoned imitative of formula, in that it constitutes direct speech. This gives it an affinity with *Ann.* 32 and other 'unique' lines from that context to be discussed here. As we saw on pp. 111–12, it is principally the descriptive character of the phrase *tuo cum flumine sancto* which was felt to be analogous to Homeric epithet, along with the line's context among the largely formulaic-style verses of *Sat.* 6.1, that caused *Ann.* 26 to be drawn into the interpretative framework in which Homer is the principal key. While Norden–Skutsch's methodology and speculative reconstruction leaves real room for doubt, *Ann.* 26 may in fact be uniquely occurring, as their use of it implies, and hence it may belong among the lines I am discussing here.

[143] The mss. of Macrobius give the readings *nisi* for *nec* and *das* for *dabis*; see Skutsch 1985: 241 for the reasons for accepting his text, as here printed.

Ennius in Book 1:

> nor by god shall any man breathing do this and go unpunished, nor shall you, for you shall pay me the price with your warm blood

Finally, at *Sat.* 6.1.19, we have:

> ne qua meis dictis esto mora: Iuppiter hac stat [*Aen.* 12.565]

Ennius in septimo:

> non semper vostra evortit: nunc Iuppiter hac stat [*Ann.* 232]

> let there be no delay to my behests: Jupiter stands with us

Ennius in Book 7:

> not always does he subvert your [fortunes]: now Jupiter stands on this side (?)/with us (?)

Skutsch considers the context for the first two of these fragments fixed: *Ann.* 32 belongs to the conclusion of the meeting between Aeneas and the king of Alba Longa (see n. 142), while *Ann.* 94–5 are the words of Romulus about to kill Remus for having insultingly jumped over the City's new wall.[144] He quarrels with Norden in assigning *Ann.* 232 to a speech of Hannibal's on the road for Italy rather than to a divine assembly in Book 7, as Norden had done.[145] While we are dealing with such fragmentary remains of the poem, certainty about context is clearly out of reach, but where Skutsch (and indeed all the other scholars who have offered conjectures about context) must be right is that this language marks crucial moments of the narrative and was therefore designed to be memorable. Despite the presence of arguably inceptively formula-like elements in these lines,[146] their language is distinctive. This is most clearly the case with *Ann.* 94–5, where *pol* is admitted uniquely not only in the *Annales* but in heroic poetry generally, and where the parallels for the use of *animatus* come from a comic context.[147] At *Ann.* 32, the largely colloquial use of *bene* as a qualifier

[144] See Skutsch 1985: 191 and 240–1.

[145] *ibid.* 412–13 Skutsch is influenced in first place by the argument of Friedrich 1941: 113–16, but he is also on principle against the idea of a divine assembly anywhere in the *Annales* except in Book 1 (see Skutsch 1985: 368, 414, 429). Skutsch here again applies Norden's reconstructive principles more strictly than Norden himself had done, in insisting that this line should be construed in a context similar to that in which the parallel line in the *Aeneid* occurs.

[146] Vergil uses *sanguine poenas* from *Ann.* 95 not just in his full imitation at *Aen.* 9.422; it recurs as a tag at *Aen.* 7.595 and 766, 10.617, and 11.592 (Skutsch 1985: 241).

[147] Skutsch (*ibid.* 240) supplies the data here. His parallels for *animatus* are the use of *vivos* at Plaut. *Amph.* 398, *tu me vivos hodie numquam facies quin sim Sosia*, and *Bacch.* 515, *numquam edepol viva me inridebit.*

of *firmum*[148] promotes the effectiveness of the line in describing a moment in which a significant friendship is secured, and the alliteration and swift rhythm contribute to the representation of a moment of ease and success. By contrast, the solemnity of the rhythm of *Ann.* 232 helps communicate the seriousness of the announcement being made.

Sat. 6.1.18 provides us with an example of the transference to the narrator of the *Aeneid* of a single, striking expression associated with the narrator of the *Annales*:

> et mecum ingentes oras evolvite belli [*Aen.* 9.528]
> Ennius in sexto:
> quis potis ingentes oras evolvere belli [*Ann.* 164]
>
> and with me roll out the massive expanse of war
> Ennius in Book 6:
> who is able to roll out the massive expanse of war

This line was well known: Quintilian (6.2.86) relates an anecdote about Cicero's witty use of it in court, and in the scholarly tradition it also surfaces in DS's comment on *Aen.* 9.528 and in Diomedes (*GLK* 1.385–6).[149] Cicero's use of it in particular, as well as Lucretius' and Vergil's, make inevitable that its location in Book 6 was a prominent one, possibly at the very start.[150] Again, even though Skutsch suggests that behind Ennius' metaphor may lie a Hellenistic expression using ἀναπτύσσω or ἀνελίσσω (he cites ἔπος . . . ἐλίσσω, Callim. *Aet.* 1.5), perhaps based on Homer's ἑκάστου πείρατ' ἔειπε (*Il.* 23.350),[151] it is the striking nature of the difficult Latin phrase *oras evolvere belli* that gives the line its character and motivates its re-use in the *Aeneid*.

Macrobius provides examples of two proverbial sayings adopted from the *Annales* into the *Aeneid*. The first is at *Sat.* 6.1.62, and the thought and wording are arguably of too general a character for there to be much significance to the Ennian precedent:

[148] See Skutsch 1985: 192. Skutsch also notes that *bene* in the sense of *valde* is not unparalleled in our extant record of the *Annales*; cf. *bene saepe* at *Ann.* 268 and *bene . . . serena* at *Ann.* 541. 'Porphyrio' ad Hor. 3.24.50 says that it is common in Ennius: *(si bene paenitet) pro valde positum, ut apud Ennium frequenter*.

[149] DS reads *qui* for *quis*.

[150] Skutsch 1985: 329. See, however, esp. Fantham 2006: 549–68 on the line, its quotation-context in Cicero and its original context in Ennius, esp. 553–5 on the line's placement in Book 6.

[151] Skutsch 1985: 330.

audentes fortuna iuvat [*Aen.* 10.284]
Ennius in septimo:
fortibus est fortuna viris data [*Ann.* 233]

fortune helps the daring
Ennius in Book 7:
fortune is given to brave men

Skutsch cites as representatives of the proverb Ter. *Phorm.* 203, Cic. *Tusc.* 2.11 and Livy 8.29.5 (cf. also id. 34.37.4), together with Donatus' comment on Terence (παροιμία), and Cicero's accompanying *ut est in proverbio*.[152] By contrast, there is a great deal more particularity to the longer passage Macrobius quotes at *Sat.* 6.2.16:

multa dies variusque labor mutabilis aevi
rettulit in melius: multos alterna revisens
lusit et in solido rursus fortuna locavit. [*Aen.* 11.425 7]
Ennius in octavo:
multa dies in bello conficit unus
. . .
et rursus multae fortunae forte recumbunt:
haud quaquam quemquam semper fortuna secuta est [*Ann.* 258 60]

many things has the passing of days and the ever different tasks demanded by shifting time changed for the better; many men has ambivalent minded fortune disappointed, yet then restored again to firm ground.
Ennius in Book 8:
many things does a single day accomplish in war . . . and in turn many fortunes relapse by the hand of chance: there is no man on earth whom fortune constantly favoured.

In this case, the quotation is long enough that we can see that, while ensuring that Ennius' language is still recognisable in his lines, Vergil has radically changed their sense. The speaker of the Vergilian lines is Turnus, who has figured largely as prey to epic ambitions and emotions, as is amply represented in the speech of which the lines quoted here are a part (*Aen.* 11.376–444). These lines represent Turnus' effort to grace with the effect of long-sighted meditation the passions he has so far expressed, and the presence of Ennius behind them serves to enhance their respectability.[153] The problem is the degree to which the sentiment appears changed in Turnus' attempt to co-opt it: the lines in Ennius are essentially pessimistic,

[152] Skutsch 1985: 414. He cites Otto 1890: 144. [153] Cf. Gransden 1997: 34.

speaking of the likelihood of disaster following on success. That background makes Turnus' re-phrasing of the lines, to make them speak of good fortune as the likely successor to bad, ring hollow, and as a result his attempt at expressing equanimity does nothing to reassure his audience of his mastery of himself or of the situation. Macrobius' juxtaposition of these lines so much at odds with one another thus makes clear the difference between Vergil's re-use of highly individualised passages and his re-use of Ennian quasi-formulaic lines, where there is no change from the sense of the original.

It should be noted that the memorable quality of the Ennian lines just discussed is, for post-Vergilian readers, created once again in good measure because of their recurrence in the *Aeneid*. Other sources also occasionally transmit lines of speech that appear to mark an emotional high-point in the narrative and that served their new user to lend weight to the moment at hand. An example is *Ann.* 156, *moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque*, which circulated in antiquity with frequency comparable to that of *Ann.* 363 (see p. 125 with n. 139)[154] and has the same aphoristic value as these two examples. Because of its popularity, *Ann.* 156 can compete with lines preserved via Vergil, but other Ennian formulations of potentially equal value are at a disadvantage as regards impact on an audience today. Thus, for example, the line *nam vi depugnare sues stolidi soliti sunt*, ('for it is dumb brutes who fight things out by force', *Ann.* 96) is as forceful in its expression as any of the formulations reflected in Vergil, but, because it is known only via Festus (416–18), it is a line that remains in relative obscurity. It is Vergil's enshrinement of particular lines that renders them meaningful to post-Vergilian readers.

THE SOURCES AND THE CONSTRUCTION OF THE EPIC TRADITION (4): PECULIARITIES OF LANGUAGE AND ENNIUS' EXPLANATORY POWER

A final way in which the Vergiliocentric sources construct the Roman epic tradition for us is when they treat puzzles presented by particular Ennian or Vergilian expressions or descriptions as resoluble by recourse to each other's texts or to Homer (cf. p. 96, on the function of *Ann.* 311 at *Sat.* 6.4.17–18). For example, Servius offers his readers two ways of understanding *Aen.* 4.576, *sequimur te sancte deorum quisquis es*, depending on how the line is

[154] Thus Hist. Aug. *Avid. Cass.* 5.7: *versum . . . omnibus frequentatum*, and the frequency of allusion to it; see Skutsch 1985: 317.

punctuated. He adduces Ennius as evidence for the viability of the second and more unusual expression: *aut distinguendum 'sancte', aut 'sancte deorum' secundum Ennium dixit* respondit Iuno Saturnia, sancta dearum ('either you have to mark off "holy one", or else he meant "holiest of gods" following Ennius: "Saturnian Juno, holiest of goddesses, replied"', *Ann.* 53). Servius thus suggests that the line means either 'We follow you, holy one, whichever of the gods you are' or, if one construes following Ennius, 'We follow you, holiest of gods, whoever you are'. The use of the positive for the superlative degree of the adjective with a partitive genitive is itself an obtrusively Homerising move (cf. δῖα θεάων at e.g. *Il.* 5.381, 6.305, *Od.* 5.159, δῖα γυναικῶν at e.g. *Il.* 2.714, 3.171, 228, 423, etc.).[155] Similarly, Ps.-Probus, commenting primarily on the Silenus of *Eclogue* 6, quotes the lines *doctusque Anchises†que Venus quem pulchra dearum/fari donavit, divinum pectus habere* ('and learned . . . Anchises, to whom Venus, loveliest of goddesses, granted the power of prophecy and to have a divinely inspired heart', *Ann.* 15–16), together with some lines of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, as an explanation of why the Anchises of the *Aeneid* is given a speech on the origin and nature of human life (6.724 ff.). The Scholia Veronensia quote the same lines (in mangled and trivialised form) as a comment on Anchises' action and address to Jupiter at *Aen.* 2.687–91.[156] It is thus clear that the Ennian lines circulated in the scholarship on Vergil as an explanation whenever the Vergilian Anchises' actions seemed peculiar or extraordinary, and that these lines, too, with the Homeric ancestry of their phrasing, are of material help in constructing the genealogy of epic at Rome.

T. Berres was able to make extraordinary progress in explaining some of Vergil's most puzzling abbreviated metaphorical expressions by recourse to a fuller Ennian original.[157] Ancient critics likewise were able to point out that some of the most startling of Vergil's uses of language are the result of his shifting of Ennian locutions. For example, in his note on *belli ferratos rupit Saturnia postes* ('the Saturnian one burst open the iron-clad door(-post)s of war', *Aen.* 7.622), Servius points out that Vergil's (mis-)use of language (*rupit . . . postes*) is the result of his compression of Ennius' line, *belli ferratos postes portasque refregit* – language fleshed out for us by Horace at *Serm.* 1.4.60 to *postquam Discordia taetra/belli ferratos postes portasque*

[155] See Monro 1891: 142, §147 (2): 'the governing word implies some sort of distinction or eminence.' For further examples of Ennius' adoption of this Homerising form of expression, see p. 97.

[156] For quotation of both sources, see n. 100, pp. 108–9. Ps.-Probus on *Ecl.* 6 had also felt the same passage of the *Aeneid* to be relevant enough to his comments to quote a line from this passage (*Aen.* 2.703) immediately following.

[157] Berres 1977: 255–68; see n. 102.

refregit ('after foul Discord broke open the iron-clad door(-post)s and gates of war', *Ann.* 225–6).[158] The oddness of the expression is still palpable,[159] for all that synecdoche can do to explain it; but, by way of confirmation, Servius' sensitivity to the peculiarity of Vergil's expression is useful in helping preserve our access to that peculiarity today, when Vergil's Latin is one of the most familiar forms of the language. Servius' quotation of Ennius for later readers of Vergil also suggests Vergil's reliance on his original readers' awareness of the Ennian phrase to guide their comprehension and render his coinages of phrase acceptable.[160] Modern exponents analogously use Homeric lines to explain the phrasing and (as we saw Servius do with *Aen.* 4.576 on pp. 131–2) assure the syntax of Ennian ones: F. Skutsch points out how the potentially ambiguous fragment *multa tenens antiqua sepulta vetustas/quae facit* (*Ann.* 282–3) can be explained by reference to the phrase παλαιά τε πολλά τε εἰδώς ('knowing many ancient things') at *Od.* 2.188.[161] According to this explanation, punctuation is required after *antiqua* and the phrase means 'possessed of much ancient knowledge, which the passing of time buries'. The construction of the epic tradition as modelled by the Vergiliocentric sources thus continues into the modern era.

On the rare occasions where Vergil's language is more restrained than that of Ennius, the Vergiliocentric sources remain our most probable route of access to such information. Thus, in regard to Vergil's phrase 'irarum . . . habenas' ('the reins of wrath') at *Aen.* 12.499, Servius comments: . . . *hic moderate locutus est. nam Ennius ait 'irarum effunde quadrigas'* ('our man used restraint in his expression; for Ennius said "let loose the chariots of wrath"', *Ann.* 534). Servius is not always an impressive reader of Vergil, but, if we choose to trust him, he has given us some information about the relative strength of the two metaphors that the modern reader is otherwise unlikely to discern.

[158] Servius ad *Aen.* 7.622 ('*rupit Saturnia postes*'): *acyrologiam fecit commutando Ennii versum: nam ille ait* [*Ann.* 226]. (On the conjectural history of the word *acyrologia* ['incorrect use of vocabulary'], see Norden 1915: 19, n. 1.)

[159] Cf. Horsfall's literal reading of the phrase: 'It was not easy to destroy an ancient door by assault upon its *postes* (in the narrow sense) . . . Juno – hurried, wrathful and nearly omnipotent – must be envisaged as bursting open the hundred bars and parting the unwilling leaves' (Horsfall 2000: 402).

[160] These lines provide another example of Vergil retroactively determining the interpretation of Ennius for later readers. Norden as usual assumed a direct correspondence (Norden 1915: 1–40, esp. 15–25). He was vigorously supported by Timpanaro 1978: 640–2, who cites further bibliography, including, *contra*, e.g. Fraenkel 1945: 12–14. Buchheit, in particular, argues that a correspondence as close as that envisaged by Norden is impossible, on the grounds that the practice of opening and closing the Gates of Janus was a practice that only began after Ennius' day, despite the lengthy pre-history constructed for it; also, *discordia* may have been entirely abstract rather than personified (Buchheit 1963: 82–5).

[161] Skutsch 1905: 2611. *Ann.* 282–3 is part of the 18-line 'good companion' passage preserved by Gellius at *NA* 12.4.

In this chapter, we have examined some ways in which modern interpretation of the *Annales* is liable to be both directed and discernibly limited by the proportionally hefty and strong-voiced Vergiliocentric sources. To the extent that the *Annales* today seem to the modern reader crucial to the epic tradition, they are the creation of Vergil and of the Vergiliocentric sources. When sources do not set about limiting the material they select to what was relevant to Vergil, material with no evident macroscopic link to Homer or Vergil emerges. It is worth bearing in mind that this is true of some 80 per cent of our extant fragments, although many of them are easy to ignore because they do not constitute sense-units and are thus not readily interpretable, as well as because their generic affiliations are more difficult to identify. The argument here has been that the type of reading promoted by the Vergiliocentric sources is, on the one hand, only one of a number of possible readings and indeed one probably more muted in the eyes of readers of the poem in its heyday amidst a mixture of other modes of expression and possible readings no longer accessible to us; but that at the same time it remains the most compelling ancient reading of the poem that we have, and one with a broad base of support among sources whose interests can vary quite widely, as we have seen. In Chapter 3, we return to the *Annales* as a work of historiography, that is, as one of the principal means by which its early readers felt themselves to have access to the history of Rome, before confronting, in Chapter 4, the nexus represented by the *Annales* as a Homerising text and the *Annales* as a record of the Roman past. There I shall argue that Ennius' Homerising is an essential element in his approach to the historiography of Rome, one among others which in combination made for a hybrid vigour with which other texts retailing the Roman past long found it difficult to compete. For now, our main focus will be Cicero, by whom the *Annales* are consistently represented as a reliable means of access to the history of Rome.

CHAPTER 3

The pre-Vergilian sources

In aggregate, the four pre-Vergilian sources for the *Annales* – Varro, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, Cicero and the ps.-Caesarian *Bellum Hispaniense* – account for slightly over a fifth of our direct evidence for the poem. These texts, all of the first century BCE, represent the very earliest moment of direct access to the words of the *Annales*. Prior to them, the only indication that the epic existed is the mention at Lucilius 343 M, which tells us that the poem was known as *Annales* and constituted a coherent whole, analogous to the *Iliad*.[1] There is no second century evidence for what the poem meant, or how it was received. The reception of the *Annales* in the work of Lucretius, Cicero, Catullus, Propertius, Livy, Vergil and Ovid is our best indication of how well established the poem was in first-century culture, and this carries its own implications for the second-century response. The pre-Vergilian sources constitute a subsection of that reception. They offer us a glimpse of what the *Annales* looked like to its audiences before the interference of the *Aeneid* – one that, through comparison and contrast to the interests of and material offered by post-Vergilian sources, can help us determine the nature of the *Aeneid*'s interference in the later transmission of the text.

The quantity of material for which the pre-Vergilian sources for the *Annales* are individually responsible is shown in Table 3.1. Their interests fall into two broad categories: Varro and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* initiate the long tradition of scholarly interest in the word-forms offered by the *Annales*, while Cicero and the *Bellum Hispaniense* quote for content. The etymological, lexicographical and grammatical interests of Varro and of the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* survive the interference of the *Aeneid* in excellent shape and go on to promote the transmission, through the later forms of the traditions they

[1] Lucil. 342–4 M: *illa poesis opus totum, (tota[que] Ilias una/est, una ut* θέσις *annales Enni) atque opus unum/est, maius multo est quam quod dixi ante poema*. (Cf. Varro, *Men*. 398 A: *poesis est perpetuum argumentum e rhythmis, ut* Ilias *Homeri et* Annalis *Enni*.)

Table 3.1. *The pre-Vergilian sources*

Source (dates BCE)	Number of quotations (lines) for which the author/text is the sole or leading source	Rough per cent of total lines of the *Annales* (623)
Varro (116 27)	27 (37)	6
Rhetorica ad Herennium (*c.* 86 2)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Cicero (106 43)	31 (96)	15.4
Bellum Hispaniense (soon after 45)	2 (2)	< 0.5

represent, of a good 38 per cent of the lines we know today; the interests of Cicero and the *Bellum Hispaniense* do not.

VARRO

Varro is the sole or primary source for a total of 27 fragments (37 lines; *c.* 6 per cent of the remains). He quotes only 1 line attributed to the *Annales* more than once,[2] and 21 fragments (26 lines) survive solely through a single quotation in Varro.[3] In most cases, he names Ennius as the source of his quotation; but he never mentions the *Annales* specifically (hence, no book-numbers either).[4] He frequently enough quotes sense-units, but these are rarely crucial to his purpose, and he does not always do so. His interests are not such as to move him to supply or suggest anything about the original context; indeed, he provides a model for decontextualised quotation for the later scholarly traditions who adopt a similar mode of engagement with Ennius' text. In consequence of these quotation-habits, the contexts in which lines deriving from Varro are placed in modern editions are always

[2] This is the line we know as *Ann.* 6–7 (*terra<que> corpus quae/dedit ipsa capit neque dispendi facit hilum*) at *LL* 5.60 (in indirect discourse), with partial quotations of the fragment at *LL* 5.111 and 9.54. No other source quotes the line. Varro attaches the name Ennius in the first two passages listed here; the third quotation of the lines comes without formal attribution.

[3] See Appendix Table A5.1 on Varro. Of the 21 fragments, 16 are single lines, from Book 5 or Book 7 of *LL*, and are attributed to Ennius but not specifically to the *Annales*. Ennius is not named in connection with the remaining five fragments, of which 4 (consisting of between 1 and 3 lines) originate in *LL* 7 and one 3-line quotation (not formally signalled as such) in *RR*.

[4] See further Skutsch 1985: 34–5.

the result of modern conjecture.[5] (On one significant result of this, see pp. 145–51, below, on the proem to the *Annales*.) Ennius is Varro's favourite source, and Gellius (*NA* 12.4) attests that Varro's teacher, Aelius Stilo, had also shown an interest in the poet. Varro is as interested in quoting from the tragedies (a subject I do not tackle here) as from the epic.

In those rarer instances where Varro's quotations and purposes coincide with those of other sources, it is most frequently with authors of the later etymological, lexicographical and grammatical traditions. Almost all Varro's surviving quotations occur in Books 5 or 7 of the *De Lingua Latina*, whose primary subject is etymology and the relationship between words and the objects they represent. (Two fragments, however, *Ann.* 154–5 and *Ann.* 340–2, originate in the *De Re Rustica*.) It is thus no surprise to see the lexicographical tradition in particular cull Varronian quotations of the *Annales* for its purposes. For example, Varro quotes *Ann.* 115, *libaque fictores Argeos et tutulatos* ('ritual cakes, ritual cake-makers, Argei and becapped priests') because of its collection of rare vocabulary, for which he has a series of etymologies to propose.[6] Festus' (and Paulus') quotations of the line echo his (their) interest in it directly.[7] Again, etymological interests prompt Varro to cite as poetical (without attribution) the expression *sola terrae* ('the floor of the earth'), which occurs in a line quoted in full by Festus, *Ann.* 461, *sed sola terrarum postquam permensa parumper* ('but after she had traversed the floor of the earth for a short while'); cf. *Ann.* 138, *Tarquinio dedit imperium simul et sola regni* ('he gave Tarquin command and strong-founded rule'). Both lines are supplied by Festus (386) as illustrations of the use of the term *solum*. At *LL* 6.82, Varro illustrates the use in Ennius of an ancient

[5] A slight exception exists in the indication at *RR* 1.1.4 (*quoniam ut aiunt di facientes adiuvant, prius invocabo eos, nec ut Homerus et Ennius Musas sed duodecim Deos Consentis*) that Ennius, in Homer's wake, invoked the Muses at the start of his work. Varro's words here serve as subsidiary evidence moving editors to designate as *Ann.* 1 the line quoted by Varro (*LL* 7.20) and Serv. *Aen.* 11.660 (discussed on p. 140). Given that the line is clearly an invocation to the Muses, and given the information we have about the extent of Ennius' imitation of Homer, the subsidiary support *RR* 1.1.4 provides for such placement scarcely revolutionises the decisions editors would have made even without it.

[6] Varro, *LL* 7.44: [*Ann.* 115] *liba quod libandi causa fiunt. fictores dicti ab fingendis libis. Argei ab Argis; Argei fiunt e scirp[e]is, simulacra hominum XXVII; ea quotannis de ponte sublicio a sacerdotibus publice deici solent in Tiberim. tutulati dicti hi qui in sacris in capitibus habere solent ut metam: id tutulus appellatus ab eo quo . . . sive ab eo quod . . . sive ab eo quod . . . vocatur.*

[7] Fest. 484–6: *TUTULUM vocari aiunt flaminicarum capitis ornamentum, quod fiat vitta purpurea innexa crinibus et tutulos in altitudinem. quidam pilleum lanatum forma metali figuratum, quo flamines ac pontifices utantur eodem nomine vocari. Ennius: 'libaque fictores Argeos et <tutulatos'. TUOR>* Paul. 485: *TUTULUM dicebant flaminicarum capitis ornamentum vitta purpurea innexa crinibus et in altitudine<m> exstructum. Ennius 'fictores Argeos et tutulatos'.*

verb-form, *specio*,[8] thus supplying part of the line we know as *Ann.* 408, given in full – and again as an illustration of an ancient, unprefixed form of *spicio* – by Festus: *quos ubi rex Epulo spexit de cotibus celsis* ('when king Epulo spied them from the lofty cliffs').[9] These coincidences of both interest and of material quoted suggest a fairly direct line of descent from Varro – or, more generally, the first-century branch of scholarship he represented – to the later etymological tradition. The fact that the later tradition sometimes knows fuller versions of a given fragment than does Varro (at least, in the sections of his work that survive), as in the case of *Ann.* 408, as well as that its representatives can quote many more lines than Varro transmits (see Appendix Table A5.1 vs. A5.11, for Festus), implies that the later etymologists had available sources other than Varro's (now surviving) works.

The broader grammatical tradition also shows awareness of Varronian engagement with the language of the *Annales*. Where coincidence occurs, his concerns are sometimes parallel to those of the tradition, and narrow; on other occasions, Varro's interests can be much broader than those of the grammarians. The general picture that results is of grammarians sifting Varro's work – or no longer extant work related to Varro's – for material to suit their purposes. Varro's work was of interest because it dealt with concerns analogous to the grammarians' enough of the time, but they were also able to adapt material that he had put to other purposes to suit their own needs.

Grammarians' awareness of Varro is evident especially when the etymological interest we encountered above is uppermost in both him and in them. Thus, when Varro cites *Ann.* 206–7,[10] *scripsere alii rem/vorsibus quos olim Faunei vatesque canebant* ('others have written of the matter in verses which once Fauns and seers used'), it is to provide an etymology for the word *faunus*.[11] DS's dependence on Varro surfaces explicitly in his comment on *G.* 1.11, where he repeats Varro's explanation for the term *faunus*, with

[8] Varro, *LL* 6.82: *spectare dictum ab antique<specio>, quo etiam Ennius usus: '<q>uos Epulo postquam spexit'.*

[9] Fest. 446: *SPICIT quoque sine praepositione dixerunt antiqui. Plautus* [*Mil.* 694]: *'flagitium est, si nihil mittetur, quae superc<i>lio spicit'. et 'spexit'. Ennius lib. XVI:* [*Ann.* 408].

[10] The main source for the line is Cicero, who quotes it in the course of a teleological argument about the development of oratory at Rome (*Brut.* 71, 75–6), another on syncopated verbal forms (*Orat.* 157, 171) and as a passing comment on the different modes in which divinely inspired prophecies are delivered (*Div.* 1.114).

[11] Varro *LL* 7.36: [*Ann.* 207]: *Fauni dei Latinorum, ita ut et Faunus et Fauna sit. hos versibus quos vocant Saturnios in silvestribus locis traditum est solitos fari, <a> quo fando Faunos dictos. antiquos poetas vates appellabant a versibus viendis.*

direct attribution to Varro.[12] Again, in quoting *Ann.* 513, *qui vincit non est victor nisi victus fatetur* ('he who conquers is no conqueror unless the conquered admits it') on *Aen.* 11.306, DS cites Varro's explanation of the proper use of the term *vinci*.[13] In neither of these instances do Varro and DS share a quotation of the *Annales*, but DS is clearly aware of Varro in the vicinity of Varro's and his own quotations of Ennius, and the nature of their interest in the poem's words is similar.

Elsewhere, Varro's original interests in quoting Ennius are obviously much broader than those of the grammarians who partially re-quote his material. This is the case with the quotation of *Ann.* 8–10, *ova parire solet genus pennis condecoratum/non animam.* [*et*] *post inde venit divinitus pullis/ ipsa anima* ('the race bedecked with feathers produces eggs, not living creatures; and thereafter life comes to the chicks by divine power'). Varro gives us our fullest version of the fragment. For him, the line is part of a discussion of the mortal and immortal constituents of the world, in which he names the originary gods as *Caelum* and *Terra* and identifies them with soul (*anima*) and earth (*terra*). Ennius heads the list of philosophers and poets whom Varro quotes to lend substance to his characterisation of the properties belonging to these entities.[14] The grammarians Diomedes and Priscian, however, reproduce *Ann.* 8 (in whole or part) solely to illustrate the antique use of a fourth conjugation infinitive for *pario*.[15]

[12] DS *G.* 1.11: FAUNIQUE PEDEM *cum unus Faunus sit, cur pluraliter posuit? sed Varro ad Ciceronem [7.36] ita ait (Fauni) dii Latinorum, ita ut (et) Faunus et Fauna sit † per ex versibus quos vocant Saturnios, in silvestribus locis solitos fari futura atque inde faunos dictos.*

[13] Serv. *Aen.* 11.305 [*bellum importunum, ciues, cum gente deorum/inuictisque uiris gerimus, quos nulla fatigant/proelia nec uicti possunt absistere ferro*]: *INVICTISQUE VIRIS GERIMUS atqui supra legimus* [9.599] *'bis capti Phryges'. sed 'invictis' adeo dicit quia sequitur 'nec victi possunt absistere ferro'. 'possunt' autem 'absistere' mire ait, ac si diceret: etiam si velint, eos a bellis discedere natura non patitur. DS: Ennius* [*Ann.* 513]. *Varro et ceteri invictos dicunt Troianos quia per insidias oppressi sunt. illos enim 'vinci' affirmant qui se dedunt hostibus.*

[14] Varro, *LL* 5.57–60: [57] *quod ad loca qu<a>eque his coniuncta fuerunt, dixi; nunc de his quae in locis esse solent immortalia et mortalia expediam, ita ut prius quod ad deos pertinet dicam. principes dei Caelum et Terra* . . . [59] . . . *quod anima et corpus. humidum et frigidum terra, sive 'ova parire solet genus pennis condecoratum, non animam'* [*Ann.* 8–9], *ut ait Ennius, et 'post inde venit divinitus pullis ipsa anima[m]'* [*Ann.* 9–10] *sive, ut Zenon Cit<ie>us* [frg. 126 Arn.], *animalium semen ignis is qui anima ac mens, qui caldor e caelo, quod huic innumerabiles et immortales ignes. itaque Epicharmus dicit de mente humana: ait* [Enn. V. 52 sq. V.²]: *'istic est de sole sumptus ignis'; idem <de> sole[m]: 'isque totus mentis est', ut humores frigidae sunt humi, ut supra ostendi.* [60] *quibus iuncti caelum et terra omnia ex <se> genuerunt, quod per hos natura* [Enn. V. 46 V.²] *'frigori miscet calorem atque humori aritudinem'. recte igitur Pacuvius quod ait* [93 R.]: *'animam <a>ether adiugat' et Ennius: 'terram corpus quae dederit, ipsam capere, neque dispendi facere hilum'* [*Ann.* 6–7]. *animae et corporis discessus quod natis is exi<t>us, inde exitium, ut cum in unum ineunt, initia.*

[15] *GLK* 1.383, 2.401, 500, 540.

At the same time, as we saw also in the case of Festus, some grammatical sources know fuller versions of the fragments of the *Annales* than Varro quotes (in what survives of his work). The fullest quotation of the fragment *Ann.* 220–1, *corpore tartarino prognata paluda virago/cui par imber et ignis, spiritus et gravis terra* ('the cloaked he-woman born of the mass of hell, to whom rain and fire, breath and heavy earth are as one') survives in Ps.-Probus, on *Ecl.* 6.31. Probus quotes the lines to illustrate the equivalence to Ennius of *spiritus* and *aer*, attributing the line specifically to the *Annales*.[16] Varro quotes only *Ann.* 220. His interest is once more quite strictly etymological: he explains the line's strangest words, *tartarino* and *paluda*.[17] His interest is thus parallel but not identical to Ps.-Probus'. In the latter regard, a similar phenomenon occurs when Varro (as primary source) and Servius both quote *Ann.* 1, *Musae quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum* ('you Muses, who with your feet strike great Olympus'): Varro (*LL* 7.20) is concerned with *Olympum*, as part of his discussion of place-names at the start of *LL* 7;[18] Servius is instead interested in giving a piece of history for *pulsant* at *Aen.* 11.660.[19]

A few other pieces of information suggest Varro's instrumentality as a source for Ennian material for the grammatical tradition. Nonius quotes *Ann.* 23–4, *Saturno/quem Caelus genuit* ('whom Sky bore to Saturn') and *Ann.* 559, *fortis Romani sunt quamquam caelus profundus* ('the Romans are as brave as the sky is deep') solely to illustrate the use of masculine *caelus* in poetic contexts. In his text, a quotation from Book 6 of Varro's *ARD* illustrating the same point immediately precedes the quotations from Ennius, in a manner that leaves open the possibility that Varro himself

[16] Ps.-Probus, *Ecl.* 6.31: *si ergo caelum pro igni acceperimus superest ut in eo quod ait 'spiritus intus alit' aerem dictum praesumamus . . . hoc illud et Ennius appellavit in* Annalibus*: 'corpore tartareo prognata palude virago, cui par imber et ignis, spiritus et gravis terra'.*

[17] Varro, *LL* 7.37: *'corpore tartarino prognata paluda virago'. 'tartarino' dictum a Tartaro. Plato in IIII* [*Phaedo* 112] *de fluminibus apud inferos quae sint in his unum 'Tartarum' appellat: quare Tartari origo graeca. 'paluda' a paludamentis. haec insignia atque ornamenta militaria: ideo ad bellum cum exit imperator ac lictores mutarunt vestem et signa incinuerunt, 'paludatus' dicitur proficisci; quae propter quod conspiciuntur qui ea habent ac fiunt palam, 'paludamenta' dicta.*

[18] Varro, *LL* 7.5–20: [5] *dicam in hoc libro de verbis quae a poetis sunt posita, primum de locis* . . . [20] [*Ann.* 1] *caelum dicunt Graeci Olympum, montem in Macedonia omnes; a quo potius puto Musas dictas Olympiadas: ita enim ab terrestribus locis aliis cognominatae Libethrides, Pipleides, <T>hespiades, <H>eliconides*. Cf. also the apparent allusion to this or a similar line at *RR* 1.1.4.

[19] Serv. *Aen.* 11.660 [*quales Threiciae cum flumina Thermodontis/pulsant et pictis bellantur Amazones armis,/seu circum Hippolyten seu cum se Martia curru/Penthesilea refert, magnoque ululante tumultu/ feminea exsultant lunatis agmina peltis*]: *PULSANT Ennius ad Musas* (*Ennius Musae* A Sang.) *'quae pedibus* (*pedibus* om. A Sang.) *pulsatis Olympum'.*

may have pointed to that material.[20] Nonius quotes Varro and Ennius in close proximity to each other on six further occasions,[21] although on none of those occasions does the order of quotation favour the idea of Varro's instrumentality as much as in the instance above. Because we do not have contexts for the extracts from Varro, which come largely from highly fragmentary works (the *ARD* and *ARH*, the *Synephebus* and the *Andabata*), comparison of Varro's uses of Ennius in these instances with Nonius' is impossible, although the quotation from *ARD* at Non. 197.2–13, concerning the reference of the term *caelus* to a god, suggests a wider perspective at any rate than Nonius' focus on grammatical gender alone.

Varro is occasionally a named source for Ennian material for one other author besides those belonging strictly to the etymological and grammatical traditions: Gellius. At *NA* 3.14.5, Gellius writes:

[20] Non. 197.2–13: *CAELUM neutro. masculino Lucretius* [2.1097]: *'quis pariter caelos omnis convertere et omnis/ignibus aetheriis terras suffeire feracis?'; Varro* Rerum divinarum VI *'deum significans, non partem mundi 'sic pater magnus, mater magna his sunt Caelus, Tellus'; – Ennius 'fortis Romani sunt quamquam caelus profundus'; idem 'Saturno,/quem Caelus genuit'.* We have little to suggest that Varro regularly quotes Ennius in the *ARH* or the *ARD*, but in texts as fragmentary as they are, that absence from the record is not conclusive.

[21] Non. 150.18–25: *PRAECOX et <PRAECOQUIS>: praecoca quod est immatura. Ennius* Annalium *lib. VIII*: *'praecox pugna est'* [*Ann.* 261]. *Lucilius lib. iii [130] 'an<n>icula aspera <praecox'. Varro* Synephebo περὶ ἐμμονῆς [514] *'cum tempus revoc>at ea* (*atque* codd.) *praecox est fuga'. Novius* [106] *'huic puellae praecoquis libido inest'.*

Non. 66.18–26: *POLITIONES agrorum cultus diligentes, ut polita omnia dicimus exculta et ad nitorem deducta. Ennius* Saturarum *lib. III 'testes sunt lati campi, quos gerit Africa terra politos'. idem* Annalium *lib. VIIII: 'rastros dentes †fabres capsit causa poliendi/agri'* [*Ann.* 300]. *Varro: 'quid mirum? ex agri depolitionibus eiciuntur; hic in cenaculo polito recipiuntur'.*

Non. 483.1–7: *LACTE nominativo casu, ab eo quod est lac. Ennius lib. XI* (X C^A): *'et simul erubuit ceu lacte et purpura mixta'* [*Ann.* 361]. *Hemina* Annalium *lib. IIII: 'ex Tiberi lacte aurire'. Caecilius* Titthe: *'praesertim quae non peperit, lacte non habet'. Varro* Andabatis*: 'candidum lacte papilla com fluit'.*

Non. 418.2–20: *URGUERE est premere, cogere. Vergilius* Georg. *lib. III* [522–3]: *'ima/solvuntur latera atque oculos stupor urguet inertis' et* [222–3]: *'versaque in obnixos urguentur cornua vasto/cum gemitu'; Lucilius lib. XXVIIII* [820] *'urguet gravido saepius culpa tua'; Varro* Antiquitate Rerum Humanarum * * *. [Enn. *Ann.* 449]: *'qua murum fieri voluit urguemur in unum'. M. Tullius in* Hortensio: *'itaque tunc Democriti urguebatur: est enim non magna'. Urguere est tegere. Vergilius* Georg. *lib. II* [351–2]: *'qui saxo super adque ingenti pondere testae/*urguentur*'.*

Non. 223.33–6: *SAGUM generis neutri ut plerumque. masculini Ennius 'tergus †igitur sagus pinguis opertat'* [*Ann.* 529]. *Varro* Virgula Divina: *'cum neque aptam mollis umeris fibulam sagus ferret'.*

Varro, *Men.* 542 *ap.* Non. 478.16: *NUTRITUR ET NUTRICATUR pro 'nutrit' et 'nutricat': Varro* Testamento, περὶ διαθήκης: *e mea* φιλοφθονίᾳ *natis* [C; *eos* M], *quos Menippea haeresis nutricata est, tutores do * * * 'qui rem Romanam Latiumque alciscere* [C, Bamb.; ctr. Porph.] *vultis'.* (Nonius' note here supports 'Porphyrio''s transmission of *Ann.* 494–5: Porph. Hor. *Serm.* 1.2.37: *AUDIRE EST OPERAE PRETIUM PROCEDERE RECTE/QUI MOECHIS NON VULTIS UT OMNI PARTE LABORENT urbane abutitur Ennianis versibus 'audire est operae pretium procedere recte/qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere vultis'; sed illud urbanius quod, cum Ennius 'vultis' dixerit, hic 'non vultis' intulerit.*)

> Varro ... disserit ... ac dividit subtilissime quid dimidium dimidiato intersit, et Q. Ennium scienter hoc in *annalibus* dixisse ait: 'sicuti siquis ferat vas vini dimidiatum' [*Ann.* 549], sicuti pars quae deest ei vaso non dimidiata dicenda est sed dimidia.
>
> Varro ... treats of the matter ... and differentiates very acutely between a half and a halved entity. He says that Q. Ennius spoke learnedly when he wrote this in the *Annales*: 'just as if someone were to bring a halved jar of wine', when the part that was missing from that jug was not to be referred to as halved but a half part.

At *NA* 17.21.43, Gellius names Varro as the source for Ennius' age and date of birth.[22] And, as we saw with Nonius, Gellius (now at *NA* 10.1.6) follows a quotation of Varro with a quotation of Ennius, in such a way as to allow for the possibility that Varro's text itself used the Ennian line (*Ann.* 290) as an illustration:

> verba M. Varronis ex libro *disciplinarum* quinto haec sunt: 'Aliud est 'quarto' praetorem fieri et 'quartum', quod 'quarto' locum adsignificat ac tres ante factos, 'quartum' tempus adsignificat et ter ante factum. igitur Ennius recte, quod scripsit: *Quintus pater quartum fit consul* [*Ann.* 290], et Pompeius timide, quod in theatro, ne adscriberet 'consul tertium' aut 'tertio', extremas litteras non scripsit.'
>
> These are the words of M. Varro in the fifth book of his *Disciplinae*: 'It's one thing to be praetor 'fourth' and another 'for the fourth time', since 'fourth' refers to place and to the fact that three have gone before, while 'for the fourth time' refers to temporal order and to an event having taken place three times previously. Therefore Ennius was quite right when he wrote, 'Quintus the father becomes consul for the fourth time', and Pompey was hesitant in that, on his inscription in the theatre, he didn't add the final letters, so that he didn't have to choose in writing between 'consul for the third time' or 'third'.'

Furthermore, Skutsch takes it as read that the long fragment *Ann.* 268–86 (the 'faithful companion'), quoted exclusively by Gellius (*NA* 12.4) derives from Varro,[23] on account of the association with that fragment of the name of Aelius Stilo, Varro's teacher.[24]

Given Gellius' frequently manifested interest in scholars and scholarly debates and the frequency of his quotation of the *Annales* (he is the sole or

[22] *Claudium et Tuditanum consules sequuntur C. Valerius et C. Mamilius, quibus natum esse Q. Ennium poetam M. Varro in primo de poetis libro scripsit, eumque cum septimum et sexagesimum annum ageret* (Fy: *haberet* δ) *duodecimum* (ω: *XXII eraso X priore X* [Sk.]) *annalem scripsisse idque ipsum Ennium in eodem libro dicere*.

[23] See Skutsch 1985: 30, 448.

[24] *NA* 12.4.5: *L. Aelium Stilonem dicere solitum ferunt Q. Ennium de semet ipso haec scripsisse picturamque istam morum et ingenii ipsius Q. Ennii factam esse*; see further pp. 228–30, below.

primary source for 39 lines, or just over 6 per cent of the surviving text; see Appendix Table A5.10), it would make sense to construe him as a significant intermediary between Varro and the later grammatical tradition in the transmission of Ennius. Indeed, we can see that parts of the grammatical tradition, especially as represented by Nonius, are, in their role as sources for the *Annales*, palpably dependent on Gellius (see Table A5.16 with A5.10). The grammatical tradition, however, knows much Ennian material, including that plausibly deriving from Varro, besides that which we can trace in that vast, extant majority of *NA*. It is furthermore noteworthy how infrequently Gellius's own dependence on Varro for Ennian material can be substantiated.

Two other sources show awareness of Varro's Ennian material: Cicero and Suetonius. In neither case does it seem especially likely that Varro had a role as the source. Varro has only a little material in common with his contemporary, Cicero. That the two do not share more can be explained by the fact that both had the full range of the text available to them, as much as by the fact that their interests and the purposes to which the text could be put diverge widely. We have already noted (n. 10, p. 138) that Varro (*LL* 7.36), along with several other authors, contributes to Cicero's multiple transmission of *Ann.* 206–7. At *LL* 7.46, he supports Cicero's transmission of *Ann.* 329, *egregie cordatus homo, catus Aelius Sextus* ('the outstandingly sagacious man, sharp Aelius Sextus'). For Varro, the line serves only to elaborate the proper meaning of *catus*.[25] Cicero (*Tusc. Disp.* 1.27; and, through him, Jerôme) are aware of *Ann.* 22, *quam Prisci, casci populi, tenuere Latini* ('which the Ancient Latins, those antique peoples, once possessed') which is Varro's primary transmission.[26] Cic. *Div.* 2.82 provides us with *Ann.* 541, *tum tonuit laevom bene tempestate serena* ('then it thundered loudly on the left, though the sky was clear'), which is supported by a secondary quotation in Varro (*Men.* 103), preserved at Non. 408.3.[27] Finally, *Men.* 225, *Africa terribilis, contra concurrere civis* ('Africa was frightful, its citizens rushed to arms') seems to have *Ann.* 309, *Africa terribili tremit horrida terra tumultu* ('Africa, that fearsome land, trembled in frightful uproar'),

[25] *LL* 7.46: *apud Ennium: 'iam cata signa fere sonitum dare voce parabant'* [*Ann.* 450]: *cata acuta; hoc enim verbo dicunt Sabini. quare 'catus Aelius Sextus'* [*Ann.* 329] *non ut aiunt sapiens sed acutus, et quod est 'tunc coepit memorare simul cata dicta'* [*Ann.* 543] *accipienda acuta dicta*. For discussion of Cicero's use of the line, see pp. 176–7.

[26] *LL* 7.28: *cascum vetus esse significat Ennius quod ait:* [*Ann.* 22]. Cf. Cic. *Tusc.* 1.27: *unum illud erat insitum priscis illis, quos cascos appellat Ennius, esse morte sensum*; and thence Jerôme, *Ep.* 8.1: *rudes illi Italiae homines, quos cascos Ennius appellat*. On Cicero's use of the line, see Cole 2006: 533–5.

[27] Varro, *Men.* 103 (*ap.* Non. 408.3): *dum sermone cenulam variamus, interea 'tonuit bene tempestate serena'*.

Cicero's primary transmission (*De or.* 3.167, *Fam.* 9.7.2, *Orat.* 93), in its background. Last of all, Suetonius is never a primary source for Ennius, but at *Aug.* 7 Suetonius supports Varro's transmission of *Ann.* 155: *augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est* ('after renowned Rome was founded with prospering augury').[28]

One of the main results of Varro's use of the *Annales* was to establish the text as a source for the Latin etymological, lexicographical and grammatical traditions, traditions in which Gellius, too, had some involvement. It is clear that these traditions had sources other than Varro, the soundest proof of this being supplied by the fact that they are in our record the most regular sources of book-numbers (see Chapter 1, p. 67), which Varro never supplies. Varro, together with the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, nevertheless stands in our record at the head of a mode of interest in the *Annales* that was responsible for the preservation of a large proportion of the surviving fragments (38 per cent, the combined total for the authors in Table 3.2), but which had no interest in the text as a work of literature. (For detail on each, see Appendix 5).

The fragments these authors supply are severely limited: they rarely constitute sense-units and are thoroughly decontextualised. Those few authors at the head of Table 3.2 who had access to a full text of the poem did not care to read it directly; all produce their quotations by culling material from their predecessors in the scholarly traditions in which they worked. Their quotations thus represent the end-product of a long process of transmission, during which the material quoted could only become narrower and more corrupt. It can only occasionally and by chance, as it were, reveal larger characteristics of the text or (despite the book-numbers) inform us about its arrangement, aesthetics or economy.

Varro's fragments and the proem to the Annales: *the methodology of re-construction*

We noted above that the contexts in which Varronian fragments of the *Annales* are placed are (with the slight exception of *Ann.* 1; see n. 5, p. 137)

[28] Suet. *Aug.* 7: *postea Gai Caesaris et deinde Augusti cognomen assumpsit, alterum testamento maioris avunculi, alterum Munati Planci sententia, cum, quibusdam censentibus 'Romulum' appellari oportere quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis, praevaluisset ut 'Augustus' potius vocaretur, non tantum novo sed etiam ampliore cognomine, quod loca quoque religiosa et in quibus augurato quid consecratur 'augusta' dicuntur ab auctu vel ab avium gestu gustuve, sicut etiam Ennius docet scribens: 'augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est'* [*Ann.* 155]. Cf. at *Tib.* 21, Suetonius quotes Augustus' letter to Tiberius in which *Ann.* 363 (for which the primary source is Cicero) comes into play. For all the Ciceronian material cited in this paragraph, see Appendix Table A5.3 on Cicero.

Table 3.2. *The etymological, lexicographical and grammatical sources for the* Annales

Source (dates CE)	Number of quotations (lines) for which the author/text is the sole or leading source	Rough per cent of total lines of the *Annales* (623)
Quintilian (*c.* 35 ? 90s)	3 (3)	0.5
Festus (late *c.* 2)	70 (79)	12.7
Fragmentum de Metris (*c.* 3?)	2 (2)	< 0.5
Sacerdos (late c. 3)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Atilius Fortunatianus (?before *c.* 4?)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Nonius (early *c.* 4)	41 (56)	9
Donatus (mid *c.* 4)	2 (2)	< 0.5
Charisius (late *c.* 4)	12 (13)	2.2
Diomedes (late *c.* 4 early *c.* 5)	5 (7)	1
'Porphyrio' (redaction dating to *c.* 5?)	3 (3)	0.5
Consentius (probably *c.* 5)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Priscian (*c.* 5^{ex} *c.* 6$^{1/3}$)	34 (44)	7
Cassiodorus (*c.* 490 *c.* 585)	1 (1)	< 0.5
De Ultimis Syllabis (*c.* 6?)	1 (2)	< 0.5
Isidore (*c.* 7)	8 (8)	1
Paulus (*c.* 8)	13 (14)	2.2
Ps. Acro (redaction dating to ? *c.* 8?)	2 (2)	< 0.5

necessarily the result of modern conjecture. Rarely, a line itself suggests something about its context. This is the case with *Ann.* 54–5, *unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli/templa* ('there will be one whom you shall bear up to the azure regions of the sky'), where the context is clearly a divine prophecy. This motivates the fragment's (reasonable, if not certain) attribution to the divine council in Book 1 (supported by the its re-use at Ov. *Met.* 14.814 and *Fast.* 2.485).[29] Again, the unique referent in the proper name at *Ann.* 113, *olli*

[29] See Conte 1986: 57–9; Hinds 1998: 14–16.

respondit suavis sonus Egeriai ('to him sweet-voiced Egeria replied') allows us to know that its context was in the description of early Rome and the reign of Numa. Many fragments are placed in unobtrusive contexts that serve well enough as (again) plausible if not necessary locations;[30] 13 of the 27 fragments are placed candidly among the *sed. inc.*[31]

It is worth noting, however, the role that three Varronian fragments play in the reconstruction of the *rerum natura* – as Lucr. 1.126 has it – given by the apparition of a weeping figure of Homer in the proem to the *Annales*. Because of the prominent place accorded them by editors, two fragments transmitted by Varro, *LL* 5.57–60 (as the only significant source) are today among the epic's best known.[32] They are:

> . . . terra<que> corpus
> quae dedit ipsa capit neque dispendi facit hilum [*Ann.* 6 7]
>
> and the earth herself takes back the body which she provided and makes no whit of waste
>
> ova parire solet genus pennis condecoratum,
> non animam, [et] post inde venit divinitus pullis
> ipsa anima . . . [*Ann.* 8 10]

[30] This is true, for example, of *Ann.* 21, *Saturnia terra*, and *Ann.* 22, *quam Prisci, casci populi, tenuere Latini*, both placed by Skutsch and Flores in Book 1 (Flores in fact, following L. Mueller's radical editorial decision, presents them as a single fragment, his *Ann.* 23–4); *Ann.* 114–15, *mensas constituit idemque ancilia – –/libaque, fictores, Argeos, et tutulatos*, and *Ann.* 116–18, *Volturnalem/Palatualem Furinalem Floralemque/Falacrem<que> et Pomonalem fecit hic idem*, placed in Book 2; and *Ann.* 215, *Poeni stipendia pendunt*, regularly if not universally placed in Book 7 (see the impressive doxography at Flores *et al.* 2002: 202).

[31] These are: *Ann.* 450 (for which Skutsch tentatively proposes Book 1); *Ann.* 481, *animusque in pectore latrat* (for which Skutsch tentatively proposes Book 10); *Ann.* 487, *Musas quas memorant nosce nos esse Camenas* (tentatively assigned by Skutsch to Book 15); *Ann.* 492, *quis pater aut cognatus volet nos contra tueri*; *Ann.* 542, *tantidem quasi feta canes sine dentibus latrat*; *Ann.* 543, *tunc coepit memorare simul cata dicta*; *Ann.* 545, *clamor ad caelum volvendus per aethera vagit*; *Ann.* 554, *contremuit templum magnum Iovis altitonantis*; *Ann.* 583, *decretum est stare <et fossari> corpora telis*; *Ann.* 591, *divomque hominumque pater, rex*; *Ann.* 593, *oratores doctiloqui*; *Ann.* 594, *clamore bovantes*; *Ann.* 595, *pausam fecere fremendi*. Flores (2000 and 2003) places *Ann.* 450 and *Ann.* 481 (his *Ann.* 141 and 354) in Books 1 and 10. He argues for this placement of the former line on the grounds that it forms a plausible narrative sequence with the Vergilian line *exoritur clamorque virum clangorque tubarum* (*Aen.* 2.213). Servius comments that cities are usually overthrown to the sound of the war-trumpet, giving as example Tullus Hostilius' destruction of Alba Longa – an event assigned to Book 1 of the *Annales*. Flores *et al.* (2006) therefore print *Aen.* 2.213 as *Ann.* 11.xvii, and it is this editorial decision that motivates the allocation of *Ann.* 450 Sk. 141 Fl.) to Book 1. Flores assigns *Ann.* 481 to Book 10 without any indication of hesitancy – although as usual with a full and informative history of the lines' treatment at the hands of former editors. With the exception of these two lines, Flores *et al.* also place the same Varronian fragments as Skutsch among the *sed. inc.*

[32] *Ann.* 6–7 is also partially quoted by Varro at *LL* 5.111 and 9.54; *Ann.* 8–10 is also partially quoted by Diom. 1.383 and Prisc. 2.401. For the texts of these, see Appendix Table A5.1 on Varro.

> the race bedecked with feathers produces eggs, not living creatures; and thereafter life comes to the chicks by divine power

As is his wont, Varro transmits these fragments without explicit indication of the work to which they belong. I suggest that their assignation to the proem of the *Annales* is the result not of any intrinsic feature of theirs nor of any indication in their transmission context but rather of the pressure exercised on editorial decisions by Lucretius' clearly tendentious description of 'Homer''s speech as a *rerum natura*.[33]

Varro transmits these fragments in a quasi-scientific or philosophical context, in a passage in which he identifies the divine constituents of nameable places (see n. 14, p. 139). Besides Ennius, Varro cites in that passage the philosopher and founder of Stoicism Zeno of Citium, Epicharmus and Pacuvius, each as authorities for the identification of *caelum* ('sky'), *anima* ('soul'), *ignis* ('fire') and *mens* ('mind') and of *terra* ('earth') and *corpus* ('body'). Until H. Ilberg's 1852 edition of the Book 1 of the *Annales*, *Ann.* 8–10 was regularly attributed to Ennius' *Epicharmus*,[34] a work on the constitution and physical operation of the universe – an entirely plausible context (Ilberg 1852). True, *Ann.* 6–7 and 8–10 as we have them scan more satisfactorily as hexameters than as trochaic septenarii, the apparent metre of the surviving fragments of Ennius' *Epicharmus*. But room for doubt exists not only in that our evidence-base for the *Epicharmus* is extremely limited; for the fragments are not transmitted in especially good shape. Indeed, the explanation for Varro's quoting *Ann.* 6–7 in indirect discourse at *LL* 5.60 could lie in his quoting at second hand (which would make him fully a part of the later traditions to which I have connected him on pp. 136–44); and trochaic rhythms are not far off.[35] Furthermore, Nothing about the content of either fragment rules out their attribution to the *Epicharmus*,[36] while the quasi-scientific context provided by Varro's concern with the behaviour of the soul and its relationship to the divine, and by the mention of Zeno and Epicharmus himself, rather prompts it. Also, nothing makes *Ann.* 6–7 a better candidate for the proem to the *Annales* than other lines Varro quotes, which are regularly assigned to the *Epicharmus* – such as *terris gentis omnis peperit et resumit denuo* ('[the earth] produces all the peoples for (from ?) the lands and at the end receives

[33] For discussion of Lucretius' use of the term in relation to the *Annales*, see Suerbaum 1968: 96, incl. n. 303; Gale 1994: 108; Zetzel 1998: 233–5; Harrison 2002: 1–13; Volk 2002: 105–7.

[34] See Flores *et al.* 2002: 32.

[35] I am grateful to Jarrett Welsh for advice and conversation on these points.

[36] In terms of subject-matter of *Ann.* 6–7 in particular, cf. *V.* 51 V, *terra corpus est, at mentis ignis est*, attested by Prisician for Ennius' *Epicharmus*.

them back', *V.* 28 V = 39 C), together with its companions transmitted by Varro at *LL* 5.64.[37] This line has content similar to *Ann.* 6–7 and nothing more secure by way of attribution to a text than the same *ut ait Ennius* that Varro accords to *Ann.* 6–7. Of the 9 lines Varro quotes at *LL* 5.64, editors have regularly given the first 8 to the *Epicharmus* (they consitute *c.* 50 per cent of the extant remains of the work as current editions present it to us), the last to the *Annales* (*Ann.* 591; see n. 37). Yet the criteria that differentiate *Ann.* 591 from its 8 companions are unspoken and unclear. Presumably the imitation of Homeric expression in *Ann.* 591, its metre and possibly the second person pronoun *tibi* at *V.* 57 V (text in n. 37) are factors influencing the lines' various distribution. Against this, Varro gives no indication at all of a change of work. The distribution of these lines into different works appears to be conventional, rather than dictated in any traceable fashion by internal features or circumstances of transmission.

The one possible serious argument in favour of attribution of *Ann.* 6–7 and 8–10 to the *Annales* is the distinction Varro makes between their originator, whom he names as Ennius, and the originator of two lines in their vicinity (*V.* 52 and 53 V), whom he names as Epicharmus. This makes Varro's Latin-speaking 'Epicharmus' look like he is the Ennian *Epicharmus*. Since Varro's quotations of Ennius are very frequently introduced by the phrase *ut ait Ennius* ('as Ennius says'), that majority of Ennian quotations that editors attribute to the *Annales* appear in Varro's presentation as spoken by their author rather than by characters within the poem. It is, however, not clear whether Varro's procedure in dealing with the different texts of given authors was consistent: the lines from *LL* 5.64 that have consistently been attributed to the *Epicharmus* (see n. 37) are also introduced by a simple *ut ait Ennius*. Why the pressure that caused *Ann.* 6–7 and 8–10 to be attributed to the *Annales* did not also cause the lines attributed without ancient authority to the *Epicharmus* to be re-assigned to the *Annales* is not wholly clear; metrics, around which doubt necessarily lingers given the transmission-situation, cannot alone provide a sufficient explanation.[38]

[37] *LL* 5.64: *Terra Ops, quod hic omne opus et hac opus ad vivendum, et ideo dicitur Ops mater, quod terra mater. haec enim 'terris gentis omnis peperit et resumit denuo'* [*V.* 48 V], *quae 'dat cibaria'* [*V.* 49 V], *ut ait Ennius, quae 'quod gerit fruges, Ceres'* [*V.* 50 V]*; antiquis enim quod nunc G C. idem hi dei Caelum et Terra Iupiter et Iuno, quod ut ait Ennius 'istic est is Iupiter quem dico, quem Graeci vocant/Aerem, qui ventus est et nubes, imber postea,/atque ex imbre frigus, ventus post fit, aer denuo. haece propter Iupiter sunt ista quae dico tibi,/qua mortalis atque urbes beluasque omnis iuvat* [*V.* 54–8 V]. *quod hinc omnes et sub hoc, eundem appellans dicit 'divumque hominumque pater, rex'* [*Ann.* 591]. *pater, quod patefacit semen: nam tum esse conceptum patet, inde cum exit quod oritur* (39).

[38] These lines include, besides those already discussed (*V.* 48, 49, 50, 54–8 V), *V.* 46 V 38 C (*LL* 59.60), *V.* 47 V 36 C (*RR* 1.4.1),

A third, again Varronian, fragment, excluded from Skutsch's edition, often forms part of the aggregate assigned to the proem – still in response, I suggest, to the influence of Lucretius' phrase:

> . . . cava quaeque
> corpore caeruleo caeli cortina receptat [*Ann.* 8 9 Fl. = 9 V]
> the convex vault of the azure bodied sky encompasses all things

Varro gives the lines at *LL* 7.48, in the vicinity of a host of Ennian fragments regularly attributed to the *Annales*, as well as quotations from Ennian tragedy (and from other authors entirely: Lucilius, Plautus, Naevius and others). As usual, he names the source simply as Ennius. Skutsch and Jocelyn both read this heavily corrupt line as an anapaestic septenarius: Skutsch excludes it from his *Annales*, and Jocelyn includes it in his fragments of the tragedies.[39]

If Skutsch excludes the fragment above on metrical grounds, he instead includes, in an atypical editorial decision, another remarkable fragment besides Varro's three in the vision of the proem he presents: Skutsch moves up into the proem a line referred by all editors since Merula to the exposure of Romulus and Remus at the flooding of the Tiber, a setting to which Flores returns it.[40] The line is transmitted by Festus (354–6) and Paulus (355) and attested for Book 1 by the former. Skutsch prints the (highly corrupt) line as *desunt rivos camposque remanant* (?'are missing <and the waters?> ?flow back to? the streams and the fields'?) and designates it as his *Ann.* 5.[41] For him, '[his] interpretation [of the line and its place in the poem] . . . seems to prove that Homer's exposition of the *natura rerum* was not restricted to matter closely connected with the migration of souls [since t]he Lucretian term *rerum naturam* would be difficult to square with that restriction'.[42] Skutsch's statement is striking for so obviously putting the Lucretian cart before the horse of what the fragmentary evidence on its own strengths allows us to establish, but his basic approach to the construction of the episode is not unrepresentative of editorial treatment of it.

[39] Skutsch 1968: 108; *inc.* 365–6 J. See Chapter 5, n. 81, for Flores' further reconstruction of this fragment as one element in a universalising mechanism in his vision of the proem.

[40] Flores *et al.* 2002: 49, who rightly protest Skutsch's move. They print the line (their *Ann.* 67) as *destituunt campos rivoque remanant*.

[41] See Skutsch 1968: 105–9 for his fullest reasoning. [42] Skutsch 1985: 158.

The sense of the proem with which we operate today is thus constructed in the first place out of Lucretius' label for the episode.[43] Available fragments are then marshalled to populate it in conformity with Lucretius' description. These fragments are able to serve the purpose of providing contents for Lucretius' *rerum natura* precisely because their subject-matter is different from that of the rest of the *Annales* and would more naturally be at home either in a tragic context or the quasi-scientific context with which Lucretius' term is associated (as well as because Varro's method of quotation without attribution to the work to which it belongs frees the lines up for the purpose). Were it not for Lucretius' use of the term *rerum natura*, there would be very little motivation to read these fragments (with the exception of the close to meaningless *Ann.* 5) as part of the *Annales* at all.

Ancient support for Lucretius' use of the term does exist. It exists in the first place in the remarks of the scholiasts to Horace and Persius (see Appendix Tables A5.26 and A5.41 for 'Porphyrio' on Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.51 and for the scholia to Persius),[44] in so far as they confirm a dream-apparition of a figure of Homer to a figure of Ennius at the start of the *Annales* and the transference of the soul from the one to the other. But Lucretius' term carries implications of a far broader discourse than what the scholiasts imply. It is that breadth that makes room for all the fragments currently assigned to the proem: they can only have a place in 'Homer''s discourse if he communicates not only the migration of his soul, as the scholiasts attest, but gives besides that the broad philosophical background that Lucretius' (glaringly tendentious) term implies. Support for Lucretius' term exists in the second place in Vergil's inclusion of cosmogonical and cosmological elements in the *Aeneid* in particular (in Iopas' song at *Aen.* 1.740–6 and in Anchises' speech at *Aen.* 6.724–51), as well as in the *Eclogues* (6.31–42); and in the opening cosmogony of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*. These elements may have been conceived under Lucretius' own influence (although we have few enough other tokens of the direct influence of the *DRN* on subsequent poetry; see, however, e.g. n. 114 to Chapter 2, p. 115); but an alternative and

[43] Both the most recent editors print Lucr. 1.120–26 as a fragment of the text, differentiated from a direct quotation by the use of italics. Their remarks, however, encourage the reader to assimilate it to the text: 'Lucretius clearly follows Ennius' words very closely. . .' (Skutsch 1985: 155); 'Il passo lucreziano probabilmente contiene molti lessemi d'origine enniana. . .' (Flores 2000: 30). Both these statements are doubtless true, but they distract attention from the possibility that Lucretius was at the same time re-writing Ennius' text to suit his own agenda. There is no suggestion in these editions that the term *rerum natura* might represent a distortion.

[44] Various testimonia further support these scholiasts; so, e.g. Cic. *Rep.* 6.10; M. Caes. *Ad Front.* 1.4.5; Fronto, *De Eloquentia* 2.15; Tert. *De An.* 33.8; see Skutsch 1985: 152.

plausible literary history for them exists in the proem to the *Annales* – if we accept Lucretius' implication of a cosmogony there.

Acceptance of that implication is not necessarily wrong. Lucretius' term presumably had a referent that his immediate audience, who knew the *Annales*, could identify; and it is plausible that this referent is identical with the description of the proem the scholiasts give. But no surviving fragment has any necessary connection with it: a text re-constructed on the basis of positive evidence supplied by the surviving fragments and their sources would leave the proem bare. In as much as the scholiasts lack Lucretius' complex and independent literary and philosophical agenda, their statements, which typically yield the limelight to Lucretius, are less likely to represent gross distortions of the text.

THE *RHETORICA AD HERENNIUM*

The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* quote the *Annales* twice at *Rhet*. 4.18 and nowhere else, both times as instances of faulty composition.[45] Ennius is named neither here in connection with the two quotations nor anywhere else in the text. Both quotations re-appear in circulation in the later grammatical tradition, again to illustrate poor compositional taste. The first of the two, *Ann*. 104, *o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti* ('you yourself, Titus Tatius, tyrant, earned yourself so great a reward'), is attributed to Ennius first by Priscian (12.23, *GLK* 2.591), who (uniquely) is interested in the reduplicative form *tute*. I therefore count Priscian as the primary source. The line recurs frequently elsewhere in the grammatical

[45] *Rhet*. 4.18 offers 6 quotations, of which the first and the last are prose. The first is anonymous and, as Skutsch declares, probably fictitious; Coelius Antipater is named as the author of the last. The 4 enclosed metrical or potentially metrical quotations are (1) the line known as *Ann*. 104, (2) the line known as *Inc*. 311 J; (3) an anonymous line that may be prose; Skutsch thinks that, if metrical, it may belong to Ennius; (4) the line known as *Ann*. 498. The text of *Rhet. Her*. 4.18 runs thus: *compositio est verborum constructio, <quae facit omnes partes oratio>nis aequabiliter perpolitas. ea conservabitur si fugiemus crebras vocalium concursiones, quae vastam atque hiantem orationem reddunt, ut haec est: 'bacae aeneae amoenissime inpendebant'; et si vitabimus eiusdem litterae nimiam adsiduitatem, cui vitio versus hic erit exemplo – nam hic nihil prohibet in vitiis alienis exemplis uti: 'o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti'* [*Ann*. 104]; *et hic eiusdem poetae '– – quoiquam quicquam quemquam, quemque quisque/conveniat, neget'* [*Inc*. 311 J]; *et si eiusdem verbi adsiduitatem nimiam fugiemus, eiusmodi: 'nam cuius rationis ratio non extet, ei rationi ratio non est fidem habere'; et si non utemur continenter similiter cadentibus verbis, hoc modo: 'flentes, plorantes, lacrimantes, obtestantes'. et si verborum transiectionem vitabimus, nisi quae erit concinna, qua de re posterius loquemur; quo in vitio est Coelius adsiduus, ut haec est: 'in priore libro has res ad te scriptas, Luci, misimus, Aeli'* [24 B P]. *item fugere oportet longam verborum continuationem, quae et auditoris aures et oratoris spiritum laedit.*

tradition as an instance of parhomoeon or related phenomena.[46] *Ann.* 498: *flentes plorantes lacrumantes obtestantes* ('crying, lamenting, weeping, beseeching') is also quoted repeatedly in the later grammatical tradition, as an example of homoeoptoton, which is essentially how the *Rhetorica* too quote it. It is attributed by none of its sources to Ennius, but Skutsch (1985: 655) favours the attribution because of the line's metrical characteristics and because at least two of this quotation's closest neighbours (*Ann.* 104 and *Inc.* 311 J) appear to be Ennian. Whether or not there is a direct line of transmission from the *Rhetorica* to the later grammatical tradition (and *Ann.* 498 is transmitted in forms so various that Skutsch and others before him have suspected that we are in fact dealing with more than one fragment),[47] the *Rhetorica*, like Varro, represent early in the transmission of the *Annales* a form of interest and a manner of quoting the poem that flourished in later centuries amid a set of scholars who had no connection to and no understanding of the work of literature in which the lines originated.

CICERO

Cicero is the sole source of 21 fragments equivalent to 69 lines, or *c.* 11 per cent of the poem. He is the primary source of 10 fragments or 27 lines, roughly equivalent to a further 4 per cent. The bulk of this quotation comes in the *De Divinatione*, with the quotations of Ilia's dream (*Ann.* 38–50) and of the passage describing the augury of Romulus and Remus (*Ann.* 72–91). The other substantial passage Cicero quotes is Pyrrhus' speech (*Ann.* 183–90), in the *De Officiis*. The same text supplies our fullest and most authoritative version of the lines on Fabius 'Cunctator' (*Ann.* 363–5), which circulate widely in antiquity (see Appendix Table A5.3 on Cicero, pp. 388–90.). The *Brutus* and the *De Senectute* share *Ann.* 304–8, and the early passages of the *De Senectute* (1, 14, 16) are relatively rich in quotation from the *Annales*. Besides this, however, Cicero's direct quotation from the *Annales* is rather limited and repetitive. There is little in the letters and speeches, and only in the *De Oratore* and the *De Republica* does Cicero mark his vaunted fondness for the poet with slightly more frequent quotation.[48]

[46] Pomp. *Comm.* (*GLK* 5.303), Explan. in Don. 2 'De schematibus' (*GLK* 4.565), Isid. *Orig.* 1.36.14., who name Ennius as the source. Charis. 4.4 'De schemate lexeos' (*GLK* 1.282), Don. *Art. Gr.* (*GLK* 4.398); Pomp. *Comm.* 445, 22 (*GLK* 5.287); Prisc. *Partit.* 141, on *Aen.* 7.1; Mart. Cap. 5.514; Sacerd. (*GLK* 6.454) also know the line, but, like *Rhet. Her.* 4.18, do not name an author.

[47] For full details, see Flores *et al.* 2009: 190–7.

[48] For Cicero's use of Ennian texts in general, see Zetzel 2007: 2–3.

Despite the fact that Ennius is a favourite of Cicero's,[49] there is only a limited number of short passages that Cicero quotes repeatedly. It thus looks as if he had these few by heart,[50] while, for the few longer passages cited above, he appears to have turned to a manuscript.

None of the major surviving branches of transmission have deep roots in Cicero. Not only is remarkably little Ciceronian material re-quoted by later sources (as the statistics on p. 152 indicate); even where other sources' quotations coincide over a few words with Cicero's longer quotations, the fact that they are able to give book-numbers, where he does not, shows that they have their material from a different source – one presumably internal to the scholarly traditions in which they write. There are such three occasions: Gellius quotes a single line of *Ann.* 72–91, for which the primary source is *Div.* 1.107–8, and tells us that it is from Book 1; Priscian quotes a single line of *Ann.* 105–9 (from *Rep.* 1.64) and tells us that it is from Book 2 (Skutsch prefers on the grounds of the subject-matter to locate the fragment in Book 1); finally, in quoting *Ann.* 363, Macrobius tells us that it is from Book 12. Only once does Cicero provide a book-number for a quotation of the *Annales*. This is at *Brut.* 58 (with regard to *Ann.* 304–8, '*in nono, ut opinor, annali*'),[51] where Cicero's apparent hesitation is a mark of his desire to avoid the appearance of pedantry.[52]

In general, given how frequently Cicero repeats the quotations of Ennius he likes best, and given the circulation of his texts, it is perhaps surprising how rarely his quotations recur in other sources. This is a testament to the dedication of the scholarly sources – the ones to survive the irruption of the *Aeneid* into the scene and indeed to thrive in the new environment – to their own internal resources. It also suggests how abandoned, perhaps how impractical, Cicero's form of interest in the poem was in the new era. Gellius, it is true, has clearly obtained some material via Cicero, partly via Seneca (see n. 51); but it is clear that he also has other significant sources. On the other hand, a few important lines from Cicero's lost works survive through re-quotation by Augustine,[53] whose only source for Ennius is

[49] Cicero names Ennius four times more often than he does any other early writer (Zetzel 2007: 3).

[50] Cicero has a greater number of passages from the tragedies in mind, presumably as a result of seeing them on the stage. He cites Ennius' tragedies twice as often as he cites his epic (Zetzel 2007: 3).

[51] Of the two sources who show awareness of (phrases from) that fragment, Quintilian and Gellius, the latter at any rate is clear that his immediate source is Seneca; see Appendix Table A5.3, under *Ann.* 304–8. Seneca's information probably derives from Cicero; see Table A5.5; Skutsch 1985: 28–29.

[52] Cf. Skutsch 1985: 27.

[53] These are *Ann.* 156, from the proem to the *De Republica*, and *Ann.* 575, from the *Hortensius*.

Cicero. Likewise, the exiguous amount of material from the *Annales* in Seneca,[54] Lactantius Firmianus[55] and Jerôme derives directly from Cicero.[56]

In terms of how it directs modern understanding of the text, the single most noteworthy aspect of Cicero's transmission of the *Annales* is that, to the extent that our sense of the *Annales* as a serious historiographical endeavour emerges from the sources, it is Cicero, and more or less Cicero alone, who is responsible.[57] No other source is interested to any comparable degree in the *Annales* as a record of Rome, while Cicero for his part rarely contemplates the epic outside the context of historiography.[58] Within that context, however, Cicero has a vast array of different and at times even contradictory things to say about the type of record of the past the *Annales* represent. This array does not represent a trajectory through time of the development of a consistent point of view; rather, quotation of the *Annales* serves the *ad hoc* purposes of the argument of the moment, as Cicero moves between different texts and different speakers within his texts. The sections that follow map out the different types of use to which Cicero puts the text. These never stray far from the notion of the text as a representation of the past, first established at *Inv.* 1.27. After a glance at this introductory passage, we will turn to instances promoting the *Annales* as not just a reliable reflection of the past but specifically as a factually accurate and objective historical record. After surveying the diversity of views on offer, we will end with ones from the opposite extreme of the spectrum of views Cicero puts forward, ones in which the speaker exposes the poem's fictionalising nature to immediate view. There is no occasion on which Cicero discusses the *Annales* purely for their own sake, and the misreadings (or partial readings) of the text that result are collateral damage, due to a 'no-hold-barred' approach to securing his own and his speakers' argumentative success.

De Inventione *1.27 (80s* BCE*):* Ann. *216*

Even though there is no consistent chronological development of Cicero's use of the *Annales*, the general tone is largely set by his early use of the line we know as *Ann.* 216, at *Inv.* 1.27. Cicero does not name the author of the

[54] Sen. *Ep.* 102.16 is the sole source for *Ann.* 575, *laus alit artes*; see further Appendix Table A5.5 on Seneca as a source for the *Annales*.

[55] See Appendix Table A5.3 under *Ann.* 105–9.

[56] Skutsch 1985: 28–9.

[57] Another much smaller and less accessible prompt to such a reading is Diomedes (*GLK* 1.483–4). Diomedes designates Ennius' epic an account of *Romanorum res* or *Romanorum res gestae*, that is, a narrative of the historical past (see the discussion of *Inv.* 1.27 below) and suggests that the text was structurally modelled on the pontifical chronicle. See Chapter 1, n. 6, p. 19.

[58] Cf. Prinzen 1998: 163–70.

hexametric line he there quotes (and for which he is our sole source), but it is regularly, and with good reason, attributed to the *Annales*.[59] The context is a discussion of the different categories of *narratio*, and Cicero quotes the line as an illustration of the sub-division of *narratio* he names *historia*:

> narratio est rerum gestarum aut ut gestarum expositio. narrationum genera tria sunt: . . . tertium genus est remotum a civilibus causis, quod delectationis causa non inutili cum exercitatione dicitur et scribitur. eius partes sunt duae, quarum altera in negotiis, altera in personis maxime versatur. ea quae in negotiorum expositione posita est tres habet partes: fabulam, historiam, argumentum. fabula est in qua nec verae, nec veri similes res continentur, cuiusmodi est 'angues ingentes alites, iuncti iugo' [Pacuv. *Medus* 397 R]. historia est gesta res, ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota, quod genus 'Appius indixit Carthaginiensibus bellum' [*Ann*. 216]. argumentum est ficta res, quae tamen fieri potuit. huiusmodi apud Terentium [*Andr*. 51]: 'nam is postquam excessit ex ephebis, [Sosia] . . . '

> Narrative is the setting forth of events that have taken place or that are represented as having taken place. There are three types of narrative . . . The third kind has nothing to do with public lawsuits; it is undertaken (in speech or writing) purely for the sake of pleasure, although it provides an oppor tunity for potentially useful practice. It is divided into two parts, of which one is most concerned with actions, the other with characters. The one which has to do with the setting out of actions is further subdivided into three parts: *fabula*, *historia* and *argumentum*. *Fabula* is narrative compre hending events that are not true and do not resemble reality, as for example: 'huge winged serpents, yoked together'. *Historia* is actual fact that took place before our time, of the type: 'Appius declared war on the Carthaginians.' *Argumentum* is fictitious subject matter that however could potentially have occurred. An example of the kind in Terence is: 'For he, after he reached manhood . . . '

Cicero's selection of the line as an illustration of *historia*, defined as *gesta res, ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota* ('an actual event removed in time from the present day'),[60] and opposed to both *fabula* (obvious fiction) and

[59] The quotations in the *De Inventione* come from a stock set established in the time of the Gracchi (Skutsch 1985: 385–6, citing Norden 1915: 71, n. 1). This, in combination with this line's metre and subject-matter, make the *Annales* a candidate difficult to find a plausible competitor for. For the doxography, beginning from Spangenberg's 1825 edition, see Skutsch and Tomasco (in Flores *et al.* 2002: 202–5).

[60] Servius' distinction between *historia* and *annales* (discussed in Chapter 1, pp. 58–9), had defined the former as an account of events within the audience's lifetime, the latter as one of events 'of which our own generation has no direct experience' Serv. ad *Aen*. 1.373). He thus differentiates *annales* from *historia* not qualitatively but by suggesting that the former covers an earlier time-period than the latter. The language he uses of the period proper to *annales* (i.e. *quae aetas nostra non novit*) is

argumentum (fiction that looks like fact), establishes it as a representation of the historical past.[61] This idea, that the *Annales* reflect Rome's past accomplishments, remains steady throughout Cicero's writings, even as the author puts forward on different occasions radically divergent views of what type of representation the poem constitutes.

Cicero's presentation of the line readily promotes the assumption that it is in some larger sense emblematic of its text of origin.[62] As it stands in the isolation Cicero imposes on it, *Ann.* 216 is easily assimilated to a prose statement of fact, its hexametric form passing as a relatively muted aspect of it. Thus the line has come in some modern readings to illustrate the bald 'annalistic' narrative style often used to characterise the epic.[63] Yet it is arguable that it is precisely the brevity and isolation of each of Cicero's quotations that allow them to evoke a theoretically pure type of narrative. Arguably, had more of the text been adduced, that theoretical purity could only have been compromised.[64]

Brutus *57–60 (46* BCE*):* Ann. *304–8*

The most complex and detailed treatment Cicero gives the *Annales* as a work of historiography occurs at *Brutus* 57–60. In Cicero's astonishing presentation here, the *Annales* themselves inaugurate the era of historically documented times. The subject under discussion is the early history of oratory at Rome. Cicero first lists a number of early Romans, such as App. Claudius Caecus, C. Fabricius and M.' Curius, whose achievements suggest their rhetorical prowess, but for whom no actual record of eloquence is available: *sed eos oratores habitos esse aut omnino tum ullum eloquentiae praemium fuisse nihil sane mihi legisse videor: tantum modo coniectura ducor*

confusingly similar to the language Cicero uses at *Inv.* 1.27 in the definition of *historia* (*ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota*). The contexts, however, distinguish the senses of the phrases in question: Servius' very point is the distinction between different historical eras; at *Inv.* 1.27, no such distinction is in view, and the phrase *ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota* has the weak sense of simply 'past' or 'historical' and functions as no more than an amplification of the past participle *gesta*.

[61] Cf. Cole 2006: 534, n. 11, on the 'exceptional role' Cicero assigns to the *Annales* by his use of this line at *Inv.* 1.27 as an illustration of *historia*.

[62] Skutsch suggests that each of the lines quoted at *Inv.* 1.27 is intended to recall to the audience the entire passage it introduces. *Ann.* 216, in his view, initiated and was intended by Cicero to recall a (postulated) 'skeleton history' of the First Punic War (Skutsch 1985: 385) which, the argument runs, could neither be omitted completely, given 'annalistic' procedure as Skutsch understood it, nor dealt with in detail, given Naevius' previous treatment (cf. *Ann.* 206–7).

[63] See Chapter 1, p. 51, with n. 103 there, and pp. 53–4.

[64] Cf. Chapter 1, pp. 52 and 54–7, on *Ann.* 304–5 vs. *Ann.* 304–8.

ad suspicandum ('But that these men were considered real orators or indeed that any value at all was placed on eloquence I cannot recollect ever having read: it is only that I am led by inference to think them such', *Brut.* 56). This all changes with M. Cornelius Cethegus, for whose status and reputation as an orator in his own day the *Annales* provide the first 'historical evidence' on offer:

> [57] . . . quem vero exstet et de quo sit memoriae proditum eloquentem fuisse et ita esse habitum, primus est M. Cornelius Cethegus, cuius eloquentiae est auctor, et idoneus quidem mea sententia, Q. Ennius, praesertim cum et ipse eum audiverit et scribat de mortuo: ex quo nulla suspicio est amicitiae causa esse mentitum. [58] est igitur sic apud illum in nono ut opinor annali: 'additur orator Cornelius suaviloquenti/ore Cethegus Marcus Tuditano conlega/Marci filius ' [*Ann.* 304 6] et oratorem appellat et suaviloquentiam tribuit, quae nunc quidem non tam est in plerisque (latrant enim iam quidam oratores, non loquuntur), sed est ea laus eloquentiae certe maxima: 'is dictus ollis popular ibus olim,/qui tum vivebant homines atque aevom agitabant/flos delibatus populi ' [*Ann.* 306 8];[65] probe vero; [59] ut enim hominis decus ingenium, sic ingeni ipsius lumen est eloquentia, qua virum excellentem praeclare tum illi homines florem populi esse dixerunt 'Suadaeque medulla' [*Ann.* 308] . . . [60] at hic Cethegus consul cum P. Tuditano fuit bello Punico secundo quaestorque his consulibus M. Cato, modo plane annis CXL ante me con sulem; et id ipsum nisi unius esset Enni testimonio cognitum, hunc vetustas, ut alios fortasse multos, oblivione obruisset.[66]
>
> [57] . . . But the first man for whom recorded evidence survives that he was genuinely eloquent and acknowledged as such is M. Cornelius Cethegus. Our authority for his eloquence is Ennius, and an appropriate one, too, I think, in as much as he in person both heard Cethegus speak and recorded his opinion of him after his death: so that there can be no suggestion that he distorted things out of partisanship. So there is the following notice in his work, in the ninth book, I think it is, of the *Annals*: 'Joined as colleague to Tuditanus is the sweet voiced speaker Marcus Cornelius Cethegus, the son of Marcus.' He both terms him an orator and he attributes sweetness of speech to him, which nowadays at any rate is not such a common trait (for today orators don't so much speak as bark); but it is, for sure, when he says,

[65] Cicero returns to *Ann.* 304–8 at *Sen.* 50, where he makes his speaker, Cato, into another 'witness' to Cethegus' rhetoric and has him add his own (fictitious) authority to Ennius' description: *Marcum vero Cethegum, quem recte 'Suadai medullam' dixit Ennius* . . . The passage is also known to Quintilian (11.3.30–1 and 2.15.4) and Gellius (12.2.1–8).

[66] This passage is discussed by Prinzen, who sees it as evidence of Cicero's treatment of Ennius as a reliable historical source (Prinzen 1998: 164–8). Taken at face value, it is such; its juxtaposition with passages such as *Div.* 2.115, *Sen.* 16 and *Rep.* 3.4–5 (see pp. 189–93, 161–4 and 170–1) makes clear the extent to which that appearance is itself a tool readily manipulated by Ennius for the purposes of his argument.

> 'He was pronounced by his fellows of that era the men who were then alive and living out their years to be the choicest flower of the people', that he pays the greatest compliment to his eloquence. He says so quite rightly; for as a man's glory is his intellect, so the very acme of his intellect is his eloquence, so that the men of that day did well to call the man who excelled in eloquence the flower of the people and 'the very soul of Persuasion' . . . Now this Cethegus was consul along with P. Tuditanus during the Second Punic War, and M. Cato was quaestor during their consulship, only 140 years precisely before my consulship; and if this very fact had not been made known by Ennius' attestation, and his alone, the long passing of time would have consigned him to oblivion, as mayhap it has done many others.[67]

Perhaps most striking here is the fact that Cicero defends the reliability of Ennius' account of Cethegus not by recourse to independent testimony – of which, as he points out, there was none – but by measuring him by recognisably rationalising and analytic standards for historical writing. Ennius is, as Cicero has him, explicitly 'witness' to history (*id ipsum nisi unius esset Enni testimonio cognitum*). Cicero here goes so far as to make a virtue of the fact that Ennius' 'attestation' to Cethegus' rhetorical powers is unique in the historical record. Far from casting doubt on the historicity of Ennius' account, that only makes the epic (as Cicero has it) all the more valuable as a record of the past: the sense is of Ennius 'rescuing' history's precious details.

Cicero urges besides this that Ennius had direct personal access to the events in question (*ipse . . . audiverit*). In other words, he suggests that the quality of Ennius' narrative and the reason to trust it lie in the author's autoptic (or rather aut-otic!) relationship to his subject matter. Cicero thus makes on behalf of the poet essentially the same claim as that on which analytic historians since Thucydides had prided themselves and signalled the distinctness of their type of account from other possible approaches to the past, including precisely that of epic poets.[68] Not just this, but Cicero raises the question of potential bias, again more typically the concern of prose historiography, to repudiate it on Ennius' behalf: *praesertim cum . . . scribat de mortuo: ex quo nulla suspicio est amicitiae causa esse mentitum*. The principle which Cicero is here drawing into account is essentially Tacitus'

[67] Both here and elsewhere, translations of the *Brutus* are either taken from or heavily informed by Douglas 1966.

[68] Cf. Thuc. 1.22.2: τὰ δ' ἔργα τῶν πραχθέντων ἐν τῷ πολέμῳ οὐκ ἐκ τοῦ παρατυχόντος πυνθανόμενος ἠξίωσα γράφειν οὐδ' ὡς ἐμοὶ ἐδόκει, ἀλλ' οἵς τε αὐτὸς παρῆν καὶ παρὰ τῶν ἄλλων ὅσον δυνατὸν ἀκριβείᾳ περὶ ἑκάστου ἐπεξελθών. Cf. also Livy's statement of greater confidence in Fabius Pictor's report of the number of dead at Trasumene, on the grounds that Fabius was *aequalem temporibus huiusce belli* ('contemporary with the events of this war', Livy 22.7.1).

principle of writing *sine ira et studio* ('without spite or bias', Tac. *Ann.* 1.1).[69] This kind of arrogation to Ennius of principles proper to an historiographical tradition to which the *Annales* did not formally belong suits Cicero's purposes because, in his bid to explain the course of rhetoric at Rome, he is indeed after the sort of factual historical detail and causal and temporal sequence that the analytic tradition would properly supply. With no such account available, he turns to the work that suggests the information that he would like and treats it as if it were of the type he requires.

Just as arresting is that, here in the *Brutus*, Appius Claudius Caecus does not rank among the 'definitely historical' orators at all (*Brut.* 55–6) – even though, as the *Brutus* has it, nothing other than the *Annales* marks the boundary between the pre-historical and the historical. We shall shortly contrast the presentation in the *De Senectute*, written two years after the *Brutus*, in 44 BCE: there, precisely the same sort of 'evidence' as that used to 'prove' Cethegus' historical primacy here at *Brut.* 57 – that is, the record of the *Annales* – implies the historical validity and enduring cultural presence of Appius' speech and hence of his powers of oratory, here denied. In the *Brutus*, not only is Ennius' material on Appius ignored; even Appius' (supposed) own words, referred to at *Sen.* 16 and also mentioned at *Brut.* 61, are set aside, on the grounds that they are insufficiently pleasing.[70] The contrast between how Appius is treated in the two texts is surely a reflex of Cicero's determination to create a tidy rhetorical genealogy leading in a straight line from Ennius' Cethegus through Cato to himself (see esp. *Brut.* 61). Perhaps Appius, especially the Ennian Appius, is excluded in the *Brutus* because his fiery and emotional rhetoric (see pp. 161–4) makes him a more problematic rhetorical ancestor for Cicero than Cethegus with his *suaviloquentia* or Cato with his dignity and restraint. At any rate, whatever details Cicero chooses to select from the *Annales* to suit the purposes of his various arguments of the moment, the poem as a whole serves him (or rather his speakers) in these instances as a source of incontrovertible authority about the past.

In fact, *Ann.* 304–8 are arguably very rich in the elaborate linguistic moves by which the poet heroises and archaises the recent past: they offer a distortion that would have been especially palpable to the poet's immediate

[69] Cf. Prinzen 1998: 164.

[70] *Brut.* 61: *hunc igitur Cethegum consecutus est aetate Cato, qui annis ix post eum fuit consul. eum nos ut perveterem habemus, qui L. Marcio M'. Manilio consulibus mortuus est, annis lxxxvi ipsis ante me consulem. nec vero habeo quemquam antiquiorem, cuius quidem scripta proferenda putem, nisi quem Appi Caeci oratio haec ipsa de Pyrrho et nonnullae mortuorum laudationes forte delectant.*

contemporaries.[71] This, however, raises no Ciceronian eyebrows. Far from pointing to the artificiality of Ennius' language, Cicero here disguises it by absorbing its most striking elements directly into his discourse:[72] at *Brut.* 58, Cicero converts Ennius' rare epic adjective *suaviloquenti* into the even rarer noun *suaviloquentia* and uses it without further comment in his response to the Ennian lines he quotes.[73] By thus following up the quotation of *Ann.* 304–8 with seamless integration, into his own discourse, of the alien language introduced by Ennius in his efforts to remodel the Roman past, Cicero draws attention away from the artificiality of the poet's construction – an artificiality that otherwise stood in danger of pointing out the plasticity of the text as a whole and the oddity of his using the *Annales* as a means of access to the facts of the past.[74] Alongside this, the unhesitating indicatives, *appellat* and *tribuit*, with which Cicero recapitulates Ennius' tribute to Cethegus, add the authority invested in the speaker to the portrait given in the *Annales*. Thus, Cicero has in fact used considerable sleight of hand in presenting the *Annales* as a mode of access to the past tantamount to a factual representation based on hard evidence.

We are not in a position to gauge the historical accuracy of Ennius' account, since, as *Brut.* 57–60 itself makes clear, even in Cicero's day the *Annales* alone supplied notice of Cethegus' oratory. The proximity of Cicero's day to Ennius, makes it less likely that the loss of their names was due to accident. We have already encountered in Chapter 1 (pp. 61–5) instances of Ennius' inclusion in his narrative of persons and events that political and military history typically excluded and that otherwise left scant trace on the documentary record; and it is to this set that his mention of

[71] Cf. Chapter 1, pp. 54–7.

[72] For similar instances of Cicero's absorption of Ennian language directly into his text, in the vicinity of quotation from the *Annales*, see Cole 2006: 538, n. 21.

[73] On the artificiality of the compound *suaviloquenti*, see Chapter 1, pp. 56–7, with n. 130 there. See also Douglas 1966: 48: *suaviloquens* is rare even for Ennius and unique in the record of the *Annales* as we have it. It occurs elsewhere only at Lucr. 1.945 and Cic. *Rep.* 5.11 (known via Gell. 12.2.7). *Suaviloquentia* is found nowhere else.

[74] Cicero's trickiness is also evident in the different uses of *orator* at *Brut.* 55 and 58. In the old sense favoured by the poets in general and in use in Livy, *orator* means 'legate' or 'envoy' (*TLL*, s.v. *orator*), as it certainly does, e.g., at *Ann.* 202, although Ennius also uses the word in the sense normal for Cicero and his day, that is, as 'skilled public speaker', e.g. at *Ann.* 249 and 593. Cicero himself uses the word primarily in the older sense at *Brut.* 55: *possumus C. Fabricium* [sc. *suspicari disertum*] *quia sit ad Pyrrhum de captivis recuperandis missus orator*; cf. Douglas 1966: 44 and 48 ad both *Brut.* 55.11 and 58.8 on *orator*. Given *suaviloquenti ore* and *Suadae medulla* at *Ann.* 304–8, Cicero is doubtless not misconstruing Ennius' intention in suggesting that the emphasis there is on rhetorical prowess. But at the same time he is aware of the different connotation the word potentially carries in an older and poetic context, and he is certainly capitalising on the ambiguity between the two uses and negotiating for extra room for the later use of the word in his predicative application of *orator* to Fabricius at *Brut.* 55.

Cethegus appears from Cicero's account of it to belong – despite Cicero's best efforts to disguise the fact.

This passage of the *Brutus*, with its presentation of the *Annales* as a straightforward 'witness' to the past, along with *Inv.* 1.27, provides some possible ancient history for those modern readings of the poem in which its historicity and its reliability as an historical source are treated as self-evident.[75] It is not only on modern readings, however, that there is room to suspect Cicero's influence. At Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.117, Cethegus is mentioned in the same breath as Cato as worthy of imitation in the use of language:[76]

> obscurata diu populo bonus eruet atque
> proferet in lucem speciosa uocabula rerum,
> quae priscis memorata Catonibus atque Cethegis
> nunc situs informis premit et deserta uetustas.

> The good poet will unearth and bring forth into the light splendid terms for objects, terms which have been long unknown to the common people ones which were uttered by such men as Cato and Cethegus of old, but which unsightly disuse and the forsaken passing of time now beset.

Cicero's insistence that the historical datum provided by *Ann.* 304–8 was unique in his day implies that Cethegus can only have been known to Horace from this passage and/or from Cicero's comment on it here at *Brut.* 57–60.[77] In fact, Cato's appearance alongside Cethegus at *Ep.* 2.2.117–18 suggests that Horace was in fact thinking of Cethegus through *Brut.* 60, where the two are likewise paired. This would make Cicero a determinative reader of Ennius for other readers as early as Horace, who themselves still had full access to the text.

De Senectute *16 (44* BCE*):* Ann. *199–200*

At *Sen.* 16, Cicero again foregrounds the issue of historicity. Here, he presents the *Annales* as different from yet preferable to an existing transcript of the past, for he chooses to include Ennius' version of a speech by Appius Claudius Caecus (in which the latter successfully persuaded the senate to reject Pyrrhus' peace-proposals following the battle of Heraclea – or Ausculum[78]) in preference to an historical document recording the original speech (or what was believed to be such).[79]

[75] See Chapter 1, n. 82. [76] Cf. *AP* 50: *fingere cinctutis non exaudita Cethegis.*
[77] Cf. Skutsch 1985: 483. [78] Skutsch 1985: 348.
[79] For the relationship between the speech that was known as Appius Claudius' own in Cicero's day (cf. *Brut.* 61), Ennius' version of the speech, and the version of the speech that circulated among the prose

Cato is here discussing the potential of old age for keeping men from four pleasures he enumerates, of which the one in question here is political activity in the service of the state. Appius Claudius Caecus is the culminating example in Cato's list of vigorous old men (including Fabius Maximus and Aemilius Paulus) whom old age did nothing to deter from participation in public affairs. Cato presents him as an extreme case, on the grounds that he took effective political action despite blindness as well as old age. In illustration of this, Cicero has Cato quote a (now mutilated) fragment from the beginning of Appius Claudius' effective speech. He frames the quotation thus:

> ad Appii Claudii senectutem accedebat etiam ut caecus esset; tamen is, cum sententia senatus inclinaret ad pacem cum Pyrrho foedusque faciendum, non dubitavit dicere illa quae versibus persecutus est Ennius 'quo vobis mentes, rectae quae stare solebant antehac, dementes sese flexere †via? . . . ' [*Ann.* 199 200] ceteraque gravissime; notum enim vobis carmen est, et tamen ipsius Appi extat oratio.
>
> In addition to the burden of his old age, Appius Claudius had to contend with the fact that he was blind; yet he, when the senate was officially inclining towards making a peace treaty with Pyrrhus, had no hesitation in making those pronouncements that Ennius set to verse: 'What way has your sense, which used to maintain a sound position in times past, ?gone senseless, derailed? . . . ' [*Ann.* 199 200] and the rest, all in the most awe inspiring tones; for you are familiar with the poem. And at the same time Appius' own speech survives.

Cicero's preference for Ennius' speech over the original document is not entirely different from the practice of the historians, who also seem to have avoided including in their works extant published speeches.[80] There, however, such omission is best accounted for in generic terms: by giving their own versions of speeches, historians were able to maintain stylistic homogeneity and generic propriety and to use those speeches to forward their own overarching interpretative objectives.[81] These motives cannot account for Cicero's avoidance of the documentary version of Appius Claudius' speech in favour of recall of the Ennian version.

historiographers (of which Plut. *Pyrrh.* 19, the so-called *Ineditum Vaticanum* and Appian, *Samn.* 10.5 supply the remains), see Skutsch 1985: 360; cf. Powell 1988: 136, 138, Flores *et al.* 2002: 152, citing Isid. *Etym.* 1.38.2. We have no evidence that the historical Cato supplied a version of the speech in his *Origines* (indeed, we have no evidence that he supplied speeches other than his own), but the possibility that he did and that Cicero simply ignored it is intriguing.

[80] See Brock 1995: 209–24. Cicero's formula *extat oratio* is the same as that used by Livy and Tacitus (*ibid.* 210, 211). It recurs in Cicero at *Font.* 39 (re. a speech of C. Gracchus), *Off.* 2.51 (of his own *Rosc. Am.*) and elsewhere.

[81] *Ibid.* 217–19.

Cicero clearly expects his immediate audience to need only a few words of the speech to situate themselves in the text of the epic and to recall Appius' speech in Ennius as a whole; and he has his speaker express a similar confidence in the familiarity of the relevant passage to the audience of the dramatic date, 150 BCE (*notum enim vobis carmen est*). There was no guarantee that the extant speech possessed any such familiarity to his audience.[82] Ennius' version of the speech thus appears as *the* serviceable version of what Appius said, since it had a place in people's consciousness that the original (and/or a speech that presented itself as the original) did not.

Not only is it serviceable, but Cicero's speaker is also evidently at ease with the accuracy of its representation. The phrase *illa quae versibus persecutus est Ennius* boldly points attention the fact that the *Annales* constitute a poetic representation, while the casual mention at the end of Appius' own original speech foregrounds the distinction between Ennius' artefact and what Appius actually said at the time. Yet the speaker betrays no concern whatsoever that Ennius' versification would have introduced any undesirable distortion; there is no sense that whatever transformation the poet had effected could have had any negative impact on the historicity of the version of the speech he presents.[83] Questions such as what sort of access the poet had to Appius' original words or whether he chose to avail himself of such make no appearance. *Ceteraque gravissime* further blurs the distinction between the words of the poet and those of the politician.[84] The established fact that Appius spoke on the occasion in question, combined with the currency of the poet's account, was enough to make even an obviously reworked version of the speech equivalent to or even better than the historical original in the eyes of Cicero's Cato and, presumably, a substantial part of his audience. He thus seems to reckon Ennius' account intrinsically more useful than an accurate factual report (assuming such) that was less capable of making a palpable moral impact. At *Sen*. 16, Cicero's Cato all but makes that point explicitly.

This capacity of the *Annales*, to make a palpable moral impact, surfaces repeatedly in Cicero's uses of the text. It is especially evident in four passages to which we now turn: *Off*. 1.84 and *Balb*. 50–1; *Off*. 1.38 and *Rep*. 3.4. In

[82] Again, cf. Brock 1995: 210–13, on the unlikelihood of Tacitus' and Sallust's audiences, or even themselves, having had access to the originals of the speeches they re-write.

[83] Cf. Prinzen 1998: 166–7, with his n. 17; Prinzen strongly favours the view that the *Annales* represented a reliable version of Roman history for Cicero.

[84] Prinzen suggests that Cato's praise is directed at Ennius rather than at Appius (*ibid.*) but, in as much as Ennius' words fully represent the speaker here, the two have, I suggest, become indistinguishable.

these instances, Cicero has culled from the poem positive images of behaviours he wishes to encourage, from the description of Romans and their enemies alike. Cicero does not himself pair these passages. It is therefore perhaps merely an accident of transmission (or result of the fame of the individuals there described) that the first two passages I will discuss concern one of the most famous matches of Republican history, Fabius 'Cunctator' and Hannibal. The language itself of the second two fragments, however, pairs them, and in it we get a glimpse at what looks rather like the kind of contestation of identity between Romans and their enemies that we see between the Romans and the Gauls in Book 5 of Livy or between Fabius Maximus and Hannibal in Book 22, which made Livy's use of exemplarity so engaging and dynamic.[85] Overall, Cicero's use of these four fragments suggests that, whether or not Ennius himself explicitly constructed his text as a source of exemplarity in the way Livy did, the poem readily leant itself to such use.[86] Cicero's readings show how the *Annales* ensconced themselves in the Roman historical imagination, with the text's bold episodic images supplanting other ways of thinking about the past.[87]

De Officiis *1.84 (44* BCE*):* Ann. *363–5*

At *Off.* 1.84, the question at issue is that of how people are motivated to and dissuaded from true patriotism, of the kind that disregards outward appearances. After citing various instances of behaviour he regards as heroic, Cicero, as he does elsewhere too, ends with an *exemplum* from the *Annales* that trumps the rest of the list. In this case, it is that of Ennius' Fabius Maximus 'Cunctator':

> inventi autem multi sunt, qui non modo pecuniam, sed etiam vitam pro fundere pro patria parati essent, idem gloriae iacturam ne minimam quidem facere vellent, ne re publica quidem postulante, ut Callicratidas, qui, cum Lacedaemoniorum dux fuisset Peloponnesiaco bello multaque fecisset

[85] See Luce 1971: 265–302, esp. 269–71 and Kraus 1994b: 267–89, esp. 273–82; cf. Elliott 2009a: 531–41.

[86] Chaplin defines exemplarity, in regard to Livy, as the text's function as a 'storehouse of beneficial lessons . . . [which allow] people [to] tailor their actions according to what they have learned from the past' (Chaplin 2000: 2).

[87] Gellius also shows signs of reading the *Annales* as exemplary in function. Thus *NA* 12.4.2: *eos ego versus* [*sc. Ann.* 268–86, the 'good companion'] *non minus frequenti adsiduoque memoratu dignos puto quam philosophorum de officiis decreta*. There is little to suggest that Gellius reads Ennius through Cicero, although occasionally his readings appear to depend on Cicero via an intermediary source (see nn. 51, 65 and 73, and 137 to the present chapter). To the extent that he does, the fact infringes the ability of *NA* 12.4.2 to act as independent testimony to the ancient understanding of the *Annales* as exemplary.

egregie, vertit ad extremum omnia, cum consilio non paruit eorum, qui classem ab Arginusis removendam nec cum Atheniensibus dimicandum putabant. atque haec quidem Lacedaemoniis plaga mediocris, illa pestifera, qua, cum Cleombrotus invidiam timens temere cum Epaminonda conflix isset, Lacedaemoniorum opes corruerunt. quanto Q. Maximus melius! de quo Ennius:

> unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem.
> noenum rumores ponebat ante salutem.
> ergo postque magisque viri nunc gloria claret. [*Ann*. 363 5]

quod genus peccandi vitandum est etiam in rebus urbanis. sunt enim qui quod sentiunt, etsi optimum sit, tamen invidiae metu non audeant dicere.

There have been many individuals who were prepared to sacrifice wealth and life for their fatherland but who proved unwilling to give up even the least iota of glory, even at the behest of their state as for example Callicratidas who, being general of the Spartans in the Peloponnesian War with many fine accomplishments to his name, in the end upset everything, when he refused to obey the advice of those who thought that he ought to take the fleet out of Arginusae and avoid final conflict with the Athenians. Yet this blow to the Spartans was to some extent tolerable; destructive indeed that which brought Sparta's might low, when Cleombrotus, fearing a negative popular reaction, rashly engaged with Epaminondas. How much better Q. Maximus' attitude was, of whom Ennius wrote:

> One man alone by delaying restored our state. He did not place his popular repute before the common welfare. Therefore the man's glory now shines bright and shall only shine brighter with time.

That type of mistake should be avoided in the practice of the city's affairs too. For there are those who don't dare to say what they think, even if it is to the best advantage, because of their fear of unpopularity.

With the words *quanto . . . melius* and *quod genus peccandi vitandum est . . .* , Cicero draws the exemplary quality of the Ennian lines explicitly to attention. Alongside the honorific position he accords Fabius Maximus by citing him last, the fact that he alone is adorned by a quotation serves to highlight his example above the rest. At the same time, the alignment of Ennius' laudatory hexameters alongside the simple mention of historical figures – and the suggestion that Ennius' poetry is relevant to the question of what action should be taken in the present-day political or moral arena – implies that, for Cicero, the *Annales* represent a reflection of historical realities that he feels no need to question. The same alignment also allows him to rank Roman history and its medium directly alongside famous Greek figures whom the Roman, in the presentation here, trumps.

Pro Balbo *50–1 (56* BCE*):* Ann. *234–5*

It is not Romans alone, however, who provide the model for Roman behaviour in Cicero's deployment of the *Annales*. At *Balb*. 50–1 and *Off*. 1.38, Cicero draws the Ennian Hannibal's and the Ennian Pyrrhus' actions (respectively) to attention as of positive exemplary value. The *Pro Balbo* is a defence of the citizenship procured by Pompey, in return for assistance during the Sertorian War, for a wealthy Spaniard (and friend of Caesar's), Cornelius Balbus.[88] At § 50–1, Cicero runs through a list of Romans who had deemed it right to bestow citizenship on various of Rome's allies and whose actions thus serve as precedent for Pompey's (e.g. Pompey's father's grant of citizenship to P. Caesius, Marius' to two entire cohorts of Camertes, Sulla's to Aristo of Marseilles, etc.). The climax of this particular section comes, however, when he holds up none other than Ennius' Hannibal as model for the behaviour and sentiments Romans should aspire to:

> etenim cum ceteris praemiis digni sunt qui suo labore et periculo nostram rem publicam defendunt, tum certe dignissimi sunt qui civitate ea donentur pro qua pericula ac tela subierunt. atque utinam qui ubique sunt propugna tores huius imperi possent in hanc civitatem venire, et contra oppugnatores rei publicae de civitate exterminari! neque enim ille summus poeta noster Hannibalis illam magis cohortationem quam communem imperatoriam voluit esse:
>
> > hostem qui feriet, †erit, inquit, mi† Carthaginiensis,
> > quisquis erit. cuiatis siet, [*Ann*. 234 5]
>
> id habent hodie [*Halm*; hoc *codd*.] leve et semper habuerunt, itaque et civis undique fortis viros adsciverunt et hominum ignobilium virtutem persaepe nobilitatis inertiae praetulerunt.
>
> For in fact, though those who by their own toil and at their own peril come to the aid of our state are worthy of all possible other rewards also, they are in the first place worthy to have bestowed on them the citizenship of the state for which they have faced dangers and wars. And would that all the bulwarks of this empire wherever they are could be gathered into this state and that conversely all its assailants be banished from its territory! For that most distinguished poet of ours did not intend that Hannibal's famous exhorta tion be considered his own more than the common exhortation of all generals:
>
> > He who will strike the enemy, he said, will be a Carthaginian in my eyes, whoever he shall be. Wherever he hail from, . . .

[88] The trial took place in 56 BCE. The legal situation is described by Steel 2001: 79. On Cicero's strategy in the speech in general, see *ibid*. 98–110.

> Today too they consider this a small thing, as they always have, and so they adopted into the citizenry brave men from everywhere and preferred the courage of men of no particularly eminent rank to the sloth of the nobility.

Cicero slightly mitigates the effect of holding Hannibal up as a model for Romans by suggesting that the Carthaginian was merely exemplifying an action that Cicero would have his audience believe was routine under the circumstances. At the same time, if he summons the dignified Ennian Hannibal, with his graceful Ennian words, it is presumably because it allows him provocatively to treat Carthaginian behaviour as exemplary via a medium so familiar and so identified with the praise of Rome that it rendered his move acceptable. In the remark immediately following the quotation, Cicero further insinuates that the Romans will be neglecting their own advantage if they do not follow Hannibal's suit.

In all of this, the question of the historicity of Ennius' presentation of the past at *Ann.* 234–5 is simply removed from view. It is in a sense immaterial to Cicero's purposes, since all he needs is an image of the action he wants to encourage that presents the action as both noble and profitable. At the same time, however, part of the rhetorical force of the example is generated by the idea that Hannibal's action was in fact an historical one, one that brought real danger to Rome and one that it was in her best interests to imitate if she did not want to find herself in a similar position of disadvantage in days to come. One of the functions of the preceding list of more recent and certainly historical grants of citizenship is to imply that Hannibal's action, as represented in the *Annales*, is similar in kind, to make its historicity its cardinal feature;[89] only the identity of its agent and the language in which his words are expressed distinguishes this culminating example from the preceding ones.

De Officiis *1.38 (44* BCE*):* Ann. *183–90*

At *Off.* 1.38, Cicero quotes Pyrrhus' famous speech (*Ann.* 183–90), in the context of a discussion of the concept of a just war and of how behaviour

[89] The debate among the various editors of the *Annales* as to whether the fragment was to be connected to a speech at the Ticino battle or with Cannae, cited by Skutsch 1985: 414–5 and Flores *et al.* 2002: 236–7, responds to the temptation thus proferred by Cicero's handling of the fragment. Although the fragment would fit well into either of these contexts, we do not have the information that would enable us to adjudicate between them. Other locations in the text also remain possible; our lack of evidence does not give us the means to judge with accuracy. While it would clearly be desirable to know where the fragment belongs, Cicero's overt presentation diverts attention from questions that our evidence might allow us to answer by promoting debate of the unanswerable.

towards an enemy should vary in accordance with the stakes of the conflict (survival, or the acquisition or retention of empire).[90] Cicero chooses the Ennian Pyrrhus as an example of the less brutal sort of conflict with an enemy more worthy of respect. Once more, he unhesitatingly aligns the quotation from the *Annales* with a series of references to historical events unmediated by literature, and Ennius' representation appears as a reflection of historical realities there is no reason to question:

> cum vero de imperio decertatur belloque quaeritur gloria, causas omnino subesse tamen oportet easdem, quas dixi paulo ante iustas causas esse bellorum. sed ea bella, quibus imperii proposita gloria est, minus acerbe gerenda sunt. ut enim cum civi aliter contendimus si est inimicus, aliter si competitor (cum altero certamen honoris et dignitatis est, cum altero capitis et famae), sic cum Celtiberis, cum Cimbris bellum ut cum inimicis gereba tur, uter esset, non uter imperaret, cum Latinis, Sabinis, Samnitibus, Poenis, Pyrrho de imperio dimicabatur. Poeni foedifragi, crudelis Hannibal, reliqui iustiores. Pyrrhi quidem de captivis reddendis illa praeclara:
>
> > nec mi aurum posco nec mi pretium dederitis:
> > non cauponantes bellum sed belligerantes
> > ferro, non auro vitam cernamus utrique.
> > vosne velit an me regnare era quidve ferat Fors
> > virtute experiamur, et hoc simul accipe dictum:
> > quorum virtuti belli fortuna pepercit
> > eorundem me libertati me parcere certum est.
> > dono ducite doque volentibus cum magnis dis. [*Ann.* 183 90]
>
> Now when the contest is for empire, and glory in war is what is at stake, then still the same reasons I described just a little while ago as the just causes of wars should support any action undertaken. But those wars that aim at the glory of extended rule should be waged less bitterly. Just as we compete differently with our fellow citizens depending on whether they are actually our [personal or political] foe or simply our rival in an election (for with the one the contest is for respect and office, with the other for life and reputation), so we waged war with the Celtiberi and the Cimbri as with total enemies, to decide who would survive, not who would be in control; but with the Latins, the Sabines, the Samnites, the Carthaginians and with Pyrrhus we fought for rule. Among those, the Carthaginians were treacherous, Hannibal cruel,[91] but the rest acted with greater justice. And in fact, those words of Pyrrhus' on the return of the prisoners of war are outstanding:

[90] See Dyck 1996: 146–50.

[91] This Hannibal appears to be a generic one, i.e. not identifiably Ennian, in contrast to the specifically Ennian Hannibal of *Balb.* 50–1.

> I make no demand for gold, nor shall you give me a ransom: not in trafficking in but in waging war, with iron and not with gold, let us resolve the issue of our lives. Whether it is you or me whom lady fortune wishes should rule, or whatsoever she may bring let it be by valour that we put it to the test. And hear this word too: those to whose valour the fortune of war was kind, it is my resolve to grant their freedom. I bestow them on you take them I give them with the will of the great gods.

Thus Cicero quotes Ennius' Pyrrhus because his words illustrate so well the generosity of spirit that he wants to suggest is apt and admirable under the circumstances of this nobler kind of war.

As in the case of Hannibal at *Balb*. 50–1, an Ennian non-Roman serves Cicero just as well as a Roman for his positive exemplary value. This tends to suggest that Ennius' epic was capable of sympathetic representation regardless of national identity or personal politics, in the same way as is true of its primary model, the *Iliad*,[92] but as contradicts the popular view of the poem as partisan and nationalistic.[93] Promoting the skill and nobility of Rome's most challenging enemies serves the later Roman prose historiographical tradition well. (Sallust's Jugurtha and Catiline, the Gauls of Livy Book 5, the Hannibal of Livy 21 and the Calgacus of Tacitus' *Agricola* are among the numerous examples that will come readily to mind.) Cicero's rendition of the Hannibal and Pyrrhus of the *Annales* suggest that this manner of fostering Roman pride in the Roman past begins with Ennius.

We will later see Cicero, at *Div*. 2.115, treat Ennius' narrative of the oracle given to Pyrrhus before his invasion of the Italian peninsula (*Ann*. 167) as the very type of fictionality. The fictitiousness of the characterisation of Pyrrhus offered by the speech at *Ann*. 183–90 is just as evident as is that of the oracle at *Ann*. 167.[94] Cicero, however, has no cause to privilege that here: his interest in Ennius' useful representation here as elsewhere trumps interest in the historical reality it conceals.

[92] Cf. Elliott 2007: 39, nn. 5 and 6.

[93] That is, as regards the politics of the poem in regard to the situation internal to Rome, the reading of Ennius as *poeta cliens*, as articulated by M. Martina (Martina 1979: 13–74) and fully accepted by Skutsch, a view countered by S. Goldberg (Goldberg 1995: 114); cf. Chapter 1, n. 75. For a summary of how readings of the poem for and against Martina's thesis play themselves out, see Breed and Rossi 2006: 403–5.

[94] See Chapter 4, pp. 222–5, for the passage itself and the unmistakeable shaping of Ennius' Pyrrhus after the Achilles of *Iliad* 24.

De Re Publica *3.4–5 (51* BCE*):* Ann. *456*

At *Rep*. 3.4–5, an account of the development of civilisation is concluding with a discussion of the rise of philosophy and politics. The debate moves on to how the ideal statesman is formed and to the relative contributions that, on the one hand, Greek philosophy and, on the other, practical experience in the service of the state, on the traditional Roman model, have to make. The speaker declares that the combination, where it can be achieved, yields perfection; but that, where one practice has to be chosen over the other, the traditional Roman path is preferable. He illustrates this principle by drawing to attention past Romans whose exemplary political involvement in the state was directed simply by the *mos maiorum*. Only the first example from this list survives, M.' Curius Dentatus, whom Cicero describes exclusively in Ennian language:

> sin altera sit utra via prudentiae deligenda . . . haec civilis laudabilior est certe et illustrior, ex qua vita sic summi viri ornantur ut vel Manius Curius, 'quem nemo ferro potuit superare nec auro' [*Ann*. 456], vel * * *

> but if one of these two paths towards wisdom has to be chosen over the other . . . then certainly our native mode of public service is both more commendable and more distinguished; by such a mode of life the most exalted men win honour, as for example Manius Curius, 'whom no one was able to overcome with iron nor with gold', or . . .

According to this image, Ennius' Curius combines the valour and incorruptibility frequently touted among the foremost traditional Roman virtues. As elsewhere, it is clear that Cicero can expect his audience to acquiesce in the use of Ennius here as a source for the past, whose authority does not come into question.

At the same time, the rhetorical shaping of the line is evident: Ennius is placing Curius, Pyrrhus' contemporary and conqueror (at the battle of Beneventum in 275 BCE), into direct relationship with him.[95] In the passage Cicero quotes at *Off*. 1.38, the poet famously has Pyrrhus declare: *ferro, non auro vitam cernamus utrique* ('with iron and not with gold let us each make trial of our lives', *Ann*. 185); so that, with *Ann*. 456, Ennius appears to have

[95] Skutsch (1985: 613) suggests that the later rhetorical accounts of Curius' virtues (e.g. Val. Max. 4.3.5, cited by Skutsch) may derive from Cato, whose admiration is recorded at Plut. *Cato Mai*. 2, but that this 'need not be thought to have influenced Ennius'. I agree that Ennius is unlikely to have been currying political favour by his description of Curius, since I believe that the literary patterning that I see him effecting in his work (here between Curius and Pyrrhus) is a sufficient explanation for the presentation of Curius (or what we can see of it), but I suggest that the *Annales* are at least as likely a source of inspiration for the later rhetorical accounts as was Cato.

created a counterpoise between the virtues of the Roman general and his Greek counterpart.[96] Later authors were clearly confused about what bribe Curius was supposed to have been offered, and for what purpose,[97] which suggests that no information on the specifics was readily available. This makes it appear that Curius' resistance was an invention of Ennius' peculiar to the *Annales*: it looks like this particular expression of Curius' incorruptibility had everything to do with matching him up against Pyrrhus: it sets up a dynamic within the text but bears no necessary or obvious relation to historical reality. Cicero himself is at *Rep*. 3.4–5 making headway out of the interpretative upshot of Ennius' account in presenting the 'iron, not gold' version of incorruptibility as a (now unambiguously) Roman virtue, Curius' uncontested property.

The Pro Archia *(62* BCE*): poetry and patronage in second- and first-century Rome*

The *Pro Archia* is not a significant source for the fragments of the *Annales*,[98] and I shall therefore not discuss it at length. The grant of Roman citizenship made to Ennius and the social circumstances that engendered his poem, however, figure prominently in the case Cicero makes in favour of the poet Archias' Roman citizenship.[99] Cicero's argument is based on an extended if never explicitly articulated analogy between Archias' works and those of Ennius, on the patronage that generates them, and above all on the service that he alleges the two poets did Rome by their poetic activity.[100] Cicero's

[96] Jackson (Flores *et al*. 2009: 136) notes the similarity between the two lines but the also more general popularity of the 'with iron and not with gold' antithesis: thus Plaut. *Truc*. 929 (*auro hau ferro deterrere potes hunc ne amem*), Livy 5.49.3 (*arma aptare ferroque non auro reciperare patriam iubet*, of Camillus' response to the Gauls) and Plut. *Cam*. 29.2 (εἰπὼν ὡς σιδήρῳ πάτριόν ἐστι Ῥωμαίοις οὐ χρυσῷ τὴν πατρίδα σῴζειν). He sees the trope as thus a topos, perhaps one associated with a (hypothetical) pre-Ennian legendary Camillus, which Ennius could then have given to Pyrrhus (but why?). He rejects the idea that the Plautine line was a parody of Ennius. Given the influence of the *Annales* on Livy and on Plutarch's account of Pyrrhus (see Jackson, Flores *et al*. 2009: 136), these two later instances more probably represent responses to the *Annales* than evidence of the independent popularity of the antithesis.

[97] See Skutsch 1985: 613.

[98] The only potential quotation is at *Arch*. 18: *sanct*i *poet*ae (*Op. inc*. 19).

[99] On the date and circumstances of the case, see Steel 2001: 79–81.

[100] Thus e.g. *Arch*. 22: *carus fuit Africano superiori noster Ennius, itaque etiam in sepulcro Scipionum putatur is esse constitutus ex marmore: at eis laudibus certe non solum ipse qui laudatur sed etiam populi Romani nomen ornatur. in caelum huius proavus Cato tollitur; magnus honos populi Romani rebus adiungitur. omnes denique illi Maximi, Marcelli, Fulvii non sine communi omnium nostrum laude decorantur. ergo illum qui haec fecerat Rudinum hominem maiores nostri in civitatem receperunt; nos hunc Heracliensem multis civitatibus expetitum, in hac autem legibus constitutum de nostra civitate eiciamus?* On Cicero's equation of Archias and Ennius (or Homer), see *ibid*. On the reasons for scepticism towards what Cicero says or implies about Ennius, see Zetzel 2007: 8–13.

aim in creating the analogy with the circumstances he vaguely conjures up for Ennius' poetic activity and Archias' is to disassociate the latter from the (restricted) model of poetic patronage that held in his day and to suggest instead that an entirely different model of patronage and its ensuing social benefits was relevant in Archias' case, too: one in which the interests of the state as a whole, and not those of any individual patron, were served by the poet's work.[101]

Cicero's immediate success in winning the case is, presumably, due in some part to this strategy. In terms of modern readings of Ennius' social circumstances, however, the same strategy ironically produced results that are directly opposed to what Cicero aimed for with his original audience. For Cicero planned that his picture of Ennian circumstances and activity be taken by his contemporaries as a model for interpreting Archias' place in Roman society. In modern readings of Ennius, Cicero's representation has, in the absence of hard evidence for how second-century Roman patronage operated, led instead to the retrojection of the client–patron relationship of Archias' day onto Ennius. It is thus largely responsible for the reading of Ennius as *poeta cliens* on the model of Archias.[102] Thus, Cicero's attempt to have the (real or assumed) circumstances of Ennius' poetic activity blot out Archias' known historical circumstances has in this instance ended up intruding on what Cicero would have us believe of the circumstances under which the *Annales* (and, should we let him have his way, Archias' works, too) were composed.

In the passages above, we have seen Cicero present the *Annales* as a quasi-documentary record of past events at Rome, or alternatively as preferable to the documentary record itself. We have also seen him promote the exemplary value of Roman and enemy actions. We turn now to two examples in which Cicero uses the established cultural prestige of the *Annales* to suggest that the text is able to provide access to mysterious truths about the operation of the universe.

De Re Publica *1.25 (51* BCE*):* Ann. *153*

At *Rep*. 1.25, Cicero's speaker, Scipio, treats the *Annales* as a repository of arcane as well as highly accurate facts about the cosmos, as capable as the

[101] On Cicero's strategy of removing Archias' immediate patrons, L. Lucullus and Q. Metellus, from view, see Steel 2001: 84, 86–7, 90–1. On Cicero's presentation of Ennius' poetry as of communal value and correspondingly of Archias as instrumental in his day to the public promotion of the achievements not of individual Romans but of the state as a whole, see Damon 1997: 268–76.

[102] See n. 93, p. 169.

foremost politicians and most respected sages of the ancient world of freeing people from ignorance and superstition:

> atque eius modi quiddam etiam bello illo maximo, quod Athenienses et Lacedaemonii summa inter se contentione gesserunt, Pericles ille et auctor itate et eloquentia et consilio princeps civitatis suae, cum obscurato sole tenebrae factae essent repente Atheniensiumque animos summus timor occupavisset, docuisse civis suos dicitur, id quod ipse ab Anaxagora cuius auditor fuerat acceperat, certo illud tempore fieri et necessario, cum tota se luna sub orbem solis subiecisset; itaque etsi non omni intermenstruo, tamen id fieri non posse nisi intermenstruo tempore. quod cum disputando ration ibusque docuisset, populum liberavit metu; erat enim tum haec nova et incognita ratio, solem lunae oppositu solere deficere, quod Thaletem Milesium primum vidisse dicunt. id autem postea ne nostrum quidem Ennium fugit; qui ut scribit, anno quinquagesimo CCC fere post Romam conditam 'Nonis Iunis soli luna obstitit et nox' [*Ann.* 153]. atque hac in re tanta inest ratio atque sollertia, ut ex hoc die quem apud Ennium et in maximis annalibus consignatum videmus superiores solis defectiones repu tatae sint usque ad illam quae Nonis Quinctilibus fuit regnante Romulo;[103] quibus quidem Romulum tenebris etiam si natura ad humanum exitum abripuit, virtus tamen dicitur in caelum sustinuisse.

> They say that, during that great war which the Athenians and the Spartans waged with unparalleled strife against each other, the famous Pericles, he who by legal title and because of his rhetorical power and his wise advice was leader of his state, informed his fellow citizens of something of the same sort [as Galus' explanation of the lunar eclipse of 21 June 168 to the army in Macedonia, as described by Scipio in the previous chapter].[104] When once the sun was veiled and there was all of a sudden darkness and the Athenians' hearts were seized with utter terror, he told them what he had himself heard from Anaxagoras, whose student he had been: that such an occurrence took place at fixed and unavoidable intervals, when the moon in its entirety inserted itself in front of the circular sun; and that, even if it didn't take place at every new moon, still it couldn't happen except at a new moon. Once he had convinced them of this with his arguments and calculations, he freed the people from fear; for at that time the knowledge that the sun is habitually eclipsed when the moon blocks it something they say Thales of Miletus was the first to recognise was still fresh and unfamiliar. Later on, our own Ennius too was quite well aware of this; and as he writes, in about the 350th year after the foundation of Rome, 'on the Nones [5th] of June, the moon and night obscured the sun'. And in this matter there is such expert reckoning that, from this day which we see recorded in Ennius and in the *Annales Maximi*, earlier eclipses of the sun have been retroactively calculated

[103] See Chapter 1, n. 20. [104] See Zetzel 1995: 115–16.

> all the way back until the one which took place on the Nones [7th] of July in the reign of Romulus; and in the darkness of that eclipse, though it may be that nature in the order of things bore him off to the end of his human existence, yet his worth, it is said, raised him up to the skies.

Ennius is here aligned in stature and authority with both Thales and with Pericles, while the contents of his text vie in accuracy with – are indeed given priority over – the priestly lore of the *Annales Maximi*.[105] By thus ranking Ennius alongside the most prestigious sources of scientific, political and priestly knowledge of the ancient world, and ensuring that both his *Annales* and the *Annales Maximi* get a look-in alongside established Greek authorities, Cicero works powerfully to enhance the ideological status of the *Annales* as a whole.

Cicero's insistence on the accuracy of Ennius' language bears a lot of weight in support of Ennius' place amid the august company of Cicero's argument. Yet, even as Cicero ensconces *Ann*. 153 in this loaded setting, his language raises issues about that vaunted accuracy: if Ennius' text was indeed so accurate,[106] why does Cicero (or his source) not give us the poet's own terminology for 'the 350th year after the foundation of Rome'?[107] Was it evident to Cicero which year Ennius took as the date of Rome's foundation?[108] Why *fere*, which seems directly to contradict the insistence on accuracy?[109] Cicero attributes to Ennius knowledge that it is

[105] Cf. Chapter 1, pp. 23–30.

[106] Skutsch 1985: 311 points out that the eclipse took place at sunset; thus, for him, even *luna . . . et nox* represent literal detail. This detail with its putative literal accuracy then becomes the basis for further reasoning about the dating: 'Most of the alternative dates proposed are unsuitable because the eclipses in question did not occur at sunset . . .' (*ibid.*).

[107] Skutsch argues against the possibility that Ennius used *a.u.c.* dating (*ibid.* 316, on *condita Roma est* at *Ann*. 155; so too Frier 1999: 116). He therefore does not believe that Cicero's *anno quinquagesimo CCC fere post Romam conditam* reflects Ennius' language (Skutsch 1985: 312; cf. Cornell 1995: 405, n. 35). The only possible trace of *a.u.c.* dating to survive in the *Annales* is at *Ann*. 154–5, *septingenti sunt, paulo plus aut minus, anni/augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est*. We do not need to assume, on the basis of so scanty a record or trusting in our understanding of the implications of the poem's title, that the poet would exclusively have used consular dating. All we can conclude from the likelihood that Cicero is not here using Ennius' dating-mechanism is that for some reason he preferred another. (Cornell 1995 suggests the possibility that someone in the late Republic added *a.u.c.* dates to the year-entries in the *Annales Maximi*; if so, Cicero may have adopted these.) It might imply that Ennius' terms were unclear to Cicero or might have been unclear to his audience and that this motivated him to re-write them as best he understood them.

[108] See Chapter 1, p. 65, on the state of our information about Ennius' foundation-date. We have no information about what the city's foundation-date according to Ennius appeared to Cicero to be.

[109] Skutsch suggests that it 'may be intended to cover the slight discrepancy between the Polybian era (750 BC), which [Cicero] still follows in the *de re publica*, and the Varronian era (753 BC) which he begins to use in the *Brutus*, possibly also the Capitoline era (752 BC)'or '[a]lternatively it may . . . be merely a stylistic device to avoid the impression of pedantry in the dialogue'(Skutsch 1985: 312). Zetzel suggests that 'it may reflect genuine uncertainty about the chronology' (Zetzel 1995: 116).

neither evident nor likely that he possessed or communicated. The general cultural visibility and esteem in which the *Annales* were held, and which Cicero routinely promotes, are presumably what allows him to do this.

De Natura Deorum *2.4–5 (45* BCE*):* Ann. *592*

At *Nat. D.* 2.4–5, the speakers (Velleius, Cotta, Balbus and Lucilius) are debating how to tackle the question of the existence and nature of divinity and of the extent of its concerns (*Nat. D.* 2.3). Lucilius suggests that the first matter, the existence of divinity (the only part of the argument to concern us here), is indisputable and so not in need of discussion. He does so largely on the basis of Ennius' words, in both a tragedy and in the *Annales*:

> quid enim potest esse tam apertum tamque perspicuum, cum caelum suspeximus caelestiaque contemplati sumus, quam esse aliquod numen praestantissimae mentis quo haec regantur? quod ni ita esset, qui potuisset adsensu omnium dicere Ennius [*Thyestes* 301 J]: 'aspice hoc sublime candens, quem invocant omnes Iovem' illum vero et Iovem et dominatorem rerum et omnia nutu regentem, et, ut idem Ennius, 'patrem divumque hominum que' [*Ann.* 592] et praesentem ac praepotentem deum. quod qui dubitet, haud sane intellego cur non idem sol sit an nullus sit dubitare possit; qui enim est hoc illo evidentius?
>
> What could be more manifest or more transparent, when we look up at the sky and survey the heavenly bodies, than that some supremely intelligent divine will exists to govern them? If that were not the case, how could Ennius with everyone's approval have said, 'Behold the brightness above us, which all call upon as Jove' the same Jove who is lord of the universe and governs all things with his nod and who is, as Ennius also says, 'the father of gods and men', a god both present to us and supremely powerful. If anyone doubts this, I am confused as to why he does not also doubt whether or not the sun exists; for how is its existence plainer than divinity's?

Here, Cicero has his speaker in the first place translate the popularity of Ennius' *Thyestes* (cf. *adsensu omnium*) into unanimous acceptance of the identification of Jupiter with the sky. He presents as a philosophical doctrine, and indeed as proof, Ennius' conventional tragic parlance. The image of the supreme god the speaker Lucilius has in mind is filled out with a hexametric phrase presumably from the *Annales*. Ennius' authority is thus effectively used, casually and in passing, to resolve the question of the existence of divinity for Cicero's purposes at the start of *Nat. D.* 2. It is a testament not only to Cicero's deftness as a rhetorician but also to the cultural status that made Ennius' words into a powerful rhetorical device

that Cicero was so casually able to harness Ennius' words in the service of his speaker's doubt-ridden philosophical argument.

De Oratore *1.197–8 (55* BCE*),* De Re Publica *1.30 (51* BCE*),* Tusc. Disp. *1.18 (45* BCE*):* Ann. *329*

Cicero quotes *Ann.* 329 three times in his surviving works, and in each case the implication is that the *Annales* offer an undistorted reflection of the past – a past essentially contemporary with Ennius, though Cicero does not comment on the point. The three quotations thus serve to bolster the text's general authority. *Ann.* 329 describes the jurisconsult Sextus Aelius Paetus (cos. 198) in flattering terms: *egregie cordatus homo, catus Aelius Sextus* ('that outstandingly wise man, sharp Sextus Aelius').[110]

At *De or.* 1.197–8, Cicero is eager to advance the claims to respect that Roman law and knowledge of the law have over the tomes of Greek philosophy. The speaker, Crassus, suggests both that Roman law is inherently superior to the law of other societies and that one of the points in which Roman society surpasses Greek society is in its respect for those who command the law. By way of example, he points to Ennius' celebration of Aelius, which he says is a response to the man's knowledge of the law: *ille, qui propter hanc iuris civilis scientiam sic appellatus a summo poeta est:* [*Ann.* 329] ('he who on account of precisely this knowledge of civil law was hailed thus by our greatest poet: [*Ann.* 329]'). Ennius' line thus figures as a fitting tribute to the man, a token of the recognition offered by Roman society at large to a person who so admirably embodied one of its cardinal values. Ennius' expression is by Crassus' implication representative of general opinion and his authority unquestionable; possible alternative points of view about Aelius are out of view.

We do not know the context for the second instance of quotation of the line, at *Rep.* 1.30, for the *folium* immediately preceding the quotation is missing. We know only that the discussion of which our passage is the first extant piece introduces the work's principal subject, the nature of the *res publica*.[111] What we have is this: * *in ipsius paterno genere fuit noster ille amicus, dignus huic ad imitandum*[112] [*Ann.* 329], *qui 'egregie cordatus' et 'catus' fuit et ab Ennio dictus est non quod ea quaerebat quae numquam inveniret, sed*

[110] For Sextus Aelius, including the Homerising poetic licence Ennius claims in order to reverse the normal order of the man's *praenomen* and gentilician, see Skutsch 1985: 504–6.

[111] Zetzel 1995: 120.

[112] Here again Cicero promotes the exemplary value of the actions and characters described in the *Annales*.

quod ea respondebat quae eos qui quaesissent et cura et negotio solverent ('. . . belonging to his father's family was that illustrious friend of mine, an ideal model for this young man here [*Ann.* 329], who was "outstandingly wise" and "sharp" and was described as such by Ennius not because he was on a search primarily characterised by its futility but because his legal advice was such as to free his clients from anxiety and trouble'). The phrase *qui . . . fuit et ab Ennio dictus est* succinctly equates historical reality and Ennius' representation of it. Besides this, Cicero's use of the indicative in *quaerebat* and *respondebat* translates what is pure inference – from the text of the *Annales*? – into 'fact'.[113]

At *Tusc. Disp.* 1.18, the final occurrence of *Ann.* 329 in Cicero, the topic is what death is; whether the soul or mind (*animus*) departs the body at the moment of death; and what the *animus* is. Hence the reflection: *aliis cor ipsum animus videtur, ex quo 'excordes', 'vecordes' 'concordes'que dicuntur, et Nasica ille prudens bis consul 'Corculum' et* [*Ann.* 329] ('some think the *animus* is nothing other than the heart, and that this is why the expressions "mindless" ["those who have lost their heart"] and "insane" ["heartless"] and "of one mind" ["of one heart"] exist, and why the famously judicious Nasica who was twice consul was called "little heart" and why the line exists "the outstandingly wise ["hearted"] man, sharp Sextus Aelius" [*Ann.* 329]').[114] Ennius' use of language appears here as evidence for the validity of a particular metaphysical belief (cf. Cicero's use of *Ann.* 592 at *Nat. D* 2.4–5, discussed on pp. 175–6). Cicero operates on the assumption that the description of Aelius offers an undistorted view of the man, equivalent to the snapshot of public response given by Nasica's popular sobriquet *Corculum*. The fact that Ennius' unusual adjective *cordatus* is treated as parallel to the popular use of the adjectives *excordes*, *vecordes* and *concordes* gives the poet's use of language, extraordinary as it was, normative status. At the same time, the quotation is inserted into a passage in which Cicero reviews diverse philosophical schools' positions on death (those of the Epicureans, the Stoics, Empedocles),[115] which further elevates the status of Ennius' expression in Cicero's presentation (cf. Cicero's equation of the *Annales* with the advice of Pericles, the insight of Thales and the authority of the *Annales Maximi* at *Rep.* 1.25).

[113] Cf. Zetzel 1995: 121: 'the indicative is unusual in reporting inferences at second hand (cf. H–S 588), and emphasises the truth of what is said'.

[114] Varro, too, knows the line; see p. 143 (with n. 25). Because his interest focuses on the interpretation of a single word, however, he in no way directs us as to how to read the line as a whole.

[115] See Rockwood 1966: 17–22.

De Re Publica *1.64 (51* BCE*):* Ann. *105–9*

In describing Aelius, Ennius was describing a man of his own generation with whom he may have had personal contact. Elsewhere, however, Cicero has his speakers treat Ennius' descriptions even of the remote past as accurate reflections of what happened,[116] including of what pre-historic persons did and felt. At *Rep*. 1.64, Cicero's Scipio quotes a passage from Ennius' description of the City's very early history. We again cannot tell the context because the *folium* that would provide it is missing; we know only that there is an emphasis on the need for justice.[117] The passage as we have it runs thus:

> *iusto quidem rege cum est populus orbatus, 'pectora' diu 'tenet desiderium' [*Ann*. 105], sicut ait Ennius, post optimi regis obitum:
>
> simul inter
> sese sic memorant: 'o Romule, Romule die,
> qualem te patriae custodem di genuerunt!
> o pater, o genitor, o sanguen dis oriundum!' [*Ann*. 105 8]
>
> non eros nec dominos appellabant eos quibus iuste paruerunt, denique ne reges quidem, sed patriae custodes, sed patres, sed deos, nec sine causa. quid enim adiungunt?
>
> 'tu produxisti nos intra luminis oras.' [*Ann*. 109]
>
> vitam honorem decus sibi datum esse iustitia regis existimabant. mansisset eadem voluntas in eorum posteris, si regum similitudo permansisset; sed vides unius iniustitia concidisse genus illud totum rei publicae.

> . . . when the people were bereaved of their truly just king, then for a long time 'longing gripped their hearts', as Ennius says, after the excellent king's death:
>
> and then all together among themselves they said: 'O Romulus, god like Romulus, what a guardian of our fatherland the gods brought forth in you! O father, o sire, o bloodline sprung from the gods!'
>
> They did not call those whom they had duly obeyed lords or master, nor indeed kings, but guardians of their fatherland, fathers, gods and were quite right to do so. For what do they go on to say?
>
> 'You brought us forth into the regions of light.'
>
> They felt that it was through the king's clemency that life, distinction, honour were in their grasp. The same feeling would have remained among their descendants, had kings too preserved a likeness to their forerunners; but you see that, through one individual's wickedness, that entire type of governance has fallen.

[116] Cf. the treatment of *Ann*. 197–8 at *Div*. 2.116, discussed on pp. 189–93. [117] See Zetzel 1995: 150.

The distortion that Cicero effects by having Scipio suggest that the lines are evidence for Romulus' apotheosis has not gone unnoticed: even though no one in the Ciceronian text objects, commentators on the passage have seen that Ennius clearly does not present the Romans as revering Romulus as a god.[118] Not only is the combined authority of Ennius and Scipio here used to support the idea of Romulus' divinity;[119] the status associated with them is used to distract attention away from Cicero's own sleight of hand.

The effectiveness of Cicero's (deliberate) misreading of the passage shows in how Lactantius Firmianus, whose quotations of the *Annales* derive exclusively from Cicero,[120] later treats *Ann.* 106–9. At *Inst.* 1.15, Lactantius is concerned to demonstrate to his audience how Greek, Egyptian, Macedonian, Carthaginian, Sabine, Latin and Roman gods came to be worshipped by artificial processes that show that they were not gods at all. When he comes to Quirinus, he uses Cicero's quotation of *Ann.* 106–9 to 'prove' the intensity of the people's grief over the loss of Romulus. This grief, he has it, made them excessively credulous and thus willing to believe that Romulus had been transformed into the god Quirinus:

> nam Romulum desiderio suis fuisse declarat Ennius, apud quem populus amissum regem dolens haec loquitur: [*Ann.* 106 9]
> ob hoc desiderium facilius creditum est Iulio Proculo mentienti, qui sub ornatus a patribus, ut nuntiaret plebi vidisse se regem humano habitu augustiorem eumque mandasse ad populum, ut sibi delubrum fiere, se deum esse et Quirinum vocari, quo facto et ipsi populo persuasit Romulum ad deos abisse et senatum suspicione caedis regiae liberavit. [*Inst.* 1.15.31 3]

> For Ennius tells us that Romulus' people missed him. In his work, the people in their grief over the loss of the king say the following words: [*Ann.* 106 9] On account of this grief the people more readily believed the lie of Julius Proculus, whom the senators had secretly incited to tell the people that he had seen the king in a guise more reverend than human appearance allowed and that Romulus had sent instructions to the people to make him a shrine and the message that he was a god called Quirinus. By this act, Proculus both persuaded the people that Romulus had gone to join the gods and he cleared the senate of the suspicion that they had been responsible for the king's murder.

[118] See Skutsch 1985: 256 and Cole 2006: 538. For another instance of Cicero's use of the *Annales* as 'evidence' for Romulus' divinity, see *Tusc. Disp.* 1.27–8, discussed by Cole (*ibid.* 533–6). Cole draws attention to the 'exceptional role' Cicero assigns to the *Annales* by treating the text as a reflection of Roman religious attitudes entirely on a par with pontifical law and traditional Roman burial rites.

[119] Cole 2006: 539. [120] Skutsch 1985: 28.

Lactantius' argument thus depends on acceptance of Ennius' description as the true account of real people's experience. Lactantius may in any case have been disposed to a naive reading, but Cicero's treatment of the *Annales* as a transparent text in the *De Re Publica* both enabled and encouraged the persistence of such reading practice in late antiquity and beyond.

We turn now to two instances (*Brut.* 71 and *Acad. Pr.* 2.88) in which Cicero uses material assigned by modern editors to the proems of Books 7 (*Ann.* 207–9) and 1 (*Ann.* 4), respectively. Although these quotations deal (apparently) with literary historical questions, Cicero nevertheless treats the first as a reliable reflection of past historical realities and the second as 'proof' of the trustworthiness of prophetic dreams. (We shall presently see that the latter use contrasts with the approach Cicero has his speakers take to Ennian dreams in the final set of passages we will examine, from the *De Divinatione*, where more signs of scepticism are apparent.)

Brutus *71 (46* BCE*):* Ann. *207–9*

At *Brut.* 71, the speaker, identified with Cicero himself, makes the famous argument that history shows that all art-forms develop in a teleological manner from initial roughness to ultimate perfection. As 'proof' for his argument, he quotes the famous group of lines from the proem to *Annals* 7 in which Ennius, according to Cicero's implication, describes the Roman poetic landscape as it was before he came on the scene:

> et nescio an reliquis in rebus omnibus idem eveniat: nihil est enim simul et inventum et perfectum; nec dubitari debet quin fuerint ante Homerum poetae, quod ex eis carminibus intellegi potest, quae apud illum et in Phaeacum et in procorum epulis canuntur. quid, nostri veteres versus ubi sunt?
>
> quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant,
> cum neque Musarum scopulos. . .
> nec dicti studiosus quisquam erat ante hunc [*Ann.* 207 9]
>
> ait ipse de se nec mentitur in gloriando: sic enim sese res habet. nam et *Odyssia* Latina est sic [in] tamquam opus aliquod Daedali et Livianae fabulae non satis dignae quae iterum legantur.

> I rather think that the same thing is true in other matters also, for nothing was both invented and perfected at the same time; nor should one doubt that there were poets before Homer, as can be seen from those songs sung in Homer at the Phaeacians' feasts and those of the princes. And what of our own old poetry which once 'Fauns and prophets sang', when 'neither the mountain of the Muses' 'nor was anyone devoted to learning before the present author' as he says of himself, nor is his boast untrue: for that's the fact

> of the matter. For the Latin *Odyssey* is for its part like some sort of product of Daedalus', and Livius' dramas are not worth reading a second time.

Ennius' own ideological footwork and self-promotion under the banner of literary historical progress at *Ann.* 207–9 has attracted considerable attention.[121] That self-promotion is abrasive enough to prompt Cicero to a touch of defensiveness on the poet's behalf – without, however, his also alluding to the vulnerability of Ennius' claims lurking beneath his aggressiveness, or suggesting that other perspectives were possible. Because the text (or Cicero's reading of the text) suits his argument so well, Cicero has no motivation to present to his audience any alternative source or judgement that would contradict Ennius' authority here. Just as we have seen with historical and metaphysical matters, with literary historical matters, too, Cicero capitalises on the general cultural status of the *Annales* to present Ennius' authority – on behalf of Cicero's arguments – as incontrovertible.

Academica Priora *2.88 (45* BCE*):* Ann. *4*

At *Acad. Pr.* 2.88, Ennius' description of his dream-encounter with Homer at the start of the *Annales* (we assume)[122] figures as 'evidence' for the assertion that dream-appearances can be trusted just as much as waking experience. At *Acad. Pr.* 2.51, the speaker, Lucullus, had suggested that the common response to dreams, once they are identified as such, is, rightly, to despise them and to rank them far below waking experiences. Indeed, Ennius' use of language once again figures as 'proof' for Cicero's speaker: Lucullus suggests that Ennius' use of the deponent form *videor* as opposed to the active *video* at *Ann.* 3, *visus Homerus adesse poeta* ('the great poet Homer seemed to be present'), shows that Ennius, too, adopted this dismissive attitude towards dreams – since he wouldn't have adopted such an expression in describing his waking experiences.[123] The response to this comes at *Acad. Pr.* 2.88, where the speaker, who is invested with authority

[121] See Conte 1984: 128–9 and Hinds 1998: 52–74.

[122] We have no more evidence about the origin of *Ann.* 4 than appears in the passage here. It makes sense, however, to correlate what Cicero says with the remarks of the the scholiasts to Horace and Persius (see Appendix Tables A5.26 and A5.41). The line is also quoted by 'Don.' Ter. *Eun.* 560; see Appendix Table A5.3, p. 367.

[123] *Acad. Pr.* 2.51: *omnium deinde inanium visorum una depulsio est, sive illa cogitatione informantur, quod fieri solere concedimus, sive in quiete sive per vinum sive per insaniam. nam ab omnibus eius modi visis perspicuitatem, quam mordicus tenere debemus, abesse dicemus. quis enim, cum sibi fingit aliquid et cogitatione depingit, non simul ac se ipse commovit atque ad se revocavit, sentit quid intersit inter perspicua et inania? eadem ratio est somniorum. num censes Ennium cum in hortis cum Servio Galba vicino suo ambulavisset, dixisse 'visus sum mihi cum Galba ambulare'? at, cum somniavit, ita narravit:*

by his identification with Cicero, suggests that the point is not to distinguish retrospectively between dreaming and waking experiences but lies in the impact dreams have at the time of their occurrence. He counters Lucullus' use of Ennius with some of his own:

> dormientium et vinulentorum et furiosorum visa imbecilliora esse dicebas quam vigilantium siccorum sanorum. quo modo? quia, cum experrectus esset Ennius, non diceret se vidisse Homerum, sed visum esse, Alcmaeo autem 'sed mihi neutiquam cor consentit . . . ' [*Alc.* 21 J]. similia de vinu lentis. quasi quisquam neget et qui experrectus sit, eum somnia reri, et cuius furor consederit, putare non fuisse ea vera quae essent sibi visa in furore. sed non id agitur: tum, cum videbantur, quo modo viderentur, id quaeritur. nisi vero Ennium non putamus ita totum illud audivisse 'o pietas animi' [*Ann.* 4], si modo id somniavit, ut si vigilans audiret. experrectus enim potuit illa visa putare, ut erant, et somnia. dormienti vero aeque ac vigilanti probabantur. quid? Iliona somno illo 'mater, te apello' [Pacuv. *Iliona* 195 R] nonne ita credit filium locutum, ut experrecta etiam crederet? unde enim illa: 'age adsta: mane, audi, iteradum eadem istaec mihi' [Pacuv. *Iliona* 202 R]? num videtur minorem habere visis quam vigilantes fidem?

> You were suggesting that the impressions of those sleeping or drunk or in the grips of frenzy were not as trustworthy as those that come to the waking, the sober and the sane. And why? On the grounds that, after Ennius woke up, he didn't say that he had seen Homer but that he thought he had; while Alcmaeon for his part said, 'But in no wise does my mind agree . . .'. And you made a similar point about those who are drunk. As if anyone would deny either that, after a person has woken, he realises that it was a dream or that, once a man's frenzy has left him, he understands that what had appeared to him in his frenzy was not real. But that is not what is at issue; rather what concerns us is how their perceptions appeared at the time they had them. Unless of course we don't think that Ennius really heard that entire speech 'O reverend spirit' quite in the same way as if he had heard it while he was awake, just because he dreamt it. Once he had woken up, he was at liberty to realise that it was all a dream vision, as in fact it was. Yet he trusted it equally when he was asleep and when he was awake. And here again: did Iliona not in her dream, 'Mother, I call on you. . .', so firmly believe that her son had spoken to her that, even after she had woken up, she continued to believe? Isn't that why she said, 'Come now, stay with me: wait, listen, tell me again what you just said'. Does she then seem to have less trust in what she saw than a waking person would?

'visus Homerus adesse poeta' [*Ann.* 3]. *idemque in* Epicharmo*: 'nam videbar somniare med ego esse mortuom'* [*V.* 45 V]. *itaque, simul ut experrecti sumus, visa illa contemnimus neque ita habemus, ut ea, quae in foro gessimus.*

Cicero, then, treats the figurative language Ennius uses to describe his engagement with his literary predecessors as the description of a lived experience – just as, at *Ann.* 207–9, he had treated it as the description of a literary historical matter of fact. In the speaker's presentation, that Ennius trusted his dream sufficiently to recount it serves as authority for the reliability of supposedly analogous occurrences. The very countering of Ennius with Ennius reflects that (regularly), in Cicero's construction, there is no authority supervening the statements of the *Annales* – in Cicero's own use and interpretation.

We will see Cicero take a very different approach to Ennian dreams from that adopted at *Acad. Pr.* 2.88, at *Div.* 1.39–43, to be discussed on pp. 186–90. Cicero quotes the *Annales* on three different occasions in the *De Divinatione*, and the work is the single richest source for Ennius' epic we possess. Over the course of the three passages, Cicero quotes 40 lines of the *Annales*, over 6 per cent of the poem's extant remains. In the first passage we will consider, *Div.* 1.107–8, Cicero's presentation overtly bolsters Ennius' authority in a manner analogous to what we have regularly seen above, although he also introduces a mild ambiguity. In the other two passages, *Div.* 1.39–43 and 2.115–16, contrary to the majority of instances, the speakers bring the fictionalising qualities of Ennius' narrative sharply to attention. At the same time, even as the speakers point fingers at Ennius' fabrication of his material, the situation is complicated by subtle suggestions of the *Annales*' underlying historicity.

De Divinatione *(43* BCE*)*

Div. *1.107–8:* Ann. *72–91*

At *Div.* 1.107–8, Cicero's speaker Quintus is arguing in defence of the trustworthiness of traditional Roman religious practices. He presents Ennius' account of the augurate of Romulus and Remus (*Ann.* 72–91) as the climactic instance of the time-hallowed practice of divination. Ennius numbers among the *certi* (the 'sure authorities') who are responsible for the transmission of the account. His narrative both guarantees, as it were, and adorns the notion that 'the most exalted statesman of the most powerful civilised nation used augury'.[124] Quintus suggests that it was impossible that Romulus and Remus, as early and ingenuous individuals, should have set about deceiving the population by staging a false augury (as the argument of Cicero's sceptical speaker, Marcus, would have it). Instead, he suggests, the

[124] Wardle 2006: 365–6.

difficulty of understanding augury's arcane lore was what explained people's hostility to the practice (105–6). He continues:

> atque ille Romuli auguratus pastoralis non urbanus fuit, nec fictus ad opiniones imperitorum sed a certis acceptus et posteris traditus. itaque Romulus augur, ut apud Ennium est, cum fratre item augure:[125]
>
> curantes magna cum cura tum cupientes
> regni dant operam simul auspicioque augurioque.
> in †monte Remus auspicio sedet atque secundam
> solus avem servat. at Romulus pulcer in alto
> quaerit Aventino, servat genus altivolantum.
> certabant urbem Romam Remoramne vocarent.
> omnibus cura viris uter esset induperator.
> expectant veluti consul quom mittere signum
> volt, omnes avidi spectant ad carceris oras
> quam mox emittat pictos e faucibus currus:
> sic expectabat populus atque ore timebat
> rebus utri magni victoria sit data regni.
> interea sol albus recessit in infera noctis.
> exin candida se radiis dedit icta foras lux
> et simul ex alto longe pulcerrima praepes
> laeva volavit avis. simul aureus exoritur sol
> cedunt de caelo ter quattuor corpora sancta
> avium, praepetibus sese pulcrisque locis dant.
> conspicit inde sibi data Romulus esse propritim
> auspicio regni stabilita scamna solumque.
>
> And that famous augurate of Romulus was that of a shepherd, not that of a city slicker. It wasn't fabricated to satisfy fools' expectations but rather treated by reliable authorities and passed down to posterity. And so Romulus, as augur, as it says in Ennius, with his brother likewise as augur:
>
> then with utmost concern, in great eagerness for rule, they lend their attention together to auspice and augury. Remus takes his seat on ?the hill? for the auspicate and in isolation waits for a bird to portend success. Excellent Romulus, for his part, conducts his search on the lofty Aventine and keeps watch for the race of high flying birds. At stake was whether they would call the city Rome or Remora. Every man's attention was engaged on the question of who would be leader. They waited, just as when the consul is about to give the sign, and all gaze eagerly at the barriers of the starting posts, to see how soon he will release the painted chariots from their maw: just so did the people wait, with apprehension for the future in their faces, to see which of

[125] Pease on *a certis acceptus* notes that Cic. *Rep.* 2.16 works on the assumption of a similarly early date for the beginnings of augury; see Pease 1920 for the different interpretation of the origins of augury available in Livy (4.4.2, 10.6.6) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (2.64.4).

> the two would be granted the prize of lordly rule. Meanwhile, the glittering sun retreated to the recesses of night. Then, a bright light, struck forth by [the sun's] rays, revealed itself, and at that moment from on high a flock portending exceptional success flew by on the left. As soon as the golden sun rose, twelve holy avian beings came down from the sky and betook themselves to lofty and propitious regions. Thus Romulus saw that strong founded rule was granted as his personal right and confirmed by the auspicate.

For the speakers of this dialogue, then, Ennius' account serves as the equivalent of an historical datum, rather like the instances we saw above at *Brut.* 57–60 (on Cornelius Cethegus' rhetorical skills) or *Rep.* 1.64's use of *Ann.* 105–9 (the lines on Romulus' 'apotheosis'), among others. Elsewhere, Cicero has his speakers argue that epic accounts of the City's pre-history in particular are manifestly fabulous (*Leg.* 1.5; see Chapter 4, pp. 202–5). That point of view would not serve Quintus' argument here and is kept entirely out of view.

There is, however, one possible ambiguity Cicero allows Quintus to introduce. The phrase *ut apud Ennium est* in this context primarily means 'as we can see from Ennius', and is one of the mechanisms by which Quintus communicates his assumption that *Ann.* 72–91 faithfully reflects past events. In this, its primary function, it is fairly closely equivalent to Varro's frequent *ut ait Ennius* ('as Ennius says') – a straightforward use, since Varro's focus is routinely on Ennius' vocabulary. At the same time, however, the limiting function of *ut* also lies latent: the meaning 'at least as Ennius has it' might also surface, depending on the audience's capacity for scepticism.[126] Thus this single phrase well captures an ambiguity that the other approaches to the *Annales* in the *De Divinatione* amplify.

Div. *1.39–43:* Ann. *34–50*

At *Div.* 1.39–43, Cicero has his speaker, Quintus, refer to a series of four prophetic dreams which serve him as illustrations of the validity and utility of such occurrences: (1) the dream the mother of Dionysius I of Syracuse (*c.* 430–368 BCE) was reputed to have had when she was pregnant with him, a dream Quintus says was recounted by Philistus of Syracuse (*c.* 430–356

[126] Cicero also uses the phrase *ut apud Ennium* at *Div.* 1.40 and 1.88 (see Pease 1920: 164 and 280–1). The latter instance occurs in a context where Quintus – rather unusually for a Ciceronian speaker – contradicts the version of events Ennius gives, albeit in a tragedy. The quotation there describes the seers Amphiaraus and Teiresias as profiteers, which was not going to suit the *pro*-divination speaker's line of argument. It might be from the *Telamon* (Zillinger 1911: 119, cited by Pease *ibid.* 250). Vahlen tends to agree, but places the line among the *trag. inc.* [394 V²], as do Ribbeck [364 R] and Jocelyn [343 J].

BCE); (2) Ilia's dream (*Ann.* 34–50); (3) Hecuba's dream in Ennius' *Alexander* (*Alex.* 50–61 J); (4) a dream of Aeneas' retailed in the 'Greek annals' of Fabius Pictor, which successfully foretold all of his vicissitudes to come. Quintus repeatedly emphasises the fictional nature of the Ennian dreams (alone). This emphasis is curious in as much as it in no way serves Quintus' argument: he intends all the examples of prophetic dreams he cites to serve equally as reasons for confidence in such occurrences. He seems to draw attention to the fictitiousness of Ennius' accounts as a point made for its own sake and to assume that it entails no damage to his case. The very fact that Ennius elevated the stories by including them in his narratives, alongside their alleged verisimilitude, seems to confer sufficient status on them for them to serve as validation for his argument. Moreover, the Ennian passages are, unlike the stories from Philistus or Fabius Pictor, thrown into relief by full quotation. The passage runs thus:

> [39] sed omittamus oracula; veniamus ad somnia. de quibus disputans Chrysippus multis et minutis somniis colligendis facit idem quod Antipater ea conquirens quae Antiphontis interpretatione explicata declarant illa quidem acumen interpretis, sed exemplis grandioribus decuit uti.[127] Dionysi mater, eius qui Syracosiorum tyrannus fuit, ut scriptum apud Philistum est, et doctum hominem et diligentem et aequalem temporum illorum, cum praegnans hunc ipsum Dionysium alvo contineret, somniavit se peperisse Satyriscum. huic interpretes portentorum, qui Galeotae tum in Sicilia nominabantur, responderunt, ut ait Philistus, eum quem illa peper isset clarissimum Graeciae diuturna cum fortuna foret. [40 1] num te ad fabulas revoco vel nostrorum vel Graecorum poetarum? narrat enim et apud Ennium Vestalis illa:
>
> et cita cum tremulis anus attulit artubus lumen.
> talia tum memorat lacrimans, exterrita somno:
> 'Eurydica prognata, pater quam noster amavit,
> vires vitaque corpus meum nunc deserit omne.
> nam me visus homo pulcer per amoena salicta
> et ripas raptare locosque novos. ita sola
> postilla, germana soror, errare videbar
> tardaque vestigare et quaerere te neque posse
> corde capessere: semita nulla pedem stabilibat.
> exim compellare pater me voce videtur
> his verbis: 'o gnata, tibi sunt ante gerenda
> aerumnae, post ex fluvio fortuna resistet.'
> haec ecfatus pater, germana, repente recessit
> nec sese dedit in conspectum corde cupitus,

[127] On Chrysippus, Antipater, and Antiphon, see Pease 1920: 162.

quamquam multa manus ad caeli caerula templa
tendebam lacrumans et blanda voce vocabam.
vix aegro cum corde meo me somnus reliquit.' [*Ann.* 34 50]

[42] haec, etiamsi ficta sunt a poeta, non absunt tamen a consuetudine somniorum. sit sane etiam illud commenticium, quo Priamus est conturba tus, quia

mater gravida parere se ardentem facem
visa est in somnis Hecuba. quo facto pater
rex ipse Priamus somnio mentis metu
perculsus curis sumptus suspirantibus
exsacrificabat hostiis balantibus.
tum coniecturam postulat pacem petens
ut se edoceret obsecrans Apollinem
quo sese vertant tantae sortes somnium.
ibi ex oraclo voce divina edidit
Apollo puerum primus Priamo qui foret
postilla natus temperaret tollere;
eum esse exitium Troiae, pestem Pergamo. [*Alex.* 50 61 J]

sint haec, ut dixi, somnia fabularum, hisque adiungatur etiam Aeneae somnium, quod nimirum in Fabi Pictoris Graecis annalibus eius modi est ut omnia quae ab Aenea gesta sunt quaeque illi acciderunt ea fuerint quae ei secundum quietem visa sunt.

But let's forget about oracles and turn instead to dreams. In his inquiry into them, when he gathered together innumerable trivial instances of dreams, Chrysippus achieved the same thing as Antipater did when he sought out those things which, once expounded in Antiphon's interpretation, reveal the interpreter's intellect yet he should have used more significant examples. Philistus, a learned and careful man and a contemporary of the events in question, has it that the mother of that Dionysius who was tyrant of the people of Syracuse, when she was pregnant with this very Dionysius in her womb, dreamt that she had brought forth a little Satyr. The interpreters of prodigies, who at that time in Sicily were known as Galeots, told her, so Philistus says, that the child she would bring forth would enjoy lasting wealth as the most renowned man of Greece.

[40 1] And should I remind you of the fables found in the works of our own poets just as much as those of the Greeks? For in Ennius the famous Vestal tells the tale:

> Rapidly, with trembling limbs, the old woman brought the light. Then, in tears, frightened out of her sleep, she [Ilia] gave this account: 'Child of Eurydice, beloved of our father, even now my life strength is seeping from my entire body. For it seemed to me that a handsome man hurried me away through lush willowy river banks, places unknown to me. And so it was that, thereafter, I seemed to wander alone, and slowly to cast around and to seek after you, yet I was not

> able to seize hold of you, ?much as I desired you?:[128] for there was no path to guide my feet. Then our father seemed to greet me with these words: "My daughter, first there are hardships for you to endure; thereafter, your fortunes, emerging from the flood tide, will find their foothold." Once he had said this, sister, our father of a sudden withdrew, and did not return to my sight, though I wished for him greatly, and though I lifted my hands many a time to the azure regions of the sky, in my tears, and called to him in endearing tones. And only just has sleep left me all sick at heart.' [*Ann.* 34 50]

[42] Even if these things are fashioned by the poet, they well represent what is normally true of dreams. Let's grant too that that other dream is also fictitious, the one that threw Priam into confusion because:

> his pregnant mother Hecuba seemed in her dream to give birth to a blazing torch. At this his father, the king himself, Priam, struck at heart with terror by the dream, became the prey of sighing anxieties and began to make sacrifice with bleating victims. Then he asked for an interpre tation, in hope of grace, beseeching Apollo to tell him to what end such portentous dream decrees would tend. Then from his oracle Apollo announced aloud in his divine voice that he should refrain from raising the child to be born to him next thereafter; that child would be the destruction of Troy, a plague on Pergamum. [*Alex.* 50 61 J]

Let's grant that these are, as I've said, the fancies that crop up in fables, and we can add to them Aeneas' dream too, which, in Fabius Pictor's Greek annals, has, as you know, all of Aeneas' achievements and vicissitudes turn ing out to be the very same ones as appeared to him during his sleep.

The prose origin of the first and last of Quintus' examples is probably intended to guarantee their historicity – so the contrast in their case with Quintus' emphasis on the fictitious nature of the Ennian dreams implies. Dionysius' mother's dream is clearly modelled on the literary dreams regularly bestowed on the mothers of the politically powerful in the ancient world,[129] but the very familiarity of the motif would have promoted an ancient audience's trust in it: here was something the audience could feel they knew.[130] Along with this, the fact that Dionysius and his mother were historical persons would have abetted the impression that the dream attributed to her was itself historical. The association of 'annals' with historicity and the author's status at Rome probably guaranteed Pictor's account for the audience; besides which Cicero's Quintus takes a distant and respectful

[128] See Skutsch 1985: 199 on the difficulties of construing the phrase *corde capessere*; he glosses the phrase as *cupitam capessere*, with 'to reach you' the only sense possible for *capessere*.

[129] See Pease 1920: 163 for examples besides the one that Enn. *Alex.* 50–61 J supplies.

[130] Cf. Fleischmann's description of the mediaeval notion of the historical as 'what was willingly believed' (Fleischmann 1983: 305, cited by Woodman 1988: 110, n. 100) and 'what was held to be true' (Fleischmann 1983: 305 at Feeney 1991: 255).

approach to it. As he turns to it, he immediately drops the emphasis on fictitiousness his references to the epic and dramatic dreams had had, and the fact that he only cites the narrative rather than actually quoting it means that any obviously fantastic elements in it are hidden from view.

It is into this (faux-)historical context that the Ennian dreams are inserted. Quintus both advertises their fictitiousness (cf. *fabulas*, *ficta*, *commenticium*, and the ironic *somnia fabularum*) and at the same time undermines it, by making no practical distinction in the use to which he sets these dreams and the two surrounding ones. The introductory part of the passage serves to suggest that all Quintus' instances of prophetic dreams have a general cultural visibility that Chrysippus' lacked (this is how I interpret *exemplis grandioribus*), and placing Quintus' four dreams in contrast to Chrysippus' instances homogenises them in terms of their status and helps disguise the very difference between them that Quintus himself suggests. The Ennian dreams also benefit from the trust accruing from simple familiarity in the same way as does the pregnancy dream attached to Dionysius' mother. That familiarity seems to have a large role to play in explaining how Quintus' use of Ennius gets to pass as legitimate despite his own emphasis on Ennius' inventiveness: for, since the question at issue is whether or not prophetic dreams can be seen as reliable and trustworthy, one might have thought that the literal occurrence of the examples quoted, and not just their arguable verisimilitude, was a relevant issue. The speaker's blithe dismissal of the question of historicity could be seen in part as intentional characterisation of his credulity. But Cicero is not obviously out to undermine Quintus here; rather, Quintus' tack suggests that the dreams he brings into play were so well established in the audience's historical imagination that his manoeuvre would have passed relatively unnoticed, neither distressing an audience that knew them well and was therefore not about to dismiss them nor serving to signal any intellectual weakness on Quintus' part or on the part of those whose views he represented. In effect, the treatment of the Ennian dreams in this passage as a whole reduces their fictitiousness, for all the attention to it, to merely theoretical and negligible status. This passage is therefore a good illustration of how any, even obvious, questions about the historicity of the *Annales* (and other Ennian works) are easily subsumed by the work's cultural status, especially as bolstered by Cicero's treatment of it.

Div. *2.115–16:* Ann. *167, 197–8*

At *Div*. 2.115–16, Cicero steps up the emphasis that epic narrative, now not just of distant events but of times more or less within living memory, is in

no significant sense true to history as a participant might have witnessed it. In fact, verse narratives, illustrated precisely by the example of the *Annales*, are presented as the type of fictionality, and Ennius' ability to re-work the past to a pattern of his own invention is brought full square into view. The target at this point in the discussion is the veracity of oracles, and the speaker is now the sceptical Marcus. As examples of the absurdity of trust in oracles, Marcus chooses the famous oracle given to Croesus as recounted at Hdt. 1.53–4, 91, in Cicero's own translation, and the parallel oracle given to Pyrrhus, as Ennius has it in Book 6 of the *Annales*. At *Leg.* 1.5 (discussed in Chapter 4, pp. 202–5), the Marcus of that dialogue maintains the basic commitment of prose narratives to historical truth, but concedes that even they sometimes contain fabulous elements. Here, the Marcus of *De Divinatione* goes further, urging that there is no reason to think Herodotean narrative in any way less fictitious than Ennius' poetic account, which he presents as obviously so:

> [115] sed iam ad te venio, 'o sancte Apollo, qui umbilicum certum terrarum obsides/unde superstitiosa primum saeva evasit vox fera' [*trag. frag. inc. inc.* 19 20 R][131] tuis enim oraculis Chrysippus totum volumen implevit partim falsis, ut ego opinor, partim casu veris, ut fit in omni oratione saepissime, partim flexiloquis et obscuris, ut interpres egeat interprete et sors ipsa ad sortes referenda sit, partim ambiguis et quae ad dialecticum deferendae sint. nam cum illa sors edita est opulentissimo regi Asiae: 'Croesus Halyn pene trans magnam pervertet opum vim' [Cic. frg. 54 Bl.], hostium vim se perversurum putavit, pervertit autem suam. [116] utrum igitur eorum acci disset, verum oraclum fuisset. cur autem hoc credam umquam editum Croeso? aut Herodotum cur veraciorem ducam Ennio? num minus ille potuit de Croeso quam de Pyrrho fingere Ennius? quis enim est qui credat Apollinis ex oraclo Pyrrho esse responsum: 'aio te, Aeacida, Romanos vincere posse' [*Ann.* 167]? primum Latine Apollo numquam locutus est; deinde ista sors inaudita Graecis est; praeterea Pyrrhi temporibus iam Apollo versus facere desierat; postremo, quamquam semper fuit, ut apud Ennium est, 'stolidum genus Aeacidarum,/bellipotentes sunt magis quam sapientipo tentes' [*Ann.* 197 8], tamen hanc amphiboliam versus intellegere potuisset, 'vincere te Romanos' nihilo magis in se quam in Romanos valere; nam illa amphibolia quae Croesum decepit vel Chrysippum potuisset fallere, haec vero ne Epicurum quidem.[132]
>
> [115] But now I turn to you, 'O sacred Apollo, you who haunt the one sure navel of the earth, whence the prophet's untamed voice first emerged in all its

[131] Ribbeck suggests that this passage is probably Ennian (*dubium vix est quin Enniana haec sint*), but Jocelyn does not include it in his edition of the tragic fragments.

[132] Discussion at Prinzen 1998: 168–70, as well as Skutsch 1985: 333–4 and 358–60.

> ferocity'; for it was with your oracles that Chrysippus filled full an entire volume, some of them, as seems to me, plain wrong, others right by happen stance, as will commonly be the case with any utterance, and yet others so equivocal and unintelligible that one interpreter has need of another and the response itself has to be referred to oracular guidance, others simply so riddling as to need to be turned over to a logician. For when that famous oracle was given to Asia's extravagantly wealthy king, 'When he crosses the Halys, Croesus will destroy a great power', he thought that he would destroy his enemies' might, but it was his own that he destroyed. [116] Whichever of the two had happened, the oracle would have turned out to be true. Why, then, should I believe that this oracle was ever given to Croesus? Or why should I think Herodotus any more truthful than Ennius? Was he any the less able to treat his story about Croesus inventively than Ennius was his about Pyrrhus? For who in the world would believe that Pyrrhus received the following response from Apollo's oracle? 'I say that the Romans have the power to conquer you, son of Aeacus/you, son of Aeacus, have the power to conquer the Romans' [*Ann.* 167]. For a start, Apollo didn't speak Latin; secondly, the Greeks have never heard of that oracle; and furthermore, in the time of Pyrrhus, Apollo had ceased to issue oracles in verse. Finally, even though, as it says in Ennius, ever was 'the race of the Aeacids obtuse; they are more powerful in war than in wits' [*Ann.* 197 8], even so he could have grasped that this ambiguity, 'that you conquer the Romans/that the Romans conquer you' had just as much force against him as it had against the Romans. For that other ambiguity that deceived Croesus could have deceived even Chrysippus, but this one not even Epicurus.[133]

With the verbs *fingere* ('to invent') and *credere* ('to believe'), both Ennius' and Herodotus' truthfulness and credibility are put directly on the line. In doing so, he is responding directly to a point Quintus had made at *Div.* 1.37, where he claimed that one can trust the Greek historians on the matter of oracles. Quintus admits that in his own day the Delphic oracle was no longer reliable but wants to prove his case through the supposed reliability of the historians. Nevertheless, even as the speaker here, Marcus, overtly emphasises the fictionality of the literary narratives he cites, he relies on no serious question being raised about the validity of their representation of history. Marcus is, in the first place, right that Pyrrhus' oracle in the *Annales* is transparently fictitious (although his first argument against it, that the words of the oracle appear in the text in a language Delphi did not speak, fails on its own strength to persuade); furthermore, the evident slipperiness of Ennius' oracle and the Herodotean one on which it is modelled proves

[133] On Chrysippus as the type of the subtle reasoner, see *Div.* 1.6 with Pease, 1920: 60 on *acerrumo vir ingenio*, as well as Pease 1923: 539–41 on *Div.* 2.116; see *ibid.* 541 for the presentation of Epicurus from the perspective of his opponents, as the type of ignorance and inability to reason.

nothing about the veracity of Delphi itself, unless it is assumed that the Ennian and Herodotean texts are necessarily transparent records of the oracle's words, rather than the works of authors capable of freely inventing riddling and self-fulfilling prophecies or else tricking out historical oracles in their own rhetoric beyond all recognition. For the purposes of his argument, then, Marcus is made to assume that the distinction (privileged at *Leg.* 1.5) between an historical object or act and its literary representation is not significant. Paradoxically, even as Cicero highlights the fictitiousness of the incidents Ennius and Herodotus relate, he builds on and thus strengthens the basic assumption that what they say represents a trustworthy account of an historical reality.[134]

Given how forthright Cicero's speaker is at *Div.* 2.115 about the fictional nature of the Pyrrhus-narrative (or at least the aspect of it that concerned the oracle), it is striking that modern scholars have most frequently chosen that very moment in the narrative as the starting-point for the 'annalistic' section of Ennius' text they saw as founded on research and documentation (see Chapter 1, pp. 43–5). Their belief could, however, have drawn encouragement not only from the basic assumption at *Div.* 2.115–16 of the underlying historicity of the *Annales* but also from the overtly very different treatment of Book 6 of the *Annales* that follows immediately, with Marcus' quotation of *Ann.* 197–8 (cf. that at *Off.* 1.38, which yields *Ann.* 183–90, Pyrrhus' speech graciously agreeing to the return of the Roman hostages).

When, at the end of *Div.* 2.116, Marcus goes on to quote *Ann.* 197–8, *stolidum genus Aeacidarum:/bellipotentes sunt magis quam sapientipotentes* ('the brutish race of the Aeacids: they are more powerful in war than in wits'), his purpose is wittily to acknowledge the proverbial dullness of the descendants of Homer's Ajax and to deny that even they could have been fooled by *Ann.* 167. In so doing, Cicero's Marcus reverts to the most common use Cicero makes of the *Annales*, that is, as a transparent version of historical truth. Here it is noteworthy that, just as soon as he has finished suggesting that there is nothing more fictional than Ennius' narrative, Cicero has Marcus turn to the words of that narrative to provide a description of the past he has no plan for his readers to question. There is some possibility that *Ann.* 197–8 was spoken not by the narrator but by a character on whose own motivations and actions the text may have allowed

[134] Thus, Pease 1923: 539–40 for his part reads Ennius' oracle as basically historical, presuming it a translation of a Greek original.

multiple perspectives,[135] but this too Marcus disregards when he presents *Ann*. 197–8 as the only possible view of the past.

In conclusion, it appears both that Cicero was aware that Ennius re-elaborated the past he presents and that this does not, in his eyes, limit or compromise the authority the *Annales* wielded. That authority is rather a fundamental assumption on which Cicero constantly operates. It encompasses command of historical fact, which in Cicero's treatment includes even qualities of character and attitude; but, beyond that, also the ability to offer moral and religious guidance and even access to the arcane secrets of the universe, such as the laws of astronomy and metaphysics; and one has the sense that the list is theoretically extendible to anything.[136] If Cicero's awareness of the artificiality of the poet's account of the past manifests itself most strongly in a text from the end of Cicero's career, the *De Divinatione* (of 43 BCE), the timing is coincidental. At around the same time, he published other texts fully invested in maintaining and propagating the authority of the *Annales* in a range of forms: the *Brutus* (46 BCE), the *Tusculan Disputations* and the *De Natura Deorum* (45 BCE) and the *De Officiis* and *De Senectute* (44 BCE). His awareness of Ennius' fabrication is thus an aspect of his view of the poem that happens to surface in the *De Divinatione* to suit his speaker's argument there, but it is an aspect that elsewhere is simply latent. In subdued form, it co-exists happily with his promotion of Ennius' authority and his collusion with Ennius' dramatic vision of the Roman past.[137]

[135] See Skutsch 1985: 358–60; cf. Elliott 2007: 52–4.

[136] Cf. Cole 2006: 534–5 on the exceptional role Cicero assigns to the *Annales* at *Tusc. Disp*. 1.27 as carrying comparable weight to pontifical law and construing the text as 'reflecting Roman religious attitudes just as accurately as family ritual practice and state protocols'; likewise, *ibid*. 533: 'Cicero uses Ennius through the *de Re Publica* to give his reconstruction of the Roman past a patina of authenticity. Ennius's verses are invested with prodigious cultural authority, here elevated to a mantic register . . . and presented as dynamic links to the republican past . . . ' and *passim*.

[137] Cicero is of course not the only source to construe the *Annales* as massively authoritative. In using Ennius' language as an explanation for Vergil's mode of expression, the Vergiliocentric sources in their way abet Cicero's practice of endowing the *Annales* with blanket authority. This is generally true of the scholarly tradition on both Ennius and Vergil when its practitioners use the words of the *Aeneid*, occasionally in conjunction with those of the *Annales*, as a founding explanation for more or less anything mysterious, from religious ritual to the movements of the universe to unusual or illogical uses of language; see e.g. Gell. 2.3.5–6, 3.2.1–16, 6.12.5–7, 7.6.9, 12.4.2 (cf. Cic. *Rep*. 3.3–5), 16.10.1–8. Although it is probable that at least some (whole or partial) copies of the *Annales* circulated in the second century, it is not unlikely that Cicero served on occasion as a source for Gellius' quotations of Ennius, as e.g. Gell. 12.2.1–8 and 18.15.1 show (see Appendix Table A5.3 on Cicero, pp. 383–4 and 396). Thus, we might suspect that his attitude towards Ennius, if generally typical of

Cicero gives us some help in understanding this complex attitude towards the authority of the *Annales* in the introduction to the *De Senectute*. Granted that the two works belong to different genres, his comments in the *De Senectute* are nevertheless helpful because they directly address the issue of textual *auctoritas* and because the passage there makes explicit the same idea of integrity of content, untouched by evidently artificial presentation, as Cicero manifests when he brings the *Annales* into play. At *Sen.* 3, Cicero describes how he himself went about constructing authority for the dialogue, in terms that draw attention to the artificiality of the process. He thus describes his choice to identify his main speaker as Cato the Censor:

> omnem autem sermonem tribuimus non Tithono, ut Aristo Ceus parum enim esset auctoritatis in fabula sed Marco Catoni seni, quo maiorem auctoritatem haberet oratio; . . . qui si eruditius videbitur disputare quam consuevit ipse in suis libris, attribuito litteris Graecis, quarum constat eum perstudiosum fuisse in senectute.[138]
>
> Now I have given the discourse in its entirety not to Tithonus, as Aristo the Cean did for then my tale would carry too little authority but to Marcus Cato in his old age, so that the speech would carry greater weight; . . . if he [as I characterise him] seems to you to argue his points more learnedly than the man himself typically did in his own writings, then ascribe that to his investment in Greek scholarship, as it is commonly agreed that as an old man he was extremely given to such matters.

Cicero's dialogue is, in his own description, a *fabula*, an all-out (dramatic) fiction,[139] and his audience are the more likely to find it incredible because, as he says, he makes his Cato rather more conversant in the finer points of Greek learning than was believable of the historical Cato. Cicero's playful advertisement of his appropriation of the historical Cato's *auctoritas* for this obviously artificial Cato suggests that he assumes that the move is a legitimate and unproblematic one.[140] He does not, it is evident, expect this open manufacture of *auctoritas* to undermine the seriousness with which his audience will engage with the philosophical contents of the work. What Cicero says here seems to reflect a general attitude of his towards texts he favours: the formal arrangements an author undertakes

his age's reverence of antiquity, also derives to some extent from Cicero. These various accounts of the *Annales* cohere in a general sense with the authority vested in the work by those first-century literary authors whose work is run through with Ennian allusions.

[138] See Powell 1988: 101–2 on this passage.

[139] See the definition of *fabula* at *Inv.* 1.27, quoted on p. 155.

[140] For a comparandum from the *De Re Publica* that involves Ennius, see the citation of Cole in n. 118, p. 179.

to promote his work's contents represent a complementary display of his skill that can only enhance the – to him, self-evident – value of the work overall. While it might be hard to justify such an attitude in theoretical terms, Cicero's assumption of the value, especially the historiographical value, of the *Annales*, and his simultaneous minimisation of the evident literary re-working of the subject-matter has left a deep trace on the history of Ennian scholarship. This is a subject we will tackle at the start of Chapter 4.

Cicero's reading of the *Annales* is the most complex and articulate one to have reached us, albeit as a tessellation of competing perspectives put forward in the service of diverse arguments.[141] The sophistication of the views he offers has no parallel among the other sources for the text, and he is one of very few among our ancient sources for the fragments to know the text in its entirety and to read it as literature. A subset of his readings gives us grounds to suspect that exemplarity ranks quite high on the list of Ennius' contributions to the formation of Roman historiography. Cicero is also valuable as a source for the *Annales* because, by adopting contrary positions with regard to the text through the voices of different speakers, he more than any other single source exposes how arbitrary and contingent the perspectives he provides are, even as the flow of his eloquence does much to mask the bias of each individual position. The vast gap between his essentially historiographical readings of the poem (various as they are) and the Vergiliocentrics' narrower reading of the poem as crucial to the development of Roman epic language reveals that same contingency. The question of how to reconcile these two views of the poem is central to Chapter 4.

THE *BELLUM HISPANIENSE*

The final pre-Vergilian source for the *Annales* is the anonymous author of the *Bellum Hispaniense*. He was an eye-witness to Caesar's Spanish War and himself a soldier of Caesar's. His control of the language is poor, and he is frequently criticised by the editors and commentators of his text for his inability to express himself clearly and for the curious mélange which constitutes his writing style: repetitiveness and colloquialism, mixed with literary reminiscences, which testify to a scant

[141] Cf. Schofield 1986: 47–63, on the awareness of ambiguity manifest in Cicero's choice of the form of the dialogue as a vehicle for what he has to say, and Fox 2007: 1–13, 21, 55–6, similarly on the competition of discourses in Cicero's multi-vocal and self-aware philosophical project and the contingent quality of the positions he associates with different speakers.

sense of the appropriate.[142] The author's very carelessness, however, should assure us that his quotations of Ennius came to him spontaneously; he is a member of the last generation whose imagination and descriptive language at large was formed by Ennius. Thereafter, knowledge of the text became the preserve of the literary and intellectual elite, whose sense of the *Annales* continued to be fed by first-century literature informed by Ennius or else by their research in areas of recondite scholarly interest.

The author of the *Bellum Hispaniense* transmits two single lines of the *Annales*: *Ann.* 480, *nostri cessere parumper* ('our side briefly gave way'), at *Bell. Hisp.* 23.3; and *Ann.* 584, *premitur pede pes atque armis arma teruntur* ('foot is ground on foot, arms on arms'), at *Bell. Hisp.* 31.7. No other extant source shows knowledge of either line, although the second has obvious analogues in several surviving Greek and Roman epics;[143] neither does the *Bellum Hispaniense* contribute to the transmission of any other fragment. Both quotations are fully integrated into the stream of the ps.-Caesarian narrative as part of the description of fighting, to replace the author's own words, and each is introduced by a brief *ut ait Ennius* ('as Ennius has it'). *Ann.* 584 is transmitted in unmetrical form (the manuscripts have *pes pede premitur, armis teruntur arma*).[144] To the extent that this is not the result of later transmission,[145] it betokens the informal nature of the quotation, suggesting that the line came fleetingly to mind and was as quickly forgotten. The lines themselves carry no indication of context and could belong to the description of fighting at any point in the *Annales*. Their context of quotation and verbal similarities in Livy prompt Skutsch to suggest that they belong to Iberian episodes he places in Book 9, but even he is hesitant.[146]

A tiny trace of the *Bell. Hisp.*'s mode of quoting the *Annales* survives in the handful of unique fragments preserved as supralinear additions in Ekkehart's manuscripts of Orosius (See Appendix Table A5.42 on the

[142] See Klotz 1927: v1; Skutsch 1985: 724; cf. Norden 1915: 158, 'seiner stammelnden Rede', but also now Gaertner's attempt to rehabilitate the author of this text (Gaertner 2010: 243–54).

[143] See Chapter 2, p. 85. [144] Corrected by Vahlen and Merula (Jackson at Flores V: 427).

[145] Gaertner 2010: 246–7.

[146] For *Ann.* 480, Skutsch (1985: 640) compares Livy 26.44.3, *Romani duce ipso praecipiente parumper cessere*; for *Ann.* 584, he cites and discusses Klotz's comparison of Livy 28.2.6, *tum pes cum pede conlatus et gladiis geri res coepta est* (*ibid.* 724). For discussion of the the Homerising and quasi-formulaic nature of *Ann.* 584 in particular, see Chapter 2, p. 85; cf. Jackson at Flores *et al.* 2009: 152 on the impossibility of assigning a fixed context to *Ann.* 480 (*Ann.* 496 Fl.) and *ibid.* 428–9 on the generalising nature of *Ann.* 584 (*Ann.* 582 Fl.). For a full history of editorial decisions concerning *Ann.* 480, see *ibid.* 151–2.

latter). These supralinear notations supply the surprising information that an unknown reader, probably of the fifth or sixth century CE, was still able to quote the *Annales* for content. This reader thus had access to a partial or full manuscript of the text.[147] He quotes for us *Ann.* 158, *quom nihil horridius umquam lex ulla iuberet* ('though no law ever ordered more fearful punishment'), on the punishment of the Vestal Virgin, Minucia; *Ann.* 213, *quantis consiliis quantumque potesset in armis* ('with how formidable a strategy and what his military resources were'), on Alexander the Great, when Hamilcar was delegated to investigate the nature of the threat he posed to Carthage; and *Ann.* 474–5, *at non sic dubius fuit hostis/Aeacida Pyrrhus* ('Aeacid Pyrrhus was no treacherous enemy like this'), in contrast to Hannibal's perfidy. The reader attributes all three fragments to Ennius. They are known to no other source. This is by far the latest such evidence that exists. Otherwise, we have to reach back to the scholarly debates in Gellius to find evidence of readers who had access to more than just lines preserved within the tradition in which they were working; and even in Gellius, such evidence is sparse.

With the publication of the *Aeneid*, interest in the *Annales* on their own account plummets: with the lone fifth-century exception discussed above it is indiscernible in the surviving post-Vergilian authors responsible for the transmission of the fragments. No longer do the *Annales* appear to be part of general education, to be tossed into correspondence among educated friends or quoted in passing to lend special dignity to an occasional context.[148] The educated Augustine reads the *Annales* only through Cicero, and the learned disputants of Gellius' *Attic Nights* know only snippets of the epic that they use to trump each other's confused and partial knowledge. The *Annales* continue to be a source for etymologists and grammarians, in scholarly traditions related to those which Varro and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* early represent. But in the new era, scholars of Vergil are now indisputably the group most responsible for the transmission of sizeable and interpretable fragments of the epic.

[147] See Norden 1915: 79–89.

[148] As e.g. *Ann.* 589 (Cic. *Att.* 6.2.8) and *Ann.* 590, *urbes magnas atque imperiosas* (Cic. *Rep.* 1.3), among the few Ciceronian quotations not discussed in this chapter. See Appendix Table A5.3 for a full list of Cicero's quotations.

CHAPTER 4

The Annales *as historiography: Ennius and the invention of the Roman past*

This chapter begins from a problem: that of how to reconcile the divergent sets of information about the *Annales* that emerge from the pronounced biases of our strongest-voiced sources for the work, the Vergiliocentrics and Cicero. The Vergiliocentrics, as we have seen, are demonstrably responsible for our detailed knowledge of Ennius' use of the established terms of Homeric literature, Cicero for our awareness that Ennius' representation of Roman history was crucial to how Republican Romans understood their past in its relationship to their present identity. Just as striking as the particular information these sources supply is the distance between their respective perspectives on the poem: we could not begin to imagine the Vergiliocentrics' picture of the *Annales* from Cicero's presentation (for the poem's metre and the Graecising linguistic detail that emerges from sources across the board is far from tantamount to the sense of macroscopic engagement the Vergiliocentrics provide); and the reverse is also true. The questions of what their divergent views of the poem have to do with each other and what they tell us about the original coherent and homogeneous whole are those that this chapter attempts to answer.

THE HISTORY OF THE PROBLEM IN ANCIENT AND MODERN LITERATURE

This breach between the most articulate and persuasive ancient sources may help explain why twentieth-century scholarship on the *Annales* tended to treat the poem's Homerising material as separable from (indeed, in some cases, as hostile to) its status as a work of Roman history. Modern studies that confront the *Annales* as historiography favour three approaches to the Homerising material, each of which marginalises it as something inimical to the purposes of the historian. The first is to treat the Homerising as a

superficial veneer, to be stripped away so as to reveal the valuable core of historical fact, the object of the historian's inquiry, appearing dimly beneath.[1] The second is to create a theoretical distinction between the historiographical calibre of the early part of the narrative – that telling of the foundation, regal period and very early Republic, stretching roughly to the end of Book 5 (see Appendix Table A1.1) – and that of the narrative from then on; for by Book 6 (the 280s–70s BCE), the account runs, hard evidence was available, and annalistic procedure consequently possible. The earlier part of the narrative could comfortably accommodate Homerising practices (including the deployment of a divine apparatus in a generally fabulous narrative), without prejudice to the view of Ennius presenting carefully researched facts in an objective manner as soon as historical documentation was available to him; the later part could not.[2] The third approach is to acknowledge the Homerising but to dismiss it as absurd, a mark of Ennius' unrefined poetic sensibilities. Thus Norden found 'something preposterous' ('etwas absonderliches') in the representation of Roman consuls and tribunes in the guise of Homeric heroes.[3]

This push to rid the historiographer in Ennius of the burden of the Homerising material results from the desire to read the poem as the reliable reflection of the past Cicero makes it, but by the lights of an historiographical standard which dictates that serious historiography is by nature scientific and analytic and that its aim is the objective representation of the past, for which autopsy and documentation are the preferred tools.[4] This

[1] See Chapter 1, n. 82. Skutsch represents an extreme in terms of the sort of historical detail he thinks can (at least theoretically) be gleaned from the *Annales*. The nuggets to be extracted by the historian in Skutsch's reading include (from the relationship among *Ann.* 183–90 [Pyrrhus' speech], the periocha of Livy 13, Dio-Zonaras and Trogus-Justin) 'a *prima facie* case against peace negotiations before the battle of Ausculum' (Skutsch 1985: 348–9) and (from the relationship among *Ann.* 265, *amplius exaugere obstipo lumine solis* (a formulaic line; see Elliott 2010: 150–3), and extracts from Livy, Seneca and Valerius Maximus) the idea that, on the debated question of whether the Roman army faced east or south, that 'Ennius must have thought it faced east' (Skutsch 1985: 444–5).

[2] See Chapter 1, pp. 43–5. Citations of the views here described are given in the footnotes there. See esp. the quotation from Gratwick's article in *CHCL* II.

[3] Norden 1954: 16. Cp. the grounds on which Fraenkel rejects Norden's reconstruction of the *Discordia* episode: 'while making full allowance for the odd inventions to which a poet may be driven who has taken upon himself the task of mingling Roman history with elements of Homeric mythology, we should not believe that there are limits to what we can believe Ennius to have done. I for one am not prepared to foist on him anything so childish as this' (Fraenkel 1945: 13). Prinzen notes that such criticism (i.e. of embellishing the deeds narrated in the *Annales* to excess) is missing in antiquity (Prinzen 1998: 164).

[4] Thus Rawson treats Cicero's citations of the *Annales* as evidence of the seriousness of his own efforts to discover the truth about the past (Rawson 1972: 38, 41). Contrast what she has to say about Cicero's use of Ennius at *Tusc. Disp.* at 1.27–8 with Cole's discussion of the same issue (Cole 2006: 534–5).

modern assumption is on occasion powerful enough to cause ancient evidence to be set aside. Thus, the distinction between the historiographical content of the pre- and post-Book 6 narrative overrides the evidence supplied by many fragments attested for the later books, which are witness to Ennius' continued, intensely Homerising presentation of events down to his own day. (Among the undisputed, large-scale examples are *Ann.* XV.iv, of the two Istrians modelled on the Polypoites and Leontes of *Il.* 12.127–95, and *Ann.* 391–8, of the tribune 'Caelius', both of which are attested for Book 15 by Macrobius.) The same distinction disregards the fact that Cicero himself chooses the presentation of events in Book 6 (the moment at which the narrative enters living memory and at which Ennius is therefore deemed to have gained sure access to hard evidence and embarks upon a new, now evidence-based historiographical mode)[5] as the epitome of epic fabulousness.[6]

At the same time, there are also instances in which the ancient sources feed the modern assumption quite directly. This can be seen clearly in the case of a second distinction scholars point to: a stylistic distinction now, between strictly Homerising fragments and those few (6 in total) that modern readers have deemed unintegrated representatives of an indigenous 'chronicle style'. In Chapter 1,[7] I argued that these 6 fragments constitute poor evidence for the ideas that they (alone) have traditionally been used to support: that annalistic dating was the epic's principal organisational device; and that a radical stylistic break exists between them and the Homerising practice attested elsewhere. On this latter score, we may now also note that this supposed stylistic distinction is suggested by the biases of the sources: while the Homerising fragments are (as we have seen in Chapter 2) the legacy of the Vergiliocentrics, the 6 'chronicle-style' fragments are the product of a set of sources whose uses of the text cohere around its function, for them, as proof, on the one hand, of the existence and character of historical events or personalities, on the other, of past and/or present linguistic practices. At the same time, ancient readers including Cicero overtly show no sense at all of a split in narrative style within the *Annales* – or, for that matter, that the calibre of the historical information on offer changes as it reaches the more recent past.

Of the 6 fragments in question, four are the products of Cicero's (sole or supporting) testimony. These are: *Ann.* 216, *Appius indixit Carthaginiensibus bellum* ('Appius declared war on the Carthaginians'), quoted (exclusively)

[5] So e.g. again Gratwick 1982: 62.
[6] See Chapter 3, pp. 189–93, for the discussion of Cic. *Div.* 2.115–16. [7] Pp. 52–8.

at *Inv.* 1.27 to provide an example of *historia*, the true and credible narrative of past events; *Ann.* 329, *egregie cordatus homo, catus Aelius Sextus* ('the outstandingly sagacious man, sharp Aelius Sextus'), quoted because of its reflection of historical Roman values (*De Or.* 1.197–8), as notice of the exemplarity of Aelius' practice (*Rep.* 1.30) and as evidence of the use and meaning of *cordatus* (*Tusc. Disp.* 1.18); and *Ann.* 304–6, *additur orator Cornelius suaviloquenti/ore Cethegus Marcus Tuditano collega/Marci filius* ('joined as colleague to Tuditanus is the sweet-voiced speaker Marcus Cornelius Cethegus, the son of Marcus'), quoted at *Brut.* 57–60 as quasi-documentary evidence for the subject's skills and reputation as orator in his day. This last we considered (on pp. 54–7) in the larger context Cicero gives it, which includes *Ann.* 306–8, *is dictus popularibus ollis,/qui tum vivebant homines atque aevom agitabant,/flos delibatus populi Suadaique medulla* ('he was pronounced by his fellows of that era – the men who were then alive and living out their years – to be the choicest flower of the people and the very soul of Persuasion'). Cicero also knows a fourth of these fragments, *Ann.* 290, *Quintus pater quartum fit consul* ('Quintus the father becomes consul for the fourth time'), part of which he quotes in a joking aside to Atticus, using his knowledge of the *Annales* to add cachet to his scorn for his target.[8] As we have seen (p. 142; see also p. 420), the line's primary source, Gellius (10.1.6), supported by Nonius (435.12), traces it to Varro. All sources with the exception of Cicero are interested only in the line as illustration of the 'correct' use of *quartum* ('for the fourth time') as opposed to *quarto* ('fourth'). Cicero is not involved in the transmission of *Ann.* 299, *Livius inde redit magno mactatus triumpho* ('Livius returned thence magnified by a great triumph'), or *Ann.* 324, *Graecia Sulpicio sorti data, Gallia Cottae* ('Greece fell by lot to Sulpicius, Gaul to Cotta'). The former we owe exclusively to DS – DS, that is, in the more technical and lexicographical mode that distinguishes many of his quotation-contexts from those of the other substantial Vergiliocentric sources:[9] he quotes the line to illustrate the antique use of *mactatus*, as opposed to Vergil's *macte* in Apollo's address to Ascanius at *Aen.* 9.641. *Ann.* 324 we owe to Isidore (*Orig.* 1.36.3), who is interested in nothing besides the zeugma. These quotation-contexts are sufficient to explain why the text's poetic qualities and role in literary history are effectively out of sight. Besides this, the very fact that the sources for these lines belong to two related constituencies, the larger of which is represented by a single individual, is a measure of the narrowness of the

[8] *Att.* 12.5.1: *Quintus pater quartum vel potius millesimum nihil sapit qui laetetur Luperco filio et Statio ut cernat duplici dedecore cumulatam domum.*

[9] See Chapter 2, pp. 103–7.

viewpoint they offer. None of the six fragments as quoted would have suited the Vergiliocentrics' purposes, for none have clear analogues in Vergil – which is not to say that their effect in the original context was such as their sources imply or create.

The brevity and isolation of the lines are without doubt crucial to their ability to stand for the bald statements of historical fact that they are made by their editors, ancient and modern, to represent. It is surely telling that, when Cicero (at *Inv.* 1.27) wants to provide an uncontaminated instance of *historia*, he quotes no more than four words; for those four are in themselves entirely sufficient for his purposes and liable only to be complicated by a wider context. In fact, none of Cicero's own longer quotations of the *Annales*, such as *Ann.* 72–91 (the augurate of Romulus and Remus), *Ann.* 34–50 (Ilia's dream), or even *Ann.* 304–8 (Cethegus' rhetorical skill), with their complex narrative structures, use of time and generic counter-currents, would have served that purpose at all well.[10] It is likewise indicative of brevity's crucial role that *Ann.* 306–8 is detached from *Ann.* 304–6 when the poem's modern exegetes make the latter a representative of the poem's 'annalistic' qualities. It is this dependence on brevity, as much as the richness of what the Vergiliocentrics provide, that assures us that the six quotations, in their isolation and modern aggregation, offer a distorted view of even that aspect of the text they are supposed to represent.

ALIAS IN HISTORIA LEGES OBSERVANDAS . . . ALIAS IN POEMATE (CIC. *LEG.* 1.5)

If we are today well equipped to elaborate a capacious concept of historiography able to encompass and reconcile what the Vergiliocentrics and Cicero each have to say about the *Annales*, it is not least Cicero who supplies us with the means to do so.[11] Famously, in the Introduction to the *De Legibus*, he engages directly with the question of what constitutes historicity and of how different generic contexts alter readers' expectations thereof.[12] The speakers are an interrogative Atticus [A], a credulous Quintus [Q] and a sceptical Marcus [M], the latter

[10] On the literary qualities of the six lines even as cited and complex artistry of *Ann.* 216 and *Ann.* 299 in particular, see Goldberg and Jackson, as cited in Chapter 1, n. 118.

[11] See Woodman 1988: 70–116. For discussion of Cicero's views of prose historiography and historians generally, see further Rambaud 1953; Wiseman 1979: 18, 31–5, 117–21; Wiseman 1994: 1–4, 19–20; and Fox 2007: esp. 111–48. For Cicero's approach in his own works to discovering the past, see Rawson 1972: 33–45.

[12] For comparable ancient views, see Luc. *Hist. conscr.* 8, . . . ποιητικῆς μὲν καὶ ποιημάτων ἄλλαι ὑποσχέσεις καὶ κανόνες ἴδιοι, ἱστορίας δὲ ἄλλοι; cf. Thuc. 1.21.1, . . . οὔτε ὡς ποιηταὶ ὑμνήκασι περὶ αὐτῶν ἐπὶ τὸ μεῖζον κοσμοῦντες . . . and 22.4, καὶ ἐς μὲν ἀκρόασιν ἴσως τὸ μὴ μυθῶδες αὐτῶν ἀτερπέστερον φανεῖται . . . (Dyck 2004: 67–8).

associated with the historical Cicero as the author of the epic, *Marius*, a poem on recent historical events (just as the other speakers, too, are identified with their historical counterparts).[13] The passage runs thus:[14]

[A] atqui multa quaeruntur in *Mario*, fictane an vera sint; et a nonnullis, quod et in recenti memoria et Arpinati homine versere, veritas a te postulatur.

[M] et mehercule ego me cupio non mendacem putari. sed tamen 'nonnulli' isti, Tite noster, faciunt imperite, qui in isto periculo non ut a poeta sed ut a teste veritatem exigant; nec dubito quin idem et cum Egeria collocutum Numam, et ab aquila Tarquinio apicem impositum putent.

[Q] intellego te, frater, alias in historia leges observandas putare, alias in poemate.

[M] quippe, cum in illa ad veritatem <omnia>, Quinte, referantur, in hoc ad delectationem pleraque; quamquam et apud Herodotum, patrem historiae, et apud Theopompum sunt innumerabiles fabulae.

[A] People have a lot of questions about the *Marius*, whether what it says is fictional or true. Quite a few people want truthfulness from you, because your subject-matter concerns both the recent past and a man of Arpinum.

[M] And by Hercules I for my part don't want anyone to think I'm a liar. Yet those 'quite a few people' of yours, Titus my friend, prove themselves rather foolish in demanding the truth in that particular arena not as from a poet but as from a witness. I have no doubt that those same people think both that Numa conversed with Egeria and that Tarquin had the cap placed on his head by the eagle.

[Q] I understand from this, brother, that you are of the opinion that there is one set of rules to be attended to in historical narrative, another in poetical composition.

[M] For sure, since in the former all things, Quintus, are measured by the yardstick of truth, whereas in the latter it's what pleases that counts more; even so, both in Herodotus, the father of history, and in Theopompus there are countless fabulous tales.

As this discussion has it, then, *historiae* (prose accounts of the past) create an expectation for *veritas*, which is not necessarily generated in the same way by

[13] For discussion, see Fox 2007: 5.

[14] See Lieberg 1985: 23–32, Feeney 1991: 258–60, Wiseman 2002: 338–42, and Fox 2007: 141–4, as well as Dyck 2004: 65–70.

poemata (verse narratives). *Veritas* appears to equate both to verifiable factual accuracy, of the sort to be extracted from a witness at a trial,[15] and also to verisimilitude, the convincing imitation of lived experience.[16] Atticus' *nonnulli* are (as represented by him at the start of the passage) unclear as to whether to extend their expectation for *veritas* to the *Marius* but, to the extent that the poem represents the narrative of recent times and of events within the author's personal experience, they rather suspect that they have a right to do so. For them, then, the temporal proximity of narrated events and the possibility that the author had an autoptic relationship to those events is a proper determinant of their expectations, one powerful enough to override any expectations that the genre of the narrative might have created (a question that the *nonnulli* do not appear to address).

In sustaining this view, the *nonnulli* have a modern analogue in those twentieth-century readers of Ennius cited above who banish the fabulous from the *Annales* from Book 6 on. Marcus, however, takes such readers to task: he teasingly produces a *reductio ad absurdum* of their view, by suggesting that they would doubtless also like to take literally the evidently fabulous stories of Rome's early days, stories such as those about Numa and Tarquinius Priscus (or of Romulus' epiphany to Julius Proculus and of Orithyia, on which Marcus challenges Atticus at *Leg.* 1.3). Marcus' remark justifies the expectation that tales of the City's origin and early days may contravene expectations set up by everyday experience – he agrees with the *nonnulli* thus far; but he names the standard of veracity to which poetic accounts of modern times need aspire as a low and an elastic one: no more than that their author would want to appear *non mendacem* ('not a liar').[17]

[15] Cf. Brunt 1980b: 311–22 and Dyck 2004: 68. Dyck cites Antonius' remarks at *De Or.* 2.36 (*historia vero testis temporum, lux veritatis . . .*) and id. *ibid.* 2.62 (*nam quis nescit primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat?*) as further instances of the commitment Cicero repeatedly has his speakers express to the idea that *historia* was constitutionally bound to tell the truth. For the idea of it being inappropriate to treat poets as if they were court witnesses, cf. Ov. *Am.* 3.12.19, *nec tamen ut testes mos est audire poetas*, and Cicero's jest to Tiro: *ego certe singulos eius* [sc. *Euripidis*] *versus singula testimonia puto* (*Fam.* 16.8.2), both given by Dyck (*ibid.*). On the perennial question of the relationship between truth and *inventio*, a question driven by the ancient desire to read authoritative poets, beginning from Homer, as witnesses to the events they narrate, see Kroll 1924: 49–52.

[16] Cf. Woodman 1988: 114–15 and Feeney 1991: 259, who emphasise that *veritas* encompasses the notion of credible resemblance to real life; also Kroll 1924: 52. Cp. Aristotle's insistence at *Poet.* 1451b29–32 that probability is critical to the descriptions required of a (tragic, as it happens) poet, while the actual occurrence of events is incidental and trivial; and Plautus, *Pseud.* 401–3, *sed quasi poeta, tabulas cum cepit sibi,/quaerit quod nusquam gentiumst, reperit tamen,/facit illud verisimile quod mendacium est* (both cited by Kroll, *loc. cit.*).

[17] On the development of alternative truth-criteria among poetic accounts, as well as on the pleasure-principle (Marcus' *delectatio*), which sometimes mitigated the demand on poetry for *veritas*, see Kroll 1924: 49–60. Cf. Dyck 2004: 66, on *Leg.* 1.6, who sees Cicero as there 'at pains to create space for a

The conversation between Marcus and Quintus complicates the generic boundary between *historiae* and *poemata* in both directions, by suggesting that neither prose nor verse accounts have a straightforward relationship to historical accuracy. Quintus' *nonnulli* want a place in epic for *veritas*, the proper attribute of *historiae* (as everyone seems to agree); and indeed Marcus' *pleraque* (in the last sentence quoted above) also leaves room for the possibility that epic narrative may at times approximate to historically correct material.[18] At the same time, Marcus observes that *historiae*, as represented by Herodotus and Theopompus, contain obviously fantastic elements. His remark about the dubious credibility of the tales such as those about Numa and Tarquinius Priscus is equally applicable to verse and prose narratives. Thus Livy (*Praef.* 6–7) famously reminds his readers to treat the *AUC*'s inclusion of just such stories of the City's origins with indulgence, on the grounds that, though they might be more appropriate to poetic tales with no strong truth-claim, they endow Rome's earliest history with a certain awe.

EPIC, HISTORIOGRAPHY AND THE NARRATION OF THE PAST

The twentieth century saw much useful elaboration of the relationship between poetry and historiography. It is today well established that epic was not, in the ancient conception,[19] divorced from history;[20] it was itself a form of memory of the national past with, at least in the initial assumption, absolute truth-value and the power to provide a compelling account of the relationship between that past and the realities of the present.[21] The multiple key features Homeric epic and historiography share (for example, the predominantly third-person narrative, the concern with the κλέα ἀνδρῶν, the element of *mimesis*, and the interest in causality and sequences of events)[22] bear witness to the kinship between the two forms. From Herodotus on,

different type of poetic truth'; similarly Lieberg 1985: 23–5, on the power of poetry, as presented at *Leg.* 1.6, to create a 'spiritual reality . . . of a higher level than the physical reality of nature, and . . . strictly separated from historical reality'. Cf. Goldberg 1995: 113, with reference to the *Annales* specifically.

[18] On the textual difficulties of Marcus' reply to Quintus, see, however, Woodman 1988: 115, n. 141.

[19] Besides *Leg.* 1.6, as quoted above, see e.g. the Suda's definition of epic: Ἐποποιία· ἡ διὰ ἡρωικοῦ μέτρου ἱστορία καὶ γὰρ στερομένη μύθου ποίησις ἐποποιία ἐστίν (discussion at Häussler 1976: 37).

[20] See Kroll 1924: 59, n. 34 on the ability of the word ἱστορία to designate 'mythical' as well as 'historical' material. Homer was the 'Wegbereiter der Historie und des historischen Epos' (Häussler 1976: 21); *ibid.* for the origin of *laudatio maiorum* in Homer's τῶν προσθὲν κλέα ἄνδρων, and the way from there to history. On the lack of a clear boundary between myth and history, see, early, Peter 1897: 12–14 and more recently e.g. Feeney 1991: 250–62.

[21] See Häussler 1976: 22, citing Loebell 1841: 287–8, which I quote on p. 264 of Chapter 5.

[22] Strasburger 1972: 12–18; Strasburger *et al.* 1982: 2.1057–97; Fornara 1983: 62–4, 76–8; Woodman 1988: 1–9, 28–40; and Marincola 1997: 6–7, with further bibliography, 159–60, 184.

prose historians were no strangers to the use of Homerising language, motifs and narrative techniques, to an extent that suggests their conscious use of the poet;[23] and by adopting prose and articulating alternative criteria for the truth-value of their accounts, they only showed how much they still felt under Homer's shadow. Antiquity had indeed by Ennius' day already long ago seen efforts to identify the writing of history as, properly, an analytic process based on autopsy and primary source-material (even if that source-material in reality remained by and large ancillary to historians' reliance on prior narratives – prose ones when poetry gave out). Thucydides' radical attempt (most explicit at 1.10.3–5 and 1.21) is the earliest and the best known; and the rationalising stances of Polybius and Livy developed from there. Yet the success over time of the understanding of history as a rational and analytic pursuit and the dominance of that definition today should not obfuscate the fact that such maverick ideas had an uphill battle to fight in antiquity against the established position of the *Iliad* in particular as the *fons et origo* of all historical writing.[24]

This conception of the *Iliad*, and the productive relationship subsequent 'historical' epic forged to the *Iliad* in that guise, has generated increasing interest among scholars over the past hundred years.[25] An early and elegant articulation of the treatment of historical material in metrical form at Rome is that of W. Kroll, at the end of his essay, *Der Stoff der Dichtung*:

> Die übliche Gleichsetzung epischer und historischer Überlieferung ist gerade auch für die römische Literatur wichtig geworden. Sie machte es möglich, daß historische Stoffe in tragischer oder epischer Form behandelt wurden, ohne daß man den Unterschied von den sagenhaften empfand. Wenn man Römerdramen als *fabulae praetextae* bezeichnete, so hob man nur die vom griechischen Drama verschiedene Tracht hervor; im übrigen deckte dieser Name mythische wie historische Stoffe, Romulus und Sabinae so gut wie Clastidium und Paulus. Beim Epos empfand man den Abstand ebenso wenig: hier war Naevius der Bahnbrecher, der in seinem *Bellum Poenicum* ein selbsterlebtes Ereignis erzählte, aber freilich in der Einleitung auf die mythischen Zeiten der Gründung Roms und Karthagos zurückgriff. Auf ihn stützte sich Ennius, und auf diesen wieder die lange Reihe der späteren Annalendichter, denen die Mischung der unsicher oder gar nicht und der urkundlich überlieferten Tatsachen kaum zum Bewußtsein kam und in keinem Falle Kopfzerbrechen machte. Daraus darf man ihnen bei der

[23] Fornara 1983: 31–2; Woodman 1988: 5–47.

[24] Cf. Kroll 1924: 62: '. . . aber er [sc. Thucydides] blieb ein Prediger in der Wüste'. See again Woodman 1988: 5–47 on the cosmetic nature, even so, of Thucydides' claimed differences from Homer.

[25] See e.g. Kroll 1916: esp. 12; Kroll 1924: 44–63, esp. 49–52, 58–63; Strasburger 1972: 5–44; Häussler 1976: 21–38, with much further bibliography; Marincola 1997: 3, 6, 14, with n. 65 there, 35, 50, 51, 54, n. 76, 63–4, 159–60, 173, 184, 225–6; cf. also Suerbaum 1968: 14–16.

> allgemeinen Verbreitung dieser Anschauung keinen Vorwurf machen; eher ist Ennius deshalb zu tadeln, weil auch im Stile die annalistischen und die poetischen Partien voneinander merklich abstachen. An Lucans Epos über den Bürgerkrieg tadelte man nicht die Wahl eines im vollen Lichte der Geschichte, ja der Erinnerung stehenden Stoffes, sondern die von der üblichen epischen Technik abweichende Behandlung.[26]

Kroll's point, like that of Cicero's Marcus, is that Roman epic poetry operates on the assumption of an insensitivity to the demands of *veritas*. This does not preclude it from aspiring to communicate its own form of truth,[27] construed by the reverent as of the highest order. In its lucid description of the interchangeability of verifiable, historical material with mythical or semi-mythical stories in Roman genres of all sorts, Kroll's summary is perfectly suited to explaining the extant remains of Ennius' epic as a coherent whole.[28] (Given this, it is ironic that Kroll, too, points to the *Annales* as an instance of a failure to integrate in style its two supposed narrative portions, the pre-historical and the historical – although the authority he properly owns, once leant to that view, helps explain its propagation.) In the *Annales*, the poet found new ways of presenting recent events as cut from the same cloth as the events the Romans construed as belonging to their dim and distant early history – in a manner perhaps imitated by Cicero in the *Marius*, to judge by the quizzical response of Atticus' *nonnulli*. By re-clothing all material alike in Homeric garb, he offered his audience a re-interpreted version of their past, bracing precisely because his account of still-recognisable events differed so extraordinarily from history as they had understood and experienced it to date. This new approach to integrating the historical and the mythical well explains how the *Annales* were able to breathe life and strength into a tradition of Roman historicising epic that, as Kroll says, begins, as we know it, with Naevius.

In effect, the innovative manner in which Ennius chose to express his relationship to genre and his poetic genealogy pre-determined the re-description of his subject-matter in the terms of the *Iliad*. It meant not only that his language was consistently Homerising throughout the work, as is clear from the fragments; for, concomitant with this, the traditions of epic dictated that its other conventions, too – the continued intervention of the gods throughout the narrative and the re-description of its actors, be they Roman consuls and tribunes of any era, in the terms of Homeric

[26] Kroll 1924: 44–63. [27] See n. 17, pp. 205–6.
[28] See Kroll 1924: 52, on the popularity of the point of view expressed by Plaut. *Pseud.* 401–3 (cited in n. 16, p. 204) and the related ancient definition of epic as *continens vera cum fictis*.

characters – should remain in place across the books of the *Annales*.[29] These conventions were the prerogative of the long-established, hexametric historiographical mode, constituting its proper means of representing a type of truth about the past that was distant from that literal *veritas* close to the hearts of Quintus' *nonnulli*. They amount to the formal features of the narrative, and they do as much as the uncontroversially sustained Homerising details of Ennius' language and the hexameter itself to create homogeneity in the characterisation of the early and late days of the City alike, in that integration of fact and fiction that Kroll so aptly describes.

If Ennius chose to present Roman history in the cultural and poetic mould provided by Homer, that constituted above all a positioning of his material in a particular generic framework and of his text into a mode of recall that had its own manner of prompting its audience to receive its contents in a particular, historically established way. It little mattered whether that material was of recent provenance or was the product of long established oral tradition. What mattered rather was the manner of its presentation, which allowed material of any origin to be assimilated to a pre-existent knowledge of the past, whether that material came from distant legend, was represented in the records of the priests, was the product of the further elaboration of the nation's past at the hands of the author or formed part of his and/or the audience's personal experience.[30] If Ennius' presentation matched events to the pre-existing models of Greek literature, the familiarity of the story-patterns into which he fitted Roman history only added to the confidence an audience would feel in his version of events,[31] even if it also gave the occasional reader in an unusually sceptical mood the chance to test the strength of the illusion Ennius had created.[32]

The relationship between fact and fiction in epic, as relevant to the *Annales*, can also be described thus: myths and, generally, the matter of epic were in antiquity understood as true historical material decked out by the poets in the fantastic elements proper to their tradition, in a process that was the opposite of our concept of rationalisation.[33] Hence even sceptical critics of the Homeric accounts of the past, such as Polybius and Strabo, assumed a kernel of historical truth at epic's core.[34] Subsequent rationalisation was itself a product of such an

[29] Cf. Feeney 1991: 250–62; Marincola 1997: 125–7; and Feeney 2006.

[30] On the 'expansion of the past' at the hands of the Roman annalists Gnaeus Gellius and Valerius Antias as a practice related to *inventio* (on which see further below), see Wiseman 1979: 21–5.

[31] See p. 209, with n. 37.

[32] Thus Cicero at *Div.* 2.115–16 on Ennius' account of the oracle issued to Pyrrhus (*Ann.* 167).

[33] Thus Wiseman 2002: 335.

[34] See Kroll 1924: 51; Strasburger 1972: 16–18; and Marincola 1997: 119, with n. 290 there. On the impossibility in practice of distinguishing between core and rhetorical elaboration, see Woodman 1988: 90–3. As regards the *Annales*, modern access to its supposed core of historical truth (cf. n. 1,

understanding of epic, since it was based on a belief in the recoverability of that kernel (cf. Thucydides' acceptance of the basic 'facts' and statistics of the Homeric account of the expedition to Troy, once stripped of poetic 'exaggeration').[35] The incorporation of the legendary subject-matter of epic into chronologies, such as that of Eratosthenes,[36] was similarly licensed by that same belief. And what constituted the kernel of truth was not so much what could be documented as what was familiar and what was known to have previously been thought true.[37] To satisfy Marcus' terms that a poet should not be thought a liar, the poet of recent as of distant times need do no more than promote belief that this kernel of historicity (or historical familiarity) was present.

Thus, if Cicero generally avoids addressing the subject of Ennius' re-casting of the Roman past directly,[38] it is not only because it does not serve his immediate purposes to do so; it is also because it does not interfere with his sense of the epic's historicity, a type of historicity which operated on all the traditional epic mechanisms. The reason he has so little to say about Ennius' Homerising is because, far from representing a fanciful and distracting ornament to the narrative, the re-calibrated sense of the City's history it effected is crucial to Ennius' historiographical endeavour as Cicero understood it. The fragments Cicero supplies betray the presence of Homerising material in less obtrusive a fashion than the Vergiliocentric material does but, as I shall argue below, where they are not limited to an individual line wrenched from the setting that would more fully inform us, they are just as susceptible to a Homerising reading as are those of the Vergiliocentrics themselves. Indeed, the fragments' effectiveness for Cicero's purposes is generally promoted if the Homeric elements are amplified to full strength. Many of the effects of Ennius' Homerising leant drama and vividness to a moralising view of the past and so were precisely what Cicero valued.

Even if Cicero was well enough aware that factual accuracy was not really part of the guarantee offered by epic, his faith in the work was a large one, not anchored directly in what the narrative presented as fact, although extending if necessary even to that, especially if it could be used to push a

p. 199) is even more complicated than it is in the case of prose historians, because so large a proportion of the surviving lines are quasi-formulaic (see Chapter 2, pp. 84–107). There has been a tendency to confuse quasi-formulaic language with historical detail (see Elliott 2010: 150–3, on Cannae).

[35] Thuc. 1.9–1.10; see Feeney 1991: 253. [36] Kroll 1924: 62, incl. n. 40; Feeney 1991: 256.

[37] Cf. Fleischmann's description of the mediaeval notion of history as 'what was willingly believed' (Fleischmann 1983: 305, quoted by Woodman 1988: 110, n. 100) and 'what was held to be true' (Fleischmann 1983: 305, quoted by Feeney 1991: 255).

[38] The most significant exceptions, as we have seen, are at *Div.* 1.39–43 and 2.115–16 (see Chapter 3, pp. 185–93).

key point. His apparent concept of Ennius' enterprise is, I suggest, readily analogous to the general, 'more philosophical and serious' kind of subject-matter that Aristotle attributes to poetry in general as opposed to historiography.[39] As we have seen, Cicero's attention tends to be drawn by the text's capacity for exemplarity, that is, its depiction of behaviours whose point lies not in their factual accuracy but rather in their paradigmatic nature – that are thus not intended to be unique and that Cicero quotes precisely with the aim of persuading his audience that they should be repeated.[40] To expose truths of this kind to detailed scrutiny on points of fact was neither practically possible (even when Cicero is interested in questioning the accuracy of the facts as presented in the text, he does so exclusively on grounds of probability),[41] nor would Cicero have held it generally a desirable or worthwhile exercise. The *Annales* did count as serious historiography for Cicero, but serious historiography legitimated by the sense of the greatness of the Roman past it promoted through serviceable images of the nation's history – ones that constituted known and trusted models and had the power to direct and inform the behaviours of the present day.

THE *ANNALES* AND ROMAN PROSE HISTORIOGRAPHY

The debate over the past thirty years on the nature of Roman historiography in its relationship to poetry and to rhetorical practice is fully germane to the interpretation of the *Annales*.[42] If the *Annales* have not been an explicit part of that debate, the reason is not least that the formal features of Ennius' account have insulated it, ironically enough, from involvement; for the discussion has focused above all on how ancient prose historiography retains the traces of its poetic predecessors and relatives. The arguments about the rhetorical and ideological shaping of ancient prose accounts of the past are *par excellence* applicable to the *Annales qua* poetry. This point would perhaps be too obvious to need stating, were it not that the idea that Ennius' task and aim in recounting Roman history was the detailed tracking

[39] In Aristotle's definition, the difference between poetry and historiography lies not in their formal properties but in their respective approaches to subject-matter: . . . τούτῳ διαφέρει, τῷ τὸν μὲν τὰ γενόμενα λέγειν, τὸν δὲ οἷα ἂν γένοιτο. διὸ καὶ φιλοσοφώτερον καὶ σπουδαιότερον ποίησις ἱστορίας ἐστίν· ἡ μὲν γὰρ ποίησις μᾶλλον τὰ καθόλου, ἡ δ'ἱστορία τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον λέγει (*Poet.* 1451 b 4–6).

[40] Chapter 3, pp. 163–71.

[41] See Chapter 3, pp. 190–2, on the treatment of *Ann.* 167 at *Div.* 2.115–16.

[42] See Wiseman 1979; Veyne 1983; Finley 1985; Woodman 1988; Luce 1989: 16–31; Gill and Wiseman 1993; and Marincola 1997; cf. Kroll 1924: 44–63. For a useful summary of the controversy engendered by the debate, see Kraus and Woodman 1997: 5–6.

of a documented past stands unchallenged in current standard editions and accounts of the *Annales*. Here, my argument will suggest that the relationship between the *Annales* and Roman prose historiography, particularly as instantiated by Livy, is not only a theoretical one, the result of their adoption of common mechanisms for the treatment of the past; rather, a genuine genealogy exists between them, far more palpable than that which Kroll (in the passage quoted on pp. 206–7) suggests exists between Ennius and the later composers of hexametric *annales*.

One of the primary battle-grounds for the debate over Roman historiography has been its practioners' use of *inventio*. This term, proper to the fields of rhetoric and forensic law, names the process by which an author 'discovers' a new but plausible way of looking at things, designed to change the audience's understanding of the subject-matter and its implications and consequences.[43] At *Inv.* 1.9, Cicero defines the term as *excogitatio rerum verarum aut veri similium, quae causam probabilem reddant* ('the devising of subject-matter that is true or like the truth, to make a claim appear credible'). The implied theory is that the 'discovery' is of a way of looking at the subject-matter which has always been latent; the task of the practitioner of *inventio*, be he orator, poet or historian, is to make his audience aware of this latent aspect of his subject-matter, to enable them to judge the situation in a more appropriate manner than they had done previously.

Ennius' Homerising practice can well be represented in these terms. On the one hand, it was the result of the literary strategy Ennius adopted to express his work's literary status and his own pre-eminence as a poet. At the same time, it was the key element in the poet's charged re-description of the past, critical to the new vision of Roman history the poem offered, yet representing an underlying reality (the implicit claim ran) that had always been there. It tacitly suggested that Rome's history was of a piece with Greece's history, which had already long had a place in international affairs and a conception of itself as central on the world stage, and thus invited the audience to re-think Rome's place in the world along these lines. To this extent, Ennius' Homerising is tantamount to the thoroughgoing exercise of *inventio*.

If the re-casting of material in Homerising form is less obtrusive where it manifests itself in prose historiography, it nevertheless does little to distinguish Ennius' practice from that of the prose historians, who regularly

[43] See Russell 1967: 135; Wiseman 1979: 21–6 (without explicit mention of the term) and 27–40, on the general relationship between rhetoric and historiography, including in terms of the need for plausibility in *narratio* and the place of *exempla* in either tradition;Wiseman 1981: 388–9; Woodman 1988: 83–94, 176–9.

presented their version of the Roman past using narrative patterns and images originating in Greek epic. Instances include Claudius Quadrigarius' presentation of a picture of single combat in terms heavily influenced by Homer.[44] The Homerising duel is frequent in Livy, as, for example, at 8.7.8–12 (the narrative of the younger Manlius Torquatus' duel with the Tusculan Geminus Maecius).[45] At Livy 25.18, the duel between the guest-friends Crispinus (Roman) and Badius (Campanian) is preceded by an exchange in which Crispinus attempts to make the Homeric Glaucus and Diomedes of *Il.* 6.227–9 the model for the episode – although, when he is thwarted in this by Badius' arrogant aggression, Crispinus goes on to win the duel outright.[46] The origin of this unconcealed Homerising in the description of Roman history may in some part lie in the *Annales*. Of course, neither the widespread practice of *inventio* nor the place of Homerising within it was an innovation on the part of Roman historiographical literature.[47] These typical aspects of ancient historiographical practice at large are evidence for its close contact with and origin in verse. Given Ennius' evident role in shaping the Roman historiographical imagination,[48] however, and the centrality (from our perspective) of Homerising among his literary strategies, whenever *inventio* takes on a Homerising cast in Roman prose historiography, we might begin to discern Ennius' particular presence.

Besides the idea of a core of historicity and the use of Homer as a common rhetorical technique for re-imagining the Roman past, other similarities, too, in technique, in scope and in structure, give token of a strong relationship between the *Annales* and Roman prose historiography. The competition Ennius sets up between Pyrrhus and Curius for proper possession of the characteristics of courage and resistance to bribery has an analogue in Livy's creation of a productive ambivalence in the presentation

[44] Frg. 12. This instance is cited and discussed by Fornara 1983: 29, n. 51, in support of the idea that history's mimetic mode filtered gradually into theoretically separate branches of historiography, such as chronography, as represented by Claudius Quadrigarius.

[45] Feldherr 1998: 107, with n. 81; Oakley 1985: 392–410.

[46] This instance is cited by Wiseman 1979: 23, n. 92.

[47] Norden 1958: 91–5, Ogilvie 1965: 29, Woodman 1988: 98–101, Foucher 2000 and the essays in Levene and Nelis 2002 are among the basic points of reference for the vast topic of *inventio* as practice in the ancient historiographical tradition at large. For Homer and historiography generally, see Strasburger 1972 (the standard work); cf. the literature cited in nn. 20, 21 and 22, p. 205. For Homer and Herodotus specifically, see Walbank 1960: 221–8; also *RE* 2A.502–4; Norden 1958: 38–41; Fornara 1983: 30–2; and Woodman 1988: 1–5; on Thucydides and Homer, *ibid.*

[48] See nn. 13 and 14 of Chapter 2, p. 80, as well as the sections on Cicero and the *Bell. Hisp.* of Chapter 3.

of Romans and their enemies in the *AUC*,[49] sometimes with palpable use of Ennius himself.[50] Again, in terms of the familiar Horatian distinction between history as beginning *ab ovo* and epic *in medias res* (*AP* 147–8), the *Annales* align themselves with the prose medium as opposed to the genre to which they formally belong. Beginning *ab ovo* is in its own way a generic marker as significant as the use of the hexameter, and the two in conjunction represent one manifestation of the particular tension between modes of writing up the past that defines the *Annales*. Besides this, structural analogies on both a large and a small scale strengthen the relationship between the *Annales* and the *AUC*.

C. J. Classen points out that Ennius' division of the work into books is something new at that date in Roman literature of any genre.[51] The book-division can be read as evidence that Ennius was aware of and responding to the Alexandrians' treatment of Homeric epic;[52] but another possibility, not exclusive of the former, is that the book-division is the result of Ennius' reading of Greek historians. At any rate, as Classen also points out,[53] Ennius' use of book-divisions further constitutes one of his principal legacies to Roman literature as a whole, for which Roman historiography is just as indebted to him as later Roman epic is.

In Chapter 1, we glanced at the theory of the triadic structure of the *Annales*, also illustrated and discussed in Appendix Table A1.1.[54] These triads may in fact be a retrojection from Livy, the product of scholarly

[49] Kraus 1994b: 267–89. (On the reciprocity between Curius and Pyrrhus, see Chapter 3, pp. 170–1. For further suggestion of the even-handed allocation of sympathy between Romans and non-Romans in the *Annales*, see Chapter 5, pp. 279–81).

[50] Elliott 2009a: 531–41.

[51] Classen 1992: 133–4. Unlike with Naevius, there is no evidence that the book-divisions of the *Annales* are not original to Ennius. (On the division of the *Bellum Punicum* into seven books by Octavius Lampadio, perhaps under the influence of Crates' visit to Rome in 168 BCE, see Suet. *Gramm.* 2, with Hendrickson 1898: 286. Gratwick 1982: 60 suggests that, in his division of the *Bellum Punicum* into books, Octavius Lampadio was influenced not least by Ennius himself.) See also Suerbaum 1992: 153–73 on Naevius, Ennius and book-division in antiquity. Classen points out that, of itself, the division into books and, beyond that, the postulated triadic organisation (see Appendix Table A1.1), constitutes something of an interpretation of the 'history' at hand and makes the *Annales* something other than 'annalistic'.

[52] For exploration of the idea that Ennius' interaction with Greek literature was mediated by the scholar-poets of Alexandria, see Kroll 1916: 5–7; and, with specific regard to hypothetical Hellenistic historical and encomiastic epic, Ziegler 1966: Appendix (cf. also Brink 1972: 547–60). Cameron 1995: 263–302 takes issue with Ziegler in particular and is in turn criticised by Kerkhecker 2001: 47–79 (esp. 58–60); cf. Knox 1996: 419–24. For further bibliography on the affiliations of Ennius' work to Hellenistic poetry in general, see Kerkhecker 2001: 50, n. 29 and *passim*; and for a recent summary of the views of Ennius as the descendant of Hellenistic poets, including historical epicists, with further bibliography, see Breed and Rossi 2006: 415–17. Bing 1988: 50–90, supported by the *Supplementum Hellenisticum*, describes the traits and techniques of the Homerising Hellenistic poets (summarised *ibid.* 56 as 'non-allusive epicism, familiar epic vocabulary, "typical" actions taken over intact'), in terms which suggest their close kinship with Ennius.

[53] Classen, *loc. cit.*, n. 23. [54] Pp. 38–40.

imagination prompted not only by the common subject-matter but by organisational similarities, such as the fact that the *Annales*, like the *AUC*, cover progressively fewer years.[55] If in fact the theory of the triads represents an original organisational reality, the conceptual correspondence between these triads and Livy's famous pentads and decades is plausibly the result of a similar approach to the writing of Roman history and perhaps even of a direct line of descent.[56] If not, it at any rate reflects scholars' sensitivity to the fundamental similarities between the two works.

One reason to accept the larger thematic grouping of books in the *Annales* as in the *AUC* is that it is clear that the two works share an analogous choreography on a smaller scale: both Ennius and Livy use the episode as a primary articulating device of the narrative.[57] Our few extended fragments of the *Annales* show every sign of episodic construction after Homer, sometimes with simple substitutions of characters (the tribune Caelius for Ajax at *Ann.* 391–8, the two Istrians for Polypoites and Leontes of *Il.* 12 at *Ann.* Bk. 15, frg. iv), sometimes through the free invention of altogether new episodes that nevertheless retain points of contact with Homeric narrative (Ilia's dream at *Ann.* 34–50, the auspicate of Romulus and Remus at *Ann.* 72–91, Pyrrhus' speech at *Ann.* 183–90, and the 'good companion' at *Ann.* 268–86).[58] Gellius' notice that *Ann.* 268–86 (the 'good companion' fragment) occurs *sub historia Gemini Servilii* ('during the story of Servilius Geminus', *NA* 12.4.1) also implies the use of tableaux. Livy's episodic construction will also depend on Homer, whether directly or indirectly (a theoretical distinction); but given Livy's subject-matter and the fact that he too would have been educated on the *Annales*, there is every probability that his conception of the structure of events (especially of early history) would have been informed by Ennius.

Wiseman suggests that, from the fourth century on, Romans received knowledge of the past from dramatic performances at the *Ludi Romani* and the *Ludi Plebei*; and that the episodic nature of Roman historiographical narrative is thus indirectly traceable to an origin on the stage.[59] The *Annales*

[55] See Chapter 1, pp. 67–9, on the ancient evidence for the distribution of material into the books of the *Annales*, and pp. 69–71, on Livy as a comparandum for Ennius narrative economy; also, p. 65, on how little we actually know about the chronology and dates with which Ennius operated.

[56] On the structure of Livy's history, see Stadter 1972: 287–307. Stadter argues (e.g. on p. 293) that the irregularity of the number of years covered per book signals thematic division. The same argument could well be applied to Ennius. On book-division and symmetry in Livy's first pentad and the parallels to be found in the poetry books of the 30s and early 20s BCE and in the *Aeneid*, see Vasaly 2002: 275–90.

[57] For Livy's episodic construction, see Witte 1910: 270–305, 359–419. For the argument that follows, cf. Ogilvie 1965: 670 on Livy's 'arrangement of material . . . [being] . . . calculated to recall epic treatment'. Ogilvie (*ibid.*) also speaks of 'the overall epic pattern which L. may in part have inherited from a tradition that went back to Ennius'.

[58] Cf. Chapter 1, pp. 60–6, on the shape and pace of the *Annales*.

[59] Wiseman 1994: 12, 16–22.

provide an alternative (again not mutually exclusive) point of derivation for the historiographical episode. Their claim to consideration is promoted by the survival of those fragments that confirm that episodes are central to the text's mode of narration, in fulfilment of the *a priori* expectation set up by the text's primary model, the *Iliad*. The common modelling of narrative patterns on Homer in Ennius and Livy strengthens the likelihood that the connection to Ennius is the relevant one to make; so, too, does the occasional traceable contact in points of detail between their texts,[60] despite the reticence of the sources.[61] Conversely, Livy's deployment of episodes within a compromised annalistic structure is one possible model on which to base a tentative understanding of the economy of the *Annales*.

Episodic construction is a prerequisite of exemplarity as we know it from Livy.[62] As we have seen, Cicero makes it appear that exemplarity was a feature of the *Annales*;[63] so, too (though this does not constitute independent testimony), do his direct descendants.[64] If this is not misleading and exemplarity was indeed a feature of the *Annales*, that would accord with the conclusions of modern studies of the function of epic at Rome as a form of moral education and exhortation.[65] It would also constitute another point of contact between Ennius' enterprise and Livy's and another possible aspect of Livy's Ennian inheritance.

It has long been recognised that Livy's Preface is rife with allusions to epic poetry.[66] Livy effectively begins the *AUC* with the Ennian words *operae pretium*,[67] and Quintilian confirms that the phrase to which they belong is properly dactylic;[68] while the words with which he concludes the preface make open allusion to his epic predecessors:

[60] See, again, Chapter 2, nn. 13 and 14, p. 80.

[61] For brief speculation as to the reason for this in the working methods of the sources, see Chapter 2, n. 12, p. 79.

[62] For exemplarity in Livy, see primarily Chaplin 2000.

[63] For Cicero's use of the *Annales* as a source for exemplary instances from the past, see Chapter 3, pp. 163–71.

[64] For Augustine's use (*Civ*. 2.21) of *Ann*. 156 for its exemplary value, in direct dependence on Cicero, see Elliott 2007: 41–3.

[65] See e.g. Keith 2000: 9–18 and Habinek 1998: Chapter 2.

[66] On the preface as a whole, see Moles 1993a: 141–68; on Livy's dactyls and Ennian *operae pretium*, *ibid*. 141–2; and *ibid*. 158 on the relevance of the *Odyssey*; cf. Lundström 1915: 1–24; Wilkinson 1963: 160–1; and Pinsent 1977: 13–18. See also Feeney 2007: 101 on Livy's possible engagement with *Ann*. 154–5 at *Pref*. 4.

[67] Not everyone agrees that *operae pretium* is interpretably Ennian: see Ogilvie 1965: 25. Early instances of the phrase *operae pretium* outside Ennius exist, e.g. at Plaut. *Cas*. 879 and Ter. *Andr*. 217; see the literature cited in n. 72, p. 217.

[68] Quintilian, *Institutiones* 9.4.74: *T. Livius hexametri exordio coepit:* '*facturusne operae pretium sim*' – *nam ita editum est, [quod] melius quam quo modo emendatur* . . . Ogilvie (*loc. cit*.) is altogether sceptical about the significance of the hexametric rhythms with which the Roman prose historians tend to begin; he suggests that they are no more than 'a fashionable affectation'.

> sed querellae, ne tum quidem gratae futurae cum forsitan necessariae erunt, ab initio certe tantae ordiendae rei absint: cum bonis potius ominibus votisque et precationibus deorum dearumque, si, ut poetis, nobis quoque mos esset, libentius inciperemus, ut orsis tantum operis successus prosperos darent.
>
> But complaints will find no favour even on those occasions when perhaps there will be no avoiding them; let them, then, be gone at least from the beginning of this great undertaking. I would more gladly begin if only it were our [i.e. prose historians'] habit, as it is the poets' with good omens and prayers and entreaties to all the gods that at least to the beginnings of this work they grant successful issue.

In these words, Livy both overtly distances himself, as a prose historian, from the fantasies of the poets and at the same time covertly draws his own chronicle of the City into relation with epic,[69] the mode of writing that occupied the highest rung in the ancient hierarchy of genres. In view of the other (evident or hypothetical) points of contact between the *AUC* and the *Annales*, I suggest that Livy's allusion is not just to epic procedure and to epic rank generally, as is typically conceded, but specifically to Ennius, as the author Livy thought of as his most impressive competitor. In particular, I suggest that what motivates the Ennian signposting at the head of the *AUC* is the contact between Livy's work and Ennius' in terms of their common exemplary function.

Livy's phrase *operae pretium* is attested at *Ann.* 494–5: *audire est operae pretium procedere recte/qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere voltis* ('It is worthwhile to listen, you who desire the Roman state to flourish and Latium to find increase'), a fragment we owe to the commentators on Horace.[70] They, however, provide us with no way of telling which episode these lines introduced. Despite this, it is clear enough from their content that they constituted a forceful textual marker highlighting the ethical significance of what was to follow. The listeners, whether they are an unknown speaker's internal audience or the poet's external audience (or both) are exhorted to listen on the grounds that listening will represent a fulfilment of their yen to see Rome grow stronger on the path ahead. The implication is thus that the tale that followed presented its hearers with evidence of how to bring about such flourishing in the city – effectively that it represents an exemplary episode.

[69] Moles 1993a: 141–2, 156–9.

[70] 'Porphyrio' and Ps.-Acro on Hor. *Serm.* 1.2.37: *audire est operae pretium procedere recte/qui moechis non vultis ut omni parte laborent* (see Appendix Table A5.26, p. 502).

The phrase *operae pretium* recurs fairly rarely in the extant remains of Livy's text.[71] One noteworthy instance is at *AUC* 3.26.7, which runs: *operae pretium est audire qui omnia prae diuitiis humana spernunt neque honori magno locum neque uirtuti putant esse, nisi ubi effuse affluant opes* ('It is worthwhile for them to listen who despise all human achievement when compared to riches and who think that neither great recognition nor worth has a place except where wealth in abundance comes flooding in'). Ogilvie calls the phrase 'a magnificent *exordium* ushering on to the stage the one man who exemplifies the highest Roman qualities of character'.[72] This man is L. Quinctius Cincinnatus, in Livy as elsewhere a cipher for the austerity and steadfastness associated with early Rome and the antithesis of modern corruption and lust for power. In Livy's narrative, Cincinnatus, like Camillus and Fabius Maximus 'Cunctator', fits the type of a Roman leader whose behaviour is in some respect problematic but who is ultimately vindicated and whose selfless actions prove to be Rome's salvation. In this capacity and as the ideal representative of such quintessential Roman virtues as frugality, industry and dedication to duty, Cincinnatus was long a firm fixture in the Roman historical imagination. (No trace of him survives among the scarce remains of the *Annales*.) As Ogilvie writes, '[the] uniqueness [of the occurrence of the phrase in the body of the text] stresses the emphasis which Livy wishes to place on the moral character of Cincinnatus. It is a new opening. We are now to witness the contrast between contemporary decadence and ancient simplicity, between Cincinnatus and Appius Claudius.'[73] The intrusion of Ennius' voice into Livy's narrative via the antique phrase alerts the reader to the ethical significance of what is to follow and endows the moment with the authority of the *Annales*.

The *Annales* were undoubtedly the most culturally prominent competitor that Livy faced as he embarked on the task of presenting his own

[71] The phrase is used of what is or is not worth recording or recounting (at 1.24.6; 5.21.9; 26.34.2; 29.29.5; 33.20.13, in the abbreviated form *non operae est* . . ., as also at 41.25.8; 35.40.1); of what is worth hearing (at 21.9.3, in the abbreviated form *operae esse*); and of effort worth investing, enterprises worth undertaking, persons worth rewarding, or return to be received, sometimes specifically in terms of material reward (at 4.8.3, in the abbreviated form *operae erat*; at 5.15.5, with Ogilvie's note *ad loc.*; at 9.23.12, in the abbreviated form *operae est*; 21.43.9, in the odd plural form *magna operae pretia*, directly of financial reward; 22.28.4; 25.6.21; 25.19.11; 25.30.3; 27.17.14; 28.42.7; 31.45.9; 39.46.8; 43.10.2 and 21.5; and 44.26.13, once more in abbreviated form).

[72] Ogilvie 1965: 441. Ogilvie, citing Fraenkel 1957: 81 in support, proposes that the phrase was indeed traditional, 'an old introductory formula' which, he suggests, in all probability originally belonged to forensic oratory; cf. Fraenkel on Ter, *Andr.* 217, *audireque eorumst operae pretium audaciam*: the phrase is a 'wahrscheinlich sehr alte Einleitungsformel effektvoller Berichte' (Fraenkel and Fränkel 1931: 121, 1).

[73] Ogilvie *loc. cit.*

mammoth chronicle, and in themselves the *Annales* explain Livy's urge to signal hexametric epic so strongly in his opening. Livy's vocabulary shows him confronting this titan, Ennius, head on. The occurrence of the phrase *operae pretium* right at the start of the *AUC* gestures, if ironically, at the aspirations of his work in terms of both scope and in terms of its claim to rival the *Annales* as the crucial expression of what it meant to be Roman.

It is worth reflecting on the possibility that, just as Ennius stood as the Roman Homer to subsequent poets at Rome,[74] so, too, he represented to the Roman historiographical tradition what Homer had represented to its Greek equivalent.[75] Would the prose historians of Rome have made their famous opening gestures at hexametric epic,[76] if Ennius had not been a particular inspiration to their reconstruction of the Roman past? Those gestures, after all, are not something we find in the Greek historiographical prefaces (unless we count Thuc. 1.21.1 as an exception),[77] however close the general engagement with Homer. What marked Ennius' vision of Roman history for success was his ground-breaking amalgamation of the features of local Roman or annalistic historiography with the habits of Homeric epic. This combination communicated that the same Rome that had heretofore appeared as of local (if gradually expanding) significance effectively represented the culmination of the development of world history: that, unbeknownst to the actors, the City had been of importance on the global stage from the beginnings of time into a predetermined future.[78] It is not clear that the subsequent authors of verse *annales* were able to co-opt and extend this aspect of Ennius' work with any degree of success; we have little by which to gauge such poems' real relationship to Ennius' epic, beyond the fact that their formal features were alike. Neither does it appear from our present perspective that these poems commanded any large success, either in broadening contemporary understanding of the Roman past or in affecting the subsequent course of literary history.[79] It is instead in prose

[74] In terms of explicit remarks, see e.g. Prop. 3.3.6, Ov. *Am.* 1.15.19.

[75] For the relationship between Homer and Greek historiography, see the literature cited in nn. 20, 22 and 23, pp. 205–6.

[76] Not just Livy, *Pref.* 1, but Tac. *Ann.* 1.1 and Sall. *Jug.* 5.1; see Dunn 1989: 489. Cardinali postulates that even Cato's *Origines* began with a hexameter (Cardinali 1988: 205–15).

[77] Furthermore, Boedeker 2001: 123–4 collects some examples of 'hexameters and hexameters *manqués*' in Herodotus' text at large, judging them not only deliberate but, at least in some cases, specifically allusive.

[78] See the argument of Chapter 5.

[79] Hexametric '*Annales*' are attested for Accius and Furius Bibaculus (cf. Chapter 1, n. 52, p. 34). Courtney thinks that Accius' *Annales* might have been 'a chronicle epic like Ennius', of unknown subject-matter (Courtney 2003: 60); if so, it failed to make its mark. Courtney also contemplates the

historiography that Ennius' hybridisation of the contents and methods of local Roman or annalistic historiography and the formal features of Homeric epic was to bear fruit in the burgeoning understanding of Rome's place in the world.[80]

In highlighting the similarities between the rhetorical strategies of Ennius and of the prose historians, I have not meant to downplay the difference that genre makes. Not only did the poet's startling use of actual Homeric metre and of the artificial Homerising language he coined heave the practice as a whole into a prominence it could never have had in the works of his prose competitors; it also brought in its train a fundamental difference in mode of presentation, in the light in which his audience would envision the past. For one thing, the criterion of 'probability' or 'lifelikeness' that Cicero's definition of *inventio* highlights (see p. 212) finds itself altered in a new generic context; for the issue of what was appropriate or credible in a given work's presentation was in the ancient world not primarily determined by how recent or distant in time its subject-matter was (even though Quintus' *nonnulli* take up that cause) but by that work's formal features.[81] This difference in mode of presentation and its interpretative consequences is ultimately what I seek to privilege, for it is this that determined the unique contribution the *Annales* had to make to how Rome's past was now to be conceived. This explains why what the *Annales* and the *AUC* (or any other work of Roman historiography) had to offer was not interchangeable simply on account of the fact that they and other texts covered common ground, were hung, perhaps, on a similar framework of 'data'.[82]

We return now to the text of the *Annales*, in the interests of exploring some particulars of that unique contribution. Below, I consider five passages, privileging their Homeric resonances. All the passages are attributed (by their source or by modern conjecture) to the 'historical' section of the narrative, from Book 6 on. Two originate in Cicero (*Ann.* 199–200 and *Ann.* 183–90, the latter considered together with *Ann.* 197–8), one in

possibility that the work was 'a kind of *Fasti*, about months and festivals'; the six-line frg. 3 describes the Athenian Cronia, comparable to the Roman Saturnalia (Macr. *Sat.* 1.7.36). Frier suggests the poem was 'an antiquarian work probably on Roman pre-history alone' (Frier 1999: 217, n. 48). Despite the title, however, there are no evident traces of the annalistic tradition in the seven surviving fragments. The same is true of Furius Bibaculus' *Annales*. Macrobius, who provides seven of our nine fragments, names this work as '*Annales' tout court*. Schol. Ver. *Aen.* 9.379, however, term it *Annales Belli Gallici*, thus limiting its subject-matter; cf. Chapter 1, pp. 58–9. Ps.-Acro for his part termed the work *Pragmatia Belli Gallici* (see Courtney 2003: 198), a title which complicates the relationship between Roman epic and the traditions of historiography still further.

[80] For a discussion of the reflexes of the originally local annalistic tradition in Livy and Tacitus, whose works represent late and hybridised tokens of that tradition, see the bibliography cited in Chapter 1, n. 51.

[81] See Feeney 1991: 250–63; Feeney 2006.

[82] For the relevant sense of the term 'data', see nn. 37, 34 and 35, pp. 208–9.

Nonius (*Ann.* 361), one in Macrobius (*Ann.* 391–8) and one in Gellius (*Ann.* 268–86).

Book 6: Appius Claudius, Ann. *199–200 (Cic.* Sen. *16)*

Like its partner, Pyrrhus' speech (*Ann.* 183–90), the speech of Appius Claudius in Book 6 of the *Annales* has strong Homeric resonances. These have come to scholars' attention but have largely remained inert in modern interpretation of the text.[83] We have already considered the fragment's context at *Sen.* 16, where Cicero promotes the lines as more serviceable than the documentary version of Appius' speech extant in his day.[84] The surviving words of the quotation run:

> quo vobis mentes, rectae quae stare solebant
> antehac, dementes sese flexere †via?
>
> What way has your sense, which used to maintain a sound position in times past, ?gone senseless, derailed?

The words recall the beginning of Hecuba's speech to Priam in response to his announcement that he intends to go in person to Achilles' hut (*Iliad* 24.201–2):

> ὤ μοι, πῇ δή τοι φρένες οἴχονθ', ᾗς τὸ πάρος περ
> ἔκλε' ἐπ' ἀνθρώπους ξείνους ἠδ' οἷσιν ἀνάσσεις;[85]
>
> Ah me, where has that wisdom gone for which you were famous
> In time before, among outlanders and those you rule over?[86]

Related poetic resonances have been noted. Skutsch dismisses comparison of Archil. 172.2 West, τίς σὰς παρήειρε φρένας ('who has stolen your wits?') and Soph. *Ajax* 182–4, οὔποτε γὰρ φρενόθεν γ' ἐπ' ἀριστερά . . . ἔβας τόσσον ('for never before have you wandered so far afield from your wits'); but it is clear that the Ennian speech began on a emotional high-note that rather inspires comparison to the language of poetry than to 'the more sedate opening of the historians'.[87] Skutsch (*loc. cit.*) notices the tragic

[83] Vahlen 1903: 36; Kameke 1926; Gratwick 1982: 62, n. 1, where the notice of the Homeric echo is subordinated to the statement in the body of the text of the switch at this juncture to a rational and evidence-based mode of historiography; Skutsch 1985: 360–1, the latter more non-committal than is Gratwick about the relevance of the Homeric lines and the directness of the modelling. Flores *et al.* 2002: 153 cite Niese 1896: 494, n. 2, who compares not *Il.* 24.201–2, as the rest, but *Il.* 8.229, πῇ ἔβαν εὐχωλαί . . . (speech of Agamemnon reproving the troops).

[84] Chapter 3, pp. 161–4.

[85] Cf. *Aen.* 2.519, *quae mens tam dira, miserrime coniunx/. . .*, cited by Flores *et al.* 2002: 153.

[86] Transl. Lattimore 1951.

[87] Skutsch 1985: 360–1. Skutsch's search there is for something resembling a speech that could actually have been given by Appius in the senate.

roots of the oxymoron *mentes . . . dementes* ('senseless . . . sense'), referring it to Euripides' αἰὼν δυσαίων ('life that is a travesty of living'; *Hel.* 213) and γάμοι δύσγαμοι ('marriage, no marriage'; *Phoen.* 1047), and suggesting that Scaliger's translation, φρένες ἄφρονες ('senseless sense'), may recover a Greek original, possibly foreshadowed in *Il.* 4.104 and 16. 842, φρένας ἄφρονι πεῖθεν ('he won over the senseless fool's mind'). The expressions Ennius has his Appius Claudius employ thus have their origins deep in the rhetoric of tragedy and Homeric epic. They hint at the emotional nature of the senate-scene in the *Annales*, and they suggest how Ennius dramatised Appius' impassioned response to potential Roman capitulation to Pyrrhus' request for peace.

The series of references suggested by the implied comparison between Appius Claudius and Hecuba are no easy ones, given Hecuba's gender and her history in both epic and tragedy, and this may help explain why its ramifications have largely been left unexplored. The many obvious points of dissimilarity between Hecuba's situation and Appius Claudius' in the particular Roman historical moment in question include the fact that Hecuba's outburst was conducted in the domestic arena, in the grip of intense personal grief for Hector, and that it was motivated by fear for her husband. Hecuba ultimately fails in her attempt at persuasion, and that turns out to be for the best; Appius succeeds, and his stand against the majority is portrayed as being in the interests of Rome.

Despite the differences, however, we can easily construe points of contact. Appius' exasperation with the Senate and his fear of the possible consequences of its decisions are communicated to great effect by Ennius' adumbration of Hecuba's parallel exasperation with her husband and of her fear on his behalf. Appius' long experience of the Senate surely has an echo in Hecuba's seasoned knowledge of the foibles of her spouse. The authority over their addressees these aged persons share is in each case communicated by the rather undermining remonstrance, 'Where has your good sense gone?' The differences between the two situations thus arguably only add expressive power to what Appius has to say. The intensity of Hecuba's visceral appeal to Priam and the emotional drama of that particular, desperate moment in the *Iliad* help convey the extremity in which Rome momentarily found herself, as well as the deep concern moving Appius to speak.

Ennius' startling characterisation of the stern, aged and blind senator via the language of the grief-stricken and exasperated Asiatic queen is critical to Cicero's use of the episode at *Sen.* 16. The emotional power of the moment would graft Ennius' words into his audience's memory for generations to come, with the result that Cicero could expect the speech to come easily to

mind (cf. *notum enim vobis carmen est*) and well to illustrate Appius' effective involvement in political action. Hecuba's own old age is relevant to the context in the *De Senectute*, while her failure only thrusts the power of Appius' oratory into relief.

Book 6: Pyrrhus, Ann. *183–90 (Cic.* Off. *1.38);* Ann. *197–8 (Cic.* Div. *2.115–16)*

We have already seen Cicero (*Div.* 2.115–16) use Ennius' rendering of Pyrrhus' oracle (*Ann.* 167) to illustrate the licence of which the poet availed himself in presenting the actors and events of Roman history.[88] Although Cicero does not make a similar point at *Off.* 1.38, where he supplies Pyrrhus' speech, the speech itself as Cicero quotes it suggests that the same licence characterised Ennius' presentation of events as a whole concerning Pyrrhus.[89] The speech as we have it runs thus:[90]

> Pyrrhi quidem de captivis redendis illa praeclara:
> nec mi aurum posco nec mi pretium dederitis:
> non cauponantes bellum sed belligerantes
> ferro, non auro vitam cernamus utrique.
> vosne velit an me regnare era quidve ferat Fors
> virtute experiamur, et hoc simul accipe dictum:
> quorum virtuti belli fortuna pepercit
> eorundem me libertati parcere certum est.
> dono ducite doque volentibus cum magnis dis.
> regalis sane et digna Aeacidarum genere sententia.

> There is that illustrious speech of Pyrrhus' on the return of the captives: 'I make no demand for gold, nor shall you give me a ransom. Not in trafficking in but in waging war, with iron and not with gold, let us each resolve the issue of our lives. Whether it is you or me whom Lady Fortune wishes should rule, or whatsoever she may bring, let it be by valour that we put it to the test. And hear this word, too: those whose valour the fortune of war has spared, it is my resolve to grant their freedom. I bestow them on you take them I give them, with the will of the great gods.' It's a thoroughly kingly thought and worthy of a scion of the Aeacids.

[88] For the quotation context, see Chapter 3, pp. 189–93.

[89] In contrast to my view that the speech represents poetic re-invention, Jackson suggests that the idiosyncracies of Ennius' version of the speech may reflect a Calabrian oral tradition, with which Ennius had come into personal contact (Flores *et al.* 2009: 132). He notes the profound effect of Ennius' account on the Roman historiographical tradition.

[90] Elliott 2007: 52–4 makes a similar case. The translation of the passage I give above is taken from there.

The fact that Cicero conceives of and refers to Pyrrhus' words as 'worthy of a scion of the Aeacids' (*digna Aeacidarum genere sententia*) is surely a result of his thinking of Pyrrhus primarily through Ennius' narrative, where every recognisable mention of Pyrrhus refers to him via a heroised version of his descent.[91] There is particular emphasis on the nobility of Pyrrhus' Greek lineage at *Ann.* 165, *navos . . . homo, Graio patre, Graius homo, rex* ('an active man, of Greek lineage, a Greek man, a king'), where the poetic and specifically epic form *Graius* places Ennius' character at a further remove from the problematic historical person of Pyrrhus;[92] as well as at *Ann.* 166, with *a stirpe supremo* ('of most distinguished descent'). The graceful expression and the elaborate rhetorical structure of Pyrrhus' speech as transmitted by Cicero add further to the effect.[93] This fragment thus well explains how Cicero arrives at his rather surprising sense of Pyrrhus' nobility and exemplary nature.

The literary qualities of Pyrrhus' speech assimilate it to the fragment of Appius Claudius' speech discussed above. In both cases, the poetic cast of the language moves the episode out of the recent, historically accessible past into a world coloured as a literary–heroic one. The presentation of Pyrrhus, like that of Appius, is refracted through the lens of possible counterparts in the *Iliad*. The consistent characterisation of Pyrrhus by his descent from Aeacus plays on the fact that the historical Pyrrhus and his family were especially keen to claim descent from Achilles. And indeed, Pyrrhus' words, as quoted by Cicero, present him winningly to us as a particularly gentle version of the Achilles of *Iliad* 24, in his lack of interest in ransom (*Ann.* 183–5, 188–90) and in his insistence on valour alone as the arbiter of life and freedom (*Ann.* 186–7). The modelling of Pyrrhus on the noble and humane Achilles of *Iliad* 24 has everything to do with the passage's utility to Cicero, since the allusion promotes precisely those qualities of grace, nobility and

[91] Those references are *navos . . . homo, Graio patre, Graius homo, rex* (*Ann.* 165); *nomine Burrus uti memorant a stirpe supremo* (*Ann.* 166); *te Aeacida* (*Ann.* 167); *stolidum genus Aeacidarum* (*Ann.* 197); and *at non sic dubius fuit hostis/Aeacida Burrus* (*Ann.* 474–5).

[92] See Skutsch 1985: 524 and 331 on *Graecos* and *Graios*. Skutsch (1985: 331) aptly compares the expression *Graius homo* to Homeric Δάρδανος ἀνήρ.

[93] See *ibid.* 348–53 (based on Fränkel 1935: 66–72); also Williams 1968: 254–5 and Goldberg 1995: 101–2. These scholars note e.g. repeated rhetorical antithesis: see Skutsch on *nec. . . nec* (*Ann.* 183), *non* (*Ann.* 184), *ferro non auro* (*Ann.* 185 and *Ann.* 188 f.). For the literary ancestry of the phrase *cauponantes bellum* (*Ann.* 184), and *cauponor* as a calque of Aeschylus' καπηλεύω, see Skutsch 1985: 350, Fränkel 1935: 66 and Williams 1968: 255. For the archaic and poetical nature of *cernere* in place of *decernere*, see Skutsch on *vitam cernamus* (*Ann.* 185); likewise for the alliterative groupings *vosne velit . . . ferat Fors* (*Ann.* 186) and the likely reflection in *era Fors* of a Greek comment on Τύχη being a δέσποινα; cf. Fränkel 1935: 68. For poetic concentration of expression (e.g. *virtuti* replacing the expected *vitae*), see Skutsch on *virtuti* (188 f.). For aesthetic appreciation of the passage as a whole, see Flores *et al.* 2009: 131–40.

humanity that Cicero wishes to illustrate as appropriate to honourably motivated warfare.

To the recall of Achilles, the insulting assessment of the Aeacids at *Ann.* 197–8 offers a striking contrast. This fragment gestures at the *Iliad*'s other famous Aeacid, the stalwart but uninspired Ajax,[94] and indeed it promotes the less flattering aspects of that reference, for the lines openly refer to the proverbial stupidity of Ajax and his descendants:

> stolidum genus Aeacidarum:
> bellipotentes sunt magis quam sapientipotentes

> dull is the race of the Aeacids:
> they are more powerful in war than in wits.

In relaying the fragment, Cicero (*Div.* 2.115–16) says only that the lines are *apud Ennium* ('in Ennius'). We thus have no indication of who their speaker is. Skutsch dismisses Müller's and Valmaggi's suggestion that the speaker was Appius Claudius, on the grounds that 'the Roman statesman can hardly be credited with allusions to Greek mythology or with flattering references to the enemy's military prowess'.[95] Such reasoning depends, however, on an understanding of Ennius' characters as accurate portrayals of their historical counterparts. In my reading, the former if not the latter all consistently spoke the language of Homeric epic, besides being themselves described in it. If the Ennian Appius' own words cast him as an Achilles-hating Hecuba, as I suggested above, he would have all the more reason to use Pyrrhus' patronymic in a derogatory way.

Whoever the speaker was, the co-existence of the fragment alongside *Ann.* 183–90 implies an oscillation in the text between the reference in the patronymic Aeacides to the Achilles of *Iliad* 24 and the far less flattering comparison at *Ann.* 197–8 to the *Iliad*'s brave but inarticulate Ajax, depending on the perspective of the speaker. In this way we arrive at a complex process of characterisation and counter-characterisation reminiscent of how, in the *Aeneid*, different facets of Achilles (murderous beserker of *Iliad* 21 or pattern of humanity in *Iliad* 24) are at different moments reflected in Aeneas and Turnus. The competition for honourable characteristics I suggested between Pyrrhus at *Ann.* 183–90 and Curius Dentatus at *Ann.* 356 is also comparable,[96] as is the complication of Appius Claudius' characterisation at *Ann.* 199–200 by the effective incongruity of his juxtaposition with the Homeric Hecuba.

[94] Cf. Skutsch 1985: 358–9. [95] *Ibid.*
[96] See the sections on Cic. *Off.* 1.38 and *Rep.* 3.4 in Chapter 3, pp. 167–71.

The words of *Ann.* 183–90 as a whole, and especially *Ann.* 186–7 (*vosne velit an me regnare era quidve ferat Fors/virtute experiamur*), imply that Pyrrhus envisioned a moral equality between himself and the Romans. They are thus well suited to Cicero's point at *Off.* 1.38: that the contest with Pyrrhus was about *uter imperaret* ('which would rule') rather than about *uter esset* ('which would survive'). Pyrrhus' mention of 'the will of the great gods' (*Ann.* 190) and his implication of his own obedience to it was in itself means for him to command Roman respect. Given the presence of *Iliad* 24 in the speech as quoted, the same phrase is perhaps also reminiscent of the gods' oversight of Priam's embassy to Achilles and the ransoming of Hector's body. If we are not deceived by the text's fragmentary state, the common allusion to *Iliad* 24 in *Ann.* 183–90 and *Ann.* 199–200 creates a sort of responsion between the two principal opposing speakers who dominated the scene in the aftermath of Pyrrhus' onslought on Italy.

Book 11: Ann. *361 (Non. 483.1)*

Nonius quotes *Ann.* 361 as an instance of the the nominative form *lacte* and places it in Book 11.[97] The fragment reads: *et simul erubuit ceu lacte et purpura mixta* ('and at the same instant (s)he blushed like milk and purple mixed'). Even though the line is not the product of the Vergiliocentric tradition, it has clear analogues at *Il.* 4.141–8, ὡς δ' ὅτε τίς τ' ἐλέφαντα γυνὴ ποίνικι μιήνῃ/Μῃονὶς ἠέ Κάειρα, παρήϊον ἔμμεναι ἵππων ('as when a woman, a Maeonian or a Carian, stains ivory with purple dye, to be a cheek-piece for horses'), where the comparison is to Menelaus' thigh-wound staining his leg with blood; and at *Aen.* 12.64–9:

> accepit vocem lacrimis Lavinia matris
> flagrantis perfusa genas, cui plurimus ignem
> subiecit rubor et calefacta per ora cucurrit.
> Indum sanguineo veluti violaverit ostro
> si quis ebur, aut mixta rubent ubi lilia multa
> alba rosa, talis virgo dabat ore colores.

Lavinia received her mother's words with tears spilling down her blazing cheeks. A great blush lit her, speeding across her burning face. As when a someone stains Indian ivory with blood red dye or as when lilies grow bright when mixed with many a rose, so did the girl's blush appear on her cheeks.

[97] Some mss. read x, not xi. On the debate about the book-number and how assumptions about the tenor of the narrative play into it, see Elliott 2007: 45–6.

The surrounding tradition represented by Homer and Vergil does not guarantee that the subject of the Ennian line was a woman,[98] but it at any rate suggests it. The Homeric background for its part shows which elements and possible connections were readily available to Ennius, and the coincidence of the blush in the Ennian and the Vergilian reprises is difficult to ignore. It is at least possible that the point in Ennius was similar to that in Vergil: that is, that the masculine world was about to erupt in blood-red violence because of the female blood-red prettiness. The Homeric original, on a broader view, suggests that too, with its inclusion of the woman at her work, hinting at the domestic serenity that Helen's abduction has abandoned at Sparta and will destroy at Troy.

The little we know of the narrative of Book 11 (see Appendix Table A1.1 and Skutsch's introduction to the book) does not provide an easy historical referent. In order to have one available, Skutsch suggests re-locating the fragment in Book 9 or Book 12.[99] The motivation for his (in itself wholly reasonable) palaeographical argument lies in the discomfort the editor feels with the blush's implications for the tenor of the narrative, which fit poorly with his understanding of a rational, evidence-based and sequential narrative focused on a male world of political and military action. But to take a Procrustean approach in forcing the surviving information to fit what we think we know about the text is to lose an opportunity to learn what the sources have to tell us. Nonius' evidence suggests that descriptions of the manifestations of female psychology had a place even in those books of the *Annales* where we have no particular reason to expect them, if we assume a narrative describing a succession of political events belonging to a male sphere of action. An entirely different sense of the historiographical calibre of the *Annales* results, should we allow the Vergiliocentrics to extend their reading of the text to this Nonian fragment.

Book 15: Caelius (or C. Aelius), Ann. *391–8 (Macr.* Sat. *6.3.3)*

A passage securely located late in the narrative and testament to the Homerising cast Ennius continues to give to events of recent, lived history is *Ann.* 391–8:[100]

[98] Cf. Chapter 2, p. 111, with n. 103 there. [99] See Skutsch 1985: 526.

[100] The manuscripts of Macrobius are divided between 15 and 12: XV is the reading of *RFA*; *NPT* read XII. Skutsch argues for the reading of *RFA*, reasoning that it would be too great a coincidence for scribal error mistakenly to attribute two passages belonging to the same book of the *Aeneid* (i.e. this and *frg.* XV.iv [the two Istrians related to the Polypoites and Leontes of *Il.* 12.127–95 and the

undique conveniunt velut imber tela tribuno,
configunt parmam, tinnit hastilibus umbo
aerato sonitu galeae, sed nec pote quisquam[101]
undique nitendo corpus discerpere ferro.
semper abundantes hastas frangitque quatitque.
totum sudor habet corpus multumque laborat
nec respirandi fit copia, praepete ferro
Histri tela manu iacientes sollicitabant.

From all sides missiles fly at the tribune like a rain: they pierce his shield, the boss rings from the impact of the spears to the brazen clanging of his helmet; yet, however much they strive from all sides, no one is able to rip through his body with their weapon. Constantly he dashes down and shatters the incessant stream of their spears. Sweat covers his entire body, he is in great distress and has no chance to catch his breath. With their swift winged weapons, the Istrians keep him occupied, hurling their weapons by main force at him.[102]

Macrobius transmits this passage alongside its relatives in the *Iliad* (*Il.* 16.102–11) and the *Aeneid* (*Aen.* 9.806–14), as evidence for his contention that Vergilian passages people think of as deriving directly from Homer are in fact more immediately dependent on an Ennian intermediary.[103] The literary genealogy of which the passage forms a part is thus all-important to Macrobius. By the time the fragment reaches him, any historical referent the passage may have had has lost all importance: Macrobius does not know who the tribune is, nor does the question matter to him. In effect, the historical referent is entirely subsumed in its Homerising re-description: what is important about the tribune is not his historical action in its own right but the potential for analogy to the Ajax at *Il.* 16.102–11.

This situation is not only the product of the working practices and limited interests of the tradition in which Macrobius worked, as discussed in Chapter 2, although it is that, too. Macrobius and those he represents were able to marginalise the historical particulars pertaining to the tribune because

Pandarus and Bitias of *Aen.* 9.672–90], yielded by *Sat.* 6.3.2) to the same book of Ennius. On the dangers of the view that context in Vergil is regularly a reliable index of context in Ennius, see again Chapter 2, p. 111, with n. 103 there. Yet the problems of such reconstructive reasoning are in this instance mitigated because the information we have about both Ennian passages is fairly full, because the link between them and the Vergilian passages is attested by their sources, and because the manuscript-evidence itself gives some grounds for attributing the Caelius-passage to Book 15. Flores *et al.* 2006: 393–4 gives a full doxography of editorial decisions concerning this fragment's location.

[101] On the difficulties of *Ann.* 392–3, see De Paolis 1986–7: 195 (a summary of the debate).

[102] Chapter 5, pp. 286–8, develops the discussion here of Caelius' historical identity *vis-à-vis* the Homerising instantiation with which Ennius endows him, to point out how Macrobius' reading of *Ann.* 391–8 (and of *Ann.* xv.iv: the Istrians) makes it available to a universalising reading.

[103] See Chapter 2, p. 84–5.

Ennius replaced description of those particulars with pre-existing motifs and familiar phrases that already possessed a grip on the imagination of his audience. Attempts to trace historical referents, already ill fated in Cicero's day,[104] risk obscuring the character of Ennius' text by attributing significance to historical referents in a manner ill matched to the poet's inventive historiographical practice.[105] Ennius' tribune mattered because, as the poet made him, he instantiated Roman potential for stepping into Greece's shoes. We have no reason to think that he would have had even the most fleeting significance in Polybius' eyes; even if he did, in the *Annales*, that importance was secondary and subordinate to his potential for persuading the Romans to re-evaluate their recent history as much as the more distant past, which more readily comes endowed with a reverend aura.

Book 7: The 'good companion', Ann. *268–86 (Gell. 12.4)*

The tribune of *Ann.* 391–8 is hardly the only mysterious figure the remains of the *Annales* make prominent. The famous 'good companion' passage supplies another such example. The sole source, Gellius (*NA* 12.4) gives us licence, on authority allegedly going back to Aelius Stilo, that the fragment is to be read as autobiographical, as well as moralising and paradigmatic.[106] The fragment's historical references and, in conjunction with this, its place in the narrative, have thus come under scrutiny. The fragment itself runs:

haece locutus vocat quocum bene saepe libenter
mensam sermonesque suos rerumque suarum
consilium partit, magnam quom lassus diei
partem fuisset de summis rebus regundis
consilio indu foro lato sanctoque senatu;
quoi res audacter magnas parvasque iocumque
eloqueretur †et cuncta† malaque et bona dictu
evomeret si qui vellet tutoque locaret;
quocum multa volup
gaudia clamque palamque;
ingenium quoi nulla malum sententia suadet
ut faceret facinus levis aut mala: doctus, fidelis,
suavis homo, iucundus, suo contentus, beatus,
scitus, secunda loquens in tempore, commodus, verbum
paucum, multa tenens antiqua, sepulta vetustas

[104] See Chapter 3, pp. 158 and 160, on *id ipsum nisi unius esset Enni testimonio cognitum* (Cic. *Brut.* 60).
[105] For elaborate, modern attempts to find an historical match for Ennius' tribune, see Chapter I, n. 151, p. 63.
[106] On the latter score, see Chapter 3, n. 87.

quae facit, et mores veteresque novosque †tenentem[107]
multorum veterum leges divomque hominumque
prudentem qui dicta loquive tacereve posset:
hunc inter pugnas conpellat Servilius sic:

Once he has said this, he summons the man with whom very often he has gladly shared his meals and conversation and his plans for his affairs, when exhausted from managing affairs of state and dispensing advice in the forum and the sacred Senate for a great part of the day. To him he speaks out without hesitation of matters great and small and jesting . . . and can unrestrainedly unburden himself of any talk he wishes, vicious or admirable, and keep it in a safe place. With whom much pleasure . . . joys privately and publicly, whom no capricious or mischievous thought moves to engage in wicked acts, an agreeable man, delightful, pleased with his lot, who counts his blessings, informed, who says the right thing at the right time, obliging, a man of few words, who holds in his mind many matters of ages gone by that the passing of time buries and who knows customs old and new and the laws of many gods and men of old, a wise man, with the ability to speak or keep silent. This man does Servilius now address in these words, in the midst of the fighting:

In concluding, Gellius writes: *L. Aelium Stilonem dicere solitum ferunt Q. Ennium de semet ipso haec scripsisse picturamque istam morum et ingenii ipsius Q. Ennii factam esse* ('people say that L. Aelius Stilo regularly claimed that Q. Ennius wrote this about his own person and that the passage was created as a representation of the behaviour and character of Q. Ennius himself', *NA* 12.4.5). The mention of Aelius clearly serves to endow the association between the 'good companion' and the poet with authority.

Ennius' unusual and challenging use of the first person in the *Annales* makes the claim that this was self-description not impossible.[108] In the past, scholars have suggested that Gellius' information on Aelius' opinion derives from Varro's *De Poetis*;[109] and, on the assumption that the information is genuine and correct, that is indeed its most likely derivation. Gellius does, after all, read Varro and cite Ennius through Varro, including with mention of the *De Poetis* specifically.[110] The evidence for that connection elsewhere is what motivates the conjecture here.[111]

[107] On the difficulties of the change of construction here and with *prudentem*, see Skutsch 1985: 460–1.
[108] See *Ann.* 525 and 535–9, with their respective contexts in Cicero.
[109] See Norden 1915: 132, citing Marshall 1990: lxiv, who gives further references; Skutsch 1985: 448.
[110] He cites Varro, in (direct or indirect) association with Ennius, at *NA* 1.22.10; 3.14.5; 10.1.6; and 18.9.4. For mention of the *De Poetis* specifically, see *NA* 17.21.43 (in association with Ennius) and *NA* 1.24.3 (no association with Ennius).
[111] See Norden, *loc. cit.*, n. 1. He also (*ibid.* 133) notes the disagreement of some in his day, including Vahlen.

The very fact that Aelius represents such high authority might, however, provoke suspicion: his name is the ideal legitimising mechanism for a later invention. *Ferunt*, too, might give us pause, for it suggests that Gellius is not himself entirely clear as to how the information about Aelius' opinion originated; he is only repeating hearsay.[112] Given Gellius' pride in his scholarly ability and in his production of recherché material from authoritative sources, the fact that he does not name Varro as his source for the information rather suggests that he did not have the opportunity to do so; that the mention of Aelius in connection with the episode originates rather with some unknown quantity.[113] These circumstances leave room for the possibility that the mention of Aelius was a bald attempt by this unknown party to give authority to a popular thought.

Even if the story does represent an historical reality,[114] it itself suggests that Aelius was in a position of having to instruct his (late second-/early first-century) contemporaries about Ennius' latent presence behind the mask of the 'good companion'. The idea was, then, not especially evident to readers early in the history of the *Annales*.[115] Was it in fact Aelius' peculiar reading (and, if so, what motivated it)? On any scenario, the idea that the 'good companion' represents thinly disguised authorial self-description represents conjecture rather than a self-evident reading of the text.

However the matter stands, the place of the passage in the *Annales* is extraordinary. Gellius spells out that it comes *sub historia Gemini Servili* ('during the episode of Servilius Geminus') and belongs *in annali septimo* ('in the seventh *Annal*'). Discussions of the passage often start from the belief that Ennius privileged events of political and military significance and can therefore in this passage only have been describing the most politically important Servilius Geminus of whom we know: Cn. Servilius Geminus, consul of 217 BCE, whose deeds provide an echo of Aemilius Paullus' heroism in Livy's account of Cannae.[116] In consequence of this and of the

[112] Norden (*loc. cit.*, n. 1) wants *ferunt* to designate Aelius' oral teaching, with Varro responsible for the written transmission of the idea. The problem is that *ferunt* regularly designates oral tradition and popular repute (see *NA* 1.11.9; 3.9.3; 5.10.3, 14.2; 9.3.3, 4.6; and 10.23.2) and should designate the transmission itself rather than Aelius' original teaching. At *NA* 3.3.11, Gellius opposes Aelius Stilo's authority (on the question of how many Plautine tragedies are genuine) to popular opinion (*feruntur*).

[113] Cf. Flores *et al.* 2002: 263: '... 'l'autoritratto, se tale fu in realtà e non posteriore invenzione di grammatici'.

[114] Flores points out that at the time of the battle of Cannae, Ennius was still too young to have been able at that time to fulfil the role of the 'good companion'; neither is there any evidence to suggest that Ennius was present at Cannae (*ibid. loc. cit.*).

[115] Cf. Cicero's attestation (*Brut.* 60) that all notice of Cornelius Cethegus' existence besides that provided by Ennius had disappeared by the first century (discussed in Chapter 3, pp. 156–61).

[116] See Skutsch 1985: 447–8.

phrase *inter pugnas* of the final line of the fragment, the passage is in modern editions re-located to Book 8, where it is attributed to the description of the battle of Cannae. The size of the passage is one of the main reasons why editors place it in the midst of so major a battle as Cannae: it had to be a big battle Ennius was describing in order to subsume so long an interruption.[117]

But does this reasoning work? If we envisage *Ann.* 268–86 inserted into the description of Cannae, it constitutes a major interruption and distracts attention from precisely those (hypothetical) narrative concerns of Ennius' that motivated editors to place it in the midst of that battle in the first place. The location of the fragment *inter pugnas* is hard to correlate with any prose historical account. Rather, the passage removes the audience's view from the battle-field as completely as do Homeric similes and the lengthy conversations that Iliadic battle-fields witness. Those, I submit, are the closest analogues and best explanations for what we have here. The emphasis on human relations is the point of contact with the suggested Homeric analogue, although the comparison at the same time throws into relief the contrast between the Iliadic social order and the current Roman one newly introduced by Ennius into epic. The fact that Ennius' focus can be so exclusively on the 'companion' and the relief he provides from political and military affairs suggests that the latter were not Ennius' exclusive concern and that the events Ennius privileged are not likely to have been the same as the ones Polybius privileged. This means that there is no reason to distrust Gellius' attribution of the episode to Book 7, regardless of where Cannae stands in the narrative; and, more broadly, that the search for historical referents distracts attention from the character of Ennius' historiographical enterprise.

The evidence for Ennius' success within the Roman prose historiographical tradition arrives, principally via Cicero and Livy, in a more enigmatic form than does the evidence for his success within the hexametric tradition, and we have to work harder to interpret it. I have here argued that the separation of his roles our sources suggest is misleading, and that the best clue as to how to read the *Annales* as history, as Cicero urges us to do, lies in what the Vergiliocentric sources tell us about Ennius' mode of narration. The distinction the sources appear to make was, earlier in the history of modern scholarship, magnified by the emergence through time of new historiographical standards, that increased the apparent distance between the surviving bodies of information.

The popular heroes who gave the nation a sense of its own identity and whom successive generations of writers used to think about Rome's inherent values and characteristics are not visible before Ennius. These elements certainly derive at

[117] See Ch. 1, p. 63, with n. 152 there.

their origin from epic and, because of the strength of their presence in Roman historiography, it makes sense that they should derive quite immediately from the *Annales* – that is, from a work that consciously set out to make emblems of individuals to match the figures of Homeric verse. Whether we think of Ennius' immediate and otherwise completely unknown contemporaries, such as the tribune Caelius and the Istrians of *Ann.* XV.iv, or the description of the only slightly more distant past in the still living experience of Servilius and Cannae, or the refashioning of persons beyond that, such as Pyrrhus and Appius Claudius, these figures acquired real power over the imagination of the audience only once they had been recast in the pre-existing literary mould Ennius chose for them. On this view, the *Annales* were the crucible in which the figures that were to become Rome's exemplary past were forged. This explains Cicero's fascination with the text and his recurrent return to it as a source for these emblems.[118] It suggests that the typologies in which Roman historiography subsequently dealt and the episodic structure it employed were a cardinal part of Ennius' legacy.

Chapter 5 is devoted to a more specific and a more radical interpretation of Ennius' historiographical achievement. In combination with other forms of historiography, his use of Homer will remain central to the view there presented of Ennius' recreation of an idealised, indeed ideological, understanding of the past and present. On the hypothesis to be considered there, Ennius' innovative combination of literary modes constitutes one mechanism by which the poet communicated a complex vision of Rome's place in the wider world. That vision offered his immediate audience a new way to think about Rome, one that I think lies behind Cicero's enthusiasm for the work and that itself lasted long after the *Annales* had passed into oblivion.

[118] Cf. Rawson 1972: 39–40 on Cicero's hunger for information about the great individuals of the Roman past.

CHAPTER 5

Imperium sine fine*: the* Annales *and universal history*

The thesis[1] this chapter proposes is that there is a useful analogy to be made between Ennius' epic and the concept of universal history.[2] This thesis is motivated by the fact that our sources for the *Annales*, together with those responses to the epic that this study does not tackle (see the Introduction, pp. 6–7), cumulatively pose a larger question than they can individually answer: for nothing that any individual author or any subset of the sources can tell us amounts to an explanation for the general impact of the *Annales* on the collective Roman psyche, an impact manifest both in the sources themselves and in the hexametric and historiographical traditions at large. The observations that have been made, such as the fact that the *Annales* were the crucible in which so much of the Latin poetic vocabulary was first formed, or that the text came to embody those notions about Roman history and the Roman ethos that remained crucial to the rhetorical, historiographical and poetic articulation of the City for generations, are answers informed by hindsight. The preceding chapters of this study have attempted to anatomise these answers: to detail where in the ancient evidence they come from and what sorts of impulses direct the sources to give us such information as they transmit. This chapter addresses the question of what it was about the *Annales* that so captured the imagination and the admiration of its immediate audience that it resulted in the text's thought and language being bred into future generations and issuing into the works of authors as diverse as Lucretius, Varro, Cicero, Livy, the author of the *Bellum*

[1] I have sketched a few of the preliminary ideas of this chapter in a paper in a volume on universal history (Elliott 2010: 148–61).

[2] For competing definitions of the latter and explanations of its development, see Sacks 1981: 96–121; Fornara 1983: 42–6; Momigliano 1987: 31–57; Alonso-Núñez 1990: 173–202 (beginning from a strict definition, which few works in practice can sustain); Clarke 1999a: 114–28; Clarke 1999b: 249–79; Alonso-Núñez 2002b: 11–13; Yarrow 2006: 124–33; Cornell *et al.* 2010: 1–11; Cornell 2010: 102–3; and Elliott 2010: 149.

Hispaniense, Vergil and on, as variously and enduringly as we see it do. In doing so, this chapter necessarily moves beyond the narrow focus on the evidence that characterised Chapters 1–3 in particular and into more speculative territory. To some extent, my argument will be vulnerable to the criticism that it too is a retrospective reading, predicated on two facts of later history that Ennius could not in his day have known: the fact that Rome's claim to world dominion would continue to grow apace (as preliminarily advertised by Polybius' overtly universalist *Histories*. These, it might be noted, were composed within a generation of the *Annales* by an author who, subsequent to his deportation to Rome in 167 after Pydna, was in a position to be among the *Annales*' earliest audiences); and the fact that universalist interpretations of Roman history were to gain increasing sway in the Roman historiographical tradition. The hypothesis I offer, however, is that Ennius' reading of Rome was in no small part germane to the second of these developments. My primary objective remains to make sense of the literary legacy of the *Annales*, especially as it pertains to Roman historiography. The route I have chosen here is to read the fragments in the light of the ideas and techniques of the universal historians proper.

I thus propose that what was new about the *Annales* in terms of the vision it laid before its primary audience was the idea of Rome as the hub of space and time, the primary focus of the cosmos in all its aspects. This idea, in any number of variations, is common to post-Ennian texts about Rome across the genres.[3] If those later texts supply a future for the universalising interpretation of Roman history, then the universalising interpretation of Homer, evident in some Alexandrian scholarship,[4] supplies a possible

[3] Vitruvius (*De architectura* 6.1.11) and Strabo (6.4.1), cited by Clarke 1999b: 264 and Clarke 1999a: 89, n. 26 and 217–18 with n. 54 there, are explicit about Rome's physical centrality as a stimulant to the City's hegemonic role. Further examples selected on no particular principle include Hor. *C.* 4.14.1–6 (*quae cura patrum quaeve Quiritium/plenis honorum muneribus tuas,/Auguste, virtutes in aevum/per titulos memoresque fastus/aeternet, o, qua sol habitabilis/illustrat oras, maxime principum*); Prop. 4.6.37 (Augustus addressed as *Longa mundi servator ab Alba*), cf. *ibid.* 19 (of Actium: *huc mundi coiere manus*) and 39–40 (spoken by Apollo: *vince mari: iam terra tua est. tibi militat arcus/et favet ex umeris hoc onus omne meis*); Ov. *Met.* 15.877 (*quaeque patet domitis Romana potentia terris*); Val. Max. 8.14.1 (*totiusque terrarum orbis summum columen arx Capitolina possideret*). For Roman universalism in Ovid, see Wheeler 1999: 20–33 (with explicit comparison to Ennius at 23–4), 194–9; also *ibid.* 117–39, esp. 126. For bibliography on the historiographical manifestations of the idea, see n. 7, p. 235.

[4] See Porter 1992: 67–114, esp. 85–111, on Crates of Mallos' Stoic and allegorical readings of Homer. The relevance of these to Ennius depends on their having slightly earlier (and today untraceable, but see *ibid.* 106) analogues in earlier scholarship, since Crates was a slightly younger contemporary of Ennius'. For a possible specific point of contact with the cosmic reading of the Eris of *Il.* 11.6–8 suggested *ibid.* 110, cp. Ennius' Empedoclean *paluda virago,/cui par imber et ignis, spiritus et gravis terra* (*Ann.* 220–1, with Skutsch 1985: 394–5). See also Hardie 1986: 25–9, 382, including his citation (*ibid.* 382, n. 28) of von Albrecht 1964: 19, n.7; 151, for reference to the *Iliad* as a 'Weltdichtung' and to Homer as 'Vater des universalen Epos' (cf. Sil. *Pun.* 13.788, *carmine complexus terram, mare, sidera, manis*).

pre-Ennian history. So well established are such readings of Rome by the first century BCE that Cicero and Vergil take the idea virtually for granted, and it is an enduring feature of post-Vergilian epic.[5] In Livy and Tacitus, the sense that Roman affairs had become coterminous with world affairs appears in adult form,[6] and it is well known that the number of those chroniclers of the City who more or less overtly declare their works universal histories mushrooms at the turn of the era, when iconography and political discourse of all kinds become saturated with universalising images.[7] By contrast, the little we can see of pre-Ennian written tradition, poetry or prose, gives us small grounds for supposing the intrusion of any notion of Rome's centrality within the wider network of the world.[8] In particular, it is informative to compare the potential of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* for expressing a universalising perspective to that of the *Annales*; I will propose that the surviving evidence, for all its limitations, indicates that the universalising potential of the *Annales* clearly trumps that of the *Bellum Punicum* in terms of the poem's language, its scope and the background against which the narrative is set. In charting the trajectory of universalising thought at Rome on the slightly new course I here propose, we will therefore on occasion look back at what preceded as well as across and ahead to the prose historiographical traditions, in which the claims to writing global history were of necessity (see pp. 241–4) at their most explicit.

Polybius' comments on universalising practice suggest it is appropriate to think in terms of two different modes of universalism.[9] One, as Polybius sees it, is 'quantitative' or encyclopaedic and represents the simple accumulation of material from all the different temporal and geographical arenas

[5] See Hardie 1986: 377–86, with reference to possible Ennian influence on the universalising combination of the cosmological and the historical in the *Aeneid* (*ibid.* 76–83). In his discussion of the relationship between Homer as father of universalising epic and Silius (cited on p. 234, n. 4), von Albrecht insists that Homer in this capacity is important to Silius less as a model in his own right than as Ennius' prototype.

[6] See Jacoby 1949: 111; Ginsburg 1981: esp. 96–101; Frier 1999: 201–5; Rich 2011; and Feeney 2007: 65, citing Clarke 1999b: 251–2. For Roman historiography's tendency towards universalising from its earliest accessible days, see pp. 240–1 with nn. 33 and 34 there.

[7] On universalism in iconography and political discourse, see Hardie 1986: 377–86; Momigliano 1987: 31–57; and Clarke 1999b: 249–79; Feeney 2007: 59–67; and Yarrow 2010: 131–47. On Posidonius' universalism, see Clarke 1999a: 185–92; on Diodorus Siculus', see Sacks 1990: 3, 10, 12–13, 36, 55–82, 206; on Trogus', see Alonso-Núñez 1987: 56–72; on Strabo's, see Clarke 1999a. 294–36; on Velleius Paterculus', Woodman 1975: 272–306, Starr 1981: 162–74 and Schultze 2010: 116–30. For the notion that the unity of the inhabited world under Augustus acted as a spur to the universalising interpretation of history, see Alonso-Núñez 2002: 95–6.

[8] See, however, n. 34, p. 241, on apparent universalising impulses in Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus.

[9] See Sacks 1981: 96–121, recapitulated by Yarrow 2006: 125 and Liddel 2010: 15.

that fall under the historian's eye. 'Quantitative' attempts at universalism constitute giant collages of information and impress by their scale and detail but not because they provide their audience with an interpretative mechanism for understanding the progress of human history as a whole. The idea that the accounts of different localities are interrelated pertains only in so far as all the parts of the narrative contribute to the story of mankind as a whole. Ephorus' and Diodorus' universalism is quantitative in this sense,[10] while Herodotus is often portrayed as the forefather of this type of universal history.[11] Polybius himself, however, aspires to what Kenneth Sacks terms the 'qualitative' form of universalism:[12] that is, the claim to universality rests on the work's alleged revelation of the dominant force governing the trajectory of world affairs. In such instances, a given work's status as universal history depends not so much on the scope of the material covered as on the author's ability to present material of even narrow focus as of supreme significance. That may be because, as in Polybius' vision, it explains why the rest of world affairs are organised as they are and (the work's assumption is) will continue to be. It may also (complementarily or alternatively) be because the cycle of history runs according to an identifiable pattern, and because a slice of history that makes that pattern visible can stand for all repetitions of the pattern in the future and the past.[13] The history is limited (often explicitly so) in regard to the time-period it covers,[14] but for that period,

[10] For Ephorus as, in Polybius' eyes, a (successful) 'quantitative' universal historian, see Sacks 1981: 105–7. For the 'quantitative' nature of Diodorus' project (discussed in relation to Trogus and Strabo, whose projects likewise lean towards the 'quantitative'), see Clarke 1999b: 252–65 (though she does not here use Sacks' terminology). On Ephorus' universalising work more generally, see Burde 1974: 17–25; Schepens 1977: 95–118; Vannicelli 1987: 165–91; and Clarke 2008: 96–109; on Diodorus', see Sacks 1990: esp. Chapter 1, 3, 4; Alonso-Núñez 2002b: 87–2002; Clarke 2008: 121–39.

[11] For discussion of Herodotus' relationship to universal history, see Burde 1974: 9–17; Vattuone 1998: 57–96; Vannicelli 2001: 211–40; and Alonso-Núñez 2002: 145–52; Alonso-Núñez 2003: 17–25; for a genealogical approach, see Fornara 1983: 29–46. Cf. also Flower 1994: 160–2 (with, however, Vattuone 1998: 78–84).

[12] Sacks 1981: 105–10.

[13] On schematisation as a key universalising strategy, see Momigliano 1987: 31–57. For the importance of schematisation to Polybius' version of universalism, see Clarke 1999a: 118, with n. 89 there, Liddel 2010: 25 (Polybius' was 'a work which was more interested in elucidating a scheme for thinking about the passage of history than attempting to write down everything'). On the (relevant) relationship between Posidonius' Stoicism and his interest in history, and in this context on why the Polybian account of history will have appealed to him, see Humphreys 1997: 214–16.

[14] Polybius says that, after an initial archaeology (Books 1–2), his universal account proper will begin when he reaches the 140th Olympiad (equivalent to 220–16 BCE): see Polyb. 1.3.4–6 (cf. Polyb 2.37.1–4), with Walbank 1957: 42–4. Polybius' entire 'universal' narrative covers only 220–149 BCE (an expansion of the 220–169 BCE plan he had originally proposed). See Sacks 1981: 117–18, 120; Alonso-Núñez 1990: 185–8; Clarke 1999a: 115–28; Clarke 1999b: 274–5; and Alonso-Núñez 2002: 71–80.

the claim runs, world affairs are so interrelated as to make a master-narrative, able to subsume all smaller narratives of individual localities, the best tool for allowing readers a comprehensive grasp of history as it unfolds.

In practice, both 'quantitative' and 'qualitative' universalism is necessarily limited, since the universal historian's claim, to write up all of history (or all the history that matters), can never literally be fulfilled.[15] The 'qualitative' form, however, displays its partiality more directly. 'Quantitative' and 'qualitative' universal historians face slightly different challenges: the former need to give some sort of shape or coherence to the mass of their material; and while the latter likewise face a challenge from volume, they have besides this to fit the stuff of history to the principle they see as the source of its illumination.[16] In the case of Hebrew and Christian writers of universal history, this principle is God's plan for mankind;[17] in the case of Polybius – and, I suggest, in incipient fashion, of Ennius – it was Rome's movement towards domination of the world around her that represents the *telos* of history as the author understands it.[18]

It is against the 'qualitative' form of universalism that we shall here read the fragments of the *Annales*. This is not to deny obvious differences between the *Annales* and 'qualitative' universalism as practised by Polybius. Where a synthetic approach and analysis of cause and consequence were basic constituents in Polybius' view of his own work's universalism,[19] Ennius' poem offered its own, radically different scheme of how the world worked – not a rational or analytic one, yet one not any the less powerful for that.[20] The remaining analogy between 'qualitative' universalism and Ennius' enterprise lies in the author's successfully grandiose presentation of a manifestly partial view of 'world' history: a 'world' history that advertises the limitations on its subject-matter but at the same time claims for that subject-matter unlimited significance.

Ennius' poem displays the partiality of its perspective in its very title. Parochialism, however, is a charge from which no extant instance of universal history, even of the 'quantitative' type, escapes.[21] Again, the actual

[15] On the claim to universality as, necessarily, a conceit (Clarke's apposite word), see Burde 1974; Momigliano 1987: 31; and Clarke 1999b: 250, 265; cf. Clarke 1999a: 118–23 on the particular version of this 'conceit' in Polybius.

[16] Cf. Sacks 1981: 98, 105, 108–9; Clarke 1999a: 125; and Clarke 2008: 109–10.

[17] See Momigliano 1987: 31, 46–52; Fear 2010: 275–88.

[18] For the dawning of a teleological perspective on Roman history in Polybius, through the notion of natural order (and perhaps due in part to the influence of Stoicism), see Clarke 1999a: 125–7.

[19] See e.g. Sacks 1981: 108, 111; Clarke 1999a: 77–128, esp. 83–5, 126.

[20] See Chapter 4, pp. 207–11 and Chapter 5, pp. 267–8.

[21] Thus Ephorus is ridiculed by Strabo for inserting into his universalising narrative mention of his native Cyme, unmotivated other than by local patriotism: 'Meanwhile', he wrote, 'the people of

limitations on the geographical areas under Rome's influence at any point in history might exist in tension with universalising claims made on the city's behalf, but they pose no fundamental obstacle to the propagation of such views.[22] No doubt the idea that universal history could be written with a bias that was not straightforwardly Greek was also originally, in this historiographical tradition, a startling one – sufficiently startling, perhaps, to prevent Timaeus' *Histories* from being represented as such,[23] even though his work ranked with that of Ephorus and Theopompus in terms of ambition and scale and in the use of universalising devices.[24] Ennius' title

Cyme were at peace' (*FGrHist* 70 F 236 Strabo, *Geog.* 13.3.6), quoted by Cornell 2010: 102, likewise speaking to the relationship between Roman *annales* and universal history. Sicily figures prominently in Diodorus Siculus. The title of Theopompus' *Philippica*, echoed by Trogus, displays a bias no less obtrusive than does Ennius' epic. We might read Trogus' own partiality for his native Gaul in his counterbalancing of his account of the origins of Massilia with those of Rome; the impression of such partiality, at any rate, is the impression with which Justin's summary of Book 43 leaves one. As regards Posidonius, we cannot tell whether the dominance of Syria among the fragments is an accident of survival or a result of the author's attachment to his country of origin: see Clarke 1999a: 157–66. For Nicolaus of Damascus' tendency towards local Syrian patriotism, see the mention at Alonso-Núñez 2002: 100. For Polybius, cf. also Walbank 1975: 201, on the conference convened at Naupactus by Philip V – an event of no more than local importance, despite the historian's claims. Velleius, for whose purposes relatively vague chronological markers generally suffice (Starr 1980: 287–301), dates backwards from the consulship of M. Vinicius (30 CE), apparently as a means of signalling the importance of such events as the institution of the Olympic Games (1.7.1), the foundation of of Rome (1.7.3) or the beginning of hostilities between Carthage and Rome. (See Woodman 1975: 273, n. 2, for a full list of apostrophes to Vinicius used for dating purposes.) That these Vinician dates occur alongside the equally occasional use of Olympiads and of dating from the Fall of Troy only increases the sense of parochialism that the references to Vinicius generate. See further Starr 1981: 174 on other forms of parochialism in Velleius (also mentioned in passing by Cornell 2010: 102).

[22] Cf. n. 15, p. 237. Among countless specific instances of the universalising conceit akin to that encountered in the *Annales*, see e.g. Clarke 1999a: 114–28 on the practical limitations on both the universalism that Polybius envisioned for the world under Rome's control and on the historiographical reflection of that universalism which he sought to mirror in his work; and Mendels 1990: 97–102 on Hellenistic Egyptian universalising literature: 'there existed a tension between the visions of a world-empire and [Egypt's] actual borders.'

[23] Cornell terms Timaeus 'a universal historian who wrote only about the western Mediterranean' (Cornell 2010: 113, n. 43). No surviving source for Timaeus, however, uses any of the standard ancient terms associated with universal history in relation to his work. (On the crucial role of an explicit label in identifying a work as a universal history, see pp. 241–3, with nn. 36 and 41 there.) It is perhaps telling of the real challenge to his own primacy as universal historian of the West, however, that Polybius sees fit to ridicule the notion that Timaeus might have considered himself such (Polyb. 12.23.4–7 *FGrHist* 566 F 119a) – as well as to proclaim so abrasively that Ephorus alone had earlier attempted universal history (Polyb. 5.33.2 *FGrHist* 70 T 7). We would, however, expect Diodorus, who had no anti-Timaean axe to grind, to mention him as a predecessor alongside Ephorus (Diod. Sic. 4.1.2, 16.76.5), had Timaeus' work been known in the ancient world for its universalising cast.

[24] The 38 volumes of Timaeus' *Historiai* began with the mythical period and extended to the death of Agathocles in 289/8 BCE (*FGrHist* 566 T 8, F 124b; see Walbank 1967: 395). Ephorus' general history in 30 books covered affairs in Europe and Asia from the Fall of Troy (the Suda *FGrHist* 70 T 1) or the Return of the Heracleidae (Diod. Sic. 4.1.3 and 16.76.5 *FGrHist* 70 T 8 and 10, respectively) to the siege of Perinthus in 341/0 BCE (Diod. Sic. 16.76.5 *FGrHist* 70 T 10). Theopompus' *Philippica*, in 58 books, focused primarily on mainland Greece between 359 and 336 BCE, but with massive digressions, up to eight books long. In terms of volume, scope and economy, it is far from clear that

countered this Hellenocentricity strongly, pinning the world to a new *umbilicus*; at the same time, his poetic techniques (including simply allusion to Greek literature) implied the relevance of Rome to times and places to which she could lay no literal claim.[25] His epic is the first work to combine 'the central annalistic bias' – that is, the insistence that 'something must be said about the City of Rome' – with geographical and temporal frames of reference that were both impressively wide in their literal references and also enlarged far beyond the literal and the (politically) legitimate by poetic means.[26] Furthermore, from the Romanocentric perspective it privileges, Ennius' poem was the first to 'tell the whole story from beginning to end'.[27] The profound structural analogy between local and universal history, already evident to ancient readers,[28] has now been well documented.[29] The 'annalistic' features of the *Annales* are thus basic to the work's claim to be read alongside universal history, provided that it can at the same time be shown that the poem's perspective and aspirations are such as to warrant the comparison.

Timaeus was outmatched by the universalising efforts of Ephorus and Theopompus. Timaeus' innovative means of establishing temporal co-ordinates, the use of Olympiad dating, including to indicate synchronicities (famously, the parallel founding of Rome and Carthage in the equivalent of 814 BCE), pioneered what was to become a standard universalising technique; see Feeney 2007: 18–19, 47–52 (also 92–5 on Timaeus' synchronised down-dating of Rome's foundation date) and Clarke 2008: 111–12, 233. The latter, however, suggests reading Timaeus' temporal frameworks as deliberately Greek rather than generally universalising. For the bridge that Timaeus provides between local and universal history, see *ibid*. 230–43. (For further comparison of the Timaeus, Ephorus and Theopompus, see n. 41, pp. 242–3) Cf. Cornell's suggestion that Cato's *Origines* constituted 'a species of universal history, but with its centre of gravity in Italy and the West' (Cornell 2010: 107–11; the quotation is from p. 110). In n. 43 to the same paper, Cornell suggests that Timaeus was Cato's chief inspiration and model for setting his history of Rome in the context of the world – a world, however, that consisted only of the western Mediterranean.

[25] Cf. Yarrow 2006: 131–2, on how among Trogus' universalising techniques is his 'anachronistic linking of Rome to events far beyond its sphere of influence', and Clarke 2008: 231, on how Timaeus used synchronisms 'as a means of broadening the context of his narrative beyond the purely local'.

[26] The quotations are from Fornara 1983: 27, n. 48.

[27] The quotation is from Momigliano 1987: 31. On Fabius Pictor's and Cincius Alimentus' competing claims, for which much less evidence survives than for Ennius, see pp. 240–1.

[28] Thus Diodorus suggests that, in adopting a single criterion – relevance to the city at hand – as the sole criterion for inclusion, local history provides the ideal model for the universal historian struggling to structure his material. He defines universal historians as οἵ τε τὰς κοινὰς τῆς οἰκουμένης πράξεις καθάπερ μιᾶς πόλεως ἀναγράψαντες and describes their ambition as πάντας ἀνθρώπους . . . τόποις δὲ καὶ χρόνοις διεστηκότας, ὑπὸ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν σύνταξιν ἀγαγεῖν (both at Diod. Sic. 1.1.3; cf. Diod. Sic. 1.3.6). Polybius uses the imagery of the city and its constituent elements to represent the structure of the world dominated by Rome (discussed by Clarke 1999a: 101–2, 109–10).

[29] See Fornara 1983: 21 on Hellanicus' *Priestesses of Hera at Argos*, Yarrow 2006: 130–3, Clarke 2008: 236–43 and *passim*.

My argument begins from the historical circumstances in which the poem was composed, years that saw the burgeoning of Rome's international power.[30] The high popularity of universalising accounts of Rome under Augustus is often and with reason attributed to the mentality engendered by the extension of Roman military domination at that time.[31] In similar vein, it is worth taking into account that the generation which saw the publication of the *Annales* had the first opportunity to suspect the extent of Rome's capabilities; they lived through the period that Polybius identifies as witness to those events that would in time allow Rome to put her plan of universal domination into effect.[32] The moment was in this sense ripe for the emergence of a new type of narrative about Rome, one that made the City the central node linking together the rest of the known world.[33]

The observation of this timing might in itself be idle, were there no indication that universalising ideas and universalising strategies were beginning to infiltrate contemporary thinking about Rome; but evidence to that effect is not lacking. Scholars have argued to good effect that Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus took steps towards setting their Roman histories against a broad, international background; for example, by framing their accounts of Rome with the history of civilisation's technical development, by incorporating euhemeristic elements, and by the at least occasional use of a dating system that grafted Rome into the wider network of the Mediterranean, instead of relying on one internal to the City and

[30] So, too, Cornell's argument on the relationship of Cato's *Origines* to universal history: 'By Cato's time it was possible to argue that Roman history and the contemporary history of the Mediterranean world had become synonymous, as a result of the growth of Roman power and the establishment of the Roman empire' (Cornell 2010: 110–11; cf. *ibid.* 111–12). For historical accounts of Rome's expansion up to and including Ennius' day, see Cornell 1989: 351–419; Cornell 1995: 380–98; David 1997: 3574; Errington 1989: 81–106; Franke 1989: 456–85; Gabba 1989: 197–243; Harris 1989: 107–62; Scullard 1989: 486–572.

[31] Momigliano 1987: 44; Alonso-Núñez 1987: 56; Clarke 1999b: 277–8; and Feeney 2007: 59–64. Comparably, Alonso-Núñez posits that the growth of Macedonian power and the influence of Alexander and his successors prompted the spread of earlier, Greek universalising trends in historiography (Alonso-Núñez 1990: 176, 179–82) – as did Polybius' circumstances at Rome in the mid-second century (*ibid.* 185; cf. Clarke 1999a: 117). In Liv Yarrow's view, however, the extension of military domination is no more than a factor in the spread of the phenomenon, perhaps rather less important than increased possibilities of travel, communication and the accessibility of research material among a now international elite (Yarrow 2010: 126–9).

[32] See n. 14, p. 236.

[33] Cf. Cornell 2010: 110–11 and Gelzer 1933: 129–66. Gelzer argues specifically that, at the time of the Second Punic War, the eyes of the Roman governing class were fixed on the twin goals of the safety of the state and of ensuring the visibility of the Republic's honour. The corollary is that a policy of imperial domination was not in sight until the middle of the second century. On this scenario, Ennius' role, like that of Fabius and Cincius, would be to raise the dawning awareness of the possibilities that lay ahead.

meaningless to outsiders.[34] The extant record, however, unkind as it has been to these two, suggests that it was not they who popularised it. Granted, there is every reason to be suspicious of that record; but I will argue below, on the internal grounds of the *Annales*' literary strategies, that the poem, with its long reach into both the epic and the historiographical traditions at Rome, was far better equipped at the origin than were prose histories to promote the idea of the identity of Roman history with world history.

Universal history in its extant Roman form is conventionally considered the preserve of the prose historians. Accordingly, it is in the works of second-century prose historians writing in Greek that the origin of the idea at Rome has typically been sought.[35] This strong association of universal history with prose is the result not least of its authors giving their narratives the clearest markers of status as universal accounts: they (or those who transmit their *reliquiae*) tell us directly if we are to consider them as such.[36] The claim is then backed up, whether to greater or to lesser effect, by the vision the unfolding text communicated, of the conceptual unity of the world. To be sure, the precedent for making a direct claim to be writing universal history had been set by Greek historians espousing a universalising model, including Ephorus, Theopompus and Polybius.[37] For, not surprisingly, universal historians, including the earliest, make no exception to

[34] Dillery 2002: 1–23, esp. 7–8, although Dillery argues that Fabius' principle dating system was annalistic and that into this 'aggressively native dative system he brings emphasis to a signal event by means of an "international" time marker'; Feeney 2007: 85–6, with n. 153 there (with *ibid.* 85, on the use of Olympiad dating as 'a rhetorical move'); Cornell 2010: 103–7, 102–15; cf. Gelzer 1933: 129–66, esp. 132, 144. Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.74.1 tells us that Fabius gave Rome's foundation-date as 'the first year of the eighth Olympiad' [747 BCE] (*FGrHist* 809 F 3a), Cincius as 'around the fourth year of the twelfth Olympiad' [729/8 BCE] (*FGrHist* 810 F 1). It remains that we cannot tell whether the Olympiad dating was a feature proper to Fabius' and Cincius' narratives or the product rather of Dionysius' re-formulation, but the earlier historians' use of other Graecising strategies favours the former possibility; cf. Clarke 2008: 155. Marius Victorinus (*GLK* 6.23) testifies that both (a) Fabius and (b) Cincius mentioned the arrival of the alphabet in Italy (*FGrHist* 809 F 23, *FGrHist* 810 F 6). The probable context is one of a history of civilisation, into which the story of Rome was set; see the careful discussion of Cornell 2010: 106–7. From these earliest times described in summary fashion ('κεφαλαιωδῶς'), Fabius and Cincius carried their histories of Rome to their own times, which they described in detail (Dion. Hal. *AR* 1.6.2).

[35] See Burde 1974: 25–43; Fornara 1983: 46 (66–7); Hardie 1986: 377; Alonso-Núñez 1990: 182–92 (beginning in *c.* 3 with Timaeus); Clarke 1999a: 77–128; Alonso-Núñez 2002: 71–80, 96; Yarrow 2006: 1, 125; and Cornell 2010: 102–15.

[36] For a list of the (apparently largely interchangeable) ancient terms used to denote universal history, see Burde 1974: 6. For particular instances of explicit claims, see Polyb. 1.1.5–5, cf. 1.2.7–8, 1.3.4–66, 1.4.3 and 7, 2.37.1–4, 3.1.4, 5.33.2, 39.8.5–7 and the further examples listed by Sacks 1981: 100–01; Diod. Sic. 1.1.3, 1.4.6, 1.9.1. In Trogus' case, the claim is made on his behalf by his epitomator, Justin, at *Praef.* 2, as well as by the work's title, as it is given in the heading to prologues, *Liber Historiarum Philippicarum et totius mundi origines et terrae situs*; cf. Catullus 1 for Cornelius Nepos.

[37] For these earliest universal historians, the claims survive not in their own, now fragmentary, work, but in the works of later authors (not typically from a disinterested perspective): thus Polyb. 5.33.2 and Diod. Sic.

prose historians' general practice, of stating their methodology explicitly,[38] as a means of distinguishing themselves from their predecessors, be it their most immediate prose competitors or their hexametric predecessors.[39] It is, however, perhaps not only in response to the standard generic behaviours of prose historiography that prose universalists so directly proclaim their purpose: the difficulty of achieving their universalising goal by means of a rational account made it expedient, I suggest, to tell their audiences directly what they were about. The definition of universal history is singularly nebulous – with the result, as already noted, that its execution will necessarily be compromised.[40] Under these circumstances, there is no more effective means of identifying a work as a universal history than the author's (or later ancient respondents') *fiat*.[41] Indeed, explicit authorial labels are

4.1.2 and 5.1.4 of Ephorus (*FGrHist* 70 T 7, 8 and 11, respectively); cf. more tendentiously (though see n. 11, p. 236), Diod. Sic. 11.37.6 of Herodotus (the latter cited e.g. by Alonso-Núñez 2003: 151). (For Polybius himself, see n. 36, p. 241.) We have some assurance of that such claims were made in the original works of Ephorus and Theopompus, too, in the surviving evidence for their statements of methodology: see n. 38, below.

[38] The fact that Ephorus was the first historian to write formally distinct prefaces (*FGrHist* 70.7–8; Barber 1935: 68), and indeed prefaces for each of the 30 books of his *Histories* (*FGrHist* 70 T 10), suggests the self-consciousness of universal history from its inception; as does Diodorus' report that Ephorus distinguished between *spatium mythicum* and *spatium historicum* (Diod. Sic. 4.1.2 *FGrHist* 70 T 8) and began his account of the latter with the return of the Heracleidae (Diod. Sic. 16.76.5 *FGrHist* 70 T 10). For surviving statements of methodology: for Ephorus, see *FGrHist* 70.9 (on the difference in the quality of narratives of recent and distant events), 110 (on the virtues of autopsy), with Marincola 1997: 69–71, and 111 (on the demanding nature of historiography); for Theopompus, see *FGrHist* 115.342 (on the virtues of autopsy). On Ephorus' methodological innovations (which included the introduction of book-divisions and, in consequence of a re-negotiated set of boundaries between *spatium mythicum* and *spatium historicum*, a move away from the primary source-material promoted by Thucydides and Herodotus to a greater reliance on secondary material), see Schepens 1977: 95–118 and Clarke 2008: 96–109.

[39] See Fornara 1983: 47–90; Marincola 1997: 34–51, 63–86, 158–74, 225–57 and *passim*; and Vannicelli 2001: 211.

[40] On the ambiguities of definition, see Momigliano 1987: 31–57; Sacks 1981: 96–121; Cornell *et al.* 2010: 1–2; and Liddel 2010: 15–16 (cf. Elliott 2010: 149). For bibliography on the inevitable limitations on any form of universality, see n. 15, p. 237.

[41] The importance of the label for the identification of an author as a universal historian can be seen in the difference in the treatment of Ephorus and Theopompus on the one hand and Timaeus on the other. For a summary comparison of their works' (comparable) vital statistics, see n. 24, pp. 238–9. Of the three, only Ephorus' status as a universal historian is uncontroversial, cemented as it is by his identification as such by Polybius and Diodorus (see n. 37, pp. 241–2). Theopompus' *Philippica* are termed a universal history by late sources (*FGrHist* 115 F 25 [Photius] and T 51 [Evagrius]); but the work's title, description and remains are sufficient to cause M. Flower, entirely reasonably, to reckon it a contemporary history of Greece (Flower 1994: 155; *contra* Vattuone 1998: 78–84). Flower's argument comes up hard, however, against Photius' language: according to Photius, Theopompus claimed to have written ἐπῶν . . . πλείους . . . ἢ ιε μυριάδας, ἐν οἷς τάς τε τῶν Ἑλλήνων καὶ βαρβάρων πράξεις μέχρι νῦν ἀπαγγελλομένας ἔστι λαβεῖν. This sounds so much like the language in which universal history was typically identified (cf. n. 36, p. 241; there is special similarity to *FGrHist* 70 T 10, of Ephorus) that Flower (*ibid.* 155–6) is forced to explain Photius' language as referring to Theopompus' historiographical output as a whole (the *Epitome of Herodotus* and the *Hellenica* as well as the *Philippica*) in order to avoid the implication that the *Philippica* themselves constitute a universal history. I suggest in nn. 23–24 on pp. 238–9, that, from a modern perspective, nothing

largely what allows us today to group under a common heading a set of authors as diverse as those we conventionally term 'universal historians'. So, too, in the ancient world, explicit direction ensured that audiences would read the ensuing account, inevitably limited as it was, as an authoritative, all-encompassing guide to history. To be sure, universal historians backed their declaration by implementing strategies that helped construct history as they presented it as a unity: synchronisms and diachronic parallels are among the forms of patterning to which they regularly resort,[42] not to mention the role of selectivity and proportioning.[43] But those strategies alone and unsupported would arguably not as effectively have matched the author's inevitably (and often conspicuously) limited product to the vast aspirations directly advertised in his explicit claim.

The inherent difficulties of effecting a universalising narrative are particularly exacerbated, I suggest, when the author has to contend with influence from the tradition primarily associated with Thucydides, that prizes and advertises historical accuracy and analysis – as Roman prose historiographers all to some extent had to do.[44] Polybius, it is true, saw universal history as the ideal form for his analytic approach, integral to the task of writing up Rome, as he understood it, because it was the form that *par excellence* sponsored the synthetic approach he favoured.[45] Yet the Thucydidean aspiration to track the discrete and unique events of the past in all their particularity jars against universalism's notional goal, to draw the whole of history into one tidy skein, that allows for a single narrative thread to unroll unbroken,[46] and diverts the writer from 'qualitative' universalism's proper requisite: commitment to the belief that the unfolding of events through time can be explained on a single, unifying principle. The more the narrative adheres to a single conceptual mould (that

militates so strongly against Timaeus' being reckoned a universalist as the absence of that label from the ancient record surrounding him; that aside, the *reliquiae* for their part present at least as strong a case for universalism as do the remains of Ephorus' and Theopompus' works.

[42] For temporal strategies, including synchronisms, put to use in conventional universal historians (here including Timaeus), see Meister 1971: 506–8; Walbank 1974: 59–80; Walbank 1975: 200; Sacks 1981: 110–112; Alonso-Núñez 1990: 183, 185; Mendels 1990: 108; Clarke 1999a: 121–2; Clarke 1999b: 256–61; Feeney 2007: 47–52; and Clarke 2008: 138–9.

[43] On selectivity and proportion in universal history, see Sacks 1981: 99–100, 106–7, 114–15; Sacks 1990: 98–100; Clarke 1999b: 265–6.

[44] See Miles' emphasis on the analytic tendency of Roman prose historiography (Miles 1995: 9–14). Miles' emphasis is overstated in my view; cf. Chapter 4, pp. 205–6. On the affinities of universal history, since its earliest days, with poetry, religion and philosophy, see Momigliano 1987: 33–4, 36, 37–9, 46–52.

[45] See Sacks 1981: 111–21; Clarke 1999a: 124–8; cf. Momigliano 1987: 39–40.

[46] On the single thread (whence the structural analogy to annalistic history), see Polyb. 3.32.2, with Sacks 1981: 110–20, including on the logistical problems Polybius encountered in striving to attain that notional goal (cf. Polyb. 5.31.4–5); cf. Clarke 1999a: 123.

is, the more it aspires to theoretical universalist purity), the more inconvenient the actual facts of the past will be for it. Those willing to take a Procrustean approach – as, for instance, Diodorus – have some success in making the past they write up tally with their universalising claims;[47] Polybius's sophisticated universalising, twinned with his honesty about his material – that is, about the continued existence of distinct historical arenas even after the 140th Olympiad (see n. 14, p. 236) – leads him to recognise the failure of his ability to carry out what he had initially promised:[48] an account that itself would be fully unified once he reached that point in time when, he had claimed at the outset, world affairs had themselves been essentially unified under Rome's domination. The marriage between a narrative that attempts to be rationalising and analytic and one that would explain time in its entirety on a single unifying principle is no natural one.

Because of its defining affiliation to a single principle, of universal explanatory power, 'qualitative' universalism can best be effected when the view of the past is free from such obstacles; that is, when the past is reconstructed in idealised form, untroubled by historical particularities. Here, the poet was at an advantage, bound as he was differently from the historian by audience expectations of *veritas*.[49] Besides this, the poet had at his disposal a wide range of strategies that could serve to communicate implicitly the vision of a unified world at work[50] – only some of which were available to the prose historian. We have noted the role of schematisation and selectivity in giving a wide-ranging narrative structure and unity, and thus the illusion of coherence.[51] This makes it unsurprising that universal history has its original and most comfortable home in rhetorical, philosophical and religious thought; for an overarching ideology is a well-designed tool for separating the wheat of past events from the chaff and thus

[47] Diodorus is aided by the fact that his form of universalism is the less ideologically loaded 'quantitative' kind. His task is the simpler one of cutting his material down to size. See Clarke 1999b: 257–60, 265–7 on Diodorus' explicit use of principles of selectivity and proportion. Velleius, too, signals his own brevity and selectivity with such terms as *festinatio* (1.16.1; 2.41.1, 108.2, 124.1), *brevitas* (2.55.1) and *transcursus* (2.55.1 and 2.86.1, with Woodman 1983: 230, on *quis in hoc transcursu*; cf. 2.99.4); see Woodman 1975: 277–87; cf. Starr 1981: 163, 166, 170 and Schultze 2010: 116.

[48] Cf. Clarke's discussion of Polyb. 5.31.4–5 at Clarke 1999a: 122–3. Walbank, however, notes the Procrustean tendencies of Polybius himself: 'In the process [of seeking to interpret Roman customs and institutions in the light of Greek political theory] he sometimes forces his material into an over-schematic form and, moreover, simplifies and abbreviates, to make the evidence fit the pattern his imposes' (Walbank 1998: 47).

[49] See Chapter 4, pp. 202–5.

[50] On Hesiod as a universalist, see Momigliano 1987: 31–5; on Vergil, Hardie 1986: *passim*; on Ovid, Wheeler 1999, as cited in n. 3, p. 234.

[51] See nn. 16, 43 and 48, with the text to them, on pp. 237, 243 and 244.

drawing history into the desired focus so as newly to illuminate its significance.[52] But the schemata used to re-draft an audience's understanding of the past need not be of philosophical or religious origin in order to be effective; any move that implicitly unifies time and space is at root universalising.[53] The poets have extended means of creating temporal and spatial analogies through the use of allusion.[54] Poetry's idealised (re-interpreted) version of events functions alongside selectivity as the poet's natural mode for lifting the audience's eyes from the mundane and from the difficulties of historical reality. In either medium, anachronisms and aetiologies connect past and present, while poetry (more typically) engages in prophetic references to the future, similes and analogies between (for example) the mythical past and current Roman experience as additional means of suggesting an overarching temporal and geographical continuum.[55] These organic means of creating a universal narrative, because effective, dispensed, I suggest, with the need for the overt claim that universalising poetry's less well-equipped and more explicit prose cousin regularly made. While poetry's subtler approach has meant that it has stood rather in the shadow of the boldly self-proclaimed prose universalists,[56] it was also, I contend, an ideal means for allowing a universalising current to enter broad thinking about Rome.

THE CASE OF THE *ANNALES*

To recapitulate: the motivation for positing an analogy between the *Annales* and universal history lies in the invitation, proferred by both the poem's sources and the broader, implicit engagement with the poem in both the historiographical and epic traditions at Rome, to find an explanation for the poem's impact on literary history that takes into account not only the artistry of its language but also its conceptual response to the historical circumstances into which it was born. These circumstances were ripe for the emergence of an incipiently universalising narrative, and the idea that universalising interpretations of history properly belong to the province of

[52] For universal history's connection, even at its origin, to rhetoric and philosophy, see Fornara 1983: 43, 45–6; for its role in religious accounts of the past (and future), see Momigliano 1987: 31–2, 34–5, 46–52 and Fear 2010: 175–88; for its continued life in modern philosophy, see de Laurentiis 2010: 207–20; Farrenkopf 2010: 221–37; and Momigliano 1986: 235–46.

[53] Cf. n. 42, p. 243.

[54] Thus Wheeler counts the use of *color Romanus* for Greek myths among Ovid's universalising strategies (Wheeler 1999: 197 and 194–205 *passim*).

[55] On the use of these media in Ovid, see Wheeler as cited in the note above. Cf. Feeney 2007: 24 on the 'simile-like nature of synchronism'.

[56] Cf. Momigliano 1987: 39.

prose is little more than a prejudice. The arguments I shall adduce below from the *reliquiae* of the *Annales* in favour of a universalising reading of the poem fall under three principal headings.

First is the probability, already mentioned, that Ennius was the first to deal with history in its entirety, as it appeared from a Roman perspective.[57] Among the most surprising testimonia to the epic are ones suggesting that, in the proem to the *Annales*, a figure of Homer offered a cosmological account of the origins of the universe (a *rerum natura*, as Lucretius would have it at *DRN* 1.126)[58] – against which the account of Roman history, we surmise, is then set. That juxtaposition implies, first, chronological continuity between the origins of the universe and Roman history – an implication strengthened by Ennius' allusions to annalistic reckoning, which likewise support the sense of unbroken succession. A further, compatible implication is that the account about to unfold was of sufficient moment as to warrant such an impressive backdrop – whether because the reader is to infer that the cosmos and Roman history function on the same mechanism or because of the temporal (and hence also causal?) continuity their juxtaposition implies.

My earlier argument (in Chapter 1) in favour of the presence of the gods throughout the narrative of the *Annales* is germane to this latter implication, of the centrality of Rome to the cosmos. The essentially continuous presence of the gods, in my reading of the fragments, is a reflex of the generic combinations effected by Ennius: it is in line not only with the poem's character as Homerising epic but also with its relationship to

[57] According to Dion. Hal. *Ant. Rom.* 1.6.2, Fabius Pictor's and Cincius Alimentus' accounts of the City set detailed narratives of their own day against summary treatment of the Rome's early history (cf. Badian 1966: 3, 11 on early Roman historiography's typical hour-glass shape; so too Timpe 1972: 932–40; Kierdorf 2002: 402–3; and Cornell 2010: 103, with further references). Some testimony suggests that, in either case, the whole was framed by an account of the development of human civilisation; see n. 34, p. 241. The indications are thus that their narratives traced a progression from early times to the present but not at a steady pace. (Out of 28 fragments attributed to the Fabius in Peter, *HRR*², F 1–14 concern pre-history and regal history, F 15–17 the very early Republic, F 18–21 *c.* the turn of c. 4, and F 22–6 the events of Fabius' own lifetime; F 27–8 offer no basis on which to attribute them to any part of the narrative. Of the 11 fragments of Cincius [*FGrHist* 810], F 1–3, 6, 9 and 10 concern the pre-historical period, F 4 the later c. 5, F 5 and possibly 8 Cincius' own lifetime, while F 7 and 11 offer no basis for attribution.) Scarce as the hard evidence is for the progression of the narrative of the *Annales* (see pp. 67–71), it seems that it at any rate moved more steadily than those of Fabius or Cincius. Ultimately, we do not have sufficient evidence for any of these authors to be assured of their narrative economy, but the total absence of book-numbers from the record for Fabius and Cincius means that we have no assurance at all of the dimensions of the narrative and can at best (and circularly) judge them from Cato's *Origines*. Ennius' book-numbers give at least some assurance that he approached narrative pace and regularity in a self-conscious manner, however poorly we may be able to judge the particulars that resulted.

[58] Cp. the opening cosmogony of Ovid's *Metamorphoses*, possibly an Ennian gesture.

the annalistic tradition, the tradition that properly oversaw the relationship between gods and men at Rome. The hybrid result is that Rome is presented as the focus of the cosmos at large. I shall presently return to the question of the evidence for and the implications of the opening cosmology, along with the reminders of that cosmology dispersed throughout the remains of the poem, as well as the (related, as I see it) role of the gods in the poem. For now, suffice it to observe that one welcome result of positing an analogy between the *Annales* and universal history is that it provides a function for the *rerum natura* worthy of its privileged place in the proem and in 'Homer''s mouth.

In addition to the effects created by the opening cosmology, any time spent on the pre-foundation period once the narrative proper had been broached broadens the context in which the narrative of Rome was set.[59] Like Fabius and Cincius, Ennius clearly spent time on the pre-foundation period[60] and, besides this, devoted attention to Rome's foundation-date (at *Ann.* 154–5), in a manner that in itself made a significant statement of Rome's claim to an august beginning, one analogous to Greek cities with similar claims.[61] This matter will detain us briefly below; for it is relevant to consideration of the work's universalising impulses that the Greek and rationalised version of early world history (including the role of Troy and the subsequent movement of heroes around the Mediterranean world) that famously characterises Roman prose historiography from its earliest surviving origins characterises the *Annales*, too.

As relevant to a universalising interpretation of the *Annales* as the poem's chronological scope are its geographical reach and emphases. Here, the standard assumption is that the poem covered all of Rome's conquests down to Ennius' day, although the fragments permit us little sense of how the poem's space–time matrix operated in practice (as the schematic nature of the poem's traditional reconstruction makes plain; see Appendix 1). Examination of the few surviving references to the geography of the

[59] So Cornell 2010: 102–15, esp. 103, on Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus.

[60] Besides the proem-material, the mentions of Priam (*Ann.* 14), Anchises (*Ann.* 15–6, 28–9), the Prisci Latini (*Ann.* 22), the king of Alba Longa (*Ann.* 31), Ilia (*Ann.* 34–50, 56, 58–9, 60, 61–2), the wolf (*Ann.* 65), etc. testify to this. The ancient evidence locates none of these fragments in any particular book. Although we have only a limited sense of the distribution of material in Books 1–3, Gellius tells us that *Ann.* 72–91 (the auspicate of Romulus and Remus) belong to Book 1; if this is reliable, it assures us that the story of the foundation was given in Book 1. Other fragments (*Ann.* 92, 93, etc.) assigned by ancient evidence to Book 1 are regularly attributed to the foundation-story, but in fact the reference of these fragments is obscure; they are attributed to the foundation-story only because their sources assign them to Book 1. For discussion of our sense of the overall pace of the *Annales* and of the limited evidence on which it is based, see Chapter 1, pp. 60–71.

[61] See Feeney 2007: 93.

Roman world yields two observations. First, there is a vast preponderance of fragments describing action at the periphery of emergent empire over fragments describing action at its hub: internal affairs at Rome suffer virtual eclipse in the extant record in favour of theatres abroad. This engages the question of how the poem, whose title designated the expanding geographical ambit it covered as *annales* – that is, as the stuff of local Roman historiography – portrayed the relationship of the City to the territories that it controlled and fought for. Second, as regards foreign theatres, six (predictable) discrete geographical arenas present themselves in the surviving fragments: the Italian peninsula, Africa, Illyria, Greece and Macedon, Asia (as represented variously by Troy and by Antiochus) and the West (Spain and Gaul). Among these, the East, broadly interpreted to include Carthage as well as Troy and Antiochus,[62] dominates, while the West has next to no surviving presence. The extant fragments can at best only coarsely represent the distribution of emphasis in the original poem and may indeed be utterly misleading. Yet the first imbalance, that between fragments clearly describing foreign affairs and ones clearly describing internal affairs, is so pronounced that it is hard to explain if not as a reflection of an original strong focus on Rome's expanding military ventures, at the expense of the domestic. The disproportion in the amount of attention different theatres receive is inevitably suspect, and presumably events of such contemporary moment as Cato's victories in Spain in 195 BCE and Aemilius Paullus' campaign of 190/89 did indeed figure. But the relative abundance of material on the East is despite that worth noting, especially since there survive several pieces of evidence (to be discussed below) suggesting that references to the East were confined neither to their chronological place in the narrative nor to their literal range of meaning. My reading will suggest that Ennius' Rome was represented, in Greece's stead, as the bastion of the West, the primary power capable of withstanding the hostile Orient (as represented by Antiochus and Hannibal); and thus that the *Annales* are heir to the archetypal clash between East and West that characterised both the *Iliad* and Herodotus' *Histories*. This polarising East–West dynamic is not least what gives the Greek texts – and with them, I submit, Ennius' *Annales* – their universalising cast. At the same time, it remains true that Ennius also made Rome Troy's successor (cf. *Ann.* 14, 15–16 and 344–5, quoted on p. 277). The dual role Rome thus occupies

[62] For the reasons to include Carthage, as construed by Ennius in the *Annales*, as a city of the East, see Elliott forthcoming: 232 n. 27.

results in a paradox familiar from Vergil and capable of complicating our sense of Ennius' representation of Roman identity and ethics.

The third element of Ennius' universalising strategy lies in the well-known correlative to Rome's expansion over others' territory near and far: that is, Ennius' poetic appropriations and amalgamations.[63] The fragments amply illustrate how, in the *Annales*, Ennius mapped pre-existent Greek epic and historiographical images and expressions onto Rome's history. The most impressive evidence for this strategy (*Ann.* 391–8, the passage describing the tribune 'Caelius' in terms of the Homeric Ajax of *Iliad* 16 and *Ann.* XV.iv, the Istrians modelled on the Polypoites and Leonteus of *Il.* 12.127ff.) is located by its source, Macrobius, in Book 15 of the narrative. This evidence indicates that the re-description of Roman history in imaginative terms borrowed from Greek literature continued late into the narrative, just as the lexical and metrical Homerising common to all the fragments suggests that the strategy was not confined to any one point in the narrative. Such allusion to the Greek past allowed more than one 'historical' moment to be viewed simultaneously, creating a sort of diachronic prism through which the Greek and the Roman past were held together as reflections of one another. This extended reach means that the story Ennius told readily escaped the bounds of the narrow or the parochial; it took on the scope and the value of the narratives on which it was built – and, arguably, became by extension emblematic of further possible large-scale narratives of other geographical regions or historical moments. What resulted was a history of a Roman world wider than it had ever previously been, that tacitly subsumed a great deal to which even in Ennius' day Rome had no particular claim.

Ennius' transposition of the persons and events of Roman history onto Homeric 'history' thus effected a claim that Roman history was both co-extensive with and the fulfilment of that ultimate narrative of the past that the Homeric epics had, for their world, always represented.[64] That claim, I submit, could posture as an explanation of sorts, though certainly no rational one, for Rome's dominance in the contemporary world: it was to Rome in the end, Ennius' strategy implied, that the stories long familiar to the 'civilised' world applied. Roman history was in this perspective no different from world history not only because, as the later narratives of the city were to tell, her military and political might was on the rise over the known world, but because, as presented by Ennius, Roman history, still

[63] The correlation has frequently been pointed out, perhaps most recently by Sciarrino 2006: 462.
[64] Cf. Elliott 2010: 149–50.

clearly labelled *annales*, subsumes the most famous stories of the other places and events of which the Romans knew.[65]

The combination of the poem's title with Ennius' allusions to Greek literature results in a generic hybrid that is, I suggest, particularly effective in promoting a strongly Romanocentric universalising vision – a 'focalised universality', as Katherine Clarke and Liv Yarrow have termed it.[66] On the one hand, the use of allusion extends the reach of the narrative beyond the confines that it could literally claim; in particular, I will discuss how the appearance of Homer (in a variety of senses) promotes the poem's universalising overtones. At the same time, the title and the poem's other reflexes of the annalistic tradition insist on the centrality of Rome and on relevance to Rome as the exclusive criterion determining whether or not an item was to be included.[67] For, as with all forms of *annales*, relevance to the City is in this text the criterion determining whether or not an item is to be included: Rome remains the geographical and ideological centre, even as Ennius maps the City's steadily increasing reach over the world around her and the growth of her dominance through time. By amalgamating *annales* with Homerising poetry, Ennius staked a confrontational claim to the identity of Roman history and world history. The long reach of the poem into Greek history (Herodotus as well as Homer), and into the various other interwoven genres, effectively suggested that Rome's 'locality' was by now something that resisted confinement to traditional interpretation. In terms of temporal depth, allusion to the Greek past allowed the poem to encompass more of human history (as then understood) than the account of Rome alone would have allowed, while at the same time enlarging its geographical and cultural horizon of expectations. The hybrid gods of the *Annales* are one instance of the result of this cross-breeding: they represent both the distinctively Roman gods that had always been the focus of traditional *annales*, and the Homeric gods, whose role it was to administer the affairs of mankind at large. My thesis is thus that, using exclusively implicit means negotiated via the hybridisation of genre, Ennius successfully offered an

[65] Cf. Clarke 2008: 139, on 'the repetitive nature of history' in Diodorus, which 'lends the diversity of times and places a certain unity'.

[66] See Clarke 1999a: 268 (on Trogus); cf. *ibid.* 264 and Clarke 1999: 100–1, 210–29, 45 and 89, with her n. 26 (on the relevance of the concept in Polybius and Strabo). Diodorus and Velleius also manifestly offer focalised, that is, Romanocentric, versions of universality. For the concept, cf. Yarrow 2010: 131–47. Of the two forms of focalised universality Yarrow proposes, the 'gentle' version, in which 'all points of a perceived periphery of history are interconnected through a focal point' (Cornell, Fear, Liddel 2010: 8) is the one relevant to my reading of the *Annales*.

[67] See Elliott 2010: 155–6 and p. 239 above, with nn. 28–9 there. For full argument, see Ch. 1 of the present study.

arresting vision of Rome as the focal point of the known world, in both its temporal and its geographical aspects, that was tantamount to what the universal historians were later explicitly to claim on behalf of the city. Thus the most substantial grounds, as I see it, for reading the *Annales* as the poetic equivalent of a universal history are internal to the poem and native to its mode of expression.

Further aspects of the poem can be harnessed to both its geographical descriptions and to its generic hybridising strategy, in support of the work's universalising drive. First, the focalisation around Rome has an analogue in Ennius' frequent and surprising use of the first person – a feature that, furthermore, draws his poem into closer relationship with its prose historiographical cousins,[68] whose use of the first person as a generic marker of difference and distance from epic is well known.[69] One fragment in particular, *Ann.* 12–13, highlights the analogy between the spread of Ennius' fame and Roman expansion, both of which emanate from the central standpoint of Rome. Second, universal histories often make use of the idea of a relationship between microcosm and macrocosm or of *pars pro toto*.[70] This, too, has a bearing on a reading of the *Annales* in which the poem promotes Rome's relationship to, and indeed her ability to stand for, the cosmos at large. Finally, besides the large-scale structural analogy between *annales* and universal history,[71] no reconstruction of Ennius' poem can do without the flashbacks and digressions (such as ethnographical digressions; emphasis on origins) that are hallmarks of conventional universal histories – as they are also of Homeric epic.[72] No more than traces suggesting these survive, in such fragments as *Ann.* 297, *Poenos Didone oriundos* ('the Phoenicians, who trace their origin from Dido') and *Ann.* 472, *Poenos Sarra oriundos* ('the Phoenicians, who trace their origin from Sarra'); but these lines remind us of the logical necessity of flashbacks in a narrative that had, after all, to tell the story of more than one time and place.[73]

For now, we return to the poem's representation of Rome as the centre of the cosmos. This emerges not only from the initial *rerum natura*, which sets

[68] Cf. Clarke 1999a: 97–101, where Clarke draws attention to Polybius' use of the first person in the context of her discussion of geographical focus in the *Histories*.

[69] See Marincola 1997: 8–12, 287–8; also *ibid.* 179–205.

[70] Cf. Clarke 1999a: 40–3, 109–10, 120, 127–8, on Polybius.

[71] See nn. 28 and 29, p. 239.

[72] E.g. Trogus' *prologi* show that he included *origines* of forty peoples, cities, countries and kings and five *situs* (Alonso-Núñez 1990: 179 and Clarke 1999b: 271–3). On flashback digressions in Diodorus, see *ibid.* 269–71. On the need for postulating digressions and flashbacks in Ennius, see Elliott 2010: 154–5.

[73] Cf. Clarke 1999a: 156, on Polybius, Posidonius and Trogus; Cornell 2010: 107–11, on the universalising function of ethnography, including in early Roman prose historians.

the description of Roman history to follow against the magnificent backdrop of the universe at large; further fragments, dispersed throughout the text's remains, present Rome and its inhabitants in a symbiotic relationship with the natural world around them. The sky itself (as in Homer) responds with sympathy or horror to the events unfolding below it, and nature's behaviour mirrors that of the text's human actors. From there, we shall move to examine the terms in which the gods are described, and how this contributes to the sense of a world revolving around Rome, contrasting this with what we can glean of their description in Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*.

THE TEMPORAL SPECTRUM (I): ROME AS THE CENTRE OF THE COSMOS

Rome and the natural universe

In discussing the relationship between the Vergilian Anchises' synopsis of Roman history (*Aen*. 6.756–886) and his preceding description of the operation of the physical universe (*Aen*. 6.724–51),[74] Philip Hardie identifies two different modes of establishing the broader significance of a particular and limited historical narrative: a simultaneous one, operating via allegory, and a sequential one, of which the use of a cosmic setting is an instance. Hardie writes:

> The essential characteristic of the cosmic setting is that it establishes a relation ship between particular places, people, or events and the most general structure or history of the universe. As such it is comparable to certain types of allegory . . . in which particular events are made to convey significance of a far more general import. Allegory proper dispenses with the restrictions of time and space; it involves the *simultaneous* presentation of two orders of reality, in

[74] Hardie discusses possible Ennian influence on the cosmological component in Anchises' speech at Hardie 1986: 76–83 (and on that of Pythagoras in Ovid, *Met*. 15 at *ibid*. 83, n. 121). It is also perhaps worth noting, in the context of the discussion to follow, that editors have postulated a specific link between *Aen*. 6.724–51 and Ennius' proem. They do so on the basis of Servius' comment on Vergil's phrase at *Aen*. 6.748, *rotam volvere per annos . . . est autem sermo Ennii*, Servius says. Although no further ancient evidence exists as to the location and function in context of this 'Ennian expression' – and indeed, Servius does not even guarantee his testimonium a place in the *Annales* – many editors, including the most recent, place it in the proem to the *Annales*, to have it form part of the *rerum natura*. (Thus both Skutsch and Flores. Flores *et al*. 2002: 33 gives the fullest history of the phrase's fate in earlier editions. He and Skutsch both note that Columna and Merula printed the phrase among their fragments *sed. inc*., while Spangenberg attributed it to Book 18.) The decision to do so depends on the assumption that the phrase originated in an Ennian context analogous to the one in which it re-appears in Book 6 of the *Aeneid* (see Chapter 2, p. 111, with n. 103 there, and pp. 115–17, cf. n. 142, p. 127, and n. 145, p. 128, for this methodology, which, in the case of the *Annales*, is primarily associated with Norden).

> this case one of a particular and one of a general nature, within the same segment of text. The cosmic setting, on the other hand, presents the general and the particular *in sequence*; a relationship between the two is established when it is perceived that this sequence does form a unity of some kind.[75]

My further argument about Ennian allusion to the Greek literary-*cum*-historical past (as outlined above) involves suggesting that his narrative regularly encapsulated more than one layer of history and that this multi-dimensionality endowed his narrative of Rome with an overall emblematic quality. To this extent, I suggest, the poet's superimposition of Roman history onto the pre-existent pattern of Greece's past constitutes a move analogous to '[allegory's] simultaneous presentation of two orders of reality'. Here, however, it is my purpose to argue that the *rerum natura*, to use Lucretius' contentious term from *DRN* 1.126,[76] placed by Ennius in 'Homer''s mouth during the latter's dream-apparition in the proem to the *Annales*,[77] suggests that Ennius sought to establish at the start of his poem a relationship between the cosmos at its grandest and the history of Rome that ensues.[78] As Hardie again puts it (with regard to the *Aeneid*), '[t]he cosmic setting exists to lend dignity to, or to provide an explanation of, the particular';[79] and further, '[t]he use of a cosmic setting . . . most simply . . . may spring from a desire for completeness, what might be called an encyclopaedic drive'.[80]

In my discussion of the evidence for the *rerum natura* in Chapter 3, pp. 144–51, I concluded that the motivation for assigning fragments to this passage (regularly: *Ann.* 6–7, 8–10; 8–9 Fl. = 9 V) lies in scholarly concern to populate with fragments Lucretius' term *rerum natura* rather than in any clear impetus supplied by the fragments themselves or their quotation-contexts (Varro, *LL* 5.57–60 and 7.48).[81] Aside from *Ann.* 11, *memini me*

[75] Hardie 1986: 66.

[76] See the citations in n. 33 to Chapter 3, p. 147, for discussions of the Lucretian passage.

[77] Our fullest and most direct evidence for Ennius' proem comes from the scholia to Persius and from Porphyrio on Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.51 (see Appendix Tables A5.41 and A5.26).

[78] For a different kind of link between cosmology and Roman universalism, in Polybius, see Clarke 1999a: 112–13; cf. *ibid.* 118, 126–7.

[79] Hardie 1986: 68. [80] *ibid.* 67.

[81] The hold that Lucretius' term has on the imaginations of editors is also suggested by a move effected by the most recent editors of the *Annales*, who introduce into their vision of Ennius' proem a standard universalising mechanism, the juxtaposition of sky, earth, sea (cf. Hardie 1986: 313–25 for the occurrence of the trope in the *Aeneid*, with discussion of its literary history; and see *Ann.* 555–6 for its occurrence in the *Annales*). To reconstruct this tripartition, if still only partially, for the proem, these editors juxtapose separate and previously unrelated fragments: . . . *cava quaeque/corpore caeruleo caeli cortina receptat* (ll. *Ann.* 8–9 Fl. – lines which Skutsch reads as an anapaestic septenarius and hence excludes it from his edition. Turnebus and Timpanaro supply the reconstruction of this severely corrupt material on which Flores *et al.* rely [see Flores *et al.* 2002: 31]) and . . . *terra<que> corpus/quae dedit ipsa capit neque dispendi facit hilum* (*Ann.* 10–11 Fl. *Ann.* 6–7 Sk.). Flores *et al.* are

fiere pavom, we have no fragments that obviously and unambiguously represent the episode. Acceptance of the implications of Lucretius' term is not, however, necessarily therefore wrong. Presumably Lucretius would not have used it unless it could designate, however tendentiously, a feature of the *Annales* that his immediate audience could identify. Besides this, the testimony of the scholiasts to Persius and Horace, and arguably also the inclusion of cosmogonical and cosmological elements in the later hexametric tradition at Rome, as argued in Chapter 3, pp. 150–1, tend on the whole to support the notion that Lucretius' term had an identifiable referent in the proem to the *Annales*.

The transition from 'Homer''s speech to Ennius' narrative of Rome is now all but erased from our view, and so it is not surprising that it has not generated much discussion. Its simple existence, however, carries implications, to which the audience would have been sensitive even without explicit instruction from the author to read the juxtaposed accounts as related.[82] If Ennius began his narrative with a cosmology placed just ahead of his narrative of the Roman past, he thereby created an implicit parallelism between the origins of the cosmos and the origins of the Roman race (however blatant the omission of history between the narrative's point of origin and its goal may be). And, as Hardie again writes, 'From the contemplation of a cosmic setting the buoyant spirit derives pride in the immediate and particular object of interest, to which is transferred something of the grandeur of the setting; there is an irrational feeling that the whole exists only for the sake of the small part'.[83] The proem with its *rerum natura* on this reading sets up a double reciprocity, first between Homer and

explicit in noting that their purpose is to recreate the tripartition (see Flores *et al.* 2002: 31). Perhaps some support for the move can be deduced from Lucan 7.810–18, which they cite and which appears to quote both fragments in close succession; but see Goldberg 2009: 637–55 on the ambitious nature of editorial moves made in this Italian edition, which the juxtaposition of these fragments serves further to illustrate.

[82] Thus Hardie, *loc. cit.*

[83] Hardie 1986: 68; see n. 70, p. 251, for bibliography on the relationship of microcosm and macrocosm in conventional universal history. Hardie (*loc. cit.*) goes on to speak of the pessimistic reading of the same sequence, which results in an awareness of the insignificance of the part as thus seen in the context of the whole. It seems to me plausible that the *Annales* would have allowed for this pessimistic reading of Rome's history against its cosmic setting as well as for the optimistic one, although this is not the place to argue the case. At any rate, a number of lines among the extant fragments reflect an Herodotean and tragic awareness of the transience of fortune: thus *Ann.* 258–60, . . . *multa dies in bello conficit unus/. . ./et rursus multae fortunae forte recumbunt: haud quaquam quemquam semper fortuna secuta est*, lines which their source (Macr. *Sat.* 6.2.16) relates to those of apparently rather different sentiment at *Aen.* 11.425–7; *Ann.* 312–13, *mortalem summum Fortuna repente/reddidit †summo regno famul †ut †optimus esset*, to which Skutsch, notably in the context of the present argument, compares Lucr. 3.1034–44, a passage that had some influence on the history of the reconstruction of this fragment (see Flores *et al.* 2006: 99–103); and *Ann.* 385–6, *infit: o cives, quae me fortuna fero sic/contudit indigno bello confecit acerbo*.

Ennius (or the *Iliad* and the *Annales*) on the one hand, as dramatised in the metempsychosis narrative, but then also between the history of the cosmos given by 'Homer' and the history of Rome given in the poem's main narrative voice on the other. The scale and detail of the main narrative following after the relatively brief proem would create the sense that the later story has the mass to counter-balance the other.

Reminders of either reciprocity fill the narrative. The Homerising and quasi-formulaic language of the text act as constant reminders of the former, while even in its present state the text is studded with lines that repeat the gesture of the proem by pointing to the story's ultimate setting, its 'full address'.[84] As the following examples show, there is considerable overlap between the two sets of lines. Representative examples of lines reminding us of the cosmic setting are *Ann.* 27, *qui caelum versat stellis fulgentibus aptum* ('who whirls about the heavens fitted with the gleaming stars'); *Ann.* 145, *caelum prospexit stellis fulgentibus aptum* ('he gazed out at the heavens fitted with the gleaming stars'); *Ann.* 205, *vertitur interea caelum cum ingentibus signis* ('in the meantime the heavens wheeled about with their massive constellations'); *Ann.* 348, *hinc nox processit stellis ardentibus apta* ('hence night came forth, fitted with the blazing stars'); *Ann.* 414, *nox quando mediis signis praecincta volabit* ('when night, the constellations girding her midst, shall fly forth'); *Ann.* 415–6, *interea fax/occidit Oceanumque rubra tractim obruit aethra* ('meanwhile the sun sinks and buries the Ocean by degrees in reddish light'); *Ann.* 419, *montibus obstipis obstantibus, unde oritur nox* ('with the sloping mountains, whence night arises, blocking the path'); *Ann.* 571, *interea fugit albus iubar Hyperionis cursum* ('meanwhile the bright morning-star flees before Hyperion's onrush'); and *Ann.* 572, *inde patefecit radiis rota candida caelum* ('then the sparkling orb with its beams opened up the sky'). These lines set the narrative in its fullest context, dignifying the contents and lending them grandeur, in a manner familiar to us from the works of Homer and Vergil.

Other lines subtly depict the sky, the night and the day as potentially taking something of an active interest in the events they witness and enable or put a stop to. Some forms of Homerising expression will naturally impart a degree of agency to these entities. Iliadic lines such as *Il.* 5.506–7, ἀμφὶ δὲ νύκτα/θοῦρος Ἄρης ἐκάλυψε μάχῃ Τρώεσσιν ἀρήγων ('headlong Ares wrapped the battle around with night, lending help to the Trojans') make the idea of superhuman agency involved in night's intervention fully

[84] Thus Hardie 1986: 67, where Hardie gives as an instance of the universalising tendency the modern child's inscription of its possessions with an address ending with 'the world, the universe'.

explicit. The effect in the fragments of Ennius is subtler than this: so *Ann.* 33, *quom superum lumen nox intempesta teneret* ('while dead of night obscured the light of day that shines above us')[85] and *Ann.* 160, *bellum aequis* [de] *manibus nox intempesta diremit* ('night at her darkest sundered the fighting, the odds level') partially personify night by making it (her) the subject of the sentence. As a result, they can be read as implying that night possesses a kind of consciousness and a concern for the action in which it (she) intervenes. That is especially the case in the second of these two lines: *nox intempesta* is, on the one hand, simply quasi-formulaic in Ennius' hands (see Chapter 2, p. 91), but at *Ann.* 160 it imitates one of those striking uses of formula that generate meaning by appearing at odds with their context. *Intempestus* properly refers to dead of night, the darkest period when time cannot rightly be told.[86] Yet at *Ann.* 160 it is used to qualify the onset of night and thus suggests that night, by arriving in her darkest guise, conspires to bring battle to a non-negotiable close. Again, the calm and clarity evoked in the quasi-formulaic final phrase of *Ann.* 387, *omnes occisi occensique in nocte serena* ('all were killed and burned in the peaceful night'), contrasts with the grimness of the action the line describes.[87] In all of these instances, Ennius frames the world of men against a vast celestial backdrop which appears as a kind of witness to that world, being endowed with moods and aspects that are at times contrary to those of the world below and that thereby throw human action into a kind of magnificent relief. The effect of all this is at any rate very different from that produced by lines that simply locate action during the night. *Ann.* 292 illustrates the contrast: *ob Romam noctu legiones ducere coepit* ('he began to lead his forces by night towards Rome').

[85] Flores understands *superum lumen* as a reference to the moon, as the Vergilian line that the source, Macrobius, quotes in parallel to this (*Aen.* 3.587) suggests; and not, as Skutsch takes it on the basis of *Aen.* 6.680 and Lucr. 6.856, as a reference to the light of day (Flores *et al.* 2002: 41; the line *Ann.* 35 Fl.). For my purposes here, the exact meaning of the phrase, long the subject of debate, matters little.

[86] See Skutsch 1985: 193, citing Varro, *LL* 6.7, 7.72 and Paul. Fest. 98; and *TLL* s.v. *intempestus*.

[87] Kameke 1926: 40 (reported by M. Paladini, in Flores *et al.* 2006: 383) places the phrase into relation with Homeric νύκτα δι' ἀμβροσίην, which, as Paladini says (*loc. cit.*), is at *Il.* 10.41 and 142 'lo sfondo di scene belliche ma non cruente'; that is, the contrast appears to be Ennius' work. Paladini considers, among other possibilities, the idea that that phrase *in nocte serena* 'non fu un dato reale nella cronaca dei fatti ricostruiti da Ennio, ma una notazione poetica che tradiva il pensiero epicureo dell'uomo, un tempo razionalista: gli dei assistono indifferenti alla strage di Magnesia'. As Paladini says, 'immaginando che questa [sc. l'incinerazione] avvenne in una *nocte serena*, difficile sarebbe stato credere che dai Siriani, sconfitti e decimati quantunque a fine guerra, la notte potesse essere percepita come tale' (*ibid.* 382). Paladini and Skutsch both point out that Cicero's use of *nocte serena* at *Arat.* 104 translates Aratus' καθαρῇ ἐνὶ νυκτί (Arat. 323); see p. 262 on another possible link between Ennius' language and Aratus'. *Ann.* 387 is frequently assigned to the battle of Magnesia (because its source, Festus, assigns it to Book 14), although my translation of the participle *occisi* does not accord with this assignation (see Skutsch 1985: 551).

Men's actions and their consequent effects are also repeatedly, as in Homer,[88] depicted as reaching up to the sky and even, conceivably, as eliciting reactions from it. *Ann.* 264, *iamque fere pulvis ad caeli vasta videtur* ('and now at about this time the dust seems to . . . to the desolate . . . of the sky'), *Ann.* 428, *tollitur in caelum clamor exortus utrimque* ('the shouting, emanating from both sides, rose to the sky'), and *Ann.* 545, *clamor ad caelum volvendus per aethera vagit* ('the shouting sounds out, rolling up through the air to the sky'), technically denote the sky simply as the goal of motion. The lines effectively communicate the magnitude of the (to modern readers unknown) events to which they relate; as in Homer, the *amplificatio* (exaggeration) involved in this trope expresses the idea that the heroic action described is of such consequence that even those regions, normally unaffected by humankind, find themselves unexpectedly permeated by its by-products (the dust, the sound). It might further be the case that the imaginative reader, who feels the effects of the agency attributed to night in the lines discussed above (*Ann.* 33, 160), might understand the sky as an intelligent and perhaps startled witness to the events below that suddenly intrude into its normally undisturbed sphere. In this way, one might see in Ennius the embryo of Vergil's adoption of the dative in place of a preposition with the accusative (as, for example, at *Aen.* 5.451, *it clamor caelo* ['the din rises up to heaven'], and *Aen.* 11.192, *it caelo clamorque virum clangorque tubarum* ['the din of the men and the sounding of the trumpets rise up to the sky']), to suggest the affective involvement of the heavens alongside their status as the goal of motion.[89]

Three lines suggest that Ennius had a tendency to possess the sky of a kinship with mankind in general or with Rome or the Romans in particular. The most striking of these is *Ann.* 559, which explicitly posits an analogy between the sky and the martial courage of the Roman people: *fortis Romani sunt quamquam caelus profundus* ('the Romans are brave as the sky is deep').[90] This line expresses the limitlessness of Rome's capacity to achieve dominion. It is thus unambiguously universalising and so constitutes, if a small, nevertheless a strong piece of evidence in favour of the hypothesis for which I am arguing. The pun at *Ann.* 127, *Cael>i caerula prata*, 'the azure meadows of the Caelian/sky',[91] creates an analogy between the sky and the places humans live and locates it specifically at Rome. The prominence of this punning phrase is suggested by its near replication in the fragment best known today through

[88] See Hardie 1986: 291–2.
[89] See Woodcock 1985: 39–40 (with *ibid.* 3–4 on the prepositional use). The translations do not capture the effect of the use of the dative.
[90] See Mariotti 1991: 106–7 for discussion of the textual history of this line.
[91] The reading is assured by the context in Festus; see Skutsch *ad loc.*

Ovid's quotation of it (*Met.* 14.814) but transmitted in a fuller version by Varro (*LL* 7.5): *Ann.* 54, *unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli/templa* ('there will be one whom you shall raise to the azure regions of the sky'). The recurrence here of the phrase between these two fragments suggests that it represents (in the terms of Chapter 2) an instance of quasi-formula. Further, while *Ann.* 54 abandons the analogy between Rome and the gods' habitation in the sky, it implies that there existed direct transit between Rome and the abode of the gods and makes Rome's first leader the subject of divine discussion. The third line, *Ann.* 51, *cenacula maxuma caeli*, presents the sky as a habitation of the gods analogous, and rather quaintly so, to human habitations.[92] The phrase probably means no more than 'the great dome of the sky' (cf. *cohus*, 'vault', at *Ann.* 558; and the related Greek metaphors for the sky: δόμος, δῶμα, μέλαθρον, τέμενος);[93] but its sources, the hostile Tertullian and the Scholia Veronensia, clearly find its expression novel. The phrase's utility to Tertullian is promoted by its apparent reduction of divine activity to the level of human activity. He heads his assault on the powerful gnostic sect known as the Valentinians and on their portrayal of the celestial system and the beings that inhabit its highest part (the Ogdoad) with a quotation from Ennius (*Adv. Valent.* 7.1):[94]

> primus omnium Ennius poeta Romanus 'caenacula maxima caeli' simpliciter pronuntiavit elati situs nomine, vel quia Iovem illic epulantem legerat apud Homerum.
>
> The very first publicly to use the phrase 'the great halls of the sky' was the Roman poet Ennius, who used it naively, either in reference to the term's application to an elevated structure or because he had read in Homer of Jupiter dining there.

Tertullian's two alternative explanations of the phrase are each designed to ridicule his pagan target.[95] The second and more scathing of these explanations

[92] Cf. *Ann.* 586, *divom domus, altisonum cael*, if indeed that line is authentic (contra Zetzel 1974: 137–40).

[93] The Greek terms are those suggested by Skutsch 1985: 203.

[94] There may be some intended humour in Tertullian's treatment of *cenacula* as a true rather than a poetic plural, when he suggests that the Valentinians' multiple celestial beings would have to be lodged in multiple apartments in the sky and captures that idea using Ennius' term: *etiam creatori nostro Enniana cenacula in aedicularum disposita sunt forma* ([according to the Valentinians] 'our creator too has Ennian-style chambers arranged after the manner of a (subdivided) house'; *ibid.* 7.2) – although multiple dining-rooms are presumably not in themselves ridiculous in a Roman palatial context. For the possible humour of the term also to a contemporary and not hostile audience, cf. Plaut. *Amph.* 861–3: *ego sum ille Amphitruo* [scil. Jupiter] . . . *in superiore qui habito cenaculo* (cited by Skutsch *ibid.*).

[95] Tertullian not only writes on the assumption that pagan writers generally are utterly mistaken in their apprehension of reality but he uses Ennius' phrase in a particularly harsh polemical context against his immediate target, as the Valentinians. The quotation of Ennius is presumably intended to illustrate just how wrong-thinking the Valentinians must be, if they have anything in common with a pagan poet's description of the world.

for the term represents it as meaning specifically 'dining hall'; the first, which is presumably closer to how Ennius intended it, more generally as 'upper storey'.[96] The Scholia Veronensia (Longus) quote the line on *Aen.* 10.1 (*panditur interea domus omnipotentis Olympi*, 'meanwhile the house of all powerful Olympus is thrown open'):

> utrum sic domum dicit aperiri quomodo et Homerus χαλκοβατὲς δῶ, αὐτόμαται δὲ πύλα[ι μύκον οὐρανοῦ, ἅς ἔχον ἕωραι [e.g. *Il.* 1.575, 584], et Ennius non tantum domum sed etiam cenaculum caeli. per hoc diem significat; [facto enim die] omnia reserantur.[97]

> Longus wonders whether he says that the house is being opened up in the same sense as Homer too, who has 'the bronze based house, and of their own accord the gates of heaven, warded by the Hours, creaked open' and Ennius, who speaks not just of 'the dwelling' but actually 'the dining hall/frame above us of the sky'. This is how he indicates day; because, when day dawns, everything is unlocked.

This explanation clearly recognises Ennius' term as unusual, even if it fits into an established category of epic usage. The sense, present also in Tertullian, that the term paints the sky as peopled is compounded by the fact that the Scholia Veronensia refer the Ennian phrase to the thoroughly domestic scene on Olympus at the beginning of *Aeneid* 10, which itself takes place in a demonstrably Ennianising context.[98] It is as if the phrase's metaphor involves the sky itself as the gods' habitation in their anthropomorphism, thus promoting a thoroughgoing relationship between the divine and the human worlds of the *Annales*.

A further series of analogies emerges from the fragments, this time comparing the actions of men to the behaviour of the weather and effectively equating the forces propelling the human drama with the forces of nature. Thus *Ann.* 266, *hastati spargunt hastas. fit ferreus imber* ('armed men send their spears in all directions. An iron rain comes on . . .');[99] *Ann.* 391, *undique conveniunt velut imber tela tribuno* ('from all sides missiles fly at the tribune like a shower of rain'); and *Ann.* 432–4:[100]

[96] Cf. Varro, *LL* 5.162, *postquam in superiore parte cenitare coeperunt domus universa cenacula dicta* (quoted by both Skutsch 1985: 203 and Flores 2002: 44).

[97] Both sources' reference to Homer is one of the indications that *Ann.* 51 is correctly attributed to the *Annales*; both its sources name Ennius as its author but neither gives a specific provenance.

[98] With *divum pater atque hominum rex* at *Aen.* 10.2, cp. *Ann.* 203, 591 and 592, with Chapter 2, p. 87.

[99] Cf. Skutsch's comment that this line's language may 'convey something of the elemental force of a great battle' (Skutsch 1985: 483).

[100] These three fragments all derive from Macrobius (*Sat.* 6.1.52, 2. 30 and 2.28, respectively). It is unsurprising that information about the poem's habit of portraying action emerges primarily from a

> concurrunt veluti venti, quom spiritus Austri
> imbricitor Aquiloque suo cum flamine contra
> indu mari magno fluctus extollere certant
>
> they clash, as when the rainy gust of the South wind and, against him, the North with his blast strive to raise high the waves over the wide sea

This last fragment in particular conveys the 'theme of elemental confusion' that Hardie discusses in relation to the storm of *Aeneid* 1.[101] In bringing to attention the enormity of the events they describe by presenting them as tantamount to the behaviour of nature itself, these fragments draw Roman history on a scale large enough to occupy the natural world as a whole.

The appearance in the *Annales* of the familiar division of existence into the triad earth, sea and sky is guaranteed by *Ann.* 555–6, *qui fulmine claro/ omnia per sonitus arcet, terram mare caelum* ('who with the clear sound of thunder keeps all things in their place: the earth, the sea and the sky').[102] The trope's visible history begins with its appearance as the first element described on the Shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18, and from then on it figures as a stock component of accounts of the origins of the universe both in epic and elsewhere,[103] sometimes initiating extended cosmogonies, sometimes acting as a complete summary in its own right.[104] One of the sources for *Ann.* 555–6, the ps.-Proban commentator on *Ecl.* 6 (see Appendix Table A5.35 for Servius Danielis, p. 537), in some sense implies a cosmogonic setting for this fragment by quoting it in the context of Verg. *Ecl.* 6.31 (his primary target), a line that initiates its own brief cosmogony, and of

Vergiliocentric source, since the technique of presenting the human and the natural worlds as echoes of or in harmony with each other is Homeric (cf. above, on the presentation at *Ann.* 264, 428 and 525 of the sky as, in some sense, touched by the actions of men).

[101] The phrase quoted is from Hardie 1986: 107, n. 57. In general, for the connection between Vergilian descriptions of the forces of nature, in particular the weather, and interpretation of the *Aeneid* as a universalising work, see *ibid.* 90–110, esp. 105–10, 186, 202–9; for the universalising connotations of the Lucretian storm and its further reflexes in the *Aeneid*, *ibid.* 190–3; cf. Morford 1967: 37–58 on storms in Lucan (cited by Hardie 1986: 107, n. 56).

[102] In introducing the use of such universalising expressions in the *Aeneid*, Hardie points out their function in sacral language and in philosophical and scientific explanations geared, like religion, towards 'providing a coherent account of the totality of man's environment and of supplying guidelines for man's proper relation to that environment' (Hardie 1986: 293–4). On this, cf. my argument on pp. 263–9 about the universalising function of the gods in the *Annales*.

[103] See Flores *et al.* 2002: 162 on the history of Ennius' tricolon in Homer, Lucretius and Vergil. For documentation and discussion of its role in the *Aeneid*, see Hardie 1986: 313–25. The trope also figures in the scholarly tradition on the *Aeneid* as an explanation not directly of the constitution of the universe but of the human constitution as a reflection of that of the universe: see Servius ad *Aen.* 4.654 ('sub terras ibit imago') and the Scholia Veronenesia ad *Aen.* 5.81 (cited by Flores *et al.* 2002: 31). For a handful of examples from Roman drama and Cicero's philosophical works, see Skutsch 1985: 702, on *terram mare caelum* at *Ann.* 556.

[104] For examples of the first, see Lucr. 5.416–508 and *Ecl.* 6. 31–42, on which see Hardie 1986: 17, with his n. 35. For the second, see Lucr. 5.92–4; Verg. *Aen.* 1.58, 280, 5.9, 6.724–51; Ov. *Met.* 1.257, 12.39–40.

Lucretius' own initiatory tripartition at 5.92–4, *principio maria ac terras caelumque tuere,/quorum naturam triplicem, tria corpora, Memmi,/tris species tam dissimiles, tria talia texta* ('first, consider the sea, the land and the sky, whose three-fold constitution, three bodies, Memmius, three forms utterly unlike, three such distinguished substances . . .').[105]

I noted above the significant degree of overlap between, on the one hand, the quasi-formulaic lines enacting the identification of Ennius with Homer and, on the other, those lines constantly setting Ennius' Roman history back against the proem's cosmic backdrop. The heavy hand of the Vergiliocentric sources ensures that the Homeric origin of Ennius' language is never far from view. Homer is not, however, the only significant representative of the link between cosmology and hexametric poetry as it re-surfaces in the *Annales*. As just noted, the history of that link relevantly begins with the Shield of Achilles in *Iliad* 18, and it continues through the Hellenistic reading of Homer as the poet of the natural universe.[106] But not only did Hesiod, with the *Theogony*, also help forge the early alliance between cosmogonies and hexametric verse – as did those later readers of the *Theogony* who construed the *Eoiai* as its continuation, thus illustrating the instinctive tendency of readers across the board to interpret cosmogonies as the opening salvos of universalising accounts;[107] the poems of the pre-Socratic philosophers Xenophanes, Parmenides and especially Empedocles cemented the recognition of hexameter's role as a vehicle for cosmology.[108] In his commentary on *Ann.* 368 Fl. (= 348 Sk., *hinc nox processit stellis ardentibus apta*, translated on p. 256), a line with which the Vergiliocentric Macrobius supplies us, Jackson rightly points to the connection between Ennius' vocabulary and the language of Anaximenes (e.g. ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἥλιον καὶ σελήνην καὶ τὰ ἄλλα ἄστρα πάντα πύρινα ὄντα 13A7.4 D-K, πυρίνην μὲν τὴν φύσιν τῶν ἄστρων, 14) and Empedocles (e.g. πύρινα [sc. εἶναι τὰ ἄστρα] ἐκ τοῦ πυρώδους 31A53 D-K), whose own

[105] Ps.-Probus Verg. *Ecl.* 6.31: *plane trinam esse mundi originem et Lucretius confitetur dicens* [5.92–4]*; et alio loco* [*Ann.* 555–6]. *Afranius etiam in* Augure [8]*: 'modo post arripuit rabies hunc nostrum augurem, mare caelum terram ruere ac tremere diceres.'* Probus thus appears to assign the fragment to Lucretius, but Skutsch, following Bernays, posits a lacuna in Probus to be filled with Ennius' name and a preceding instance of the tripartition from his work (Skutsch 1985: 701). Although Skutsch was troubled by the situation, he argued firmly for Ennian authorship of the line, as testified by DS *Aen.* 1.31, our primary source for the fragment. He and Bernays are now supported by Knut Kleve's publication of PHerc 21, which argues, albeit on the basis of difficult evidence, not only that the fragment belongs to the *Annales* but also that it belongs specifically to Book 6 (Kleve 1990: 5–16).

[106] See Porter 1992: 91–5 and Hardie 1986: 25–9.

[107] On the ancient reconstruction of the *Theogony* and the *Eoiai* as of a piece, see West 1966: 48–50.

[108] Hardie 1986: 7–8. See also Clarke 1999a: 42–5, 188, 218 on the relation of pre-Socratic thought to universalism as it occurs in historiography.

hexameters appropriate what was understood as Homer's pre-eminent right to speak with authority about the natural universe (see p. 261, with n. 106 there).[109] The Hellenistic cosmological poets who continue the tradition are also likely to be a relevant conduit for this language to the *Annales*: Jackson cites as examples Aratus' *Phaenomena* 211–2, ἔσχατος ἀστηρ/. . . αἰθομένης γένυος, and 402–3, . . . ὑπ' αἰθομένῳ κέντρῳ . . . μεγάλοιο/Σκορπίου. By crafting his language out of theirs, Ennius made himself heir to both these related traditions – the Homeric–Hesiodic and the pre-Socratic with its Hellenistic recipients[110] – and thus staked a serious claim to transmit crucial knowledge about the way the world works.[111] What was above all new in Ennius' vision is that the heavenly bodies, as described in language that carried all the authority of the various Greek hexametric traditions of 'scientific'-*cum*-heroic poetry behind it, now presided over action unambiguously centred at Rome.

One fragment in particular suggests how the marriage of Romanocentricity, as implied by the poem's title and subject-matter, with descriptions of the natural universe might have been achieved. *Ann.* 153, *Nonis Iunis soli luna obstitit et nox* ('on the Nones [5th] of June, the moon and night obscured the sun'), quoted by Cicero (*Rep.* 1.25), has often been read as representative of those mundane and myopic details that the vexed Cato, as reported by Gellius (2.28.6), associates with early Roman historiography.[112] And indeed the line should certainly be read in the context of the local Roman record-keeping tradition, since its earliest accessible reader, Cicero, places it in relation to that tradition for us.[113] But the line's hexametric form and the plethora of surviving material detailing the cosmological impulses of the *Annales* causes *Ann.* 153 to appear in a different perspective, too. The effective amalgamation of the recorded observations of the City's priests with the traditions of Greek hexametric and cosmological poetry moved the tabulation of the City's relations with the gods out of the sphere of the local.

[109] Flores *et al.* 2006: 257–8, [citing Ziegler 1966: 84.]

[110] If some critics have remarked on a particular austerity or numinous and transcendental quality to Ennius' vision of the cosmos (thus Skutsch 1985: 580 [on *Ann.* 415], Flores *et al.* 2002: 164 and 165 [on *Ann.* 220 Fl. 205 Sk.] and Flores *et al.* 2006: 259 [on *Ann.* 368 Fl. 348 Sk.], all citing earlier scholarship), that can perhaps be attributed to his engagement with the pre-Socratics and the later Hellenistic cosmological poets.

[111] Cf. Hardie 1986: 68: 'Knowledge of the *cosmos* leads to power over its detailed workings.'

[112] See Chapter 1, pp. 23–30.

[113] Cf. Gildenhard 2003: 97, n. 17, for *Ann.* 153 as the expression of a specifically Roman point of view, contrasted with the affiliation to Greek chronological mechanisms expressed by other surviving fragments of the *Annales*.

The new terms in which it appeared suggested that there existed no limits on the consequence of the connection between Rome and the celestial sphere, in which the gods supervised the movements of the planets and the stars, and these in turn traced out the City's protected course in some ineffable manner.

To conclude: the fragments well support the generically plausible notion that the natural world, including the cosmos at its broadest, received considerable attention in the *Annales*. If the proem contained a *rerum natura* from the mouth of Homer, as Lucretius suggests, subsequent fragments support the notion that the cosmos remained a steady presence throughout the epic, as backdrop to and reflection of the human action. This cosmic setting implies that Rome's history is part and parcel of the orderly working of the universe by which, in Ennius' treatment, it was (I suggest) so magnificently framed.

Rome and the gods

The idea that Ennius' descriptions of the natural world are intimately linked to the poem's communication of cosmic concern for Rome's fate returns us to the question of the gods in the *Annales*. Ennius made his poem heir both to Homeric narrative, with its wide-angled perspective and its depiction of an involved set of gods, and to the annalistic tradition, with its intense focus on the specific link between the gods and Rome. These traditions each claimed a different form of authority over the negotiations between gods and men (essentially descriptive in the case of Homeric epic, perhaps somewhat more prescriptive in the case of the annalistic tradition). Their effective hybridisation was one of the most powerful mechanisms Ennius put into action in re-interpreting Rome's place in the world. If Ennius' co-option of the Homeric gods meant that the gods of the *Annales* were the gods of the world at large, the signalling of the annalistic and local tradition, for its part, ensured that these gods' focus was more or less exclusively on Rome – Rome now in its new, global context.

In Chapter 1, I argued against the idea that the gods were restricted to limited portions of Ennius' narrative. Instead, the licence to introduce the gods at regular intervals throughout the narrative, however recent the events recounted, was precisely what Ennius' co-option of the hexameter gave him. Thus (to recapitulate an argument to which I alluded in Chapters 1 and 4) Feeney argues that what at heart differentiates epic from prose history was neither subject-matter nor time-period nor the imaginative dramatisation of the past nor even '"historicity" (whether something really happened or

not)'.[114] It is rather the mode in which action is presented that distinguishes these genres; and the appearance of the gods is as crucial to hexametric epic as their essential absence is to historiography. As Loebell wrote many years ago, the epic poet:

> wirkte mit dem ganzen Zauber, welchen das Nationelle übt; in dem Wesen und Thun jener höchst populären Heroen erblickte die Nation sich selbst wieder, während ihre potenzirte Gestalt, die glückliche Vorwelt, in der sie lebten, sie doch zugleich über das Gemeine und Alltägliche erhob. Eben so fand sie in den dem Heldenalter beigelegten Sitten die hochverehrte und angestaunte Vergangenheit sich auch wiederum verwandt und nahe gerückt.[115]

This elevation of the mundane struggle of the present day into imaginative terms that ennoble it, explaining and re-framing it by means of an account of a heroic past that turns out to be intimately related to the present, is at the core of epic from its origins and throughout its history.[116] Epic conventionally categorised as 'mythological' speaks to the present obliquely, but the question of how the present originated and therefore how best to understand it is nevertheless always at its heart. 'Historical' epic, that treats recent events, including the present day, directly, more explicitly re-drafts the immediate audience's understanding of their own experience by re-presenting it in a (doubtless astonishing) new form. The very act of setting the account to hexametric verse implies the ambition to effect such a recreation and, because of the connotations inherent in such verse, partially of itself accomplishes it. In thus re-drafting contemporary experience in unambiguously heroising terms, 'historical' epic was not, however, setting about a task that was alien to traditional 'mythological' epic;[117] rather, it accomplished that end (the representation of the national present in relationship to an explanatory past), on which the sights of epic had always been set, by one particular – arguably more direct – set of the various means available. The presence of the gods in epic narrative was one of the regular mechanisms by which the poet of 'historical' and 'mythological' epic alike established the tenor of his account and thus directed its interpretation. It is a trait no less germane to the categorisation of a work as epic as are its formal

[114] Feeney 1991: 260. [115] Loebell 1841: 287–8, cited by Häussler 1976: 22.

[116] This is not to say that this function is absent from historiography either – especially where historiography goes out of its way to display its co-option of epic (as in Livy's description of the fall of Alba Long at *AUC* 1.29 or in his depictions of Fabius and Hannibal and their interactions in Book 22; for the latter, see Elliott 2009a: 531–41). For the function in Herodotus, see Pelling 2006: 75–104.

[117] The sharp modern distinction the terms 'historical epic' and 'mythological epic' make is not least the creation of the modern belief that epic that treats recent times operated in terms different from those of epic treating unambiguously legendary times. It is wholly unclear that antiquity thought there was any such distinction to be made.

features.[118] Both Ennius' choice of the hexameter and, by the same token, his presentation of Roman history as Homeric epic newly revealed, made the gods an integral part of his narrative.

At the same time, Ennius' decision not to ignore the local Roman annalistic tradition significantly distinguished his effort from those of the various Hellenistic Homerising poets singing the glories of their cities. It also guaranteed, I think, the centralisation in the work as a whole of the relationship between gods and men; which, in the annalistic tradition's terms, meant specifically the gods and men of Rome. As explored in Chapter 1, we can say very little with certainty about the early annalistic tradition; but one of the ideas that consistently recurs is its association with the pontificate and that institution's oversight of the miracles and portents that gave men access to understanding the will of the gods. The title alone endows the work with religious connotations,[119] designating the contents of the work as a conduit for knowledge of the gods' actions, desires and intentions in regard to the life of Rome. That probability is increased by our knowledge that the poem did indisputably describe not just appeals to the gods (e.g. *Ann.* 26, 58–9) or statements made to them (e.g. *Ann.* 180–2) but communication and interactions between mortals and immortals and among immortals (e.g. *Ann.* 15–16, 60, 72–91, 110–11, 113, 203; frg. VIII. xiv, xv; *Ann.* 444, 445) – however vexed the question of the extent of that description and of its location in the text.[120]

The results of the amalgamation of the gods of the Homeric and annalistic traditions are illustrated by Feeney's discussion of Ennius' presentation of the local god of the Capitoline, Jupiter Optimus Maximus, as the world-god, Zeus, of the Homeric epics. Thus, of the line *o genitor noster, Saturnie, maxime divom* (*Ann.* 444, translated below) Feeney writes:

> Whatever other manifestations Jupiter may have had in the poem, as a god of nature, or as Homer's Zeus, he was before all the Capitoline god of the Roman people. When a goddess addressed Jupiter in Naevius, he had been adorned both with Homeric epithets and with one of his two Capitoline cult titles, *optumum*, 'Best' (fr. 15 16). Ennius performs exactly the same oper ation, blending the other cult title, *maximus*, 'Greatest', into an Homeric line of address. The first half of the Homeric line (ὦ πάτερ ἡμέτερε, Κρονίδη, 'O

[118] 'The more identity one sees between historical epic and history proper, the more clearly it emerges that the characterful narration of divine action is the irreducible line of demarcation between epic and history – in particular, the more flamboyant species of history' (Feeney 1991: 261). Thus it is, Feeney points out, that ancient critics go so far as to deny that Lucan, who pointedly omitted the gods from his epic, is a poet at all (*ibid.* 252).

[119] See the conclusion to Chapter 1 (pp. 71–3) cf. pp. 34–5.

[120] See, again, Chapter 1, pp. 45–50.

> our father, son of Cronus', *Il.* 8.31), goes directly into Ennius' Latin as *o genitor noster Saturnie* ('O our father, son of Saturn', 444). The second half (ὕπατε κρειόντων, 'highest of the ruling gods') becomes *maxime divom*, 'greatest of the gods'. Zeus is now Jupiter Optimus Maximus, and the world he rules is now a Roman world.[121]

One might add that the epithet *Saturnius* insists on this Jupiter's local origin. That epithet occurs repeatedly (of Juno at *Ann.* 53, *respondit Iuno Saturnia, sancta dearum*, 'Saturnian Juno, holiest of goddesses, replied' and *Ann.* 445, *optima caelicolum, Saturnia, magna dearum*, 'best of the heaven-dwellers, Saturnian, greatest of goddesses'; of Jupiter at *Ann.* 444, as cited above; also in the phrase *Saturnia terra* at *Ann.* 21), of gods otherwise addressed in ostentatiously Homerising terms and style. Each line thus incorporates the pointedly local into a form of language new to the Roman ear, one that obtrusively broadens the realm of action beyond the confines of the city and arrogates high international cultural status for the contents. Elaine Fantham notices a similar effect in the phrase *pater optume Olympi* ('excellent father of Olympus') at *Ann.* 181, when she writes '[i]f the father of Olympus brings a whiff of Homeric epic, the epithet *optume* recalls the Roman Jupiter Optimus Maximus'.[122]

Nor is it only major divinities that are thus metamorphosed: at *Ann.* 113 the local Roman water goddess, Egeria, too, is re-incarnated in heavily Homerising form. The surviving hexameter dedicated to her is complete with archaism and periphrasis: *olli respondit suavis sonus Egeriai* ('to him sweet-voiced Egeria replied'). Similarly, a series of local Roman divinities are saluted, alongside their more powerful and prestigious partners, in hexametric language, at *Ann.* 99 (*<te Mavors, te> Nerienem Mavortis et Heriem*, 'you, Mavors, you, Nerie, wife of Mavors, and Herie') and 100 (*<teque> Quirine pater veneror Horamque Quirini*, 'you too, father Quirinus, I beseech, and Hora, wife of Quirinus'). The new metrical setting alone in which these deities now find themselves transforms their status and lends them new dignity, while the resolutely native names of both major and minor players form a piquant contrast with that setting. In this work, that presented itself as the now more relevant version of the *Iliad*, these distinctly Roman divinities with their traditionally local role effectively usurp the positions of the traditional Greek gods of epic, in whose imprint they are now cast. The gods who previously had administered the affairs of Greece, and who had seen to the proper operation of fate and ensured that the physical universe functioned normally by participating in its actions, are

[121] Feeney 1991: 128. [122] Fantham 2006: 566.

now revealed as, in current terms, the local gods of Rome, and the universe they govern is co-terminous with the world as beheld from the perspective of the City.

Occasionally, aspects of divine behaviour reveal the same process of translation from Greek and Homeric into specifically Roman terms as do Ennius' epithets for the gods. Thus, Marcus, the sceptical speaker of *Div.* 2.82, points out that the thunder-clap indicative of divine favour in Ennius comes from the left *ad nostri augurii consuetudinem* ('to suit our native augury-practices'), as opposed to from the right, as pertained for Greek practice – a difference that for Marcus is evidence that the practice of augury as a whole is a sham. The line used in illustration is *Ann.* 541: *tum tonuit laevom bene tempestate serena* ('then the thunder sounded out loudly on the left, though the sky was clear'),[123] and Marcus matches it against a more direct translation of Homer: *prospera Iuppiter his dextris fulgoribus edit* ('by means of these lightning-flashes on the right Jupiter indicated his favour').[124] The transposition of Homeric action into Roman terms offers a parallel to the translation of Homeric gods to a new centre at Rome.

In this way, I understand the presentation of the gods in the *Annales* as a process of re-definition, whereby Capitoline Jupiter and related Roman divinities are revealed as gods with whom the wider world had long been familiar, the Homeric world-god Zeus and his entourage. Rome, as the preoccupying focus of this reconceived world-god, stands at the centre of the universe thus understood. Wiseman's concept of *annales* as, in their primary function, records of divine concern specifically for Rome, significantly abets this interpretation, for it helps to explain how the gap between a traditional understanding of the City as a place of local importance, guided by its proper, tutelary deities, and its new presentation as the most significant cross-roads of the divine and human worlds, was bridged.[125] This presentation functioned, I suggest, as a justification of sorts and an explanation for the fact that Rome was progressively laying claim to the world around her. As her dominion spread over Italy and, increasingly, over the known world, the fact of her sovereignty appears to have come increasingly to seem to the second- and first-century chroniclers of the City in need of both historical and moral explanation, as Polybius and Livy are testament. If conventional *annales* were indeed woven into Ennius' generically complex epic, and if they pointed back to the pre-existing connection between the

[123] Skutsch points out that the verb may well be impersonal in the *Annales*, adducing as evidence the context in the secondary quotation of the line in Varro (*Men.* 103 [*ap.* Non. 408.3]): *dum sermone cenulam variamus, interea 'tonuit bene tempestate serena'* (Skutsch 1985: 688–9).

[124] See Pease 1923: 482–4 ad *Div.* 2.82.

[125] For reference to this argument, see Chapter 1, pp. 34–5.

gods and Rome in its traditional form, that afforded a means of tacitly communicating the idea that Rome's steady progress towards domination of the known world had been guaranteed all along by the soundness of her relations to the gods; it suggested that the mechanism that made her today into the pre-eminent power of the Mediterranean had long been in motion. The representation of this mechanism potentially provided, in its way, a powerful explanation-*cum*-justification of the Romanocentric view of history now on offer – albeit not one with any appeal to rationality.

On this reading, what results from Ennius' literary strategy in amalgamating the gods of *annales* with those of Homeric narrative is a version of 'focalised universality', in which the City functions as a centripetal force drawing all of time and space, all human and divine affairs, into relationship with each other through their link to the crucial point of intersection it constitutes.[126] It is perhaps worth noting the correspondence between the perspective of the Greek world-god, now in Roman guise, on Rome within the narrative and Diodorus Siculus' memorable expression of the god's-eye view that, he suggests, universal historians must adopt in order successfully to present the history of mankind in a coherent manner:

> πάντας ἀνθρώπους, μετέχοντας μὲν τῆς πρὸς ἀλλήλους συγγενείας, τόποις δὲ καὶ χρόνοις διεστηκότας, ἐφιλοτιμήθησαν [sc. writers of universal histories] ὑπὸ μίαν καὶ τὴν αὐτὴν σύνταξιν ἀγαγεῖν, ὥσπερ τινὲς ὑπουργοὶ τῆς θείας προνοίας γενηθέντες. Diod. Sic. 1.1.3
>
> The aim of [writers of universal histories] is to bring all men, in view of their fundamental kinship and despite the geographical and temporal distances separating them, into a single organisational frame, as if they were ministers of divine providence.

The idea of a god's-eye view is one that defines Jewish and Christian universal histories, whose authors write self-consciously as 'ministers of divine providence', to show God's plan in effect. If Ennius, as an epic poet, avoids making any direct claims about the universal nature of his text, he has nevertheless, through his negotiation of the gods, secured a perspective within the poem which was closely analogous to that which the universal historian, according to Diodorus, himself needed to adopt.

We turn now to consider what we can see of the gods and of celestial phenomena at large in Ennius' immediate predecessor, Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* (with glances across to Livius Andronicus' *Odusia*). I shall argue that, while Naevius' practice in some respects foreshadows Ennius', the

[126] See n. 66, p. 250.

comparison highlights the ways in which the *Annales* constitute in our record the watershed between earlier perspectives on the City and all subsequent ones, in which Rome's centrality in world history is consistently a defining characteristic.

The Annales *and the* Bellum Punicum

Of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, not many more than 60 fragments remain.[127] The longest of these are no more than 3 lines in length. And of these 3-line fragments, only half a dozen or so survive. Thus simply in terms of volume we have less than a tenth of the amount of evidence we have for the *Annales*. On such scarce evidence assessments of Naevius' epic are perforce based. The dangers of arguing *e silentio* are considerable – not lessened by the extant remains of Naevius *not* being so clearly conditioned by the scholarly tradition on Vergil as those of Ennian epic are (see n. 134, p. 272). The remains of Livius' *Odusia* amount to not much more than half the volume of what survives for the *Bellum Punicum*.

Naevius' achievement in the *Bellum Punicum* was above all to establish a story of the recent Roman past as a worthy subject for epic. This is not the only sense in which Naevius paved the way for the *Annales*, however. As Feeney (in the quotation on pp. 265–6) suggests, there exist traces of the use by Naevius of Roman cult-titles for a set of still recognisably Homerising gods, complete with Latin versions of their original Homeric epithets. A single instance of Naevius' adoption of one of Capitoline Jupiter's cult-titles survives, in a fragment that replicates the Homeric technique of introducing speech with a line fully occupied by an accumulation of epithets describing the addressee: *patrem suum supremum optumum adpellat* ('[s]he addresses her father, the highest and the best', *BP* 14 B). The line demonstrates how, in Naevius' hands, the short Saturnian proves to be a serviceable vehicle for a stately Homerising manner. Besides this, as noted in Chapter 2, there survive instances of Naevius' use of Homerising epithets in the reproduction of ὕπατε κρειόντων ('highest of the ruling gods') at *BP* 15 B: *summe deum regnator, quianam genus <od>isti*?[128] ('greatest ruler of the gods, why have you come to hate the race?'), and in the similar terms of address at *BP* 12 B: *senex fretus pietati deum adlocutus/summi deum regis fratrem Neptunum/ regnatorem marum* ('the old man, strong armed in his sense of right, addressed the god who was the brother of the highest king of the gods,

[127] On the *Bellum Punicum*, especially questions of organisation, see Strzelecki 1935 and Rowell 1947: 21–46, with the introduction to Barchiesi's 1962 commentary.

[128] For notes on the corruption of this line and the history of its emendation, see Chapter 2, n. 98.

Neptune, ruler of the sea'). At *BP* 30 B, *deinde pollens sagittis inclutus arquitenens/sanctus Iove prognatus Pythius Apollo* ('then the one lordly with his arrows, the renowned archer, Jupiter's hallowed son, Pythian Apollo'),[129] the double lines of description, with their strings of epithets, offer testament to Naevius' ambition to rival Homeric grandeur – and to show a here unambiguously Greek god transferring his attentions to the Roman sphere: for though the fragment itself gives us no indication of the nature of Apollo's role in the poem, his presence in the *Bellum Punicum* alone is enough to assure us that it was Apollo's relations to Rome that were being advertised.[130] *BP* 56 B, a testimonium from Gellius, suggests that local Roman cult titles also retained a strong presence in the poem: in explaining ancient Roman cult titles, beginning with Diovis and Vediovis, Gellius tells us that 'in the books of the *Bellum Punicum*' Naevius calls Jupiter 'Lucetius' *quod nos die et luce quasi vita ipsa afficeret et iuvaret* ('on the grounds that he endows and blesses us with the light of day as if with life itself'; *NA* 5.12.7).

The yet scantier fragments of the *Odusia* offer little that is comparable to Naevius' reproduction of Homerising epithets. There, the gods are adorned with simple patronymics, as at *Od.* 2, *pater noster, Saturni filie* ('our father, son of Saturn'), and *Od.* 17 W, *apud nimpham Atlantis filiam Calipsonem* ('at the house of the nymph Calypso, Atlas' daughter'). The only possibility for anything grander is offered by *Od.* 6 W, *sancta puer Saturni . . . regina* ('holy queen, child of Saturn'), an incomplete line whose possibilities should not be ignored, given the fuller set of epithets on display in connection with a mortal hero at *Od.* 13 W, *ibidemque vir summus adprimus Patroclus* ('and then the outstanding hero, the leader Patroclus').

Although one would not want to press evidence so scarce too hard, it appears that Naevius' practice of setting Roman cult-titles amid patently Homerising descriptive terms represents a development of that of Livius Andronicus; and that it is a credible precursor and possible determinant of Ennius' practice in this respect. Furthermore, in the *Bellum Punicum*, the description of distinctively Roman practices (such as the mention of Anchises' auspicate and of the involvement of the *penates* in the rite he performs at *BP* frg. 3 B)[131] had intruded into the Greek world of literature, and the persons of recent Roman history were found side by side in the same poem with obtrusively Greek gods (such as the Apollo of *BP* 30 B). The introduction by both Livius Andronicus and

[129] On the history of this line's emendation, see Chapter 2, n. 99.

[130] For discussion of these three fragments of the *Bellum Punicum*, their sources and the role of their sources in constructing the Roman epic tradition for modern readers, see Chapter 2, pp. 107–8.

[131] *Postquam avem aspexit in templo Anchisa,/sacra in mensa Penatium ordine ponuntur;/immolabat auream victimam pulchram.*

Naevius of still recognisably Homeric gods into a new, Saturnian context – a form, as best we can gauge, native to and associated with Italy[132] – emphasised these gods' alienation from their traditional roles and thus constituted a highly charged move.

Naevius' ambitions are besides this clear: quite apart from such moves as the inclusion of the Muses (frg. 1 B: *novem Iovis concordis filiae sorores*, 'the nine harmonious sisters, daughters of Jove'), the *Bellum Punicum* gestures directly at Homer. The very act of narrating the war with Carthage over the course of a long poem represented it as comparable to the Trojan War; indeed, its single subject in some sense made it more strictly analogous to the *Iliad* than the *Annales* themselves were. Thus Naevius' poem dramatised the point that the wars Rome now fought were no longer local: this conflict was one that pitched against each other the newly emerged major powers of the world as it was understood and, like the Homeric account of the Trojan War before it, met the eye as the crisis engendered by the encounter of East and West.[133] Furthermore, if it took a single episode of Roman conquest, the First Punic War, as its primary subject, Naevius' inclusion of the story of Rome's Trojan origin (represented in frg. 3, 4, 5, 11, 13a and 17 B) widened the poem's primarily narrow vista.

Significant as this achievement was, the *Annales* offer an impressive contrast: the transition we witness is one in both the scale of the history and, yet more tellingly, in its setting. In the *Bellum Punicum* the backdrop to the primary action is, so far as we can tell, provided by the gesture towards Rome's general history that the narrative of the City's origins affords. That longer perspective arguably goes some way in endowing the principal narrative with larger meaning; but it is dwarfed by the moves Ennius makes in the *Annales*. Just as Ennius chooses Roman history in its entirety as his subject, where Naevius focused on a single episode, so Ennius establishes, by means of the opening *rerum natura* and the multiple references to the sky that ensue, the cosmos in all its majesty as the stage for the story he told. Of universalising analogies such as *Ann.* 559 (see p. 257) or of references to the cosmos or the natural world, essentially no trace survives in the *Bellum Punicum*. Caution in drawing conclusions is in order, given the scarcity of the evidence and the palpable limitations imposed by the sources,

[132] Most recently on the Saturnian, see A. Mercado, *The Latin Saturnian and Italic Verse* (diss. UCLA 2006), which concludes that the Saturnian is likely to have been of native Italic origin.

[133] For Carthage as representative of the East in Ennius, see Elliott forthcoming: 232, n. 27. Naevius' description of the struggle of the Titans against the Olympians, known to have featured in an ecphrastic description of a temple-pediment of the *BP* (frg. 19 B), perhaps stood as a reflection of his account of the struggle between the two Mediterranean powers.

with their observable dependence on identical formal properties in their tracking of similar thought and language.[134] It remains worth noting that, on the evidence of our record as it stands, the scope and setting of the *Annales* trump those of its predecessor in grand style. Similarly, if Naevius' gods have started gently to morph from their Homeric incarnations, the detail of their Romanisation and the variety afforded by the inclusion of minor Roman divinities without any Homeric equivalents is first evident in the *Annales*. The effect that Ennius was able to produce by re-casting the Homeric gods, replaced in their hexametric setting, as the major and minor divinities of Rome, supervising the full panorama of Roman history, now playing itself out, startlingly, under the aspect of known Iliadic episodes, must have been wholly arresting.

THE TEMPORAL SPECTRUM (2): THE *ANNALES* AND THE FOUNDATION OF ROME

Ennius' narrative proper, like the narratives of Naevius, Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus, began with an account of Roman prehistory. Such prehistory in itself has the universalising property of 'show[ing] how [the narrative's] memorable events were linked to the world at large'.[135] One fragment allows us some insight into the critical question of how the establishment of Rome was then tied into that wider context. This is *Ann.* 154–5:

> septingenti sunt, paulo plus aut minus, anni
> augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est.
>
> It is seven hundred years, more or less, since renowned Rome was founded under sacred omen.

The standard assumption is that the speaker is Camillus and that the passage is equivalent to Livy 5.52.2 and 54.5.[136] Thus, the one surviving indication of Rome's foundation-date appears to be given from the perspective of an internal, Roman narrator rather than by synchronistic means (as would be more typical of universal historians proper). Yet, as Feeney has argued, the very fact of having a fixed foundation-date, rather than having the city gradually grow from indeterminate origins, indicates the aspiration to place

[134] For those few lines of the *Bellum Punicum* salvaged by the Vergiliocentric sources, see above, Chapter 2, pp. 107–9. For the propensity of the sources to gravitate towards material metrically identical to Vergil's work, see briefly *ibid.* n. 12, p. 79.

[135] Cornell 2010: 103, with reference to Fabius and Cincius. In Naevius' case, it is clear that the narrative *contained* such prehistory, if not that it *began* with it (Rowell 1947: 21–46).

[136] See Skutsch 1985: 314–15.

Rome on a par with Greek cities whose origin-stories involved discrete foundational acts.[137] Moreover, the fragment primarily originates in Varro, at *RR* 3.1, a passage in which Varro puts the fragment to standard universalising work in tracing the early origins of civilisation and in effecting parallels with a supposed Greek equivalent:

> cum duae vitae traditae sint hominum, rustica et urbana, quidni, Pinni, dubium non est quin hae non solum loco discretae sint, sed etiam tempore diversam originem habeant. antiquior enim multo rustica, quod fuit tempus, cum rura colerent homines neque urbem haberent. etenim vetustissimum oppidum cum sit traditum Graecum Boeotiae Thebae, quod rex Ogyges aedificarit, in agro Romano Roma, quam Romulus rex; nam in hoc nunc denique est ut dici possit, non cum Ennius scripsit:
>
> septingenti sunt, paulo plus aut minus, anni
> augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est. [*Ann.* 154 5]
>
> Thebae, quae ante cataclysmon Ogygi conditae dicuntur, eae tamen circiter duo milia annorum et centum sunt.
>
> As we hear of two forms of life proper to mankind, life in the country and life in the city, we may, Pinnius, hold as certain that these two forms are not only separate in place but trace their origins to different moments in time. For the older by far is the life in the country, since there was a time when men cultivated the soil but had no cities. Indeed, though the oldest Greek city of which we hear is Boeotian Thebes, since the story is that king Ogyges built it, in Roman territory the oldest was Rome, which king Romulus founded. And it is only now, not when Ennius wrote, that it can be said
>
> 'It is seven hundred years, more or less, since renowned Rome was founded under sacred omen.'
>
> Thebes, which they say was founded before the flood of Ogyges, for its part is about 2,100 years old.

We cannot assume the function of Ennius' lines in their original context from their function in the source, but it remains worth noting that Varro was at any rate attuned to the universalising potential of Ennius' rendition of Rome's foundation-date. Moreover, the figure 700 with which the fragment begins – a figure that Livy too seeks to activate in his Preface – is pregnant with the symbolism of the life-span of cities,[138] and this amplifies the lines' rhetorical power.

[137] See Feeney 2007: 93, 96. We know for certain that Timaeus anticipated Ennius in this (*FGrHist* 566 F 60) and that Hellanicus of Lesbos (FGrHist 4.84) anticipated Timaeus, if not in dating the foundation, then in allowing for a specific foundational act by Aeneas, here in conjunction with Odysseus (for discussion of *FGrHist* 4 F 84, including the argument that this story of Rome's foundation may not have originated with Hellanicus, see Solmsen 1986: 93–110). So it is no surprise that the *Annales* or Fabius Pictor's or Cincius Alimentus' histories contained such a foundation-date (for the latter two, see n. 34, p. 241).

[138] See Feeney 2007: 100–1.

Skutsch on *Ann.* 155, *condita Roma est*, is at pains to deny that *ab urbe condita (a.u.c.)* dating was regularly employed by Ennius, insisting that the reference to the city's origin is dictated by the (hypothetical) Camillan context alone.[139] The surviving evidence, however, does not in fact put us in a position to confirm whether or not *a.u.c.* dating was among the chronological mechanisms at least occasionally used by Ennius. As noted on p. 65, the very fact that the poet has a discrete date for the foundation of Rome correlates with a certain ideological investment in the city's pre-eminence.[140] That, alongside the rhetorical force of the figure 700, and the rhetorical use to which he has his speakers (if not indeed the authorial persona, as Varro implies) put *Ann.* 154–5, does anything but foreclose the possibility of further *a.u.c.* dating at moments of heightened narrative drama.[141]

THE GEOGRAPHY OF THE *ANNALES*

I have elsewhere reviewed the surviving evidence for the geography of the *Annales*, along with the methodological concerns that such a study carries with it.[142] Here I will more briefly consider the upshot of that inquiry, along with some of the most critical pieces of evidence, in so far as it concerns the interpretation of the *Annales* in the light of universal history. The poem's scarce remains allow us to discern its mapping of Rome's expanding horizons only dimly. There is a plethora of fragments referring to fighting, as one would expect from a poem making full use of the intersection between epic and historiography.[143] Twinned with the rarity of surviving evidence for the description of internal affairs, these fragments offer the

[139] Skutsch 1985: 316. His principal grounds for denying that *a.u.c.* dating was possible in Ennius' day was that no such date had been fixed at that time. Yet Timaeus' date for the foundation had then been established for close to 100 years and had recently been re-worked by Fabius and Cincius (see n. 137, p. 273). The fact that the issue had not been resolved as it was in the first century does not preclude the possibility that Ennius worked with one of several dates available to him.

[140] Ctr. the absence of a foundation-date for Rome in Apollodorus' *Chronica*, coming a generation after Ennius; Feeney 2007: 93.

[141] This, incidentally, would put Ennius' practice roughly in line with that of Velleius Paterculus, who generally relies on vague chronological indicators but infrequently uses a variety of precise dating-systems, often in conjunction with each other, apparently to highlight events of signal importance. Thus, at 1.8.3 (for example), Velleius dates the foundation of Rome (i) in Olympiads, (ii) from the Fall of Troy), (iii) backwards from the consulship of his patron M. Vinicius. On dating and organisation in Velleius, see Starr 1980: 287–301 and Wiseman 2010: 73–83. For a view of a similar operation of chronological markers in Fabius Pictor, see Dillery as cited in n. 34, p. 241.

[142] Elliott forthcoming.

[143] See Ash 2002: 253–73 on battle-narrative as a particularly fertile area of intersection between the two genres.

(unsurprising) assurance that the poem faced primarily outward from the central standpoint of Rome, itself fixed firmly by the title *Annales*. The growth of Rome's dominance over the world around her drew in its wake the need for its historical and moral explanation, clearly evinced by second- and first-century accounts of Rome (Polybius, Livy, Vergil). The need for such explanation was, I suggest, a driving force behind the *Annales*, too, the first text to display in succession the full extent of Rome's conquests to date.

Other tokens of the notional centrality of Rome and of the primacy of the theme of military success survive, besides the poem's title. One example is the fragment *Ann.* 12–13, which presents Ennius' text as a microcosm in which the growth of Roman power was reflected: *latos per populos res atque poemata nostra/. . . clara> cluebunt* ('broadly through the peoples our affairs and poems will achieve bright fame'). Its source places the fragment in Book 1,[144] so that we can be certain that it occupied a privileged place near the start of the poem. Indeed, even though the source offers no clues as to interpretation, the fragment is regularly understood as belonging to the proem and constituting a proclamation at the head of the epic of the work's impending fame and, by the same token, of Rome, too, in her proto-imperial guise. *[N]ostra* is ambiguous, not least on account of the fragment's decontextualised state, but it appears to be doing double duty: in its (transferred) reference to *res*, it looks to mean 'our [Roman] state/the affairs of Rome',[145] while in its reference to *poemata* it seems to represent the standard poetic plural for singular and thus to refer to Ennius' ('my') poems.[146] If this is right, then the word suggests an analogy between the growing fame of Rome on the one hand and of the *Annales* on the other. The first person of *nostra* – a first person Ennius is, for an epic poet,

[144] *De Ult. Syll.* (*GLK* 4.231): *neutro genere in casibus supra dictis* [nom., acc., voc.] *sine ambiguitate brevis est* [sc. *syllaba finalis*] *Graecis Latinisque nominibus: . . . Graeci etiam nominis exempla subiciamus: Ennius in primo annali* [Ilberg; *nam* cod.] *'latos <per> populos res atque poemata nostra <- - - clara> clueb*u*nt' et in Vergilio 'Arcada piscosae cui circum flumina Lernae'* [*Aen.* 12.518]. For the problems of the text, see Skutsch 1985: 167–9.

[145] If so, it supplies a history for Cato's use of the first person plural (frg. 82 P), which is otherwise the first occurrence in our record of a convention that was to become characteristic of the Roman historiographical tradition: see Marincola 1997: 287. Cf. also *nostri* at *Ann.* 480, *nostri cessere parumper*.

[146] The alternative, given that the source assures us that the fragment originates in Book 1, is that it is associated with the dream-proem of the *Annales* and that *nostra* continues the association there explicitly initiated between Ennius and Homer and so represents a true plural. Thus *res atque poemata nostra* would mean 'our [viz. Ennius' and Homer's] poems and their subject-matter'. Skutsch's future tense *cluebunt* represents a problem for such an interpretation, given Homer's already established fame, unless the claim is for the future fame of Ennian and Homeric epic in association. (Mariotti's imperfect *cluebant* is equally problematic, if the claim is to include the not-yet-established *Annales*.)

remarkably fond of intruding – makes both the site of Rome and the persona of the poet into the poem's central point of reference (and Ennius himself becomes a sort of analogue to the Helen of the *Iliad*, conscious of the eternal fame of what s/he is doing).[147] At the same time, the contrast implied between that central point of reference and *latos per populos* highlights the poem's centrifugal thrust – its own and Rome's tendency to spread limitlessly through the world. In a sense, *Ann.* 20, *est locus Hesperiam quam mortales perhibebant* ('there is a place – mankind used to call it Hesperia') effects the reverse move, zooming in from a wider frame of reference to a single focal point. Its source, too (Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.11), places it in Book 1.

The narration of Rome's successful military ventures under the heading *Annales* would, arguably, prompt the audience to construe the account so offered, for all its geographical breadth, as a part of Rome's internal workings, just as much as the description of local operations and internal affairs, the matter of conventional *annales*, had traditionally been. I thus propose that, in Ennius' presentation, Rome and the lands she drew in increasing numbers into her orbit looked to become synonymous. The concept of *imperium*, a term not yet used in the *Annales* – so far as we can tell – of Rome's wider rule,[148] was thus arguably finding, if not yet explicit articulation, at least a kind of literary form.[149]

Analysis of the different geographical arenas still traceable among the poem's scattered remains reveals a preponderance of lines dealing with the East (Carthage, Greece, Troy and its neighbouring and descendent peoples) over those dealing with the West (Spain and Gaul).[150] The statistics are here

[147] For further uses of the first person plural apparently of the authorial persona, see *Ann.* 210, *nos ausi reserare*, *Ann.* 525, *nos sumus Romani qui fuimus ante Rudini*; cf. *Ann.* 522–3 (Ennius' comparison of his own old age to that of a victorious racing-horse), quoted and discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 123–4.

[148] It is found three times in the fragments: at *Ann.* 138, it is used of the administrative power exercised by the king, at *Ann.* 412 and 613 of military orders (*OLD* 1 and 8, respectively); cf. Richardson 2008: 51, with n. 129 there.

[149] On the development, from the third century on, of the term *imperium* from its use designating the power vested in an individual to its use designating Roman dominion over an international landscape, see Richardson 1991: 1–9, where Richardson makes clear that 'the transferred, concrete meaning "dominion", "realm", "empire", becomes especially frequent during and after the Augustan period'. Before then, e.g. for Cicero and his contemporaries, it designated the power of a nation-state, as well as the power of an individual magistrate (*ibid.* 7). On the earliest surviving uses of the term in Accius, and thereafter in Cicero and Varro, to signify Roman power in a wider sense than that belonging to an individual magistrate, see *ibid.* 6. See also Lintott 1981: 53–67; Lintott 1993; and Richardson 2008. See *ibid.* 51–2 for analysis of Ennius' rare surviving uses of the term (in the *Annales*, the *Medea*, the *Hectoris Lytra* and the *Euhemerus*).

[150] For more detail than given here, see Elliott forthcoming: 205–20.

slight enough to be suspect, but the over-representation of the East in the *Annales* is not suggested by statistics alone. While the fragments that set Troy in its chronological place in the *Annales* find that place through editorial conjecture,[151] the resurgence of Troy late in the narrative is guaranteed for us by Macrobius. He gives Book 10 as the origin of *Ann.* 344–5 (just as he tells us that *Pergama* is the antecedent of the relative with which the fragment begins):

> [Pergama]
> quae neque Dardaniis campis potuere perire
> nec quom capta capi nec quom combusta cremari [*Ann.* 344 5]
>
> [Troy]
> which could not be destroyed on the Dardan plain
> nor when captured remain captured nor when torched be consumed by flame.

In doing so, he assures us that Troy continued to be a relevant and redeployed notion late into the poem. Moreover, Macrobius' quotation-context – he quotes the fragment on *Aen.* 7.294–6 (Juno's irate speech expressing dismay at the Trojans' incipient successes in Italy) – works with the fragment's own characteristics (the insistent *p* and *c* alliteration and the evident strength of sentiment associated with the reference to Troy's now distant re-birth) to suggest that the concept of Troy was being engaged to some charged rhetorical end – and thus that Troy functioned in the narrative not merely as a geographical location but as an ideological construct and a rhetorical device available to the poem's internal speakers.[152]

Nor is it the Homeric East alone that expands the poem's literal geographical references: the Herodotean East also has a presence. At *LL* 7.21, Varro quotes and explains a fragment of an unknown Roman tragedy thus: *'quasi Hellespontum et claustra'* [*trag. frg. inc. inc.* 107 R], *quod Xerses quondam eum locum clausit; nam ut Ennius ait 'isque Hellesponto pontem contendit in alto'* ("'as if the Hellespont and its barriers", because Xerxes once barred up that place; for, as Ennius says, "he drew a bridge out over the deep Hellespont'", *Ann.* 369). The critical piece of information Varro supplies is that the referent of Ennius' unnamed *is* is Xerxes, who has no natural place in Ennius' primary narrative of Roman history. Skutsch 1985: 535–6 supposes that the fragment belongs to the narrative of Antiochus' movement West towards Rome in 192 BCE. Whether

[151] These fragments are two: *Ann.* 14, *quom veter occubuit Priamus sub Marte Pelasgo*, and *Ann.* 15–16, *doctus†que Anchisesque Venus quem pulcra dearum|fari donavit, divinum pectus habere.*

[152] Thus Skutsch 1985: 514–15 suggests that the fragment originates in Ennius' replication of a speech of the Lampsacene embassy to Massilia and Rome in the 190s BCE, in which the Lampsacenes requested that Rome protect them from Antiochus, on the grounds of their kinship with the Romans through Troy.

or not his particular conjecture is right, given that Xerxes and his bridge across the Hellespont are not part of the primary narrative, it must be the case that the role of *Ann.* 369 in Ennius' narrative was to promote an analogy between a critical moment in Herodotus' *Histories* and a more recent moment of Roman history as presented in the *Annales*.[153] The effect of such a strategy, too, is to suggest the relevance of Greek and Roman history to each other and to draw Persian history also, in its temporal and geographical depth, into the ambit of *annales*.[154] The move we here witness is in a sense analogous to Ennius' implicit allusion to figures and scenes of the Greek past (more commonly, in the surviving material, the Greek epic past), which similarly draws other moments and places into implicit relationship with Rome.

On the evidence of these fragments, it appears that Homer and Herodotus were key texts through which Ennius enlarged the spectre of the East in the *Annales*. His use of them not only shows him subsuming and claiming to transcend the established dominant accounts of human society and the organisation of nations: more particularly, these works told of the shaping of the world stage through the conflict of continents. In so far as the *Annales* appear to have replicated their approach, there is then room to suspect that the central struggle represented in this epic too was one between East and West.

Small additional pieces of evidence support the possibility that an East–West dynamic had a palpable presence in the *Annales*. Thus, in commenting on Numanus Remulus' slur on Trojan clothing at *Aen.* 9.616,[155] Gellius (*NA* 6.12.6–7) informs us: *Q. quoque Ennius Carthaginiensium 'tunicatam iuventutem'* [*Ann.* 303] *non videtur sine probro dixisse* ('Q. Ennius too appears to have intended a slur in speaking of the "young men" of Carthage "in their trailing gowns"').[156] Gellius' reading implies that the anti-Eastern bias familiar from the *Aeneid* (along with the non-obvious association of Carthage with the East, perhaps at least in part on the grounds

[153] Cf. Clarke 1999a: 99–100, on the recurrence of the Greek Xerxes-episode in Polybius' history of Rome, likewise as an analogy for recent threats to Rome. Clarke there cites Polyb. 3.6.2 (the Carthaginian crossing of the River Iberos in contravention of the treaty of 226 BCE) and Polyb. 3.66.6 (Hannibal's crossing of the Po by means of a bridge of boats) as instances of the episode's recurrence. Though no mention of these moments is traceable among the surviving fragments of the *Annales*, they fall within the scope of his narrative and could also be considered as possible occasions for Ennius' introduction of *Ann.* 369.

[154] On the role of historical parallels, between events and between lives, as a mechanism for binding together the vast narratives of conventional, prose universal historians, see Clarke 1999b: 268–9.

[155] For the Vergilian passage as a whole, see Horsfall 1971: 1108–16 (where *Ann.* 303 is not discussed).

[156] The attribution of the phrase to Ennius does not confirm that it appeared in the authorial voice, since it is the regular practice of ancient readers to attribute the words of speakers within texts directly to the author, without any indication of the distance preserved by the representation.

of the city's Tyrian origins) was at least occasionally available, whether in implicit or in explicit form, to the ancient reader of the *Annales*.

Ennius' use of large-scale Homerising re-description applied to both Romans and non-Romans through the end of the text is relevant also to the politics of the text.[157] Both the *Iliad* and Herodotus' *Histories*, strongly Hellenocentric as they are, are noteworthy for the sympathetic portrayal of all their participants, across the boundaries of ethnicity.[158] I suggest that the closeness with which Ennius replicated Homer favours the transference of such sympathy to the new text. It is clear that the Romans were construed as having analogues both in the Greeks, by virtue of their military dominance (thus *Ann.* 391–8, the description of a Roman tribune in terms modelled on the description of the Homeric Ajax; and *Ann.* xv.iv, the episode of the Istrians besieged by the Romans modelled on the Trojans Polypoites and Leonteus of *Il.* 12.127 ff.), although not, so far as I can see, by virtue of Greek origins; and in the Trojans, by virtue of their ancestry (probably implied by *Ann.* 14 and 15–16, quoted in n. 151, p. 277; and *Ann.* 28–9, *Assaraco natus Capys optimus isque pium ex se/Anchisen generat*, 'Assaracus' son, excellent Capys, and he was father of faithful Anchises'; cf. *Ann.* 58–9, Ilia's prayer to Venus, and *Ann.* 60, the presumed reply). There is thus evidence for a complex dynamic within the text, which may have abetted the sharing of sympathy among the Romans and the peoples they faced. Again, Ennius may have cast some of the Romans' military opponents as the monsters of mythology (if, as Skutsch 1985: 496 suspects, Philip II of Macedon is the referent of *Ann.* 319–20, *Cyclopis venter velut olim turserat alte/carnibus humanis distentus*, 'just as once the Cyclops' belly had swollen huge, crammed with pieces of human flesh'); but others, such as Pyrrhus and Hannibal, as well as the Istrians of *Ann.* xv.iv, he ennobled.[159] The latter technique, for which more evidence happens to survive among the fragments, served to elevate the moral tone of Roman engagement as well as to dignify their eventual victories.

In the particular presentation of Pyrrhus from an essentially Greek perspective and in Graecising language, there was not little at stake. As Feeney has pointed out, in Greek accounts of universal time like those of Eratosthenes or Apollodorus (virtual contemporaries of Ennius', the former pre-dating him by roughly two generations, the latter post-dating him by but one), Rome only starts to figure once it becomes involved with

[157] See Chapter 4, pp. 212–13 (with n. 49 there) on analogous productive ambivalence between the Romans and their enemies in Ennius and Livy.

[158] Cf. e.g. Fornara 1983: 62. [159] See Chapter 3, pp. 166–9.

mainland Greece, in the form of Pyrrhus. Before then, Rome is relegated to an 'allochrony' (a discrete and irrelevant chronological space) and does not feature: thus they have no synchronic date even for the foundation of Rome.[160] If Ennius could successfully integrate a Greek perspective for a critical moment such as Pyrrhus' clash with Rome into an account which, by its thoroughgoing use of Homer, suggested the interrelation of Greece and Rome from Rome's earliest beginnings, then his account could appear both aware of and capable of effectively responding to Hellenocentric visions of history in which Rome had appeared only marginal – visions which, from the new Roman perspective Ennius was suggesting, could only appear increasingly outdated.[161]

An even-handed allocation of sympathy is perhaps again visible on a smaller scale in *Ann.* 418, *matronae moeros complent spectare faventes* ('women throng the walls in their eagerness to see'), a scene that readily calls to mind the *Iliad*'s teichoskopiai. DS, the fragment's source, places it in Book 16; hence, by standard accounts, it is part of the narrative of events taking place outside Italy.[162] The transference of Roman cultural equivalents to foreign peoples, as in the case of *matronae* here, is no surprise in an early Roman writer (cf. also Ennius' reference in his *Medea* to the women on Corinth as *matronae opulentae optumates*; the term does not, however, recur in the fragments of the *Annales*). Indeed, the technique, neither distinctively Ennian nor distinctively epic, is common to Roman authors across the board (cf. e.g. the Gallic *matres familiae* at Caes. *B. Gall.* 7.26). It is, notwithstanding, a technique that, wherever it occurs, invites the audience to re-construe others' experience as their own; as such, it too serves as a token of the possibility that Ennius did not discriminate by ethnicity, or not by ethnicity alone.

The traditional reading of the *Annales* as chauvinist and narrowly nationalist is based on an interpretation of the poem's relationship to the early history of Roman epic – that is, to texts yet more fragmentary than the

[160] Feeney 2007: 24–5.

[161] Of course, Ennius was not the only member of his generation engaged in integrating a Greek perspective via a Greek medium into native accounts of the City; cf. (although it does not exactly match the case I wish to make here) Dionysius of Halicarnassus' characterisation of Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus' histories of Rome as 'just like those of their Greek predecessors, and in no way different' (Dion. Hal. 1.6.2, cited e.g. by Cornell 2010: 103).

[162] Vahlen's first (1854) edition connects the fragment which Seleucus' siege of Pergamum in 190 BCE – perhaps not least because the situation and phrasing are so reminiscent of Homeric Troy. By his second edition (published half a century later), he had retracted the suggestion, but Vahlen's connection remains of interest, if only as a testament to how the fragments invite their readers to discern the *Iliad*'s outline beneath the surface of the text.

Annales themselves – and of a handful of fragments whose de-contextualised state heightens their apparently apophthegmatic qualities.[163] Yet the real relationship of the *Annales* to these earlier Roman texts is a matter about which the fragments supply little hard evidence; the only models that we know served Ennius regularly, on both large and small scale, are Greek. Ennius consistently re-interpreted the individuals and events of Roman history, both recent and distant, in terms of the characters and episodes of the heroic world of the Greek literary past in so detailed a manner that it implies a relatively equal distribution of (differing) admirable ethical properties among all the text's participants, in imitation of its attested Greek models.

GENERIC STRATEGY: ENNIUS' NARRATIVE MODE AS A UNIVERSALISING DEVICE

Ennius' narrative mode is even at the most general level indicative of his account's universalising aspirations. Tim Cornell has argued, with regard to the works of Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus, that the act itself of writing in Greek and of adopting Greek methods of conceptualising and narrating the past constitutes a universalising move.[164] Their contemporary Ennius tempered the Hellenocentricity implied by his use of Homeric metre and phraseology by writing in Latin (a linguistic equivalent to the references to the annalistic tradition that kept the poem's epicentre at Rome), but the Graecising elements broadened the poem's horizons and drew attention to its aspirations not only on a literary level but also as regards its subject's place in the world. In this section, after a brief initial discussion placing conventional universal histories' use of Homer as a universalising device in relation to the appearance of a figure of Homer at the start of the *Annales*, I explore Ennius' use of Homeric episodes as models for reconstructing the Roman past: Homerising reconstruction is evident in the representation of personality, place and action (in particular fighting), while similes, too, suggest the constancy with which the actors and events of Roman history were re-imagined in intrinsically Greek and Homerising terms. The mirroring of the Greek epic and historiographical past in Ennius' Roman history suggested a conceptual unity between all moments

[163] Thus e.g. Conte 1986: 142–53. I have argued elsewhere that the same apparently apophthegmatic fragments that are used to argue the univocality of the *Annales* in the service of the Roman state might as easily be taken to compromise the moral standing of their speakers (Elliott 2007: 41–5).

[164] Cornell 2010: 102–15.

on view, in a manner analogous if not identical to the narrative continuum implied between the opening *rerum natura* and the subsequent body of the narrative. The presence, via allusion, of the earlier, Greek history in the narrative is comparable to universal historians' tendency to delve back into the mythological past, not only out of an impulse to tell the whole story from beginning to end but because the past was needed to illuminate and explain the historian's present day.[165] It should be clear that neither the scope nor the narrative mode of Naevius' poem (let alone Livius') gave the earlier poet(s) access to any such strategy.

Recognition and inclusion of 'Homer' – in terms of both the person of the poet and of the poetry attributed to him – was a standard feature of universalising texts.[166] Odysseus – or indeed Homer himself – is figured as the universal traveller and original model for the autoptic historian.[167] Thus, at the outset of his universal history, Diodorus quotes *Od.* 1.3 (πολλῶν ἀνθρώπων ἴδεν ἄστεα καὶ νόον ἔγνω, 'he saw the cities of many men and learned their ways of thinking'), as an instance of the kind of learning that universal history affords. Again, Homer stands as the head of those authorities Strabo cites for his universalising *Geography* (*Geog.* 1.1.1; cf. 8.1) and is the subject of extended discussion in the proem, discussion that aims to demonstrate that Homer is the origin of all sound 'geography'. Thus, at *Geog.* 1.1.2–7 and 10 (where Homer's narrative is characterised as primarily ἱστορικός ['dedicated to historical inquiry'] and διδασκαλικός ['instructive'], with mythical or poetic elements added as a garnish), Homer appears as geographer of the earth in its entirety (and also as a source for Posidonius' geographical speculations [*ibid.* 7]).[168] Polybius, too, if in less insistent fashion, sets Homer at the head of the tradition in which he writes.[169] And Velleius Paterculus, in his eclectic universalising narrative focusing on Rome, repeatedly introduces Homer (as well as literary history more generally) in a move designed to augment his abbreviated narrative's credentials to represent an account of everything that mattered from its origins to the

[165] Cf. Clarke on Diodorus' delving back into the distant mythological past: 'past and present were interrelated in ways which formed a historical continuum and meant that the distant past was needed to illuminate all subsequent phases of history up to the present' (Clarke 1999b: 255–6).

[166] See n. 4, p. 234, on the universalising interpretation of Homer from the Hellenistic era on.

[167] Odysseus quite specifically the model e.g. in Herodotus' preface; see Moles 1993b: 96–7. For Homer and the historians in general, see Marincola 2007a: 1–79, with much further bibliography.

[168] See Clarke 1999a: 212, 248–9, 260–3, 308, 334–5, for the function of Homer more generally in Strabo, including as the assumed source of the audience's pre-existing knowledge of the subjects and areas Strabo addresses.

[169] E.g. at 12.27.

author's present day.[170] In such ways, universal histories laid claim to an origin in Homeric epic and displayed the poet as a source of authority and a token of their own aspiration to universalism.

Ennius' introduction of an omniscient person of Homer at the start of the narrative, and the use of this character's voice as the vehicle for the opening cosmology, can thus in itself be read as an attempt to give his Roman history a universalising framework. Homerising techniques, including the hexameter, function as constant reminders throughout the narrative of this original universalising move, while Ennius' use of Homerising lines to describe the firmament against which Roman history is set promotes the sense that allusion to Homer was predicated on a universalising function. Like the pre-Socratics' use of the hexameter, these techniques acknowledge the Homeric roots of speculation on the nature of the universe and of human society, while appropriating for the poet Homeric authority to speak about human existence as a whole.

Besides adopting a Homeric mode of expression throughout his narrative, however, Ennius also repeatedly used pre-existing Homeric templates to re-configure Roman history and endow it with epic stature, as a significant number of fragments show. I argued in Chapter 4 that Ennius' pervasive recreation of Homer re-drafted his audience's understanding of history: it amounted to a form of *inventio*,[171] since it presented that history in a wholly new light. In the *Annales*, Rome's present was projected onto the Homeric past and reconfigured as her destiny, made manifest by its prefiguration, so Ennius implied, in Homeric poetry. Ennius thus recreated both recent and long-past events as the culmination of history's trajectory to date and the proper subject of epic song. To this I here add that the mechanism by which this process took place was in effect a universalising one: poetic allusion allowed Ennius to speak simultaneously of more than one time and place and in the process to imply the existence of parallels between the different historical moments in question.[172] Where universal

[170] Homer appears at 1.5, before a shift back to the typically universalising theme of the succession of empires at 1.6; Hesiod at 1.7 (dated relative to Homer), where Velleius' quarrel with Cato the Elder on the foundation-dates for Capua and Nola also appears; and reflection on the flourishing of literary genius within strict temporal limits at 1.16–18. More notes on recent, Roman literary history appear at 2.36. For Velleius as a universalising author, see Sumner 1970: 257–97; Woodman 1975: 272–306; Starr 1981: 162–75; and Schultze 2010: 116–30. Cf. also Cassius Hemina's discussion of the date of Homer and Hesiod (frg. 8 P), cited by Cornell 2010: 111 in the context of discussion of universalising strategies.

[171] See pp. 207–12.

[172] Cf. Feeney 2007: 24–5. In discussing Roman authors' efforts to integrate Rome into Greek time, Feeney places the universalising practice of synchronism in the context of the larger enterprise of

histories (and indeed some of their poetic analogues) tell sequentially of the succession of empires,[173] Ennius' allusive technique allowed for simultaneous viewing of the principal moments of both Greek and Roman history (newly interpreted), cross-tabulated through allusion into a powerful, diachronic charter. What the poet offers amounts to a tacit version of the conventional universal historian's explicit registration of diachronic parallels, one of the principal tools of the universalist's trade.[174] The same strategy (arguably) reveals the emblematic quality of the Roman past, its ability to stand for other narratives of exceptional cultural value; for the recurrence under new guise of well-known images and episodes implies a cyclical pattern in history, in which typologies appear operative. Roman history then stands as the culmination of a wider past: previous instantiations of significant scenes, actors and acts, as found in earlier records, are revealed as simple precursors to the history Ennius unfolds. Heretofore unimagined analogies across space and time promote the significance of Roman events and Roman actors. In effect, we are not far from the teleological view of history more routinely associated with Polybius' account of Rome.[175]

Some of the longest surviving fragments (products, these too, of the Vergiliocentrics) illustrate what the text's quasi-formulaic floscules imply: that Ennius regularly reconstructed historical Roman battles to match the details of the famous battles of Homeric and Herodotean narrative. The two Istrians of *Ann.* XV.iv (attested for Book 15) and the tribune of *Ann.* 391–8 are cardinal examples of this.[176] Both passages re-enact scenes from the *Iliad*, and, in doing so, they transform the earlier

establishing sets of comparisons between Greece and Rome. In doing so, Feeney speaks of the synchronism's 'simile-like nature', a quality shared by poetic allusion, though the latter can operate across time as well as across space.

[173] See Momigliano 1987: 31–57, esp. 39–46 and Lehmann 1973: 42–51; cf. Alonso-Núñez 2002: 48–52, 71–2, 99–100, 103. *ibid.* 142 gives further bibliography on the subject.

[174] See n. 42, p. 243.

[175] See e.g. Alonso-Núñez 1990: 187 on teleology as a Polybian innovation in universal history.

[176] The two passages are linked by their common analogues in *Aeneid* 9 and by their common transmission through Macrobius (*Sat.* 6.2–3.) The Macrobian manuscript tradition is divided between Books 12 (XII) and 15 (XV) as regards the location of *Ann.* 391–8, and Kaster judges that there are no internal grounds favouring one reading over the other. Editors (including Skutsch and Flores; the fragment is the latter's *Ann.* 419–26) prefer Book 15, because that is the unambiguously attested location of the two Istrians, and they interpret the connection of the two passages through *Aeneid* 9 as uncomplicated testimony to the location in the text of *Ann.* 391–8, too (see Skutsch 1985: 558–9, discussed in full doxographical context at Flores *et al.* 2006: 393–5). Kaster supports this, but his grounds for doing so are none other than Skutsch's judgement about the location of *Ann.* 391–8 in the *Annales* ('since XV is correct relative to the text of Ennius [citing Skutsch 1985: 556–9], there is no good reason to assume that it is incorrect relative to the text of Macrobius'; Kaster 2010: 52).

Homeric characters and moments from particulars to types. The Homeric version's new role was now to support and endow with history and international significance the Roman instantiations that now effectively superseded them.

In testifying to the role of the two Istrians of *Ann.* XV.iv (at *Sat.* 6.2.32), Macrobius indicates only that they were cousins to the Pandarus and Bitias of *Aen.* 9.672ff.:

> de Pandaro et Bitia aperientibus portas locus acceptus est ex libro quinto decimo Ennii, qui induxit Histros duos in obsidione erupisse porta et stragem de obsidente hoste fecisse.
>
> The passage that describes Pandarus and Bitias opening the gates is taken from the fifteenth book of Ennius, who staged two Istrians having burst out from the gate during the siege and created havoc among the besieging foe.

The mention of the Istrians' Vergilian descendants is, however, sufficient to point to their Homeric ancestry in the Polypoites and Leonteus of *Il.* 12.127ff. In quoting *Ann.* 391–8 (at *Sat.* 6.3.2–4), Macrobius reproduces both its Homeric and its Vergilian analogue:[177]

> Αἴας δ᾽ οὐκέτ᾽ ἔμιμνε· βιάζετο γὰρ βελέεσσι·
> δάμνα μιν Ζηνός τε νόος καὶ Τρῶες ἀγαυοὶ
> βάλλοντες, δεινὴν δὲ περὶ κροτάφοισι φαεινὴ
> πήληξ βαλλομένη καναχὴν ἔχε· βάλλετο δ᾽αἰεὶ
> κὰπ φάλαρ᾽ εὐποίηθ᾽· ὁ δ᾽ ἀριστερὸν ὦμον ἔκαμνεν
> ἔμπεδον αἰὲν ἔχων σάκος αἰόλον, οὐδ᾽ ἐδύναντο
> ἀμφ᾽ αὐτῷ πελεμίξαι ἐρείδοντες βελέεσσιν,
> αἰεὶ δ᾽ἀργαλέῳ ἔχετ᾽ ἄσθματι, κὰδ δέ οἱ ἱδρὼς
> πάντοθεν ἐκ μελέων ῥέεν ἄσπετος οὐδέ πῃ εἶχεν
> ἀμπνεῦσαι, πάντῃ δὲ κακὸν κακῷ ἐστήρικτο. [*Il.* 16.102 11]
>
> hunc locum Ennius in quinto decimo ad pugnam Caelii tribuni his versibus transfert:
>
> undique conveniunt velut imber tela tribuno:
> configunt parmam, tinnit hastilibus umbo,
> aerato sonitu galeae, sed nec pote quisquam
> undique nitendo corpus discerpere ferro.
> semper abundantes hastas frangitque quatitque.
> totum sudor habet corpus, multumque laborat,
> nec respirandi fit copia: praepete ferro
> Histri tela manu iacientes sollicitabant. [*Ann.* 391 8]

[177] See also the preliminary discussion of this passage and of the relative weight of Caelius's presumable original historical referent vis-à-vis Ennius' re-incarnation of him as a Homeric figure, at Chapter 4, pp. 226–8.

hinc Vergilius eundem locum de incluso Turno gratia elegantiore composuit:

> ergo nec clipeo iuvenis subsistere tantum
> nec dextra valet, iniectis sic undique telis
> obruitur, strepit adsiduo cava tempora circum
> tinnitu galea et saxis solida aera fatiscunt
> discussaeque iubae capiti, nec sufficit umbo
> ictibus; ingeminant hastis et Troes et ipse
> fulmineus Mnestheus. tum toto corpore sudor
> liquitur et piceum nec respirare potestas
> flumen agit, fessos quatit aeger anhelitus artus. [*Aen*. 9.806 14]

> Ajax no longer stood his ground; he was forced back by their missiles. Zeus' plan and the lordly Trojans with their spear casts were breaking him, and the shining helmet rang terribly about his temples under the blows: the well constructed cheek pieces were their constant target. His left shoulder grew weary holding his gleaming shield constantly steady, though they were not able to make him quail as they set upon him with their weapons; but all the same shortness of breath wracked him painfully, and sweat ran plentifully everywhere down his limbs, and he had no chance to catch his breath, for on all sides trouble was heaped on trouble.

Ennius adopts this passage in his fifteenth book for the fight of the tribune (perhaps 'Caelius'; see n. 151 to Chapter 1), in the following verses:

> From all sides weapons converge on the tribune like a rain storm. They pierce his shield, the boss rings with spear strikes to the brazen clanging of his helmet, but no one is able, strive as they might from all sides, to dismember his person with their weapon blows. Ceaselessly he shatters and shakes off their ever increasing spear casts. Sweat covers his entire body; his efforts are many, but he has no chance to catch his breath: with the winged iron and strong armed weapon casts, the Istrians bore hard on him.

Vergil re wrote this same passage in a more attractive style and applied it to Turnus when he was shut in [the Trojan encampment]:

> And so the man has the strength neither to stand his defensive ground nor for counter attacks, so beset is he on all sides by flying missiles. There is a constant din of the helmet clattering about his hollow temples, and his strong armour starts to crack under the rock blows; the crest is knocked from his head, nor can his shield with stand the blows. First among the Trojans, others following his lead, lightning swift Mnestheus redoubles his spear casts. Then truly the sweat streams over [Turnus'] entire body in a pitch black torrent he has no chance to catch his breath painful panting jars his weary limbs.

As the tribune and the Istrians have come down to us, their stature is thus determined entirely by the Homeric mould in which they are cast.

We might count this – and by extension the reading of the passages I here suggest – an accident of transmission. After all, Macrobius is exclusively concerned with the relationship of Vergil's language and episodes to those of his poetic predecessors, and this is sufficient to account for the fact that the tribune and the Istrians are for us so intimately linked to their Homeric analogues; had these characters' literal historical identity been of significance in the original text of the *Annales*, the Vergiliocentrics' filter was easily capable of shearing off the critical details that would allow us to identify them in those terms. But this fact does not preclude the possibility that Macrobius' reading of the Istrians and the tribune might reflect the text as encountered even by pre-Vergilian readers. The distinction between the historical and the literary was generally perceived as less jarring in the ancient world than in the modern (*pace* occasional anomalous readers, such as the Quintus of Cic. *Leg.* 1.5).[178] At the same time, the re-shaping of historical individuals after Homer is so pronounced that it would rapidly have obscured any original memory of underlying historical individuality – especially in circumstances where other records of their personality and deeds were absent, difficult to access or rapidly lost; and, as we have seen, the historical referents of individuals promoted in the *Annales* were already obscure in the first century BCE, even to readers as engaged and informed as Cicero.[179] Even if the tribune and the Istrians were not, to an early generation of readers of the *Annales*, as historically obscure as they appear today, the *Annales* were soon to be the only surviving record of their role, and their assumption in that text of the stature of the Homeric characters will have caused Ennius' figures to tower over their historical analogues in the audience's imagination. The designations 'Caelius' and 'Istrians' might be taken to betray the traces of a lingering ancient interest in literal historical identity, muted in Macrobius' account. Those designations are adequately explained, however, by their role in firmly designating as Roman property the originally Homeric figures.

The few surviving portrayals of known historical quantities confirm that it is not only historically obscure figures that are made to fit the pattern of the Greek past; nor is it exclusively the Vergiliocentric sources, with their pronounced bias, that give us access to the phenomenon. The Pyrrhus of Book 6 of the *Annales*, and in particular *Ann.* 183–90 and 197–8,[180] is the fullest and the only clearly identifiable sketch. The fragments cast Pyrrhus variously in the mould of the noble Achilles to whom his patronymic, Aeacides, aspires and in that of the

[178] See Chapter 4, pp. 202–5. [179] See Chapter 3, pp. 158, 160–1.
[180] See Chapter 3, pp. 167–9 and 189–92, for quotation and discussion of these fragments in their Ciceronian quotation-contexts.

dull Ajax, whom the same patronymic also inevitably recalls.[181] Either set of allusions entails the suggestion that in Pyrrhus there re-appeared in new guise the Greek epic past. In adopting the patronymic into his own language in the quotation-context, Cicero (*Off.* 1.38) shows himself susceptible to and complicit in the re-reading of Pyrrhus as a re-incarnation of the Homeric prototypes the patronymic claimed.[182] Cicero thus assures us that the web of specific points of cross-reference between the Greek and the Roman past was as operative in Book 6 as it appears in Book 15 and no less viable in the case of known historical quantities than in that of obscure ones. The *Iliad* represented in microcosm (in as much as it tells the story of a single generation of heroes) the heroic age that finds its resurgence in the grander tableau represented by the unfolding of centuries of Roman history.

Focus on great individuals is apparent in (although not restricted to) universal histories, which have a tendency to promote the cult of personality. Initially, this tendency is evident in works that coalesce around a single individual, represented as a game-changer: thus Theopompus' universalising *Philippika*, with its focus on Philip II of Macedon, and the 'prose epics' of Callisthenes (*FGrHist* 124), Cleitarchus (*FGrHist* 137), Onesicritus (*FGrHist* 134) and others around Alexander.[183] In later universal histories with no single individual as the focus, there recur series of iconic figures used as points of reference: Hercules and Alexander are enduring instances of the type, to which are added further figures whose resemblance to these individuals is evidently, in the author's view, a token of greatness of the ages to which they belong: Romulus and Remus (in Diodorus and Nicolaus), Pompey (in Posidonius and Velleius), L. Mummius, L. Aemilius Paulus and, ultimately, Tiberius (in Velleius) are, among others, variously added to the list.[184] These individuals have a place in universal histories because of their capacity to catch the human imagination and to be construed as reflecting the aspirations attainable by man, especially in his efforts to explore and to dominate the world around him.

Ennius' Pyrrhus, Roman tribune and Istrians fulfil a function similar to that of the Philip, Alexander or Pompey of later prose universal histories: they, too, represent the enduring ability of man across the ages to match the prowess and nobility of his most revered ancestors. The contrast between Ennius' more mysterious characters and a Philip or an Alexander may make it appear that

[181] See Chapter 4, pp. 222–5.
[182] For discussion of the pay-off of his complicity for Cicero in the quotation-context at *Off.* 1.38, see Chapter 4, pp. 222–5.
[183] The quotation is from Fornara 1983: 36, who cites these Alexander-historians.
[184] For Polybius and Timagenes, see *ibid.* 35.

Ennius foisted universalising identities on individuals who did not obviously invite it; but, while from a modern perspective his interpretation of these characters has appeared forced and even ridiculous,[185] it is apparent through the responses of Cicero and Vergil and their readers that his immediate audience found themselves accepting and internalising the views so promoted.[186] In a sense, the extremity of the poet's reconstruction only makes for all the more profound an impression. In literary historical terms, too, the Ennian figures and those of the universal historians ultimately have a common ancestry: Fornara traces the evolution of the phenomenon in prose histories from Homer through Herodotus and Thucydides and the *Hellenika* written in his wake.[187] While it would be natural to assume that Ennius took his inspiration in magnifying individuals more directly from Homer, nothing precludes the possibility that the historiographical fetishisation of individuals after the Homeric manner represents a parallel influence. Above all, the claim Ennius made by endowing the figures of Roman history with epic stature and representing them as 'types' of heroism was similar to the claim made by universal historians that the figures they lionised were representative of their nation and age and properly dominated history's trajectory.

Fragments besides those concerned with the representation of individuals also suggest that the idea of the resurgence at Rome of an era known from the foreign past permeated the *Annales*. Some of the longer passages essentially construct as *topoi* what previously had been (to the best of our knowledge) unique Homeric passages: passages familiar from Greek literature but not previously associated with Rome. Thus the description of tree-felling which Macrobius quotes on *Aen*. 6.179–2 and which he places in Book 6 of Ennius' epic:

> incedunt arbusta per alta, securibus caedunt,
> percellunt magnas quercus, exciditur ilex,
> fraxinus frangitur atque abies consternitur alta,
> pinus proceras pervortunt: omne sonabat
> arbustum fremitu silvai frondosai. [*Ann*. 175 9]

> They make their way through the lofty groves of trees, with axes they cut them down: they strike down the grand oak trees; the holm oak is uprooted, the ash tree brought low and the lofty pine levelled; they overturn the tapering pine trees. The entire forest resounded with the crash of the leafy wood.

[185] This is surely what motivates the objections of Norden, Fraenkel, etc. to Ennius' recasting of the figures of Roman history in Homeric mould (see Chapter 4, n. 3, p. 199).

[186] For the bite that Alexander-*imitatio* had in the real world of Roman political life, see Weippert 1972: best traceable, granted, for figures of very considerable political stature (Scipio Africanus, Pompey, etc.).

[187] Fornara 1983: 32–6.

The model for this passage, in the description of the foray for wood for Patroclus' funeral-pyre in *Iliad* 23, is well known:

> οἱ δ᾽ἴσαν ὑλοτόμους πελέκεας ἐν χερσὶν ἔχοντες
> σειράς τ᾽εὐπλέκτους. πρὸ δ᾽ἄρ᾽ οὐρῆες κίον αὐτῶν.
> πολλὰ δ᾽ἄναντα κάταντα πάραντά τε δόχμιά τ᾽ ἦλθον.
> ἀλλ᾽ ὅτε δὴ κνημοὺς προσέβαν πολυπίδακος Ἴδης
> αὐτίκ᾽ ἄρα δρῦς ὑψικόμους ταναήκεϊ χαλκῷ
> τάμνον ἐπειγόμενοι. ταὶ δὲ μεγάλα κτυπέουσαι
> πῖπτον. [*Il.* 23.114 220]
>
> They made their way armed with tree felling axes and strong woven ropes. Ahead of them went the mules. Long did they journey uphill and down dale and sideways across the mountains. But when they came to the hills of Ida of the many springs, immediately they set about zealously cutting down with their sharp bronze the oaks with their lofty foliage, which with great crashes fell to the earth.

The context of the Ennian lines is today inaccessible.[188] Whatever action framed this passage, however, the recurrence of the vignette retrospectively illuminated its role in its earlier, Homeric context, by revealing it as simple precursor to an eventual Roman destiny.

The surviving similes of the narrative, distributed throughout,[189] also suggest the constancy with which its actors and actions were re-imagined in intrinsically Homeric terms. The Homeric element in these similes varies from strong and overt, in the case of those surviving via Macrobius (*Ann.* 535–9, the stall-fed horse simile; *Ann.* 432–4, the warring winds simile), Priscian (*Ann.* 319–20, the Cyclops' swollen belly simile) and Nonius (*Ann.* 361, the simile of the blush compared to milk and purple mixed); to more muted, as in the case of the similes surviving via Cicero (*Ann.* 79–81, the consul-simile; *Ann.* 522–3, the retired race-horse simile), Varro (*Ann.* 542, the toothless bitch simile) and Gellius (*Ann.* 549, the halved flask of wine

[188] For the range of possibilities proposed, see Skutsch 1985: 41 and Flores *et al.* 2002: 122–3. Suggestions include the collection of wood for the construction of a fleet (Columna, Merula) and wood for the construction of a funeral pyre for Pyrrhus' dead and the Roman dead alike after Heraclea (Vahlen[1], Mueller, Suerbaum).

[189] The earliest book of the *Annales* for which a simile is attested is Book 1. (*Ann.* 79–81, the consul-simile, is attested for that book not by its primary source, Cicero, but by a secondary source, Gell. 7.6.9. Gellius there attributes to Book 1 *Ann.* 89, which is linked to *Ann.* 79–81 by Cicero's quotation of them as part of the same extended fragment, *Ann.* 72–91, at *Div.* 1.107–8.) The latest is Book 17 (*Ann.* 432–4, Macrobius' winds simile, preserved, together with the book-number, at *Sat.* 6.1.21). The source for *Ann.* 319–20, Priscian, places it in Book 8 or 9 (for the difficulties over the book-number, see Skutsch 1985: 495–6), while Nonius, the source for *Ann.* 361 (the blush), places it in Book 11. Neither source nor content allow editors to ascribe the remaining instances (*Ann.* 522–3, Cicero's retired race-horse simile; *Ann.* 535–9, Macrobius' stall-fed horse simile; *Ann.* 542, Varro's toothless bitch simile; *Ann.* 549, Gellius' jar of wine, halved, simile) to particular books.

simile).[190] The analogy they propose might be directly between a figure of the Roman world and an Homeric figure, as in the case of the Cyclops simile (*Ann.* 319–20), whose unknown referent editors variously postulate to be Philip v of Macedon, Hannibal or Scipio Africanus (or rather the sails of his fleet);[191] or indirectly, as when Ennius uses an image familiar from an Homeric simile to describe a figure of his narrative: thus the (unknown) referent of Ennius' stall-fed horse simile (*Ann.* 535–9) is made analogous to Homer's Paris, the referent of the Homeric version of that simile (*Il.* 6.506–11). More generally, similes such as *Ann.* 423–4 (the warring winds simile), that were themselves recurrent in all texts in which they are found,[192] function as hallmarks of the heroic action that signalled critical historical eras.

Most similes, like the Homeric and Herodotean allusion, glance backwards in time. One, however, is extraordinary in that it uses a moment of pre-foundation history to glance ahead to the Republican future. This famous simile occurs in the context of the augurate of Romulus and Remus (*Ann.* 72–91), where it describes the tension of the assembled crowd. It runs thus:

> expectant veluti consul quom mittere signum
> volt, omnes avidi spectant ad carceris oras
> quam mox emittat pictos e faucibus currus:
> sic expectabat populus atque ore timebat
> rebus utri magni victoria sit data regni. [*Ann.* 79 83]

> They wait as when the consul is about to give the signal and all direct their gazes eagerly at the gates of the starting post, to see how soon it will release the painted chariots from its maw: just so did the people wait and show their apprehension for the future on their faces, in their anxiety to know to which of the two the victory of great rule would be given.

Large-scale Homeric input (of the kind we see with the Roman tribune, the Istrians and Pyrrhus) is not evident here, but the metre and the Homerising detail of the language of the fragment continue to invite the audience to read it as analogous to the Homeric narratives. At the same time, the fragment also effects its own telescoping of time – if *not* in this instance of Greek and Rome history – through the anachronism introduced in the simile (comparable to that of the first simile of the *Aeneid*). Like *Ann.* 304–8,[193] this passage represents Ennius' ability to play a very

[190] All the similes in question here are quoted and discussed in Chapter 2, pp. 117–25.
[191] Priscian's book-number (see n. 189, p. 290) roughly allows for these possibilities. See Flores *et al.* 2006: 122–4 for a full history of editorial conjectures and disputes about the simile's missing referent.
[192] See Chapter 2, pp. 119–20.
[193] The Cethegus and Tuditanus fragment, discussed in Chapter 1, pp. 54–7.

controlled game with historical perspective. Adrian Gratwick points out how the anachronistic reference 'impl[ies] the tradition, continuity, even timelessness of Roman public institutions'.[194] This too then, like the allusion to the Greek past, is interpretable as an aspect of Ennius' universalising, since it too suggests the transcendence of Roman customs as well as persons, their existence in other guises, at other culturally crucial places and times.

CONCLUSION

Universalising overtones enter Ennius' text variously through its vast temporal scope; through its geographical reach and emphases; and through its broad poetic appropriations, with the Homeric elements in particular (accessible, as Cicero's Pyrrhus and Macrobius' tribune and Istrians jointly prove, to a broad spectrum of ancient readers), here as elsewhere promoting the sense of universal application and universal consequences. Among these (or particularly between the first two and the last), there is an unresolved tension between a progressive and teleological view of history (Rome as the culmination) and a cyclical view, according to which all this could happen again, with a different central player. I suggest that this tension was muted: that the teleological view to all intents and purposes trumped the cyclical view, which served its purpose well enough by guaranteeing, on the basis of the past, the significance of the present, Roman moment; in the triumph of that moment, the future was for now untroubling or out of view.

In the *Annales*, Ennius effectively pitted (his version of) 'annalistic' history against two contemporary historiographical giants: 'Homeric' historiography (see Chapter 4, pp. 205–10), whose powers he effectively usurped; and analytic historiography, as represented by Thucydides and Polybius, which prided itself explicitly on its power to explain and instruct – even if, in doing so, it claimed as its peculiar prerogative a power that in different forms all written memorialisations of the past had always exercised. Ennius' presentation of Roman history in the cultural and poetic mould provided by Homer co-opted the power of 'Homeric' historiography to provide a transformative understanding of the present by offering an authoritative and glorious vision of the past against which it was to be understood; at the same time, it gave his version of history a means of

[194] Gratwick 1982: 61. See also Goldberg 1995: 106–7 for similar suggestions, as well as Newman 1988: 432–4, esp. on *vult* which, according to Newman's argument, 'sets us in the Roman world of law and *res publica* even before Rome is founded' (*ibid.* 433).

rivalling analytic historiography on its self-assumed territory. For if traditional *annales*, records of the progress of years in terms of turn-over in political offices, prophecies and wonders, served as rhetorically rather feeble means of inculcating a vision of moral order and of the workings of the world and were felt (by late and invested readers, at any rate) to be no match for analytic history with its explanatory power,[195] Ennius' tendentious presentation of his material in an ennobling Homeric cast enabled his *Annales* to stand their ground and serve, as they did for so long, as the persuasive account of the origins and nature of the (Roman) world. We noted in Chapter 1 (p. 36) that the revelation of *annales*, the local history of Rome, as 'world' history in the works of Livy and Tacitus is uncontroversial, effected through their amalgamation of the annalistic tradition's chronological framework and focus on Rome with a rationalising approach and, above all, with a transformative sense of the significance to the world at large of what was being recorded. Here I have argued that Ennius' incorporation of *annales* into an Homeric narrative, though using different means, had already achieved something of that transition and offered just such a new understanding of the centrality and significance of the affairs of Rome.

The best evidence for ancient universalising interpretation of the *Annales* would be the survival of explicit expressions thereof. Without such explicit testimony, the mechanisms by which universalism operates have rarely sufficed to bring it to attention (witness the histories of Timaeus and Posidonius).[196] This is as true in the ancient world, when the texts in question were fully extant, as in the modern (perhaps not least because of the lack of standard Latin or Greek vocabulary to denote this type of historical writing). In the case of the *Annales*, such explicit testimony is *a priori* unlikely ever to have existed: the conventions of epic were such that direct attention is never drawn to the universalising aspects of any surviving Graeco-Roman instance of the genre; while the hexameter more or less prescribed for subsequent scholarship the approach to the poem it was to take. Where ancient scholarship did take notice of what we would recognise as epic universalising,[197] its language tended to be oblique and minimal – something we can again ascribe to the underdevelopment of the concept and its accompanying terminology in the ancient world.

[195] Cf. Sempronius Asellio at Gell. *NA* 5.18.9, quoted and discussed in Chapter 1, pp. 30–7.
[196] See nn. 23, p. 238 and 41, pp. 242–3.
[197] See n. 4, p. 234 and pp. 260–1, with n. 105. Cp. also the responses to Homer as the original author of universalism in conventional universal historians such as Strabo and Velleius (see pp. 282–3); and perhaps also Varro *RR* 1.3 on *Ann.* 154–5 (the foundation date) (p. 273).

In place of clear testimony to ancient recognition of Ennius' universalising practice, there survives the fact that the works that we know engaged most directly and seriously with Ennius – those of Livy,[198] Lucretius and Vergil – all represent different facets of universal writing about Rome. Indeed, the universalising strategies of the two poets are directly dependent for their expression on Ennian epic metre, Ennian vocabulary and Ennian word-forms. Roman universalism surely entered the Roman thought-stream by a variety of currents, but I hope to have suggested here why it makes sense at least to consider the possibility that Ennius' *Annales* were a significant point of entry for such thought into the Roman epic and historiographical traditions.

[198] For Livy and Ennius, see Chapter 4, pp. 210–19 and *passim*.

Epilogue

The fragments of the *Annales* are not the most inviting body of evidence to survive from antiquity. The poem's encounter with the Augustans, in what was still its heyday, ensured that it would ever after appear forbidding, even had it survived intact. Our accounts of it, however, clearly matter, not only in themselves but also because of their part in defining the starting-point from which we trace the subsequent trajectory of Roman literary history. In such a situation, and where the evidence we have is challenging at once in its complexity and in its limitations, in the invitations it proffers and in the questions that it begs, it is especially desirable to continue to question what we think we know and to examine how it is that we have come by those views.

My primary aim in this study has been to explain the mechanisms generating the appearances of the *Annales* with which we are familiar today. The initial impulses of my engagement with the poem were conservative, prompted by the desire to understand and allow myself to be informed by the manner in which the fragmentary evidence reaches us. The study's principal results, too, I consider to be negative, consisting in a more material and detailed sense of where and how our access to the poem begins and ends, and therefore why we cannot be sure of some of the things that have routinely been said of this poem and, conversely, what it is that we *can* say we know about it, with all the accompanying provisos that such a statement might entail.

This method of inquiry, however, opened up for me possibilities of how to read the poem, perhaps by the steps just detailed, and I thus arrived at a partial, positive account. The exercise has, inevitably, only increased my awareness of how the result is liable, as any other account, to overemphasising beyond their due the phenomena produced by the transmission and not fully dealing with the consequences of how our evidence reaches us. I have, on balance, tried to articulate the sense of the work that is most aptly based on the evidence as I currently understand it and, in almost equal degree

(although the two issues are hardly extricable), on the poem's place in literary history. For the reasons I have given in the body of this study, it is in fact what seems to me at this time the most likely way to read the remains of the poem. At the same time, the correctness, as it were, of what I have to say, or its viability *vis-à-vis* other interpretations is, despite my real commitment to it, not the principal matter at stake for me. Instead, what I hope to have shown is why it might make sense to allow the evidence some freedom outside the roles in which it has traditionally been cast. My aim has not been to offer a definitive assessment of the poem but to highlight the possibility of alternative accounts that respect the evidence – indeed, not just the possibility of them but their vitality to our interactions with the difficult material that constitutes our principal point of access to Roman poetry at its origin.

The enduring frustration of working with fragmentary texts, perhaps too obvious to need stating, is of not being able to see around the corner, not being able to see what the fragments fail to show us. One consequence of this is that, in reconstructing fragments, use of the imagination is not an avoidable temptation but a necessity – the imagination, albeit governed by awareness of the limits within which the author operated, however we identify and assess them. Traditional accounts of the *Annales* have for the most part not tended to advertise the ways in which they, too, are the products of the modern imagination as much as of philological endeavour, and they have tended to carry sufficient authority to discourage further detailed engagement with the material on which they are based. Yet, given that the indications the sources supply are so sparse, the question of how to arrange the fragments and the stories that we imagine they amount to are limited by little other than what we think makes generic sense. Of necessity, we rely on our sense of the history and the function of the text as a whole, about which we are too little informed, in re-imagining any part of it. The resulting circularity is a vice that no reconstruction attempting to make whole sense of a broken text can escape. There is perhaps no remedy to this vice beyond advertisement of it, as an invitation to critical engagement.

In a sense, then, what this study seeks ultimately to privilege is simply the fragility of all of our accounts of the *Annales*. As with any effort to reconstruct any aspect of the ancient world from its now fragmented remains, there is an inherent risk that we all too easily find what we are looking for. There is probably no case in which our broken evidence cannot support a variety of narratives, and the fragments of the *Annales* simply present an acute version of this problem, and one in which there is a huge amount at stake for historians of literature. We who reconstruct Ennius find

ourselves subjecting the fragments to the limited mercy of our own powers of rhetoric and re-inventing the past surely in a far more radical sense than was true of Ennius' own recasting of events. The rashness of my own re-invention of Ennius' *Annales* can perhaps best serve as a reminder of the extent to which all our constructions are at root the invested products of our own narrative desires.

APPENDIX I

Triadic structure and the organisation of the text according to established scholarship

Appendix Table A1.1 is based on the accounts of the organisation of the *Annales* given by F. Skutsch, F. Leo, O. Skutsch and A. Gratwick.[1] These accounts are themselves largely enabled by the hypothesis of straightforward chronological progression.[2] The plausible structure that results is attractive, but it is worth bearing in mind that the thesis of the Ennian triads rests on multiple assumptions about the poet's approach to husbanding the contents of the narrative and is thus the product of some circularity.[3] F. Skutsch and Leo are clearest about the frequency with which extrapolation and surmise are necessary to assign material to books to arrive at this picture. Percentages for individual books and for triads were calculated on the basis of a rough total of 1,000 years covered overall in the *Annales*. But the very use of that figure and the attempt to allocate sequential strings of years to particular books raises multiple questions about the treatment of time in the *Annales*: Were flashbacks used? Were all episodes treated in chronological sequence or were some episodes related via the speech of characters (cf. Ilia's dream)? Were there ever any 'gaps' in sequences of years? Was the question of specific dates, for example, the date of the Fall of Troy or the foundation of the City or the limits of the regal period, given priority? Was Ennius' approach to time better comparable to that of Homer or that of Thucydides? Was there a palpable shift between a mythological era into historical time? All figures in Appendix Table A1.1 are guesses or approximations, based at best on analogy with other texts.

[1] F. Skutsch 1905: 2604–10; Leo 1913: 166–71; O. Skutsch 1985: 5–6; and Gratwick 1982: 60–3. Cf. also O'Neal 1988: 35–6. F. Skutsch does not subscribe to the notion of the triadic or hexadic (Vahlen) structure of the *Annales* common to the other scholars cited (Skutsch 1905: 2610).

[2] See Chapter 1, pp. 38–40.

[3] See Appendix Table A3.1 for the contents of each book as assured by ancient testimony; for discussion of the sources that provide the book-numbers, together with the limitations on the type of information they provide, see Chapter 1, pp. 67–9.

Table A1.1. *Triadic structure and the organisation of the text according to established scholarship*

Triad and theoretical or approx. dates BCE it covers	**Triad's unifying concept**	**Approx. per cent of total years covered in the triad and equivalent books; approx. number of years covered**	**Book number: approx. dates BCE**		**Events presumed covered in the Book**
First (Books 1 3): 1184 510	Pre Republican history	**70 per cent** = *c.* 700 years	**10 per cent** = *c.* 100 years	1: 1184 1100 (??); 3 generations: Aeneas, Ilia, R&R	Fall of Troy; flight of Aeneas; arrival in Italy; treaty with Alba; Ilia's dream; Council of the gods; Romulus and Remus; rape of Sabine women; Titus Tatius; deification of Romulus
			60 per cent = *c.* 600 years (??)	2 3: 1100 510 (??); the regal period	Reigns of Numa (Egeria and foundation of religious institutions); Tullus (Mettus Fufetius, Horatii, destruction of Alba, settlement of Caelian Hill); all kings through Ancus
					Tarquin: story of birth and omen; wars against tribes of Italy; Tanaquil and Servius Tullius; expulsion of the Tarquins
Second (Books 4 6): 510 271	Foundation of Roman Republic and subjugation of Italy	**24 per cent** = *c.* 240 years	**12 per cent** = *c.* 120 years	4: 509 390/387	Foundation of Republic: sieges of Porsenna and Tarracina; eclipse of 400; Gallic invasion; Camillus (??)
			10 per cent = *c.* 100 years	5: 385 295	Events through end of Samnite Wars (*c.* 295): execution of younger

Table A1.1. (*cont.*)

Triad and theoretical or approx. dates BCE it covers	**Triad's unifying concept**	**Approx. per cent of total years covered in the triad and equivalent books; approx. number of years covered**	**Book number: approx. dates BCE**		**Events presumed covered in the Book**
					Manlius (340); bestowal of citizenship on Capua; punishment of Vestal Minucia; battles and sieges
			1 per cent = *c.* 10 years	**6**: 281 71	War against Pyrrhus
Third (Books 7 9): 264 01	Punic Wars	**6 per cent** = *c.* 60 years	**4 per cent** = *c.* 40 years	**7**: 264 18	First Punic War (in outline? cf. Cic. *Brut.* 76); history of events down through 218, poss. incl. Trebia; Skutsch also postulates an *Origo Carthaginis* (from 332?) in flashback at the beginning of the book (Skutsch 1985: 367; Leo 1913: 168)
			1 per cent = *c.* 10 years	**8**: 218 11	Second Punic War: Cannae and aftermath; the beginnings of Roman recovery
			1 per cent = *c.* 10 years	**9**: 210 01	Roman successes throughout the Mediterranean, culminating in Scipio's defeat of Hannibal at Zama in 202; attention turns to Philip of Macedon and Greece.

Triad and theoretical or approx. dates BCE it covers	Triad's unifying concept	Approx. per cent of total years covered in the triad and equivalent books; approx. number of years covered	Book number: approx. dates BCE		Events presumed covered in the Book
Fourth (Books 10 12): 201 193	Affairs of Greece	**1 per cent** = *c.* 10 years	**0.5 per cent** = *c.* 5 years	**10**: 201 197/6	Second Macedonian War, against Philip
			0.2 per cent = *c.* 2 years?	**11**: 197 6	(??) Conclusion of war against Philip (Cynoscephalae?) and declaration of freedom for Greece
			0.2 per cent = *c.* 2 years	**12**: 196 5	Campaign against Nabis of Sparta; Cato's victories in Spain (?)
Fifth (Books 13 15): 192 87	Syrian War against Antiochus; and (Book 15) Fulvius Nobilior's campaigns and triumph	**0.5 per cent** = *c.* 5 years	**0.1 per cent** = *c.* 1 year	**13**: 191	War against Antiochus
			0.1 per cent = *c.* 1 year	**14**: 190	(?) Final defeat of Antiochus by Scipio at Magnesia
			0.2 0.4 per cent = *c.* 2 4 years	**15**: 189 7; or 189 185/3 (see Gratwick 1982: 65).	Nobilior in Aetolia, Cephallenia and Ambracia; incl. triumph at Rome and founding of temple *Herculis Musarum*
Sixth (Books 16 18): ??178 70	Skutsch's *bella recentia*, incl. the Istrian Wars	**1 per cent** = ?? c. 10 years	**0.1 per cent ??** = 1 year??	**16**: *c.* 177	All attributions, except the Istrian Wars, are problematic Skutsch lists the following as either treated or calling for treatment in Book 16: reconciliation of Fulvius and Aemilius Lepidus in 179; deaths of both Scipio

Table A1.1. (*cont.*)

Triad and theoretical or approx. dates BCE it covers	**Triad's unifying concept**	**Approx. per cent of total years covered in the triad and equivalent books; approx. number of years covered**	**Book number: approx. dates BCE**		**Events presumed covered in the Book**
					and Hannibal in 183; downfall of Scipio (if not occurring and treated earlier); an *origo gentis Illyricae*, probably in connection with growing Illyrian piracy *c.* 181 (Skutsch 1985: 564)
			?? 1 year	**17**: *c.* 176	No certain attributions (Skutsch 1985: 565)
			?? 1 year	**18**: *c.* 175	As above. Jerôme's notice of Ennius' own death in 169 is the only means of dating.

APPENDIX 2

The gods in the Annales

INTRODUCTION

Appendix 2 presents the evidence for Homerising anthropomorphic activity and intervention in the *Annales*. 11 fragments (14 lines) relate uncontroversially to Homerising anthropomorphic divine action or intervention (see Appendix Table A2.1), while 2 testimonia from Servius give further evidence in the same category. Of the 11 fragments, 2 (*Ann.* 18 and 19) are attributed by their source to Book 1, and 1 (*Ann.* 203–4) to Book 6. Skutsch attributes another 3 (*Ann.* 53, 54–5 and 60) to Book 1, and tentatively suggests that another 3 (*Ann.* 444, 445 & 446–7) may also belong to Book 1, while nevertheless listing them as *sed. inc.* For 2 of the fragments (*Ann.* 553 and 581), he makes no suggestion as to book-attribution. Flores proceeds similarly, except that he prints 2 about whose attribution to Book 1 Skutsch had hesitated (*Ann.* 444 and 445 Sk. = *Ann.* 59 and 55 Fl.) as belonging unambiguously to Book 1; and he places 1 line which Skutsch had hesitatingly attributed to Book 1 (*Ann.* 446–7 Sk. = *Ann.* 776–7 Fl.) among the *sed. inc.*

In the second category (Appendix Table A2.2) are listed lines that refer to gods but that do not necessarily require their immediate presence or direct representation in the narrative: they may be metaphorical expressions or ones that represent narrative or descriptions by mortals of divine activity. Even though these lines may not themselves guarantee divine intervention at the point in the narrative where they occur, they nevertheless testify to the relevance and general awareness of Homerising gods in the *Annales*. There are 16 fragments (21 lines) in this second category, of which 5 are attributed by their source to a particular book. A comment of 'Porphyrio''s is also potentially relevant under this heading. Of the 16 fragments, two (*Ann.* 27 and 58–9 Sk. = *Ann.* 29 and 60–1 Fl.) are attributed by their sources to Book 1, 1 (*Ann.* 146 Sk. = *Ann.* 159 Fl.) to Book 3, 1 (*Ann.* 232 Sk. = *Ann.* 255 Fl.) to Book 7, and 1 (*Ann.* 399–400 Sk. = *Ann.* 427–8 Fl.) to Book 15. The most recent editors both attribute the same 4 further fragments (*Ann.* 15–16, 23–4, 25, 51 Sk. = *Ann.* 17–18, 25–6,

27, 53 Fl.) to Book 1 and 1 (*Ann.* 113 Sk. = *Ann.* 121 Fl.) to Book 2. Both place 5 fragments (*Ann.* 541, 554, 586, 591, 592 Sk. = *Ann.* 542, 555, 584, 589, 590 Fl.) simply among the *sed. inc.* Skutsch has his *Ann.* 555–6 there, too, while Flores, on the basis of Kleve 1990: 5–16, prints it in Book 6, as *Ann.* 217–18 (boldly amalgamated with *Ann.* 203–4 Sk.; see Jackson in Flores *et al.* (2006: 158–9). Where previous editors have on occasion attributed *sed. inc.* fragments to particular books, Book 1 has, unsurprisingly, found itself favoured: thus *Ann.* 554 and 591 Sk. were assigned to Book 1 by Pascoli and Spangenberg, respectively (reported by Jackson at Flores *et al.* 2009: 356 and 451).

In total, in Appendix Tables A2.1 and A2.2, 34 lines (27 fragments) are listed, which represents just over 5 per cent of the extant 623 lines attributed by Skutsch to the *Annales*. At the end of the Appendix are listed lines that scholars have thought might relate to divine action and also categories of reference (personifications, religious ritual) that can be thought of as related to the gods but that do not give evidence of divine intervention. These lines are excluded from the count just given.

BOOK-NUMBERS

Where they are attested by our sources, book numbers in bold precede the line numbers (e.g. **I**). Skutch's attributions to particular books precede the line numbers in ordinary script (e.g. I). Question marks precede the book numbers for editors' tentative attributions to particular books for fragments they nevertheless class as *sed. inc.* (e.g. ?I). Where the editors make no attempt at attribution to any particular book, a question mark alone precedes the line number. As usual, I print the text according to Skutsch.

Table A2.1 *Fragments uncontroversially relating to divine intervention*

I: *Ann.* 18 Sk.	transnavit cita per teneras caliginis auras	**I:** *Ann.* 20 Fl.
I: *Ann.* 19	constitit inde loci propter sos dia dearum	**I:** *Ann.* 21
I: *Ann.* 53	respondit Iuno Saturnia, sancta dearum	I: *Ann.* 56
I: *Ann.* 54 5	unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli templa	I: *Ann.* 57 8
I: *Ann.* 60	Ilia, dia nepos, quas aerumnas tetulisti	I: *Ann.* 62
VI: *Ann.* 203 4	tum cum corde suo divom pater atque hominum rex effatur	**VI:** *Ann.* 216 17
?I: *Ann.* 444	o genitor noster, Saturnie, maxime divom	I: *Ann.* 59

Table A2.1 (*cont.*)

?I: *Ann.* 445	optima caelicolum, Saturnia, magna dearum	I: *Ann.* 55
?I: *Ann.* 446 7	Iuppiter hic risit tempestatesque serenae riserunt omnes risu Iovis omnipotentis	?: *Ann.* 776 7
?: *Ann.* 553	effudit voces proprio cum pectore sancto[1]	?: *Ann.* 554
?: *Ann.* 581	atque manu magna Romanos impulit amnis	?: *Ann.* 579

TESTIMONIA

Number	**Source**	**Testimonium**
VIII: xv Sk. VIII: xiv Fl.	Serv. ad *Aen.* 1.20: '(Iuno)... audierat'	... et perite 'audierat'; in Ennio enim inducitur Iuppiter promittens Romanis excidium Carthaginis
VIII: xvi Sk. VIII: xv Fl.	Serv. ad *Aen.* 1.281: 'consilia in melius referet' cf. Serv. ad *Aen.* 12.841	quia bello Punico secundo, ut ait Ennius, placata Iuno coepit favere Romanis constat bello Punico secundo exoratam Iunonem

Table A2.2 *Fragments relating to Homerising gods but which may not entail direct divine intervention in the narrative*

I: *Ann.* 15 16 Sk.	doctus†que Anchisesque Venus quem pulcra dearum fari donavit, divinum pectus habere	I: *Ann.* 17 18 Fl.
I: *Ann.* 23 4	Saturno quem Caelus genuit	I: *Ann.* 25 6
I: *Ann.* 25	cum †suo obsidio magnus Titanus premebat	I: *Ann.* 27
I: *Ann.* 27	qui caelum versat stellis ardentibus aptum	**I:** *Ann.* 29
I: *Ann.* 51	cenacula maxuma caeli	I: *Ann.* 53
I: *Ann.* 58 9	te †saneneta precor, Venus, te genetrix patris nostri, ut me de caelo visas, cognata, parumper	**I:** *Ann.* 60 1

[1] This ought to be of a god (cf. Skutsch *ad loc.*); *sanctus* elsewhere in the *Annales* only of *pater Tiberinus* at *Ann.* 26, of Juno at *Ann.* 53, of the augural birds at *Ann.* 88 and of the Roman Senate at *Ann.* 282.

Table A2.2 (*cont.*)

II: *Ann.* 113	olli respondit suavis sonus Egeriai	II: *Ann.* 121
III: *Ann.* 146	olli de caelo laevom dedit inclutus signum	**III:** *Ann.* 159
VII: *Ann.* 232	non semper vostra evortit: nunc Iuppiter hac stat	**VII:** *Ann.* 255
XV: *Ann.* 399 400	arcus ubi aspicitur, mortalibus quae perhibetur <Iris>	**XV:** *Ann.* 427
?: *Ann.* 541	tum tonuit laevom bene tempestate serena	?: *Ann.* 542
?: *Ann.* 554	contremuit templum magnum Iovis altitonantis	?: *Ann.* 555
?: *Ann.* 555 6	qui fulmine claro omnia per sonitus arcet, terram mare caelum	VI: *Ann.* 217 18
?: *Ann.* 586	divom domus, altisonum cael	?: *Ann.* 584
?: *Ann.* 591	divomque hominumque pater, rex	?: *Ann.* 589
?: *Ann.* 592	patrem divomque hominumque	?: *Ann.* 590

TESTIMONIA

Number	Source	Testimonium
I: xxxix Sk.	'Porphyrio' on Hor. C. 1.2.17	Ilia auctore Ennio in amnem Tiberim iussu Amulii regis Albanorum praecipitata Antemnis (Buecheler; *antea enim* codd.) Anieni matrimonio iuncta est

POSSIBLY RELEVANT LINES

1. Norden 1915: 43–52 attributes the following line to a speech of Jupiter's; Skutsch (1985: 429–30) disputes the suggestion.

VII: *Ann.* 246 Sk.	quianam dictis nostris sententia flexa est?	**VII**: *Ann.* 269 Fl.

2. Skutsch (1985: 729) suggests that, '[i]f we could assume that Cicero had substituted *ausus es* for *ausa es* [at *Ann.* 589] we might attribute it to the divine assembly, comparing Hom. *Od.* 1.64 τέκνον ἐμὸν, ποῖόν σε ἔπος φύγεν ἕρκος ὀδόντων; Liv. Andron. *Od.* 3 W *mea puera, quid verbi ex tuo ore supera fugit*'. But he concludes that a quarrel is more likely.

??: *Ann.* 589 Sk.	ausus es hoc ex ore tuo?	??: *Ann.* 587 Fl.

TYPES OF LINE EXCLUDED

• Lines relating to human ritual	*Ann.* 116 18	practices instituted by Numa *lectisternium*
	Ann. 240 1	
• Lares	VIII.xxi	Prop.(3.3.11) metaphorical use of the term
	Ann. 619	direct address to Lares
• Personifications	*Ann.* 225	*Discordia*
	Ann. 220 1	*P/paluda virago*
	Ann. 308	*Suada*
	Ann. 186	*era . . . Fors*
	Ann. 312	*Fortuna*
• Muses	*Ann.* 1, 208, 293, 322	

• Prayers and addresses to gods where the gods themselves need not be physically present; e.g. *Ann.* 99, 100 except *Ann.* 58 9, where Venus seems to be physically present after Ilia's address; *Ann.* 60 is usually construed as Venus' response in person to Ilia (see Skutsch 1985: 210 11).

APPENDIX 3

The organisation of the fragments: evidence and conjecture

Table A3.1 *Fragments attributed to a particular book by their source(s)*

Book 1: (For comment, see Chapter 1, pp. 67 9.)

I: *Ann.* 5	desunt rivos camposque reman<an>t	Fest. 354 6; Paul. Fest. 355
I: *Ann.* 12 13	latos <per> populos res atque poemata nostra <. . . . . clara> cluebunt	*De ult. syll.* (*GLK* 4.231)
I: *Ann.* 17	face vero quod tecum precibus pater orat	Fest. 218
I: *Ann.* 18	transnavit cita per teneras caliginis auras	DS *G.* 4.59 *et aliter*
I: *Ann.* 19	constitit inde loci propter sos dia dearum	Fest. 386 8 (as *Ann.* 141, 230, 357)
I: *Ann.* 20	est locus Hesperiam quam mortales perhibebant	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.11
I: *Ann.* 26	teque pater Tiberine tuo cum flumine sancto	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.12
I: *Ann.* 27	qui caelum versat stellis fulgentibus aptum	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.9 (as *Ann.* 145, 348)
I: *Ann.* 32	accipe daque fidem foedusque feri bene firmum	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.13
I: *Ann.* 33	quom superum lumen nox intempesta teneret	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.14
I: *Ann.* 57	haec ecfatus, ibique latrones dicta facessunt	Non. 306.26
I: *Ann.* 58 59	te †saneneta† precor, Venus, te genetrix patris nostri, ut me de caelo visas, cognata, parumper	Non. 378.15 (as *Ann.* 66 68)
I: *Ann.* 66 68	indotuetur ibi lupus femina, conspicit omnis. hinc campum celeri passu permensa parumper conicit in silvam sese	Non. 378.15 (as *Ann.* 58 59)

I: *Ann.* 92	Iuppiter ut muro fretus magis quamde manu sim	Fest. 312 14 (as *Ann.* 122)
I: *Ann.* 93	ast hic quem nunc tu tam torviter increpuisti	Non. 516.11 (cf. Prisc. 15.13 [*GLK* 3.72])
I: *Ann.* 96	nam vi depugnare sues stolidi soliti sunt	Fest. 416 18
I: *Ann.* 97	astu non vi sum summam servare decet rem	Fest. 384 (as *Ann.* 135)
I: *Ann.* 98	†virgines nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas	Fest. 432 (as *Ann.* 211 12; cf. *Ann.* 432, *sapsa*)
I: *Ann.* 99	<te Mavors, te> Nerienem Mavortis et Heriem	Gell. 13.23.18; Non. 120.1
I: *Ann.* 100	<teque> Quirine pater veneror Horamque Quirini	Non. 120.1
I: *Ann.* 101	aeternum seritote diem concorditer ambo	Charis. (*GLK* 1.196)
I: *Ann.* 102 3	quod mihi reique fidei regno vobisque, Quirites, se fortunatim feliciter ac bene vortat	Non. 111.39
I: *Ann.* 112	(de ruit) ç mu	Fest. 278, cf. Paul. Fest. 279

Book 2:

II(!): *Ann.* 105 9	pectora . . . tenet desiderium; simul inter sese sic memorant: 'o Romule, Romule die, qualem te patriae custodem di genuerunt! o pater, o genitor, o sanguen dis oriundum! tu produxisti nos intra luminis oras'	Cic. *Rep.* 1.64; Lact. *Inst.* 1.15.30 Prisc. 6.66 (*GLK* 2.250) gives 'o genitor, o sanguen dis oriundum', along with the book number, disputed by Skutsch 1985: 256.
II: *Ann.* 119	si quid me fuerit humanitus, ut teneatis	Fest. 152
II: *Ann.* 122	quamde tuas omnes legiones ac popularis	Fest. 312 14 (as *Ann.* 92)
II: *Ann.* 123	hic occasus datus est, at Horatius inclutus saltu	Fest. 188 90 (as *Ann.* 159 and 255)

II: *Ann.* 127	Cael>i caerula prata	Fest. 362 (as *Ann.* 478, 231, 540)
II: *Ann.* 128 9	Ostia munita est. idem loca navibus pulcris munda facit, nautisque mari quaesentibus vitam	Fest. 312; Paul. Fest. 313; Fest. *Apogr.* 126; Paul. Fest. 127
II: *Ann.* 130	ferro se caedi quam dictis his toleraret	Fest. 490
II: *Ann.* 131	qui ferro minitere atque in te ningulus	Fest. 184
II: *Ann.* 132	adnuit sese mecum decernere ferro	Prisc. 10.12 (*GLK* 2.504)
II: *Ann.* 133	ingens cura †mis cum† concordibus aequiperare	Prisc. 13.4 (*GLK* 3.3)
II: *Ann.* 134	et simul effugit. speres ita funditus nostras	Fest. 446 (as *Ann.* 421)
II: *Ann.* 135	at sese sum quae dederat in luminis oras	Fest. 384 (as *Ann.* 97)
II: *Ann.* 136	haec inter se totum tuditan>tes	Fest. 480

Book 3:

III: *Ann.* 138	Tarquinio dedit imperium simul et sola regni	Fest. 386 (as *Ann.* 461)
III: *Ann.* 139 40	et densis aquila pennis obnixa volabat vento quem perhibent Graium genus aera lingua	Ps. Probus, Verg. *Ecl.* 6.31 (p. 341 Th.)
III: *Ann.* 141	circum sos quae sunt magnae gentes opulentae	Fest. 386 388 (as *Ann.* 19, 230, 357)
III: *Ann.* 142	hac noctu filo pendebit Etruria tota	Macr. *Sat.* 1.4.17 18 (as *Ann.* 227 228)
III: *Ann.* 143 4	postquam defessi sunt stare et spargere sese hastis ansatis, concurrunt undique telis	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.16
III: *Ann.* 145	caelum prospexit stellis fulgentibus aptum	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.9 (as *Ann.* 27, 348)

III: *Ann.* 146	olli de caelo laevom dedit inclutus signum	Non. 51.7
III: *Ann.* 148	prodinunt famuli tum candida lumina lucent	Fest. 254
III: *Ann.* 149	inde sibi memorat unum super esse laborem	Gell. 1.22.14 16

Book 4:

IV: *Ann.* 151	Romani scalis: summa nituntur opum vi	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.17 (as *Ann.* 404 5)

Book 5:

V: *Ann.* 159	inicit inritatus: tenet occasus, iuvat res	Fest. 188 90 (as *Ann.* 123 and 255)
V: *Ann.* 161	ansatas mittunt de turribus	Non. 556.19
V: *Ann.* 163	quod per amoenam urbem leni fluit agmine flumen	Macr. *Sat.* 6.4.4
V (!): *Ann.* 166	nomine Burrus uti memorant a stirpe supremo	Fest. 412, 364; Non. 226. 29; cf. Cic. *Orat.* 160; Quintil. 1.4.15 (cf. Paul. Fest. 28, Ter. Scaur. 7.14; Isid. *Orig.* 1.27.4)

Book 6:

VI: *Ann.* 164	quis potis ingentis oras evolvere belli	Quintil. 6.3.86; Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.18; DS *Aen.* 9.528; Diom. (*GLK* 1.385 6)
VI: *Ann.* 165	navos repertus homo, Graio patre, Graius homo, rex	Fest. 168 (as *Ann.* 412)
VI: *Ann.* 168	>ntus in occulto mussabat	Fest. 384, Paul. Fest.131 (as *Ann.* 435)

VI: *Ann.* 169	balantum pecudes quatit, omnes arma requirunt	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.54
†VI[1]: *Ann.* 173 4	†decimo tamen induvolans secum abstulit hasta insigne	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.53
VI: *Ann.* 175 9	incedunt arbusta per alta, securibus caedunt percellunt magnas quercus, exciditur ilex, fraxinus frangitur atque abies consternitur alta, pinus proceras pervortunt: omne sonabat arbustum fremitu silvai frondosai.	Macr. *Sat.* 6.2.27
VI: *Ann.* 191 4	divi hoc audite parumper: ut pro Romano populo prognariter armis certando prudens animam de corpore mitto, <sic>	Non. 150.5
VI: *Ann.* 195 6	aut animo superant atque asp rima fera belli spernant	Schol. Veron. *Aen.* 5.473
VI: *Ann.* 201	sed ego hic animo lamentor	'Donat.' Ter. *Phorm.* 821
VI: *Ann.* 203 4	tum cum corde suo divom pater atque hominum rex effatur	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.10
VI: *Ann.* 205	vertitur interea caelum cum ingentibus signis	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.8
VI: *Ann.* 469 70	non si lingua loqui saperet quibus, ora decem sint in me, tum ferro cor sit pectusque revinctum	Brev. Expos. *G.* 2.43; Schol. Bern. *ibid.*; PHerc. 21 (see Kleve 1990: 5 16)
VI: *Ann.* 555 6	qui fulmine claro omnia per sonitus arcet, terram mare caelum	DS *Aen.* 1.31; PHerc. 21 (see Kleve 1990: 5 16)

[1] The book number given in the text of Macrobius is *sexto decimo*; see Skutsch 1985: 339 40, 32 3 and Kaster 2010: 52.

Book 7:

VII: *Ann.* 211 12	nec quisquam sophiam, sapientia quae perhibetur, in somnis vidit prius quam sam discere coepit	Fest. 432 (as *Ann.* 98 and 422); Paul. Fest. 433
VII: *Ann.* 217	urserat huc navim conpulsam fluctibus pontus	Prisc. 9.50 (*GLK* 2.485 6)
VII: *Ann.* 218	poste recumbite vestraque pectora pellite tonsis	Fest. 488 (as *Ann.* 219)
VII: *Ann.* 219	pone petunt, exim referunt ad pectora tonsas	Fest. 488 (as *Ann.* 218)
VII: *Ann.* 222	sulpureas posuit spiramina Naris ad undas	Prisc. 6.31 (*GLK* 2.222 3)
VII: *Ann.* 223 4	longique cupressi stant rectis foliis et amaro corpore buxum	DS *G.* 2.449
VII: *Ann.* 227 8	qua Galli furtim noctu summa arcis adorti moenia concubia vigilesque repente cruentant	Macr. *Sat.* 1.4.17 18 (as *Ann.* 142)
VII: *Ann.* 229	Marsa manus, Paeligna cohors, Vestina virum vis	Charis. (*GLK* 2.382); (Diom. *GLK* 1.446); Donat. *Art. Gr.* 4.398; *Explan. in Don.* 4.565; Pomp. 5.303; Iul. Tolet. *De vit. et fig.* 5.32
VII: *Ann.* 230	dum censent terrere minis hortantur ibe sos	Fest. 386 8 (as *Ann.* 19, 141, 357)
VII: *Ann.* 232	non semper vostra evortit: nunc Iuppiter hac stat	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.19
VII: *Ann.* 233	fortibus est fortuna viris data	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.62
VII: *Ann.* 236 7	denique vi magna quadrupes, eques atque elephanti proiciunt sese	Gell. 18.5.2 11; Non. 106.26; Macr. *Sat.* 6.9.9; DS *G.* 3.116 (*et aliter*)
VII: *Ann.* 238	alter nare cupit, alter pugnare paratust	Fest. 166 8

VII: *Ann.* 239	deducunt habiles gladios filo gracilento	Non. 116.2
VII: *Ann.* 242	explorant Numidae, totam quatit ungula terram	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.22 (as *Ann.* 263, 431)
VII: *Ann.* 243 4	legio †redditu †rumore †ruinas mox auferre domos populi rumore secundo	Non. 385.2
VII: *Ann.* 245	russescunt frundes	Charis. (*GLK* 1.130)
VII: *Ann.* 246	quianam dictis nostris sententia flexa est?	Fest. 306

Book 8:

VIII: *Ann.* 247 53	proelia promulgantur pellitur e medio sapientia, vi geritur res; spernitur orator bonus, horridus miles amatur; haud doctis dictis certantes, nec maledictis miscent inter sese inimicitias agitantes; non ex iure manu consertum, sed magis ferro rem repetunt regnumque petunt vadunt solida vi	Cic. *Mur.* 30, *Fam.* 7.13.2, *Att.* 15.7; Gell. 20.10.4; Lact. *Inst.* 5.1.5
VIII: *Ann.* 254 5	<monuit res> aut occasus ubi tempusve audere, repressit	Fest. 188 90 (as *Ann.* 123 and 159)
VIII: *Ann.* 258 60	multa dies in bello conficit unus . . . et rursus multae fortunae forte recumbunt: haud quaquam quemquam semper fortuna secuta est	Macr. *Sat.* 6.2.16
VIII: *Ann.* 261	praecox pugna est	Non. 150.18
VIII: *Ann.* 262	certare abnueo: metuo legionibus labem	Diom. (*GLK* 1.382)

VIII: *Ann.* 263	consequitur. summo sonitu quatit ungula terram	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.22 (as *Ann.* 242, 431)
VIII: *Ann.* 264	iamque fere pulvis ad caeli vasta videtur	Non. 217.8 (as *Ann.* 315)
VIII: *Ann.* 265	amplius exaugere obstipo lumine solis	Fest. *Apogr.* 210 (as *Ann.* 419)
VIII: *Ann.* 266	hastati spargunt hastas. fit ferreus imber	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.52
VIII: *Ann.* 267	densantur campis horrentia tela virorum	Prisc. 9.43 (*GLK* 2.480)
VII(!): *Ann.* 268 86	haece locutus vocat quocum bene saepe libenter mensam sermonesque suos rerumque suarum consilium partit, magnam quom lassus diei partem fuisset de summis rebus regundis consilio indu foro lato sanctoque senatu; quoi res audacter magnas parvasque iocumque eloqueretur †et cuncta† malaque et bona dictu evomeret si qui vellet tutoque locaret; quocum multa volup gaudia clamque palamque; ingenium quoi nulla malum sententia suadet ut faceret facinus levis aut mala: doctus fidelis, suavis homo, iucundus, suo contentus, beatus, scitus, secunda loquens in tempore, commodus, verbum paucum, multa tenens antiqua, sepulta vetustas quae facit, et mores veteresque novosque †tenentem multorum veterum leges divomque hominumque prudentem qui dicta loquive tacereve posset: hunc inter pugnas conpellat Servilius sic:	Gell. 12.4
VIII: *Ann.* 288	nunc hostes vino domiti somnoque sepulti	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.20
VIII: *Ann.* 293	tibia Musarum pangit melos	Schol. Bern.Verg. *G.* 4.72

VIII:[2] *Ann.* 294 6	tonsamque tenentes parerent observarent portisculus signum quom dare coepisset	Non. 151.18
VIII: *Ann.* 297	Poenos Didone oriundos	Prisc. 6.18 (*GLK* 2.210)

Book 9:

IX: *Ann.* 298	viri varia validis viribus luctant	Non. 472.5
IX: *Ann.* 300	rastros dente †fabres capsit causa poliendi agri	Non. 66.18
IX: *Ann.* 304 8	additur orator Cornelius suaviloquenti ore Cethegus Marcus Tuditano collega Marci filius. is dictus popularibus ollis qui tum vivebant homines atque aevom agitabant flos delibatus populi Suadaique medulla.	Cic. *Brut.* 57 60; *Sen.* 50; Quintil. 11.3.31; 2.15.4; Gell. 12.2.3
IX: *Ann.* 311	lychnorum lumina bis sex	Macr. *Sat.* 6.4.17
IX: *Ann.* 314	sed quid ego haec memoro? dictum factumque facit frux	Prisc. 6.93 (*GLK* 2.278) (as *Ann.* 423)
IX: *Ann.* 315	pulvis fulva volat	Non. 217.8 (as *Ann.* 264)
IX: *Ann.* 316	praeda exercitus undat	Brev. Expos. *G.* 2.437
IX: *Ann.* 317 18	libertatemque ut perpetuassint †que †maximae†	Non. 150.37

[2] This reading is disputed by Mueller, L. (ed.) (1888), *Noni Marcelli Compendiosa Doctrina*. Leipzig, reporting Merula's conjecture: VII.

IX: *Ann.* 319 20	Cyclopis venter velut olim turserat alte carnibus humanis distentus	Prisc. 9.50 (*GLK* 2.485 6) (as *Ann.* 217)
IX: *Ann.* 321	†debilo homo	Non. 95.30

Book 10:

X: *Ann.* 325	Acanth*us*	Schol. Bern. Verg. *G.* 2.119
X: *Ann.* 326 8	aspectabat virtutem legionis suai expectans si mussaret [dubitaret] quae denique pausa pugnandi fieret aut duri <finis> laboris	DS *G.* 4.188 (as *Ann.* 435 6)
X: *Ann.* 330 1	insignita fere tum milia militum octo duxit delectos bellum tolerare potentes	Prisc. 1.38 (*GLK* 2.30)
X: *Ann.* 332 4	veluti, [si] quando vinclis venatica velox apta dolet si forte <feras> ex nare sagaci sensit, voca sua nictit ululatque ibi acute	Fest. 184
X: *Ann.* 343	regni versatum summam venere columnam	'Donat.' Ter. *Phorm.* 287
X: *Ann.* 344 5	*Pergama* quae neque Dardaniis campis potuere perire nec quom capta capi nec quom combusta cremari	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.60
X: *Ann.* 346	Leucatan campsant	Prisc. 2.541
X: *Ann.* 347	horitatur induperator	Diom. (*GLK* 1.382) (as *Ann.* 424)
X: *Ann.* 348	hinc nox processit stellis ardentibus apta	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.9 (as *Ann.* 27, 145)
X: *Ann.* 349	aegro corde, comis passis	Non. 370.19 (as *Ann.* 490)
X: *Ann.* 350	pinsunt terram genibus	Diom. (*GLK* 1.373)

X: *Ann.* 351	verut	Fest. *Apogr.* 514
X: *Ann.* 352	fiere	Ps. Macr. *Exc. Bob.* (*GLK* 5.645)

Book 11:

XI: *Ann.* 353	quippe solent reges omnes in rebus secundis	Fest. 306 (as *Ann.* 403)
XI: *Ann.* 354	<rimantur> utrique	Fest. 344 6
XI: *Ann.* 355	tum clipei resonunt et ferri stridit acumen	Prisc. 8.96 (*GLK* 2.445), 9.38 (*GLK* 2.473 4) (as *Ann.* 375)
XI: *Ann.* 356	missaque per pectus dum transit striderat hasta	Prisc. 8.60 (*GLK* 2.419)
XI: *Ann.* 357	contendunt Graecos, Graios memorare solent sos	Fest. 386 8 (as *Ann.* 19, 141, 230)
XI: *Ann.* 358	alte delata petrisque ingentibus tecta	Fest. *Apogr.* 226
XI: *Ann.* 359 60	malo cruce, fatur, uti des, Iuppiter	Non. 195.10
XI: *Ann.* 361	et simul erubuit ceu lacte et purpura mixta	Non. 483.1
XI: *Ann.* 362	pendent peniculamenta unum ad quemque pedum	Non. 149.27

Book 12:

XII: *Ann.* 363 5	unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem. noenum rumores ponebat ante salutem. ergo postque magisque viri nunc gloria claret.	Cic. *Off.* 1.84, *Sen.* 10, cf. *Att.* 2.19.2; Livy 30.26.7 9; Suet. *Tib.* 21; Sen. *Benef.* 4.27.2; *Aen.* 6.845, with Serv. *Aen.* 6.845 and Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.23; Ov. *Fast.* 2.240; and others.
XII: *Ann.* 366 8	omnes mortales victores, cordibus vivis laetantes, vino curatos somnus repente in campo passim mollissimus perculit acris	Prisc. 5.17 (GLK 2.153) (as *Ann.* 420); *id.* 6.40 (*GLK* 2.230)

Book 13:

XIII: *Ann.* 371 3	Hannibal audaci cum pectore de me hortatur ne bellum faciam, quem credidit esse meum cor suasorem summum et studiosum robore belli	Gell. 6.2.8 9; Non. 195.17

Book 14:

XIV: *Ann.* 375	litora lata sonunt	Prisc. 9.38 (*GLK* 2.474) (as *Ann.* 355)
XIV: *Ann.* 376	labitur uncta carina, volat super impetus undas	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.51
XIV: *Ann.* 379 80	quom procul aspiciunt hostes accedere ventis navibus velivolis	Macr. *Sat.* 6.5.10
XIV: *Ann.* 381	rumpia	Gell. 10.25.4
XIV: *Ann.* 382 3	nunc est ille dies quom gloria maxima sese nobis ostentat, si vivimus sive morimur	Prisc. 10.8 (*GLK* 2.501)
XIV: *Ann.* 384	horrescit telis exercitus asper utrimque	Macr. *Sat.* 6.4.6
XIV: *Ann.* 385 6	infit: 'o cives, quae me fortuna fero sic contudit indigno bello confecit acerbo . . .'	Prisc. 10.26 (*GLK* 2.518) (as *Ann.* 410 and 520 21)
XIV: *Ann.* 387	omnes occisi occensique in nocte serena	Fest. *Apogr.* 218

Book 15:

XV: *Ann.* 389 90	occumbunt multi letum ferroque lapique aut intra muros aut extra praecipe casu	Prisc. 6.95 (*GLK* 2.281), Ars Anon. Bern. (*GLK* 8.122); Prisc. 6.66 (*GLK* 2.250)

XV: *Ann.* 391 8	undique conveniunt velut imber tela tribuno: configunt parmam, tinnit hastilibus umbo, aerato sonitu galeae, sed nec pote quisquam undique nitendo corpus discerpere ferro. semper abundantes hastas frangitque quatitque. totum sudor habet corpus, multumque laborat, nec respirandi fit copia: praepete ferro Histri tela manu iacientes sollicitabant.	Macr. *Sat.* 6.3.3
XV: *Ann.* 399 400	arcus ubi aspicitur, mortalibus quae perhibetur <Iris>	Prisc.6.74 (*GLK* 2.258 9)

Book 16:

XVI: *Ann.* 401	post aetate pigret sufferre laborem	Non. 219.14
XVI: *Ann.* 402	hebem	Charis. (*GLK* 1.132.6)
XVI: *Ann.* 403	quippe vetusta virum non est satis bella moveri	Fest. 306 (as *Ann.* 353)
XVI: *Ann.* 404 5	reges per regnum statuasque sepulcraque quaerunt, aedificant nomen, summa nituntur opum vi	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.17 (as *Ann.* 151)
XVI: *Ann.* 406	postremo longiqua dies confecerit aetas	Gell. 9.14.5
XVI: *Ann.* 407	primus senex Bradylis regimen, bellique peritus	Fest. 348
XVI: *Ann.* 408	quos ubi rex Epulo spexit de cotibus celsis	Fest. 446; Varro, *LL* 6.82
XVI: *Ann.* 409	qui clamos oppugnantis vagore volanti	Fest. *Apogr.* 514
XVI: *Ann.* 410	ingenio forti dextra latus pertudit hasta	Prisc. 10.26 (*GLK* 2.518) (as *Ann.* 385 6 and 520 21)

XVI: *Ann.* 411	concidit et sonitum simul insuper arma dederunt	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.24
XVI: *Ann.* 412	navorum imperium servare est induperantum	Fest. 168 (as *Ann.* 165)
XVI: *Ann.* 413	non in sperando cupide rem prodere summam	Fest. 254; Paul. Fest. 255
XVI: *Ann.* 414	nox quando mediis signis praecincta volabit	Fest. 310
XVI: *Ann.* 415 16	interea fax occidit Oceanumque rubra tractim obruit aethra	Macr. *Sat.* 6.4.19
XVI: *Ann.* 417	tunc timido manat ex omni corpore sudor	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.50
XVI: *Ann.* 418	matronae moeros complent spectare faventes	DS *G.* 1.18 and 4.230 (as *Ann.* 424 5)
XVI: *Ann.* 419	montibus obstipis obstantibus, unde oritur nox	Fest. *Apogr.* 210 (as *Ann.* 265)
XVI: *Ann.* 420	aestatem autumnus sequitur, post acer hiems it	Prisc. 5.17 (*GLK* 2.153) (as *Ann.* 366 8); Serv. *Aen.* 6.685; *Explan. in Don.* 4.491
XVI: *Ann.* 421	spero si speres quicquam prodesse potis sunt	Fest. 446 (as *Ann.* 134)
XVI: *Ann.* 422	quo res sapsa loco sese ostentatque iubetque	Fest. 432 (as *Ann.* 98 and 211 12); Paul. Fest. 433
XVI: *Ann.* 423	si luci si nox si mox si iam data sit frux	Prisc. 6.93 (*GLK* 2.278) (as *Ann.* 314)
XVI: *Ann.* 424	prandere iubet horiturque	Diom. (*GLK* 1.382) (as *Ann.* 347)
XVI: *Ann.* 425 6	hic insidiantes vigilant, partim requiescunt succincti gladiis, sub scutis, ore faventes	DS *G.* 1.18 and 4.230 (as *Ann.* 418)
XVI: *Ann.* 427	lumen scitus agaso	Fest. 444

Book 17:

XVII: *Ann.* 428	tollitur in caelum clamor exortus utrimque	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.21
XVII: *Ann.* 429	tum cava sub monte late specus intus patebat	Non. 222.25; Prisc. 6.75 (*GLK* 2.260); Fest. 462; Serv. *Aen.* 7.568
XVII: *Ann.* 430	dux ipse vias	Prisc. 6.6 (*GLK* 2.199)
XVII: *Ann.* 431	it eques et plausu cava concutit ungula terram	Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.22 (as *Ann.* 242, 263)
XVII: *Ann.* 435 6	noenu' decet mussare bonos qui facta labore enixi †militiam peperere	Paul. Fest. 131 (as *Ann.* 168); DS *G.* 4.188 (as *Ann.* 326 8), cf. DS *Aen.* 12.657
XVII: *Ann.* 437 8	neque corpora firma longiscunt quicquam	Non. 134.18 (as *Ann.* 439)

Book 18:

XVIII: *Ann.* 440	aere fulva	Gell. 13.21.14, cp. id. 2.26.11
XVIII: *Ann.* 441	degrumare forum	Non. 63.8

Sed. inc. lxx = Gell. 17.21.43:	Claudium et Tuditanum consules sequuntur C. Valerius et C. Mamilius, quibus natum esse Q. Ennium poetam M. Varro in primo de poetis libro scripsit, eumque cum septimum et sexagesimum annum ageret (Fy: haberet δ) duodecimum (XXII eraso X priore X) annalem scripsisse idque ipsum Ennium in eodem libro dicere.

Table A3.2 *Reasonable modern attributions to particular books*

The lines in Appendix Table A3.2, unlike those of Appendix Table A3.1, are not attributed to a particular book of the *Annales* by their source, and they should therefore be used with caution as aids to constructing an outline of the narrative. The determinations I here make as to what is reasonable to attribute to a given book are by and large conservative; they rely on positive indications as regards the matter in either the fragments' quotation-context or in their content (for example, in the occurrence of proper nouns with clear referents and sufficient context minimally to suggest that the lines were presented by the poem's principal narrator). Such positive indications have not in the past tended to limit editors' conjectures about the placement of fragments – in part because of editors' concern to guide readers through the *disiecta membra* in an organised fashion. In the service of this aim, editors have typically adopted a sanguine view of where it is possible to identify referents. They have also tended not to take account of such factors as the possibility of events being referred to out of temporal sequence, whether through the poem's speakers or through flash-backs of any kind. Such considerations, however, have led me to relegate considerably more fragments to Appendix Table A3.3 ('fragments we have no sound means of placing') than are found among the *sed. inc.* of existing editions of the *Annales*. My claim is not that it is impossible to think of possible contexts for the fragments of Appendix Table A3.3 or that the traditional identifications are impossible, but my interest is in re-defining where the line lies between ancient evidence proper and the spectrum constituted by scholarly judgement, scholarly conjecture, scholarly inclination and scholarly wishful thinking. The Appendix Table A3.2 and its implications do nothing to reduce the ultimate blurriness of that line, wherever we place it; but it offers more of a sceptic's view as to what material we have available for gauging

the shape of the narrative. This table, too, necessarily relies on an array, if a more limited array, of assumptions (for example, that the four fragments that survive through the Orosius-manuscripts are placed by their source at the point in Orosius' narrative equivalent to their original Ennian narrative position – something typically assumed but of which there is no guarantee). It should be noted that Appendix Table A3.2 indicates where positive ancient information about fragments' original location exist even in instances where there is reason to doubt the correctness of that information (see e.g. *Ann*. 180–2, p. 328, with the footnote there).

I: *Ann.* 1	Musae quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum	Varro, *LL* 7.5
I: *Ann.* 2	somno leni placidoque revinctus	Fronto, *Ep.* 4.12.4
I: *Ann.* 3	visus Homerus adesse poeta	Cic. *Ac.* 2.51, cf. *ibid.* 88, *Rep.* 6.10, Fronto, *De eloqu.* 2.15
I: *Ann.* 6 7[3]	terra<que> corpus quae dedit ipsa capit neque dispendi facit hilum	Varro, *LL* 5.60, 5.111, 9.54
I: *Ann.* 8 10	ova parire solet genus pennis condecoratum non animam. [et] post inde venit divinitus pullis ipsa anima	Varro, *LL* 5.59; Diomed. (*GLK* 1.383); Prisc. 33 (*GLK* 2.401), cf. *ibid.* 500, 540
I: *Ann.* 11	memini me fiere pavom	Charis. (*GLK* 1.98); 'Donat.' Ter. *Andr.* 429, 'Donat.' Ter. *Ad.* 106, 'Donat.' Ter. *Phorm.* 74
I: *Ann.* 31	olli respondit rex Albai Longai	Atil. Fortun. (*GLK* 6.284); cf. Donat. *Art. Gr.* (*GLK* 4.396), Pomp. *Comm.* 5.297, *Explan. in Don.* (*GLK* 4.547ff.); Ars Anon. Bern. (*GLK* 8.354).
I: *Ann.* 34 50	et cita cum tremulis anus attulit artubus lumen. talia tum memorat lacrimans, exterrita somno: 'Eurydica prognata, pater quam noster amavit, vires vitaque corpus meum nunc deserit omne. nam me visus homo pulcer per amoena salicta et ripas raptare locosque novos. ita sola postilla, germana soror, errare videbar tardaque vestigare et quaerere te neque posse corde capessere: semita nulla pedem stabilibat.	Cic. *Div.* 1.40 41

[3] For this and the following fragment, see the argument of Chapter 3, pp. 144 51. The primary question is whether they belong to the *Annales* at all; if they do belong, it is reasonable to locate them in the proem.

	exim compellare pater me voce videtur his verbis: 'o gnata, tibi sunt ante gerendae aerumnae, post ex fluvio fortuna resistet.' haec ecfatus pater, germana, repente recessit nec sese dedit in conspectum corde cupitus, quamquam multa manus ad caeli caerula templa tendebam lacrumans et blanda voce vocabam. vix aegro cum corde meo me somnus reliquit.'	
I: *Ann.* 54 5	unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli templa	Varro, *LL* 7.5 6; cf. Ovid *Met.* 14.806, *Fast.* 2.485.
I: *Ann.* 56	at Ilia reddita nuptum	DS *Aen.* 3.333 (as *Ann.* 452)
I: *Ann.* 60	Ilia, dia nepos, quas aerumnas tetulisti	Charis. (*GLK* 1.90); *Explan. in Don.* (*GLK* 4.563.14), Non. 215.6; Fest. 364 (as *Ann.* 166, 65, 562); cf. Fest. 462, Prisc. 6.68 (*GLK* 2.253)
I: *Ann.* 61 2	cetera quos peperisti ne cures	DS *Aen.* 9.653
I: *Ann.* 71	occiduntur. ubi potitur ratus Romulus praedam	Fest. 340
I: *Ann.* 104	o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne tulisti	Prisc. 12.23 (*GLK* 2.591), Pomp. *Comm.* (*GLK* 5.303), *Explan. in Don.* (*GLK* 4.565), Isid. *Orig.* 1.36.14; (without attribution to Ennius) *Rhet. Her.* 4.18, Charis. (*GLK* 1.282), Donat. *Art. Gr.* (*GLK* 4.398), etc.
II: *Ann.* 113	olli respondit suavis sonus Egeriai	Varro, *LL* 7.42
II: *Ann.* 114 15	mensas constituit idemque ancilia libaque, fictores, Argeos, et tutulatos	Varro, *LL* 7.43, 44 (the lines are not given continuously); Fest. 484 6; Paul. Fest. 483; cf. DS *Aen.* 2.683.
II: *Ann.* 116 18	Volturnalem Palatualem Furinalem Floralemque Falacrem<que> et Pomonalem fecit hic idem	Varro, *LL* 7.45

III: *Ann.* 147	exin Tarquinium bona femina lavit et unxit	Serv. *Aen.* 6.219; 'Donat.' Ter. *Hec.* 135
IV: *Ann.* 154 5	septingenti sunt, paulo post aut minus, anni augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est	Varro, *RR* 3.1.2 ff.; Suet. *Aug.* 7
V: Ann. 156	moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque	Aug. *Civ.* 2.21, referring to Cic. *Rep.* 5; *Hist. Aug.* Avid. Cass. 5.7 (*Divi Marci epistula*)
V: *Ann.* 158	quom nihil horridius umquam lex ulla iuberet	Ekkehartus IV ad Oros. *Hist.* 3.9.5, copying an unknown reader of Ennius (of c. 5 6? See Norden 1915: 79 89)
V: Ann. 160	bellum aequis [de] manibus nox intempesta diremit	Ps. Acro, Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.98
VI: *Ann.* 167	aio te Aeacida Romanos vincere posse	Cic. *Div.* 2.116 (as *Ann.* 197 8); Quintil. 7.8.6; Vel. Long. (*GLK* 7.55); 'Porph.' Hor. *Ars P.* 403; Prisc. 18.65 (*GLK* 3.234)
VI: *Ann.* 180 2[4]	qui antehac invicti fuere viri, pater optume Olympi, hos ego vi pugna vici victusque sum ab isdem	Oros. *Hist.* 4.1.14 (not attributing the lines to Ennius)
VI: *Ann.* 183 90	nec mi aurum posco nec mi pretium dederitis: non cauponantes bellum sed belligerantes ferro, non auro vitam cernamus utrique. vosne velit an me regnare era quidve ferat Fors virtute experiamur, et hoc simul accipe dictum: quorum virtuti belli fortuna pepercit eorundem me libertati me parcere certum est. dono ducite doque volentibus cum magnis dis.	Cic. *Off.* 1.38; cf. Serv. *Aen.* 10.532, for *Ann.* 188 and Serv. *Aen.* 12.709, for *Ann.* 185
VI: *Ann.* 197 8	stolidum genus Aeacidarum: bellipotentes sunt magis quam sapientipotentes	Cic. *Div.* 2.116 (as *Ann.* 167)

[4] The source here makes the fragment Pyrrhus' inscription in the temple of Jupiter at Tarentum, dedicated after his bitter victory at Heraclea in 280 BCE. The fragment's vocative, however, possibly casts doubt on the idea that the lines are to be attributed to Ennius, doubt that is exacerbated in consideration of this source's distance from the original text of the *Annales* not to mention the fact that an attribution to Ennius is absent from the quotation context.

VI: *Ann.* 199 200	quo vobis mentes, rectae quae stare solebant antehac, dementes sese flexere †via	Cic. *Sen.* 16
VII: *Ann.* 206 7[5]	scripsere alii rem vorsibus quos olim Faunei vatesque canebant	Cic. *Brut.* 75 6, *Orat.* 157, *Brut.* 71, *Orat.* 171 (as *Ann.* 208 9, 210); Varro, *LL* 7.36; Cic. *Div.* 1.114; Quintil. 9.4.115; *Orig.* 4.4 5; cp. Fest. 432, Mar. Victorin. (*GLK* 6.138 f.), Ps. Placid. F15
VII: *Ann.* 208 9	[cum] neque Musarum scopulos nec dicti studiosus [quisquam erat] ante hunc	Cic. *Brut.* 71, *Orat.* 171 (as *Ann.* 206 7, 210)
VII: *Ann.* 210	nos ausi reserare	Cic. *Orat.* 171 (as *Ann.* 206 7, 208 9)
VII: *Ann.* 213	quantis consiliis quantumque potesset in armis	Ekkehartus IV ad Oros. *Hist.* 4.6.21
VII: *Ann.* 220 21	corpore tartarino prognata paluda virago cui par imber et ignis, spiritus et gravis terra	Ps. Probus, Verg. *Ecl.* 6.31; Varro, *LL* 7.37; Fest. *Apogr.* 494
VII: *Ann.* 227 8	postquam Discordia taetra belli ferratos postes portasque refregit	Serv. *Aen.* 7.622, with Hor. *Sat.* 1.4.60; cf. 'Porphyrio' and Acro ad loc.
VII: *Ann.* 234	hostem qui feriet †erit (inquit) mi† Carthaginiensis quisquis erit. cuiatis siet	Cic. *Balb.* 51
VIII: *Ann.* 290	Quintus pater quartum fit consul	Gell. 10.1.6; Non. 435.12; cf. Cic. *Att.* 12.5.1.
IX: *Ann.* 303	tunicata iuventus	Gell. 6.12.6 7
X: *Ann.* 322 3	insece Musa manu Romanorum induperator quod quisque in bello gessit cum rege Philippo	Gell. 18.9.3 5
X: *Ann.* 340 42	rursus vos reddite nobis, o Epirotae *(de unaquaque re ut videamus quid)* pastores a Pergamide Maledove potis sint	Varro, *RR* 2.2.1
?VIII: *Ann.* 474 5	at non sic dubius fuit hostis Aeacida Burrus	Supralinear addition to Cod. Sang. 621 s. IX (Oros. *Hist.* 4.14.3)

[5] See, however, Valmaggi's interpretation, reported by Skutsch 1985: 370, which would bear on our ability to place this fragment.

Table A3.3 *Fragments we have no sound means of placing (*See the introduction to Table A3.2.*)*

I: x	rotam volvere per annos	Serv. *Aen*. 6. 748
I: *Ann*. 14	quom veter occubuit Priamus sub Marte Pelasgo	Prisc. 3.21 (*GLK* 2.97); Ars Anon. Bern. (*GLK* 8.81)
I: *Ann*. 15 16	doctus†que Anchisesque Venus quem pulcra dearum fari donavit, divinum pectus habere	Ps. Probus, *Ecl*. 6.31; Schol. Veron. *Aen*. 2.687; Sacerdos (*GLK* 6.450); cf. Schol. cod. Par. lat. 7930; (Cynthius Cenet. in *Aen*. 2.687)
I: *Ann*. 21	Saturnia terra	Varro, *LL* 5.42; cf. Fest. 430
I: *Ann*. 22	quam Prisci, casci populi, tenuere Latini	Varro, *LL* 7.28; Cic. *Tusc*. 1.27; Hieron. *Epist*. 8.1; cf. *CGL* VI p. 185.
I: *Ann*. 23 4	Saturno quem Caelus genuit	Non. 197.2; Charis. (*GLK* 1.72) (as *Ann*. 559)
I: *Ann*. 25	cum †suo obsidio magnus Titanus premebat	Non. 216.31
I: *Ann*. 28 9	Assaraco natus Capys optimus isque pium ex se Anchisen generat	DS *G*. 3.35; cf. DS *Aen*. 1.273., serv 6.777, DS *Aen.* 8.130.
I: *Ann*. 30	quos homines quondam Laurentis terra recepit	Prisc. 7.61 (*GLK* 2.337 8)
I: *Ann*. 51	cenacula maxuma caeli	Tertull. *Adv. Valent*. 7.1
I: *Ann*. 52	bipatentibus	Serv. *Aen*. 10.5
I: *Ann*. 53	respondit Iuno Saturnia, sancta dearum	Serv. *Aen*. 4.576; Donat. *Art. Gr*. 4.394, whence *Explan. in Don*. 4.563; Pomp. *Comm*. (*GLK* 5.291), Sacerd. (*GLK* 6.450)
I: *Ann*. 69 70	pars ludicre saxa iactant inter se licitantur	Non. 134.11
I: *Ann*. 110 11	Romulus in caelo cum dis genitalibus aevom degit	Serv. *Aen*. 6.763; Cic. *Tusc*. 1.28, cf. Cic. *De or*. 3.154; CIL IV 3135, 7353, 8568, 8995
II: *Ann*. 120	Mettoeo<que> Fufetioeo	Quintil. 1.5.12

II: *Ann.* 121	quianam legiones caedimus ferro	DS *Aen.* 10.6
II: *Ann.* 124	tractatus per aequora campi	Ps. Macr. *Exc. Bob.* (*GLK* 5.651)
II: *Ann.* 125 6	volturus in †spineto† miserum mandebat homonem: heu quam crudeli condebat membra sepulcro	Prisc. 6.15 (*GLK* 2.206); Charis. (*GLK* 1.147); Serv. *Aen.* 6.595
III: *Ann.* 137	postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliquit	Fest. 388
IV: *Ann.* 150	et qui se sperat Romae regnare Quadratae	Fest. 310 12
IV: *Ann.* 152	Volsculus perdidit Anxur	Paul. Fest. 20
V: *Ann.* 157	cives Romani tunc facti sunt Campani	*Fragm. de Metr.* (*GLK* 6.612)
VI: *Ann.* 170 2	proletarius publicitus scutisque feroque ornatur ferro. muros urbemque forumque excubiis curant	Gell. 16.10.1 2, 5; Non. 155.19
VI: *Ann.* 202	orator sine pace redit regique refert rem	Varro, *LL* 7.41 (as *Ann.* 593)
VII: *Ann.* 214	Poeni soliti suos sacrificare puellos	Fest. 290 92; Paul. Fest. 291; Non. 158.14
VII: *Ann.* 216	Appius indixit Carthaginiensibus bellum	Cic. *Inv.* 27
VII: *Ann.* 231	inde Parum sim>ulabant	Fest. 362 (as *Ann.* 127, 478, 540)
VII: *Ann.* 240 1	Iuno Vesta Minerva Ceres Diana Venus Mars Mercurius Iovis Neptunus Volcanus Apollo	Apul. *De Deo Socr.* 2; (Mart. Cap. 1.42)
VIII: *Ann.* 256 7	vel tu dictator vel equorum equitumque magister esto vel consul	Paul. Fest. 507
VIII: *Ann.* 287	his pernas succidit iniqua superbia Poeni	Fest. 396, Paul. Fest. 397
VIII: *Ann.* 289	summus ibi capitur meddix, occiditur alter	Paul. Fest. 110

VIII: *Ann.* 291	de muris rem gerit Opscus	Fest. *Apogr.* 218; cf. *ibid.* 204.
VIII: *Ann.* 292	ob Romam noctu legiones ducere coepit	Fest. 188; Paul. Fest. 184; Fest. *Apogr.* 206; cf. Paul. Fest. 133, CGL 5.573.45f.
IX: *Ann.* 302	Europam Libyamque rapax ubi dividit unda	Cic. *Tusc.* 1.45; *Nat. D.* 3.24
IX: *Ann.* 309	Africa terribili tremit horrida terra tumultu	Cic. *De or.* 3.167, *Fam.* 9.7.2, *Orat.* 93; Fest. 138
IX: *Ann.* 310	perculsi pectora Poeni	Columna, ed. *Q. Ennii fragmenta* (Naples 1585: p. 239)
IX: *Ann.* 312 13	mortalem summum Fortuna repente reddidit †summo regno famul †ut †optimus esset	Non. 110.8
X: *Ann.* 329	egregie cordatus homo, catus Aelius Sextus	Cic. *Rep.* 1.30, *De or.* 1.198, *Tusc.* 1.18; Varro, *LL* 7.46
XIII: *Ann.* 369	isque Hellesponto pontem contendit in alto	Varro, *LL* 7.21
XIII: *Ann.* 370	salsas lamas	DS *Aen.* 2.173; Schol. Veron. *ibid.*
XVII: *Ann.* 439	quom soles eadem facient longiscere longe	Non. 134.18 (as *Ann.* 437 8)
?I: *Ann.* 442	ei mihi (?qualis erat)	Serv. *Aen.* 2.274
?I: *Ann.* 443	nobis unde forent fructus vitaeque propagmen	Non. 64.29, 221.8
?I: *Ann.* 444	o genitor noster, Saturnie, maxime divom	Prisc. 17.201 (*GLK* 3.205)
?I: *Ann.* 445	optima caelicolum, Saturnia, magna dearum	Prisc. 11.166 (*GLK* 3.192)
?1: *Ann.* 446 7	Iuppiter hic risit tempestatesque serenae riserunt omnes risu Iovis omnipotentis	DS *Aen.* 1.254
?I: *Ann.* 448	fici dulciferae lactantes ubere toto	Iul. Roman. ap. Charis. (*GLK* 1.128)

?I: *Ann.* 449	qua murum fieri voluit urguemur in unum	Non. 418.3
?I: *Ann.* 450	iam cata signa fere sonitum dare voce parabant	Varro, *LL* 7.46 (as *Ann.* 329 and 543)
?II: *Ann.* 451	at tuba terribili sonitu taratantara dixit	Serv. *Aen.* 9.503; Prisc. 8.103 (*GLK* 2.45)
?II: *Ann.* 452	isque dies †aut marcus† quam regna recepit	DS *Aen.* 3.333 (as *Ann.* 56)
?II: *Ann.* 453	et Tiberis flumen <flavom> vomit in mare salsum	Macr. *Sat.* 6.4.3 re. *G.* 2.462
?IV: *Ann.* 454	erip˘ ˘ patres pueris plorantibus offam	Pliny, *NH* 18.84
?V: *Ann.* 455	aqua est aspersa Latinis	Charis. (*GLK* 1.240)
?VI: *Ann.* 456	quem nemo ferro potuit superare nec auro	Cic. *Rep.* 3.6
?VI: *Ann.* 457	Brundisium pulcro praecinctum praepete portu	Gell. 7.6.6 (as *Ann.* 89 [Gell. 7.6.9]); cf. Gell. 9.4.1
?VII: *Ann.* 458	neque me decet hanc carinantibus edere chartis	DS *Aen.* 8.361 (as *Ann.* 576)
?VII: *Ann.* 459 60	ços Grai memo li>ngua longos per	Fest. 362 (as *Ann.* 471)
?VII: *Ann.* 461	sed sola terrarum postquam permensa parumper	Fest. 386 (as *Ann.* 138); cf. Varro, *LL* 5.22
?VII: *Ann.* 462	et melior navis quam quae stlataria portat	G. Valla (ed. 1486) *ad* Iuv. *Sat.* 7.134; Schol. Cod. Leid. 82 (*ibid.*).
?VII: *Ann.* 463 4	quom a carcere fusi currus cum sonitu magno permittere certant	Schol. Bern. *G.* 1.512
?VII: *Ann.* 465	quomque gubernator magna contorsit equos vi	Quintil. 8.6.9; Charis. (*GLK* 1.272); Diom. (*GLK* 1.457); Sacerd. (*GLK* 6.466)
?VII: *Ann.* 466	ingenti vadit cursu qua redditus termo est	Fest. *Apogr.* 498 (as *Ann.* 467)

?VII: *Ann.* 467	hortatore bono prius quam sam finibus termo	Fest. *Apogr.* 498 (as *Ann.* 466)
?VII: *Ann.* 468	et detondit agros laetos atque oppida cepit	Prisc. 9.46 (*GLK* 2.482)
?VII: *Ann.* 471	Hispane non Romane memoretis loqui me	Fest. 362 (as *Ann.* 459 60); Charis. (*GLK* 1.200)
?VIII: *Ann.* 473	consiluere	Paul. Fest. 51
?VIII: *Ann.* 476	quom illud quo iam semel est imbuta veneno	Fest. *Apogr.* 516
?VIII: *Ann.* 477	Bruttace bilingui	Paul. Fest. 31; 'Porph.' Hor. *Sat.* 1.10.30
?VIII: *Ann.* 478	rigido<que Calore>	Fest. 362 (as *Ann.* 127, 231, 540)
?VIII: *Ann.* 479	incedit veles volgo sicilibus latis	Paul. Fest. 453
?IX: *Ann.* 480	nostri cessere parumper	*Bell. Hispan.* 23.2
?X: *Ann.* 481	animusque in pectore latrat	Varro, *LL* 7.103 4 (as *Ann.* 545, 594, 595)
?XIII: *Ann.* 482	contempsit fontes quibus ex erugit aquae vis	Ps. Macr. *Exc. Bob.* (*GLK* 5.651); *Exc. Par.* 5.626; cf. Paul. Fest. 73
?XIV: *Ann.* 483 4	oscitat in campis caput a cervice revulsum semianimesque micant oculi lucemque requirunt	Serv. *Aen.* 10.396
?XIV: *Ann.* 485 6	quomque caput caderet carmen tuba sola peregit et pereunte viro raucum sonus aere cucurrit	Lact. Stat. *Theb.* 11.56
?XV: *Ann.* 487	Musas quas memorant nosce nos esse Camenas	Varro, *LL* 7.25
?XVI: *Ann.* 488 9	rex deinde citatus convellit sese	DS *Aen.* 11.19
??: *Ann.* 490	<passis> late palmis pater	Non. 370.19 (as *Ann.* 349)

??: *Ann.* 491	exin per terras postquam celerissimus rumor	Prisc. 7.57 (*GLK* 2.334 5)
??: *Ann.* 492	quis pater aut cognatus volet nos contra tueri	Varro, *LL* 7.12
??: *Ann.* 493	avorsabuntur semper vos vostraque volta	Non. 230.15
??: *Ann.* 494 5	audire est operae pretium procedere recte qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere voltis	'Porph.' Hor. *Sat.* 1.2.37; Varro, *Men.* 542 ap. Non. 478.16; (Mart. Cap. 3.272)
??: *Ann.* 496 7	tibi vita seu mors in mundo est	Charis. (*GLK* 2.201); cf. Paul. Fest. 97
??: *Ann.* 498	flentes plorantes lacrumantes obtestantes	*Rhet. Her.* 4.18; Diom. (*GLK* 1.447); Charis. (*GLK* 1.282); Donat. *Art. Gr.* 4.398; etc.
??: *Ann.* 499	quom sese exsiccat somno Romana iuventus	Lact. Stat. *Theb.* 6.27
??: *Ann.* 500 1	omnes corde patrem debent animoque benigno circum sum	'Donat.' Ter. *Phorm.* 1028
??: *Ann.* 502	it nigrum campis agmen	Serv. *Aen.* 4.404
??: *Ann.* 503	redinunt	Fest. 362, with Paul. Fest. 363
??: *Ann.* 504	idem campus habet textrinum navibus longis	DS *Aen.* 11.326; Cic. *Orat.* 157
??: *Ann.* 505	labitur uncta carina per aequora cana celocis	Isid. *Orig.* 19.1.22
??: *Ann.* 506	impetus haud longe mediis regionibus restat	Fest. 356
??: *Ann.* 507	haud temere est quod tu tristi cum corde gubernas	DS *Aen.* 9.327
??: *Ann.* 508	dum clavom rectum teneam navemque gubernem	Isid. *Orig.* 19.2.12; Quintil. 2.17.24
??: *Ann.* 509	cum magno strepitu Volcanum ventus vegebat	Fest. 138

??: *Ann.* 510	terrai frugiferai	Charis. (*GLK* 1.19); Anon. Bobiens. (*GLK* 1.538); cf. Sacerd. (*GLK* 6.449); Fragm. Bob. (*GLK* 5.555); Martial. 11.90.5
??: *Ann.* 511	capitibus nutantis pinos rectosque cupressos	Gell. 13.21.13; Non. 195.21
??: *Ann.* 512	multa foro ponet et agea. longa repletur	Isid. *Orig.* 19.2.4; cf. Paul. Fest. 9
??: *Ann.* 513	qui vincit non est victor nisi victus fatetur	DS *Aen.* 11.306
??: *Ann.* 514	dum equidem unus homo Romanus toga superescit	Fest. 394; Paul. Fest. 395
??: *Ann.* 515 16	ratibusque fremebat imber Neptuni	DS *Aen.* 1.123, 11.299 and *G.* 1.12
??: *Ann.* 517	tonsillas apiunt, configunt litus, aduncas	Isid. *Orig.* 19.2.14
??: *Ann.* 518	navibus explebant sese terrasque replebant	Serv. *Aen.* 6.545
??: *Ann.* 519	succincti corda machaeris	Serv. *Aen.* 9.678
??: *Ann.* 520 1	viresque valentes contu<n>dit crudelis hiems	Prisc. 10.26 (*GLK* 2.517 18) (as *Ann.* 385 6 and 410)
??: *Ann.* 522 3	sicuti fortis equos spatio qui saepe supremo vicit Olympia nunc senio confectus quiescit	Cic. *Sen.* 14
??: *Ann.* 524	Messap*us*	Serv. *Aen.* 7.691
??: *Ann.* 525	nos sumus Romani qui fuimus ante Rudini	Cic. *De or.* 3.168 (as *Ann.* 560 1)
??: *Ann.* 526	Illyrii restant sicis sybinisque fodentes	Paul. Fest. 453
??: *Ann.* 527	succincti gladiis, media regione cracentes	Paul. Fest. 46
??: *Ann.* 528	leves sequuntur in hastis	DS *Aen.* 5.37
??: *Ann.* 529	tergus †igitur sagus pinguis opertat	Non. 223.32

??: *Ann.* 530	sagus caerulus	Charis. (*GLK* 1.105)
??: *Ann.* 531	spiras legionibus nexit	Fest. 444; Paul. Fest. 445
??: *Ann.* 532	vortant crateras aenos	Serv. *Aen.* 9.163
??: *Ann.* 533	dictis Romanis incutit iram	DS *Aen.* 1.69
??: *Ann.* 534	irarum effunde quadrigas	Serv. *Aen.* 12.499
??: *Ann.* 535 9	et tum, sicut equos qui de praesepibus fartus vincla suis magnis animis abrumpit et inde fert sese campi per caerula laetaque prata celso pectore; saepe iubam quassat simul altam, spiritus ex anima calida spumas agit albas	Macr. *Sat.* 6.3.7 8
??: *Ann.* 540	unus surum Surus ferre, tamen defendere possent	Fest. 362 (as *Ann.* 127, 231, 478)
??: *Ann.* 541	tum tonuit laevom bene tempestate serena	Cic. *Div.* 2.82; Varro, *Men.* 103 (*ap.* Non. 408.3)
??: *Ann.* 542	tantidem quasi feta canes sine dentibus latrat	Varro, *LL* 7.32
??: *Ann.* 543	tunc coepit memorare simul cata dicta	Varro, *LL* 7.46 (as *Ann.* 329 and 450)
??: *Ann.* 544	inde loci lituus sonitus effudit acutos	Paul. Fest. 103
??: *Ann.* 545	clamor ad caelum volvendus per aethera vagit	Varro, *LL* 7.103 104 (as *Ann.* 481, 594 and 595)
??: *Ann.* 546	pandite sulti genas et corde relinquite somnum	Fest. 462
??: *Ann.* 547	invictus ca<nis nare sagax et vi>ribus fretus	Fest. 426
??: *Ann.* 548	aut permarceret paries percussus trifaci	Paul. Fest. 504

??: *Ann.* 549	sicuti siquis ferat vas vini dimidiatum	Gell. 3.14.5
??: *Ann.* 550	atque atque accedit muros Romana iuventus	Gell. 10.29.2; Non. 530.2
??: *Ann.* 551 2	fortunasque suas coepere latrones inter se memorare	Non. 134.9
??: *Ann.* 553	effudit voces proprio cum pectore sancto	Serv. *G.* 2.424
??: *Ann.* 554	contremuit templum magnum Iovis altitonantis	Varro, *LL* 7.7
??: *Ann.* 557	quae valide veniunt falarica missa	Non. 555.14
??: *Ann.* 558	vix solum complere cohum torroribus caeli	Isid. *Nat. Rer.* 12.3
??: *Ann.* 559	fortis Romani sunt quamquam caelus profundus	Non. 197.2; (*GLK* Charis. 1.72) (as *Ann.* 23)
??: *Ann.* 560 1	at Romanus homo, tamenetsi res bene gesta est, corde suo trepidat	Cic. *De or.* 3.168 (as *Ann.* 525)
??: *Ann.* 562	nec metus ulla tenet, freti virtute quiescunt	Non. 214.9
??: *Ann.* 563	optima cum pulchris animis Romana iuventus	'Donat.' Ter. *Phorm.* 465
??: *Ann.* 564 5	nam me gravis impetus Orci percutit in latus	DS *Aen.* 1.81
??: *Ann.* 566 7	tanto sublatae sunt a<u>gmine tunc lapides	Non. 211.10
??: *Ann.* 569	olli cernebant magnis de rebus agentes	Serv. *Aen.* 12.709
??: *Ann.* 570	perque fabam repunt et mollia crura reponunt	Serv. *G.* 3.76
??: *Ann.* 571	interea fugit albus iubar Hyperionis cursum	Prisc. 5.44 (*GLK* 2.170)
??: *Ann.* 572	inde patefecit radiis rota candida cursum	Isid. *Orig.* 18.36.3

??: *Ann.* 573	hos pestis necuit, pars occidit illa duellis	Prisc. 9.34 (*GLK* 2.470)
??: *Ann.* 574	omnes mortales sese laudarier optant	Aug. *Ep.* 231.3, *De Trin.* 13.3.6
??: *Ann.* 576	contra carinantes verba atque obscena profatus	DS *Aen.* 8.361 (as *Ann.* 458)
??: *Ann.* 577	cum legionibus quom proficiscitur induperator	Cassiod. (*GLK* 7.207)
??: *Ann.* 578	flamma loci postquam concussa est turbine saevo	Schol. Bemb. Ter. *Heaut.* 257 (p. 60 Mountford)
??: *Ann.* 579	huic statuam statui maiorum †orbatur† athenis	Consent. (*GLK* 5.400)
??: *Ann.* 580	silvarum saltus latebras lamasque lutosas	Ps. Acro Hor. *Ep.* 1.13.10
??: *Ann.* 581	atque manu magna Romanos impulit amnis	Schol. Veron. *Aen.* 5.241
??: *Ann.* 582	pila retunduntur venientibus obvia pilis	Comm. Bern. in Lucan 1.6
??: *Ann.* 583	decretum est stare <et fossari> corpora telis	Varro, *LL* 7.100
??: *Ann.* 584	premitur pede pes atque armis arma teruntur	*Bell. Hispan.* 31.7
??: *Ann.* 585	laetificum gau	Auson. *Technop.* 15
??: *Ann.* 586	divom domus, altisonum cael	Auson. *Technop.* 15
??: *Ann.* 587	endo suam do	Auson. *Technop.* 15; cf. Charis. (*GLK* 1.278), Diom. (*GLK* 1.441), Mar. Victorin. (*GLK* 6.56), *De ult. syll.* (*GLK* 4.263); Consent. (*GLK.* 5.388)
??: *Ann.* 588	frun	Auson. *Technop.* 15
??: *Ann.* 589	ausus es hoc ex ore tuo	Cic. *Att.* 6.2.8

??: *Ann.* 590	urbes magnas atque imperiosas	Cic. *Rep.* 1.3
??: *Ann.* 591	divomque hominumque pater, rex	Varro, *LL* 5.65
??: *Ann.* 592	patrem divomque hominumque	Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.4, 64
??: *Ann.* 593	oratores doctiloqui	Varro, *LL* 7.41 (as *Ann.* 202)
??: *Ann.* 594	clamore bovantes	Varro, *LL* 7.103 4 (as *Ann.* 481, 545, 595)
??: *Ann.* 595	pausam fecere fremendi	Varro, *LL* 7.103 4 (as *Ann.* 481, 545, 594)
??: *Ann.* 596	adgretus fari	Paul. Fest. 6
??: *Ann.* 597	runata recedit	Paul. Fest. 317
??: *Ann.* 598	sospite> liber	Fest. 388; Paul. Fest. 389
??: *Ann.* 599	equitatus iit celerissimus	Charis. (*GLK* 1.83)
??: *Ann.* 600	iamque fere quattuor partum	Charis. (*GLK* 1.141)
??: *Ann.* 601	furentibus ventis	Serv. *Aen.* 1.51
??: *Ann.* 602	fluctusque natantes	Serv. *Aen.* 6.705
??: *Ann.* 603	heia machaeras	Serv. *Aen.* 9.37
??: *Ann.* 604	ipsus ad armentas eosdem	Non. 190.20; Paul. Fest. 4
??: *Ann.* 605	(quem) non virtutis egentem	Serv. *Aen.* 11.27
??: *Ann.* 606	funduntque elatis naribus lucem	Serv. *Aen.* 12.115; Mar. Victorin. (*GLK* 6.28)

??: *Ann.* 607	teloque trabali	DS *Aen.* 12.294
??: *Ann.* 608	aplustra	Gloss. Philox. AP 7
??: *Ann.* 609	Anionem	Serv. *Aen.* 7.683
??: *Ann.* 610	ambactus	Paul. Fest. 4
??: *Ann.* 611	tetros elephantos	Isid. *Orig.* 10.270
??: *Ann.* 612	stant pulvere campi	'Porph.' Hor. *Carm.* 1.9.1
??: *Ann.* 613 14	nec retrahi ˘ ˘ ˘ potestur imperiis	Diom. (*GLK* 1.385)
??: *Ann.* 615	ab laeva rite probatum	Schol. Bern. *G.* 4.7
??: *Ann.* 616	haec abnu(eram)	Schol. Veron. *Aen.* 10.8
??: *Ann.* 617	rex ambas ultra fossam protendere coepit	Sacerd. (*GLK* 6.468)
??: *Ann.* 618	despoliantur eos et corpora nuda relinquont	Donat. *Art. Gr.* (*GLK* 4.394); *Explan. in Don.* (*GLK* 4.564); etc.
??: *Ann.* 619	vosque Lares tectum nostrum qui funditus curant	Charis. (*GLK* 1.267)
??: *Ann.* 620	machina multa minax minitatur maxima muris	Diom. (*GLK* 1.447)
??: *Ann.* 621	olli creterris ex auratis hauserunt	*Fragm. de Metr.* (*GLK* 6.615)
??: *Ann.* 622	viden <ut>	Serv. *Aen.* 6.779
??: *Ann.* 623	crebrisuro	Paul. Fest. 51

APPENDIX 4

The chronology of the sources

Table A4.1 *The pre-Vergilian sources for the* Annales

Appendix 4 and Appendix 5 chart the sources for the surviving material constituting Skutsch's edition of the *Annales*. Sources that provide testimonia only are excluded, although I have included, as a lone exception, the scholia to Persius, which provide the most transparent information we have available about the proem to the *Annales* and which in other ways, too, are linked into the network of sources for the text.

In aggregate, the pre-Vergilian sources are responsible for roughly a quarter of our direct evidence for the text.

Author (date BCE)	**Number of quotations (lines) for which the author is the sole or leading source**	**Rough % of total surviving lines of the *Annales***
Rhetorica ad Herennium (? *c.* 86 2)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Varro (116 27)	27 (37)	6
Cicero (106 43)	31 (96)	15.4
Bellum Hispaniense (soon after 45)	2 (2)	< 0.5

Varro Herz.-Schm. § 284

Title of the work (date BCE)	Number of quotations (lines) of the *Annales* the text contains	Rough % of total surviving lines of the *Annales*
De Lingua Latina (before Cicero's death, probably 43)	25 (32)	5
De Re Rustica (37)	2 (5)	< 1

Cicero

Title of Cicero's work (date BCE)	Number of quotations (lines) of the *Annales* the text contains	Rough percentage of the total surviving lines of the *Annales*
Speeches		
Pro Balbo (56)	1 (1)	> 0.5
Philosophical works		
De Oratore (55)	4 (5)[1]	0.8
De Republica (51)	5 (10)[2]	1.5
Academica Priora (45)	2 (2)	> 0.5
Tusc. Disp. (45)	2 (2)[3]	> 0.5
De Natura Deorum (45)	2 (2)	> 0.5
De Senectute (44)	6 (12)[4]	2
De Officiis (44)	2 (11)[5]	1.7
De Divinatione (43)	6 (42)[6]	6.7

[1] 1 of these lines, *Ann.* 329, appears equally in *Rep.* and *Tusc.*; another (*Ann.* 309) appears equally in *Fam.*

[2] 1 of these lines, *Ann.* 329, is equally accessible through *De or.* 1.198 and *Tusc.* 1.18. Another, *Ann.* 156, is today accessible through Augustine, *Civ.* 2.21, who has taken it directly from the proem to *Rep.*

[3] Both lines are also transmitted in equally satisfactory form in other Ciceronian texts: *Ann.* 329 at *De or.* 1.198 and *Rep.* 1.30 and *Ann.* 302 at *Nat. D.* 3.24.

[4] Cic. *Off.* 1.84 is an equally good source for *Ann.* 363–5, and the first line of the fragment is frequently quoted or played on in later authors. In addition to the lines listed here, Cicero at *Sen.* 50 also contributes to the transmission of *Ann.* 308, which is, however, part of a 5-line fragment for which Cicero, *Brut.* 57–60 is by far our most important source.

[5] See n. 4, above.

[6] For 1 of these lines, *Ann.* 207, the transmission at *Div.* 1.114 is only partially responsible; our knowledge of the fragment *Ann.* 206–7 is constituted from a variety of quotations in different constellations in the *Brutus*, the *Orator*, and in Varro.

Rhetorical works

De Inventione (80s)	1 (1)	> 0.5
Brutus (46)	3 (9)[7]	1.4
Orator (46)	3 (3)[8]	0.5

Letters

Ad Atticum 6.2.8 (50)	1 (1)	> 0.5
Ad Familiares 9.7.2 (46)	1 (1)[9]	> 0.5

[7] For 2 lines (*Ann.* 207–8), Varro and Cicero's *Orat.* and *Div.* are also a significant primary sources.
[8] For 2 lines (*Ann.* 207–8), Varro and Cicero's *Brut.* and *Div.* are also significant primary sources.
[9] This line (*Ann.* 309) is supplied in equally good form at *De or.* 3.167, as well as by Festus, and in less satisfactory form at *Orat.* 93.

Table A4.2 *The post-Vergilian sources for the* Annales

In aggregate, these sources are responsible for roughly three-quarters of our direct evidence for the text. The dates given are those to which the form of evidence that has survived dates, as best as it is possible to gauge it, rather than the point at which the information originates. (Thus, for example, in dating collections of scholia, I have given the dates at which experts believe those collections coalesced into the form in which they reached us, even though it is often evident that at least some of the information within them is much older.)

Author (date CE)	**Number of quotations (lines) for which the author is the sole or leading source**	**Rough % of total surviving lines of *Ann.***
Seneca (c. 1 65)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Pliny the Elder (23/4 79)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Quintilian (c. 35 ?90s)	3 (3)	0.5
Fronto (c. 95 c. 166)	3 (3)	0.5
Apuleius (c. 125 170s?)	1 (2)	< 0.5
Gellius (c. 125 c. 190)	18 (39)	6.2
Festus (late c. 2)	70 (79)	12.7
Tertullian (c. 160 c. 240)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Fragmentum de Metris (c. 3?)	2 (2)	< 0.5
Sacerdos (late c. 3)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Atilius Fortunatianus (?before c. 4?)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Nonius (early c. 4)	41 (56)	9
Donatus (mid c. 4)	2 (2)	< 0.5
Ps. Probus (c. 4??)	4 (7)	1
Ausonius (c. 4)	4 (4)	< 1
Charisius (late c. 4)	12 (13)	2.2
Diomedes (late c. 4 early c. 5)	5 (7)	1

Table A4.2 (*cont.*)

Author (date CE)	**Number of quotations (lines) for which the author is the sole or leading source**	**Rough % of total surviving lines of *Ann.***
Augustine (354 430)	2 (2)	< 0.5
Servius (late c. 4 early c. 5)	23 (26)	4
Macrobius (1st half c. 5)	40 (68)	11
Ps. Macr. *Exc. Bob.* (from a text dating to ?1st half c. 5?)	3 (3)	0.5
'Porphyrio' (redaction dating to c. 5?)	3 (3)	0.5
Consentius (probably c. 5)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Lactantius Placidus (c. 5 or 6)	3 (3)	0.5
Scholia Veronensia (late c. 5?)	3 (4)	0.5
Priscian (c. 5 6)	34 (44)	7
Scholia Bembina (c. 4/5 6)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Cassiodorus (c. 490 c. 585)	1 (1)	< 0.5
De Ult. Syll. (c. 6?)	1 (2)	< 0.5
Isidore (c. 7)	8 (8)	1
Servius Danielis (by c. 8)	28 (40)	6.4
Paulus (c.8)	13 (14)	2.2
Brevis Expositio (c. 5 + c.8)	2 (3)	0.5
'Donatian' commentaries on Terence (c. 7 8??)	5 (5)	1
Scholia Bernensia (c. 8)	3 (4)	0.5
Ps. Acro (redaction dating to ? c. 8?)	2 (2)	< 0.5
Scholia to Persius (c. 9?)		
Readers of Orosius (c. 9 11)	4 (7)	1

Table A4.2 (*cont.*)

Author (date CE)	**Number of quotations (lines) for which the author is the sole or leading source**	**Rough % of total surviving lines of *Ann.***
Glossarium Philoxenum (not earlier than c. 6 CE)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Commenta Bernensia in Lucanum (c. 9)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Valla (ed. 1496)	1 (1)	< 0.5
Columna (ed. 1585)	1 (1)	< 0.5

APPENDIX 5

Fragments organised by source

I would like to record my special debt to Skutsch (1985) for Appendix Tables A5.1–5.46. My ability to compile them has rested entirely on the references he provides. Often, I have extended his text of the sources, where I found it helpful to do so for a more complete understanding of the contexts in which the quotations of the *Annales* were given. Sometimes, I have reported his or other editors' notices of textual variations in the sources, especially (though not quite exclusively) where I felt them to be significant or informative. For the most obscure and most marginal testimony to the fragments (e.g. of some glosses or codex-readings; also the works of the Renaissance scholars G. Valla and H. Columna), I am entirely dependent on his report. In compiling Appendix Tables A5.1–A5.46, I have sought in no way to question Skutsch's judgement about the constitution of the text but simply to procure a better understanding of the material through which the lines of his text reach us. I have omitted from this Appendix the very small number of sources that supply material that occurs exclusively in Skutsch's *op. inc.* or *dubia*.

The sources themselves are arranged in chronological order (or as close to that as I have been able to achieve). Where more than one source for a fragment exists, I have allowed two factors to determine which source I treat as primary: (1) the date of the source (as best as can be determined under sometimes challenging circumstances; see the introduction to Appendix Table A4.2, p. 345 for a note on dating that pertains here too); and (2) the quality of the fragment quoted, under which heading I include ancient attribution to Ennius. In many cases, chronological priority of source and quality of quotation happily coincide; where they do not, I have allowed the quality of the quotation to take precedence, and so on occasion I allocate a fragment to one of its later sources. In subsequently listing further occurrences of the fragment, I have again let chronology be the routine determinant but again allowed it to be disturbed in instances where later sources offer material of higher quality. 'Cf.' indicates ancient material that

evidently relates to the contexts in which we find Ennius quoted but where no attempt at quotation of or reference to Ennius (or, if to Ennius, then not to the *Annales*) appears.

Where I have quoted a longer passage to give fuller context, the location of the quotation within the passage is signalled by a subordinate reference-number in bold. As with the other Appendix Tables in Appendixes 2 and 3, book-numbers are given in bold (e.g. **I**) where they are attested by our sources. Skutsch's attributions to particular books precede the line numbers in ordinary font (e.g. I). Question marks precede the book numbers for Skutsch's tentative attributions to particular books of fragments he nevertheless classes as *sed. inc.* (e.g. ?I). Where Skutsch declines to hazard a guess as to which book a fragment might belong, question marks alone precede the line-number.

TABLE A5. 1: VARRO (M. Terentius Varro) (116–27 BCE); *De Lingua Latina*, eds. G. Goetz and F. Schoell (1910); *De re rustica*, edn. 2. G. Goetz (1929); Herz.-Schm. § 284.

Varro is the sole or primary source for 27 fragments of the *Annales* (equivalent to 37 lines). He further supplies 1 testimonium, on Ennius' claim as to the origin of the names of the three original tribal divisions of Rome (to which he, Varro, objects); and Skutsch in his edition of the *Annales* lists a half-line and a one-word fragment given by Varro (at *RR* 1.4.1 and *LL* 9.107, respectively) as *operis incerti fragmenta*, although he (Skutsch 1985: 755) suggests reasons for seeing the *Epicharmus* as the origin of the first of these in particular.

Varro's surviving quotations from the *Annales* occur for the most part in the *De Lingua Latina*, although 2 fragments (*Ann.* 154–5 and 340–2) are cited in the *De Re Rustica*. From the latter text, too, *Ann.* 1, quoted primarily at *LL* 7.20, receives support. Ennius is Varro's favourite source, and he is as interested in quoting from the tragedies as from the epic. We have specific evidence from Gellius (*NA* 12.4) that Varro's teacher, Aelius Stilo, also dealt with Ennius – a proposition that we would in any case anticipate, given what we know of early scholarly interest in Roman epic.[1] Varro's quotations rarely coincide with those of other authors, but Servius is also aware of *Ann.* 1, various authors of the grammatical tradition of *Ann.* 8–10, Cicero (and, through him, Jerôme) of *Ann.* 22, Festus (and Paulus) of *Ann.* 115, and Suetonius of *Ann.* 155.[2] Varro (at *LL* 7.36), along with several other authors, contributes to the transmission of *Ann.* 206–7 and at *LL* 7.46 of *Ann.* 329, for both of which the main source is Cicero. At *LL* 7.37, he supports Ps.-Probus' (on the *Eclogues*) transmission of *Ann.* 220; at *LL* 6.82, Festus' transmission of *Ann.* 408. *Men.* 542A (preserved at Non. 478.16), supports 'Porphyrio''s transmission of *Ann.* 495, and *Men.* 103A (preserved at Non. 408.3), supports Cicero's transmission of *Ann.* 541. (*Men.* 225A seems to have *Ann.* 309 in its background; see under Cicero.) *LL* 5.22 has the expression 'sola terrae', comparable to both 'sola regni' (found at *Ann.* 138) and 'sola terrarum' (found at *Ann.* 461), both lines transmitted as full hexameters by Festus 386. Varro is sometimes Gellius' source: he is named precisely as the source for a quotation from the *Annales* (*Ann.* 549) at *NA* 3.14.5 (cf. *NA* 17.21.43, on Varro as a source for Ennius' age and date of birth;

[1] Suet. *Gramm.* 2; see Hendrickson 1898: 286.

[2] Suetonius is never a primary source for Ennius, but at Suet. *Aug.* 7 he supports Varro's transmission of *Ann.* 155, while at *Tib.* 21 he quotes Augustus' letter to Tiberius, in which *Ann.* 363 (for which the primary source is Cicero) comes into play.

cf. also *NA* 10.1.6, which yields *Ann.* 290). DS's (probably somewhat extensive) dependence on Varro surfaces explicitly ad *G.* 1.11 (see under Cicero) and *Aen.* 11.306 (see under DS).

Varro is for us the first visible representative of the Latin lexicographical and grammatical traditions – traditions that significantly shaped our record of the text, in the first place by the volume of what they preserve but also through their absence of interest in the text as a work of literature (see Chapter 3, pp. 135–44). The quotations in the later scholarly traditions do not necessarily derive directly from Varro, however; for the authors of those traditions regularly supply book-numbers, whereas Varro never does. One consequence of this habit of his is that the contexts in which editors place lines derived from Varro are always conjectural.

1: *Ann.* 1 Musae quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum

Varro, *LL* 7.5–20: [5] dicam in hoc libro de verbis quae a poetis sunt posita, primum de locis . . . [**20**] 'Musae quae pedibus magnum pulsatis Olympum'. caelum dicunt Graeci Olympum, montem in Macedonia omnes; a quo potius puto Musas dictas Olympiadas: ita enim ab terrestribus locis aliis cognominatae Libethrides, Pipleides, ‹T›hespiades, ‹H›eliconides.

Serv. *Aen.* 11.660 (quales Threiciae cum flumina Thermodontis/pulsant et pictis bellantur Amazones armis,/seu circum Hippolyten seu cum se Martia curru/Penthesilea refert, magnoque ululante tumultu/feminea exsultant lunatis agmina peltis): PULSANT Ennius ad Musas (Ennius Musae *A Sang.*) 'quae pedibus (pedibus *om. A Sang.*) pulsatis Olympum'.

Varro, *RR* 1.1.4: quoniam ut aiunt di facientes adiuvant, prius invocabo eos, nec ut Homerus et Ennius Musas sed duodecim Deos Consentis.

cf. Vida, *Christias* 11, pp. 260 f.: vos ideo, aligeri coetus, gens aetheris alti,/ qui levibus magnum pedibus pulsatis Olympum . . .

1: *Ann.* 6–7 terra‹que› corpus
quae dedit ipsa capit neque dispendi facit hilum

Varro, *LL* 5.57–60: [57] quod ad loca qu‹a›eque his coniuncta fuerunt, dixi; nunc de his quae in locis esse solent immortalia et mortalia expediam, ita ut prius quod ad deos pertinet dicam. principes dei Caelum et Terra . . . [**59**] . . . quod anima et corpus. humidum et frigidum terra, sive 'ova parire solet genus pennis condecoratum, non animam' [*Ann.* 8–9], ut ait Ennius, et 'post inde venit divinitus pullis ipsa anima[m]' [*Ann.* 9–10] sive, ut Zenon

Cit‹ie›us [*frg. 126* Arn.], animalium semen ignis is qui anima ac mens, qui caldor e caelo, quod huic innumerabiles et immortales ignes. itaque Epicharmus dicit de mente humana: ait [*Var.* 52, 53 V]: 'istic est de sole sumptus ignis'; idem ‹de› sole[m]: 'isque totus mentis est', ut humores frigidae sunt humi, ut supra ostendi. [60] quibus iuncti caelum et terra omnia ex ‹se› genuerunt, quod per hos natura [*Var.* 46 V] 'frigori miscet calorem atque humori aritudinem'. recte igitur Pacuvius quod ait [93 R]: 'animam ‹a›ether adiugat' et Ennius: 'terram corpus quae de*d*erit, ipsam capere, neque dispendi facere hilum' [*Ann.* 6–7]. animae et corporis discessus quod natis is exi‹t›us, inde exitium, ut cum in unum ineunt, initia.

Varro, *LL* 5.111: quod fartum intestinum crassundiis 'Lucan‹ic›am' dicunt quod milites a Lucanis didicerunt, ut quod Faleriis 'Faliscum ventrem'. fundolum a fundo, quod †ut reliquae partes, sed ex una parte sola apertum; ab hoc Graecos puto τυφλὸν ἔντερον appellasse. ab eadem fartura farcimina ‹ex› extis appellata, †a quo ‹farticulatim›: in eo quod tenuissimum intestinum fartum, hila ab hilo dicta illo quod ait Ennius 'neque dispendii facit hilum' [*Ann.* 7]. quod in hoc farcimine summo quiddam eminet, ab eo quod ut in capite apex, apexabo dicta. tertium fartum est langavo, quod longius quam duo illa.

Varro, *LL* 9.53–4: [53] quod dicunt esse quaedam verba quae habeant declinatus ut caput, quorum par reperiri quod non possit, non esse analogias, respondendum: sine dubio, si quod est singulare verbum, id non habere analogias: minimum duo esse debent verba, in quibus sit similitudo. quare in hoc †tollunt esse analogias. [54] sed 'nihilum' vocabulum recto casu apparet in hoc 'quae dedit i*p*sa cap*i*t neque dispendi facit hilum' [*Ann.* 6–7], quod valet 'nec dispendii facit quicquam'. idem hoc obliquo apud Plautum [*Most.* 245]: 'video enim te ni[c]hili pendere prae Philolacho omnis homines', quod est ex 'ne' et 'hili': quare dictus est 'ni[c]hili' qui non hili erat. casus †tum cum commutantur, de quo dicitur de homine: dicimus enim 'hic homo nihili [est]' et 'huius hominis nihili' et 'hunc hominem nihili'. potest dici patricus casus, ut ei praeponuntur praenomina plura, ut 'hic casus Terentii', 'hunc casum Terentii', 'hic miles legionis', 'huius militis legionis', 'hunc militem legionis'.

1: *Ann.* 8–10 ova parire solet genus pennis condecoratum
non animam. [et] post inde venit divinitus pullis
ipsa anima

Varro, *LL* 5.57–9: *See p. 351, under* Ann. *6–7*.

Diom. 1 'De dubia verborum positione' (*GLK* 1.383): pario: cum ex hoc dicamus infinitivum 'parere' tertio ordine, apud veteres 'parire' dictum reperimus, ut apud Ennium: 'ova parire solent'.

Pris*c*. 8.33 (*GLK* 2.401): . . . 'reperio', 'comperio', 'cooperio', sicut 'aperio', activa sunt; faciunt enim ex se passiva. et possunt magis a 'pario' esse videri composita, quod apud vetustissimos quartae coniugationis declinationem habebat. Ennius 'ova parire solet genus pinnis condecoratum'.

id. 10.8 (*GLK* 2.500): in '–rio' unum inveni, 'pario peperi'. vetustissimi tamen et secundum quartam coniugationem hoc protulisse inveniuntur. Ennius: 'ova parire solet genus pinnis condecoratum'.

id. 10.50 (*GLK* 2.540): . . . quod videtur a 'pario' compositum, quod vetustissimi non solum secundum tertiam, sed etiam secundum quartam coniugationem declinabant, unde Ennius: 'ova parire solet genus pinnis condecoratum'.

1: *Ann.* 21 Saturnia terra

Varro, *LL* 5.41–2: [41] ubi nunc est Roma, Septi[m]montium nominatum ab tot montibus quos postea urbs muris comprehendit; e quis Capitolinum dictum, quod hic, cum fundamenta foderentur aedis Iovis, caput humanum dicitur inventum. hi[n]c mons ante Tarpeius dictus a virgine Vestale Tarpeia, quae ibi ab Sabinis necata armis et sepulta: cuius nominis monimentum relictum, quod etiam nunc eius rupes Tarpeium appellatur saxum. [**42**] hunc antea montem 'Saturnium' appellatum prodiderunt et ab eo late 'Saturniam terram', ut etiam Ennius appellat. antiquum oppidum in hac fuisse Saturnia scribitur. eius vestigia etiam nunc manent tria, quod Saturni fanum in faucibus, quod Saturnia porta quam Iunius (13.5 Br.) scribit ibi, quam nunc vocant Pandanam, quod post aedem Saturni in aedificiorum legibus privatis parietes 'postici muri' sunt scripti.

cf. Fest. 430: SATURNIA Italia, et mons, qui nunc est Capitolinus, 'Saturnius' appellabatur, quod in tutela Saturni esse existimantur.

1: *Ann.* 22 quam Prisci, casci populi, tenuere Latini

Varro, *LL* 7.26–8: [26] . . . in multis verbis [in] quod antiqui dicebant 's' postea dicunt 'r', ut in carmine Saliorum sunt haec . . . [27] . . . quare e[st] Casmena Carmena carmina carmen, 'r' extrito 'Camena' factum. ab eadem voce 'canite', pro quo in Saliari versu [1 Bl.] scriptum est 'cante', hoc versu:

'divum †empta cante, divum deo supplicante'. [**28**] in *carmine Priami* [p. 44 C] quod est: 'veteres Casmenas cascam rem volo profarei'; primum 'cascum' significat vetus, secundo eius origo sabina, quae usque radices in oscam linguam egit. cascum vetus esse significat Ennius quod ait: 'quam Prisci, casci populi, *t*enuere Latini'. eo magis Manilius . . . (*See under* Ann. *487, p. 359, for the passage preceding this.*)

Cic. *Tusc.* 1.27: unum illud erat insitum priscis illis, quos cascos appellat Ennius, esse morte sensum.

Whence: Jerôme, *Ep.* 8.1: rudes illi Italiae homines, quos cascos Ennius appellat.

cf. *CGL* 6, p.185, where *cascus* is glossed as παλαιός and *cascum* as *vetus* and *antiquum*, without reference to Ennius.

1: *Ann.* 54–5 unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli
templa

Varro, *LL* 7.5–6: [5] dicam in hoc libro de verbis quae a poetis sunt posita, primum de locis . . . [**6**] incipiam hinc: 'unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli templa'. templum tribus modis dicitur: ab natura, ab auspicando, a similitudine; ‹ab› natura in caelo, ab auspiciis in terra, a similitudine sub terra. in caelo te‹m›plum dicitur, ut in *‹H›ecuba* [171 J]: 'o magna templa caelitum, commixta stellis splendidis'. in terra, ut in *Periboea* [Pacuv. 310 R]: 'scrupea saxea Ba‹c›chi templa prope aggreditur'. sub terra, ut in *Andromacha* [98 J]: 'Acherusia templa alta Orci salvete infera'. (*See further, p. 360, under* Ann. *554*.)

Ov. *Met.* 14.814:

occiderat Tatius, populisque aequata duobus, 805
Romule, iura dabas: posita cum casside Mavors
talibus adfatur divumque hominumque parentem:
'tempus adest, genitor, quoniam fundamine magno
res Romana valet nec praeside pendet ab uno,
praemia, (sunt promissa mihi dignoque nepoti) 810
solvere et ablatum terris inponere caelo.
tu mihi concilio quondam praesente deorum
(nam memoro memorique animo pia verba notavi)
'unus erit, quem tu tolles in caerula caeli' 814
dixisti: rata sit verborum summa tuorum!'

Ov. *Fast.* 2.485:

nam pater armipotens postquam nova moenia vidit,
multaque Romulea bella peracta manu,
'Iuppiter', inquit 'habet Romana potentia vires:

sanguinis officio non eget illa mei.
redde patri natum: quamvis intercidit alter, 485
pro se proque Remo qui mihi restat erit.
'unus erit quem tu tolles in caerula caeli' 487
tu mihi dixisti: sint rata dicta Iovis.'
Iuppiter adnuerat: nutu tremefactus uterque
est polus, et caeli pondera novit Atlas.

11: *Ann.* 113 olli respondit suavis sonus Egeriai

Varro, *LL* 7.42: apud Ennium: 'olli respondit suavis sonus Eg*e*riai'. 'olli' valet dictum 'illi' ab olla et ollo, quod alterum comitiis cum recitatur a praecone dicitur 'olla centuria', non 'illa'; alterum apparet in funeribus indictivis, quo dicitur 'ollus leto datus est', quod Graecus dicit λήθῃ, id est oblivioni.

11: *Ann.* 114–15 mensas constituit idemque ancilia – –
libaque, fictores, Argeos, et tutulatos
11: *Ann.* 116–18 Volturnalem
Palatualem Furinalem Floralemque
Falacrem‹que› et Pomonalem fecit hic idem

Varro, *LL* 7.43–5: [43] apud Ennium: 'mensas constituit idemque ancilia'. dicta ab ambecisu, quod ea arma ab utraque parte ut Thracum incisa. [44] 'libaque fictores Argeos et tutulatos'. liba quod libandi causa fiunt. fictores dicti ab fingendis libis. Argei ab Argis; Argei fiunt e scirp[e]is, simulacra hominum XXVII; ea quotannis de ponte sublicio a sacerdotibus publice deici solent in Tiberim. tutulati dicti hi qui in sacris in capitibus habere solent ut metam: id tutulus appellatus ab eo quo . . . sive ab eo quod . . . sive ab eo quod . . . vocatur. [45] eundem Pompilium ait fecisse flamines, qui cum omnes sunt a singulis deis cognominati, in quibusdam apparent ἔτυμα, ut cur sit Martialis et Quirinalis; sunt in quibus flaminum cognominibus latent origines ut in his qui sunt versibus plerisque: 'Volturnalem Palatualem Furinalem Floralemque Falacrem‹que› et Pomonalem fecit hic idem', quae obscura sunt; eorum origo Volturnus, diva Palatua, Furrina, Flora, Falacer, Pomo[rum]na[m].

cf. Cicero, *Rep.* 2.26f.: 'idemque Pompilius . . . augures addidit . . . idemque mercatus . . . invenit';

Pliny, *NH* 18.8: 'is et Fornacalia instituit' (Skutsch 1985: 268, n. 2: 'probably more than an accident').

Fest. 484–6: TUTULUM vocari aiunt flaminicarum capitis ornamentum, quod fiat vitta purpurea innexa crinibus et exstructum in altitudinem. quidam pilleum lanatum forma metali figuratum, quo flamines ac pontifices utantur eodem nomine vocari. Ennius: 'libaque fictores Argeos et ‹tutulatos'. TUOR›

Paul. Fest. 485: TUTULUM dicebant flaminicarum capitis ornamentum vitta purpurea innexa crinibus et in altitudine‹m› exstructum. Ennius 'fictores Argeos et tutulatos'.

cf. DS *Aen.* 2.683: Suetonius tria genera pilleorum dixit, quibus sacerdotes utuntur, apicem, tutulum, galerum: sed apicem pilleum sutile circa medium virga eminente, tutulum pilleum lanatum metae figura, galerum pilleum ex pelle hostiae caesae.

IV: *Ann.* 154–5 septingenti sunt, paulo post aut minus, anni
augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est

Varro, *RR* 3.1.1–4: [1] cum duo vitae traditae sint hominum rustica et urbana, quidni, Pinni, dubium non est quin hae non solum loco discretae sint, sed etiam tempore diversam originem habeant. antiquior enim multo rustica, quod fuit tempus cum rura colerent homines neque urbem haberent [**2**] etenim vetustissimum oppidum cum sit traditum Graecum Boeotiae Thebae, quod rex Ogygos aedificarit, in agro Romano Roma quam Romulus rex: nam in hoc nunc denique est ut dici possit, non cum Ennius scripsit: 'septingenti sunt paulo plus aut minus anni/augusto augurio postquam incl*i*ta condita Roma est'; [3] Thebae, quae ante cataclysmon Ogygi conditae dicuntur, eae tamen circiter duo milia annorum et centum sunt. quod tempus si referas ad illud principium quo agri coli sunt coepti atque in casis et tuguriis habitabant nec murus et porta quid esset sciebant, immani numero annorum urbanos agricolae praestant. [4] nec mirum, quod divina natura dedit agros, ars humana aedificavit urbes, cum artes omnes dicantur in Graecia intra mille annorum repertae, agri numquam non fuerint in terris quid coli possint. neque solum antiquior cultura agri, sed etiam melior. itaque non sine causa maiores nostri ex urbe in agros redigebant suos cives, quod et in pace a rusticis Romanis alebantur et in bello ab his alebantur.

Suet. *Aug.* 7: infanti cognomen Thurino inditum est, in memoriam maiorum originis, vel quod regione Thurina recens eo nato pater Octavius adversus fugitivos rem prospere gesserat. Thurinum cognominatum satis certa probatione tradiderim, nactus puerilem imagunculam eius aeream veterem, ferreis et paene iam exolescentibus litteris hoc nomine inscriptam, quae dono a me principi data inter cubiculi Lares colitur. sed et a M. Antonio in epistolis per contumeliam saepe 'Thurinus' appellatur, et ipse nihil amplius quam mirari se rescribit, pro opprobrio sibi prius nomen obici. postea Gai Caesaris et deinde Augusti cognomen assumpsit, alterum testamento maioris avunculi, alterum Munati Planci sententia, cum, quibusdam censentibus 'Romulum' appellari oportere quasi et ipsum conditorem urbis, praevaluisset ut 'Augustus' potius vocaretur, non tantum novo sed etiam ampliore cognomine, quod loca quoque religiosa et in quibus augurato quid consecratur 'augusta' dicuntur ab auctu vel ab avium gestu gustuve, sicut etiam Ennius docet scribens: 'augusto augurio postquam incluta condita Roma est'.

VI: *Ann.* 202 orator sine pace redit regique refert rem
??: *Ann.* 593 oratores doctiloqui

Varro, *LL* 7.41: apud Ennium: 'orator sine pace redit regique refert rem'. 'orator' dictus ab oratione: qui enim verba [orationum] haberet publice adversus eum quo legabatur ab oratione 'orator' dictus. cum res maior oratione ‹egebat› [*Stroux*: maiore ratione *F*] legebantur potissimum qui causam commodiss‹im›e orare poterant. itaque Ennius ait: 'oratores doctiloqui'.

VII: *Ann.* 215 Poeni stipendia pendunt

Varro, *LL* 5.181–2: [181] 'tributum' dictum a tribubus, quod ea pecunia quae populo imperata erat tributim a singulis pro portione census exigeba[n]tur. ab hoc ea quae assignata erat 'attributum' dictum; ab eo quoque, quibus attributa erat pecunia ut militi reddant, 'tribuni aerarii' dicti; id quod attributum erat, 'aes militare'; hoc est quod ait Plautus [*Aul.* 526]: 'cedit miles, aes petit'. et hinc dicuntur 'milites aerarii' ab aere, quod stipendia facerent. [**182**] hoc ipsum stipendium a stipe dictum, quod aes quodque stipem dicebant: nam quod asses libras pondo erant, qui acceperant maiorem numerum non in arca ponebant sed in aliqua cella stipabant, id est componebant, quo minus loci occuparet; ab stipando 'stipem' dicere coeperunt. 'stips' ab στοιβή fortasse, graeco verbo. id apparet, quod ut tum

institutum etiam nunc diis cum thesauris asses dant 'stipem' dicunt, et qui pecuniam alligat 'stipulari' et 'restipulari'. militis stipendia (*Scioppius*: milites stipendiis *codd.*: milites stipendiarii *alii*) ideo quod eam stipem pendebant; ab eo etiam Ennius scribit: 'Poeni stipendia pendunt'.

?I: *Ann.* 450 iam cata signa fere sonitum dare voce parabant
??: *Ann.* 543 tunc coepit memorare simul cata dicta

Varro, *LL* 7.46: apud Ennium: 'iam cata signa fer[a]e sonitum dare voce parabant': 'cata' acuta; hoc enim verbo dicunt Sabini. quare 'catus ‹A›elius Sextus' [*Ann.* 329] non, ut aiunt, sapiens, sed acutus; et quod est 'tunc c‹o›epit memorare simul cata dicta' accipienda 'acuta' dicta.

X: *Ann.* 340–2[3] rursus vos reddite nobis,
o Epirotae (*de unaquaque re ut videamus quid*)

pastores a Pergamide Maledove potis sint

Varro, *RR* 2.2.1–2: [1] sed quoniam nos nostrum pensum absolvimus ac limitata est pecuaria quaestio, nunc 'rursus vos reddite nobis, o Epirotae', de una quaque re ut videamus quid 'pastores a Pergamide Maledove potis sint'. [2] Atticus, qui tunc Titus Pomponius, nunc Quintus cognomine eodem, 'ego opinor', inquit, 'incipiam primus, quoniam in me videre coni‹e›cisse oculos, et dicam de primigenia pecuaria. e feris enim pecudibus primum dicis oves conprehensas ab hominibus ac mansuefactas. has primum oportet bonas emere, quae ita ab aetate, si neque vetulae sunt neque merae agnae, quod alterae [iam] nondum, alterae iam non possunt dare fructum. sed ea melior aetas quam sequitur spes, quam ea quam mors . . .'

XIII: *Ann.* 369 isque Hellesponto pontem contendit in alto

Varro, *LL* 7.21: 'quasi ‹H›ellespontum et claustra' [*trag. frg. inc. inc.* 107 R], quod Xerxes quondam eum locum clausit; nam, ut Ennius ait: 'isque Hellesponto pontem contendit in alto'; nisi potius eb eo quod Asia et Europa ibi †colludit mare; inter angustias facit Propontidis fauces.

[3] On this fragment, see Skutsch 1978: 261–2.

?x: *Ann.* 481 animusque in pectore latrat
??: *Ann.* 545 clamor ad caelum volvendus per aethera vagit
??: *Ann.* 594 clamore bovantes
??: *Ann.* 595 pausam fecere fremendi

Varro, *LL* 7.103–4: [103] in *Aulularia* [445–6]: 'pipulo *te* differam ante aedis', id est convicio, declinatum a pi‹p›atu pullorum. multa ab animalium vocibus tralata in homines, partim qu‹a›e sunt aperta, partim obscura; perspicua ut Ennii: 'animus*que in* [*Scaliger, ed. 3, Columna, comm.*; cum *codd.*] pectore latrat', Plauti [*fab. inc.* 3 Mo.]: 'gannit odiosus omni totae familiae'. ‹Cae›cilii [249 R]: 'tantum rem dibalare ut pro nilo habuerit'. Lucilius [261 M]: 'haec inquam rudet ex rostris atque hei‹u›litabit'. eiusdem [1275 M]: 'quantum hinnitum atque equitatum'. [104] minus aperta ut Porcii ab lupo [6 C]: 'volitare ululantes'.[4] Ennii a vitulo [*Inc.* 7 V]: 'tibicina maximo labore mugit'; eiusdem a bove 'clamore bovantes'; eiusdem a leone 'pausam f*e*cere fremendi'; eiusdem ab ‹ha›edo 'clamor ad caelum volvendus per aethera vagit'. Sue*i* [*C*; suet *codd.*] a ‹ merula› [5 C]: 'frendit e frunde et fritinni‹t› suaviter'. Macci in *Casina* [267] a fringuilla: 'quid fri[n]guttis? quid istuc tam cupide cupis?' Sue*i* (*C*; sues *codd.*) a ‹**› [6 C]: '†uoluerat ita tradedeq· inre† neque/in iudiucium ‹*› Aesopi nec theatri trittiles'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 108: LATRARE Ennius pro 'poscere' posuit.

?xv: *Ann.* 487 Musas quas memorant nosce nos esse Camenas

Varro, *LL* 7.25–6: [25] 'cornu‹t› a taurum umbram iaci' [*trag. frg. inc. inc.* 222 R]. dicere apparet 'cornutam' a cornibus; 'cornua' a curvore dicta quod pleraque curva. [**26**] '*Musas* [curvam; · Ac *corr. Scal.*] quas memorant †nosce nos esse Camena‹s'. Casmena›rum (*suppl. Laetus*) priscum vocabulum ita natum ac scriptum est alibi; Carmenae ab eadem origine sunt declinatae. in multis verbis [in] quod antiqui dicebant 's' postea dicunt 'r', ut in carmine Saliorum sunt haec . . . (*See under* Ann. *22, pp. 353–4, for the continuation of this passage*.)

??: *Ann.* 492 quis pater aut cognatus volet nos contra tueri

[4] This fragment of Porcius Licinus is briefly discussed by R. Büttner (1893), *Porcius Licinus und der litterarische Kreis des Q. Lutatius Catulus*. Leipzig: 56.

Varro, *LL* 7.12–13: [**12**] 'tueri' duo significat, unum ab aspectu ut dixi, unde est Enni (enim *codd.*) illud [335 R]: 'tueor te, senex? pro Iuppiter!' et: 'quis pater aut cognatus volet nos contra tueri'. alterum a curando ac tutela, ut cum dicimus †bell et tueri villam, a quo etiam quidam dicunt illum qui curat aedes sacras '‹a›edituum', non 'aeditomum'; sed tamen hoc ipsum ab eadem est profectum origine, quod quem volumus domum curare dicimus 'tu domi videbis', ut Plautus cum ait [*Men.* 352]: 'intus para, cura, vide quod opus fiat.' sic dicta vestis‹pi›ca, quae vestem spiceret, id est videret vestem ac tueretur: quare a tuendo et 'templa' et 'tesca' dicta cum discrimine eo quod dixi. [13] etiam indidem illud Enni [355 R]: 'extemplo acceptum me necato et filium'. 'extemplo' enim est continuo, quod omne te‹m›plum esse debet conti‹nu›o septum nec plus unum introitum habere.

??: *Ann.* 542 tantidem quasi feta canes sine dentibus latrat

Varro, *LL* 7.32–3: [**32**] cum tria sint coniuncta in origine verborum quae sint animadvertenda, a quo sit impositum et in quo et quid, s‹a›epe non minus de tertio quam de primo dubitatur, ut in hoc, utrum primum 'una canis' aut 'canes' sit appellata: dicta enim apud veteres 'una canes'. itaque Ennius scribit: 'tantidem quasi feta canes sine dentibus latrat'. Lucilius [1221 M]: 'nequam et magnus homo, laniorum immanis canes ut'. impositio unius debuit esse 'canis', plurium 'canes'. sed neque Ennius consuetudinem illam sequens reprehendendus nec is qui nunc dicit: 'canis caninam non est'. sed canes quod latratu[s] signum dant, ut signa canunt, 'canes' appellatae, et quod ea voce indicant noctu quae latent, 'latratus' appellatus. [33] sic dictum a quibusdam ut 'una canes', una 'trabes remis rostrata per altum' [*Spur.* 9]. Ennius [*Medea* 208–9 J]: 'utinam ne in nemore Pelio securibus/c‹a›esa accidisset abiegna ad terram trabes', cuius verbi singularis casus rectus correptus ac facta 'trabs'.

??: *Ann.* 554 contremuit templum magnum Iovis altitonantis

Varro, *LL* 7.7: quaqu[i]a intuiti erant oculi a tuendo primo 'templum' dictum; quocirca caelum quoad tuimur dictum 'templum'; sic: 'contremuit templum magnum Iovis altitonantis'. id est, ut ait N‹a›evius, 'h[i]emisph‹a›erium ubi conc‹h›a c‹a›erula septum stat'. eius templi partes quattuor dicuntur, sinistra ab oriente, dextra ab occasu, antica ad meridiem, postica ad septemtrionem. (*See under* Ann. *54–5, p. 354, for the preceding passage*.)

??: *Ann.* 583 decretum est stare ‹et fossari› corpora telis

Varro, *LL* 7.100: apud Ennium: 'decretum est stare ‹et fossari› corpora telis': hoc verbum Ennii dictum a fodiendo, a quo 'fossa'.

??: *Ann.* 591 divomque hominumque pater, rex

Varro, *LL* 5.65: idem hi dei Caelum et Terra Iuppiter et Iuno, quod, ut ait Ennius [*Euhem.* 54–8]: 'istic est is Iuppiter quem dico, quem Graeci vocant/ 'aerem', qui ventus est et nubes, imber postea,/atque ex imbre frigus, vent*us* post fit, aer denuo./haec propter Iupiter sunt ista quae dico tibi,/qua mortalis atque urbes belvasque omnis iuvat'. quod hi‹n›c omnes et sub hoc, eundem appellans dicit: 'divumque hominumque pater, rex'. 'pater' quod patefecit semen: nam tum est conceptum et inde, cum exit quod oritur.

TESTIMONIA

Frg. 1.lix = Varro, *LL* 5.55: [55] ager Romanus primum divisus in partis tris, a quo tribus appellata Titiensium, Ramnium, Lucerum: nominatae, ut ait Ennius, Titienses ab Tatio, Ramnenses ab Romulo, Luceres, ut Iunius, ab Lucumone; sed omnia h‹a›ec vocabula Tusca, ut Volnius, qui tragoedias Tuscas scripsit, dicebat. [56] ab hoc quattuor quoque partis urbis tribus dictae, ab locis Suburana, Palatina, Esquilina, Collina; quinta, quod sub Roma, Romilia; sic reliquae tri‹gin›ta ab his rebus quibus in tribum libro[s] scripsi.

OPERIS INCERTI FRAGMENTA

Op. inc. 9 aqua terra anima et sol

Varro, *RR* 1.4.1: eius (*sc.* agriculturae) principia sint eadem quae mundi esse Ennius scribit, 'aqua, terra, anima et sol'.

Op. inc. 26 solvi

Varro, *LL* 9.107: [106] . . . omnino et lava[n]t et lavatur dicitur separatim recte in rebus certis, quod puerum nutrix lava‹t›, puer a nutrice lavatur, nos in balneis et lavamus et lavamur. [107] sed consuetudo alterum utrum cum satis haberet, in toto corpore potius utitur 'lavamur', in partibus 'lavamus', quod dicimus 'lavo manus', sic pedes et cetera. quare e balneis non recte

dicunt lavi, lavi manus recte. sed quoniam in balneis 'lavor', 'lautus sum', sequitur, ut contra, quoniam est 'soleo', oportet dici 'solvi', ut Cato [*inc.* 54 Iord.] et Ennius scribit, non, ut dicit volgus, 'solitus sum', debere dici. neque propter haec, quod discrepant in sermone pauca, minus est analogia, ut supra dictum est [9.33].

TABLE A5.2: *Rhetorica ad Herennium* (86–2 BCE); ed. mai. F. Marx (1894), ed. min. F. Marx (1923, repr. 1964, 1993); J. Adamietz, *Ciceros De inventione und die Rhetorik ad Herennium* (1960).

Rhet. 4.18 is the only passage of the text in which quotations of Ennius appear. The passage offers several quotations. The first and the last are prose. The first is anonymous and, Skutsch declares, probably fictitious. The final one is Coelius Antipater (24B P). Of the enclosed four metrical or potentially metrical quotations, the first, known to us as *Ann.* 104, is named in the surviving sources as Ennian first by Priscian, to whom I therefore give the line as our primary source. The *Rhetorica* attribute the second of the four to 'the same poet', and Jocelyn 1967 lists it as *Inc.* 311 of the fragments of the tragedies. The third line is anonymous and may be prose; Skutsch thinks that, if metrical, it may belong to Ennius. Then follows the line we know as *Ann.* 498. Lines very similar to *Ann.* 498 are quoted repeatedly in the later grammatical tradition, in one case (Diom. *GLK* 1.447) under Ennius' name. They figure as examples of homoeoptoton, which is essentially how the *Rhetorica* use *Ann.* 498. Given the similarity in the interests and layout of the *Rhetorica* and the later grammatical tradition as we know it from Donatus, Charisius, etc., it is not unlikely that the *Rhetorica* are in fact directly at the root of the line's appearance in the later texts (i.e. there is no need to posit a second branch of transmission). Skutsch, however, entertains the possibility that we have two entirely separate lines in the *Rhetorica* and the grammatical tradition, since the lines as quoted are close but not identical. Skutsch favours the attribution of *Ann.* 498 to Ennius because of the line's metrical characteristics and because at least 2 of this quotation's closest neighbours (*Ann.* 104 and *inc.* 311 J) are attributed either by ancient sources or by modern scholars to Ennius.

??: *Ann.* 498 flentes plorantes lacrumantes obtestantes

Rhet. Her. 4.18: compositio est verborum constructio, ‹quae facit omnes partes oratio›nis aequabiliter perpolitas. ea conservabitur si fugiemus crebras vocalium concursiones, quae vastam atque hiantem orationem reddunt, ut haec est: 'bacae aeneae amoenissime inpendebant'; et si vitabimus eiusdem litterae nimiam adsiduitatem, cui vitio versus hic erit exemplo – nam hic nihil prohibet in vitiis alienis exemplis uti: 'o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti' [*Ann.* 104]; et hic eiusdem poetae '– – quicquam quisquam †quemquam† quemque quisque conveniat neget' [*inc.* 311 J]; et si eiusdem verbi adsiduitatem nimiam fugiemus, eiusmodi: 'nam cuius rationis ratio

non extet, ei rationi ratio non est fidem habere'; et si non utemur continenter similiter cadentibus verbis, hoc modo: 'flentes, plorantes, lacrimantes, obtestantes'. et si verborum transiectionem vitabimus, nisi quae erit concinna, qua de re posterius loquemur; quo in vitio est Coelius adsiduus, ut haec est: 'in priore libro has res ad te scriptas, Luci, misimus, Aeli' [24B P]. item fugere oportet longam verborum continuationem, quae et auditoris aures et oratoris spiritum laedit.

Diom. 2 'De schematibus' (*GLK* 1.447): de homoioptoto. homoeoptoton est oratio excurrens in eosdem casus similiter, id est cum uno similique casu totius sensus elocutionis impletur, ut apud Sallustium 'maximis ducibus, fortibus strenuisque ministris'. et aliter homoeoptoton fit cum oratio excurrit in eosdem casus et similes fines, ut Ennius: 'merentes flentes lacrimantes *ac* merentes'. item homoeoptoton est cum in similes casus exeunt verba diversa.

Donat. *Art. Gr.* 3.4 'De schematibus' (*GLK* 4.398): homoeoptoton est cum in similes casus exeunt verba diversa, ut 'merentes flentes lacrimantes *com*miserantes'.

Explan. in Don. 2 'De schematibus' (*GLK* 4.565): 'merentes flentes lacrimantes *com*miserantes'. versus hic Plauti; omnes partes orationis in accusativo casu exeunt.[5]

Pomp. *Comm.* 'De schematibus' (*GLK* 5.304): sunt item duae figurae, homoeoptoton et homoeoteleuton. inter homoeoptoton et homoeoteleuton hoc interest, quod homoeoptoton de casibus fit, homoeoteleuton de verbis fit. homoeoptoton est si ita dicas: 'merentes flentes lacrimantes *com*miserantes'. hos merentes, hos flentes, hos lacrimantes, hos commiserantes; ecce omnes casus accusativi sunt. inde dictum est homoeoptoton: Graeci enim 'ptosis' dicunt casus. homoeoteleuton est, quotiens in verba exitus est unius soni.

Charis. 4.4 'De schemate lexeos' (*GLK* 1.282): homoeoptoton est oratio excurrens in eosdem casus similes ut 'merentes flentes lacrimantes *ac* miserantes'.

[5] Skutsch 1985: 655 rightly dismisses the *Explanatio*'s attribution of the hexameter to Plautus.

TABLE A5.3: CICERO (M. Tullius Cicero) (106–43 BCE); *De Senectute*, ed. J. G. F. Powell (1988); *Brutus*, ed. A. E. Douglas (1966); *De Oratore*, ed. K. J. Kumaniecki (1995); *De Inventione*, ed. E. Stroebel (1965); *De Re Publica*, *De Legibus*, *De Senectute*, *De Amicitia*, ed. J. G. F. Powell (2006); *De Re Publica*: selections, ed. J. E. G. Zetzel (1995); *De Legibus*, ed. A. R. Dyck (2004); Skutsch 1985: 26–9; Zillinger 1911.

Cicero is the sole source of 21 fragments equivalent to 69 lines, or *c.* 11 per cent of the poem. He is the primary source of 10 fragments or 27 lines, roughly equivalent to a further 4 per cent. The bulk of this quotation comes in the *De Divinatione*, with the citations of Ilia's dream (*Ann.* 38–50) and of the passage describing the augury of Romulus and Remus (*Ann.* 72–91). The other substantial passage Cicero quotes is Pyrrhus' speech (*Ann.* 183–90) in the *De Officiis*, which also supplies our fullest and most authoritative version of the important lines on Fabius 'Cunctator' (*Ann.* 363–5), which are widely known in antiquity, including into a late age. The *Brutus* and the *De Senectute* share *Ann.* 304–8, and the early passages of the *De Senectute* (1, 14, 16) are relatively rich in quotation from the *Annales*. Besides this, Cicero's direct quotation from the *Annales* is rather limited and repetitive. There is little in the letters and speeches, and only in the *De Oratore* and the *De Republica* does Cicero mark his vaunted fondness for the poet with slightly more frequent quotation. (For Cicero's use of Ennian texts in general, see Zetzel 2007.) Despite the fact that Ennius is a favourite of Cicero's (Cicero's names him four times more often than he does any other early writer; Zetzel *loc. cit.* 3), there is, as Appendix Table A5.3 shows, only a limited number of short passages that Cicero quotes repeatedly and thus appears to have by heart. For the few longer passages mentioned above, it appears Cicero has turned to a manuscript. Cicero has a greater number of passages from the tragedies in mind, presumably as a result of seeing them on the stage; Zetzel notes that Cicero cites Ennius' tragedies twice as often as he cites his epic (*loc. cit.* 3).

In a few instances, Cicero acts as a secondary source for quotations found in fuller versions in other authors: his quotations from the *Annales* at *Tusc. Disp.* 1.27–8 support Varro's quotation of *Ann.* 22 at *LL* 7.28 and Servius' of *Ann.* 110–11 ad *Aen.* 6.763. *Ann.* 247–53 is cited in full by Gellius at 20.10.4 (who may in fact have quarried it from a Ciceronian text no longer extant); extracts from it appear at *Mur.* 30, *Fam.* 7.13.2 and *Att.* 15.7. *Orat.* 157 supports DS *Aen.* 11.326 with regard to *Ann.* 504, and *Orat.* 161 Fronto, *De Orationibus* 11 with regard to *Ann.* 63.

Only once does Cicero provide a book-number for a quotation of the *Annales*. This is at *Brut.* 58 (with regard to *Ann.* 304–8, '*in nono, ut opinor, annali*'), where Cicero's apparent hesitation is a mark of his desire to avoid the appearance of pedantry (cf. Skutsch 1985: 482, citing Vahlen); in our record it is the grammatical and encyclopaedic works that most frequently provide us with book-numbers for the quotations they supply. Quintilian and Gellius are also aware of (phrases from) that passage. Only on three other occasions do other sources' quotations coincide over a few words with Cicero's longer quotations: Gellius quotes a single line of *Ann.* 72–91, for which the primary source is *Div.* 1.105, and tells us that it is from Book 1. Priscian quotes a single line of *Ann.* 105–9 (from *Rep.* 1.64) and tells us that it is from Book 2, though Skutsch prefers to locate the fragment in Book 1. Finally, in quoting *Ann.* 363, Macrobius tells us that it is from Book 12. Given how late Macrobius and Priscian in particular are, it is evident that the lines they provide had a life in a tradition that was quite separate from anything initiated by Cicero, one that provided book-numbers. In general, given how frequently Cicero repeats the quotations of Ennius he likes best, and given the circulation of his texts, it is perhaps a little surprising how rarely his quotations recur in other sources. Gellius has obtained some material via Cicero, partly via Seneca, but it is clear that he has other significant sources. Thus, it does not appear that any of the major surviving branches of transmission have deep roots in Cicero. On the other hand, a few important lines from Cicero's lost works survive through re-quotation by Augustine (*Ann.* 156, from the proem to the *De Republica*, and *Ann.* 575, from the *Hortensius*[6]); likewise, the material from the *Annales* in Seneca, Lactantius Firmianus and Jerôme derives directly from Cicero (Skutsch 1985: 28–9).

1: *Ann.* 3 visus Homerus adesse poeta

Cic. *Acad. Pr.* 2.51: omnium deinde inanium visorum una depulsio est, sive illa cogitatione informantur, quod fieri solere concedimus, sive in quiete sive per vinum sive per insaniam. nam ab omnibus eius modi visis perspicuitatem, quam mordicus tenere debemus, abesse dicemus. quis enim, cum sibi fingit aliquid et cogitatione depingit, non simul ac se ipse commovit atque ad se revocavit, sentit quid intersit inter perspicua et inania? eadem ratio est somniorum. num censes Ennium cum in hortis cum Servio Galba vicino suo ambulavisset, dixisse 'visus sum mihi cum Galba ambulare'? at, cum somniavit, ita narravit: 'visus Homerus adesse poeta'. idemque in

[6] See Fleck 1993: 29–30 on the importance of the *Hortensius* for Cicero's view of historiography.

Epicharmo: 'nam videbar somniare med ego esse mortuom' [*Var.* 45 V]. itaque, simul ut experrecti sumus, visa illa contemnimus neque ita habemus, ut ea, quae in foro gessimus.

Cic. *Acad. Pr.* 2.88: (*see p. 367* [*below*] *under* Ann. *4*).

Cic. *Rep.* 6.10 (somnium Scipionis): post autem, apparatu regio accepti, sermonem in multam noctem produximus, cum senex nihil nisi de Africano loqueretur, omniaque eius non facta solum sed etiam dicta meminisset. deinde ut cubitum discessimus, me et de via fessum et qui ad multam noctem vigilassem, artior quam solebat somnus complexus est. hic mihi (credo equidem ex hoc quod eramus locuti; fit enim fere ut cogitationes sermonesque nostri pariant aliquid in somno, tale quale de Homero scribit Ennius, de quo videlicet saepissime vigilans solebat cogitare et loqui) Africanus se ostendit, ea forma quae mihi ex imagine eius quam ex ipso erat notior; quem ubi agnovi, equidem cohorrui; sed ille 'ades' inquit 'animo, et omitte timorem, Scipio, et quae dicam trade memoriae. . .'

(*See under Fronto, Appendix Table A5.8, for further testimonia about the dream.*)

1: *Ann.* 4 o pietas animi

Cic. *Acad. Pr.* 2.88: dormientium et vinulentorum et furiosorum visa imbecilliora esse dicebas quam vigilantium siccorum sanorum. quo modo? quia, cum experrectus esset Ennius, non diceret se vidisse Homerum, sed visum esse, Alcmaeo autem 'sed mihi neutiquam cor consentit . . .' [*Alc.* 21 J]. similia de vinulentis. quasi quisquam neget et qui experrectus sit, eum somnia reri et cuius furor consederit, putare non fuisse ea vera, quae essent sibi visa in furore. sed non id agitur: tum, cum videbantur, quo modo viderentur, id quaeritur. nisi vero Ennium non putamus ita totum illud audivisse 'o pietas animi', si modo id somniavit, ut si vigilans audiret. experrectus enim potuit illa visa putare, ut erant, et somnia. dormienti vero aeque ac vigilanti probabantur. quid? Iliona somno illo 'mater, te apello' [Pacuv. *Iliona* 195 R] nonne ita credit filium locutum, ut experrecta etiam crederet? unde enim illa: 'age adsta: mane, audi, iteradum eadem istaec mihi' [Pacuv. *Iliona* 202 R]? num videtur minorem habere visis quam vigilantes fidem?

'Donat.' Ter. *Eun.* 560: O FESTUS DIES ‹HOMINIS› pro 'homo festi diei'. Ennius 'o pietas animi'.

1: *Ann.* 34–50

et cita cum tremulis anus attulit artubus lumen.
talia tum memorat lacrimans, exterrita somno:
'Eurydica prognata, pater quam noster amavit,
vires vitaque corpus meum nunc deserit omne.
nam me visus homo pulcer per amoena salicta
et ripas raptare locosque novos. ita sola
postilla, germana soror, errare videbar
tardaque vestigare et quaerere te neque posse
corde capessere: semita nulla pedem stabilibat.
exim compellare pater me voce videtur
his verbis: 'o gnata, tibi sunt ante gerendae
aerumnae, post ex fluvio fortuna resistet.'
haec ecfatus pater, germana, repente recessit
nec sese dedit in conspectum corde cupitus,
quamquam multa manus ad caeli caerula templa
tendebam lacrumans et blanda voce vocabam.
vix aegro cum corde meo me somnus reliquit.'

Cic. *Div.* 1.39–42: [39] sed omittamus oracula; veniamus ad somnia. de quibus disputans Chrysippus multis et minutis somniis colligendis facit idem quod Antipater ea conquirens quae Antiphontis interpretatione explicata declarant illa quidem acumen interpretis, sed exemplis grandioribus decuit uti. Dionysi mater, eius qui Syracosiorum tyrannus fuit, ut scriptum apud Philistum est, et doctum hominem et diligentem et aequalem temporum illorum, cum praegnans hunc ipsum Dionysium alvo contineret, somniavit se peperisse Satyriscum. huic interpretes portentorum, qui Galeotae tum in Sicilia nominabantur, responderunt, ut ait Philistus, eum quem illa peperisset clarissimum Graeciae diuturna cum fortuna fore. [40–1] nunc te ad fabulas revoco vel nostrorum vel Graecorum poetarum. narrat enim et apud Ennium Vestalis illa '*et* cita . . . reliquit'. [42] haec, etiamsi ficta sunt a poeta, non absunt tamen a consuetudine somniorum. sit sane etiam illud commenticium quo Priamus est conturbatus, quia 'mater gravida parere ex se ardentem facem/visa est in somnis Hecuba . . .' [*Alex.* 50–61 J]. sint sane, ut dixi, somnia fabularum, hisque adiungatur etiam Aeneae somnium quod nimirum in Fabi Pictoris Graecis annalibus eius modi est ut omnia quae ab Aenea gesta sunt quaeque illi acciderunt ea fuerint quae ei secundum quietem visa sunt.

1: *Ann.* 72–91

curantes magna cum cura tum cupientes
regni dant operam simul auspicio augurioque.

in †monte Remus auspicio sedet atque secundam
solus avem servat. at Romulus pulcer in alto
quaerit Aventino, servat genus altivolantum.
certabant urbem Romam Remoramne vocarent.
omnibus cura viris uter esset induperator.
expectant veluti consul quom mittere signum
volt, omnes avidi spectant ad carceris oras
quam mox emittat pictos e faucibus currus:
sic expectabat populus atque ore timebat
rebus utri magni victoria sit data regni.
interea sol albus recessit in infera noctis.
exin candida se radiis dedit icta foras lux
et simul ex alto longe pulcerrima praepes
laeva volavit avis. simul aureus exoritur sol
cedunt de caelo ter quattuor corpora sancta
avium, praepetibus sese pulcrisque locis dant.
conspicit inde sibi data Romulus esse propritim
auspicio regni stabilita scamna solumque.

Cic. *Div.* 1.105–8: [105] quid de auguribus loquar? tuae partes sunt, tuum, inquam, auspiciorum patrocinium debet esse. tibi App. Claudius augur consuli nuntiavit addubitato salutis augurio bellum domesticum triste ac turbulentum fore; quod paucis post mensibus exortum paucioribus a te est diebus oppressum. cui quidem auguri vehementer adsentior; solus enim multorum annorum memoria non decantandi auguri sed divinandi tenuit disciplinam. quem inridebant collegae tui eumque tum Pisidam, tum Soranum augurem esse dicebant; quibus nulla videbatur in auguriis aut praesensio aut scientia veritatis futurae; sapienter aiebant ad opinionem imperitorum esse fictas religiones. quod longe secus est. neque enim in pastoribus illis quibus Romulus praefuit nec in ipso Romulo haec calliditas esse potuit ut ad errorem multitudinis religionis simulacra fingerent. sed difficultas laborque discendi disertam neglegentiam reddidit; malunt enim disserere nihil esse in auspiciis quam quid sit ediscere. [106] quid est in illo auspicio divinius quod apud te in *Mario* est? ut utar potissumum auctore te: 'hic Iovis altisoni subito pinnata satelles/arboris e trunco serpentis saucia morsu/subrigit ipsa feris transfigens unguibus anguem/semianimum et varia graviter cervice micantem./quem se intorquentem lanians rostroque cruentans/iam satiata animos, iam duros ulta dolores/abicit ecflantem et laceratum adfligit in unda/seque obitu a solis nitidos convertit ad ortus./hanc ubi praepetibus pinnis lapsuque volantem/conspexit Marius, divini numinis augur,/faustaque signa suae laudis reditusque notavit,/partibus intonuit caeli pater ipse sinistris./sic aquilae clarum firmavit Iuppiter omen' [Cic. *Marius*, 17 C]. [107–8] atque ille Romuli auguratus pastoralis non urbanus fuit, nec fictus

ad opiniones imperitorum sed a certis acceptus et posteris traditus. itaque Romulus augur, ut apud Ennium est, cum fratre item augure 'curantes . . . solumque'.

Gell. 7.6.9: locos porro 'praepetes' et augures appellant et Ennius in *Annalium* primo dixit 'praepetibus sese pulcris‹que› locis dant'. (*See under* Gellius, Appendix Table A5.10, p. 425, *for fuller quotation of this passage*.)

DS *Aen*. 1.273: DONEC REGINA SACERDOS . . . sed de origine et conditore urbis diversa a diversis traduntur. Clinias refert Telemachi filiam, Romen nomine, Aeneae nuptam fuisse, ex cuius vocabulo Romam appellatam. * * * dicit Latinum ex Ulixe et Circe editum de nomine sororis suae mortuae Romen civitatem appellasse. Ateius adserit Romam ante adventum Evandri diu Valentiam vocitatam, sed post graeco nomine Romen vocitatam. alii a filia Evandri ita dictam, alii a fatidica, quae praedixisset Evandro his eum locis oportere considere. Heraclides ait Romen, nobilem captivam Troianam huc appulisse et taedio maris suasisse sedem, ex cuius nomine urbem vocatam. Eratosthenes Ascanii, Aeneae filii, Romulum parentem urbis refert. Naevius et Ennius Aeneae ex filia nepotem Romulum conditorem urbis tradunt. Sibylla ita dicit Ῥωμαῖοι, Ῥώμου παῖδες.

Cf. *CGL* 5.578.3.

11: *Ann*. 105–9

> pectora . . . tenet desiderium; simul inter
> sese sic memorant: 'o Romule, Romule die,
> qualem te patriae custodem di genuerunt!
> o pater, o genitor, o sanguen dis oriundum!
> tu produxisti nos intra luminis oras. . .'

Cic. *Rep*. 1.64: iusto quidem rege cum est populus orbatus, 'pectora' diu (dia *corrector*) 'tenet desiderium', sicut ait Ennius post optimi regis obitum, 'simul inter sese sic memorant: 'o Romule, Romule die, qualem te patriae custodem di genuerunt! o pater, o genitor, o sanguen dis oriundum'. non eros nec dominos appellabant eos quibus iuste paruerant, denique ne reges quidem, sed patriae custodes, sed patres, sed deos; nec sine causa; quid enim adiungunt? 'tu produxisti nos intra luminis oras'. vitam honorem decus sibi datum esse iustitia regis existimabant. mansisset eadem voluntas in eorum posteris, si regum similitudo permansisset; sed vides unius iniustitia concidisse genus illud totum rei publicae.

Whence: Lact. *Inst.* 1.15.30:[7] quodsi non consul fuisset Antonius, Gaius Caesar pro suis in rem publicam meritis etiam defuncti hominis honore caruisset, et quidem consilio Pisonis soceri et Lucii Caesaris propinqui, qui vetabant funus ei fieri, et Dolabellae consuli, qui columnam in foro id est tumulum eius evervit ac forum expiavit. nam Romulum desiderio suis fuisse declarat Ennius, apud quem populus amissum regem dolens haec loquitur: 'o Romule, Romule die,/qualem te patriae custodem di genuerunt!/tu produxisti nos intra luminis oras/ o pater, o [genitor (*add. H*)] *patriae*, o sanguen dis oriundum'.

Prisc. 6.66 (*GLK* 2.250): 'hic sanguis huius sanguinis', quod veteres 'hoc sanguen' dixerunt. Cicero in *Hortensio* [102 G]: 'ut ait Ennius: 'refugiat timido sanguen atque exalbescat metu' [*Alcmeo* 20 J]'. idem in II (I *liber* '*pervetustus*' *Columnae*)[8] *Annali* 'o genitor o sanguen dis oriundum'.

IV: *Ann.* 153 nonis Iunis soli luna obstitit et nox

Cic. *Rep.* 1.25 (Scipio): [* * * neque . . . in]solens ostentatio neque oratio abhorrens a persona hominis gravissimi; rem enim magnam ‹erat› adsecutus, quod hominibus perturbatis inanem religionem timoremque deiecerat. atque eiusmodi quiddam etiam bello illo maximo, quod Athenienses et Lacedaemonii summa inter se contentione gesserunt, Pericles ille, et auctoritate et eloquentia et consilio princeps civitatis suae, cum obscurato sole tenebrae factae essent repente, Atheniensiumque animos summus timor occupavisset, docuisse cives suos dicitur; id quod ipse ab Anaxagora, cuius auditor fuerat, acceperat: certo illud tempore fieri et necessario, cum tota se luna sub orbem solis subiecisset; itaque etsi non omni intermenstruo, tamen id fieri non posse nisi intermenstruo tempore. quod cum disputando rationibusque docuisset, populum liberavit metu; erat enim tum haec nova et ignota ratio, solem lunae oppositu solere deficere, quod Thaletem Milesium primum vidisse dicunt. id autem postea ne nostrum quidem Ennium fugit, qui ut scribit anno quinquagesimo^{CCC} fere post Romam conditam, 'Non*is* Iunis soli luna obstitit et nox'. atque in hac re tanta inest ratio atque sollertia ut ex hoc die quem apud Ennium et in maximis annalibus consignatum videmus superiores solis defectiones reputatae sint usque ad illam quae Nonis Quinctilibus fuit regnante Romulo.

[7] This line of the *Annales* is quoted along with one other (see under Gellius for *Ann.* 247–53) in the *Institutiones* of Lactantius Firmianus, a Christian rhetor of (*c.* 240–320 CE). Skutsch notes that both Lactantius' quotations originate with Cicero (Skutsch 1985: 259, 433).

[8] Skutsch (1985: 256) explains the reasons for dismissing Columna's statement, even though he is in favour of attributing the line to Book I, against Priscian's evidence.

VI: *Ann.* 167 aio te Aeacida Romanos vincere posse[9]
VI: *Ann.* 197–8 stolidum genus Aeacidarum:
bellipotentes sunt magis quam sapientipotentes

Cic. *Div.* 2.115–8: [115] sed iam ad te venio 'o sancte Apollo, qui umbilicum certum terrarum obsides,/unde superstitiosa primum saeva evasit vox fera' [*frg. trg. inc. inc.* 19–20 R]. tuis enim oraculis Chrysippus totum volumen inplevit partim falsis, ut ego opinor, partim casu veris, ut fit in omni oratione saepissime, partim flexiloquis et obscuris, ut interpres egeat interprete et sors ipsa ad sortes referenda sit, partim ambiguis et quae ad dialecticum deferendae sint. nam cum illa sors edita est opulentissumo regi Asiae: 'Croesus Halyn penetrans magnam pervertet opum vim' [cf. Hdt. 1.53–4], hostium vim se perversurum putavit, pervertit autem suam. [**116**] utrum igitur eorum accidisset, verum oraclum fuisset. cur autem hoc credam umquam editum Croeso? aut Herodotum cur veraciorem ducam Ennio? num minus ille potuit de Croeso quam de Pyrrho fingere Ennius? quis enim est qui credat Apollinis ex oraclo Pyrrho esse responsum 'ai‹i›o te Aeacida Romanos vincere posse'. primum Latine Apollo numquam locutus est; deinde ista sors inaudita Graecis est; praeterea Pyrrhi temporibus iam Apollo versus facere desierat; postremo, quamquam semper fuit, ut apud Ennium est, 'stolidum genus Aeacidarum. bellipotentes sunt magis quam sapientipotentes', tamen hanc amphiboliam versus intellegere potuisset 'vincere te Romanos' nihilo magis in se quam in Romanos valere; nam illa amphibolia quae Croesum decepit vel Chrysippum potuisset fallere, haec vero ne Epicurum quidem. [117] sed, quod caput est, cur isto modo iam oracla Delphis non eduntur non modo nostra aetate, sed iam diu, iam ut nihil possit esse contemptius? hoc loco cum urguentur, evanuisse aiunt vetustate vim loci eius unde anhelitus ille terrae fieret, quo Pythia mente incitata oracla ederet. de vino aut salsamenta putes loqui, quae evanescunt vetustate; de vi loci agitur, neque solum naturali sed etiam divina; quae quo tandem modo evanuit? vetustate, inquies. quae vetustas est quae vim divinam conficere possit? quid tam divinum autem quam adflatus e terra mentem ita movens ut eam providam rerum futurarum efficiat, ut ea non modo cernat multo ante sed etiam numero versuque pronuntiet? quando ista vis autem evanuit? an postquam homines minus

[9] Skutsch 1985: 333 lists the following texts as aware of the oracle and representative of its long-lived wide circulation: Min. Fel. 26.6 (in direct dependence on Cicero); Ps.-Aur. Vict., *Vir. Ill.* 35.2; Amm. Marc. 23.5.9; August. *De civ. D.* 3.17; Hier. *Comm. in Is.* 41.21 sqq. p. 476; Boeth. *Peri herm.* p. 82. 14 Meiser (cf. Tert. *Apol.* 22.10; gloss. Oros. 4.1.7. cod. Sang. 621, p.135; Auson. *Technop.* 10.5).

creduli esse coeperunt? [118] Demosthenes quidem, qui abhinc annos prope trecentos fuit, iam tum φιλιππίζειν Pythiam dicebat, id est, quasi cum Philippo facere. hoc autem eo spectabat ut eam a Philippo corruptam diceret; quod licet existumare in aliis quoque oraculis Delphicis aliquid non sinceri fuisse. sed nescio quo modo isti philosophi superstitiosi et paene fanatici quidvis malle videntur quam se non ineptos. evanuisse mavultis et extinctum esse id quod, si umquam fuisset, certe aeternum esset, quam ea quae non sunt credenda non credere.

Quintil. 7.9.1–7 'De amphibolia': [1] amphiboliae species sunt innumerabiles, adeo ut philosophorum quibusdam nullum videatur esse verbum quod non plura significet; genera admodum pauca: aut enim vocibus accidit singulis aut coniunctis . . . [**6**] in coniunctis plus ambiguitatis est. fit autem per casus, ut 'aio te Aeacida Romanos vincere posse', [7] per conlocationem, ubi dubium est quid quo referri oporteat, ac frequentissime cum quod medium est utrimque possit trahi, ut de Troilo Vergilius 'lora tenens tamen': hic utrum teneat tamen lora, an quamvis teneat tamen trahatur quaeri potest.

Velius Longus 'De Orthographia' (*GLK* 7.55): . . . licet repugnent Graeci quo minus haec 'i' littera in unitatem cum aliqua vocali veniat, ut unam syllabam faciant, velintque μυΐα καὶ Θυϊάς trisyllaba nomina esse, vincet tamen illos natura teste praeclaro, qui ait: υἱός θ' υἱωνός τ' ἀρετῆς πέρι δῆριν ἔθεντο [*Od.* 24.515], nisi [si] hic versus a duobus anapaestis incipit, quod nullo modo potest fieri. sed quotiens, ut supra diximus, duabus vocalibus interiecta haec littera [*i*] est, duarum consonantium obtinet vicem. sic non erit acephalus versus: 'Thyias ubi audito trepidant trieterica Baccho' [*Aen.* 4.302][10] et 'Troiaque nunc stares' [*Aen.* 2.56] et 'aio te Aiacida Romanos vincere posse'. nam nec Accium secuti sumus semper vocales geminantem, ubicumque producitur syllaba, quoniam expedita debet esse condicio scribendi.

'Porph.' Hor. *Ars P.* 403 DICTAE PER CARMINA SORTES: per versus hexametros reddidit responsa Phemonoe e Pythio oraclo (Phemonoet pyrroclio *corr. Sk.*: Phemonoe *ad* Pyrr*um Epiro*‹tam› *Holder*), tamquam Pyrrho Epirotae (purphoeri poetae *olim correctum*: tamquam [Purpheori] poetae *Holder*): 'aio te Aeacida Romanos vincere posse'.

Prisc. 18.64–5 'De impersonalium constructione' (*GLK* 3.234): [64] omnia verba transitiva vel genetivo vel dativo vel accusativo vel ablativo adiunguntur, ut 'egeo tui, insidior tibi, metuo te, fruor illa re'. ergo si coniungantur duo verba, quorum alterum sit infinitum, eosdem casus asciscentia, fit dubitatio, ut

[10] Our texts have 'stimulant' for 'trepidant'.

'misereri tui eget animus mei': cum enim utrumque verbum genetivo soleat iungi, dubium est, cuius animus misereatur vel egeat. [**65**] similiter per dativos 'male dicere tibi placet mihi' et per accusativos 'cupio te vincere me' et per ablativos 'dignor gloria potiri laude'. dubium est enim, cum utrique casus similes sint et utrique verbo congrue possint aptari, quis cui reddatur. et aptius quidem est priori casui prius sociari verbum. sed auctores frequentissime hyperbatis, id est transitionibus, utuntur, ut 'aio te, Aeacida, Romanos vincere posse'. est enim ordo 'te Aeacida'; id est quod Romani te possunt vincere, quod et naturaliter passiones secundae sunt actionum et actio in Romanis, passio vero in Pyrrho significatur. sed aptissimum maxime fuit responso, etiam in confusione ordinis propriam oraculi obliquitatem servare; quamvis et apud omnes auctores huiuscemodi figura latissime pateat.

Charis. 4 'De vitiis ceteris' (*GLK* 1.271): de amphibolia. amphibolia est dictio sententiave dubiae significationis: dictio, ut vadatur Cato; sententia, ut 'aio te, Aeacida, Romanos vincere posse'. ambigua enim sors fuit ante eventum utrum Pyrrhus a Romanis an Romani a Pyrrho vinci possent. fit aliquando et in uno verbo * ut siquis se dicat hominem occidisse, cum appareat eum qui loquitur occisum non esse.

Diom. 2 'De schematibus' (*GLK* 1.450): de amphibolia. amphibolia est vitio compositionis in ambiguo posita sententia, ut 'aio te, Aeacida, Romanos vincere posse'; item 'certum est Antonium praecedere eloquentia Crassum'. hi enim duo sensus vitio ambiguitatis carent proprietate, cum sit incertum ab Aeacida Romanos vinci posse an a Romanis Aeacidam; similiter ab Antonio vinci Crassum eloquentia an *a* Crasso Antonium . . .

Isid. *Orig.* 1.34.13: amphibolia, ambigua dictio, quae fit aut per casum accusativum, ut illud responsum Apollinis ad Pyrrhum: 'aio te, Aeacida, Romanos vincere posse'. in quo non est certum, quem in ipso versu monstraverit esse victorem.

Donat. *Art. Gr.* 1.3 'De syllaba' (*GLK* 4.369): syllaba est conprehensio litterarum vel unius vocalis enuntiatio temporum capax. syllabarum aliae sunt breves, aliae longae, aliae communies. breves sunt quae et correptam vocalem habent et non desinunt in duas consonantes aut in unam duplicem aut in aliquid quod sit pro duabus consonantibus. longae aut natura sunt aut positione fiunt: natura, cum aut vocalis producitur, ut 'a' 'o', aut duae vocales iunguntur et diphthongon faciunt, ut 'ae' 'oe' 'au' 'eu' 'ei': positione, cum correpta vocalis in duas desinit consonantes, ut arma [arcus], aut in unam duplicem, ut axis, aut in alteram consonantem et alteram vocalem loco consonantis positam, ut at Iuno, at Venus, aut in 'i' litteram solam loco

consonantis positam [quam non nulli geminant], ut 'aio te, Aeacida, Romanos vincere posse'.

Incert. *De ult. syll.* 'De elementis litterarum' 2.4 (*GLK* 4.221): de vocalibus litteris . . . duae vero [sc. vocales], 'i' et 'u', nunc vocales nunc pro consonantibus ponuntur, ea ratione, si eas praecedentis aut vocalis aliqua de superioribus consequatur, ut 'inveni germana viam'; aut harum duarum, de quibus agimus, alteram praecedentem quaelibet fuerit altera consecuta, ut 'tum Iuno omnipotens' [*Aen.* 4.693] et 'altius ad vivum persedit' [*G.* 3.442]. nec immerito prior a posteriore conprimitur, quia faculta obruendi praecedentem a tergo insidiantibus exhibetur. praeterea vim naturamque 'i' litterae vocalis plenissime debemus cognoscere, quod duarum interdum loco consonantium ponatur. hanc enim ex suo numero vocales duplicem litteram mittunt, ut cetera elementa litterarum singulas duplices mittunt, de quibus suo disputabimus loco. illa ergo ratione 'i' littera duplicem sonum designat, una quamvis figura [forma] sit, si undique fuerit cincta vocalibus, ut 'acerrimus Aiax' [*Aen.* 2.414] et 'aio te, Aeacida, Romanos vincere posse'.

VI: *Ann.* 183–90

nec mi aurum posco nec mi pretium dederitis:
non cauponantes bellum sed belligerantes
ferro, non auro vitam cernamus utrique.
vosne velit an me regnare era quidve ferat Fors
virtute experiamur, et hoc simul accipe dictum:
quorum virtuti belli fortuna pepercit
eorundem me libertati me parcere certum est.
dono – ducite – doque volentibus cum magnis dis.

Cic. *Off.* 1.38: cum vero de imperio decertatur belloque quaeritur gloria, causas omnino subesse tamen oportet easdem quasi dixi paulo ante iustas causas esse bellorum. sed ea bella quibus imperii proposita gloria est minus acerbe gerenda sunt. ut enim cum cive aliter contendimus si est inimicus, aliter si competitor (cum altero certamen honoris et dignitatis est, cum altero capitis et famae), sic cum Celtiberis, cum Cimbris bellum ut cum inimicis gerebatur, uter esset, non uter imperaret, cum Latinis Sabinis Samnitibus Poenis Pyrrho de imperio dimicabatur. 'Poeni foedifragi', crudelis Hannibal, reliqui iustiores. Pyrrhi quidem de captivis reddendis illa praeclara 'nec . . . dis'. regalis sane et digna Aeacidarum genere sententia.

Serv. *Aen.* 12.709, re. *Ann.* 185: INTER SE COISSE VIROS ET CERNERE FERRO vera et antiqua haec est lectio: nam Ennium secutus est qui ait 'olli cernebant magnis de rebus agentes' [*Ann.* 569]. posteritas

coepit legere 'et decernere ferro': secundum quam lectionem synalipha opus est, sed excluso 's', ut sit 'viro et decernere ferro'.

Serv. *Aen.* 10.532, re. *Ann.* 188 (argenti atque auri memoras quae multa talenta/gnatis parce tuis): GNATIS PARCE TUIS DS: 'talenta parce' per accusativum Plautine dictum, qui ait in *Milite* [1220]: 'parce vocem'. . . Serv.: 'parce' autem est secundum antiquos 'serva', ut apud Lucilium et Ennium invenitur.

VI: *Ann.* 199–200 quo vobis mentes, rectae quae stare solebant
antehac, dementes sese flexere †via

Cic. *Sen.* 15–16 (Cato): [15] etenim cum complector animo, quattuor reperio causas cur senectus misera videatur: unam quod avocet a rebus gerendis, alteram quod corpus faciat infirmius, tertiam quod privet fere omnibus voluptatibus, quartam quod haud procul absit a morte. earum, si placet, causarum quanta quamque sit iusta unaquaeque videamus.

a rebus gerendis senectus abstrahit. quibus? an eis quae iuventute geruntur et viribus? nullaene igitur res sunt seniles, quae vel infirmis corporibus, animo tamen administrentur? nihil ergo agebat Quintus Maximus, nihil Lucius Paulus pater tuus, socer optimi viri fili mei? ceteri senes, Fabricii Curii Coruncanii, cum rem publicam consilio et auctoritate defendebant, nihil agebant? [**16**] ad Appii Claudii senectutem accedebat etiam ut caecus esset; tamen is, cum sententia senatus inclinaret ad pacem cum Pyrrho foedusque faciendum, non dubitavit dicere illa quae versibus persecutus est Ennius 'quo vobis mentes, rectae quae stare solebant antehac, dementes sese flexere †via? . . .' ceteraque gravissime; notum enim vobis carmen est, et tamen ipsius Appi extat oratio. atque haec ille egit septimo decimo anno post alterum consulatum, cum inter duos consulatus anni decem interfuissent, censorque ante superiorem consulatum fuisset; ex quo intellegitur, Pyrrhi bello eum grandem sane fuisse; et tamen sic a patribus accepimus.

VII: *Ann.* 206–7 scripsere alii rem
vorsibus quos olim Faunei vatesque canebant
VII: *Ann.* 208–9 [cum] neque Musarum scopulos
nec dicti studiosus [quisquam erat] ante hunc
VII: *Ann.* 210 nos ausi reserare

Cic. *Brut.* 70–6 (Cicero): [70] quis enim eorum qui haec minora animadvertunt non intellegit Canachi signa rigidiora esse quam ut imitentur veritatem; Calamidis dura illa quidem, sed tamen molliora quam Canachi; nondum Myronis satis ad veritatem adducta, iam tamen quae non dubites pulchra dicere; pulchriora etiam Polycliti et iam plane perfecta, ut mihi quidem videri solent? similis in pictura ratio est; in qua Zeuxim et Polygnotum et Timanthem et eorum, qui non sunt usi plus quam quattuor coloribus, formas et liniamenta laudamus; at in Aetione Nicomacho Protogene Apelle iam perfecta sunt omnia. [71] et nescio an reliquis in rebus omnibus idem eveniat: nihil est enim simul et inventum et perfectum; nec dubitari debet quin fuerint ante Homerum poetae, quod ex eis carminibus intellegi potest, quae apud illum et in Phaeacum et in procorum epulis canuntur. quid, nostri veteres versus ubi sunt 'quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant', cum (cum *extra virgulas Sk.*) 'neque Musarum scopulos' 'nec dicti studiosus' quisquam erat (quisquam erat *extra virgulas Sk.*), 'ante hunc' ait ipse de se, nec mentitur in gloriando: sic enim sese res habet. nam et in *Odyssia* Latina est sic tamquam opus aliquod Daedali et Livianae fabulae non satis dignae quae iterum legantur. [72] atqui hic Livius [qui] primus fabulam C. Claudio Caeci filio et M. Tuditano consulibus docuit anno ipso ante quam natus est Ennius, post Romam conditam autem quartodecimo et quingentensimo, ut hic ait, quem nos sequimur. est enim inter scriptores de numero annorum controversia. Accius autem a Q. Maximo quintum consule captum Tarento scripsit Livium XXX post quam eum fabulam docuisse et Atticus scribit et nos in antiquis commentariis invenimus, [73] docuisse autem fabulam annis post XI C. Cornelio Q. Minucio consulibus ludis Iuventatis, quos Salinator Senensi proelio voverat. in quo tantus error Acci fuit, ut his consulibus XL annos natus Ennius fuerit: quoi si aequalis fuerit Livius, minor fuit aliquanto is, qui primus fabulam dedit, quam ei, qui multas docuerant ante hos consules, et Plautus et Naevius. [74] haec si minus apta videntur huic sermoni, Brute, Attico adsigna, qui me inflammavit studio inlustrium hominum aetates et tempora persequendi. ego vero, inquit Brutus, et delector ista quasi notatione temporum et ad id quod instituisti, oratorum genera distinguere aetatibus, istam diligentiam esse accommodatam puto. [75] recte, inquam, Brute, intellegis. atque utinam exstarent illa carmina, quae multis saeculis ante suam aetatem in epulis esse cantitata a singulis convivis de clarorum virorum laudibus in *Originibus* scriptum reliquit Cato! tamen illius, quem in vatibus et Faunis adnumerat Ennius, *Bellum Punicum* quasi Myronis opus delectat. [76] sit Ennius sane, ut est certe, perfectior; qui si illum, ut

simulat, contemneret, non omnia bella persequens primum illud Punicum acerrimum bellum reliquisset. sed ipse dicit cur id faciat. 'scripsere,' inquit, 'alii rem vorsibus' – et luculente quidem scripserunt, etiam si minus quam tu polite. nec vero tibi aliter videri debet, qui a Naevio vel sumpsisti multa, si fateris, vel, si negas, surripuisti.

Cic. *Orat.* 157: quid, quod sic loqui, 'nosse,' 'iudicasse' vetant, 'novisse' iubent et 'iudicavisse'? quasi vero nesciamus in hoc genere et plenum verbum recte dici et imminutum usitate. itaque utrumque Terentius [*Phorm.* 384] 'eho, tu cognatum tuum non noras?' post idem [*ibid.* 390]: 'Stilponem, inquam, noveras?' 'siet' plenum est, 'sit' imminutum; licet utare utroque. ergo ibidem: 'quam cara sint, quae post carenda intellegunt,/ quamque attinendi magni dominatus sient'. nec vero reprehenderim 'scripsere alii rem'; [et] 'scripserunt' esse verius sentio, sed consuetudini auribus indulgenti libenter obsequor.

Cic. *Orat.* 170–1: [170] sed habet nomen invidiam, cum in oratione iudiciali et forensi numerus [Latine, Graece ῥυθμὸς] inesse dicitur; nimis enim insidiarum ad capiendas auris adhiberi videtur, si etiam in dicendo numeri ab oratore quaeruntur. hoc freti isti et ipsi infracta et amputata locuntur et eos vituperant, qui apta et finita pronuntiant: si inanibus verbis levibusque sententiis, iure; sin probae res, lecta verba, quid est cur claudere aut insistere orationem malint quam cum sententia pariter excurrere? hic enim invidiosus numerus nihil adfert aliud nisi ut sit apte verbis comprehensa sententia; quod fit etiam ab antiquis, sed plerumque casu, saepe natura; et quae valde laudantur apud illos, ea fere, quia sunt conclusa, laudantur. [**171**] et apud Graecos quidem iam anni prope quadringenti sunt, cum hoc probatur; nos nuper agnovimus. ergo Ennio licuit vetera contemnenti dicere 'versibus quos olim Faunei canebant': mihi de antiquis eodem modo non licebit? praesertim cum dicturus non sim 'ante hunc', ut ille, nec quae sequuntur 'nos ausi reserare'. legi enim audivique non nullos, quorum propemodum absolute concluderetur oratio; quod qui non possunt, non est eis satis non contemni, laudari etiam volunt. ego autem illos ipsos laudo idque merito, quorum se isti imitatores esse dicunt, etsi in eis aliquid desidero, hos vero minime, qui nihil illorum nisi vitium secuntur, cum a bonis absint longissime.

Cic. *Div.* 1.114–15: [**114**] ergo et ii quorum animi spretis corporibus evolant atque excurrunt foras ardore aliquo inflammati atque incitati cernunt illa profecto quae vaticinantes pronuntiant, multisque rebus inflammantur tales animi qui corporibus non inhaerent, ut ii qui sono quodam vocum et

Phrygiis cantibus incitantur. multos nemora silvaeque, multos amnes aut maria commovent, quorum furibunda mens videt ante multo quae sint futura. quo de genere illa sunt: 'eheu videte!/iudicabit inclitum iudicium inter deas tris aliquis,/quo iudicio Lacedaemonia mulier, Furiarum una, adveniet' [*Alex*. 47–9 J]. eodem enim modo multa a vaticinantibus saepe praedicta sunt, nec solum verbis sed etiam 'versibus quos olim Faunei vatesque canebant'. [115] similiter Marcius et Publicius vates cecinisse dicuntur; quo de genere Apollinis operta prolata sunt. credo etiam anhelitus quosdam fuisse terrarum quibus inflatae mentes oracla funderent.

Varro, *LL* 7.36: 'versibus quos olim Faun*ei* vatesque canebant': Fauni dei Latinorum, ita ut et Faunus et Fauna sit. hos versibus quos vocant Saturnios in silvestribus locis traditum est solitos fari, ‹a› quo fando Faunos dictos. antiquos poetas vates appellabant a versibus viendis.

Whence: DS *G*. 1.11: FAUNIQUE PEDEM cum unus Faunus sit, cur pluraliter posuit? sed Varro ad Ciceronem [7.36] ita ait (Fauni) dii Latinorum, ita ut (et) Faunus et Fauna sit † per ex versibus quos vocant Saturnios, in silvestribus locis solitos fari futura atque inde faunos dictos.

Quintil. 9.4.115–16 (on the importance of being aware of rhythm in speech without pedantic observance of narrow rules): [**115**] neque vero tam sunt intuendi pedes quam universa comprensio, ut versum facientes totum illum decursum, non sex vel quinque partes ex quibus constat versus, aspiciunt: ante enim carmen ortum est quam observatio carminis; ideoque illud 'Fauni vatesque canebant'. [116] ergo quem in poemate locum habet versificatio, eum in oratione compositio.

Origo 4.4–5: [4] post Picum regnavit in Italia Faunus, quem a 'fando' dictum volunt, quod is solet futura praecinere versibus quos Saturnios dicimus. quod genus metri in vaticinatione Saturniae primum proditum est. [5] [sed urbem Saturnus, cum in Italiam venisset, condidisse traditur.] eius rei Ennius testis est, cum ait 'versibus quos olim Fauni vatesque canebant'.

cf. Fest. 432: SATURNO dies festus celebratur mense Decembre, quod eo aedis est dedicata: et is culturae agrorum praesidere videtur, quo etiam falx est ei insigne. versus quoque antiquissimi quibus Faunus fata cecinisse hominibus videtur 'Saturnii' appellantur, quibus et a Naevio *Bellum Punicum* scriptum est et a multis aliis plura composita sunt. qui deus in Saliaribus 'Sat‹e›urnus' nominatur, videlicet a sationibus.

Whence: Mar. Victorin. 6.138 f.: huius versus cui prisca apud Latinum aetas tamquam Italo et indigenae Saturnio sive Faunio nomen dedit; Ps.-Placid. F15: Fauniorum modorum: antiquissimorum versuum, quibus Faunum celebrabant.)

VII: *Ann.* 216 Appius indixit Carthaginiensibus bellum

Cic. *Inv.* 1.27: narratio est rerum gestarum aut ut gestarum expositio. narrationum genera tria sunt: unum genus est, in quo ipsa causa et omnis ratio controversiae continetur; alterum, in quo digressio aliqua extra causam aut criminationis aut similitudinis aut delectationis non alienae ab eo negotio, quo de agitur, aut amplificationis causa interponitur. tertium genus est remotum a civilibus causis, quod delectationis causa non inutili cum exercitatione dicitur et scribitur. eius partes sunt duae, quarum altera in negotiis, altera in personis maxime versatur. ea quae in negotiorum expositione posita est tres habet partes: fabulam, historiam, argumentum. fabula est in qua nec verae, nec veri similes res continentur, cuiusmodi est 'angues ingentes alites, iuncti iugo' (Pacuv. *Medus* 397 R). historia est gesta res, ab aetatis nostrae memoria remota, quod genus 'Appius indixit Carthaginiensibus bellum'. argumentum est ficta res, quae tamen fieri potuit. huiusmodi apud Terentium [*Andr.* 51]: 'nam is postquam excessit ex ephebis, [Sosia] . . .'. illa autem narratio quae versatur in personis, eiusmodi est, ut in ea simul cum rebus ipsis personarum sermones et animi perspici possint, hoc modo: 'venit ad me clam[it]ans: 'quid agis, Micio?/cur perdis adulescentem nobis? cur amat?/cur potat? cur tu his rebus sumptum suggeris,/vestitu nimio indulges? nimium ineptus es.' nimium ipse est durus praeter aequumque et bonum' [*Ad.* 60–4]. hoc in genere narrationis multa debet inesse festivitas, confecta ex rerum varietate, animorum dissimilitudine, gravitate, lenitate, spe, metu, suspicione, desiderio, dissimulatione, errore, misericordia, fortunae commutatione, insperato incommodo, subita laetitia, iucundo exitu rerum. verum ex iis, quae postea de elocutione praecipientur, ornamenta sumentur.

VII: *Ann.* 234–5 hostem qui feriet †erit (inquit) mi† Carthaginiensis quisquis erit. cuiatis siet

Cic. *Balb.* 51: hic tu Cn. Pompei beneficium vel potius iudicium et factum infirmare conaris, qui fecit quod C. Marium fecisse audierat, fecit quod P. Crassum, quod L. Sullam, quod Q. Metellum, *quod M. Crassum*, quod denique domesticum auctorem patrem suum facere viderat? neque vero id

in uno Cornelio fecit; nam et Gaditanum Hasdrubalem ex bello illo Africano et Mamertinos Ovios et quosdam Uticensis et Saguntinos Fabios civitate donavit. etenim cum ceteris praemiis digni sunt qui suo labore et periculo nostram rem publicam defendunt, tum certe dignissimi sunt qui civitate ea donentur pro qua pericula ac tela subierunt. atque utinam qui ubique sunt propugnatores huius imperi possent in hanc civitatem venire, et contra oppugnatores rei publicae de civitate exterminari! neque enim ille summus poeta noster Hannibalis illam magis cohortationem quam communem imperatoriam voluit esse 'hostem qui feriet †erit' inquit 'mi† Carthaginiensis quisquis erit. c*ui*atis siet' id habent hodie leve et semper habuerunt, itaque et cives undique fortis viros adsciverunt et hominum ignobilium virtutem persaepe nobilitatis inertiae protulerunt.

IX: *Ann.* 302 Europam Libyamque rapax ubi dividit unda

Cic. *Tusc.* 1.45: etenim si nunc aliquid adsequi se putant, qui ostium Ponti viderunt et eas angustias per quas penetravit ea quae est nominata 'Argo quia Argivi in ea delecti viri/vecti petebant pellem inauratam arietis' (*Medea* 212–13 J), aut ii qui Oceani freta illa viderunt 'Europam Libyamque rapax ubi dividit unda', quod tandem spectaculum fore putamus, cum totam terram contueri licebit eiusque cum situm, formam, circumscriptionem, tum et habitabiles regiones et rursum omni cultu propter vim frigoris aut caloris vacantis?

Cic. *Nat. D.* 3.23–4: [23] . . . quod si mundus universus est deus, ne stellae quidem, quas tu innumerabilis in deorum numero reponebas. quarum te cursus aequabiles aeternique delectabant, nec mehercule iniuria, sunt enim admirabili incredibilique constantia. [**24**] sed non omnia, Balbe, quae cursus certos et constantis habent, ea deo potius tribuenda sunt quam naturae. quid Chalcidico Euripo in motu identidem reciprocando putas fieri posse constantius, quid freto Siciliensi, quid Oceani fervore illis in locis 'Europam Libyamque rapax ubi dividit unda'? quid aestus maritimi vel Hispanienses vel Brittanici eorumque certis temporibus vel accessus vel recessus sine deo fieri nonne possunt? vide quaeso, si omnis motus omniaque quae certis temporibus ordinem suum conservant divina dicimus, ne tertianas quoque febres et quartanas divinas esse dicendum sit, quarum reversione et motu quid potest esse constantius. sed omnium talium rerum ratio reddenda est; quod vos cum facere non potestis, tamquam in aram confugitis ad deum.

IX: *Ann.* 304–8

additur orator Cornelius suaviloquenti
ore Cethegus Marcus Tuditano collega
Marci filius. is dictus popularibus ollis
qui tum vivebant homines atque aevom agitabant
flos delibatus populi Suadaique medulla.

Cic. *Brut.* 57–60 (Brutus): [57] dicitur etiam C. Flaminius, is qui tribunus plebis legem de agro Gallico et Piceno viritim dividundo tulerit, qui consul apud Trasumennum sit interfectus, ad populum valuisse dicendo. Q. etiam Maximus Verrucosus orator habitus est temporibus illis et Q. Metellus, is qui bello Punico secundo cum L. Veturio Philone consul fuit. [**58**] quem vero exstet et de quo sit memoriae proditum eloquentem fuisse et ita esse habitum, primus est M. Cornelius Cethegus, cuius eloquentiae est auctor, et idoneus quidem mea sententia, Q. Ennius, praesertim cum et ipse eum audiverit et scribat de mortuo: ex quo nulla suspicio est amicitiae causa esse mentitum. est igitur sic apud illum in nono ut opinor annali: 'additur orator Cornelius suaviloquenti/ore Cethegus Marcus Tuditano conlega/Marci filius – ' et oratorem appellat et suaviloquentiam tribuit, quae nunc quidem non tam est in plerisque (latrant enim iam quidam oratores, non loquuntur), sed est ea laus eloquentiae certe maxima: 'is dictus ollis popularibus olim,/qui tum vivebant homines atque aevom agitabant/flos delibatus populi – '; probe vero; [**59**] ut enim hominis decus ingenium, sic ingeni ipsius lumen est eloquentia, qua virum excellentem praeclare tum illi homines florem populi esse dixerunt – 'Suadae medulla'. Πειθὼ quam vocant Graeci, cuius effector est orator, hanc 'Suadam' appellavit Ennius, eius autem Cethegum medullam fuisse vult, ut, quam deam in Pericli labris scripsit Eupolis sessitavisse, huius hic medullam nostrum oratorem fuisse dixerit. [60] at hic Cethegus consul cum P. Tuditano fuit bello Punico secundo quaestorque his consulibus M. Cato, modo plane annis CXL ante me consulem; et id ipsum nisi unius esset Enni testimonio cognitum, hunc vetustas, ut alios fortasse multos, oblivione obruisset. illius autem aetatis qui sermo fuerit ex Naevianis scriptis intellegi potest. his enim consulibus, ut in veteribus commentariis scriptum est, Naevius est mortuus; quamquam Varro noster diligentissimus investigator antiquitatis putat in hoc erratum vitamque Naevi producit longius. nam Plautus P. Claudio L. Porcio viginti annis post illos quos ante dixi consulibus mortuus est, Catone censore.

Cic. *Sen.* 50 (Cato): quid in levioribus studiis, sed tamen acutis, quam gaudebat *Bello* suo *Punico* Naevius, quam *Truculento* Plautus, quam

Pseudolo? vidi etiam senem Livium, qui cum sex annis antequam ego natus sum fabulam docuisset Centone Tuditanoque consulibus, usque ad adulescentiam meam processit aetate. quid de Publi Licini Crassi et pontificii et civilis iuris studio loquar, aut de huius Publi Scipionis qui his paucis diebus pontifex maximus factus est? atque eos omnes quos commemoravi his studiis flagrantes senes vidimus; Marcum vero Cethegum, quem recte 'Suadai medullam' dixit Ennius, quanto studio exerceri in dicendo videbamus etiam senem! quae sunt igitur epularum aut ludorum aut scortorum voluptates cum his voluptatibus comparandae? atque haec [quidem studia doctrinae quae] quidem prudentibus et bene institutis pariter cum aetate crescunt, ut honestum illud Solonis sit, quod ait versiculo quodam ut ante dixi, senescere se multa in dies addiscentem: qua voluptate animi nulla certe potest esse maior.

Quintil. 11.3.30–1: [30] non alia est autem ratio pronuntiationis quam ipsius orationis. nam ut illa emendata dilucida ornata apta esse debet, ita haec quoque. emendata erit, id est vitio carebit, si fuerit os facile explanatum iucundum urbanum, id est in quo nulla neque rusticitas neque peregrinitas resonet. [**31**] non enim sine causa dicitur 'barbarum Graecumve': nam sonis homines ut aera tinnitu dinoscimus. ita fiet illud quod Ennius probat cum dicit 'suaviloquenti ore' Cethegum fuisse, non quod Cicero in iis reprehendit quos ait latrare, non agere.

Quintil. 2.15.4: haec opinio [sc. rhetoricen esse vim persuadendi] originem ab Isocrate, si tamen re vera ars quae circumfertur eius est, duxit. qui cum longe sit a voluntate infamantium oratoris officia, finem artis temere comprendit dicens esse rhetoricen persuadendi opificiem, id est πειθοῦς δημιουργόν: neque enim mihi permiserim eadem uti declinatione qua Ennius M. Cethegum 'suadae medulla' vocat.

Gell. 12.2.1–8 (*quod Annaeus Seneca iudicans de Q. Ennio deque M. Tullio levi futtilique iudicio fuit*): [1] de Annaeo Seneca partim existimant ut de scriptore minime utili, cuius libros adtingere nullum pretium operae sit, quod oratio eius vulgaria videatur et protrita, res atque sententiae aut inepto inanique impetu sint aut levi et causidicali argutia, eruditio autem vernacula et plebeia nihilque ex veterum scriptis habens neque gratiae neque dignitatis. alii vero elegantiae quidem in verbis parum esse non infitias eunt, sed et rerum, quas dicat, scientiam doctrinamque ei non deesse dicunt et in vitiis morum obiurgandis severitatem gravitatemque non invenustam. [2] mihi de omni eius ingenio deque omni scripto iudicium censuramque facere non necessum est; sed quod de M. Cicerone et Q. Ennio et P. Vergilio iudicavit,

ea res cuimodi sit, ad considerandum ponemus. [**3**] in libro enim vicesimo secundo *epistularum moralium* quas ad Lucilium composuit [Seneca], deridiculos versus Q. Ennium de Cethego antiquo viro fecisse hos dicit: 'is dictus*t* ollis popularibus olim,/qui tum vivebant atque aevom agitabant/ flos delibatus populi Suada‹eque› medulla'. [4] ac deinde scribit de isdem versibus verba haec: 'admiror eloquentissimos viros et deditos Ennio pro optimis ridicula laudasse. Cicero certe inter bonos eius versus et hos refert'. [5] atque id etiam de Cicerone dicit: 'non miror' inquit 'fuisse qui hos versus scriberet, cum fuerit qui laudaret; nisi forte Cicero summus orator agebat causam suam et volebat suos versus videri bonos.' [6] postea hoc etiam addidit insulsissime: 'apud ipsum quoque' inquit 'Ciceronem invenies etiam in prosa oratione quaedam ex quibus intellegas illum non perdidisse operam quod Ennium legit'. [7] ponit deinde quae apud Ciceronem reprehendat quasi Enniana, quod ita scripserit in libris *De Republica* [5.11]: 'ut Menelao Laconi quaedam fuit suaviloquens iucunditas', et quod alio in loco dixerit: 'breviloquentiam in dicendo colat'. [8] atque ibi homo nugator Ciceronis errores deprecatur et 'non fuit' inquit 'Ciceronis hoc vitium, sed temporis; necesse erat haec dici, cum illa legerentur.' deinde adscribit Ciceronem haec ipsa interposuisse ad effugiendam infamiam nimis lascivae orationis et nitidae.

DS *Aen.* 8.500 (o Maeoniae delecta iuventus,/flos veterum virtusque virum): FLOS VETERUM Ennianum;

Hor. *Ep.* 2.2.116–18: '. . . speciosa vocabula rerum/quae priscis memorata Catonibus atque Cethegis/nunc situs informis premit et deserta vetustas'; id. *AP* 50: 'fingere cinctutis non exaudita Cethegis'.

IX: *Ann.* 309	Africa terribili tremit horrida terra tumultu
Dub. 12	mare saxifragis undis
Op. inc. 6	desine Roma tuos hostis
Op. inc. 7	nam tibi moenimenta mei peperere labores
Op. inc. 8	testes sunt Campi Magni

Cic. *De or.* 3.167–8: [**167**] sumpta re simili verba illius rei propria deinceps in rem aliam, ut dixi, transferuntur. est hoc magnum ornamentum orationis, in quo obscuritas fugienda est; etenim hoc fere genere fiunt ea, quae dicuntur aenigmata. non est autem in verbo modus hoc, sed in oratione, id est in continuatione verborum. ne illa quidem traductio atque immutatio in verbo quandam fabricationem habet sed in oratione: 'Africa terribili

tremit horrida terra tumultu'; pro 'Afris' est sumpta 'Africa'. neque factum est verbum, ut 'mare saxifragis undis', neque translatum, ut 'mollitur mare' (Pacuv. *Chryses* 77 R), sed ornandi causa proprium proprio commutatum: 'desine Roma tuos hostis . . .', 'testes sunt Campi Magni . . .'. gravis est modus in ornatu orationis et saepe sumendus; ex quo genere haec sunt, Martem belli esse communem, Cererem pro frugibus, Liberum appellare pro vino, Neptunum pro mari, curiam pro senatu, campum pro comitiis, togam pro pace, arma ac tela pro bello [168] quo item in genere et virtutes et vitia pro ipsis, in quibus illa sunt, appellantur: 'luxuries quam in domum inrupit' et 'quo avaritia penetravit' aut 'fides valuit, iustitia confecit'. (*The continuation of this passage is quoted under* Ann. *525/560–1, p. 391.*)

Cic. *Fam.* 9.7.1–2 (*ad Varronem*): [1] cenabam apud Seium, cum utrique nostrum redditae sunt a te litterae. mihi vero iam maturum videtur; nam quod ante calumniatus sum, indicabo militiam meam; volebam prope alicubi esse, si quid bonae salutis, σύν τε δύ' ἐρχομένω; nunc quoniam confecta sunt omnia, dubitandum non est quin equis viris. nam ut audivi de L. Caesare filio, mecum ipse: 'quid hic mihi faciet patri?' itaque non desino apud istos, qui nunc dominantur, cenitare. [**2**] quid faciam? tempori serviendum est. sed ridicula missa, praesertim cum sit nihil quod rideamus: 'Africa terribili tremit horrida terra tumultu'. itaque nullum est ἀποπροηγμένον quod non verear. sed quod quaeris, quando, qua, quo, nihil adhuc scimus. istuc ipsum de Baiis, non nulli dubitant an per Sardiniam veniat; illud enim adhuc praedium suum non inspexit nec ullum habet deterius, sed tamen non contemnit. ego omnino magis arbitror per Siciliam Veliam, *sed iam* sciemus; adventat enim Dolabella. eum puto magistrum fore. πολλοὶ μαθηταὶ κρείσσονες διδασκάλων. sed tamen, si sciam quid tu constitueris, meum consilium accommodabo potissimum ad tuum; qua re exspecto tuas litteras.

cf. Varro, *Men.* 225A: Africa terribilis, contra concurrere civis.

Cic. *Orat.* 91–3 (on the intermediate style): [91] uberius est aliud aliquantoque robustius quam hoc humile, de quo dictum est, summissius autem, quam illud, de quo iam dicetur, amplissimum: hoc in genere nervorum vel minimum, suavitatis autem est vel plurimum; est enim plenius quam hoc enucleatum, quam autem illud ornatum copiosumque summissius. [92] huic omnia dicendi ornamenta conveniunt plurimumque est in hac orationis forma suavitatis; in qua multi floruerunt apud Graecos, sed Phalereus Demetrius meo iudicio praestitit ceteris, cuius oratio cum sedate placideque l*ab*itur, tum illustrant eam quasi stellae quaedam tralata verba atque

immutata. tralata ea dico, ut saepe iam, quae per similitudinem ab alia re aut suavitatis aut inopiae causa transferuntur: mutata, in quibus pro verbo proprio subicitur aliud, quod idem significet sumptum ex re aliqua consequenti; [**93**] quod quamquam transferendo fit, tamen alio modo transtulit cum dixit Ennius 'arce et urbe orba sum' [*Androm.* 83 J], alio modo, [si pro patria arcem dixisset; et] 'horridam Africam terribili tremere tumultu' [cum dicit, pro 'Afris' immutat 'Africam']. hanc ὑπαλλαγὴν rhetores, quia quasi summutantur verba pro verbis, μετωνυμίαν grammatici vocant, quod nomina transferuntur.

Fest. 138: METONYMIA est tropos cum ab eo quod continet significatur id quod continetur, . . . ut Ennius cum ait 'Africa terribili tremi*t* horrida terra tumultu'. *See under Festus* (Appendix Table A5.11) *for* Ann. *509, p. 442, for the full passage*.

Cic. *Fin.* 2.106: sed vobis voluptatum perceptarum recordatio vitam beatam facit, et quidem corpore perceptarum. nam si quae sunt aliae, falsum est omnis animi voluptates esse e corporis societate. corporis autem voluptas si etiam praeterita delectat, non intellego cur Aristoteles Sardanapalli epigramma tantopere derideat in quo ille rex Syriae glorietur se omnis secum libidinum voluptates abstulisse. quod enim ne vivus quidem, inquit, diutius sentire poterat quam dum fruebatur, quomodo id potuit mortuo permanere? fluit igitur voluptas corporis et prima quaeque avolat saepiusque relinquit causam paenitendi quam recordandi. itaque beatior Africanus cum patria illo modo loquens 'desine Roma tuos hostes' reliquaque praeclare 'nam tibi mo*e*nimenta mei peperere labores'. laboribus hic praeteritis gaudet, tu iubes voluptatibus; et hic se ad ea revocat e quibus nihil umquam rettulerit ad corpus, tu totus haeres in corpore.

x: *Ann.* 329 egregie cordatus homo, catus Aelius Sextus

Cic. *De or.* 1.198: iam vero ipsa [sc. iuris civilis cognitio] per sese quantum adferat iis qui ei praesunt, honoris, gratiae, dignitatis quis ignorat? itaque [non] ut apud Graecos infimi homines mercedula adducti ministros se praebent in iudiciis oratoribus, ii qui apud illos pragmatici vocantur, sic in nostra civitate contra amplissimus quisque et clarissimus vir, ut ille qui propter hanc iuris civilis scientiam sic appellatus a summo poeta est 'egregie cordatus homo, catus Aelius Sextus', multique praeterea, qui, cum ingenio sibi auctore dignitatem peperissent, perfecerunt, ut in respondendo iure auctoritate plus etiam quam ipso ingenio valerent.

Cic. *Rep.* 1.30 (Laelius): [* * *] in ipsius paterno genere fuit noster ille amicus, dignus huic ad imitandum, 'egregie cordatus homo, catus Aelius Sextus', qui 'egregie cordatus' et 'catus' fuit et ab Ennio dictus est, non quod ea quaerebat quae numquam inveniret, sed quod ea respondebat quae eos qui quaesissent et cura et negotio solverent; cuique contra Gali studia disputanti in ore semper erat ille de *Iphigenia* [185–7 J] Achilles: 'astrologorum signa in caelo quid sit observationis/cum capra aut nepa aut exoritur nomen aliquod belvarum/quod est ante pedes nemo spectat, caeli scrutantur plagas'. atqui idem (multum enim illum audiebam et libenter) Zethum illum Pacuvi nimis inimicum doctrinae esse dicebat; magis eum delectabat Neoptolemus Enni, qui se ait philosophari velle, sed paucis, nam omnino haud placere. quodsi studia Graecorum vos tantopere delectant, sunt alia liberiora et transfusa latius, quae vel ad usum vitae vel etiam ad ipsam rem publicam conferre possimus; istae quidem artes, si modo aliquid, valent ut paulum acuant et tamquam irritent ingenia puerorum, quo facilius possint maiora discere.

Cic. *Tusc.* 1.18:[11] mors igitur ipsa, quae videtur notissima res esse, quid sit, primum est videndum. sunt enim qui discessum animi a corpore putent esse mortem; sunt qui nullum censeant fieri discessum, sed una animum et corpus occidere, animumque in corpore extingui. qui discedere animum censent, alii statim dissipari, alii diu permanere, alii semper. quid sit porro ipse animus aut ubi aut unde, magna dissensio est. aliis cor ipsum animus videtur, ex quo excordes, vecordes concordesque dicuntur, et Nasica ille prudens bis consul 'Corculum' et 'egregie cordatus homo, catus Aelius Sextus'.

Varro, *LL* 7.46: apud Ennium 'iam cata signa fere sonitum dare voce parabant' [*Ann.* 450]; cata acuta; hoc enim verbo dicunt Sabini. quare 'catus Aelius Sextus' non ut aiunt sapiens sed acutus, et quod est 'tunc coepit memorare simul cata dicta' accipienda acuta dicta.

x: *Ann.* 335	ille vir haud magna cum re sed plenus fidei
Ann. 336	sollicitari te Tite sic noctesque diesque
Ann. 337–9	o Tite, si quid ego adiuero curamve levasso quae nunc te coquit et versat in pectore fixa, ecquid erit praemi?

[11] Skutsch 1985: 504 notes that Pompon. *Dig.* 1.2.2.38 and August. *Ep.* 19, which show awareness of *Ann.* 329, are directly dependent on Cicero.

Cic. *Sen.* 1: 'O Tite, si quid ego adi*ve*ro curamve levasso,/quae nunc te coquit et versat in pectore fixa,/ecquid erit praemi?' licet enim mihi versibus eisdem adfari te, Attice, quibus adfatur Flamininum: 'ille vir haud magna cum re sed plenus fidei', quamquam certo scio non ut Flamininum 'sollicitari te, Tite, sic noctesque diesque'. novi enim moderationem animi tui et aequitatem, teque non cognomen solum Athenis deportasse, sed humanitatem et prudentiam intellego. et tamen te suspicor eisdem rebus quibus me ipsum interdum gravius commoveri, quarum consolatio et maior est et in aliud tempus differenda; nunc autem mihi est visum de senectute aliquid ad te conscribere.

'Donat.' Ter. *Phorm.* prol. 34.6 (quem actoris virtus nobis restituit locum/ bonitasque vostra adiutans atque aequanimitas): ADIUTANS sic maluerunt veteres quam 'adiuvans' dicere. Ennius 'O Tite, si quid ego te adiu*t*o curamve levasso' (Ennius . . . levasso *RKU*; *om. rell.*).

XII: *Ann.* 363–5 unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem.
noenum rumores ponebat ante salutem.
ergo postque magisque viri nunc gloria claret.[12]

Cic. *Off.* 1.84: inventi autem multi sunt qui non modo pecuniam sed etiam vitam profundere pro patria parati essent, idem gloriae iacturam ne minimam quidem facere vellent, ne republica quidem postulante, ut Callicratidas, qui, cum Lacedaemoniorum dux fuisset Peloponnesiaco bello multaque fecisset egregie, vertit ad extremum omnia, cum consilio non paruit eorum qui classem ab Arginusis removendam nec cum Atheniensibus dimicandum putabant. quibus ille respondit Lacedaemonios classe illa amissa aliam parare posse, se fugere sine suo dedecore non posse. atque haec quidem [de Lacedaemoniis] plaga mediocris, illa pestifera, qua, cum Cleombrotus invidiam timens temere cum Epaminonda conflixisset, Lacedaemoniorum opes corruerunt. quanto Q. Maximus melius, de quo Ennius 'unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem. *non enim* rumores ponebat ante salutem. ergo postque magis*que* viri nunc gloria claret'. quod genus peccandi vitandum est etiam in rebus

[12] Besides those listed below, Skutsch 1985: 530 lists the following further allusions to this famous line (or to Ennius' portrayal of Fabius), which include no mention of Ennius' name: Polyb. 3.105.8; Livy 22.39.18, 44.22.10; Pliny *NH* 22.10; cp. also Sil. 6.611–18; Val. Max. 7.3.7 (Skutsch cites Otto, *Sprichw.* p. 101); Claud. *Get.* 131 and 142; Ser. Samm. 1092.

urbanis. sunt enim qui quod sentiunt, etsi optimum sit, tamen invidiae metu non audent dicere.

Cic. *Sen.* 10 (Cato): ego Quintum Maximum, eum qui Tarentum recepit, senem adulescens ita dilexi ut aequalem; erat enim in illo viro comitate condita gravitas, nec senectus mores multaverat; quamquam eum colere coepi non admodum grandem natu, sed tamen iam aetate provectum. anno enim post consul primum fuerat quam ego natus sum; cumque eo quartum consule adulescentulus miles ad Capuam profectus sum, quintoque anno post ad Tarentum. quaestor deinde quadriennio post factus sum, quem magistratum gessi consulibus Tuditano et Cethego, cum quidem ille admodum senex suasor legis Cinciae de donis et muneribus fuit. hic et bella gerebat ut adulescens cum plane grandis esset, et Hannibalem iuveniliter exsultantem patientia sua molliebat; de quo praeclare familiaris noster Ennius 'unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem. *non enim* rumores ponebat ante salutem. ergo postque magis*que* viri nunc gloria claret'.

Cic. *Att.* 2.19.2: scito nihil umquam fuisse tam infame, tam turpe, tam peraeque omnibus generibus, ordinibus, aetatibus offensum quam hunc statum qui nunc est, magis me hercule quam vellem non modo quam putarem. populares isti iam etiam modestos homines sibilare docuerunt. Bibulus in caelo est, nec quare scio, sed ita laudatur quasi 'unus qui (qui *Sk.*: homo *codd.*; qui *post* homo *add. Wesenberg, ante* unus *Watt*) nobis restituit rem'. Pompeius, nostri amores, quod mihi summo dolori est, ipse se adflixit. neminem tenent voluntate; ne metu necesse sit iis uti vereor. ego autem neque pugno cum illa causa propter illam amicitiam neque approbo, ne omnia improbem quae antea gessi; utor via.

Livy 30.26.7–9: [7] eodem anno Q. Fabius Maximus moritur, exactae aetatis si quidem uerum est augurem duos et sexaginta annos fuisse, quod quidam auctores sunt. [8] uir certe fuit dignus tanto cognomine, uel si nouum ab eo inciperet. superauit paternos honores, auitos aequauit. pluribus uictoriis et maioribus proeliis auus insignis Rullus; sed omnia aequare unus hostis Hannibal potest. [**9**] cautior tamen quam promptior hic habitus; et sicut dubites utrum ingenio cunctator fuerit an quia ita bello proprie quod tum gerebatur aptum erat, sic nihil certius est quam unum hominem nobis cunctando rem restituisse, sicut Ennius ait.

Verg. *Aen.* 6.845:[13] tu maximus ille es, unus qui nobis restituis rem

[13] Skutsch 1985: 529 points out that it is on Vergil, not Ennius, that Jer. *Ep.* 77.2, *adv. Ruf.* 3.29 ('unus qui nobis scribendo restituis rem') is dependent.

Serv. *Aen.* 6.845: ille est de quo ait Ennius 'unus *qui* nobis cunctando restituit (-is *nonnulli*) rem' (cf. Mythogr. Vat. 1 fab. 224).

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.23: 'unus qui nobis cunctando restituit rem' [*Aen.* 6.846]. Ennius in duodecimo: 'unus homo nobis cunctando restituit rem'.

Ov. *Fast.* 2.240–2: unus de Fabia gente relictus erat:
scilicet ut posses olim tu, Maxime, nasci,
cui res cunctando restituenda foret.

Sen. *Benef.* 4.27.2: quid ergo? et Fabius qui 'cunctando restituit rem' temerarius est?

Suet. *Tib.* 21 (*Ep. Aug. ad Tib.*): ii quoque qui tecum fuerunt omnes confitentur versum illum in te posse dici 'unus homo nobis vigilando restituit rem'.[14]

?VI: *Ann.* 456 quem nemo ferro potuit superare nec auro

Cic. *Rep.* 3.5–6: [5] quodsi quis ad ea instrumenta animi quae natura quaeque civilibus institutis habuit, adiungendam sibi etiam doctrinam et uberiorem rerum cognitionem putavit, ut ei ipsi qui in horum librorum disputatione versantur, nemo est quin eos anteferre omnibus debeat. quid enim potest esse praeclarius quam cum rerum magnarum tractatio atque usus cum illarum artium studiis et cognitione coniungitur? aut quid Publio Scipione, quid Gaio Laelio, quid Lucio Philo perfectius cogitari potest, qui ne quid praetermitterent quod ad summam laudem clarorum virorum pertineret, ad domesticum maiorumque morem etiam hanc a Socrate adventiciam doctrinam adhibuerunt? [6] quare qui utrumque voluit et potuit, id est ut cum maiorum institutis tum doctrina se instrueret, ad laudem hunc omnia consecutum puto; sin altera sit utra via prudentiae deligenda, tamen etiamsi cui videbitur illa in optimis studiis et artibus quieta vitae ratio beatior, haec civilis laudabilior est certe et illustrior, ex qua vita sic summi viri ornantur ut vel Manius Curius, 'quem nemo ferro potuit superare nec auro', vel [* * *]

??: *Ann.* 522–3 sicuti fortis equos spatio qui saepe supremo
vicit Olympia nunc senio confectus quiescit

[14] Skutsch 1985: 529, citing W. Weber, *Princeps*, Stuttgart 1936, p. 34, notes that Suetonius' 'vigilando' is perhaps from Lucil. 216 M ('hic solus vigilavit opinor').

Cic. *Sen.* 14: sua enim vitia insipientes et suam culpam in senectutem conferunt. quod non faciebat is cuius modo mentionem feci Ennius: 'sicuti fortis equus, spatio qui saepe supremo vicit Olympia, nunc senio confectus quiescit'. equi fortis et victoris senectuti comparat suam. quem quidem probe meminisse potestis; anno enim undevicesimo post eius mortem hi consules, T. Flaminius et M'. Acilius, facti sunt; ille autem Caepione et Philippo iterum consulibus mortuus est, cum ego quinque et sexaginta annos natus legem Voconiam magna voce et bonis lateribus suasi. sed annos septuaginta natus, tot enim vixit Ennius, ita ferebat duo quae maxima putantur onera, paupertatem et senectutem, ut eis paene delectari videretur.

??: *Ann.* 525 nos sumus Romani qui fuimus ante Rudini
??: *Ann.* 560–1 at Romanus homo, tamenetsi res bene gesta est,
corde suo trepidat

Cic. *De or.* 3.168 (*for the preceding passage, see under* Ann. *309, pp. 384–5*): videtis profecto genus hoc totum, cum inflexo immutatoque verbo res eadem enuntiatur ornatius; cui sunt finitima illa minus ornata, sed tamen non ignoranda, cum intellegi volumus aut ex parte totum, ut pro 'aedificiis' cum 'parietes' aut 'tecta' dicimus; aut ex toto partem, ut cum 'unam turmam' equitatum populi Romani dicimus; aut ex uno plures ut 'at Romanus homo, tamenetsi res bene gesta est, corde suo trepidat'; aut cum ex pluribus intellegitur unum 'nos sumus Romani qui fuimus ante Rudini'; aut quocumque modo, non ut dictum est, in eo genere intellegitur, sed ut sensum est.

cf. Iul. Vict. *RLM* 432.27: aut ex uno plures ut 'Romanus invasit' aut cum ex pluribus unum ut 'Romani sumus' cum unus dicit.

??: *Ann.* 541 tum tonuit laevom bene tempestate serena

Cic. *Div.* 2.81–4: [81] at omnes reges, populi, nationes utuntur auspiciis. quasi vero quicquam sit tam valde quam nihil sapere vulgare, aut quasi tibi ipsi in iudicando placeat multitudo! quotus quisque est, qui voluptatem neget esse bonum? plerique etiam summum bonum dicunt. num igitur eorum frequentia Stoici de sententia deterrentur? aut num plerisque in rebus sequitur eorum auctoritatem multitudo? quid mirum igitur, si in auspiciis et in omni divinatione inbecilli animi superstitiosa ista concipiant, verum dispicere non possint? [**82**] ad nostri augurii consuetudinem dixit Ennius 'tum tonuit laevum bene tempestate serena'. at Homericus Aiax apud Achillem querens de ferocitate Troianorum nescio quid hoc modo

nuntiat: 'prospera Iuppiter his dextris fulgoribus edit'.[15] ita nobis sinistra videntur, Graiis et barbaris dextra meliora. quamquam haud ignoro quae bona sint sinistra nos dicere, etiamsi dextra sint; sed certe nostri sinistrum nominaverunt externique dextrum, quia plerumque id melius videbatur. [83] haec quanta dissensio est! quid? quod aliis avibus utuntur, aliis signis, aliter observant, alia respondent, non necesse est fateri partim horum errore susceptum esse, partim superstitione, multa fallendo?

Varro, *Men.* 103A (*ap.* Non. 408.3): dum sermone cenulam variamus, interea 'tonuit bene tempestate serena'.

??: *Ann.* 589 ausus es hoc ex ore tuo

Cic. *Att.* 6.2.8: sed iam ad te ipsum revertor. ain tandem, Attice, laudator integritatis et elegantiae nostrae, 'ausus es hoc ex ore tuo – – ' inquit Ennius, ut equites Scaptio ad pecuniam cogendam darem me rogare? an tu si mecum esses qui scribis morderi te interdum quod non simul sis, paterere me id facere si vellem? 'non amplius' inquis 'quinquaginta.' cum Spartaco minus multi primo fuerunt. quid tandem isti mali in tam tenera insula non fecissent? non fecissent autem? immo quid ante adventum meum non fecerunt? inclusum in curia senatum habuerunt Salaminium ita multos dies ut interierint non nulli fame. erat enim praefectus Appi Scaptius et habebat turmas ab Appio. id me igitur tu cuius me hercule os mihi ante oculos solet versari cum de aliquo officio ac laude cogito, tu me inquam rogas praefectus ut Scaptius sit? alias hoc statueramus ut negotiatorem neminem idque Bruto probaramus. habeat is turmas? cur potius quam cohortis? sumptu iam nepos evadit Scaptius.

??: *Ann.* 590 urbes magnas atque imperiosas

Cic. *Rep.* 1.3: quin etiam Xenocratem ferunt, nobilem in primis philosophum, cum quaereretur ex eo quid adsequerentur eius discipuli, respondisse, 'ut id sua sponte facerent, quod cogerentur facere legibus': ergo ille civis, qui id cogit omnes imperio legumque poena quod vix paucis persuadere oratione philosophi possunt, etiam eis qui illa disputant ipsis est praeferendus doctoribus. quae est enim istorum oratio tam exquisita, quae sit anteponenda bene constitutae civitati publico iure et morbus? equidem quemadmodum 'urbes magnas atque imperiosas', ut appellat Ennius, viculis

[15] Pease suggests that this translation of *Il.* 9.236–7 may be one of Cicero's own translations of Homer; see Pease 1920: 187 ad *Div.* 1.52, '*Homericum . . . versum*', as well as *id.* 1923: 483 ad *Div.* 2.82.

et castellis praeferendas puto, sic eos qui his urbibus consilio atque auctoritate praesunt, eis qui omnis negoti publici expertes sint longe duco sapientia ipsa esse anteponendos; et quoniam maxime rapimur ad opes augendas generis humani, studemusque nostris consiliis et laboribus tutiorem et opulentiorem vitam hominum reddere, et ad hanc voluntatem ipsius naturae stimulis incitamur, teneamus eu cursum qui semper fuit optimi cuiusque, neque ea signa audiamus quae receptui canunt, ut eos etiam revocent qui iam processerint.

??: *Ann.* 592 patrem divomque hominumque

Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.4–5: [4] tum Lucilius: 'ne egere quidem videtur' inquit 'oratione prima pars. quid enim potest esse tam apertum tamque perspicuum, cum caelum suspeximus caelestiaque contemplati sumus, quam esse aliquod numen praestantissimae mentis quo haec regantur? quod ni ita esset, qui potuisset adsensu omnium dicere Ennius [*Thyestes* 301 J]: 'aspice hoc sublime candens, quem invocant omnes Iovem' – illum vero et Iovem et dominatorem rerum et omnia nutu regentem, et, ut idem Ennius, 'patrem divumque hominumque' et praesentem ac praepotentem deum. quod qui dubitet, haud sane intellego cur non idem sol sit an nullus sit dubitare possit; [5] qui enim est hoc illo evidentius?. . .'

ibid. 2.63–5: [63] alia quoque ex ratione et quidem physica magna fluxit multitudo deorum, qui induti specie humana fabulas poetis suppeditaverunt, hominum autem vitam superstitione omni referserunt. atque hic locus a Zenone tractatus post a Cleanthe et Chrysippo pluribus verbis explicatus est. nam vetus haec opinio Graeciam opplevit, esse exsectum Caelum a filio Saturno, vinctum autem Saturnum ipsum a filio Iove: [**64**] physica ratio non inelegans inclusa est in impias fabulas. caelestem enim altissimam aetheriamque naturam id est igneam, quae per sese omnia gigneret, vacare voluerunt ea parte corporis quae coniunctione alterius egeret ad procreandum. Saturnum autem eum esse voluerunt qui cursum et conversionem spatiorum ac temporum contineret. qui deus Graece id ipsum nomen habet: Κρόνος enim dicitur, qui est idem χρόνος id est spatium temporis. Saturnus autem est appellatus quod saturaretur annis; ex se enim natos comesse fingitur solitus, quia consumit aetas temporum spatia annisque praeteritis insaturabiliter expletur. vinctus autem a Iove, ne inmoderatos cursus haberet, atque ut eum siderum vinclis alligaret. sed ipse Iuppiter, id est iuvans pater, quem conversis casibus appellamus a iuvando Iovem, a poetis 'pater divomque hominumque' dicitur, a maioribus autem nostris

'optumus maxumus', et quidem ante optimus id est beneficentissimus quam maximus, quia maius est certeque gratius prodesse omnibus quam opes magnas habere [65] – hunc igitur Ennius, ut supra [2.4] dixi, nuncupat ita dicens: 'aspice hoc sublime candens, quem invocant omnes Iovem' [*Thyestes* 301 J] planius quam alio loco idem 'cui quod in me est exsecrabor hoc quod lucet quicquid est' [*Inc.* 342 J]; hunc etiam augures nostri cum dicunt 'Iove fulgente tonante': dicunt enim 'caelo fulgente et tonante'. Euripides autem ut multa praeclare sic hoc breviter: 'vides sublime fusum immoderatum aethera,/qui terram tenero circumiectu amplectitur:/ hunc summum habeto divum, hunc perhibeto Iovem' [*tr. fr. Nauck*[2] *Eurip*. 941].

Whence: Min. Fel. *Oct*. 19.1: audio poetas quoque unum patrem divum atque hominum praedicantes.

TESTIMONIA

Frg. XVI.viii = Cic. *Prov. Cons*. 20–1: [20] ergo ego senator inimicus, si ita vultis, homini, amicus esse, sicut semper fui, rei publicae debeo. quid? si ipsas inimicitias depono rei publicae causa, quis me tandem iure reprehendet? praesertim cum ego omnium meorum consiliorum atque factorum exempla semper ex summorum hominum factis mihi censuerim petenda. [21] an vero M. ille Lepidus, qui bis consul et pontifex maximus fuit, non solum memoriae testimonio sed etiam annalium litteris et summi poetae voce laudatus est quod cum M. Fulvio collega, quo die censor est factus, homine inimicissimo, in campo statim rediit in gratiam, ut commune officium censurae communi animo ac voluntate defenderent? atque ut vetera quae sunt innumerabilia mittam, tuus pater, Philippe, nonne uno tempore cum suis inimicissimis in gratiam rediit? quibus eum omnibus eadem res publica reconciliavit quae alienarat.

Frg. ?XII.xxxvi = Cic. *Arch*. 22: carus fuit Africano superiori noster Ennius, itaque etiam in sepulcro Scipionum putatur is esse constitutus ex marmore: at eis laudibus certe non solum ipse qui laudatur sed etiam populi Romani nomen ornatur. in caelum huius proavus Cato tollitur; magnus honos populi Romani rebus adiungitur. omnes denique illi Maximi, Marcelli, Fulvii non sine communi omnium nostrum laude decorantur. ergo illum qui haec fecerat Rudinum hominem maiores nostri in civitatem receperunt; nos hunc Heracliensem multis civitatibus expetitum, in hac autem legibus constitutum de nostra civitate eiciamus?

OPERIS INCERTI FRAGMENTA

(*See also pp. 384–5, under* Ann. *309*.)

Op. inc. 5 Scipio invicte

Cic. *Orat.* 152: in ea [sc. in *Menexeno* Platonis] est crebra ista vocalium concursio [i.e. *hiatus*], quam magna ex parte ut vitiosam fugit Demosthenes. sed Graeci viderint; nobis ne si cupiamus quidem distrahere voces conceditur: indicant orationes illae ipsae horridulae Catonis, indicant omnes poetae praeter eos, qui, ut versum facerent, saepe hiabant, ut Naevius [65 R]: 'vos, qui accolitis Histrum fluvium atque algidam . . .' et ibidem [64 R]: quam numquam vobis Grai atque barbari. . .' at Ennius saepe: 'Scipio invicte' et semel quidem nos : 'hoc motu radiantis Etesiae in vada pontis. . .'

Op. inc. 17 caeli palatum

Cic. *Nat. D.* 2.49: Epicurus . . . dum palato quid sit optimum iudicat 'caeli palatum', ut ait Ennius, non suspexit.

Whence: August. *De civ. D.* 7.8: hiatus noster cum os aperimus mundo similis videatur. unde et palatum Graeci οὐρανόν appellant et nonnulli, inquit [sc. Varro], poetae Latini caelum vocaverunt palatum.

Op. inc. 18 vita vitalis

Cic. *Am.* 22: tales igitur inter viros amicitia tantas opportunitates habet quantas vix queo dicere. principio qui potest esse vita vitalis, ut ait Ennius, quae non in amici mutua benivolentia conquiescit? quid dulcius quam habere quicum omnia audeas sic loqui ut tecum?

Whence: August. *De civ. D.* 19.17: non erit vita mortalis sed plane certeque vitalis.

Op. inc. 19 sanct*i* poet*ae*

Cic. *Arch.* 18: suo iure noster ille Ennius sanctos appellat poetas, quod quasi deorum aliquo dono atque munere commendati nobis esse videantur.

Op. inc. 20 vers*us* long*i*

Cic. *Leg.* 2.68 (Marcus): extrui autem vetat [sc. Plato] sepulcrum altius quam quod ‹quinque homines› quinque diebus absolverint, nec e lapide

excitari plus nec imponi quam quod capiat laudem mortui incisam ne plus quattuor herois versibus, quos longos appellat Ennius. habemus igitur huius quoque auctoritatem de sepulcris summi viri, a quo item funerum sumptus praefinitur ex censibus a minis quinque usque ad minam. deinceps dicit eodem loco de immortalitate animorum et reliqua post mortem tranquillitate bonorum, poenis impiorum.

cf. Gell. 18.15.1: in longis versibus, qui hexametri vocantur, item in senariis, animadverterunt metrici primos duos pedes, item extremos duo, habere singulos posse integras partes orationis, medios haut umquam posse, sed constare eos semper ex verbis aut divisis aut mixtis atque confusis.

Isid. *Orig.* 1.39.6: a pedibus metra vocata, ut dactylica, iambica, trochaica. a trochaeo enim trochaicum metrum nascitur, a dactylo dactylicum; sic et alia a suis pedibus. a numero, ut hexametrum, pentametrum, trimetrum. nam senarios versus nos ex numero pedum vocamus. hos Graeci, quia geminos feriunt, trimetros dicunt. hexametros autem Latinos primum fecisse Ennius traditur, eosque 'longos' vocat (*TUB*: vocant *A'CKL; Linds.*).

Atil. Fortun. 'De dactylico' (*GLK* 6.283–4): [283] dactylicum metrum dictum, quod ex omnibus dactylis constat . . . [**284**] idem et epicus dicitur, quod sermonum capax, et quod per eius pedes simplicius et facilius verba eant atque decurrant, ἀπὸ τοῦ ἕπεσθαι. hunc Ennius 'longum' vocat, Graeci 'delphicum', quia hoc genere *metri* Phemonoe, Apollinis vatis, vaticinata est, et 'pythicum' a Pythone.

DUBIA

Dub. 3–4 Sisyphus versat
saxum sudans nitendo neque proficit hilum

Cic. *Tusc.* 1.10 (Marcus): dic, quaeso: num te illa terrent, triceps apud inferos Cerberus, Cocyti fremitus, travectio Acherontis (*trg. inc. inc.* III R): 'mento summam amnem attingens enectus siti' Tantalus? tum illud, quod 'Sisyphus versat saxum sudans nitendo neque proficit hilum'? fortasse etiam inexorabiles iudices, Minos et Rhadamanthus? apud quos nec te L. Crassus defendet nec M. Antonius nec, quoniam apud Graecos iudices res agetur, poteris adhibere Demosthenen; tibi ipsi pro te erit maxima corona causa dicenda. hae fortasse metuis et idcirco mortem censes esse sempiternum malum.

Whence Non. 121.2–6: HILUM breve quoddam. Lucilius lib. XXX [1021 M] 'quod tua *tu* (Lindsay; *tu ‹nunc›* M) laudes, culpes, non proficis hilum'. Cicero *Tusculanarum* lib. I [10]: 'tum illud, quod 'Sisyphu' versat saxum sudans nitendo neque proficit hilum".

id. 353.5–10: NITI est conari sub onere. Vergilius Georg. lib. III [172–3]: 'post valido nitens sub pondere fagus axis increpat'. Cicero *Tusculanarum* lib. I [10]: 'tum illud, quod 'Sisyphu' versat saxum sudans nitendo neque proficit hilum'.'

(*See also pp. 384–5 under* Ann. *309*.)

Dub. 5 in montis patrios et ad incunabula nostra

Cic. *Att.* 2.15.3: cum haec maxime scriberem, ecce tibi Sebosus! nondum plane ingemueram, 'salve' inquit Arrius. hoc est Roma decedere! quos ego homines effugi cum in hos incidi! ego vero 'in montis patrios et ad incunabula nostra' pergam. denique si solus non potuero, cum rusticis potius quam cum his perurbanis, ita tamen ut, quoniam tu certi nihil scribis, in Formiano tibi praestoler usque ad III Nonas Maias.

TABLE A5.4: [Ps.-Caesar] *BELLUM HISPANIENSE* (second half of c. 1 BCE); ed. R. du Pontet (1901), ed.[3] Klotz (1982); comm. A. Klotz (1927); *ANRW* I. 3 (1973), 596–630 (Pascucci); Gaertner 2010.

The author of the *Bellum Hispaniense* was an eye witness to Caesar's Spanish War and himself of Caesar's army. His control of language is poor, and the editors and commentators of his text frequently criticise his inability to express himself clearly and his writing style, characterised as it is by repetitiveness and colloquialism, mixed with literary reminiscences, illustrating his lack of a sense of the appropriate; but see now Gaertner (2010) for a more nuanced assessment. The author's very carelessness, however, should assure us that his quotations of Ennius came to him spontaneously; he is a member of the last generation whose imagination and descriptive language had been formed by Ennius. He transmits 2 single lines of the *Annales*. No other source knows these lines, neither does the *Bell. Hisp*. contribute to the transmission of any other fragments.

?IX: *Ann*. 480 nostri cessere parumper

Bell. Hisp. 23.1–8: [1] insequenti tempore Caesar castris castra contulit et bracchium ad flumen Salsum ducere coepit. hic cum in opere nostri distenti essent complures ex superiore loco adversariorum decucurrerunt nec detinentibus nostris multis telis iniectis complures vulneribus affecere. [**2**] hic tum, ut ait Ennius (adtennius *plerique*), 'nostri cessere parumper'. [3] itaque praeter consuetudinem cum a nostris animadversum esset cedere, centuriones ex legione V. flumen transgressi duo restituerunt aciem, acriterque eximia virtute pluris cum agerent, ex superiore loco multitudine telorum alter eorum concidit. [4] ita cum eius comes impar proelium facere coepisset, cum undique se circumveniri animum advertisset, regressus pedem offendit. [5] in huius concidentis centurionis ac viri fortis insignia cum complures adversariorum concursum facerent, equites nostris transgressi inferiore loco adversarios ad vallum agere coeperunt. [6] ita cupidius dum intra praesidia illorum student caedem facere, a turmis et levi armatura sunt interclusi. [7] quorum nisi summa virtus fuisset, vivi capti essent: nam et munitione praesidi ita coangustabantur ut eques spatio intercluso vix se defendere posset. [8] ex utroque genere pugnae complures sunt vulneribus adfecti, in quis etiam Clodius Arquitius; inter quos ita comminus est pugnatum ut ex nostris praeter duos centuriones sit nemo desideratus gloria se efferentis.

??: *Ann.* 584 premitur pede pes atque armis arma teruntur

Bell. Hisp. 31.1–9: [1] hic etsi virtute nostri antecedebant, adversarii loco superiore se defendebant acerrime, et vehemens fiebat ab utrisque clamor telorumque missu concursus, sic ut prope nostri diffiderent victoriae. [2] congressus enim et clamor, quibus rebus maxime hostis conterretur, in collatu pari erat condicione. [3] ita ex utroque genere pugnae cum parem virtutem ad bellandum contulissent, pilorum missu fixa cumulatur et concidit adversariorum multitudo. [4] dextrum ut demonstravimus decumanos cornum tenuisse; qui etsi erant pauci, tamen propter virtutem magno adversarios timore eorum opera adficiebant, quod a suo loco hostis vehementer premere coeperunt, ut ad subsidium, ne ab latere nostri occuparent, legio adversariorum traduci coepta sit a dextro. [5] quae simul est mota, equitatus Caesaris sinistrum cornum premere coepit ita uti eximia virtute proelium facere possent, locus in aciem ad subsidium veniendi non daretur. [6] ita cum clamor esset intermixtus gemitu gladiorumque crepitus auribus oblatus, imperitorum mentes timore praepediebat. [7] hic, ut ait Ennius, 'pede pes premitur, armis teruntur arma', adversariosque vehementissime pugnantes nostri agere coeperunt; quibus oppidum fuit subsidio. [8] ita ipsis Liberalibus fusi fugatique non superfuissent, nisi in eum locum confugissent ex quo erant egressi. [9] in quo proelio ceciderunt milia hominum circiter XXX et si quid amplius, praeterea Labienus, Attius Varus, quibus occisi utrisque funus est factum, itemque equites Romani partim ex urbe partim ex provincia ad milia III. nostri desiderati ad hominum mille partim equitum partim peditum; saucii ad D. adversariorum aquilae sunt ablatae XIII et signa et fasces praeterea hos habuit . . .

TABLE A5.5: SENECA THE YOUNGER (L. Annaeus Seneca) (c. 1–65 CE); *Epistulae Morales ad Lucilium*, Vols. 1 and 2, ed. Reynolds (1965); *De ira*, ed. Bourgery (1922, repr. 1971).

Seneca is the sole source for the 3-word fragment we have here, whose author he does not name; see Baehrens 1886 (tentative, still relegated to *inc. inc.*) and Mazzoli 1964 for attribution to Ennius. Mazzoli argues that, since Seneca has no knowledge of Ennius independently of the works of Cicero, the quotation must derive from a work of Cicero's no longer extant. Skutsch 1985: 715, following a suggestion of Mazzoli's, argues for the *Hortensius*, as in the case of *Ann.* 574 (itself transmitted by Augustine, whose exclusive source for Ennius is Cicero). The allusion to *Ann.* 329 at *Apoc.* 12.3.3 probably also derives from Cicero (Skutsch 1985: 29).

The only time it appears that Seneca names Ennius, except in the derogatory comments noted under 'testimonia', is by the implication of Gellius at 12.2.3 (see under Cicero for *Ann.* 304–8), where Gellius criticises Seneca for his negative attitude towards Ennius. The passage makes clear that, at least in the case of *Ann.* 306–8, the chain of transmission runs directly from Cicero through Seneca to Gellius; Seneca has access to the lines only through Cicero, and Gellius only through Seneca. The only other line of which Seneca (*Benef.* 4.27.2) shows knowledge is the famous *Ann.* 363, for which Cicero is our primary source.

??: *Ann.* 575 laus alit artes

Sen. *Ep.* 102.16 (aliud est laus, aliud laudatio): deinde, ut dixi, ad animum refertur laus, non ad verba, quae conceptam laudem egerunt, et in notitiam plurium emittunt. laudat qui laudandum esse iudicat. cum tragicus ille apud nos ait magnificum esse 'laudari a laudato vir' [Naev. *Hector Proficiscens* 2 R = 17 W], laude digno ait. et cum aeque antiquus poeta ait 'laus alit artis', non laudationem dicit, quae corrumpit artes; nihil enim aeque et eloquentiam et omne aliud studium auribus deditum vitiavit quam popularis adsensio.

TESTIMONIA

De ira 3.37.5: non aequis quendam oculis vidisti, quia de ingenio tuo male locutus est: recipis hanc legem? ergo te Ennius, quo non delectaris, odisset et Hortensius simultates tibi indiceret, et Cicero, si derideres carmina eius, inimicus esset. vis tu aequo animo pati candidatus suffragia?

Ep. 58.5: non id ago nunc hac diligentia ut ostendam quantum tempus apud grammaticum perdiderim, sed ut ex hoc intellegas quantum apud Ennium et Accium verborum situs occupaverit, cum apud hunc quoque, qui cotidie excutitur, aliqua nobis subducta sint.

Gell. 12.2.10–11: [10] de Vergilio quoque eodem in loco verba haec ponit [sc. Seneca]: Vergilius quoque noster non ex alia causa duros quosdam versus et enormes et aliquid supra mensuram trahentis interposuit, quam ut Ennianus populus adgnosceret in novo carmine aliquid antiquitatis. [11] sed iam verborum Senecae piget; haec tamen inepti et insubidi hominis ioca non praeteribo: quidam sunt inquit tam magni sensus Q. Ennii ut, licet scripti sint inter hircosos, possint tamen inter unguentatos placere; et, cum reprehendisset versus, quos supra de Cetego posuimus [*see pp. 383–4 under* Ann. *304–8 (Appendix Table A5.3)*]: qui huiuscemodi inquit versus amant, liqueat tibi eosdem admirari et Soterici lectos.

TABLE A5.6: PLINY THE ELDER (C. Plinius Secundus) (23/4–79 CE); *C. Plinii Secundi Naturalis Historia*, ed. D. Detlefsen (1866–2; repr. Hildesheim 1992)

Pliny the Elder quotes Ennius once. He is also responsible for the famous testimonium that has suggested that Ennius worked without an overall design for the poem and simply tacked on material at the end of the work as it caught his imagination. For discussion of this issue, see Chapter 1, pp. 61–3, with further bibliography.

?IV: *Ann.* 454 erip ˘ – ˘ patres pueris plorantibus offam

Pliny, *NH* 18.84: pulte . . . non pane vixisse longo tempore Romanos manifestum quoniam et pulmentaria hodieque dicuntur et Ennius antiquissimus vates obsidionis famem exprimens offam eripuisse plorantibus liberis patres commemorat.

TESTIMONIA FROM PLINY THE ELDER

Pliny, *NH* 7.101: Q. Ennius T. Caecilium Teucrum fratremque eius praecipue miratus propter eos sextum decimum adiecit annalem.

TABLE A5.7: QUINTILIAN (M. Fabius Quintilianus) (c. 35–?90s CE); *Institutio Oratoria*, ed. M. Winterbottom (1970); *RE* 137; Sch.-Hos. §§ 481–6; Herz.-Schm. § 390.

Quintilian is the sole or primary source for 3 lines of the *Annales*, *Ann.* 120, 164 and 465. He names Ennius as author in the case of the first line, and Macrobius, a subsidiary source for *Ann.* 164, names Ennius as its author. *Ann.* 465 is not assigned to an author by its sources. Skutsch (1985: 624–5) argues on the combined grounds of Quintilian's quoting habits, the line's hexametric nature and its monosyllabic ending that the last line, too, must belong to Ennius; the attribution goes back to J. M. Gesner's 1738 edition of Quintilian.[16] In quoting *Ann.* 164, Quintilian includes the book-number, because it is vital to the verbal game he is illustrating, but he does not usually give such information.

Quintilian contributes to the transmission of a further 5 fragments: *Ann.* 65, for which DS is the primary source; *Ann.* 167, 206–7 and 304–8 (he on two separate occasions quotes small fragments of the 5-line passage which Cicero gives us in its fullest version), for each of which the primary source is Cicero; *Ann.* 508, of which Isidore provides a fuller version. In quoting 2 of these fragments (*Ann.* 65 and 304–8), Quintilian names Ennius.

It is not evident that Quintilian had independent knowledge of the *Annales*. For his quotations, he appears to delve into the grammatical tradition of his day. For example, K. Barwick argues that *Ann.* 120 (the only fragment, incidentally, that reaches us through Quintilian alone) was derived via a grammatical work of Valerius Messala from the grammarian Caecilius Epirota, Atticus' freedman and Cornelius Gallus' friend (Barwick 1936, cited by Skutsch 1985: 273). The quotations Quintilian gives typically reappear in later grammatical tradition, yet it is unlikely that he himself is a significant source for that tradition, which appears to have relied on its own internal resources.

Quintilian's own interest in Ennius is marginal, just as the range of poets he quotes is, as Skutsch observes, quite limited (Skutsch 1985: 624). As a poet, Ennius is in Quintilian's eyes to be granted particular licence not appropriate to the orator (cf. Quintil. 1.5.12; 2.15.4 [quoted on p. 383]); in general, and perhaps for that reason, he is of limited relevance for Quintilian's purposes, except where he comes up as the subject-matter of a story (cf. Quintil. 6.3.86, quoted on p. 404). The distance Quintilian adopts in regard to Ennius is well expressed in his famous words at 10.1.88 (quoted on p. 406). Such an attitude towards Ennius and early poetry in

[16] Flores *et al.* 2009: 113–14, where the line's history in editions of the *Annales*, starting from that of A. Koch (1851), *Exercitio critica in priscis Romanis poetis*, Diss. Bonn: 11, is furthermore given in full.

general is characteristic of Quintilian's age and is yet more forcefully represented by Seneca.

II: *Ann.* 120 Mettoeo‹que› Fufetioeo

Quintil. 1.5.12: . . . duos in uno nomine faciebat barbarismos Tinga Placentinus, si reprehendenti Hortensio credimus, 'preculam' pro 'pergula' dicens, et immutatione cum 'c' pro 'g' uteretur, et transmutatione, cum 'r' praeponeret antecedenti. at in eadem vitii geminatione 'Mett*o*eo Fufetioeo' dicens Ennius poetico iure defenditur.[17]

VI: *Ann.* 164 quis potis ingentis oras evolvere belli

Quintil. 6.3.86: [84] superest genus decipiendi opinionem aut dicta aliter intellegendi, quae sunt in omni hac materia vel venustissima . . . [**86**] dissimulavit Cicero cum Sex. Annalis testis reum laesisset et instaret identidem accusator: 'dic, M. Tulli, si quid potes de Sexto Annali'; versus enim dicere coepit de libro Enni annali sexto: 'quis potis ingentis *or*as evolvere belli'.

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.18: 'et mecum ingentes oras evolvite belli' [*Aen.* 9.528]. Ennius in sexto 'quis potis ingentes oras evolvere belli'.

Serv. *Aen.* 9.526: ORAS EVOLVITE BELLI DS: 'hoc est ingentis belli'. Serv.: narrat non tantum initia sed etiam extrema bellorum. nam orae sunt extremitates. DS: est autem Ennianum: 'qui potis ingentis oras evolvere belli'.

Diom. 1 'De dubia verborum positione' (*GLK* 1.385–6): [385] 'sum' verbum in primis corruptum est, non tantum propter ceterorum declinationem sed et ipsa positione, quoniam nullum in toto sermone tale est, nisi quae ex eo conposita sunt. . . ex hoc verbo conpositum est 'prosum' . . . item 'possum' . . . 'possum' tamen nonnulli veterum et passiva declinatione figurant, 'potestur' et 'possuntur'; et 'quitur' et 'quitus sum' apud non nullos veterum reperimus, quod est ei synonymon. et hanc adnotant in illis non nulli differentiam ut activa declinatione ad personam feratur, quasi 'possum ego' 'potes tu' 'potest ille' facere ut * quasi tam prona facilisque est ut fieri possit. subtilis adnotatio, verum parum usitata. sed quoniam esse dictum rettulimus, apud quos sit dictum adfirmabimus. Accius 'quitus sum' ponit pro 'quivi' hoc modo [662 R]: 'nam *neque* pretio neque amicitia neque vi impelli neque prece/quitus sum'. idem alibi eodem modo: 'unde omnia perdisci ac percipi quentur'; Caecilius praeterea [279 R]: 'si non sarciri quitur'. item 'potestur' apud Ennium reperimus: 'nec retrahi

[17] On this passage, see Schöll 1885: 318–20.

potestur imperiis'. Scaurus *De vita sua* tertio [4 P] 'poteratur' etiam sicut 'possitur' dictitat. ex eodem etiam 'potis sit' dicebant, item 'potis est' pro 'potest', ut apud eundem Ennium: [**386**] 'quis potis ingentis oras evolvere belli', et Vergilius [*Aen.* 11.148]: 'at non Evandrum potis est vis ulla tenere'. nec non 'pote' veteres crebro dicere reperimus. proximo utar exemplo: Persius ait [1.56]: 'qui pote? vis dicam? nugaris'. cuius futurum dicitur 'potero' et 'potuero', sed 'potero' magis finitivum, 'potuero' subiunctivum, quasi cum 'potuero'.

?VII: *Ann.* 465 quomque gubernator magna contorsit equos vi

Quintil. 8.6.1–9: [1] tropos est verbi vel sermonis a propria significatione in aliam cum virtute mutatio. circa quem inexplicabilis et grammaticis inter ipsos et philosophis pugna est quae sint genera, quae species, qui numerus, quis cuique subiciatur . . . [4] incipiamus igitur ab eo qui cum frequentissimus est tum longe pulcherrimus, tralatione dico, quae μεταφορά Graece vocatur translatio . . . [5] transfertur ergo nomen aut verbum ex eo loco in quo proprium est in eum in quo aut proprium deest aut tralatum proprio melius est . . . [9] . . . huius vis omnis quadruplex maxime videtur: cum in rebus animalibus aliud pro alio ponitur, ut de agitatore 'gubernator magna contorsit equum vi' aut [ut Livius Scipionem a Catone 'adlatrari' solitum refert (*del.* Christ)] inanima pro aliis generis eiusdem sumuntur, ut 'classique immittit habenas' [*Aen.* 6.1], aut pro rebus animalibus inanima: 'ferron an fato moerus Argivom occidit?' [*frg. trg. inc. inc.* 69 R = Accius 561 W] aut contra: 'sedet inscius alto/accipiens sonitum saxi de vertice pastor' [*Aen.* 2.307–8, with *sedet* trivilialising today's texts' *stupet*].

Charis. 4.4 'De tropis' (*GLK* 1.272): de metaphora. metaphora est dictio translata a propria significatione ad non propriam similitudinem decoris aut necessitatis aut cultus gratia. haec fit modis quattuor, ab animali ad animale, ab animali ad inanimale, ab inanimali ad animale, ab inanimali ad inanimale: ab inanimali ad animale, sicut: 'Tiphyn aurigam celeris fecere carinae' [Varro Atac. 4 C]; ab agitatore ad gubernatorem transtulit. ab animali ad inanimale, sicut 'a*t* procul ex celso miratu*s* vertice montis' [*Aen.* 5.35]; pro 'cacumine' nunc 'verticem' dixit, qui est animalium. ab inanimali ad animale, sicut: 'si tantum pectore robur/concipis' [*Aen.* 9.368–9]; a ligno ad hominem trantulit. ab inanimali ad inanimale, sicut 'pelagus tenuere rates' [*Aen.* 5.8]; pro 'navibus' nunc 'rates' dixit. metaphorae quaedam sunt communes, quae a Graecis 'acoluthoe' appellantur, ut 'Tiphyn aurigam celeris fecere carinae' [Varro Atac. 4 C], quia quemadmodum in navi

'auriga' dici potest, ita et in curru 'gubernator', ut '*cumque* gubernator magna contorsit equos vi'.[18] quaedam non communes, quae a Graecis 'anacoluthoe' appellantur, ut 'vertice montis' [*Aen.* 5.35]. non enim potest invicem dici cacumen hominis, sicut vertex montis.

Diom. 2 'De virtutibus orationis: de tropis' (*GLK* 1.457): de metaphora. metaphora est rerum verborumque translatio a propria significatione ad non propriam similitudinem decoris aut necessitatis aut cultus aut emphaseos gratia. haec fit modis quattuor his, ab animali ad animale, sicut 'Tiphyn aurigam celeris fecere carinae' [Varro Atac. 4 C]; ab agitatore ad gubernatorem transtulit; item 'tondentes campum late candore nivali' [*Aen.* 5.538]. ab animali ad inanimale sic 'ad procul excelso miratus vertice montis' [*Aen.* 5.35]; pro 'cacumine' nunc 'verticem' dixit, qui est animalium tantum. item 'fertur in abruptum magno mons improbus actu' [*Aen.* 12.687]. ab inanimali ad animale, ut 'si tantum pectore robor/concipis' [*Aen.* 9.368–9]; a ligno ad hominem transtulit. item 'ambo florentes aetatibus' [*Ecl.* 7.4]; ab inanimali ad inanimale, ut 'pelagus tenuere rates'; pro 'navibus' nunc 'rates' dixit. item 'insequitur cumulo praeruptus aquae mons' [*Aen.* 1.105]. metaphorae quaedam sunt communes [*etc. as in Charis., p. 405*] . . . ita et in curru [communiter] gubernator ut 'cumque gubernator magna contorsit equos *vi*'; hic 'gubernatorem' pro 'auriga' posuit. quaedam non communes [*etc. as in Charis.*, *passage above*] . . . scire autem debemus esse metaphoras alias reciprocas, alias unius partis.

Sacerd. 1.673 'De metaphora' (*GLK* 6.466–7): metaphora est oratio a propria significatione ad non propriam translata. fit autem modis IIII: ab animali ad animale '*at*que gubernator magna contorsit equos vi'; pro 'auriga' *animali* animale posuit 'gubernatorem'. ab inanimali ad inanimale, ut 'qua sequar fastigia rerum' [*Aen.* 1.342]; nam et tectorum fastigia inanimalia sunt, et res inanimales. ab animali ad inanimale, *ut est* 'vertice montis' [*Aen.* 5.35]. ab inanimali ad animale, *ut est* 'pectore robur/concipis' [*Aen.* 9.368–9], pro 'animo'.

TESTIMONIA

Quintil. 10.1.88: Ennium sicut sacros vetustate lucos adoremus, in quibus grandia et antiqua robora iam non tantam habent speciem quantam religionem. propiores alii atque ad hoc de quo loquimur magis utiles.

[18] Attributed to Ennius by A. Koch (1851), see n. 16, p. 403.

TABLE A5.8: FRONTO (M. Cornelius Fronto) (c. 95–*c.* 166 CE); M. P. J. van den Hout (1988), edn. 2; Herz.-Schm. § 456.

Fronto quotes the *Annales* directly only twice, but the playful originality of his quotations, the frequency of his and M. Aurelius' references to the poet, the enthusiasm of his age for early Latin poetry, and the fact that Fronto was able to procure for M. Aurelius a copy of Ennius' *Sota* (*Ep. ad Caes.* 4.2.6) make it likely that Fronto had direct access to the *Annales*, as he did to Ennius' tragedies (Skutsch 1985: 30). Skutsch (*loc. cit.*) suggests that the use of the phrases *Quintus noster* and *Q. Ennium nostrum* (*Ep. ad Front.* 4.2.3, where M. Aurelius quotes from an Ennian tragedy; and *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.4.6 [see p. 408]) itself implies great familiarity with the poet; but see Zetzel 2007 on the history of such phrases in Cicero.

Skutsch infers that the quotation from the *Annales* at *Ep. ad Caes.* 4.2.3 informs us about the dream in the epic's proem, presumably because of the fact that Fronto is describing a dream of his own in which he encounters the figure whom he is addressing, in combination with the tears that ensue (these are in their turn regularly inferred from Lucr. 1.125 to have had a place in Ennius' proem). Fronto is indeed one of our sources for the dream-appearance of Homer to Ennius in the proem to the *Annales* (see *Ep. ad Front.* 1.4.6 and *De eloquentia* 2.12, quoted on pp. 408–9), but the phrase quoted at *Ep. ad Caes.* 4.12.4 could in itself come from anywhere in the narrative and indeed has a formulaising aspect to it; indeed Skutsch 1985: 153 points out the Homeric parallel in μαλακῷ δεδμημένοι ὕπνῳ (*Il.* 10.2, etc.) (though he dismisses it on the grounds that 'the metaphor . . . is so different that a connection seems unlikely'). There is no very close parallel in the *Annales*, although somewhat similar expressions exist at *Ann.* 288, *nunc hostes vino domiti somnoque sepulti*, which gives rise to a host of Vergilian formulaising expressions (see Chapter 2, p. 110) (cp. *Ann.* 366–8). Nevertheless, it is the context in Fronto rather than the phrase quoted itself that causes editors to place the line in the proem. The phrase itself could originate (or be re-used) at any point in the epic.

In the case of the quotation from the *De orationibus*, the text of Fronto is a palimpsest and the readings are very uncertain; see Skutsch 1985: 213–14, where relevant details from van den Hout's apparatus are reproduced.

1: *Ann.* 2 somno leni placidoque revinctus

Fronto, *Ep. ad Caes.* 4.12.4: si quando te 'somno leni', ut poeta ait, 'placidoque revinctus' video in somnis, numquam est quin amplectar et

exosculer: tum pro argumento cuiusque somni aut fleo ubertim aut exulto laetitia aliqua et voluptate. hoc unum ex *Annalibus* sumptum amoris mei argumentum poeticum et sane somniculosum.

1: *Ann.* 63–4 postquam constitit †isti fluvius, qui est omnibus princeps †qui sub ovilia†

Fronto, *De orat.* 11: Gallicanus quidam declamator, cum Macedones deliberarent Alexandro morbo mortuo, an et Babylonem perverte‹re›nt: 'quid si operas conduc‹iti›s leones?' inquit. is‹te› et superbe: 'factum est' eod‹e›m hoc ve‹r›bo Enni 'vobis, Quirit‹es›', exclamavit, 'factum est, factum est opus inex‹supe›rabile: Tiberis est, Tusce, Tiberis, quem iubes cludi; Tiber amnis et dominus et fluentium circa regnator undarum'. Ennius: 'postquam constitit is fluvius qui *est* omnibus princeps qui sub *o*vilia' ait.

cf. Cic. *Orat.* 161 (*de –s caduca*): quin etiam, quod iam subrusticum videtur, olim autem politius, eorum verborum, quorum eaedem erant postremae duae litterae, quae sunt in 'optumus', postremam litteram detrahebant, nisi vocalis insequebatur; ita non erat ea offensio in versibus, quam nunc fugiunt poetae novi; sic enim loquebamur: 'qui est omnibu' (*A*: –bus *cett.*) princeps', non 'omnibus (*A*: omnium *cett.*) princeps', et 'vita illa dignu' locoque' [Lucil. *Sat.* 4, 150 M] non 'dignus'. quod si indocta consuetudo tam est artifex suavitatis, quid ab ipsa tandem arte et doctrina postulari putamus?

TESTIMONIA

M. Aurelius, *Ep. ad Front.* 1.4.6: transeo nunc ad Q. Ennium nostrum, quem tu ais ex somno et somnio initium sibi fecisse. sed profecto nisi ex somno suscitatus esset, numquam somnium suum narrasset.

Fronto, *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.5.5: iam a Laertio ad Atridam eleganter transisti. ecce autem circa Q. Ennium aliam malitiosam petam dedisti, cum ais 'nisi ex somno exsuscitatus esset, numquam somnium suum narrasset'. at od‹e›rit m‹e› Marcus meus Caesar, si pote, argutius! praestrigiae nullae tam versutae, 'nulla', ut ait Laevius, 'decipula tam insidiosa'. qui‹d› si ego id postulo, ne expergiscare? quin postulo ut dormias!

Fronto, *De eloquentia* 2.11–12: fac te, Caesar, ad sapientiam Cleanthis aut Zenonis posse pertingere, ingratiis tamen tibi purpureum pallium erit sumendum, non pallium philosophorum soloci lana . . . [*defective text*] . . . ‹ne di› immortales seirint comitium et rostra et tribunalia Catonis et

Gracchi et Ciceronis orationibus celebrata hoc potissimum saeculo conticiscere, orbem terrae, quem vocalem acceperis, mutum a te fieri. si linguam quis uni homini exsecet, immanis habeatur: eloquentia‹m› humano generi exsicari mediocre facinus putas? non hunc adnumeras Tereo aut Lycurgo? qui Lycurgus quid tandem mali facinoris admisit quam vites amputavit? multis profecto gentibus ac nationibus profuisset vinum undique gentium exterminatum! tamen Lycurgus poenas caesarum vitium luit. quare metuendam censeo divinitus poenam eloquentiae exterminatae. nam vinea in unius tutela dei sita, eloquentiam vero multi in caelo diligunt: Minerva orationis magistra, Mercurius nuntiis praeditus, Apollo paeanum auctor, Liber dithyramborum cognitor, Fauni vaticinantium incitatores, magistra Homeri Calliopa, magister Enni Homerus et Somnus.

Fronto, *De eloquentia* 1.2: in poetis ‹aut›em quis ignorat, ut gracilis sit Lucilius, Albucius aridus, sublimis Lucretius, mediocris Pacuvius, inaequalis Accius, Ennius multiformis? historiam quoque scripsere Sallustius structe, Pictor incondite, Claudius lepide, Antias invenuste, Seisenna longinque, verbis Cato multiiugis, Coelius singulis. contionatur autem Cato infeste, Gracchus turbulente, Tullius gloriose; iam in iudiciis saevit idem Cato, triumphat Cicero, tumultuatur Gracchus, Calvus rixatur.

Ep. ad Caes. 4.3.7 *Skutsch judges the unplaced Ennian quotation here not to belong to the* Annales: neque id reprehendo, te verbi translatione audacius progressum, quippe qui Enni sententia oratorem audacem esse debere censeam. sit sane audax orator, ut Ennius postulat; sed a significando quod volt eloqui nusquam digrediatur.

cf. *Ep. ad verum imp. Aurelium* 2.1.6: plerisque etiam indignis patern‹us loc›us imperium per manus detulit, haud secus quam pullis, quibus omnia generis insignia ab ovo iam insita sunt: crista et pluma et cantus et vigiliae; regum liberis in utero matris summa iam potestas destinata est; obstetricis manu imperium adipiscuntur. variae sunt eis memoriae: est cor‹am p›opulo . . . non ita populo si itaque . . . et personae sicut initiatos rerum vero Persarum equi arbitratu co . . fit haec non cursu, sed hinnitu priorem de Romano . . . . . inter Remum et Romulum ex diversis montibus augurantes exempla eloquentiam non Romulus . e . . centuriatis comitiis paratur, non cum . . . . . aquilae et voltures convolent, non si Pegasus hinniat . . . . . insidiis saepe aliorum et coniurationibus ademptum aliis imperium ad alios delatum scimus, sed neque viventi eloquentia potest adimi neque morte adempta in alium transferri.

FURTHER MENTIONS OF ENNIUS IN FRONTO

Fronto, *Ep. ad Caes.* 1.7.3–4: [3] tantoque ego fortunatior quam fuit Hercules atque Achilles, quorum arma et tela gestata sunt a Patricole et Philocteta, multo viris virtute inferioribus; mea contra oratio mediocris, ne dicam ignobilis, a doctissimo et facundissimo hominum Caesare inlustrata est. nec ulla umquam scena tantum habuit dignitatis: M. Caesar actor, Titus imperator auditor. quid amplius cuiquam contingere potest, nisi unum quod in caelo fieri poetae ferunt, quom Iove patre audiente Musae cantant? enimvero quibus ego gaudium meum verbis exprimere possim, quod orationem istam meam tua manu descriptam misisti mihi? verum est profecto quod ait noster Laberius, ad amorem iniciendum delenimenta esse deleramenta, beneficia autem veneficia. quo poculo aut veneno quisquam tantum flammae ad amandum incussisset praeut tu me et facto hoc stupidum et attonitum ardente amore tuo reddidisti? quot litterae istic sunt, totidem consulatus mihi, totidem laureas, triumphos, togas pictas arbitror contigisse. [4] quid tale M. Porcio aut Quinto Ennio, C. Graccho aut Titio poetae, quid Scipioni aut Numidico, quid M. Tullio tale usuvenit? quorum libri pretiosiores habentur et summam gloriam retinent, si sunt Lampadionis aut Staberii, Plautii aut D. Aurelii, Autriconis aut Aelii manu scripta e‹xem›pla aut a Tirone emendata aut a Domitio Balbo descripta aut ab Attico aut Nepote. mea oratio extabit M. Caesaris manu scripta. qui orationem spreverit, litteras concupiscet; qui scripta contempserit, scriptorem reverebitur.

Fronto, *Ep. ad Caes.* 3.17.3: meministi autem tu plurimas lectiones, quibus usque adhuc versatus es, comoedias, Atellan‹a›s, oratores veteres, quorum aut pauci aut praeter Catonem et Gracchum nemo tubam inflat; omnes autem mugiunt vel stridunt potius. quid igitur Ennius, quem legisti? quid trageodiae ad versum sublimiter faciundum te iuverunt? plerumque enim ad orationem faciendam versus, ad versificandum oratio magis adiuvat.

Fronto, *Ep. ad Caes.* 4.3.1–2: in verbis . . . eligendis conlocandisque ilico dilucet nec verba dare diutius potest, qui se ipse indicet verborum ignarum esse eaque male probare et temere existimare et inscie contrectare neque modum neque pondus verbi internosse. quamobrem rari admodum veterum scriptorum in eum laborem studiumque et periculum verba industriosius quaerendi sese commisere, oratorum post homines natos unus omnium M. Porcius eiusque frequens sectator C. Sallustius, poetarum maxime Plautus, multo maxime Q. Ennius eumque studiose aemulatus L. Coelius nec non Naevius, Lucretius, Accius etiam, Caecilius, Laberius

quoque. nam praeter hos partim scriptorum adnimadvertas particulatim elegantis Novium et Pomponium et id genus in verbis rusticanis et iocularibus ac ridiculariis, Attam in muliebribus, Sisennam in lasciviis, Lucilium in cuiusque artis ac negotii propriis.

Ep. ad Front. 4.1.3: mitte mihi aliquid, quod tibi disertissimum videatur, quod legam, vel tuum aut Catonis aut Ciceronis aut Sallustii aut Gracchi aut poetae alicuius; χρῄζω γὰρ ἀναπαύλης, et maxime hoc genus, quae me lectio extollat et diffundat ἐκ τῶν κατειληγυιῶν φροντίδων; etiam si qua Lucretii aut Ennii excerpta habes εὐφωνότατα, ἁδρά et sicubi ἤθους ἐμφάσεις.

Fronto, *De eloquentia* 4.4: item pleraque sic explicasse oratione Sallustium ais et hoc exemplo usus: 'multi murmurantium voculis in luco eloquentiae oblectantur'. Ennium deinde et Accium et Lucretium ampliore iam mugitu personantis tamen tolerant. at ubi Catonis et Sallustii et Tulli tuba exaudita est, trepidant et pavent et fugam frustra meditantur. nam illic quoque in philosophiae disciplinis, ubi tutum sibi perfugium putant, ‹Pla›tonis ἴδια ῥήματα erunt audienda.

Fronto, *De feriis alsiensibus* 3.1: quid? ego ignoro ea te mente Alsium isse, ut animo morem gereres ibique ludo et ioco et otio libero per quattriduum universum operam dares? nec dubito quin te ad ferias in secessu maritimo fruendas ita compararis: in sole meridiano ut somno oboedires cubans, deinde Nigrum vocares, libros introferre iuberes; mox ut te studium legendi incessisset, ut te Plauto expolires aut Accio expleres aut Lucretio delenires aut Ennio incenderes, in horam istam Musarum propriam quintam . . .

TABLE A5.9: APULEIUS (c. 125–170s? CE); Herz.-Schm. § 457.

Apuleius probably knew the *Annales* as his contemporaries Hadrian and Fronto did, though he only quotes one passage. It is not clear that he knew the tragedies independently of intermediary sources: 3 of his quotations from the tragedies may derive from Cicero, the fourth, slightly misremembered, either from Varro or from a lost work of Cicero (Skutsch 1985: 30).

VII: *Ann.* 240–1 Iuno Vesta Minerva Ceres Diana Venus Mars
Mercurius Iovis Neptunus Volcanus Apollo

Apul. *De deo Socr.* 2: est aliud deorum genus . . . quorum in numero sunt illi duodecim nudo positu nominum in duo versus ab Ennio coartati 'Iuno, Vesta, Minerva, Ceres, Diana, Venus, Mars, Mercurius, Iovis, Neptunus, Vulcanus, Apollo'.

Whence: Mart. Cap. 1.42: tunc etiam ut inter alios potissimi rogarentur ipsius collegae Iovis, qui bis seni cum eodem Tonante numerantur quosque distichum complectitur Ennianum 'Iuno Vesta Minerva Ceresque Diana Venus Mars Mercurius Iup(p)iter Neptunus Volcanus Apollo', item et septem residui.

TABLE A5.10: GELLIUS (Aulus Gellius) (c. 125–*c.* 190?) ed. P. K. Marshall (1968, repr. with corr. 1990); Holford-Strevens 1988; Holford-Strevens 2003; Holford-Strevens and Vardi 2004; Gunderson 2009; Keulen 2009.

Gellius is solely or primarily responsible for the transmission of 18 fragments, equivalent to 39 lines, and he gives a book-number for 11 of these. He is supported in the transmission of *Ann.* 236–7 by Nonius, Macrobius and DS; of *Ann.* 247–53 by Cicero and Lactantius; of *Ann.* 371–3 and 550 by Nonius (who is sometimes closely dependent on him, as will be clear from the material below; although see n. 22, p. 423, under *Ann.* 371–3); of *Ann.* 377–8 by Priscian and his derivate, the *Ars Anonyma Bernensis*. In the case of *Ann.* 170–2, it is clear that Nonius' similar material derives directly from Gellius. Gellius is aware of the single line *Ann.* 89, which Cicero gives us in a much fuller context (*Ann.* 72–91). He also supports the transmission of part of *Ann.* 304–8, for which Cicero is again our primary source.

Gellius' source is sometimes Varro, sometimes Cicero, but he is far less fond of quoting Ennius' tragedies than is Cicero;[19] sometimes Seneca, who himself depends on Cicero (see Appendix Table A5.5. on Seneca, pp. 400–1). Gellius is sometimes capable of quoting material of very high quality (e.g. *Ann.* 268–86); but it is at the same time clear that he reads the text of the *Annales* in the quotations of other authors (see e.g. the transmission of *Ann.* 371–3, pp. 422–3; and the fact that his text of *Ann.* 306–8 is that of Seneca, not directly that of the Cicero-mss. [see Appendix Table A5.3. on Cicero, pp. 383–4, with Skutsch 1985: 483, ad *Ann.* 306]).

1: *Ann.* 99 ‹te Mavors, te› Nerienem Mavortis et Heriem

Gell. 13.23.11–18 (on the form of the name *Nerio*): [11] Plautus autem in *Truculento* coniugem esse Nerienem Martis dicit, atque id sub persona militis in hoc versu [515]: 'Mars peregre adveniens salutat Nerienem uxorem suam'. [12] super ea re audivi non incelebrem hominem dicere nimis comice Plautum inperito et incondito militi falsam novamque opinionem tribuisse, ut Nerienem coniugem esse Martis putaret. [13] sed id perite magis quam comice dictum intelleget qui leget Cn. Gellii *Annalem* tertium, in quo scriptum est Hersiliam, cum apud T. Tatium verba faceret pacemque oraret, ita precatam esse: 'Neria Martis, te obsecro, pacem da, te uti liceat nuptiis propriis et prosperis uti, quod de tui coniugis consilio contigit, uti

[19] He quotes the tragedies 12 times, the *Annals* 25 times, including instances where he is the secondary source (Skutsch 1985: 30). See *ibid.* for the distribution of quotations of tragedy vs. quotations of epic in the different books of Gellius.

nos itidem integras raperent, unde liberos sibi et suis, posteros patriae pararent'. [14] 'de tui' inquit 'coniugis consilio' Martem scilicet significans; per quod apparet non esse id poetice a Plauto dictum, sed eam quoque traditionem fuisse, ut Nerio a quibusdam uxor esse Martis diceretur. [15] inibi autem animadvertendum est, quod Gellius 'Neria' dicit per '–a' litteram, non 'Nerio' neque 'Nerienes'. [16] praeter Plautum etiam praeterque Gellium Licinius Imbrex, vetus comoediarum scriptor, in fabula, quae *Neaera* inscripta est, ita scripsit [1–2 R]: 'nolo ego Neaeram te vocent, set Nerienem,/cum quidem Mavorti es in conubium data'. [17] ita autem se numerus huiusce versus habet, ut tertia in eo nomine syllaba contra quam supra dictum est corripienda sit; cuius sonitus quanta aput veteres indifferentia sit, notius est quam ut plura in id verba sumenda sint. [**18**] Ennius autem in primo *Annali* in hoc versu 'Nerienem Mavortis et Her*i*em', si, quod minime solet, numerum servavit, primam syllabam intendit, tertiam corripuit.

III: *Ann.* 149 inde sibi memorat unum super esse laborem

Gell. 1.22.9–17 (on the proper use of *superesse se* in a legal context; and on the proper use of *superesse*): [9] exquisite igitur et comperte Iulius Paulus dicebat, homo in nostra memoria doctissimus, 'superesse' non simplici ratione dici tam Latine quam Graece: Graecos enim περισσόν in utramque partem ponere, vel quod supervacaneum esset ac non necessarium, vel quod abundans nimis et afluens et exuberans; [10] sic nostros quoque veteres 'superesse' alias dixisse pro superfluenti et vacivo neque admodum necessario, ita, ut supra [4] posuimus, Varronem dicere, alias ita ut Cicero dixit, pro eo quod copia quidem et facultate ceteris anteiret, super modum tamen et largius prolixiusque flueret quam esset satis. [11] qui dicit ergo 'superesse se' ei quem defendit, nihil istorum vult dicere [12] sed nescio quid aliud indictum inscitumque dicit ac ne Vergilii quidem poterit auctoritate uti, qui in *Georgicis* ita scribsit [3.10]: 'primus ego in patriam mecum, modo vita supersit'. hoc enim in loco Vergilius ἀκυρότερον eo verbo usus videtur, quod 'supersit' dixit pro 'longinquius diutiusque adsit', [13] illudque contra eiusdem Vergili aliquanto est probabilius [*G.* 3.126–7]: 'florentisque secant herbas fluviosque ministrant/farraque ne blando nequeat superesse labori'; significat enim supra laborem esse neque opprimi a labore. [14] an autem 'superesse' dixerint veteres pro 'restare et perficiendae rei deesse' quaerebamus. [15] nam Sallustius in significatione ista non 'superesse' sed 'superare' dicit. verba eius in *Iugurtha* haec sunt [70.2]: 'is plerumque seorsum a rege exercitum ductare et omnis res exequi solitus erat, quae Iugurthae fesso aut

maioribus astricto superaverant'. [**16**] sed invenimus in tertio Enni *Annalium* in hoc versu: 'inde sibi memorat unum super esse laborem', id est reliquum esse et restare, quod, quid id est, divise pronuntiandum est, ut non una pars orationis esse videatur sed duae. [17] Cicero autem in secunda *Antonianarum* [71.2], quod est relicum non 'superesse' sed 'restare' dicit.

VI: *Ann.* 170–2 proletarius publicitus scutisque feroque
ornatur ferro. muros urbemque forumque
excubiis curant

Gell. 16.10.1–8 (on the definition of *proletarius*): [1] otium erat quodam die Romae in foro a negotiis et laeta quaedam celebritas feriarum, legebaturque in consessu forte conplurium Ennii liber ex *Annalibus*. in eo libro versus hi fuerunt: 'proletarius publicitus *sc*ut*is*que feroque/ornatur ferro, muros urbemque forumque/excubiis curant'. [2, 3] tum ibi quaeri coeptum est quid esset proletarius. atque ego aspiciens quem piam in eo circulo ius civile callentem, familiarem meum, rogabam, ut id verbum nobis enarraret, et, [4] cum illic se iuris, non rei grammaticae peritum esse respondisset, 'eo maxime' inquam 'te dicere hoc oportet, quando, ut praedicas, peritus iuris es. [5] nam Q. Ennius verbum hoc ex duodecim tabulis vestris accepit, in quibus, si recte commemini, ita scriptum est: 'adsiduo vindex adsiduus esto. proletario civi quis volet vindex esto'. [6] petimus igitur, ne *Annalem* nunc Q. Ennii, sed duodecim tabulas legi arbitrere et, quid sit in ea lege 'proletarius civis', interpretere'. [7] 'ego vero' inquit ille, 'dicere atque interpretari hoc deberem, si ius Faunorum et Aboriginum didicissem. sed enim cum 'proletarii' et 'adsidui' et 'sanates' et 'vades' et 'subvades' et 'vinginti quinque asses' et 'taliones' furtorumque quaestio 'cum lance et licio' evanuerint omnisque illa duodecim tabularum antiquitas nisi in legis actionibus centumviralium causarum lege Aebutia lata consopita sit, studium scientiamque ego praestare debeo iuris et legum vocumque earum, quibus utimur.'

Whence: Non. 155.19: proletarii cives dicebantur qui in plebe tenuissima erant et non amplius quam mille et quingentos aeris in censum deferebant. Ennius *annali* 'proletari *ut* publicitus scut*a*que fer*i*que ornatu*s*'.

VII: *Ann.* 236–7 denique vi magna quadrupes, eques atque
elephanti proiciunt sese

Gell. 18.5.1–12 (Ennius wrote *quadrupes eques* and not, as popularly thought, *quadrupes ecus*, in *Ann.* VII): [1] cum Antonio Iuliano rhetore, viro hercle bono et facundiae florentis, complures adulescentuli familiares eius Puteolis aestivarum feriarum ludum et iocum in litteris amoenioribus et in voluptatibus pudicis honestisque agitabamus. [2] atque ibi tunc Iuliano nuntiatur ἀναγνώστην quendam, non indoctum hominem, voce admodum scita et canora Ennii *Annales* legere ad populum in theatro [3] 'eamus' inquit 'auditum nescio quem istum Ennianistam': hoc enim se ille nomine appellari volebat. [4] quem cum iam inter ingentes clamores legentem invenissemus – legebat autem librum ex *Annalibus* Ennii septimum – hos eum primum versus perperam pronuntiantem audivimus: 'denique vi magna quadrupes e*cus* atque elephanti/proiciunt sese'; neque multis postea versibus additis celebrantibus eum laudantibusque omnibus discessit. [5] tum Iulianus egrediens e theatro 'quid vobis' inquit 'de hoc anagnosta et de quadrupede eco videtur? sic enim profecto legit: 'denique vi magna quadrupes ecus atque elephanti proiciunt sese'. [6] ecquid putatis, si magistrum praelectoremque habuisset alicuius aeris, 'quadrupes ecus' dicturum fuisse, ac non 'quadrupes eques'? quod ab Ennio ita scriptum relictumque esse nemo unus litterarum veterum diligens dubitavit?' [7] cum aliquot eorum qui aderant 'quadrupes ecus' apud suum quisque grammaticum legisse se dicerent et mirarentur, quidnam esset 'quadrupes eques', 'vellem vos', inquit 'optimi iuvenes, tam accurate Q. Ennium legisse quam P. Vergilius legerat, qui hunc eius verum secutus in *Georgicis* suis 'equitem' pro 'eco' posuit his in versibus [*G.* 3.115–17]: 'frena Pelethronii Lapithae gyrosque dedere/impositi dorso atque equitem docuere sub armis/insultare solo et gressus glomerare superbos'. in quo loco 'equitem', si quis modo non inscite inepteque argutior sit, nihil potest accipi aliud nisi 'ecum'; [8] pleraque enim veterum aetas et hominem equo insidentem et equum qui insideretur 'equitem' dixerunt. [9] propterea 'equitare' etiam, quod verbum e vocabulo 'equitis' inclinatum est, et homo eco utens et ecus sub homine gradiens dicebatur. [10] Lucilius adeo, vir adprime linguae Latinae sciens, 'ecum equitare' dicit his versibus [1284 M]: 'quis hunc currere ecum nos atque equitare videmus/his equitat curritque: oculis equitare videmus;/ergo oculis equitat'. [11] sed enim contentus', inquit, 'ego his non fui et ut non turbidae fidei et ambiguae, sed ut purae liquentisque esset 'ecus'ne an 'eques' scriptum Ennius reliquisset, librum summae atque reverendae vetustatis, quem fere constabat Lampadionis manu emendatum, studio pretioque multo unius versus inspiciendi gratia conduxi et 'eques', non 'ecus', scriptum in eo versu inveni.' [12] hoc tum nobis Iulianus et multa alia erudite simul et adfabiliter dixit. sed eadem ipsa post etiam in pervulgatis commentariis scripta offendimus.

Whence: Non. 106.26: equitem pro equo Vergilius *georgicorum* lib. III [116] . . . ; Ennius *annali* lib. VII 'ac non (an non *corr. Roth*) quadrup*ed*es equ*it*es'.

Macr. *Sat.* 6.9.8–12: [8] iterum quaerit Avienus, 'in his versibus [*G.* 3.115–17]: 'frena Pelethronii Lapithae gyrosque dedere/impositi dorso atque equitem docuere sub armis/insultare solo et gressus glomerare superbos', cur Vergilius equi officium equiti dederit? nam insultare solo et glomerare gressus equi constat esse, non equitis.' [9] 'bene' inquit Servius 'haec tibi quaestio nata est ex incuria veteris lectionis. nam quia saeculum nostrum ab Ennio et omni bibliotheca vetere descivit, multa ignoramus, quae non laterent si veterum lectio nobis esset familiaris. omnes enim antiqui scriptores ut hominem equo insidentem, ita et equum, cum portaret hominem, equitem vocaverunt, et equitare non hominem tantum sed equum quoque dixerunt. [10] Ennius libro *Annalium* septimo ait: 'denique vi magna quadrupes e*que*s atque elephanti/proiciunt sese.' numquid dubium est quin equitem in hoc loco ipsum equum dixerit, cum addidisset illi epitheton 'quadrupes'. [11] sic et 'equitare', quod verbum e vocabulo equitis inclinatum est et homo utens equo et equus sub homine gradiens dicebatur. Lucilius namque, vir adprime linguae Latinae scius, equum equitare dicit hoc versu [1284 M]: 'nempe hunc currere equum nos equitare videmus'. [12] ergo et apud Maronem, qui antiquae Latinitatis diligens fuit, ita intellegendum est [*G.* 3.116]: 'atque equitem docuere sub armis – 'id est, docuerunt equum portando hominem [*G.* 3.117] 'insultare solo et gressus glomerare superbos'.'

DS *G.* 3.116 and *elsewhere*: hic equitem sine dubio equum dicit, maxime cum inferat insultare solo. Ennius *Annalium* septimo: 'denique vi magna quadrupes eq*ue*s atque elephanti proiciunt sese'.

VIII: *Ann.* 247–53

proelia promulgantur
pellitur e medio sapientia, vi geritur res;
spernitur orator bonus, horridus miles amatur;
haud doctis dictis certantes, nec maledictis
miscent inter sese inimicitias agitantes;
non ex iure manu consertum, sed magis ferro –
rem repetunt regnumque petunt – vadunt solida vi

Gellius 20.10.1–5, 10: * * * * * [1] 'ex iure manum consertum' verba sunt ex antiquis actionibus, quae, cum lege agitur et vindiciae contenduntur, dici nunc quoque apud praetorem solent. [2] rogavi ego Romae grammaticum,

celebri hominem fama et multo nomine, quid haec verba essent. tum ille me despiciens 'aut erras' inquit 'adulescens, aut ludis; rem enim doceo grammaticam, non ius respondeo; si quid igitur ex Vergilio, Plauto, Ennio quaerere habes, quaeras licet'. [3] 'ex Ennio ergo' inquam 'est, magister, quod quaero. Ennius enim verbis hisce usus est'. [4]cumque ille demiratus aliena haec esse a poetis et haud usquam inveniri in carminibus Ennii diceret, tum ego hos versus ex octavo *Annali* absentes [i.e. memoriter *Sk., comparing* Mart. 7.51.7] dixi – nam forte eos tamquam insigniter alios factos meminerim: 'pellitur e medio sapientia, vi geritur res;/spernitur orator bonus, horridus miles amatur;/haud doctis dictis certantes, nec maledictis/miscent inter sese inimicitia*s* agitantes;/non ex man*u* consertum sed magis ferro –/rem repetunt regnumque petunt – vadunt solida vi'. [5] cum hos ego versus Ennianos dixissem, 'credo' inquit grammaticus 'iam tibi. sed tu velim credas mihi Quintum Ennium didicisse hoc non ex poeticae litteris, set ex iuris aliquo perito. eas igitur tu quoque' inquit 'et discas, unde Ennius didicit'. . . [10] idcirco Ennius significare volens non, ut ad praetorem solitum est, legitumis actionibus necque ex iure manum consertum, sed bello ferroque et vera vi atque solida ***; quod videtur dixisse conferens vim illam civilem et festucariam, quae verbo diceretur, non quae manu fieret, cum vi bellica et cruenta.

Cic. *Mur.* 30: etenim, ut ait ingeniosus poeta et auctor valde bonus, proeliis promulgatis 'pellitur e medio' non solum ista vestra verbosa simulatio prudentiae, sed etiam ipsa illa domina rerum 'sapientia; vi *geritur res*, spernitur orator' non solum odiosus in dicendo et loquax, verum etiam 'bonus, horridus miles amatur'. vestrum vero studium totum iacet: 'non ex iure man*um* consertum sed ferro' inquit 'rem repetunt'.

Cic. *Fam.* 7.13.2: tantum metuo ne artificium tuum tibi parum prosit. nam, ut audio, istic 'non ex iure man*um* consertum, sed magis ferro rem repetunt'.

Cic. *Att.* 15.7: Servius vero pacificator cum librariolo suo videtur obisse legationem et omnis captiunculas pertimescere. debuerat autem 'non ex iure man*u* consertum' sed quae sequuntur.

Lact. *Inst.* 5.1.3–5: [3] sed novi hominum pertinaciam: numquam impetrabimus. timent enim ne a nobis revicti manus dare aliquando clamante ipsa veritate cogantur. [4] obstrepunt igitur et intercedunt, ne audiant, et oculos suos opprimunt, ne lumen videant quod offerimus: quo plane ipsi diffidentiam suae perditae rationis ostendunt, cum neque cognoscere neque congredi audent, quia sciunt se facile superari. [5] et idcirco disceptatione

sublata 'pellitur e medio sapienti*a*, *vi* geritur res' ut ait Ennius. et quia student damnare tamquam nocentes quos utique sciunt innocentes, constare de ipsa innocentia nolunt: quasi vero maior iniquitas sit probatam innocentiam damnasse quam inauditam.

(*See Appendix Table A5.3 on Cicero, pp. 370–1 for* Ann. *105–9, and ibid. n. 7, for a note on Lactantius Firmianus' contribution to the transmission of the* Annales.)

VII:[20] *Ann.* 268–86

haece locutus vocat quocum bene saepe libenter
mensam sermonesque suos rerumque suarum
consilium partit, magnam quom lassus diei
partem fuisset de summis rebus regundis
consilio indu foro lato sanctoque senatu;
quoi res audacter magnas parvasque iocumque
eloqueretur †et cuncta† malaque et bona dictu
evomeret si qui vellet tutoque locaret;
quocum multa volup
gaudia clamque palamque;
ingenium quoi nulla malum sententia suadet
ut faceret facinus levis aut mala: doctus fidelis,
suavis homo, iucundus, suo contentus, beatus,
scitus, secunda loquens in tempore, commodus, verbum
paucum, multa tenens antiqua, sepulta vetustas
quae facit, et mores veteresque novosque †tenentem
multorum veterum leges divomque hominumque
prudentem qui dicta loquive tacereve posset:
hunc inter pugnas conpellat Servilius sic:

Gell. 12.4.1–5: [1] descriptum definitumque est a Q. Ennio in *Annali* septimo graphice admodum sciteque sub historia Gemini Servili, viri nobilis, quo ingenio, qua comitate, qua modestia, qua fide, qua linguae parsimonia, qua loquendi opportunitate, quanta rerum antiquarum morumque veterum ac novorum scientia quantaque servandi tuendique secreti religione, qualibus denique ad minuendas vitae molestias fomentis levamentis solaciis amicum esse conveniat hominis genere et fortuna superioris. [2] eos

[20] Gellius gives the book-number for this passage unambiguously as *in* Annali *septimo*. There are no grounds for altering Gellius' text, but as a result of Cichorius' intervention (see Chapter 1, n. 152, pp. 63–4) Skutsch ascribes the fragment to the context of Cannae; and since the description of Cannae belonged, according to the conventional estimate (see Appendix Table A1.1), to Book 8, Skutsch places the fragment in Book 8; so too Flores *et al.* 2009.

ego versus non minus frequenti adsiduoque memoratu dignos puto quam philosophorum de officiis decreta. [3] ad hoc color quidam vetustatis in his versibus tam reverendus est, suavitas tam impromisca tamque a fuco omni remota ut mea quidem sententia pro antiquis sacratisque amicitiae legibus observandi tenendi colendique sint. [4] quapropter adscribendos eos existimavi si quis iam statim desideraret: 'haece . . . Servilius sic'. [5] L. Aelium Stilonem dicere solitum ferunt Q. Ennium de semet ipso haec scripsisse picturamque istam morum et ingenii ipsius Q. Ennii factam esse.[21]

VIII: *Ann.* 290 Quintus pater quartum fit consul

Gell. 10.1.6: verba M. Varronis ex libro *Disciplinarum* quinto [218 Fun.] haec sunt: 'aliud est 'quarto' praetorem fieri et 'quartum', quod 'quarto' locum adsignificat ac tres ante factos, 'quartum' tempus adsignificat et ter ante factum. igitur Ennius recte, quod scripsit 'Quintus pater quartum fit consul', et Pompeius timide, quod in theatro, ne adscriberet 'consul tertium' aut 'tertio', extremas litteras non scripsit.'

Non. 435.8–12: QUARTUM et QUARTO prudentes differre dixerunt. Varro *Disciplinarum* V [218 Fun.]: 'aliud est quarto praetorem fieri et [aliud] quartum: quarto locum significat et tres ante factos; quartum tempus significat et ter ante factum. Ennius recte 'Quintu' pater quartum fit consul'.'

Cic. *Att.* 12.5.1: 'Quintus pater quartum' vel potius millesimum nihil sapit, qui laetetur Luperco filio et Statio, ut cernat duplici dedecore cumulatam domum.

IX: *Ann.* 303 tunicata iuventus

Gell. 6.12.5–7 (on Greek-style long-sleeved tunics and Scipio Africanus' rebuke to Sulpicius Galus for favouring them): [5] verba sunt haec Scipionis: 'nam qui cotidie unguentatus adversum speculum ornetur, cuius supercilia radantur, qui barba vulsa feminibusque subvulsis ambulet, qui in conviviis adulescentulus cum amatore cum chirodyta tunica interior accubuerit, qui non modo vinosus sed virosus quoque sit, eumne quisquam

[21] Norden suggests that Gellius takes this circumstantial information from Varro, *De Poetis* (Norden 1915: 132; see more generally 131–42). Skutsch cites another instance retailed by Gellius of Varro apparently recording information passed to him by word of mouth (Skutsch 1985: 450, n. 1). And Gellius certainly read Varro (see e.g. his transmission of *Ann.* 290). It may, however, also be the case that the mention of Stilo was a bald attempt to give respectability to a popular thought (comparably, in some degree, to the circulation of late accretions of scholarly knowledge under such famous names as 'Probus' or 'Acro'); see Chapter 4, pp. 229–30, for argument. Skutsch suggests that Hor. *Serm.* 1.3.93–4, 1.5.44, Verg. *Aen.* 11.822, Plin. *Ep.* 2.13.5 and Claudian, *Stil.* 2.163ff. prove the fame of the passage (Skutsch 1985: 451, 459).

dubitet quin idem fecerit quod cinaedi facere solent?' [6] Vergilius quoque tunicas huiuscemodi quasi femineas probrosas criminatur [*Aen.* 9.616]: 'et tunicae' inquit 'manicas et habent redimicula mitrae'. [7] Q. quoque Ennius Carthaginiensium 'tunicatam iuventutem' non videtur sine probro dixisse.

x: *Ann.* 322–3 insece Musa manu Romanorum induperator
quod quisque in bello gessit cum rege Philippo

Gell. 18.9 (on the meaning of *insecenda* in Cato; on the correctness of the form *insecenda* over the popularly preferred *insequenda*): [1] in libro vetere, in quo erat oratio M. Catonis *de Ptolemaeo contra Thermum*, sic scriptum fuit: 'sed si omnia dolo fecit, omnia avaritiae atque pecuniae causa fecit, eiusmodi scelera nefaria, quae neque fando neque legendo audivimus, supplicium pro factis dare oportet.' *** [2] 'insecenda' quid esset quaeri coeptum. tum ex his, qui aderant, alter litterator fuit, alter litteras sciens, id est alter docens, doctus alter. hi duo inter sese dissentiebant. [3] et grammaticus quidem contendebat ‹'insequenda; scribendum esse›: ''insequenda' enim scribi' inquit '‹oportuit›, non 'insecenda', quoniam 'insequens' significat ***, traditumque esse 'inseque' quasi 'perge dicere' et 'insequere', itaque ab Ennio scriptum in his versibus: 'inseque, Musa, manu Romanorum induperator quod quisque in bello gessit cum rege Philippo'.' [4] alter autem ille eruditior nihil mendum sed recte atque integre scriptum esse perseverabat et Velio Longo, non homini indocto, fidem esse habendam, qui in commentario quod fecisset *de usu antiquae lectionis* scripserit non 'inseque' apud Ennium legendum esse sed 'insece'; ideoque a veteribus, quas 'narrationes' dicimus, 'insectiones' esse appellatas; Varronem quoque versum hunc Plauti de *Menaechmis* [1047]: 'nihilo minus esse videtur sectius quam somnia' sic enarasse: 'nihilo magis narranda esse, quam si ea essent somnia'. haec illi inter se certabant. [5] ego arbitror et a M. Catone 'insecenda' (inscite β *corr. Canterus*) scriptum sine 'u' littera. offendi enim in bibliotheca Patrensi verae vetustatis Livii Andronici, qui inscriptus est Ὀδύσσεια, in quo erat versus primus cum hoc verbo sine 'u' littera [1 W]: 'virum mihi, Camena, insece versutum' factus ex illo Homeri versu: ‹ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, πολύτροπον› [*Od.* 1.1]. [6] illic igitur aetatis et fidei magnae libro credo. nam, quod in versu Plautino est 'sectius quam somnia', nihil in alteras partes argumenti habet. [7] etiamsi veteres autem non 'inseque' sed 'insece' dixerunt, credo, quia erat lenius leviusque, tamen eiusdem sententiae verbum videtur. [8] nam et 'sequo' et 'sequor' et

item 'secta' et 'sectio' consuetudine loquendi differunt; sed qui penitus inspexerit origo et ratio utriusque una est. [9] doctores quoque et interpretes vocum Graecarum ἄνδρα μοι ἔννεπε, Μοῦσα, et ἔσπετε νῦν μοι, Μοῦσαι [*Il.* 2.484], dictum putant, quod Latine 'inseque' dicitur; namque in altero ν geminum, in altero σ esse tralatum dicunt. [10] sed etiam ipsum illud ἔπη, quod significat verba aut versus non aliunde esse dictum tradunt quam ἀπὸ τοῦ ἕπεσθαι καὶ τοῦ εἰπεῖν. [11] eadem ergo ratione antiqui nostri narrationes sermonesque 'insectiones' appellitaverunt.

Paul. Fest. 99: INSEQUE apud Ennium 'dic'. insexit 'dixerit'.

cf. Gloss. Philox. IN 466: inseque εἰπέ.

XIII: *Ann.* 371–3 Hannibal audaci cum pectore de me hortatur
ne bellum faciam, quem credidit esse meum cor
suasorem summum et studiosum robore belli

Gell. 6.2–12 (on the embarassing mistake Caesellius Vindex made in his *Lectiones Antiquae*): [1] turpe erratum offendimus in illis celebratissimis *commentariis lectionum antiquarum* Caeselli Vindicis, hominis hercle pleraque haut indiligentis. [2] quod erratum multos fugit, quamquam multa in Caesellio reprehendendo etiam per calumnias rimarentur. [3] scripsit autem Caesellius Q. Ennium in XIII *Annali* 'cor' dixisse genere masculino. [4] verba Caeselli subiecta sunt: 'masculino genere, ut multa alia, enuntiavit Ennius. nam in XIII *Annali* 'quem cor' dixit.' [5] ascripsit deinde versus Ennii duo: 'Hannibal audaci cum pectore de ‹me› hortatur/ne bellum faciam, quem credidit esse meum cor?' [6] Antiochus est qui hoc dixit, Asiae rex. is admiratur et permovetur quod Hannibal Carthaginiensis bellum se facere populo Romano volentem dehortetur. [7] hos autem versus Caesellius sic accipit, tamquam si Antiochus sic dicat: 'Hannibal me, ne bellum geram, dehortatur; quod cum facit, ecquale putat cor habere me et quam stultum esse me credit, cum id mihi persuadere vult. [**8, 9**] hoc Caesellius quidem, sed aliud longe Ennius. nam tres versus sunt, non duo, ad hanc Ennii sententiam pertinentes, ex quibus tertium versum Caesellius non respexit: 'Hannibal audaci cum pectore de me hortatur ne bellum faciam, quem credidit esse meum cor suasorem summum et studiosum robore belli'. [10] horum versuum sensus atque ordo sic, opinor, est: Hannibal ille audentissimus atque fortissimus, quem ego credidi – hoc est enim 'cor meum credidit', proinde atque diceret 'quam ego stultus homo credidi' – summum fore suasorem ad bellandum, is me dehortatur dissuadetque, ne bellum faciam. [11] Caesellius autem forte ῥαθυμότερον iunctura

ista verborum captus 'quem cor' dictum putavit et 'quem' accentu acuto legit, quasi ad cor referretur, non ad Hannibalem. [12] sed non fugit me, si aliquis sit tam inconditus, sic posse defendi 'cor' Caeselli masculinum, ut videatur tertius versus separatim atque divise legendus, proinde quasi praecisis interruptisque verbis exclamet Antiochus: 'suasorem summum!' sed non dignum est eis qui hoc dixerint responderi.

Non. 195.17: cor generis est neutri, ut dubium non est. masculini Ennius lib. XIII: 'Annibal audaci cum pectore de me hortatur ne bellum faciam, quem credidit esse meum cor?'[22]

XIII: *Ann.* 374 satin vates verant aetate in agunda

Gell. 18.2.12–16: [12] . . . hoc quaesitum est, verbum 'verant', quod significat 'vera dicunt', quisnam poetarum veterum dixerit . . . [**16**] nemo enim tum commeminerat dictum esse a Q. Ennio id verbum in tertio decimo *Annalium* in isto versu 'satin vates verant aetate in agunda?'

XIV: *Ann.* 377–8 verrunt extemplo placidum mare: marmore flavo
caeruleum spumat sale conferta rate pulsum

Gell. 2.26.21: sed cum omnia libens audivi quae peritissime dixisti, tum maxime quod varietatem flavi coloris enarrasti fecistique ut intellegerem verba illa ex annali quarto decimo Ennii amoenissima, quae minime intellegebam 'verrunt extemplo placid*um* mare: marmore flavo caeruleum spumat *sale* conferta rate pulsum'. non enim videbatur caeruleum mare cum marmore flavo convenire. sed cum sit, ita ut dixisti, flavus color e viridi et albo mixtus, pulcherrime prorsus spumas virentis maris flavom marmor appellavit.

Prisc. 5.45 'De generibus' (*GLK* 2.171): 'hic' et 'haec retis' et 'hoc rete', 'hic' et 'hoc sexus', 'hic' et 'haec' et 'hoc specus', 'hic' et 'hoc sal'. Cato in II [*Orig.* 2.67 P]: 'ex sale, qui apud Carthaginienses fit'. Afranius in *Compitalibus* [30

[22] Because this extract from Nonius coincides with the quotation associated by Gellius with Caesellius, it suggests that the scholarly exchange that Gellius depicts is not invented for the purposes of display but truly represents a separate strand of the transmission of the fragment as it existed in Gellius' day. The line Gellius was able to add did not make it in the long run into Nonius' sources. In a sense, then, the Nonius-extract should figure separately under Appendix Table A5.16 on Nonius, since it represents a separate branch of the transmission. The Gellius-strand is aware of the Nonius-strand, but the latter continues its independent life without reciprocal awareness.

R]: 'ut, quicquid loquitur, sal merum est'. etiam 'hoc sale' Ennius protulit in XIV (XII *Z*; XVII *G*): 'caeruleum spumat *sale* conferta rate pulsum' pro 'mare' (pro 'ma**re' [*fuit* 'manere'] *HL*, per mare *cett.*).

Whence: Ars. Anon. Bern. (*GLK* 8.111–12): inveniuntur tamen vetustissimi etiam neutro genere protulisse 'hoc sal'. item Priscianus dicit: 'hic' et 'hoc sal'. Cato [*Orig.* 2.67 P]: 'ex sale, qui apud Carthaginienses fit'. Afranius [30 R]: 'quicquid loquitur, sal merum est'. etiam 'hoc sale' Ennius: 'caeruleum spumat *sale* conferta rate pulsum' pro (*Sk.?* per *codd.*) 'mare'.

XIV: *Ann.* 381 rumpia

Gell. 10.25.4: item 'ru*m*pia' genus teli est Thraecae nationis, positumque hoc vocabulum in Quinti Enni *Annalium* XIV.

XVI: *Ann.* 406 postremo longinqua dies confecerit aetas

Gell. 9.14.5: Q. Ennius in XVI *Annali* 'dies' scripsit pro 'diei' in hoc versu: 'postrem*o* longinqua dies confecerit aetas'.

XVIII: *Ann.* 440 aere fulva

Gell. 13.21.14: contra vero idem Ennius in *Annali* duodevicesimo 'aere fulva' dixit, non fulvo, non ob id solum quod Homerus ἠέρα βαθεῖαν dicit, sed quod hic sonus, opinor, vocalior est visus et amoenior.

Gell. 2.26.11–13: [11] fulvus autem videtur de rufo et viridi mixtus in aliis plus viridis, in aliis plus rufi habere; sic poeta verborum diligentissimus 'fulvam aquilam' [*Aen.* 11.751–2] dicit et 'iaspidem' [*Aen.* 4.261], 'fulvos galeros' [*Aen.* 7.688] et 'fulvum aurum' [*Aen.* 7.279 and elsewhere] et 'harenam fulvam' [*Aen.* 5.374 and elsewhere] et 'fulvum leonem' [*Aen.* 2.722 and elsewhere], sic Q. Ennius in *Annalibus* 'aere fulvo' dixit. [12] 'flavus' contra videtur e viridi et rufo et albo concretus: sic 'flaventes comae' [*Aen.* 4.590] et, quod mirari quosdam video, frondes olearum a Vergilio 'flavae' dicuntur [*Aen.* 5.309], [13] sic multo ante Pacuvius aquam 'flavam' dixit et 'fulvum pulverem'. cuius versus, quoniam sunt iucundissimi, libens commemini: 'cedo tuum pedem ‹mi›, lymphis (lumpis *Ribbeck*) flavis fulvum (flavum *Ribbeck, citing A. Mai's testimony*) ut pulverem manibus isdem, quibus Ulixi saepe permulsi, abluam lassitudinemque minuam manuum mollitudine' [*Niptra* 244–6 R].

?VI: *Ann.* 457 Brundisium pulcro praecinctum praepete portu

Gell. 7.6.1–12: [1] 'Daedalus, ut fama est, fugiens Minoia regna/praepetibus pennis ausus se credere caelo' [*Aen.* 6.14–15]. [2] in his Vergilii versibus reprehendit Iulius Hyginus 'pennis praepetibus' quasi inproprie et inscite dictum. [3] 'nam 'praepetes'' inquit 'aves ab auguribus appellantur, quae aut opportune praevolant aut idoneas sedes capiunt' [Hyg. frg. 6 Fun.]. [4] non apte igitur usum verbo augurali existimavit in Daedali volatu nihil ad augurum disciplinam pertinente.

[5] sed Hyginus nimis hercle ineptus fuit, cum, quid 'praepetes' essent, se scire ratus est, Vergilium autem et Cn. Matium, doctum virum, ignorasse, qui in secundo *Iliadis* Victoriam volucrem 'praepetem' appellavit in hoc versu: 'dum dat vincendi praepes Victoria palmam' [3 C]. [**6**] cur autem non Q. quoque Ennium reprehendit, qui in *Annalibus* non pennas Daedali, sed longe diversius: 'Brundisium' inquit (*Vahlen*: quid *V*) 'pulcro praecinctum praepete portu'. [7] set si vim potius naturamque verbi considerasset neque id solum, quod augures dicerent, inspexisset, veniam prorsus poetis daret similitudine ac translatione verborum, non significatione propria utentibus. [8] nam quoniam non ipsae tantum aves, quae prosperius praevolant, sed etiam loci, quos capiunt, quod idonei felicesque sunt, 'praepetes' appellantur, idcirco Daedali pennas 'praepetes' dixit, quoniam ex locis, in quibus periculum metuebat, in loco tutiora pervenerat. [**9**] locos porro 'praepetes' et augures appellant, et Ennius in *Annalium* primo dixit: 'praepetibus sese pulcris‹que› locis dant' [*Ann.* 89; *see Appendix Table A5.3 on Cicero, pp. 368–71* for the full surviving fragment to which this line belongs].

[10] avibus autem 'praepetibus' contrarias aves 'inferas' appellari Nigidius Figulus in libro primo *Augurii Privati* ita dicit: 'discrepat dextra sinistrae, praepes inferae' [38 Fun.]. [11] ex quo est coniectare 'praepetes' appellatas, quae altius sublimiusque volitent, cum differre a 'praepetibus' Nigidius 'inferas' dixit.

[12] adulescens ego Romae, cum etiamtum ad grammaticos itarem, audivi Apollinarem Sulpicium, quem inprimis sectabar, cum de iure augurio quaereretur et mentio 'praepetum' avium facta esset, Erucio Claro praefecto urbi dicere 'praepetes' sibi videri esse alites, quas Homerus τανυπτέρυγας appellaverit, quoniam istas potissimum augures spectarent, quae ingentibus alis patulae atque porrectae praevolarent. atque ibi hos Homeri versus dixit: τύνη δ' οἰωνοῖσι τανυπτερύγεσσι κελεύεις/πείθεσθαι, τῶν οὔ τι μετατρέπομ' οὐδ' ἀλεγίζω.

Gell. 9.4.1: Brundisium . . . in portu illo inclito . . . quem Q. Ennius remotiore paulum sed admodum scito vocabulo 'praepetem' appellavit.

??: *Ann.* 511 capitibus nutantis pinos rectosque cupressos

Gell. 13.21.13: Ennius item 'rectos cupressos' dixit contra receptum vocabuli genus hoc versu 'capitibus nutantis pinos rectosque cupressos'. firmior ei credo et viridior sonus esse vocis visus est, rectos dicere cupressos quam rectas.

Non. 195.21: cupressos generis feminini ut dubium non est. masculini Ennius 'capitibus nutantis pinos rectosque cupressos'.

cf. Prisc. 5.42 (*GLK* 2.169): vetustissimi . . . inveniuntur confudisse genera, nulla significationis differentia coacti, sed sola auctoritate, ut. . . 'hic' et 'haec . . . cupressus';
'Probus', 'De Nomine Excerpta' (*GLK* 4.215.24–5): nomina arborum generis masculini, ut oleaster et malus, sed non arbor navis et cyparissus.

??: *Ann.* 549 sicuti siquis ferat vas vini dimidiatum

Gell. 3.14.5: Varro . . . disserit . . . ac dividit subtilissime quid dimidium dimidiato intersit, et Q. Ennium scienter hoc in *annalibus* dixisse ait: 'sicuti siquis ferat vas vini dimidiatum', sicuti pars quae deest ei vaso non dimidiata dicenda est sed dimidia.

??: *Ann.* 550 atque atque accedit muros Romana iuventus

Gell. 10.29.1–3: [1] 'atque' particula a grammaticis quidem coniunctio esse dicitur conexiva. et plerumque sane coniungit verba et conectit; sed interdum alias quasdam potestates habet non satis notas nisi in veterum litterarum tractatione atque cura exercitis. [2] nam et pro adverbio valet, cum dicimus 'aliter ego feci atque tu', significant enim 'aliter quam tu', et, si gemina fiat, auget incenditque rem, de qua agitur, ut animadvertimus in Q. Enni *Annalibus*, nisi memoria in hoc versu labor: 'atque atque accedit muros Romana iuventus'. [3] cui significationi contrarium est, quod itidem a veteribus dictum est 'deque ‹deque› (*? Sk.*)'.

Non. 530.1–9: 'atque' particula si diligentius intellegitur, multam habet significantiam; ut vel illud est Enni '*atque* atque acce[n]dit muros Romana iuventus'; quod est festine et intrepidanter acce[n]dit. significat enim celeriter et statim; ut Vergilius in *Georg.* lib. 1 [201–2]: 'si brachia forte

remisit,/atque illum in praeceps prono rapit alveus amni'. habet etiam huius modi intellectum, ut dicas: aliter ego feci vel locutus sum atque tu, hoc est: aliter ego ac tu vel quam tu.

OPERIS INCERTI FRAGMENTA

Gell. 17.17.1: Quintus Ennius tria corda habere sese dicebat quod loqui Graece et Osce et Latine sciret.

TESTIMONIA

Sed. inc. lxx = Gell. 17.21.43: Claudium et Tuditanum consules secuntur C. Valerius et C. Mamilius, quibus natum esse Q. Ennium poetam M. Varro in primo *de poetis* libro scripsit eumque, cum septimum et sexagesimum annum ageret, duodecimum (ω: XXII X^{1}: *eraso* X *priore* $X^{(2)}$: duodevicesimum *Merula*: XVII *L. Müller* [Sk.]) *annalem* scripsisse idque ipsum Ennium in eodem libro dicere.

TABLE A5.11: FESTUS (Sextus Pompeius Festus) (late c. 2 CE); ed. W. M. Lindsay (Leipzig 1913); Sch.-Hos. § 341; Glinister *et al.* 2007: esp. 49–68.

Festus, the abridger of Verrius Flaccus' (?*c.* 55 BCE – ?*c.* 20 CE) rich, learned and influential work of lexicography, *De Significatu Verborum*, and Paulus, Festus' own epitomator, jointly account for almost 15 per cent of the extant and securely attributed lines of the *Annales*, more than any source other than Cicero. The difference in the nature of the information they and Cicero provide, however, could not, in terms of contextualisation and coherence, be greater. Festus proper (often supported by Paulus) provides us with 75 fragments (81 lines) securely attributed to the *Annales*, while 13 fragments (14 lines) survive in Paulus alone. Of Festus' 75, only 4 (*Ann.* 166, 408, 429 and 471) are known to another source (Nonius, Varro, Nonius and Priscian, and Charisius, respectively), often in mangled form. At 484–6, Festus and Paulus support Varro's principal transmission of *Ann.* 114–15 and, at 138, Cicero's transmission of *Ann.* 309. Festus also shows awareness of Ennius' use of items of vocabulary (of interest in his text for their odd use or gender, etc.) as they occur in fragments of the *Annales* provided by other sources: e.g. *latrare*, perhaps as relevant to *Ann.* 481, transmitted by Varro; *tartarino* as used at *Ann.* 220, as transmitted by Ps.-Probus on the *Eclogues* and by Varro; the use of *lupus*, *metus*, *nepos* and *metus* in the feminine gender, as indeed they occur at *Ann.* 65, 60 and 562 (whose primary sources are DS, Charisius and Nonius respectively). *See further Appendix Table A5.36 on Paulus.*

1: *Ann.* 5 desunt rivos camposque reman‹an›t

Fest. 354–6: REMANANT replent (reptent, *corr. Sk.*; repetunt *Lindsay*). Ennius lib. 1: 'desunt rivos camposque reman‹an›t'.

Paul. Fest. 355: REMANT repetant. Ennius 'rivos camposque remant'.

1: *Ann.* 17 face vero quod tecum precibus pater orat

Fest. *Apogr.* 218: ORARE antiquos dixisse pro 'agere', testimonio sunt [quod] et oratores, et i qui nunc quidem legati, tunc vero oratores, quod reipublicae mandatas partis agebant; Ennius quoque cum dixit in l. I *Annalium*: 'face[re] vero quod tecum precibus pater orat'.

I: *Ann.* 19 constitit inde loci propter sos dia dearum
III: *Ann.* 137 postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliquit
III: *Ann.* 141 circum sos quae sunt magnae gentes opulentae
VII: *Ann.* 230 dum censent terrere minis hortantur ibe sos
XI: *Ann.* 357[23] contendunt Graecos, Graios memorare solent sos

Fest. 386–8: SOS pro 'eos' antiqui dicebant, ut Ennius lib. I: 'constitit inde loci propter sos d*i*a d*e*arum' et lib. III: 'circum sos quae sunt magnae gentes opulentae'; lib. VII: 'dum censent terrere minis hortantur ‹i›be sos; lib. XI: 'contendunt Graecos, Graios memorare solent sos'. interdum pro 'suos' ponebant, ut cum per dativum casum idem Ennius effert: 'postquam lumina sis oculis bonus Ancus reliqui*t*''.

Paul. Fest. 387: SOS pro 'eos' antiqui dicebant, ut Ennius: 'constitit inde loci propter sos dia dearum'. 'sos' interdum pro 'suos' ponebant; per dativum casum idem Ennius effert 'postquam lumina sis oculis', 'pro 'suis'.

I: *Ann.* 71 occiduntur. ubi potitur ratus Romulus praedam

Fest. 340: RATUS SUM significat 'putavi', sed alioqui pro 'firmo', 'certo' ponitur 'ratus' et 'ratum'. Ennius: 'occiduntur. ubi potitur ratus Romulus praedam'. et Accius in *Melanippo* [432 R]: 'neque ratum est quod dicas, neque [ea] quae agitas dicendi est locus'.

I: *Ann.* 92 Iuppiter ut muro fretus magis quamde manu sim
II: *Ann.* 122 quamde tuas omnes legiones ac popularis

Fest. 312–14: QUAMDE pro 'quam' usos esse antiquos cum multi veteres testimonio sunt, tum Ennius [tamen huius *corr. Ursinus*] in primo: 'Iuppiter ut muro fretus magis quamde manu sim' †pe * secundo: 'qua*m*d*e tuas* omnes legiones ac popularis'. et Lucretius [I.639]: 'clarus ‹ob› obscuram linguam magis inter inanes/quamde gravis inter Graios, qui vera requirunt'.

[23] This line is sometimes linked to a lacunose passage at Fest. 362 so as to extend the fragment; see Skutsch 1985: 523 and 616–18. (See also p. 441, under *Ann.* 459–60.)

I: *Ann.* 96 nam vi depugnare sues stolidi soliti sunt

Fest. 416–18: STOLIDUS stultus. Ennius lib. I: 'nam *vi de*pugnare sues stolidi soli*ti* sunt', et in *Alexandro* [66 J]: 'hominem appellat. 'quid †lascivi†, stolide?' non intellegit.' et Caecilius in *Hypobolimaeo* [77 R]: 'abi hinc tu, stolide; [vis] illi ut tibi sit pater?' et in *Androgyno* [8 R]: 'sed ego stolidus; gratulatum med oporte‹b›at prius.'

I: *Ann.* 97 astu non vi sum summam servare decet rem
II: *Ann.* 135 at sese sum quae dederat in luminis oras

Fest. 384: SUM pro 'eum' usus est Ennius lib. I: 'a*s*tu non v*i* sum summa*m* servare decet rem'; et lib. II: 'at sese sum quae dederat in luminis oras'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 385: SUM pro 'eum' usus est Ennius.

I: *Ann.* 98 †virgines nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas
VII: *Ann.* 211–12 nec quisquam sophiam, sapientia quae perhibetur,
in somnis vidit prius quam sam discere coepit
XVI: *Ann.* 422 quo res sapsa loco sese ostentatque iubetque

Fest. 432: SAS Verrius putat significare 'eas', teste Ennio, qui dicat in lib. I: '†virgines nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas' cum 'suas' magis videatur significare; sicuti eiusdem lib. VII fatendum est 'eam' significari cum ait: 'nec quisquam [philo]sophiam, [quae doctrina Latina lingua no‹me›n habet] sapientiae quae per‹h›ibetur in somnis vidit prius quam sam discere coepit'. idem cum ait 'sapsam', pro 'ipsa nec alia', ponit in lib. XVI: 'quo res sapsa loco sese ostentatque iubetque'. et Pacuvius in *Teucro* [324 R]: 'nam Teucrum regi sapsa res restibiliet'.

Paul. Fest. 433: SAS 'suas'. Ennius: 'virgines nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas'. SAM 'eam'. idem Ennius: 'nec quisquam philosophiam in somnis vidit priusquam sam discere coepit'.
SAPSA 'ipsa'. idem Ennius: 'quo res sapsa loco sese ostentat'.

I: *Ann.* 112 (de ruit) ç mu

Fest. 278: PERTU‹SUM DOLIUM *25 fere litterae*›ẹs dicitur ‹*34 fere litterae*›de ruit ‹*26 fere litterae* Ennius› lib. I *An*‹*34 fere litt.*›ç̣ mu‹*aliquot litt. ante novum lemma* POLLIT›.

cf. Paul. Fest. 279: PERTUSUM DOLIUM cum dicitur, 'ventrem' significat.

II: *Ann.* 119 si quid me fuerit humanitus, ut teneatis

Fest. 152: ME pro 'mihi' dicebant antiqui, ut Ennius, cum ait lib. II: 'si quid me fuerit humanitus, ut teneatis'; et Lucilius [1227 M]: 'nunc ad te redeo, ut quae res me impendet, agatur'.

II: *Ann.* 123 hic occasus datus est, at Horatius inclutus saltu
V: *Ann.* 159 inicit inritatus: tenet occasus, iuvat res
VIII: *Ann.* 254–5 ‹monuit res›
aut occasus ubi tempusve audere, repressit

Fest. 188–90: OCCASIO opportunitas temporis casu quodam provenien[ti]s est. OCCASUS interitus, vel solis, cum decidit a superis infra terras. quo vocabulo Ennius pro 'occasione' est usus in lib. II: 'hic occasus datus est. at Horatius inclutus saltu'; item in lib. V: 'inicit inritatus: tenet occasus, iuvat res'; item in lib. VIII: 'aut occasus ubi tempusve audere repressit'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 189: OCCASIO opportunitas temporis casu proveniens. OCCASUS interitus vel solis in oceano mersio.

?VIII: *Ann.* 478 rigido‹que Calore›
II: *Ann.* 127 Cael›i caerula prata
VII: *Ann.* 231 inde Parum sim›ulabant
??: *Ann.* 540 unus surum Surus ferre, tamen defendere possent

Fest. 362: 'RIGIDO‹QUE CALORE' idem› Ennius iocatus videtur ‹*19 fere litterae*›li. est enim am[a]nis no‹*19 fere litt.*›re usus est. et lib. II ‹cum ait 'per Cael›i caerula prata' Cae‹lium montem dicit.› et alibi 'inde Parum ‹caute procedere se sim›ulabant': Parum insulam refert. item 'unu*s* [u]surum surus ferre, tamen defendere possent'. suri autem sunt fustes, et hypocoristicos surculi.[24]

id. 382: surum dicebant, ex quo ‹surculus› . . . ‹Ennius: 'unus s›uru*m* surus ‹ferre, tamen defende›re possent'.

[24] See Heraeus 1930: 271 and Skutsch 1985: 411 on the sense of this passage. The supplements are given here as in Skutsch 1985.

Paul. Fest. 383: surum dicebant, ex quo per diminutionem fit 'surculus'. Ennius: 'unus suru*m* suru*s* ferre[t], tamen defendere possent'.

II: *Ann.* 128–9 ostia munita est. idem loca navibus pulcris
munda facit, nautisque mari quaesentibus vitam

Fest. 312: QUAESO, ut significat idem quod 'rogo', ita 'quaesere' ponitur ab antiquis pro 'quaerere', ut est apud Ennium lib. II: 'Ostia munita est; idem loca navibus pulchris munda facit nautisque mari quaesentibus vitam'; et in *Cresphonte* [132 J]: 'ducit me uxorem liberorum sibi quaesendum gratia'; et in *Andromeda* [112 J]: 'liberum quaesendum causa familiae matrem tuae'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 313: QUAESO significat id quod 'rogo'. 'quaesere' tamen Ennius pro 'quaerere' posuit.

Fest. *Apogr.* 124–6: ‹MUNDUS› . . . mundus etiam mulieris ‹ornatus dicitur, quia non alius est quam quod moveri› potest. Accius [654 R]: 'cum virginali mundo clam pater'. ‹mundus quoque appellatur lautus et purus›. Ennius: 'idem loc*a* navibus celsis [celso *x*] munda faci*t* nautisque mari ‹quaesentibus vitam›.' Cereris qui mundus appellatur, qui ter in anno solet patere: VIIII Kal. Sept. et III Non. Octobr. et VI Id. Novembr. qui vel † enim † dictus est quo terra movetur.

cf. Paul. Fest. 127: MUNDUS appellatur caelum, terra, mare et aer. mundus etiam dicitur ornatus mulieris, quia non alius est quam quod moveri potest. mundus quoque appellatur lautus et purus.

II: *Ann.* 130 ferro se caedi quam dictis his toleraret

Fest. 490: TOLERARE patienter ferre. Accius in *Neoptolemo* [466 R]: '*h*aut quisquam potis est tolerare acritudinem'. Ennius lib. II: 'ferro se caed*i* quam dictis his toleraret'.

II: *Ann.* 131 qui ferro minitere atque in te ningulus

Fest. 184: NINGULUS nullus ut Ennius lib. II: 'qui ferro minitere atque in te ningulus' ‹ . . . Marcius vates [2 Bl.]: 'ne ningulus› mederi queat'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 185: NINGULUS nullus. Marcius vates [2 Bl.]: 'ne ningulus mederi queat'.

II: *Ann.* 134 et simul effugit. speres ita funditus nostras
XVI: *Ann.* 421 spero si speres quicquam prodesse potis sunt

Fest. 446: SPERES antiqui pluraliter dicebant, ut Ennius lib. II: 'et simul effugit. speres ita funditus nostras' et lib. XVI: 'spero si speres quicquam prodesse potis sunt'.

II: *Ann.* 136 haec inter se totum tuditan›tes

Fest. 480: T›ṬDITANTES 'tundentes ‹negotium', id est ag›entes, significare ait Cincius ‹*De verbis priscis*. E›nnius lib. II: 'haec inter se totum ‹*6 fere litt.*+ tuditan› tes', et Lucretius item lib. II [1142]: 'nec ‹tuditantia› rem cessant extrinsecus ullam'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 481: TUDITANTES significat 'negotium tundentes', id est agentes. Lucretius [2.1142]: 'nec tuditantia rem cessant extrinsecus ullam'; CGL 5.398.2: TU[N]DITANTES: saepe tundentes.

III: *Ann.* 138 Tarquinio dedit imperium simul et sola regni
?VII: *Ann.* 461 sed sola terrarum postquam permensa parumper

Fest. 386: SOLUM terram. Ennius lib. III: 'Tarquinio dedit imperium simul et sola regni'. et aliubi: 'sed sola terrarum postquam permensa parumper'.

For *Ann.* 461, cf. Varro *LL* 5.22: . . . tera terra et ab eo poetae appellarunt summa terrae, quae sola teri possunt, 'sola terrae'.

III: *Ann.* 148 prodinunt famuli tum candida lumina lucent

Fest. 254: PRODINUNT prodeunt, ut Ennius *Annali* lib. III: 'prodinunt famuli tum candida lumina lucent'.

Paul. Fest. 255: PRODINUNT prodeunt. Ennius: 'prodinunt famuli tum candida lumina lucent'.

IV: *Ann.* 150 et qui se sperat Romae regnare Quadratae

Fest. 310–12: QUADRATA ROMA in Palatio ante templum Apollinis dicitur, ubi reposita sunt quae solent boni ominis gratia in urbe condenda adhiberi, quia saxo munitus (minitus *codd.*) est initus (*vel* introitus? *Sk.*: initio *codd.*) in speciam quadratam. eius loci Ennius meminit ‹cum ait – – –; alibi antiquam urbem significare vult› (*vel sim. Sk.*) cum ait: 'et qui *se sp*erat Romae regnare quadratae'.

VI: *Ann.* 165 navos repertus homo, Graio patre, Graius homo, rex
XVI: *Ann.* 412 navorum imperium servare est induperantum

Fest. 168: NAVUS celer ac strenuus a navium velocitate videtur dictus. Ennius lib. VI: 'navus repertus homo, Graio patre, Graius homo, rex' et lib. XVI: 'navorum imperium servare est in*d*uperantum'. Plautus in *Frivolaria* [82 Mo.]: 'nave agere oportet quod agas, non ductarier'.

V:[25] *Ann.* 166 nomine Burrus uti memorant a stirpe supremo

Fest. 412: STIR‹PEM hominum in masculino gene›re antiqui . . . mina meta‹phoric . › . . . quae nunc in ‹feminino profertur gene›re. Livius: 'tr . . . ‹quo›rundam Rom . . . conditam Romam . . . vius. 'O Strymon . . . Graio stirpe exo‹rt . . .'. . . Ennius in sexto[25]› 'nomine Pyrrh‹us uti memorant› a stirpe supremo''.

Fest. 364: 'RECTO FRONTE ceteros sequi si norit'. Cato in dissertatione consulatus [*Orat. Rel.* I.25 Iord.]. antiquae id consuetudinis fuit, ut cum ait Ennius quoque 'a stirpe supremo' et 'Ilia dia nepos' [*Ann.* 60] et 'lupus feta' [*Ann.* 65] et 'nulla metus' [*Ann.* 562]. etiam in commentariis sacrorum pontificalium frequenter est hic ovis et haec agnus ac porcus. quae non ut vitia sed ut antiquam consuetudinem testantia debemus accipere.

Non. 226.29: stirpem generis feminini. Vergilius *Aeneidos* lib. VII [293–4] dixit: 'heu stirpem invisam et fatis contraria nostris/fata Phrygum!' masculino Ennius *Annalium* lib. V [VI *Mer.*]:[25] 'homines Pyrrhus uti memorant a stirpe supremo'. Pacuvius *Atalanta* [50–51 R]: 'viam quam insistam dubito aut quod promordium capissam ad stirpem exquirendum'. Virg. *Aen.* lib. XII [781]: 'namque diu luctans, lentoque in stirpe moratus'.

cf. Cic. *Orat.* 160: Burrum semper Ennius, numquam Pyrrhum: 'vi patefecerunt Bruges' [*Inc.* 334 J], non 'Phryges'; ipsius antiqui declarant libri;
Quintil. 1.4.15: sed *b* quoque in locum aliarum dedimus aliquando, unde Burrus et Bruges et balaena;
Paul. Fest. 28: BALLENAE nomen a Graeco descendit. hanc illi φάλαιναν dicunt antiqua consuetudine, qua πυρρόν burrum, πύξον buxum dicebant;
Ter. Scaur. 'De Orthographia' 1 (*GLK* 7.14): 'b' cum 'p' et 'm' consentit, quoniam origo earum non sine labore coniuncto ore respondet. a quo quem Graeci Πυρρίαν nos 'Byrriam', et quem *nos* Pyrrum antiqui

[25] in sexto› at Fest. 412 appears to be Skutsch's supplement, based on Merula's emendation of Nonius 226.29; but see Chapter 1 pp. 67–8, for the issues presented by the book-number.

'Burrum' et Palatium *'Balatium'*, item Publicolam 'Poplicolam' . . . ; Isid. *Orig.* 1.27.4: interdum autem aliae litterae in locum aliarum litterarum rite ponuntur. 'b' et 'p' litteris quaedam cognatio est. nam pro 'Burro' dicimus 'Pyrrhum'.

VI: *Ann.* 168 ›ntus in occulto mussabat

Fest. 384: ‹SUMMU›SSI dicebantur ‹murmuratores.› Naevius [63 R]: 'odi', inquit, '‹summussos, pro›inde aperte dice, ‹quid sit *quod*› times'. Ennius in sexto: '. . . ›ntus in occulto mussa‹bat'. item Noviu›s [*Sk*; Enniu›s *Lindsay*] in *Andromacha* [101 J]: 'di . . . ›on est: nam mussare si‹ . . . s in *A‹na›gnorizomene* [Iuvent. 1 R]: 'quod potes, sile, cela, oc‹culta›, tege, tace, mussa, mane'.

Paul. Fest. 131: MUSSARE murmurare. Ennius: 'in occulto mussabat'. vulgo vero pro 'tacere' dicitur, ut idem Ennius: 'non decet mussare bonos' [*Ann.* 435–6; *see under DS*, p. 531].

Whence: Gloss. cod. Phill. 4626 (Warren 1885): MUSSAT dubitat vel submurmurat. unde Ennius: 'in occulto' inquit 'mussabat'. idem: '*noenu' decet* mussare bon*os*'.

Serv. *Aen.* 12.657 (mussat rex ipse Latinus/quos generos uocet): MUSSAT modo dubitat. DS: et cunctatur rex ipse, in quo summa rerum est. veteres 'mussat' pro 'timet': Ennius 'mussare' pro 'tacere' posuit. Clodius Tuscus 'mussare' est ex Graeco, conprimere oculos: Graeci μῦσαι dicunt.

VII: *Ann.* 214 Poeni soliti suos sacrificare puellos

Fest. 290–2: PUELLI per deminutionem a pueris dicti sunt. itaque et Ennius ait: 'Poeni soliti suos sacrificare puellos', et Lucilius [173 M]: 'cumque hic tam formosus homo, ac te dignus puellus', et Plautus [90 Mo.]: 'dolet (*Prisc.*; olim *Ursinus*; holim *Festi cod. F*) huic puello sese venum ducier'.

Paul. Fest. 291: PUELLI pueri per deminutionem. Ennius: 'Poeni soliti suos sacrificare puellos'.

Non. 158.14–25: PUELLOS pueros. Varro *Testamento*, 'περὶ διαθηκῶν': '. . . sic ille puellus Veneris repente Adon/cecidit cruentus olim' [540 A]. Lucilius *Saturarum* lib. IV [173 M] 'cumque hic tam formonsu' tibi [*Nonius*; homo *Festus 249.18, Priscian* (*GLK* 2.232)] ac te dignu' puellus'. Lucretius [4.1252] 'pos *sunt* tamen unde puellum [*Nonius*; –os *Lucr. codd.*]/suscipere et partu possent ditiscere dulci'. Ennius: 'suos divis sacrificare puellos'.

VII: *Ann.* 218 poste recumbite vestraque pectora pellite tonsis
VII: *Ann.* 219 pone petunt, exim referunt ad pectora tonsas

Fest. 488: TONSAM Ennius significat remum, quod quasi tondeatur ferro, cum ait lib. VII: 'poste recumbite vestraque pectora pellite tonsis', item 'pone petunt, exin referunt ad pectora tonsas' et in [na] *Sota* [*Var.* 27 V]: 'alius in mari vult magno tenere tonsam'.

VII: *Ann.* 238 alter nare cupit, alter pugnare paratust

Fest. 166–8: NARE a nave ductum Cornificius ait, quod aqua feratur natans ut navis. Ennius lib. VII: 'alter nare cupit, alter pugnare paratust'. Plautus in *Aulularia* [595]: 'quasi pueri qui nare discunt scirpea induitur ratis'.

VII: *Ann.* 246 quianam dictis nostris sententia flexa est?

Fest. 306: QUIANAM pro 'quare' et 'cur' positum e‹s›t apud antiquos, ut Naevium in carmine *Belli Punici* [15 B]: 'summe deum regnator, quianam genus ‹od›isti?' et in *Satyra* [1 W]: 'quianam Saturnium populum pepulisti?' et Ennium in lib. VII: 'quianam dictis nostris sententia flexa est'.

Paul. Fest. 307: QUIANAM pro 'quare' et 'cur' ponitur. Ennius: 'quianam dictis nostris sententia flexa est'.

VIII: *Ann.* 265 amplius exaugere obstipo lumine solis
XVI: *Ann.* 419 montibus obstipis obstantibus, unde oritur nox

Fest. *Apogr.* 210: obstipum oblicum. Ennius lib. XVI: 'montibus obsti*p*is obstantibus, unde oritur nox' et in lib. VIII: 'amplius exaugere obstipo lum*in*e solis'.[26] Caecilius in *Imbris* [99 R]: 'resupina obstipo capitulo sibi ventum facere tunicula'. Lucretius [4.516]: 'omnia mendose fieri atque obstipa necesse est'.

VIII: *Ann.* 287 his pernas succidit iniqua superbia Poeni

Fest. 396: SUP›PERNATI dicu‹ntur quibus femi›na sunt succisa ‹in modum suillar›um pernaru‹ṃ Ennius . . . (10 *fere litterae* [Sk.]) . . › is pernas succ‹idit iniqua superbia› Poeni. et Catullus [*c.* 17.19]: . . . 'in› fossa Liguri ia‹cet suppernata se›curi'.

[26] The book-numbers here are suspect because ascending order is usually observed in the sequences of Ennian fragments Festus quotes (Skutsch 1985: 444–5).

Paul. Fest. 397: SUPPERNATI dicuntur quibus femina sunt succisa in modum suillarum pernarum. Ennius: 'his pernas succidit iniqua superbia Poeni'.

VIII: *Ann.* 291 de muris rem gerit Opscus

Fest. *Apogr.* 218: Oscos quos dicimus ait Verrius Opscos antea dictos, teste Ennio cum dicat 'de muris rem gerit Opscus'.

Cf. *ibid.* 204: Obscum duas diversas et contrarias significationes habet. nam Cloatius putat eo vocabulo significari sacrum, quo etiam leges sacratae obscatae dicantur; et in omnibus fere antiquis commentariis scribitur Opicum pro Obsco, ut in Titini fabula Quinto [104 R]: 'qui Obsce et Volsce fabulantur, nam Latine nesciunt'. a quo etiam verba impudentia elata appellantur obscena, quia frequentissimus fuit usus Oscis libidinum spurcarum. sed eodem etiam nomine appellatur locus in agro Veienti, quo frui soliti produntur augures Romani.

VIII: *Ann.* 292 ob Romam noctu legiones ducere coepit

Fest. 188: 'ob' . . . alias pro 'ad' *ponitur*, ut Ennius› 'ob Romam noc‹tu legiones ducere coepit' et alibi› 'ob Troiam duxit'.

Paul. 187: 'ob' praepositio alias ponitur pro 'circum', ut cum dicimus urbem obsideri, obsignare, obvallari, alias in vicem praepositionis, quae est 'propter', ut ob merita, ob superatos hostes; unde obsides pro obfides, qui ob fidem patriae praestandam dantur; alias pro 'ad', ut Ennius 'ob Romam noctu legiones ducere coepit'.

Fest. *Apogr.* 206: 'oboritur', agnoscitur; name praepositionem 'ob' pro 'ad' solitum poni, testis his versus [*frg. trag. inc. inc.* 211 R] 'tantum gaudium oboriri ex tumultu maximo' et Ennius 'ob Romam noctu legiones ducere coepit'.

Paul. 133: 'mortem obisse' ea consuetudine dicitur qua dixerunt antiqui 'ob Romam legiones ductas' et 'ob Troiam duxit exercitum' pro 'ad', similiterque 'vadimonium obisse' dicimus, id est ad vadimonium isse, et 'obviam' ad viam.

CGL 5.573.45: 'ob' diversas signifiactiones habet: significat 'propter', significat 'contra', significat 'circum', ut Ennius 'ob Romam noctu legiones ducere coepit'.

X: *Ann.* 332–4 – veluti, [si] quando vinclis venatica velox
apta dolet si forte ‹feras› ex nare sagaci
sensit, voca sua nictit ululatque ibi acute

Fest. 184: NICTIT canis in odorandis ferarum vestigiis leviter ganniens, ut Ennius in lib. x: '– veluti, [si] quando vinclis venatica velox apta *d*olet, si forte ‹feras› ex nare sagaci sensit, voca sua nictit ululatque ibi acut*e*'; unde ipsa gannitio.

Paul. Fest. 185: NICTIT canis in odorandis ferarum vestigiis leviter ganniens. Ennius: 'nare sagaci sensit, voca sua nictit ululatque'; unde et 'gannitio'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 88.4: GANNITIO canum querula murmuratio;
Gloss. Abav. NI 2 (= Abba; Aff.; Amp. i; ii; AA): nictit canis cum acute gannit.[27]

x: *Ann.* 351 verut-

Fest. *Apogr.* 514: VERUTA PILA dicuntur quod ‹velut verva› habent praefixa. Ennius lib. x: ‹'– – – – (30–35 letters missing [Sk.])[28] verut-' et Lucr. l. iv [409]: 'vix etiam› cursus quingentos saepe veruti'.

xi: *Ann.* 353 quippe solent reges omnes in rebus secundis
xvi: *Ann.* 403 quippe vetusta virum non est satis bella moveri

Fest. 306: QUIPPE significare 'quidni' testimonio est Ennius lib. xi (xl *corr. Ursinus* [Sk.]): 'quippe solent reges omnes in rebus secundis'. idem lib. xvi 'quippe vetusta virum non est satis bella moveri'. item alii complures.

xi: *Ann.* 354 ‹rimantur› utrique

Fest. 344–6: ‹RIMA›RI quaere‹re valde ut in rimis quoque›[29]. . . qui te rimaṇ‹ . . . ›Ennius lib. xi: '. . . ›utrique'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 345: RIMARI est valde quaerere, ut in rimis quoque.

xi: *Ann.* 358 alte delata petrisque ingentibus tecta

Fest. *Apogr.* 226: PETRARUM genera sunt duo, quorum alterum naturale saxum prominens in mare, cuius Ennius meminit lib. xi: 'alte delata *pet*risque ingentibus tecta', et Laevius in *Centauris* [10 C]: 'ubi ego saepe petris'; alterum manu factum, ut docet Aelius Gallus (7 Br.): 'petra est, qui locus dextra ac sinistra fornicem †expleturusque† ad libramentum summi fornicis'.

[27] See Skutsch 1985: 507 for the debate over whether this last is taken from Festus.
[28] See Skutsch 1985: 520 for description of the lacuna that leaves us with so little of the Ennian line.
[29] Paulus supplies the contents of the lacuna.

XIV: *Ann.* 387 omnes occisi occensique in nocte serena

Fest. *Apogr.* 218: OB praepositione antiquos usos esse pro 'ad' testis est Ennius cum ait lib. XIIII: 'omnes o*c*cisi o*c*censique in nocte serena', id est accensi; et in *Iphigenia* [192 J]: 'Acherontem adibo ubi Mortis Thesauri obiacent'. eiusdem autem generis esse ait 'obferre', 'obtulit', 'obcurrit', 'oblatus', 'obiectus': mihi non satis persuadet.

XVI: *Ann.* 407 primus senex Bradylis regimen, bellique peritus

Fest. 348: REGIMEN pro 'regimento' usurpant poetae. Ennius lib. XVI: 'primus senex Brady*lis* regimen bellique peritus'.

XVI: *Ann.* 408 quos ubi rex Epulo spexit de cotibus celsis

Fest. 446: SPICIT quoque sine praepositione dixerunt antiqui. Plautus [*Mil.* 694]: 'flagitium est, si nihil mittetur, quae superc‹i›lio spicit'. et 'spexit'. Ennius lib. XVI: 'quos ubi rex *Epulo* spexit de *co*tibus celsis'.

Varro, *LL* 6.82: spectare dictum ab antiquo ‹specio›, quo etiam Ennius usus: '‹q›uos Epulo postquam spexit'.

XVI: *Ann.* 409 qui clamos oppugnantis vagore volanti

Fest. *Apogr.* 514: VAGOREM pro 'vagitu', Ennius lib. XVI (XII *W*): 'qui clamo*s* oppugnantis vagore volanti'; Lucretius lib. II [576]: 'et superantur item: miscetur funere vagor'.

XVI: *Ann.* 413 non in sperando cupide rem prodere summam

Fest. 254: PRODIT memoriae 'porro dat, et fallit'; item 'ex interiore loco procedit'; item 'perdit', ut Ennius lib. XVI: 'non in sperando cupide rem prodere summam'.

Paul. Fest. 255: PRODIT memoriae 'porro dat, et fallit'; item 'ex interiore loco procedit'; item 'perdit', ut Ennius: 'non in sperando cupidi rem prodere summam'.

XVI: *Ann.* 414 nox quando mediis signis praecincta volabit

Fest. 310: ‹QUANDO, cum gravi voce pro›nuntiatur, significat ‹'quoniam', acuta est temporis adverbium› ut Plautus in *Me‹naechmis* ait [78]: 'ideo quia› mensam, quando edo, detergeo'. et in *Pseudolo* [257]: 'dabo, quando erit. ducito,

quando habebis'. et Ennius lib. XVI: 'nox quando mediis signis praecincta volabit'. in XII quidem cum 'c' littera ultima scribitur, idemque significat.

cf. Paul. Fest. 311: QUANDO, cum gravi voce pronuntiatur, significat idem quod 'quoniam', et est coniunctio; quando acuto accentu, tunc est temporis adverbium.

XVI: *Ann.* 427 lumen scitus agaso

Fest. 444: ‹SCITAE alias quae sunt› bona facie, a‹li›as bonis ‹artibus mulieres a› poetis usurpantur. Te‹rentius in *Phormion›e* [110]: 'satis inquit scit*ast*'; et ‹in *Heautontimoro›umeno* [764]: 'at si scias quam scite ‹in mentem vene›rit'. Ennius in lib. ‹X›VI: 'lumen ‹*16 fere litt.* [Sk.]› scitus agaso'.

XVII: *Ann.* 429 tum cava sub monte late specus intus patebat

Fest. 462: SPECUS feminino genere pronuntiabant antiqui, ut metus et nepos; tam hercules, quam masculino stirpis †ut† frons, ut Ennius: 'tum cav[s]a sub mont*e al*te specus intus patebat', et Pacuvius in *Chryse* [99 R]: 'est ibi sub eo saxo penitus strata harena ingens specus'.

Non. 222.25–9: SPECUS genere masculino. Varro *Rerum Divinarum* lib. IIII [57 Ca.]: 'ibi cum amissam capram desiderarent, animadvertissent quendam specum tenebricosum'. Ennius *Lytris* [152 J]: 'inferum vastos specus'. feminino Ennius *Annalium* lib. XVII: '*tum* cava sub mont*e* lat*e* specus intus patebat'. Accius *Niptris* specum' [Pacuv. *Niptra* 252 R]: 'inde advenio montem Oetam scruposam'.

Prisc. 6.75 (*GLK* 2.260): 'hoc specus' melius dici in singulari, in plurali 'hi specus' Servio placet. feminino tamen hoc nomen quoque genere invenitur. A. Gellius *Noctium Atticarum* V [14.18]: 'sole medio,' inquit, 'et arido et flagranti, specum quandam nanctus remotam latebrosamque, in eam me penetro et recondo'. Ennius in XVII *Annalium*: '*tum* cava sub mont*e* late specus intus patebat'. Pacuvius in *Niptris* [252 R]: 'advenio in scrupulosam specum'.

Whence: Ars. Anon. Bern. (*GLK* 8.102): . . . item de his duobus nominibus Priscianus dixit: 'specus' et 'penus' tam masculini quam feminini et neutri generis esse auctores probant. Servio placet 'hoc specus' dici in singulari et in plurali 'hi specus'. Horatius 'quo me Bacche rapis tui/plenum? quae nemora et quos agor in specus?' [*C.* 3.25.1–2]. A. Gellius feminino genere dixit [14.18]: 'sole medio et arido et flagrante specum quandam nanctus remotam [inveniens]

latebrosameque, penetro et recondo me'. Ennius 'tum cava sub monte late specus intus patebat'. Pacuvius [252 R]: 'advenio in scrupulosam specum'.

cf. Serv. *Aen.* 7.568: HIC SPECUS HORRENDUM hoc nomen apud maiores trium generum fuit. Ennius feminino posuit, Horatius masculino [*C.* 3.25.2]: 'quae nemora aut quos agor in specus', Vergilius neutro, quod hodie in numero singulari tribus tantum utimur casibus, 'hoc specus, huius specus, o specus'. nam pluralem tantum a genere masculino habemus in omnibus casibus: hinc est [*G.* 3.376]: 'ipsi in defossis specubus'. quamquam antiqui codices habeant 'hic specus horrendus'.

?VII: *Ann.* 459–60 ços Grai memo
li›ngua longos per

?VII: *Ann.* 471 Hispane non Romane memoretis loqui me

Fest. 362:

‹ROMAN
‹us
‹ra

‹mane memoretis loqui me'.
‹bi nomen dedit

regale est di›gnum rege.
›ș appellat Enni
›cos Grai memo
li›ngua longos per
›Hispane non Ro
Gra›ecum Romulus ur
Lat›in[a]e locutus si
›gentis fuerit
›tione mutata
›icat origo eius
u›surpatio. RIGIDO

Charis. 2.13 'De adverbio' (*GLK* 1.200): 'Hispane' Ennius *annalium* libro * : 'Hispane non Romane memoretis loqui me'.

?VII: *Ann.* 466 ingenti vadit cursu qua redditus termo est
?VII: *Ann.* 467 hortatore bono prius quam sam finibus termo

Fest. *Apogr.* 498: TERMONEM Ennius Graeca consuetudine dixit, quem nos nunc terminum, hoc modo: 'ingenti vadit cursu qua redditus termo est' et: 'hortatore bono prius quam *s*am finibus termo'.

?VIII: *Ann.* 476 quom illud quo iam semel est imbuta veneno

Fest. *Apogr.* 516: VENEN— dice›bant antiqui cuius color inficiendo mutabatur, ut Ennius cum ait: 'cum illud quo iam semel est imbuta veneno'.

??: *Ann.* 503 redinunt

Fest. 362: ‹REDINUNT significat redeunt.› Ennius: ‹*28 fere litt.* re-(Sk.)›dinunt. in‹. . .

cf. Paul. Fest. 363: REDINUNT redeunt.

??: *Ann.* 506 impetus haud longe mediis regionibus restat

Fest. 356: RESTAT pro 'distat' ait Verrius Ennium (ait Ennius *corr. Urs.*) ponere cum [h]is dicat: 'impetus *h*aut longe mediis regionibus restat'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 357: RESTAT Ennius posuit pro 'distat'.

??: *Ann.* 509 cum magno strepitu Volcanum ventus vegebat

Fest. 138: METONYMIA est tropos cum ab eo quod continet significatur id quod continetur, aut superior ‹r›es inferiore, et inferior superiore. quae continet, quod continetur, ut Ennius cum ait [*Ann.* 309; *see Appendix Table A5.3 on Cicero, pp. 384–6*]: 'Africa terribili tremi*t* horrida terra tumultu'. ab eo quod continetur id quod continet, ut cum dicitur 'epota amphora vini'. a superiore re inferior, ut Ennius: 'cum magno strepitu Volcanum ventus vege*b*at'. ab inferiore superior, ut [*frg. com. inc.* 64 R]: 'persuasit animo vinum deus qui multo est maximus'.

??: *Ann.* 514 dum equidem unus homo Romanus toga superescit

Fest. 394: SUPERESCIT significat supererit. Ennius: 'dum quidem unus homo Romanus toga superescit'. et Accius in *Chrysippo* [266 R]: 'quoi, si hinc superescit, Spartam atque Amyclas trado [ego]'. sed per se 'super' significat quidem 'supra', ut cum dicimus 'super illum cedit'. verum ponitur etiam pro 'de', Graeca consuetudine, ut illi dicunt ὑπερ. Plautus in *Milite Glorioso* [1212]: 'mea opera super hac vicina, qua‹m› ego nunc concilio tibi'; in *Phasmate* [*Most.* 726–7]: 'ehe‹m,/vix› tandem percipio, super rebus nostris loqui te'. Pacuvius in *Medo* [237 R]: 'qua super red interfectum [tu] esse dixisti Hippotem'. Cato *Contra Annium* [*Orat. Rel.* XLVI Iord.]: 'nemo antea fecit super tali re cum hoc magistratus utique rem'. Afranius in *Virgine* [343 R]: 'aliis de rebus, *ni* qua coepisti super'.

Paul. Fest. 395: SUPERESCIT supererit. Ennius: 'dum quidem unus homo Romae superescit'.

??: *Ann.* 531 spiras legionibus nexit

Fest. 444: SPIRA dicitur et basis columnae unius tori aut duorum, et genus operis pistori, et funis nauticus in orbem convolutus, ab eadem omnes similitudine. Pacuvius [385 R]: 'quid cessatis, socii, eicere spiras sparteas?' Ennius quidem hominum multitudinem ita appellat cum ait: 'spiras legionibus nexit'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 445: SPIRA dicitur et basis columnae unius tori aut dorum, et genus operis pistorii, et funis nauticus in orbem convolutus, ab eadem omnes similitudine. Ennius vero hominum multitudinem 'spiram' vocavit.

??: *Ann.* 546 pandite sulti genas et corde relinquite somnum

Fest. 462: SULTIS 'si voltis' significat, composito vocabulo ita ut alia sunt: ‹sodes,› si audes; sis, si vis; †plicet† in loco; sci[s] licet, scias licet; equidem [equo], ego quidem. Ennius: 'pandite sulti*s* gen[i]as et corde relinquite somnum'.

Paul. Fest. 463: SULTIS 'si vultis'. Ennius: 'pandite sulti*s* genas et corde relinquite somnum'.

idem 83: GENAS Ennius 'palpebras' putat, cum dicit hoc versu: 'pandite sul*t*is genas et corde relinquite somnum'. alii eas partes putant 'genas' dici quae sunt sub oculis. Pacuvius genas putat esse qua barba primum oritur, hoc versu [362 R]: 'nunc primum opacat flor*a* lanugo genas'.

??: *Ann.* 547 invictus ca‹nis nare sagax et vi›ribus fretus

Fest. 426: SAGACES appellantur multi ac sollertis acuminis. Afranius in *Brundisina* [15 R]: 'quis tam sagaci corde atque ingenio unico?' Lucretius lib. 11 [840]: 'nec minus haec animum cognoscere ‹posse sagacem'. SAGACEM› etiam canem ‹indagatorem Ennius dicit›: 'invictus can‹nis nare sagax et vi›ribus fretus'.

cf. Paul Fest. 427: SAGACES appellantur sollertis acuminis, unde etiam canes indagatores sagaces sunt appellati;
Cic. *Div.* 1.65: 'sagire' enim sentire acute est; ex quo sagae anus quia multa scire volunt et 'sagaces' dicti canes;
Paul. Fest. 303: PRAESAGITIO dicta quod 'praesagire' est acute sentire. unde 'sagae' dictae anus quae multa sciunt et sagaces canes qui ferarum cubilia praesentiunt.

??: *Ann.* 598 sospite› liber

Fest. 388: SOSP‹ES 'salvum' significat›. omnes fer[r]e auc‹tores sic utuntur›: Afranius in *Epistola* [132 R]: '. . . ‹di te sospitem› servent tuis'; ‹Vergilius lib. VIII *Aeneid*. [470]:› 'maxime Teu‹crorum ductor quo sospite› numquam'; Enn‹ius [*inc*. 377 J]: '. . . ›parentem et pa‹ . . . ›sospitem'; Acc‹ius [695 R]: '‹ . . . si› rite ad patri‹am sospes rediis›set'.[30] Ennius vid‹etur 'servatorem' signi›ficare cum dix‹it: '. . . Iove sospite› liber'.

Paul. Fest. 389: SOSPES 'salvus'. Ennius tamen 'sospitem' pro 'servatore' posuit.

OPERIS INCERTI FRAGMENTA

Op. inc. 32 remorbescat

Fest. 346: ‹RE›MORBESCAT En‹nius – – – in mor›bum recidat.

cf. Paul. Fest. 347: remorbescat in morbum recidat.

Op. inc. 33 t‹apet*ae*

Fest. 478: TAPPETE ex Graeco sum ‹….. ›tae Ennius cum ait: t‹ ….

[30] The restitutions are Ribbeck's. Skutsch understands 'set' as the adversative, introducing Ennius' use of the word.

TABLE A5.12: TERTULLIAN (Quintus Septimius Florens Tertullianus) (c. 160–c. 240 CE); ed. E. Kroyman, *Quinti Septimi Florentis Tertulliani Opera*, Part III (Vienna 1906).

Tertullian is responsible for the transmission of a single line of the *Annales* (*Ann.* 51), which the Scholia Veronensia support (discussed in Chapter 5, pp. 258–9). He is not otherwise involved in the transmission of the fragments of the *Annales*.

1: *Ann.* 51 cenacula maxuma caeli

Tertullian, *Adversus Valentinianos* 7.1–2: primus omnium Ennius poeta Romanus 'caenacula maxima caeli' simpliciter pronuntiavit elati situs nomine, vel quia Iovem illic epulantem legerat apud Homerum. sed haeretici quantas supernitates supernitatum et quantas sublimitates sublimitatum in habitaculum dei sui cuiusque suspenderint extulerint expanderint mirum est. etiam creatori nostro Enniana cenacula in aedicularum disposita sunt forma: aliis atque aliis pergulis superstructis et unicuique deo per totidem scalas distributis quot haereses fuerint, meritorium factus est mundus.

Schol. Veron. *Aen.* 10.1 Long(us): utrum sic domum dicit aperiri quomodo et Homerus χαλκοβατὲς δῶ [*Il.* 1.426 al.]: αὐτόματοι δὲ πύλαι μύκον οὐρανοῦ ἃς ἔχον Ὧραι [*Il.* 5.749]. et Ennius non tantum 'domum' sed etiam 'cenaculum caeli'.

TABLE A5.13: FRAGMENTUM DE METRIS (c. 3 CE); *GLK* 6.603–17; see Skutsch 1985: 318–19 and 747–8, with some further bibliography.

This source, our earliest for Roman metre (Schultz 1887), is roughly contemporary with Censorinus, to whom the work was once attributed. The author appears to derive much material from Varro (Skutsch 1985: 318, citing Leo 1889: n. 1). Skutsch (*loc. cit.*) emphasises this source's reliability, pointing out that, while the author never names the poets he quotes, he quotes a line from the *Sota* attributed to Ennius by Varro, with the result that we can be sure that he had access to some Ennian material. No other lines from the *Annales* derive from it besides the 2 lines given here (although there exists a relationship to Atilius Fortunatianus on *Ann.* 31; see p. 448), and these two occur in no other sources.

V: *Ann.* 157 cives Romani tunc facti sunt Campani

Fragm. de Metr. 'De legitimis numeris' (*GLK* 6.611–12): primus est et legitimus maxime numerus hexameter heroicus. huius pedes aut dactyli sunt aut spondii: raro et in extremo versu reperietur trochaeus. eius exemplum: 'avia Pieridum peragro loca nullius ante' [Lucr. 1.926]. totus iste dactylicus fuit et habuit summum trochaeum. sed mixtus ex *dactylis et* spondiis hic erit: 'Italiam fato profugus Laviniaque venit' [*Aen.* 1.2]. totus ex spondiis 'cives Romani tunc facti sunt Campani'. hoc genus numeri paucissimarum duodecim syllabarum, plurimarum decem et octo: tempora recipit viginti quattuor, interim viginti tria: pedibus tribus tantum conficitur: formas recipit triginta duas, quas enumerare festinantibus longum est.

ibid. 'De numeris simplicibus' (*GLK* 6.616): nunc quem ad modum a principali heroico plures numeri transfigurantur ostendam. ac primus trimetrus sit heroicus spondiazon: 'cives Romani tunc facti sunt Campani'.

??: *Ann.* 621 olli creterris ex auratis hauserunt

Fragm. de Metr. 'De numeris simplicibus' (*GLK* 6.615): Pyrrichius 'rapite, agite, ruite celeripedes' [*frg. trg. inc. inc.* 218 R]. contrarius est huic et duodecasyllabos spondiazon: 'olli creterris ex auratis hauserunt'.

TABLE A5.14: SACERDOS (Marius Plotius Sacerdos) (late c. 3 CE?); *RE* 21.601–8 (Dahlmann), 2. Reihe, 1.1629–31 (Wessner); Sch.-Hos. 3.169–72; Nonno 1983: 245–8; *PLRE* I s.v. Sacerdos 3, p. 795; Kaster § 132; Herz.-Schm. § 522.3.

Sacerdos is the author of a grammatical treatise in 3 books (*GLK* 6.427–546), which represent the first large-scale Latin *Ars* to survive in roughly original form.[31] He is the sole source for 1 line alone, for which he provides no book-number. He also quotes a further 4 fragments (*Ann.* 15–16, 53, 465, 510) which appear in other sources (respectively: Ps.-Probus on the *Eclogues* and the Scholia Veronensia; Servius, Donatus and Pompeius; Quintilian, Charisius and Diomedes; Charisius). Sacerdos never names Ennius, but the 4 shared fragments are attributed to Ennius, and sometimes to the *Annales*, by their other sources (except in the case of Quintilian, on whose quoting habits see Skutsch 1985: 29). As Sacerdos quotes no hexametrical fragments from lost works besides these 5, it seems reasonable that the fifth line that survives in no source besides Sacerdos is Ennian too. The attribution of *Ann.* 617 to Ennius was first made by Lachmann on Lucr. 4.619 (Skutsch 1985: 742).

??: *Ann.* 617 rex ambas ultra fossam protendere coepit

Sacerd. 1.178 'De synecdoche' (*GLK* 6.488): synecdoche est oratio plus minusve dicens, quam necessaria postulat significatio. haec fit modis quattuor: aut ex parte totum, ut 'stant litore puppes' [*Aen.* 3.277] pro 'navibus'; aut per totum pars, *ut* 'ingens a vertice pontus' [*Aen.* 1.114] pro 'fluctu', parte ponti; per id quod dicitur illud quod sequitur, *ut*: 'rex am*ba*s ultra fossam *protend*ere coepit'. subauditur enim 'manus'; pro id quod sequitur illud quod debuisset dici, ut est 'et iam summa procul villarum culmina fumant' [*Ecl.* 1.82], cum debuisset praeponere vesperam factam. ex hac figura, id est synecdoche, nascuntur duae, aposiopesis et epidiorthosis.

[31] R. A. Kaster, 'Sacerdos, Marius Plotius', *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth. Oxford University Press 2009. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. University of Colorado at Boulder. 11 January 2012 www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview Main&entry t111.e5651.

TABLE A5.15: ATILIUS FORTUNATIANUS (?before c. 4 CE?); *RE* 2.2, 2082–3 (Consbruch.); Sch.-Hos. 4.1, 148–9; Kaster § 221; Herz.-Sch. § 525.2.

Atilius Fortunatianus is the only one of the several sources for *Ann.* 31 to attribute the line to Ennius. He cites no other line of Ennius. His work, a metrical treatise (*GLK* 6.278–304), depends especially on that of Caesius Bassus (*c.* 1 CE).

1: *Ann.* 31 olli respondit rex Albai Longai

Atil. Fortun. 'De dactylico' (*GLK* 6.284): maximus qui est versus syllabas habet XVII, ut 'at tuba terribilem sonitum procul aere canoro' [*Aen.* 9.503]; minimus habet XII, ut est Ennianus: 'olli respondit rex Albai Longai'. sed hos et eos qui plures spondeos quam dactylos habent, quasi minus bonos et sine dactylo parum teretes et sonoros, spondiazontas appellaverunt.

Fragm. Bob. 'De speciebus hexametri heroici' (*GLK* 6.636): non ignoro autem apud Homerum XII pedes simplices in herois versibus inveniri et apud Ennium; apud Virgilium quoque, ut non audeam dicere omnis, plerosque adfirmare possim.

Cf. Fragm. de Metr. (*GLK* 6.615): *see under that heading, p. 446.*

See perhaps also Victorin. 'De metr. ' 6.211 and Fragm. de spec. hexam. *(GLK 6.634)*, *passages which contain possibly but not verifiably Ennian material* = Dub. *9 Sk.*).

Donat. *Art. Gr.* 3.4 'De metaplasmo' (*GLK* 4.396): metaplasmus est transformatio quadem recti solutique sermonis in alteram speciem metri ornatusve causa. huius species sunt quattuordecim: prosthesis, epenthesis, paragoge, aphaeresis, syncope, apocope, ectasis, systole, diaresis, episynaliphe, synaliphe, ecthlipsis, antithesis, metathesis... diaeresis est discissio syllabae unius in duas facta, ut 'olli respondit rex Albai Longai'.

'Explan. in Don.' 2 'Explanatio pronominis' (*GLK* 4.547–8): veteres pronomina aliter declinaverunt dativo 'illa' 'ipsa', ut genetivus et dativus unam declinationem haberent. sic et 'ipsibus' 'illibus' pro 'illis'. cuius rei testis est Plautus vel Ennius, qui ait 'Albai Longai' pro 'Albae Longae'. nam et Virgilius [*Aen.* 9.26] 'pictai vestis' pro 'pictae', et in III [354]: 'aulai medio libabant pocula Bacchi' pro 'aulae in medio'.

Pomp. *Comm.* 'De metaplasmo' (*GLK 5.297–8*): item duo contrarii sibi metaplasmi, diaeresis et synaeresis. diaeresis est quotiens una syllaba in duas dividitur; synaeresis est e contrario, quotiens duae syllabae in unam contrahuntur. nam diaeresis est 'Albai Longai' pro eo quod est 'Albae Longae', ut est illud apud Vergilium 'dives pictai vestis et auri' [*Aen.* 9.26], 'aulai medio libabant pocula Bacchi' [*Aen.* 3.354]. una syllaba in duas divisa est. legite Verrium Flaccum et Catonem, et ibi invenietis. ita enim scribebant maiores nostri, 'aulai', 'la' et 'i'. graeca enim diphthongus est 'ai'. sic dicebant, 'aulai'. ergo scribe graece, et vides quoniam poteris invenire illam diaeresin: 'aulai', solve 'a' et 'i', et facis diaeresin et invenis 'aulai'; secundum ipsam consuetudinem solverunt. sic et 'Musai'. ergo ista est diaeresis, quotiens una syllaba in duas dividitur. synaeresis est, quotiens duae syllabae in unam contrahuntur, ut est illud [*Aen.* 6.802], 'fixerit aeripedem cervam' pro eo quod est 'aëripedem'. duae syllabae in unam contractae sunt, ut est 'Phaeton Neri' pro eo quod est 'Phaëton Nereï'.

Isid. *Orig.* 1.35.4 'De metaplasmis': . . . diaeresis discissio syllabae in duas, ut ['dives pictai vestis' (*Aen.* 9.26), 'Albai longai']. episynaloephe conglutinatio duarum [syllabarum] in unam, ut ['Phaethon' pro 'Phaëthon'] ['Neri' pro 'Nereï', 'aeripedem' pro 'aëripedem']. synaloephe conlisio vocalium adiuncta vocalibus, ut ['atque ea diversa penitus dum parte geruntur' (*Aen.* 9.1)].

Ars Anon. Bern. (*GLK* 8.94–5):[32] item septima species est contraria primae declinationis: nomina in '–a' desinentia, quae genetivum in '–as' et dativum in '–ai' terminant secundum Graecorum morem, ut 'haec custodia huius custodias huic custodiai', 'haec familia huius familias huic familiai': hinc legitur in evangelio secundum usum antiquorum: 'si sciret pater familias, qua hora fur veniret' et reliqua. Priscianus dixit [*GLK* 2.199, *quoted at greater length in Appendix Table A5.30, p. 518*]: 'veteres dicebant 'familias' pro 'familiae' et 'terras' pro 'terrae', 'fortunas' pro 'fortunae'.' Ennius dixit 'dux ipse vias' pro 'viae'.' Pompeius dicit: ''familias' genetivus singularis antiquus est; apud maiores nostros enim pleraque nomina ad ritum Graecum declinabantur. habemus apud Salustium [*Hist.* 4.12 Maur.]: 'thesauros custodias regias.' sic enim secundum Graecam declinationem dicitur τῆς custodias, τῆς regias, τῆς Musas, τῆς tabulas, hoc est 'huius custodiae', 'huius regiae', 'huius tabulae', 'huius Musae' . . . haec autem nomina feminina primae

[32] Besides *Ann.* 31, here misattributed by the *Ars Anon. Bern.* to Vergil (see Chapter 2, p. 95), all other quotations of the *Annales* supplied by this source (*Ann.* 14, 390, 423, 430) can be seen to derive directly from Priscian, under whom they are listed.

declinationis in '–a' desinentia, quae genetivum et dativum in '–ae' diphthongon terminant, apud veteres genetivum et dativum in '–ai' mittebant; inde in Virgilio [sic] legitur 'olli respondit rex Albai Longai', 'aulai medio' [*Aen.* 3.354], 'pictae vestis' [*Aen.* 9.26]. inde Priscianus dixit: 'veteres Romanorum poetae in genetivo primae declinationis frequenter divisionem et solutionem diphthongi faciebant, ut 'Aeneai', 'Anchisai', 'pictai', 'aulai', 'terrai', 'militiai', 'familiai' pro 'Aeneae', 'Anchisae', 'pictae', 'aulae', et cetera.'

TABLE A5.16: NONIUS (Nonius Marcellus) (early c. 4 CE); *Nonii Marcelli De conpendiosa doctrina*, ed. Lindsay (Leipzig 1903);[33] *RE* 17.882–97 (Strzelecki); Sch.-Hos. 4:1.142; *PLRE* I s.v. II, p. 552; Kaster § 237.

Nonius is the sole source of 41 quotations (56 lines), ranging in length between 2 words and 1 line. He is the primary source for a further 2 quotations (3 lines), which Charisius also quotes, if only in part. (Priscian and Paulus also show awareness of the Ennian origin of items of vocabulary that occur in Nonius' quotations from the *Annales*.)[34] Nonius is thus responsible for the transmission of roughly 9 per cent of the extant total of 623 lines attributed to the *Annales*. He supplies the book-number for 28 of the 43 quotations he gives. His manner of quoting (e.g. whether or not he quotes sense-units and whether or not he includes a book-number) will vary according to his source.[35] As Lindsay was first able to show, Nonius also possessed texts of several Republican authors, including Plautus, Lucretius, Accius, Sisenna and Cicero. He had an edition of some of Ennius' tragedies (including the *Hectoris Lytra* and the *Telephus*, in that order; possibly also the *Ambracia*); but he had no direct access to the *Annales*.[36] It is unlikely that Nonius used ancient commentaries, such as Servius, Donatus or Asconius.[37]

I: *Ann.* 23–4 Saturno
quem Caelus genuit
??: *Ann.* 559 fortis Romani sunt quamquam caelus profundus

Non. 197.2–13: CAELUM neutro. masculino Lucretius [2.1097]: 'quis pariter caelos omnis convertere et omnis/ignibus aetheriis terras suffeire feracis?'; Varro *Rerum divinarum* VI, deum significans, non partem mundi 'sic pater magnus, mater magna his sunt Caelus, Tellus' [64 Ca.]; – Ennius 'fortis Romani sunt quamquam caelus profundus'; idem 'Saturno, quem Caelus genuit'.

[33] Lindsay preserves the pagination and line-numeration of the 1583 edition of Josias Mercerus (repr. Leipzig 1826), which thus remains the only serviceable means of referring to Nonius' text.

[34] I have not in Nonius' quotations of Ennius been able to trace that relationship of Nonius' to Gellius described by M. Hertz in his 1862 essay 'A. Gellius und Nonius Marcellus' (Leipzig).

[35] Skutsch 1985: 38–9, *q.v.* for further bibliography on Nonius as a source for the *Annales*.

[36] Lindsay 1901. Lindsay's work is reprised in clearer form, with some corrections, by White 1980: 111–211. Vahlen 1903: lxxxix–xcvi deals with the transmission of all Ennian works via Nonius. He triages the Ennian content of the *De Compendiosa Doctrina* according to genre, dealing with the first four books on an individual basis, then with the sparser Ennian content of Books 5–20.

[37] Lindsay 1901: 100.

Charis. 1.15 'De extremitatibus nominum et diversis quaestionibus (*GLK* 1.72): 'caelum hoc', cum sit neutrum, etiam masculine veteres dixerunt, ut (et *N*) Ennius: 'quem Caelus genuit'; item: 'quamquam caelus profundus'.

1: *Ann.* 25 cum †suo obsidio magnus Titanus premebat

Non. 216.31–4: OBSIDIO feminino. Vergilius *Aeneidos* lib. III [52]: 'cingique urbem obsidione videret'. neutro Ennius 'cum †suo obsidio magnus Titanus premebat'.

1: *Ann.* 57 haec ecfatus, ibique latrones dicta facessunt

Non. 306.26–32: FACESSERE est facere. Ennius *Annalium* lib. I: 'haec e*c*fatus, ibique latrones dicta facessunt'. Afranius *Inimicis* [202 R]: 'multa atque [*codd.*; ac *Ribb.*] molesta es: potin ut dicta [*codd.*; hinc *Hermannus*] facessas?' Vergilius *Aen.* lib. IIII [295] 'imperio laeti parent ac iussa facessunt'. facessere significat recedere. Ennius *Eumenidibus*: . . .

1: *Ann.* 58–9 te †saneneta† precor, Venus, te genetrix patris nostri,
ut me de caelo visas, cognata, parumper
1: *Ann.* 66–8 indotuetur ibi lupus femina, conspicit omnis.
hinc campum celeri passu permensa parumper
conicit in silvam sese

Non. 378.14–24: PARUMPER, ut saepe, interim et parvo tempore. parumper cito et velociter:[38] Vergilius lib. VI [*Aen.* 4.382–3]: pulsusque parumper/corde dolor tristi: gaudet cognomine terrae; Ennius *Annalium* lib. I: 'te †saneneta† precor, Venus, *te* genetrix patris nostri, ut me de caelo visas, cognata, parumper'. idem in eodem 'indotuetur ibi lupus femina, conspicit omnis. *h*inc camp*um* celeri passu p*er*mens*a* parumper conicit in silvam sese'.

1: *Ann.* 69–70 pars ludicre saxa
iactant inter se licitantur

Non. 134.11–16: LICITARI congredi pugnare. Ennius 'pars ludicre saxa/iactant inter se licitantur'. Caecilius *Hymnide* [68–9 R]: 'quae narrare inepti

[38] See Skutsch 1985: 217–18 on Nonius' misinterpretation of the meaning of *parumper* in Vergil and Ennius.

est ad scutras ferventis :: quin machaera licitari advorsum ahenum coepisti sciens'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 104: LICITATI in mercando sive pugnando contendentes; *CGL* 6.1, p. 644.

I: *Ann.* 93 ast hic quem nunc tu tam torviter increpuisti

Non. 516.11–14: TORVITER. Pomponius *Auctorato* [18 R]: 'occidit taurum torviter; me amore sauciavit'. Ennius lib. I '*ast hic* [lupiastic *corr. Scal.*] quem nunc tu tam torviter increpuisti'.

Prisc. 15.13 (*GLK* 3.71): *lists* 'torviter' *among the adverbs in* '–iter' *used by Ennius*.

I: *Ann.* 100 ‹teque› Quirine pater veneror Horamque Quirini

Non. 120.1–2: HORA iuventutis dea. Ennius *Annalium* lib. I: 'Quirine pater veneror Horamque Quirini'.

I: *Ann.*102–3 quod mihi reique fidei regno vobisque, Quirites,
se fortunatim feliciter ac bene vortat

Non. 111.39–112.2: FORTUNATIM prospere. Ennius *Annalium* lib. I: '*quod* mihi r*ei*que fidei regno vobisque, Quirit*e*s, se fortunatim, feliciter ac bene vortat'.

III: *Ann.* 146 olli de caelo laevom dedit inclutus signum

Non. 51.7–11: LAEVUM significari veteres putant quasi a levando. Vergilium quoque sub hac ostentatione posuisse voluerunt *Georgicorum* lib. IIII [6–7]: 'siquem/numina laeva sinunt auditque vocatus Apollo'. Ennius *Annalium* lib. III 'ol*li* de caelo laevum dedit inclytus signum'.

V: *Ann.* 161 ansatas mittunt de turribus

Non. 556.19–20: ANSATAE iaculamenta cum ansis. Ennius lib. V: 'ansatas mittunt de turribus'.

cf. *CGL* 5.683.11.

VI: *Ann.* 191–4 divi hoc audite parumper:
ut pro Romano populo prognariter armis
certando prudens animam de corpore mitto,
‹sic›

Non. 150.5–10: PROGNARITER strenue, fortiter et constanter. Plautus *Persa* [588] 'ego scio hercle utrumque velle :: age indica prognariter'. Ennius *Annalium* lib. VI: 'div*i* hoc audite parumper: ut pro Romano populo prognariter armis certando prudens anima*m* de corpore mitto'.

VII: *Ann.* 239 deducunt habiles gladios filo gracilento

Non. 116.2–13: GRACILITUDO et GRACILENS pro gracilis, et GRACILENTUM pro gracili, et GRACILIUM pro gracilitas.[39] Accius *Amphitryone* [88–9 R]: 'tamen et staturae gracilitudo propemodum et luctus facit/ne dubitem'. Ennius lib. VII: 'deducunt habiles gladios filo gracilento'. Laevius *Protesilaodamia* [20.1 Bl.]: 'gracilenti' colorem'; idem [20.2 Bl.]: 'ex hoc gracilens fit'. Turpilius *Canephoro* [13 R]: 'nosti quam sit gracilo (*Quich.*: –le *L*: –li B^{A}) corpore'.

VII: *Ann.* 243–4 legio †redditu †rumore †ruinas
mox auferre domos populi rumore secundo

Non. 385.5–16: RUMOR favor auxiliatio. Vergilius lib. VIII [90] 'ergo iter inceptum peragunt rumore secundo'; hoc est, prospero favore et auxilio fluminis. – Fenestella *Annalium* lib. XXII [21 P]: 'itaque ut magistratum tribuni inierunt, C. Cato, turbulentus adulescens et audax nec imparatus ad deicundum, contionibus adsiduis invidiam et Ptolomaeo simul, qui iam profectus ex urbe erat, et P. Lentulo consuli, paranti iam iter, concitare secundo quidem populi rumore coepit'. Ennius *Annali* lib. VII 'legio †redditu †rumore †ruinas mox auferre domos populi rumore secundo'.[40]

VIII: *Ann.* 261 praecox pugna est

Non. 150.18–25: PRAECOX et ‹PRAECOQUIS›: praecoca quod est immatura. Ennius *Annalium* lib. VIII: 'praecox pugna est'. Lucilius lib. iii [130 M] 'an‹n›icula aspera ‹praecox'. Varro *Synephebo* περὶ ἐμμονῆς [514.3 A] 'cum

[39] The lemma is disturbed. See Skutsch 1985: 420, n. 27.
[40] See Skutsch 1985: 427 on the corruption here.

tempus revoc›at ea (atque *codd.*) praecox est fuga'. Novius [106 R] 'huic puellae praecoquis libido inest'.

VIII: *Ann.* 264 iamque fere pulvis ad caeli vasta videtur
IX: *Ann.* 315 pulvis fulva volat

Non. 217.7–11: PULVIS generis masculini ut saepe. feminini. Ennius *Annalium* lib. VIII: 'iamque fere pulvis ad cael*i* vasta videtur'. idem lib. IX '[iamque fere] pulvis fulva volat'.

VIII: *Ann.* 294–6 tonsamque tenentes
parerent observarent portisculus signum
quom dare coepisset

Non. 151.18–28: PORTISCULUS proprie est hortator remigum, id est, qui eam perticam tenet quae portisculus dicitur, qua et cursum et exhortamenta moderatur. Plautus *Asinaria* [517–18]: 'et meam partem loquendi et tuam trado tibi: ad loquendum atque ad tacendum tute habes portisculum'. Ennius *Annalium* lib. VIII (*codd.*; VII *Merula, Mueller*): 't*on*sa*mque* tenentes parerent, observarent, portisculus signum cum dare coepisset'. Laberius *Cythera* [*Hetaera* 53 R]: 'nec palmarum pulsus nec portisculi'.

cf. Isid. *Orig.* 19.2.13: porticulus malleus in manu portatus, quo modo signum datur remigantibus. de quo Plautus [*Asin.* 518]: 'ad loquendum atque tacendum tute habes porticulum'.

IX: *Ann.* 298 viri varia validis viribus luctant

Non. 472.5–6: LUCTANT pro luctantur. Ennius lib. IX: '*viri* validis *ut* viribus luctant'.[41]

IX: *Ann.* 300 rastros dente †fabres capsit causa poliendi
agri

Non. 66.18–26: POLITIONES agrorum cultus diligentes, ut polita omnia dicimus exculta et ad nitorem deducta. Ennius *Saturarum* lib. III [10–11 V] 'testes sunt lati campi, quos gerit Africa terra politos'. idem *Annalium* lib. IX: 'rastros dentes †fabres capsit causa poliendi/agri'. Varro [*Men.* 589 A]:

[41] See Skutsch 1985: 476 on the transmission, including his reasons for dismissing Lindsay's *ut* and for accepting Housman's solution of *viri varia* (a response to a split transmission).

'quid mirum? ex agri depolitionibus eiciuntur; hic in cenaculo polito recipiuntur'.

IX: *Ann.* 312–13 mortalem summum Fortuna repente
reddidit †summo regno famul †ut †optimus esset

Non. 110.8–10: FAMUL famulus. Ennius lib. IX: 'mortalem summum Fortuna repente/reddidit †summo regno famul †ut †optimus esset'.

IX: *Ann.* 317–18 libertatemque ut perpetuassint
†que †maximae†

Non. 150.37–40: PERPETUITASSINT † sit perpetua aeterna. Ennius *Annalium* lib. IX 'libertatemque ut perpetu*a*ssint †que †maximae'.

IX: *Ann.* 321 †debilo homo

Non. 95.30–1: DEBILO (*debil* Lipsius)[42] debilis. Ennius lib. IX: †debilo homo.

cf. *CGL* 5,640. 15: debibus debilis.

X: *Ann.* 349 aegro corde, comis passis
??: *Ann.* 490 ‹passis› late palmis pater

Non. 370.8–19: PASSUM perpessum. Vergilius *Aen.* lib. I [199]: 'o passi graviora'. passum dicitur genus liquoris, quod ex uva passa cogitur Vergilius in *Georg.* lib. II [93]: 'et passo psithia utilior'. 'passum' dispersum, solutum. Vergilius *Aen.* lib. I [480]: 'crinibus Iliades passis'. Terentius in *Phormione* [106]: 'capillus passus, nudus pes, ipsa horrida'. Caecilius *Synaristosis* [197–8 R]: 'heri vero prospexisse eum ‹se ex tegulis/haec nuntiasse et flammeum›[43] expassum domi'. 'passum' extensum, patens: unde et 'passus' dicimus quod gressibus mutuis pedes patescunt. Ennius *Annalium* lib. X 'aegro corde comis passis'/'‹– – – passis› late palmis pater'. 'passis' ait palmis patentibus et extensis. Naevius *Iphigenia* [19 R]: 'passo velo vicinum aquilone †hortum (Aquilo, med in portum *Ribb.*) fer foras'.

[42] On the instabilities surrounding this item in the lemma and in the quotation, see Skutsch 1985: 497.
[43] Supplied from Gell. 15.15, the Nonian omission resulting from homoeoteleuton.

XI: *Ann.* 359–60 malo cruce, fatur, uti des,
Iuppiter

Non. 195.10–13: CRUX generis feminini saepe. masculini Ennius *Annali* lib. XI 'malo cruce, fatur, uti des,/Iuppiter'.

cf. Fest. 136: 'malo cruce' masculino genere cum dixit Gracchus in oratione quae est in P. Popillium posteriore [C. Gracchus 36 Mal.], tam repraesentavit antiquam consuetudinem quam 'hunc frontem' atque 'hunc stirpem' idem antiqui dixerunt, et rursus 'hanc lupum', 'hanc metum' [cf. *Ann.* 166, 65, 562, at Fest. 364, 462]. item cum idem in Popillium et matronas [38 Mal.] ait 'eo exemplo instituto dignus fuit qui malo cruce periret';
Prisc. 5.42 (*GLK* 2.169): sciendum tamen, quod vetustissimi in multis, ut diximus, supra dictarum terminationum inveniuntur confudisse genera, nulla significationis differentia coacti, sed sola auctoritate, ut 'hic' et 'haec . . . crux'.

XI: *Ann.* 361 et simul erubuit ceu lacte et purpura mixta

Non. 483.1–7: LACTE nominativo casu, ab eo quod est lac. Ennius lib. XI (X C^A): '*et simul* erubuit ce*u* lacte et purpura mixta'. Hemina *Annalium* lib. IIII [36 P]: 'ex Tiberi lacte aurire'. Caecilius [*Titthe* 220 R]: 'praesertim quae non peperit, lacte non habet'. Varro *Andabatis* [26 A]: 'candidum lacte ‹e› papilla cum fluit'.

XI: *Ann.* 362 pendent peniculamenta unum ad quemque pedum

Non. 149.27–150.4: PENICULAMENTUM a veteribus pars vestis dicitur. Ennius *Annalium* lib. XI (B^A: XII L^1; *abest tertia familia, tacet F* [Sk.]) *Annalis*: 'pendent peniculamenta unum ad quemque pedum'. Lucilius lib. XVIIII [565 M]: 'peniculamento vero reprehendere noli'. Caecilius *Faeneratore* [132 R]: 'volat exsanguis, simul anhelat; peniculamentum ex pallio datur'.

XV: *Ann.* 388 malos defindunt, fiunt tabulata falaeque

Non. 114.5–8: FALAE sunt turres ligneae. Ennius lib. XV: 'malos defindunt, fiunt tabulata falaeque'. haec sunt et in Circo, quae apud veteres propter spectatores e lignis erigebantur.

cf. Paul. Fest. 78: FALAE dictae ab altitudine, a 'falado', quod apud Etruscos significat 'caelum';
Serv. *Aen.* 9.702: FALARICA VENIT de hoc telo legitur quia est ingens, torno factum, habens ferrum cubitale et rotunditatem de

plumbo in modum sphaerae. in ipsa summitate dicitur etiam ignem habere adfixum; DS: stuppa circumdatum et pice oblitum, incensumque aut vulnere hostem aut igne consumit. Serv.: hoc autem telo pugnatur de turribus, quas 'falas' dici manifestum est: DS: unde et in circo falae dicuntur divisiones inter euripum et metas, quod ibi constructis ad tempus turribus, his telis pugna edi solebat: Serv.: Iuvenalis [6.590]: 'consulit ante falas delphinorumque columnas'. ergo a falis dicta est falarica, sicut a muro muralis. sane falaricam Lucanus dixit nervis mitti tortilibus et quadam machina, ut [6.198]: 'hunc aut tortilibus vibrata falarica nervis obruat', Vergilius vero ait Turnum manu iaculari potuisse: unde apparet aut a Lucano ad auxesin illius quid occidendus fuerat esse dictum, aut a Vergilio ad laudem Turni, qui talem hastam manu iaculatus est;

DS *Aen.* 2.464 and *elsewhere*: TABULATA DABANT quidam 'dabant' pro 'faciebant' intellegunt, ut [*Aen.* 2.482] 'et ingentem lato dedit ore fenestram'. olim sane domus de tabulis fiebant, unde hodieque in aedificiis surgentibus primum et secundum tabulatum dicimus. summum autem est quod tectum sustinet.

XVI: *Ann.* 401 post aetate pigret sufferre laborem

Non. 219.14–18: PIGRET Ennius lib. XVI: 'post aetate pigret sufferre laborem'. Accius *Clytaemnestra* [30–31 R] 'omnes gaudent facere recte, male pigrent'.

XVII: *Ann.* 437–8 neque corpora firma
longiscunt quicquam
XVII: *Ann.* 439 quom soles eadem facient longiscere longe

Non. 134.17–21: longiscere longum fieri vel †frangere. Ennius lib. XVII: 'neque corpora firma longiscunt quicquam'. idem 'cum soles eadem faci*e*nt longiscere longe'.

XVIII: *Ann.* 441 degrumare forum

Non. 63.3–10: GRUMAE sunt loca media, in quae directae quattuor congregantur et conveniunt viae. est autem gruma mensura quaedam, qua fixa viae ad lineam diriguntur, ut est agrimensorum et talium. Ennius lib. XVIII: [gruma derigere dixit] 'degrumar*e* f*or*um'. Lucilius lib. III [99–100 M]: 'viamque/degrumabis uti castris mensor facit olim'.

?1: *Ann.* 443 nobis unde forent fructus vitaeque propagmen

Non. 64.29–34: PROPAGES est series et adfixio continua vel longe ducta. pages enim conpactio, unde conpages. et propagare genus iuge longe mittere. Pacuvius *Antiopa* [20 R]: 'salvete, gemini, mea propages sanguis'. Ennius: 'no*b*is unde *fo*rent fructus vitaeque propag*men*.

Non. 221.8–12: PROPAGO, PROPAGES ut saepe generis est feminini. Pacuvius *Antiopa* [20 R]: 'salvete, gemini, mea propages sanguinis'. neutri Ennius: '*no*b*i*s *u*nde forent fructus vitaeque propag*m*en'.

?1: *Ann.* 449 qua murum fieri voluit urguemur in unum

Non. 418.3–20: URGUERE est premere, cogere. Vergilius *Georg.* lib. III [522–3]: 'ima/solvuntur latera atque oculos stupor urguet inertis' et [222–3]: 'versaque in obnixos urguentur cornua vasto/cum gemitu'; Lucilius lib. XXVIIII [820 M] 'urguet gravido saepius culpa tua'; Varro *Antiquitate Rerum Humanarum* * * * [Ennius]: 'qua murum fieri voluit urguemur in unum'. M. Tullius in *Hortensio* [44 G]: 'itaque tunc Democriti manus urguebatur: est enim non magna'. 'urguere' est tegere. Vergilius *Georg.* lib. II [351–2]: 'qui saxo super adque ingenti pondere testae/urguentur'. 'urguere' adcelerare. Vergilius lib. IX [488–9]: 'tibi quam noctes festina diesque/urguebam'.

??: *Ann.* 493 avorsabuntur semper vos vostraque volta

Non. 230.10–16: VULTUS masculino genere appellatur. Vergilius lib. V [848] 'mene salis placidi vultum fluctusque quietos'. neutro Lucretius lib. IIII [1212–13]: 'ut patribus patrio; sed quos utriusque figurae esse vides iuxtim, miscentes vulta parentum'. Ennius '*av*ersab*u*ntur semper *v*os vostraque vulta'.

??: *Ann.* 529 tergus †igitur sagus pinguis opertat

Non. 223.33–6: SAGUM generis neutri ut plerumque. masculini Ennius 'tergus †igitur sagus pinguis opertat'. Varro *Virgula Divina* [569 A]: 'cum neque aptam mollis umeris fibulam sagus ferret'.

??: *Ann.* 551–2 fortunasque suas coepere latrones
inter se memorare

Non. 134.28–33: LATROCINARI militare mercede. Plautus *Cornicula*[*ria*] [63 Mo.]: '. . . latrocinatus annos decem Demetrio. qui aput regem in

latrocinio fuisti, stipendium acceptitasti. Ennius: 'fortunasque *s*uas coepere latrones inter se memorare'.

??: *Ann.* 557 quae valide veniunt falarica missa

Non. 555.14–19: FALARICA telum maximum. Vergilius lib. IX [705–6]: 'sed magnum stridens contorta falarica venit/fulminis acta modo'. Ennius 'quae valid*e* veniunt – – – – falarica missa'. et dictum hoc genus teli a falis, id est turribus ligneis.

??: *Ann.* 562 nec metus ulla tenet, freti virtute quiescunt

Non. 214.7–10: METUS masculino. feminino Naevius [*BP* 53 B]: 'magnae metus tumultus pectora possidit'. Ennius '*nec* metus ulla te*n*et, *freti* virtute quiescunt'.

cf. Fest. *Apogr.* 136: *see p. 457, under Ann. 359–60*;
ibid. 364: *see Appendix Table A5.11 on* Festus, *for* Ann. *166*, p. 434.
Paul. Fest. 53: CORIUS ab antiquis masculino genere dicebatur. Plautus [*inc.* 127 Mo.]: 'iam tibi tuis meritis crassus corius redditus est'. pari modo diverso genere dicebant 'haec lupus', 'haec metus', 'haec amnis', 'hic frons'.
ibid. 110 METUS feminine dicebant. Ennius [*inc.* 374 J]: 'vivam an moriar, nulla in me est metus'.

??: *Ann.* 566–7 tanto sublatae sunt
a‹u›gmine tunc lapides

Non. 211.10–12: LAPIDES et feminino genere dici possunt ut apud Ennium: 'tanto sublatae sunt a‹u›gmine tunc lapides', ad Homeri similitudinem, qui genere feminino lapides posuit.

??: *Ann.* 604 ipsus ad armentas eosdem

Non. 190.20: ARMENTA genere neutro plerumque. feminino Ennius: 'ips[i]us ad armentas eosdem'. Pacuvius [349 R]: 'tu pascere cornifrontes soles armentas'.
Paul. Fest. 4: ARMENTUM id genus pecoris appellatur quod est idoneum ad opus armorum. invenies tamen feminine 'armentas' apud Ennium positum.

TABLE A5.17: DONATUS (Aelius Donatus) (mid c. 4 CE); ed. L. Holtz (1981); *GLK* 4.355–402; *RE* 5.2, 1545–7 (Wessner); Sch.-Hos. 4.1, 161–5; *PLRE* I s.v. 3, p. 268; Kaster no. 52; Herz.-Sch. § 527.

Donatus' influential *Ars maior* is our primary source for 2 lines (*Ann.* 229 and 618), which we subsequently see circulate widely in the grammatical tradition. Donatus never names Ennius, and the quality of what he transmits is not better than that of what the other sources transmit for these lines, but the *Ars* represents the earliest point in the tradition at which these two lines appear. Donatus' *Ars* is subsidiary (as are a multitude of other grammatical authors) to the transmission of *Ann.* 498, the primary source for which is the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*; of *Ann.* 167, the primary source for which is Cic. *Div.* 2.116; of *Ann.* 31, the primary source for which is Atilius Fortunatianus; of *Ann.* 104, the primary source for which is Priscian; and of *Ann.* 53, the primary source for which is Servius.

VII: *Ann.* 229 Marsa manus, Paeligna cohors, Vestina virum vis

Don. *Art. Gr.* 3.5 (*GLK* 4.398): schesis onomaton est multitudo nominum coniunctorum quodam habitu copulandi ut 'Marsa manus, Peligna cohors, *V*estina virum vis'.

Charis. 3.4 'De schemate lexeos' (*GLK* 1.282): schesis onomaton est cum in textu plures antonomasiae ponuntur ut 'Marsa manus, Peligna cohors, *V*estina (vi)rum vis'.

Diom. 2 'De schematibus' (*GLK* 1.446): de schesi onomaton. schesis onomaton est cum singulis nominibus epitheta coniuncta sunt, ut 'Marsa manus, Peligna cohors, *V*estina virum vis'. et aliter schesis onomaton fit, cum in conexu vel in textu sententiarum plures antonomasiae ponuntur, ut 'armipotens praeses belli Tritonia virgo' [*Aen.* 11.483].

Explan. in Don. 2 'De scematibus' (*GLK* 4.565): de scematibus plurimi multa dixere, sed nullus vocabula eorum efferre potuit latino sermone, sed his appellationibus proferuntur, quibus ea magistra greca nuncupavit – sententiarum aliae sunt verae, aliae sunt verisimiles. Enni versus: 'Marsa manus, Peligna cohors, *V*estina virum vis': omnes partes orationis, quibus versus compositus est, nomina sunt, nulla alia interposita. eiusdem Enni versus est 'tute, Ta‹ti›, tibi tanta, tyranne tulisti' [*Ann.*104; see under Priscian, p. 508]. omnes enim partes orationes ‹a› *t* littera principium sumunt. (*See Appendix Table A5.2, p. 364, for the continuation of the passage.*)

Pomp. 'De schematibus' (*GLK* 5.303): schesis onomaton est: habebant hanc consuetudinem antiqui, modo nemo facit hoc. schesis onomaton est coacervatio nominum. difficile est ut aut nomina sint omnia aut pronomina sint omnia aut participia omnia; hoc pro ingenti adfectatione faciebant maiores nostri. faciebant versum, in quo versu non invenies nisi omnia nomina, ut 'ma*gn*a manus, Vestina virum vis'.

Iul. Tolet. *De vit. et fig* . 5.32: Marsa manus, Peligna cohors, *V*estina virum vis.

??: *Ann.* 618 despoliantur eos et corpora nuda relinquont

Don. *Art. Gr.* 3.2 'De soloecismo' (*GLK* 4.393–4): . . . fiunt soloecismi . . . per significationes, sicut 'spoliantur eos et corpora nuda relinquunt' pro 'spoliant'.

Explan. in Don. 2 'De soloecismo' (*GLK* 4.564): soloecismus est oratio inordinatis dictionibus instructa contra rectam loquendi consuetudinem . . . fiunt autem soloecismi per omnes partes orationis aut per ea quae accidunt partibus orationis . . . per genera verborum fiunt soloecismi, sicut 'spoliantur eos et corpora nuda relinquunt', pro 'spoliant'.

Pomp. *Comm.* 'De soloecismo' (GLK 5.291): [soloecismi fiunt] similiter per genera verborum, per qualitates verborum, per numeros, per modos. puta per genera verborum, si utaris passiva declinatione pro activa ut 'spoliantur eos et corpora nuda relinquunt' pro eo quod est 'spoliant'.

cf. Prisc. 8.24 (*GLK* 2.390–1): vetustissimi autem multa sic protulerunt confusa terminatione teste Capro: 'adiutor' pro 'adiuto' . . . 'despoliantur' pro 'despoliant'. . .

TABLE A5.18: Ps.-PROBUS (c. 4??); *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, 'Appendix Serviana', eds. G. Thilo and H. Hagen, Vol. 3.2.323–87 (1902); M. Gioseffi, *Studi sul commento a Virgilio dello Pseudo-Probo* (1991).

Many grammatical works circulate under the name 'Probus', in allusion to the great Flavian grammarian known especially for his devotion to Republican authors (Suet. *Gramm.* 24); see Zetzel 2005: 137. Certainly spurious are the commentaries on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics* whose contribution to the record of the *Annales* is here detailed. The commentary on *Ecl.* 6.31 supplies 3 fragments, consisting of 2 lines each, and supports DS *Aen.* 1.31's transmission of *Ann.* 555–6, while the commentary on *G.* 2.506 supplies a further half-line. This, however, represents the extent of the commentaries' contribution to the transmission of the *Annales*. That contribution is itself supported mainly from other Vergiliocentric sources, as detailed below.

1: *Ann.* 15–16 doctus†que Anchisesque Venus quem pulcra dearum
fari donavit, divinum pectus habere

Ps.-Probus, *Ecl.* 6.31: cur ibi [*Aen.* 6.724] Anchisen facit disputantem quod hic Silenum deum, nisi quod poeta Ennius Anchisen augurium (*Sk.*: -ii *codd.*) ac per hoc divini quiddam habuisse praesumit sic 'doctusque Anchises*que* Venus quem pulchra dearum fari donavit, divinum pectus habere'. Naevius *Belli Punici* libro tertio sic 'postquam avem aspexit in templo Anchisa, sacra in mensa Penatium ordine ponuntur; immolabat auream victimam pulchram' [3 B].

Schol. Veron. *Aen.* 2.687: peritum multarum disciplinarum Anchisen fuisse ‹et divini quiddam habuisse probare po›ssunt Nae‹vius et Ennius in *An.*›, qui ita de eo ait 'doctus Anchisa Venus quem pulcherrima div‹um› fata docet divinum ut pectus haberet'.

cf. Sacerd. 1.89 'De soloecismo' (*GLK* 6.449–50): soloecismus est latini sermonis inpropria ordinatio, oratio inconsequens, verborum inter se non suo loco positorum vitiosa structura, carens ordine sermo, dictio non cohaerens . . . fit autem soloecismus modis XVI: . . . per gradus conlationis, hoc est comparationis, ut est 'Saturnia pulchra dearum' pro 'pulcherrima'. (*For the genealogy of this passage, see the sources of the grammatical tradition for* Ann. *53, under Servius*, p. 481.)

Cynthius Cenetensis in *Aen.* 2.687 (A. Mai, *Class. Auct.* VII.386):[44] Anchises vates fuit auctorque divinandi. Ennius 'doctusque Anchises venis' et Naevius *Belli Punici* lib. III 'templo Anchisa' [3 B].

cf. Schol. cod. Par. lat. 7930 ad *Aen.* 7.123: vel divinitatem Anchisae assignat, qui ubique divinus dicitur. Naevius enim dicit Venerem libros futura continentes Anchisae dedisse.

III: *Ann.* 139–40 et densis aquila pennis obnixa volabat
vento quem perhibent Graium genus aera lingua

Ps.-Probus, *Ecl.* 6.31: pro aere venti hic extrinsecus accipiuntur. ad quod argumentum collegimus Ennii exemplum de *Annalium* tertio 'et densis aquila pennis obnixa volabat vento, quem perhibent Graium genus aera lingua'.

VII: *Ann.* 220–21 corpore tartarino prognata Paluda virago
cui par imber et ignis, spiritus et gravis terra

Ps.-Probus, *Ecl.* 6.31: si ergo caelum pro igni acceperimus, superest ut in eo quod ait 'spiritus intus alit' [*Aen.* 6.726] aerem dictum praesumamus. hic est etiam, qui nobis vivendi spirituum commeatum largitur. hoc illud et Ennius appellavit in *Annalibus*: 'corpor*e* tartar*e*o prognata palud*e* virago, cui par imber et ignis, spiritus et gravis terra'.

Varro, *LL* 7.37: 'corpore tartarino prognata palud*a* virago'. 'tartarino' dictum a Tartaro. Plato in IIII [*Phaedo* 112] de fluminibus apud inferos quae sint in his unum 'Tartarum' appellat: quare Tartari origo graeca. 'paluda' a paludamentis. haec insignia atque ornamenta militaria: ideo ad bellum cum exit imperator ac lictores mutarunt vestem et signa incinuerunt, 'paludatus' dicitur proficisci; quae propter quod conspicuntur qui ea habent ac fiunt palam, 'paludamenta' dicta.

Fest. *Apogr.* 494: TARTARINO cum dixit Ennius, 'horrendo et terribili' Verrius vult accipi, a Tartaro, qui locus apud inferos.

cf. Paul. Fest. 495: TARTARINO 'horrendo et terribili'.

[44] On the worthlessness of the late Cynthius's readings, see Skutsch 1985: 171.

?VII: *Ann.* 472 Poenos Sarra oriundos

Ps.-Probus, *G.* 2.506: 'Sarrano dormiat ostro': Tyriam purpuram vult intelligi Sarranum ostrum. Tyron enim Sarram appellatam Homerus docet, quem etiam Ennius sequitur auctorem cum dicit 'Poenos Sarra oriundos'.

cf. Serv. *ibid.*: SARRANO OSTRO Tyria purpura: quae enim nunc Tyros dicitur, olim Sarra vocabatur a pisce quodam, qui illic abundat, quem lingua sua 'sar' appellant. Iuvenalis [10.38–9]: 'aut pictae Sarrana ferentem ex umeris aulaea togae'.

TABLE A5.19: AUSONIUS (Decimus Magnus Ausonius) (c. 4 CE); ed. R.P.H. Green (1991); *RE* 2.2562–80 (Marx); Sch.-Hos. 4.1.21–43; *PLRE* I s.v. Ausonius 7, 140; Kaster § 21; Herz.-Schm. § 554.

Ausonius' opaque contribution to the record of the *Annales* is limited to what is detailed here. His *Technopaegnion* is a series of poems in dactylic hexameter, in which each line ends with a monosyllable – some of which monosyllables, in poem 15, are explicitly attributed to Ennius. The intersection of one of the lines (*Technop*. 15.18) with the unattributed testimony of the grammatical tradition supports, if weakly, his contribution to the record.

??: *Ann*. 585	laetificum gau
??: *Ann*. 586	divom domus, altisonum cael
??: *Ann*. 587	endo suam do
??: *Ann*. 588	frun-

Auson. *Technop*. 15:

en logodaedalias; ride modo, qui nimium	trux	
frivola condemnas; nequam quoque cum pretio est	merx.	
Ennius ut memorat, repleat te **laetificum**	**gau**;	
livida mens hominum concretum felle coquat	pus.	
dic quid significent Catalepta Maronis: in his	al	5
Celtarum posuit, sequitur non lucidius	tau,	
et quod germano mixtum male letiferum	min.	
imperium, litem, venerem, cur una notat	res?	
estne peregrini vox nominis an Latii	sil?	
lintribus in geminis constratus ponto sit an	pons?	10
Bucolico saepes dixit Maro, cur Cicero	saeps?	
an Libyae ferale malum sit Romula vox	seps?	14
vox solita et cunctis notissima, si memores,	lac	12
cur condemnatur, ratio magis ut faciat	lact?	
si bonus est insons, contrarius et reus est	sons?	15
dives opum cur nomen habet Iove de Stygio	dis?	
unde Rudinus ait '**divum domus altisonum**	**cael**'?	
et cuius de more, quod astruit '**endo suam**	**do**'?	
aut de fronde loquens, cur dicit 'populea	**fruns**'?	

Cf. Charis. 4.3 'De metaplasmo' (*GLK* 1.278): apocope est cum ex ultima parte loquellae aut littera detrahitur aut syllaba: littera ut 'aspice num magi' sit nostrum penetrabile telum' [*Aen*. 10.481] pro magis: syllaba ut 'endo suam do', hoc est domum.

Diom. 2. 'De metaplasmis' (*GLK* 1.441): de apocope. apocope est ablatio de fine dictionis prosparalepsi vel paragoge contraria, cum aut littera detrahitur aut syllaba: littera ut 'aspice nunc mage nostrum sit penetrabile telum' [*Aen.* 10. 481]; pro 'magis'; syllaba ut 'endo suam do' pro 'domum'.

Mar. Victorin. 1.14 'De versu' (*GLK* 6.56): . . . pari ratione in versu et apocope praecepta est, id est subtractio syllabae syllabarumve cuiuslibet *partis* orationis metro cogente facta, quae sive in verbo sive in nomine acciderit, pro integra parte orationis accipietur, ut 'endo suam do', id est in sua domo.

De ult. syll. 18 (*GLK* 4.263): apocope est interdum aliquid ultimae parti auferens, ut 'namque suam do', hoc est suam domum, et Lucretius in primo [186]: 'nam fierent iuvenes subito ex infantibu' parvis'; sic enim versus scandi potest: aliquando imminuens, ut Vergilius [*Aen.* 10.481]: 'aspice num mage'; 'mage' pro 'magis'.

Consent. *De barb.* (*GLK* 5.388): apocope est * litterae ut 'Achilli' pro 'Achillis' genetivo, et 'magi' pro 'magis'; syllabae *ut 'endo* suam do' pro 'domum'.

TABLE A5.20: CHARISIUS (Flavius Sosipater Charisius) (late c. 4 CE); *GLK* 1.1–296; ed. C. Barwick (1964); *RE* 3.2, 2147–9 (Goetz); Sch.-Hos. 4.1,165–9; *PLRE* 1 s.v. 3, p. 201; Kaster § 200; Herz.-Sch. § 523.2.

Charisius is the sole or leading source for 13 securely attributed fragments of the *Annales*, equivalent to 14 lines. For 3 of these he supplies book-numbers (*Ann.* 101, 245, 402). In the case of 3 (different) fragments (*Ann.* 11, 60, and 510), his testimony is supported by other authors in the grammatical and lexicographical traditions, or by 'Donatus" commentary on Terence. Charisius (with others) supports the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*'s transmission of *Ann.* 498; Cicero (*Div.* 2.116)'s of *Ann.* 167; Quintilian's of *Ann.* 465; Donatus' of *Ann.* 229; Ausonius' of *Ann.* 587; and Priscian's of *Ann.* 104 and 125–6. He alone supports Festus' transmission of *Ann.* 471 and Nonius' of *Ann.* 23–4 and 559. Skutsch has interesting observations on the distribution of Ennius-quotations in Charisius: he notes (1) that Charisius quotes Ennius 11 times in Books 1 (from Ch. 15 on) and 2 (the relevant sections being respectively *GLK* 1.52–151 and *GLK* 189–242), where he quotes Lucilius 41 times; and 7 times in Book 4,[45] where he apparently quotes Lucilius not at all [see, however, (3)]; (2) that the density of quotation is, however, far greater in the short Book 4 than in the expansive Books 1–2; (3) that Charisius names his sources in quoting in Books 1 and 2 but omits to do so in quoting from Book 4.[46] (See also Appendix Table A5.21. on Diomedes, p. 474.) Charisius supplies us with the 1 fragment that convincingly belongs to the proem to the *Annales* (*Ann.* 11); see Chapter 5, pp. 253–4. In doing so, he also links the line with the Persius-passage that is the basis of the scholiastic comment that represents our best information about the proem (see Appendix Table A5.41 on the Scholia to Persius, pp. 550–2).

1: *Ann.* 11 memini me fiere pavom

Charis. 1.15 'De extremitatibus nominum et diversis quaestionibus' (*GLK* 1.98): 'vultur' dixit Vergilius in VI [597]; sed et 'vulturius' Lucilius in I [46 M], ut 'pavos' et 'pavo'. Ennius: 'memini me fier*e* pavum'; at Persius: 'pavo'. ait enim [6.10–11]: 'postquam destertuit esse/Maeonides quinto pavone ex P*ythagoreo*'.

'Donat.' Ter. *Andr.* 429 (ego illam vidi: virginem forma bona/memini videri): MEMINI VIDERE aut 'memor sum me vidisse' aut 'memini videri', non

[45] I count only six quotations from the *Annales* (using Skutsch's attributions) in Book 4: *Ann.* 98, 104, 167, 465, 587, 619. I also, however, note a single quotation from Book 3 (*Ann.* 229, the primary source of which is Donatus).

[46] Skutsch 1985: 42, 744.

'videre', hoc est 'intellego', 'scio'. an memini quod viderim? MEMINI VIDERE pro 'vidisse'. Ennius: 'memini me [quam] fier*e* pavum'. alii –

id. *Ad.* 106 (iniuriumst: nam si esset unde id fieret,/faceremus): . . . UNDE ID FIERET 'fieret' producta prima syllaba. Ennius: 'memini me fier*e* pavum'.

ibid. Phorm. 74 (memini relinqui me deo irato meo): . . . MEMINI RELINQUI ME DEO IRATO MEO domino dicit – an vere 'deo'? *et* bene 'meo', ne esset ἀμφίβολον. *et* sic dixit 'memini relinqui', ut in *Andria* [429, *v. s.*]: 'memini videri' et 'memini me fier*e* pavum' Ennius.

1: *Ann.* 60 Ilia, dia nepos, quas aerumnas tetulisti

Charis. 1.15 'De extremitatibus nominum et diversis quaestionibus' (*GLK* 1.90): neptis grammatici nolunt dici, quod nomina in '–os' exeuntia genetivo singulari '–is' finiuntur et non possunt transire in feminina, ut 'custos custodis', 'sacerdos sacerdotis', 'nepos nepotis', et advocant Ennium, quod dixerit ita: 'Ilia dia nepos quas erumnas tetulisti'. sed consuetudo 'nepotem' masculino et 'neptem' feminino genere usurpavit.

Explan. in Don. 2 'De soloecismo' (*GLK* 4.563): soloecismus est oratio inordinatis dictionibus instructa contra rectam loquendi consuetudinem . . . fiunt autem soloecismi per omnes partes orationis aut per ea quae accidunt partibus orationis . . . per qualitates fiunt soloecismi, ut [*Aen.* 4.661–2]: 'hauriat hunc oculis ignem crudelis ab alto/Dardanus'. 'Dardanus' dixit pro 'Dardanius'; debuit enim a 'Dardano' derivative 'Dardanium' dicere: proprium posuit pro appellativo. hoc est per qualitatem facere soloecismum. per genera, sicut apud Ennium: '*I*lia dia nepos quas erumnas tetulisti', pro 'neptis'. et apud Pacuvium [*Medus* 239 R] 'quis tu es, mulier, quae me insueto nuncupasti nomine?' pro 'quae' 'quis' dixit: masculino pro feminino posuit . . .

Non. 215.6: NEPOS dici et femina potest Ennio auctore, quae nunc 'neptis' dicitur: 'Ilia d*i*a nepos (neptis *L*) quas erumnas *t*etulisti'.

Fest. 364: 'RECTO FRONTE ceteros sequi si norit'. Cato in dissertatione consulatus [*Orat. Rel.* 1.25 Iord.]. antiquae id consuetudinis fuit, ut cum ait Ennius quoque 'a stirpe supremo' [*Ann.* 166] et 'Ilia dia nepos' et 'lupus feta' [*Ann.* 65] et 'nulla metus' [*Ann.* 562]. etiam in commentariis sacrorum pontificalium frequenter est hic ovis et haec agnus ac porcus. quae non ut vitia sed ut antiquam consuetudinem testantia debemus accipere.

cf. id. 462: 'specus' feminino genere pronuntiabant antiqui, ut 'metus' et 'nepos';

Prisc. 6.68 (*GLK* 2.253): in '–os' masculina ablata '–s', addita '–ris', faciunt genetivum, ut 'hic lepos leporis', 'ros roris', 'mos moris', 'flos floris'. excipitur 'nepos nepotis', quod quidam commune putaverunt, quamvis femininum sit 'neptis'.

I: *Ann.* 101 aeternum seritote diem concorditer ambo

Charis. 2.13 'De adverbio' (*GLK* 1.196): 'concorditer' Ennius *Annā* lib. I: 'aeternum seritote diem concorditer ambo'.

VII: *Ann.* 245 russescunt frundes

Charis. 1.17 'De analogia' (*GLK* 1.130): frus, haec frus, quia sic ab Ennio est declinatum *Annalium* libro VII: 'russescunt frundes', non 'frondes'. ''fros' sine 'n' littera, ne faciat', inquit Plinius [13 dC] 'frontis', quasi non dicatur nisi frons τὸ μέτωπον, quodque se probare dicit, quoniam antea cum 'u' non recipiebat 'n', sed nec cum ‹'u'› vertet in 'o'. Varro *Rerum Rusticarum* libro I [24]: 'ulmos et populos, unde est fros', idem *Antiquitatum Romanarum* libro XV [1 Mi.]: 'fros faenum messis'.

XVI: *Ann.* 402 hebem

Charis. 1.17 'De analogia' (*GLK* 1.132): 'hebes hebetis', ut 'militis', 'segetis', 'comitis', teretis'; et omnia quae '–es' correpta terminantur, genetivo '–tis' syllaba finientur, exceptis 'residis', 'obsidis', 'desidis' nominibus, quia ex verbo generantur. 'hebem' Caecilius in Ὑποβολιμαίῳ [81 R] 'subito res reddent hebem'. Ennius XVI *ubi Fl. Caper 'non ut adiunctivo sed appellativo est locutus'.

?I: *Ann.* 448 fici dulciferae lactantes ubere toto

Charis. 1.17 'De analogia' (*GLK* 1.128): 'ficos' vitium esse corporis proinque declinari debere quasi pomum Martialis in Laetilium iocantis nobis occurret exemplum. nam ita loquitur [1.65]: 'cum dixi 'ficus', rides quasi barbara verba,/et dici 'ficos', Laetiliane, putas./dicemus 'ficus' quas scimus in arbore nasci;/dicamus 'ficos', Laetiliane, tuos'; ut sit ἀσύνδετον dictum, quamvis quidam 'ficus' vitium esse velint, ut doloris quasi sonitus audiatur, 'ficos' ut 'fagos', 'moros', 'ulmos'. 'fagus' Varronem dicere sub 'f' littera dedimus exemplum:[47] 'ficus' Cicero *De Oratore* libro II [278]: 'de ficu suspendit se';

[47] *Ibid.* (*GLK* 1.130): 'fagus' Varro, *De gente populi Romani* I [2 Se. (vol. 3)]: '"fagus" quas Graece φηγούς vocant'; 'fagos' G. Caesar *de Analogia* II [5 Fun.]: '"fagos, populos, ulmos"'.

Varro quoque *De scaenicis originibus* libro 1 [3 Se. (vol. 2)]: 'sub Ruminali ficu'. itaque Plinius Secundus [91 dC] recte arborem ita dici ait, pomum vero per 'o' litteram dici. 'fici' Ennius: 'fici dulciferae lactantes ubere toto'; Lucilius [1173 M] 'fici' inquit 'comeduntur et uvae'.

cf. Ps.-Caper, *Orth.* 7.98: 'lactens' lacte abundans, velut 'lactantes ficos' Lucilius dicit [1198 M; uncertain reading].

?v: *Ann.* 455 aqua est aspersa Latinis

Charis. 2.16 (*GLK* 1.240): euax. Plautus in *Bacchidibus* [247]: 'euax aspersisti aquam [fili nuntio]'. Ennius quoque *annalium* libro 'aquast aspersa Latinis'.[48]

??: *Ann.* 496–7 tibi vita
seu mors in mundo est

Charis. 2.13 'De adverbio' (*GLK* 1.201): 'in mundo' pro 'palam' et 'in expedito ac cito'. Plautus in *Pseudolo* [500]: 'quia sciebam, inquit, [in] pistrinum in mundo fore'. Caecilius quoque, ut Annaeus Cornutus libro tab. castarum patris sui: 'profecto qui (*codd.*; profertoque *Ribb. dubitanter*) nobis in mundo futurum/lectum' [276–7 R]; item idem 'namque malum in mundo is ire (in mundost, ere *Buecheler*)' [278 R]. Ennius 'tibi vita seu mors in mundo est'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 97: IN MUNDO dicebant antiqui cum aliquid in promptu esse volebant intellegi.

??: *Ann.* 510 terrai frugiferai

Charis. 1.10 'De ordinibus seu declinationibus nominum' (*GLK* 1.18–19): primae declinationis nom*inativi sunt hi*, '–as', '–a', '–es', quorum genetivus *facit '–ae'*, item dativus similiter '–ae', accusativus in '–am' *vel '–an'* vel '–en', vocativus in '–a' vel '–e'... dicunt quidam veteres in prima declinatione solitos nomina genetivo casu per '–as' proferre, item dativo per '–i', veluti 'haec aula huius aulas huic aulai'; etiam inde perseverasse 'pater familias', item adhuc morem esse poetis in dativo casu, ut 'aulai medio' Vergilius [*Aen.* 3.354], 'terrai frugiferai' Ennius in *Annalibus*.

[48] See Skutsch 1985: 611–12 for problems with the textual transmission.

Anon. Bobiens. ex Charisii *Arte* excerpta (*GLK* 1.538): dicunt quidam veteres in prima declinatione solitos nomina genetivo casu per '–as' proferre, item dativo per '–i' veluti 'haec aula huius aulas huic aulai', similiter et cetera, 'haec terra huius terras huic terrai', 'aqua aquas aquai'; etiam inde perseverasse 'pater familias', item adhuc esse morem poetis in dativo 'aulai medio' [*Aen.* 3.354] dicere et 'intus aquai' [*Aen.* 7.464]; 'frugiferai' Ennius in *Annalibus*. prima declinatio, ut supra diximus, neutrum nomen non habet.

cf. Sacerd. 1.84 'De diaeresi' (*GLK* 6.449): diaeresis est cum duae vocales in syllabam ductae singulatim pronuntiatae dividuntur, ut 'aulae in medio' et 'frug‹ifer›ae', 'aulai' et 'frug‹ifer›ai'. huic contraria est synaeresis;
Fragm. Bob. 'De nomine' (*GLK* 5.555): nam legimus apud Lucretium et Vergilium 'terrai frugiferai' pro 'terrae frugiferae', et 'aulai medio' [*Aen.* 3.354] pro 'aulae', atque 'aurai simplicis ignem' [*Aen.* 6.747] pro 'aurae', item 'dives pictai vestis' [*Aen.* 9.26] pro 'pictae';
Martial. 11.90: carmina nulla probas molli quae limite currunt,/sed quae per salebras altaque saxa cadunt,/et tibi Maeonio quoque carmine majus habetur,/attonitusque legis 'terrai frugiferai',/Accius et quidquid Pacuviusque vomunt./vis imiter veteres, Chrestille, tuosque poetas? dispeream ni scis mentula quid sapiat.

??: *Ann.* 530 sagus caerulus

Charis. 1.15 'De extremitatibus nominum et diversis quaestionibus' (*GLK* 1.105): 'sagum' neutro genere dicitur, sed Afranius in *Deditione* [44 R] masculine dixit 'quia quadrati sunt sagi', et Ennius 'sagus caerulus'.

??: *Ann.* 599 equitatus iit celerissimus

Charis. 1.15 'De extremitatibus nominum et diversis quaestionibus' (*GLK* 1.83): 'celer celerior celerrimus' facit, ut 'asper asperior asperrimus', 'acer acrior acerrimus', et 'pulcher pulchrior pulcherrimus'. nam quod Ennius ait, 'equitatus *ii*t cele*riss*imus', barbarismus est.

??: *Ann.* 600 iamque fere quattuor partum

Charis. 1.17 'De analogia' (*GLK* 1.141): 'partum'. Caesar in *Analogicis* [25 Fun.]: harum 'partum', Cornelius Nepos *Inlustrium* XV [2 P] * et Ennius: 'iamque fere quattuor partum', quoniam ab 'hac parte' facit et 'has partes'. 'sed consuetudo,' inquit Plinius [64 dC], 'ut 'praegnatium' 'optimatium''.

??: *Ann.* 619[49] vosque Lares tectum nostrum qui funditus curant

Charis. 4.1 'De soloecismo' (*GLK* 1.266–7): de soloecismo, ut ait Cominianus. soloecismus est oratio inconsequens. fit autem *aut* per partes orationis aut per accidentia partibus orationis . . . per accidentia partibus orationis fit soloecismus in plures species divisus, per qualitates nominum . . . per qualitates verborum . . . per qualitates adverbiorum . . . per qualitates praepositionum . . . per genera verborum . . . per numeros . . . per casus . . . per personas, ut 'vosque, Lares, tectum n*ostru*m qui funditus curant' pro 'curatis'; per modos . . .

cf. Don. *Art. Gr.* 3.2 'De soloecismo' (*GLK* 4.393–4): soloecismus fit . . . per personas, sicut 'Danai, qui parent Atridis, quam primum arma sumite' [*frg. trg. inc. inc.* 35 R], pro 'qui paretis sumite' . . .
Explan. in Don. 2 'De soloecismo' (*GLK* 4.563–4): fiunt autem soloecismi . . . per personas, sicut 'Danai, qui parent Atridis, quam primum arma sumite' [*frg. trg. inc. inc.* 35 R], pro 'qui paretis sumite': 'parent' tertia persona est, 'paretis' secunda . . .
Pomp. *Comm.* 'De verbo' (*GLK* 5.237): et alio loco dixit: 'Danai, qui parent Atridis, quam primum arma sumite' [*frg. trg. inc. inc.* 35 R]. 'Danai' qui casus est? vocativus sine dubio. iste vocativus casus quam personam debuit tenere? secundam. 'parent' tertia persona est: ecce iunxit tertiam personam vocativo, 'Danai, qui parent Atridis'; debuerat dicere 'o Danai, qui paretis', quod est in secunda persona. ergo propter confusiones antiquitatis dedit regulam, ut scias, quem casum cui personae iungere debeas.

[49] This fragment was first ascribed to Ennius by A. Koch (1852), *Exerc. Crit.* Diss. Bonn: 11 (*non vidi*); see Skutsch 1985: 744.

TABLE A5.21: DIOMEDES (late c. 4–early *c.* 5 CE); *GLK* 1.297–529; *RE* 5.1, 827–9; Sch.-Hos. 4.1, 169–72; *PLRE* I s.v., p. 257; Kaster no. 47; Herz.-Schm. § 524.

In the only work of Diomedes' that we know, an *Ars Grammatica* in 3 books, the grammarian quotes 6 fragments (7 lines) from the *Annales* for which he is the sole source. 5 of these appear in Book 1 of the *Ars*. A further 2 fragments also transmitted by other sources also appear in Book 1: *Ann.* 8 (also quoted by Varro, *LL* 5.59 and Priscian) and *Ann.* 164 (also quoted by Quintilian, Macrobius, Servius and DS). (A full 4 are in the section 'De dubia verborum positione' [*GLK* 1.382–8].) The remaining quotation for which Diomedes is the sole source, *Ann.* 620, appears in Book 2, in the section 'De schematibus'. Other quotations from the *Annales*, also given by other sources, cluster in its vicinity: *Ann.* 229 and 498, which circulate fairly widely in the grammatical tradition, and *Ann.* 167, also transmitted by Cicero, Quintilian, Velius Longus, Porphyrio, Priscian, Isidore, and others (see Appendix Table A5.3, on Cicero pp. 372–5). 2 others are only slightly more removed: *Ann.* 587 (at *GLK* 1.441), in the section 'De metaplasmis', and also transmitted by Ausonius, Charisius, Marius Victorinus, Consentius (see under Ausonius); and *Ann.* 465 (at *GLK* 1.457), for which the primary source is Quintilian. For 4 of the 6 fragments for which Diomedes is the sole source, he supplies a book-number. The other two cannot be placed.

Diomedes' immediate sources are other grammarians, including Charisius, with whom he is closely associated. Skutsch notes that the 6 quotations of the *Annales* in Book 2 are almost identical with those given by Charisius in Book 4, suggesting strongly that, in these parts of their work, they shared a source.[50] In Book 3, Diomedes offers a testimonium about the number of books of the *Annales* and its title(s), which d'Anna 1983: 60–1 suggests goes back to Varro (see Chapter 1, n. 6, pp. 19–20).

VIII: *Ann.* 262 certare abnueo: metuo legionibus labem

[50] Skutsch 1985: 42. The exception: Charisius includes both *Ann.* 104 and *Ann.* 619, which Diomedes omits; but he includes *Ann.* 620, missing from Charisius. Skutsch (*ibid.*) also notes that, while both grammarians regularly introduce their quotations with *ut*, Charisius in Book 4 never names Ennius, but Diomedes once (for *Ann.* 498) adds the name. Skutsch notes further (on *Ann.* 347) that in giving book-numbers in his first book Diomedes tends to omit *in*, but only where he gives both the book-number and the title of the work; where he gives the book-number only, he always includes the preposition (*ibid.*). Further observations on Diomedes' manner of quoting at Skutsch 1985: 517.

Diom. 1, 'De dubia verborum positione' (*GLK* 1.382): sunt praeterea quadam quorum positionem diversam quam vulgo est apud veteres reperimus. cui enim in dubium cadit quin 'abnuo abnuis' dicamus? verum apud veteres et 'abnueo' dictum annotamus, ut Ennius octavo *Annalium*: 'certare abnueo. metuo legionibus labem'. idem in *Telamone* ex eo futurum: 'abnuebunt' [279 J; cf. *Ann.* 616 (*sed. inc.* cliii): 'haec abnu(eram)' = Schol. Veron. *Aen.* 10.8].

x: *Ann.* 347 horitatur induperator
xvi: *Ann.* 424 prandere iubet horiturque

Diom. 1, 'De dubia verborum positione' (*GLK* 1.382): item 'hortatur' quod vulgo dicimus nonnulli 'horitur' dixerunt, ut Ennius sexto decimo *Annalium*: 'prandere iubet horiturque'. idem in decimo: 'horit‹at›ur induperator' quasi specie iterativa.

x: *Ann.* 350 pinsunt terram genibus

Diom. 1, 'De speciebus temporis praeteriti perfecti' (*GLK* 1.373): sunt quaedam verba quae ex una positione diversos sortiuntur declinationum ordines et sensus, quasi 'mando mandas', cum aliquid monemus, 'mando mandis', cum dentibus quid consumimus, quod in consuetudine 'manduco' dicunt; 'volo volas', quotiens alitum iter demonstramus, 'volo vis', quotiens velle quid significamus; . . . 'piso pisas', '*piso pisis*'. et est apud Persium ambiguum 'a tergo ciconia pisat' an 'pisit' legendum sit. sed apud veteres reperimus etiam '–n–' littera addita 'pinso' quod est 'tundo', et 'pinsit' secundum tertium ordinem, ut Ennius decimo *Annalium*: 'pinsunt terram genibus'. huius perfectum 'pinsui', ut apud Pomponium: 'cum interim neque malis molui neque palatis pinsui' [187/8 R]. participium erit 'pinsens'; item 'pinsurus' et 'pinsus' et 'pinsendus'.

??: *Ann.* 613–14 nec retrahi ˘ ˘ – ˘ potestur
imperiis

Diom. 1, 'De dubia verborum positione' (*GLK* 1.385–6): 'sum' verbum in primis corruptum est, non tantum propter ceterorum declinationem sed et ipsa positione, quoniam nullum in toto sermone tale est, nisi quae ex eo conposita sunt . . . ex hoc verbo conpositum est 'prosum' . . . item 'possum' . . . 'possum' tamen nonnulli veterum et passiva declinatione figurant, 'potestur' et 'possuntur'; et 'quitur' et 'quitus sum' apud non

nullos veterum reperimus, quod est ei synonymon. et hanc adnotant in illis non nulli differentiam ut activa declinatione ad personam feratur, quasi 'possum ego' 'potes tu' 'potest ille' facere ut * quasi tam prona facilisque est ut fieri possit. subtilis adnotatio, verum parum usitata. sed quoniam esse dictum rettulimus, apud quos sit dictum adfirmabimus. Accius 'quitus sum' ponit pro 'quivi' hoc modo [662–3 R]: 'nam *neque* pretio neque amicitia neque vi impelli neque prece/quitus sum'. idem alibi eodem modo: 'unde omnia perdisci ac percipi quentur'; Caecilius praeterea [279 R]: 'si non sarciri quitur'. item 'potestur' apud Ennium reperimus: 'nec retrahi potestur imperiis'. Scaurus *De vita sua* tertio [4 P] 'poteratur' etiam sicut 'possitur' dictitat. ex eodem etiam 'potis sit' dicebant, item 'potis est' pro 'potest', ut apud eundem Ennium [*Ann.* 164]:[51] 'quis potis ingentis oras evolvere belli', et Vergilius [*Aen.* 11.148]: 'at non Evandrum potis est vis ulla tenere'. nec non 'pote' veteres crebro dicere reperimus. proximo utar exemplo: Persius ait [1.56]: 'qui pote? vis dicam? nugaris'. cuius futurum dicitur 'potero' et 'potuero', sed 'potero' magis finitivum, 'potuero' subiunctivum, quasi cum 'potuero'.

cf. Consent. 'De barbarismis et metaplasmis' [*GLK* 5.388]: paragoge est, quae eadem 'paralempsis' dicitur, adiectio litterae syllabaeve ad finem dictionis: litterae, ut 'magis' pro 'mage'; syllabae, ut 'admittier orant' pro 'admitti' et 'potestur' pro 'potest'.

??: *Ann.* 620 machina multa minax minitatur maxima muris

Diom. 2 'De schematibus' (*GLK* 1.447): de parhomoeo. parhomoeon est cum verb vel nomina paululum inflexa et tamen prope similia superioribus inferuntur, ut [*Aen.* 4.3–4]: 'multa viri virtus animo multusque recursat/ gentis honos'. et aliter parhomoeon fit, cum verba similiter incipiunt, ut 'machina multa minax minitatur maxima muris'.

OPERIS INCERTI FRAGMENTA

Op. inc. 2 an aliquid quod dono †illi morare sed accipite

Diom. 1 'De his quae apud veteres diversa reperiuntur enuntiata declinatio' (*GLK* 1.400): exempli ... gratia quaedam commemorabimus, quo quibus libeat uti more vetustatis utantur. plura enim verba quae vulgo passivo more declinamus apud veteres diversa reperiuntur enuntiata declinatione. 'frustro',

[51] The primary source for *Ann.* 164 is Quintilian, under whose name it is listed: see Appendix Table A5.7, pp. 404–5.

quod vulgo 'frustror' recte dicimus, id est 'decipio'; item 'demolio', 'auxilio', 'populo', 'digno': haec et alia apud veteres reperimus contra morem doctorum posita. nunc dicet aliquis quos veteres hoc modo locutos * ait Gaius Caesar apud milites de commodis eorum, 'non frustrabo vos, milites'. item 'patio' Naevius in *Proiecto* 'populus patitur' inquit 'tu patias' [*frg. com.* 67 R]. 'moro' autem item Naevius in eodem: 'quid moras? quid imperas?' [*ibid.* 68 R]. item Pacuvius in *Hermiona* [181 R]: 'paucis absolvit ne moraret diutius'. Ennius: 'an aliquid quod dono †illi morare sed accipite'.

TESTIMONIA

Diom. 3 'De poematibus: de specie poematos communis' (*GLK* 1.483–4):

Κοινοῦ vel communis poematos species prima est heroica, ut est *Iliados* et *Aeneidos* . . . 'epos' dicitur Graece carmine hexametro divinarum rerum et heroicarum humanarumque conprehensio; quod a Graecis ita definitum est, ἔπος ἐστὶν περιοχὴ θείων τε καὶ ἡρωϊκῶν καὶ ἀνθρωπίνων πραγμάτων. Latine paulo communius carmen auditur. epos Latinum primus digne scripsit is qui res Romanorum decem et octo conplexus est libris, qui et *Annales in*scribuntur, quod singulorum fere annorum actus contineant, sicut publici annales, quos pontifices scribaeque conficiunt, vel *Romais* (*codd.*: Romanis *Reifferscheid*), quod Romanorum res gestas declarant. epos autem appellatur, ut Graecis placet, παρὰ τὸ ἕπεσθαι ἐν αὐτῷ τὰ ἑξῆς μέρη τοῖς πρώτοις. praecipue vero hexameter versus 'epos' dicitur, quoniam quidem hoc versu verba responsi in mutuam, ut sic dixerim, consequentiam primus deus vates conprehendit, unde postea abusive verbum et solutae orationis ipsa scriptura consequens ab aliis 'epos' dictum. rapsodia dicitur Graece ποιήσεως μέρος, aliqua particula discreta atque divulsa; dicta παρὰ τὸ ῥάπτειν, quod versus in unum volumen velut consuantur et conprehendantur, vel quod olim partes Homerici carminis in theatralibus circulis cum baculo, id est virga, pronuntiabant qui ab eodem Homero dicti Homeristae.

TABLE A5.22: AUGUSTINE (Aurelius Augustinus) (354–430 CE); *De civitate Dei*, edd. B. Donbart and A. Kalb (2 vols.), ed. 5 (Stuttgart 1981; repr. 1993); *S. Aureli Augustini Hipponiensis Episcopi Epistulae*, ed. A. Goldbacher (Vienna 1895–1923); *De Trinitate*, edd. W. J. Mountain and F. Glorie (Turnholt 1968).

Augustine's material is culled directly from Cicero. He is fairly singular as a late source in this, since Cicero does not appear to be a significant source for any of the major surviving branches of transmission of the *Annales*. 2 lines from Cicero's lost works survive through re-quotation by Augustine: he is our primary source for *Ann.* 156, today as in antiquity one of the best-known lines of the epic (thus the Hist. Aug. calls it a *versum . . .omnibus frequentatum*) and our only source for 1 other line (*Ann.* 572). He shows awareness of *Ann.* 329 (which Cicero quotes 3 times in the extant record and Varro once) at *Ep.* 19 and of *Ann.* 167 (the Pyrrhus-oracle which reaches us primarily through Cic. *Div.* 2.166) at *De civ. D.* 3.17. He does not otherwise intervene in the transmission of the *Annales*, unless it is relevant that he supports Cicero's transmission of *Op. inc.* 17 and 18 (see Appendix Table A5.3, p. 395).

V: *Ann.* 156[52] moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque

August. *De civ. D.* 2.21: sicut etiam ipse Tullius non Scipionis nec cuiusquam alterius sed suo sermone loquens in principio quinti libri (*de re publica*) commemorato prius Ennii poetae versu quo dixerat 'moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque', quem quidem ille versum, inquit, vel brevitate vel veritate tamquam ex oraculo quodam mihi esse effatus videtur.

Rep. 5.1–2 (*fragmentum ex prooemio*): 'moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque', quem quidem ille versum vel brevitate vel veritate tamquam ex oraculo quodam mihi esse effatus videtur; nam neque viri, nisi ita morata civitas fuisset, neque mores, nisi hi viri praefuissent, aut fundare aut tam diu tenere potuissent, aut fundare aut tam diu tenere potuissent, tantam et tam fuse lateque imperantem rem publicam. itaque ante nostram memoriam et mos ipse patrius praestantes viros adhibebat, et veterem morem ac maiorum instituta retinebant excellentes viri. nostra vero aetas, cum rem publicam sicut picturam accepisset egregiam sed iam evanescentem vetustate, non modo eam coloribus eisdem quibus fuerat renovare neglexit, sed ne id quidem curavit ut formam saltem

[52] There are frequent echoes of this line in Livy; see Skutsch 1985: 317 and Elliott 2009b. Skutsch *loc. cit.* further gives references to Cic. *Sulla* 32 and Claudian IV *Cons. Hon.* 403.

eius et extrema tamquam lineamenta servaret. quid enim manet ex antiquis moribus, quibus ille dixit rem stare Romanam? quos ita oblivione obsoletos videmus, ut non modo non colantur, sed iam ignorentur. nam de viris quid dicam? mores enim ipsi interierunt virorum penuria. cuius tanti mali non modo reddenda ratio nobis, sed etiam tamquam reis capitis quodam modo dicenda causa est; nostris enim vitiis, non casu aliquo, rem publicam verbo retinemus, re ipsa vero iam pridem amisimus.

Hist. Aug. *Avid. Cass.* 5.7 (*Divi Marci epistula*): neque enim milites regi possunt nisi vetere disciplina. scis enim versum a bono poeta dictum et omnibus frequentatum 'moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque'.[53]

??: *Ann.* 574 omnes mortales sese laudarier optant

August. *Ep.* 231.3:[54] ego autem quod ait Ennius 'omnes mortales sese laudari*er* optant' partim puto approbandum, partim cavendum.

id. *De Trin.* 13.3.6: illud etiam quod vetus poeta dixit Ennius 'omnes mortales sese laudarier optant' . . .

[53] See Skutsch 1968: 52–3 on how the context here could be used to direct interpretation.
[54] Skutsch 1985: 714 cites D. Ohlmann (1897), *De S. Aug. dial.*, diss. Argentor: 60, as author of the thesis that Augustine had this quotation from Cicero's *Hortensius*.

TABLE A5.23: SERVIUS (c. 4^{ex}–*c.* 5^{in}); *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii* (3 vols.), eds. G. Thilo and H. Hagen (1881–1902); *Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum editionis Harvardianae*, edd. E. K. Rand *et al.* Vol. 2: *Aeneid* 1–2 (1946); Vol. 3: *Aeneid* 3–5 (1965); *RE* 2.2.1834–48 (Wessner); Sch.–Hos. 4.1, 172–7; *PLRE* 1, 827; Zetzel 1981: 81–147; Kaster § 136; Herz.–Schm. § 612; Farrell 2008: 112–31.

Servius is the sole source for 18 fragments (equivalent to 19 lines) and the leading source for a further 5 fragments (equivalent to 7 lines). He is thus responsible for just over 4 per cent of the lines we have. He is a supplementary source for *Ann.* 1, for which the primary source is Varro (*LL* 7.5), and contributes to the transmission of *Ann.* 125, for which the primary source is Priscian, and of *Ann.* 472, for which the primary source is Ps.-Probus on the *Eclogues*. He quotes a mangled version of *Ann.* 147, which is correctly given by the 'Donatian' commentary on the *Hecyra*, and shows awareness of *Ann.* 185 and 188 (from the 8-line fragment of Pyrrhus' speech transmitted by Cicero, *Off.* 1.38), as well as of the history of *Aen.* 6.845 in *Ann.* 363, to which our best access comes through Cicero (*Off.* 1.84). Servius also knows that Vergil's use of *velivolum* at *Aen.* 1.224 is Ennian (see under Macrobius, p. 496). Finally, he is responsible for a number of important testimonia on the text.

Almost all the quotations for which Servius is the sole or primary source come in the commentary on the *Aeneid*; 2 (*Ann.* 553 and 570) are given on the *Georgics*. Likewise, the quotations for which he is the supplementary source are given in the commentary on the *Aeneid*, with the exception of his contribution to the transmission of *Ann.* 207 and 472, which come in the commentary on the *Georgics*.

Servius regularly names Ennius but never provides us with a book-number for any of the fragments he quotes, nor are such found in the sources that complement his quotations. We cannot with any certainty place any material deriving from him in any particular book, and rarely are quotations long or specific enough to warrant conjecture. All in all, given the volume of information about Vergil's use of Ennius in Book 6 of the *Saturnalia* and the probability of the vast quantities available to him,[55] it is if anything surprising how little Servius himself contributes to the transmission of the *Annales* (see Chapter 2, pp. 99–100, n. 67); the DS

[55] We know, for example, of the existence of Octavius Avitus' eight volumes *homoeon elenchon, ‹quae› quos et unde versus transtulerit continent* (Suet. *Vita Vergilii*), pointed out by Norden 1927: 365–7.

scholia on his commentary offer more than half as many quotations again as Servius himself does.

1: *Ann.* 52 bipatentibus

Serv. *Aen.* 10.5 (considunt tectis bipatentibus): BIPATENTIBUS physice dixit. nam caelum patet ab ortu et occasu. est autem sermo Ennianus, tractus ab ostiis, quae ex utraque parte aperiuntur. unde et modo 'bipatentibus' apertis intellegimus.

1: *Ann.* 53 respondit Iuno Saturnia, sancta dearum

Serv. *Aen.* 4.576 (sequimur te, sancte deorum quisquis es): SANCTE DEORUM aut distingue*ndum* 'sancte', aut secundum Ennium dixit: 'respondit Iuno Saturnia, sancta dearum'.

Don. *Art. Gr.* 3.2 'De soloecismo' (*GLK* 4.393–4): soloecismus fit duobus modis, aut per partes orationis aut per accidentia partibus orationis. . . . per accidentia partibus orationis tot modis fiunt soloecismi quot sunt accidentia partibus orationis . . . per comparationem, sicut: 'respondit Iuno Saturnia sancta dearum' pro 'sanctissima'.

Whence: *Explan. in Don.* 2 'De soloecismo' (*GLK* 4.563): soloecismus est oratio inordinatis dictionibus instructa contra rectam loquendi consuetudinem . . . fiunt autem soloecismi per omnes partes orationis aut per ea quae accidunt partibus orationis . . . per conparationem sic: 'respondit Iuno Saturnia sancta dearum', pro 'sanctissima', quia superlativus genitivo plurali subiungitur: positivum pro superlativo posuit.
Pomp. *Comm.* 'De soloecismo' (*GLK* 5.291): . . . fiunt soloecismi per partes orationis aut per accidentia partium orationis . . . quid per accidentia partium orationis quem ad modum fiunt soloecismi? dicit tot modis, quot sunt ipsa accidentia . . . per comparationem: 'respondit Iuno Saturnia sancta dearum'. novimus quod genetivo plurali non iungitur nisi superlativus; si tu iunxeris positivum, vitium fecisti, 'Saturnia sancta' pro eo quod est 'sanctissima'.

1: *Ann.* 110–11 Romulus in caelo cum dis genitalibus aevom degit

Serv. *Aen.* 6.763 (Siluius, Albanum nomen, tua postuma proles,/quem tibi longaeuo serum Lauinia coniunx/educet [*Aen.* 6.763–5]): TUA POSTUMA

PROLES postumus est post humationem parentis creatus. per hoc autem Aenean cito ostendit esse periturum, et statim infert consolationem dicens 'quem tibi longaevo', id est deo: aevum enim proprie aeternitas est, quae non nisi in deos venit. Ennius: 'Romulus in caelo cum d*is* *genitalibus aevum degit*'. male autem vindicavit usus, per quem dixit [*Aen*. 5.715]: 'longaevosque senes'.

Cic. *Tusc*. 1.27–8: [27] itaque unum illud erat insitum priscis illis, quos 'cascos' appellat Ennius (*see Appendix Table A5.1, for Varro, on* Ann. 22, *pp. 353–4*), esse in morte sensum neque excessu vitae sic deleri hominem, ut funditus interiret; idque cum multis aliis rebus, tum e pontificio iure et e caerimoniis sepulcrorum intellegi licet, quas maxumis ingeniis praediti nec tanta cura coluissent nec violatas tam inexpiabili religione sanxissent, nisi haereret in eorum mentibus mortem non interitum esse omnia tollentem atque delentem, sed quandam quasi migrationem commutationemque vitae, quae in claris viris et feminis dux in caelum soleret esse, in ceteris humi retineretur et permaneret tamen. [**28**] ex hoc et nostrorum opinione 'Romulus in caelo cum d*is* *agit aevum*',[56] ut famae adsentiens dixit Ennius, et apud Graecos indeque perlapsus ad nos et usque ad Oceanum Hercules tantus et tam praesens habetur deus; hinc Liber Semela natus eademque famae celebritate Tyndaridae fratres, qui non modo adiutores in proeliis victoriae populi Romani, sed etiam nuntii fuisse perhibentur. quid? Ino Cadmi filia nonne Leukothea nominata a Graecis Matuta habetur a nostris? quid? totum prope caelum, ne pluris persequar, nonne humano genere completum est?

Cic. *De or*. 3.154: novantur autem verba, quae ab eo, qui dicit, ipso gignuntur ac fiunt, vel coniungendis verbis, ut haec: 'tum pavor sapientiam omnem mi exanimato expectorat. num non vis huius me versutiloquas malitias . . . ' videtis enim et 'versutiloquas' et 'expectorat' ex coniunctione facta esse verba, non nata; sed saepe vel sine coniunctione verba novantur ut 'ille senius desertus', ut 'di genitales', ut 'bacarum ubertate incurvescere'.

cf. *CIL* 4.3135, 7353, 8568, 8995: Romulus in caelo.[57]

[56] Skutsch 1985: 262 makes the following useful points about Cicero's use of Ennius here: 'Cicero in the *Tusculans* deliberately omits *genitalibus*, a word which he remembers well enough in *de oratore*, and which nobody having once read the passage could forget. He wishes to illustrate that *clari viri* and *clarae feminae* can go to heaven and rightly feels his case weakened if in the example quoted the divine origin of the deified person is stressed. It follows incidentally that his patching of the rhythm is also deliberate. Here and elsewhere (306) the accuracy of his memory has wrongly been questioned.'

[57] See Skutsch 1985: 261 for conjectures about what accounts for the frequency of this inscription on the walls of Pompeii.

VII: *Ann.* 225–6 postquam Discordia taetra
belli ferratos postes portasque refregit

Serv. *Aen.* 7.622: (belli ferratos rupit Saturnia postes): RUPIT SATURNIA POSTES acyrologiam fecit commutando Ennii versum. nam ille ait: 'belli ferratos postes portasque refregit' (*see Chapter 2, pp. 132–3, for comment*).

Hor. *Serm.* 1.4.60: non ut si solvas 'postquam Discordia taetra
belli ferratos postes portasque refregit'
invenias etiam disiecti membra poetae.

'Porph.' Hor. *Serm.* 1.4.60: et est sensus: si dissolvas versus vel meos vel Lucilii, non eadem verba invenies, quae sunt ‹in› Ennianis versibus, qui magno scilicet spiritu et verbis altioribus compositi sunt, velut hi sunt: 'postquam Discordia taetra belli ferratos postes portasque refregit'.

Ps.-Acro Hor. *Serm.* 1.4.60 NON UT SI SOLVAS: id est non ita invenias, quemadmodum si solvas versus Ennii aut Pacuvii, qui etiam soluti altitudinem et tumorem poematis optinent. sensus: si meis et Lucilii scriptis ordinem dissipes metri, in verbis non invenies poetae spiritum, ut in Ennii versibus etiam solutis poetae pondus apparet. [ergo] ordo [est]: non [ita] invenias [ut Ennii versus si solvas]. ‹postquam discordia tetra›: et hic et sequens Ennii est.

?I: *Ann.* 442 ei mihi

Serv. *Aen.* 2.274 (ei mihi, qualis erat . . .): EI MIHI Ennii versus.

?II: *Ann.* 451 at tuba terribili sonitu taratantara dixit

Serv. *Aen.* 9.501 (at tuba terribilem sonitum procul aere canoro/increpuit, *Aen.* 9.503–4): AT TUBA TERRIBILEM SONITUM hemistichium Ennii: nam sequentia iste mutavit. ille enim ad exprimendum tubae sonum ait: 'taratantara dixit'. et multa huius modi Vergilius cum aspera invenerit, mutat. bene tamen hic electis verbis imitatur sonum tubarum.

Prisc. 8.103–4 'De personis' (*GLK* 2.450): infinita quoque et impersonalia et gerundia vel supina carent personis naturaliter. praeterea in nominationibus, id est ὀνοματοποιΐαις, sive nominum seu verborum novis conformationibus, non omnes declinationis motus sunt quaerendi, ut 'tinniat' – Persius [5.106]: 'ne qua subaerato mendosum tinniat auro'; 'taratantara' – Ennius 'at tuba terribili sonitu taratantara dixit' . . .

?XIV: *Ann.* 483–4 oscitat in campis caput a cervice revulsum
semianimesque micant oculi lucemque requirunt

Serv. *Aen.* 10.396: SEMINANIMESQUE MICANT DIGITI FERRUMQUE RETRACTANT Ennii est ut 'oscitat in campis caput a cervice revulsum, semianimesque micant oculi lucemque requirunt', quem versum ita (DS: ut fuit) transtulit ad suum carmen Varro Atacinus (*see Chapter 2, pp. 101–2, for comment*).

??: *Ann.* 502 it nigrum campis agmen

Serv. *Aen.* 4.404: IT NIGRUM CAMPIS AGMEN hemistichium Ennii de elephantis dictum, quo ante Accius usus est de Indis.

??: *Ann.* 518 navibus explebant sese terrasque replebant

Serv. *Aen.* 6.545 (Deiphobus contra: 'ne saeui, magna sacerdos;/discedam, explebo numerum reddarque tenebris'.): EXPLEBO NUMERUM ut diximus supra [? *non extat*] 'explebo' est 'minuam'. nam ait Ennius 'navibus explebant *se*se terrasque replebant'. ‹sic Probus› (*exempli gratia addidit Sk.*), quem Caper secutus cum de praepositione 'ex' tractaret, hoc exemplum posuit. nam circa Aenean et Sibyllam aliquid lucis fuisse intellegimus, quippe circa vivos: unde paulo post [548] respicit Aeneas subito et reliqua. alii 'explebo' male putant 'complebo' esse, umbrarum scilicet a quibus discesserat numerum . . .

??: *Ann.* 519 succincti corda machaeris

Serv. *Aen.* 9.675 (armati ferro et cristis capita alta corusci, *Aen.* 9.678): ARMATI FERRO aut bene instructi armis aut, ut Asper dicit, ferrea corda habentes, id est dura et cruenta cogitantes; ut Ennium sit secutus, qui ait: 'succincti corda machaeris'.

??: *Ann.* 524 Messap*us*

Serv. *Aen.* 7.691: AT MESSAPUS EQUUM DOMITOR NEPTUNIA PROLES hic Messapus per mare ad Italiam venit, unde Neptuni dictus est filius: quem invulnerabilem ideo dicit, quia nusquam periit, nec in bello. ignem autem ei nocere non posse propter Neptunum dicit, qui aquarum deus est. ab hoc Ennius dicit (commemorat *SRF*) se originem ducere: unde

nunc [*Aen.* 7.698–9] et cantantes inducit eius socios et eos comparat cycnis. 'domitor' autem 'equorum', quasi animalium a patre inventorum.

??: *Ann.* 532 vortant crateras aenos

Serv. *Aen.* 9.163 (165): VERTUNT CRATERAS AENOS potant. et est hemistichium Ennianum.

??: *Ann.* 534 irarum effunde quadrigas

Serv. *Aen.* 12.499 (saevam nullo discrimine caedem suscitat irarumque omnes effundit habenas): IRARUM HABENAS potestatem, facultatem, ut [1.63] 'et premere et laxas sciret dare iussus habenas'. hic moderate locutus est; nam Ennius ait 'irarum effund*e* quadrigas' dixit.

??: *Ann.* 553 effudit voces proprio cum pectore sancto

Serv. *G.* 2.424 (ipsa satis tellus, cum dente recluditur unco,/sufficit umorem et gravidas cum vomere fruges): GRAVIDAS CUM VOMERE FRUGES 'cum' abundat, nam hoc dicit: subministrat fruges vomere, id est per vomerem. Ennius 'eff*u*dit voces proprio cum pectore sancto', id est 'proprio pectore', nam 'cum' vacat. Urbanus tamen sic accipit: 'gravidas cum vomere', id est statim post arationem.

??: *Ann.* 569 olli cernebant magnis de rebus agentes

Serv. *Aen.* 12.709 (stupet ipse Latinus/ingentis, genitos diuersis partibus orbis,/inter se coiisse uiros et cernere ferro): INTER SE COISSE VIROS ET CERNERE FERRO vera et antiqua haec est lectio. nam Ennium secutus est qui ait 'olli cernebant magnis de rebus agentes'. posteritas coepit legere 'et decernere ferro': secundum quam lectionem synalipha opus est, sed excluso 's', ut sit 'viro et decernere ferro'.

cf. Serv. *Aen.* 11.236: OLLI 'illi' secundum Ennium.

??: *Ann.* 570 perque fabam repunt et mollia crura reponunt

Serv. *G.* 3.76 (continuo pecoris generosi pullus in aruis/altius ingreditur et mollia crura reponit): . . . MOLLIA CRURA REPONIT Ennius de gruibus [gruibus *plerr.* greibus *A* gregibus A^{1}]: 'perque fabam repunt et mollia crura reponunt'.

cf. Schol. Bern. *G.* 3.76: . . . MOLLIA flexibilia, et Ennius de gruibus dicit.

??: *Ann.* 601 furentibus ventis

Serv. *Aen.* 1.51 (loca feta furentibus Austris): . . . AUSTRIS figura est celebrata apud Vergilium, et est species pro genere. legerat apud Ennium 'furentibus ventis', sed quasi asperum fugit et posuit 'austris' pro 'ventis'.

??: *Ann.* 602 fluctusque natantes

Serv. *Aen.* 6.705 (Lethaeumque domos placidas qui praenatat amnem): PRAENATAT praeterfluit. et contrarie dictum est: nam non natant aquae sed nos in ipsis natamus. Ennium igitur secutus est qui ait 'fluctusque natantes'. . .

??: *Ann.* 603 heia machaeras

Serv. *Aen.* 9.37 (. . . ferte citi ferrum, date tela, ascendite muros/hostis adest, heia!): HOSTIS ADEST hic distinguendum ut 'heia' militum sit properantium clamor. et est Ennianum qui ait 'heia machaeras'. ergo 'heia' ingenti clamore dicentes ad portas ruebant. alii 'hostis adest, heia' legunt.

??: *Ann.* 605 (quem) non virtutis egentem

Serv. *Aen.* 11.27 (. . . Pallas, quem non virtutis egentem/abstulit atra dies et funere mersit acerbo): QUEM NON VIRTUTIS EGENTEM Ennii versus est.

??: *Ann.* 606 funduntque elatis naribus lucem

Serv. *Aen.* 12.115 (alto se gurgite tollunt/Solis equi lucemque elatis naribus efflant): Ennianus versus est ordine commutato. ille enim ait '*funduntque* elatis naribus lucem'. et sciendum, nusquam diem sic potenter descripsisse Vergilium.

Mar. Victorin. 1.5 'De syllabis' (*GLK* 6.28): videtur plurimis esse quintus communium syllabarum modus, qui apud Lucilium et veteres multos est frequentatus, ut correpta vocalis desinat in 's' et excipiatur ab alia consonanti vel vocali loco consonantis posita, ut est illud 'quare etiam *atque etiam*, ut dico, est communis voluptas' [Lucr. 4.1207] et item '*efflantque* elatis naribus lucem' ('efflantque' *e Vergilio sumptum* [Sk.]). hae syllabae pro brevibus apud veteres, pro longes vero apud omnes ponuntur.

??: *Ann.* 609 Anionem

Serv. *Aen.* 7.683: GELIDUMQUE ANIENEM Anio fluvius haud longe ab urbe est. sed hic euphoniam secutus est: nam Ennius 'Anionem' dixit iuxta regulam.

??: *Ann.* 622 viden ‹ut›

Serv. *Aen.* 6.779 (uiden, ut geminae stant uertice cristae/et pater ipse suo superum iam signat honore?): VIDEN '–den' naturaliter longa est, brevem tamen eam posuit, secutus Ennium: et adeo eius est immutata natura ut iam ubique brevis inveniatur.

TESTIMONIA

Frg. 1.x = Serv. *Aen.* 6.748: (ubi mille rotam volvere per annos): ROTAM VOLVERE PER ANNOS exegerunt statutum tempus per annorum volubilitatem. est autem sermo Ennii.

Frg. 1.xlii = *Aen.* 8.630–5: (fecerat et viridi fetam Mavortis in antro
procubuisse lupam:) geminos huic ubera circum
ludere pendentis pueros et lambere matrem
impavidos; illam tereti cervice reflexa
mulcere alternos et corpora fingere lingua.

with Serv. *Aen.* 8.631: PROCUBUISSE id est prima parte se inclinasse, quod Graeci προκύπτειν dicunt, ut inclinatione corporis ubera praeberet infantibus: nam si 'procubuisse' 'iacuisse' accipias, contrarium est quod dicit 'ludere pendentes pueros'. sciendum tamen, voluisse eum gestum proprie exprimere, quem in ipsius lupae cernimus statuis. GEMINOS HUIC re vera geminos modo, alias similes. sane totus hic locus Ennianus est.

Frag. 11.xi = Serv. *Aen.* 2.313 (exoritur clamorque virum clangorque tubarum): CLANGOR Graecum est: nam κλαγγὴ dicitur. illud sane sciendum est, quia morem tetigit expugnationis; plerumque enim ad tubam evertuntur civitates, sicut Albam Tullus Hostilius iussit everti.

and Verg. *Aen.* 2.486–90: at domus interior gemitu miseroque tumultu
miscetur, penitusque cauae plangoribus aedes
femineis ululant; ferit aurea sidera clamor.
tum pauidae tectis matres ingentibus errant
amplexaeque tenent postis atque oscula figunt.

with Serv. *Aen.* 2.486: AT DOMUS INTERIOR de Albano excidio translatus est locus.

Frg. VIII.xv = Serv. *Aen.* 1.20 (progeniem sed enim Troiano a sanguine duci/audierat, Tyrias olim quae verteret arces;/hinc populum late regem belloque superbum/venturum excidio Libyae): AUDIERAT a Iove aut a fatis. non enim omnia numina habent divinandi facultatem; denique ne ipse quidem Apollo sua sponte divinat, ut est 'quae Phoebo pater omnipotens, mihi Phoebus Apollo/praedixit' [*Aen.* 3.251–2]. et perite 'audierat'; in Ennio enim inducitur Iuppiter promittens Romanis excidium Carthaginis.

Frg. VIII.xvi = Serv. *Aen.* 1.281 (quin aspera Iuno,/quae mare nunc terrasque metu caelumque fatigat,/consilia in melius referet, mecumque fovebit/ Romanos rerum dominos gentemque togatam): CONSILIA IN MELIUS REFERET quia bello Punico secundo, ut ait Ennius, placata Iuno coepit favere Romanis.

Serv. *Aen.* 6.777 (quin et auo [sc. Numitori] comitem sese Mauortius addet/Romulus, Assaraci quem sanguinis Ilia mater/educet):[58] QUIN ET AVO COMITEM SESE MAVORTIUS ADDET ROMULUS Amulius et Numitor fratres fuerunt. sed Numitorem regno Amulius pepulit et Iliam, eius filiam, sacerdotem Vestae fecit. de hac et Marte nati sunt Remus et Romulus. qui cum adolevissent, occiso Amulio avum Numitorem in regna revocaverunt et cum eo uno anno regnaverunt. postea propter angustias imperii Romam captatis auguriis condiderunt. ergo 'avo se addet comitem': aut avito se iunget imperio, aut certe, secundum Ennium, referetur inter deos cum Aenea: dicit namque Iliam fuisse filiam Aeneae. quod si est, Aeneas avus est Romuli. unde etiam addidit 'Assaraci quem sanguinis': nam hoc epitheton non sine causa est introductum, quod est proprium Aeneae; nam Assaracus pater est Capyos, Capys Anchisae, Anchises Aeneae.

Serv. *Aen.* 1.741: DOCUIT QUAE MAXIMUS ATLAS . . . sane Atlas Graecum est, sicut et Nilus. nam Ennius dicit Nilum Melonem vocari,

[58] Skutsch does not include Servius' evidence here as part of his text, but quotes it as a piece of – in his view, misleading – information subsidiary to *Ann.* 110–11 (for which the primary source is also Servius; see pp. 481–2). He denies that Servius here attests either deification of Aeneas in Ennius or that Romulus was raised to heaven together with Aeneas. In his view, *secundum Ennium*, being explained by *dicit namque*, refers only to the interpretation of *avus* as Aeneas (this shorter genealogy being certainly the one Ennius operated with; cf. *Ann.* 34–50).

Atlantem vero Telamonem (cf. *ibid.* 4.246: sane Latine Telamo dicitur [*sc. Atlas*], ut Nilus Melo).[59]

OPERIS INCERTI FRAGMENTA

Op. inc. 13 indignas turres

Serv. *Ecl.* 10.10 (indigno cum Gallus amore peribat): INDIGNO vel meretricio vel magno. nam et Ennius ait 'indignas turr*es*', id est magnas.

Op. inc. 22 repost*us*
Op. inc. 23 porgite

Serv. *Aen.* 1.26 (manet alta mente repostum/iudicium Paridis): ALTA MENTE REPOSTUM secreta, recondita. 'repostum' autem syncope est; unam enim de medio syllabam tulit. sed cum omnes sermones aut integri sint aut pathos habeant, hi qui pathos habent ita ut lecti sunt debent poni. quod etiam Maro fecit. nam 'repostos' (*c(f)Fv*; 'repostus' *Σ*; 'repostum' *P*; cf. 'repostos' at *Aen.* 6.655 [Sk.]) et 'porgite' [*Aen.* 8.274] de Ennio transtulit. integris autem et ipsis utimur (utitur *CP*) et eorum exemplo aliis.

Op. inc. 24 flor*us*

Serv. *Aen.* 12.605 (filia prima manu flauos Lauinia crinis/et roseas laniata genas, tum cetera circum/turba furit): FLAVOS LAVINIA CRINES antiqua lectio 'floros' habuit, id est florulentos, pulchros; et est sermo Ennianus. DS: Probus sic adnotavit: neotericum erat 'flavos', ergo bene 'floros': nam sequitur 'et roseas laniata genas'; Accius in *Bacchis* [13 R] 'nam flori crines, video, ei propessi iacent'; in iisdem [8 R] 'et lanugo flora nunc demum inrigat'; Pacuvius *Antiopa* [12 R] 'cervicum floros dispergite crines'.

Op. inc. 25 insomnia

Serv. *Aen.* 4.9 (Anna soror, quae me suspensam insomnia terrent): INSOMNIA TERRENT et 'terret' et 'terrent' legitur. sed si 'terret' legerimus, 'insomnia' erit 'vigilia': hoc enim maiores inter vigilias et ea quae videmus in somnis interesse voluerunt ut 'insomnia' generis feminini numeri singularis 'vigiliam' significaret, 'insomnia' vero generis neutri numeri pluralis ea quae per somnium videmus, ut 'sed falsa ad caelum mittunt insomnia

[59] Skutsch 1985: 186 (ad *Ann.* 27), uses this statement to support his hypothesis that the subject of that line, given by Macrobius at *Sat.* 6.1.9, is Atlas. The hypothesis is an extrapolation from Macrobius' juxtaposition of *Ann.* 27 with *Aen.* 4.482.

Manes' [*Aen.* 6.896]. sciendum igitur quia, si 'terret' dixerimus, antiqua erit elocutio; 'insomniam' (*DS*: '-a' *Serv.*) enim, licet et Pacuvius et Ennius frequenter dixerint, Plinius tamen exclusit et de usu removit.[60] sed ambiguitatem lectionis haec res fecit, quod non ex aperto vigilasse se dixit, sed habuisse quietem implacidam, id est somniis interruptam, ut intellegamus eam et insomniis territam, et propter terrorem somniorum vigilias quoque perpessam.

Op. inc. 27 torrus, -i

Serv. *Aen.* 12.298 (obuius ambustum torrem Corynaeus ab ara/corripit et uenienti Ebyso plagamque ferenti/occupat os flammis): TORREM erit nominativus 'hic torris', et ita nunc dicimus: nam illud Ennii et Pacuvii penitus de usu recessit ut 'hic torrus, huius torri' dicamus.

DUBIA

Dub. 6–7 caelicolae, mea membra, dei, quos nostra potestas officiis divisa facit

Serv. *Aen.* 4.638 (sacra Ioui Stygio, quae rite incepta paraui,/perficere est animus finemque imponere curis): IOVI STYGIO hoc est Plutoni. et sciendum Stoicos dicere unum esse deum cui nomina variantur pro actibus et officiis. unde etiam duplicis sexus numina esse dicuntur, ut cum in actu sint, mares sint; feminae, cum patiendi habent naturam: unde est 'coniugis in gremium laetae descendit' [*G.* 2.326]. ab actibus autem vocantur, ut 'Iuppiter' iuvans pater; 'Mercurius' quod mercibus praeest; 'Liber' a libertate. sic ergo et modo Iovem Stygium dicit inferis sacrificatura, ut alibi [6.138] 'Iunoni infernae dictus sacer'. hinc et Iovis oratio: 'caelicolae, mea membra, dei, quos nostra potestas officiis divisa facit'.

[60] See Kaster 1988: 193–4 on the reference to Pliny the Elder's activity here (and the surmise that those statements referred to were made in his *Dubii sermonis libri* VIII).

TABLE A5.24: MACROBIUS (Ambrosius Theodosius Macrobius) (first half of c. 5 CE)[61]; *Saturnalia*, ed. R. A. Kaster (2011), 3 vols. Cambridge, MA; *PLRE* 2.1102; De Paolis 1986–7, esp. 193–6; Herz.-Schm. § 636.

Macrobius quotes 40 fragments, yielding 68 lines, of the *Annales* in his *Saturnalia*. *Ann.* 142 and 227–8 are quoted together at *Sat.* 1.4.17–18;[62] all other quotations are found at *Sat.* 6.1–4, where Macrobius illustrates Vergil's use of his Latin literary predecessors. None of the 40 fragments is transmitted in satisfactory form by any other source,[63] making Macrobius responsible for just under 11 per cent of the 623 extant lines of the *Annales*. For all of these fragments except 2 (*Ann.* 453 and 535–9), Macrobius supplies book-numbers. In addition, he contributes (at *Sat.* 6.1.18, 6.9.10, and 6.1.23) to the transmission of *Ann.* 164, 236–7, and 363, for which the primary sources are Quintilian, Gellius and Cicero, respectively. He also offers an important testimonium about Ennius' imitation in Book 15 of the episode of Pandarus and Bitias from *Iliad* 12 (*Sat.* 6.2.30). His contribution to the modern reading of the fragments is discussed in detail in Chapter 2. For Macrobius' sources in *Sat.* 6, see Jocelyn 1964 and Jocelyn 1965.

I: *Ann.* 20 est locus Hesperiam quam mortales perhibebant

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.11: 'est locus Hesperiam Grai cognomine dicunt' [*Aen.* 1.530 = 3.163]. Ennius in primo 'est locus Hesperiam quam mortales perhibebant'.

I: *Ann.* 26 teque pater Tiberine tuo cum flumine sancto

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.12: 'tuque, o Thybri, tuo, genitor, cum flumine sancto' [*Aen.* 8.72]. Ennius in I 'teque, pater Tiberine, tuo cum flumine sancto'.

I: *Ann.* 27 qui caelum versat stellis fulgentibus aptum
III: *Ann.* 145 caelum prospexit stellis fulgentibus aptum
X: *Ann.* 348 hinc nox processit stellis ardentibus apta

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.9: 'axem umero torquet stellis ardentibus aptum' [*Aen.* 4.482 = 6.797]. Ennius in primo 'qui caelum versat stellis fulgentibus aptum', et in

[61] For Macrobius' date, see Cameron 1966: 25–38.
[62] Skutsch 1985: 406 states that Macrobius here follows the first chapter of Gellius' lost Book 8.
[63] DS gives a partial, though more accurate, version of *Ann.* 95, and Servius knows that Ennius uses the phrase *naves velivolas*, which occurs at *Ann.* 379–80 as quoted by Macrobius.

tertio 'caelum prospexit stellis fulgentibus aptum'; in decimo 'hinc nox processit stellis ardentibus apta'.

I: *Ann.* 32 accipe daque fidem foedusque feri bene firmum

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.13: 'accipe daque fidem, sunt nobis fortia bello pectora' [*Aen.* 8.150]. Ennius in primo 'accipe daque fidem foedusque feri bene firmum'.

I: *Ann.* 33 quom superum lumen nox intempesta teneret

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.14: 'et lunam in nimbo nox intempesta tenebat' [*Aen.* 3.587]. Ennius in primo: 'cum superum lumen nox intempesta tene*r*et'.

cf. *CGL* 6.2, p. 591.

I: *Ann.* 94–5 nec pol homo quisquam faciet impune animatus
hoc nec tu: nam mi calido dabis sanguine poenas

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.15: 'tu tamen interea calido mihi sanguine poenas/persolves' [*Aen.* 9.422–3]. Ennius in primo: '*nec* pol homo quisquam faciet impune animatus hoc *nec* tu: nam mi calido da*bi*s sanguine poenas'.

DS *Aen.* 9.420 ('tu tamen interea calido mihi sanguine poenas/persolves amborum'; 422–3): . . . CALIDO MIHI SANGUINE POENAS Ennius in primo: 'nam mi calido dabis sanguine poenas'.

III: *Ann.* 142 hac noctu filo pendebit Etruria tota
VII: *Ann.* 227–8 qua Galli furtim noctu summa arcis adorti
moenia concubia vigilesque repente cruentant

Macr. *Sat.* 1.4.17–18: Ennius enim, nisi cui videtur inter nostrae aetatis politiores munditias respuendus, 'noctu concubia' dixit his versibus: 'qua Galli furtim noctu summa arcis adorti moenia concubia vigilesque repente cruentant'. quo in loco animadvertendum est non solum quod 'noctu concubia' sed quod etiam 'qua noctu' dixerit. et hoc posuit in annalium septimo, in quorum tertio clarius idem dixit: 'hac noctu filo pendebit Etruria tota'.

III: *Ann.* 143–4 postquam defessi sunt stare et spargere sese
hastis ansatis, concurrunt undique telis

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.16: (raptis) 'concurrunt undique telis/indomiti agricolae' [*Aen.* 7.520–1; cf. *Aen.* 9.532]. Ennius in tertio [i. t. *om. T*: in III *P*]:

'postquam defessi sunt sta*re et* (*Sk.*: †stant et† *codd.; Willis, Kaster*) spargere sese hastis ansatis, concurrunt undique telis'.

IV: *Ann.* 151	Romani scalis: summa nituntur opum vi
XVI: *Ann.* 404–5	reges per regnum statuasque sepulcraque quaerunt, aedificant nomen, summa nituntur opum vi

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.17: 'summa nituntur opum vi' [*Aen.* 12.552]. Ennius in quarto (E. i. q. *om. N*: i. q. *om. T*: q. *om. in ras. 3 litt. P*: IIII *RA*): 'Romani scalis summa nituntur opum vi' et in sexto decimo: 'reges per regnum statuasque sepulcraque quaerunt; aedificant nomen: summa nituntur opum vi'.

V: *Ann.* 163	quod per amoenam urbem leni fluit agmine flumen

Macr. *Sat.* 6.4.4: agmen pro actu et ductu quodam ponere non inelegans est, ut 'leni fluit agmine Thybris' [*Aen.* 2.782]; immo et antiquum est. Ennium enim ‹in› quinto ait: 'quod per amoenam urbem leni fuit agmine flumen'.

VI: *Ann.* 169	balantum pecudes quatit, omnes arma requirunt

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.54: 'pulverulentus eques furit: omnes arma requirunt' [*Aen.* 7.625]. Ennius in sexto: 'balantum pecudes quatit omnes arma requirunt'.

†VI:[64] *Ann.* 173–4	†decimo tamen induvolans secum abstulit hasta insigne

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.53: apicem tamen incita summum/hasta tulit' [*Aen.* 12.492–3]. Ennius in sexto: '†decimo tamen induvolans secum abstulit hasta insigne'.

VI: *Ann.* 175–9	incedunt arbusta per alta, securibus caedunt percellunt magnas quercus, exciditur ilex, fraxinus frangitur atque abies consternitur alta, pinus proceras pervortunt: omne sonabat arbustum fremitu silvai frondosai.

[64] The mss. of Macrobius read in *sexto decimo*. Kaster works on the assumption that *decimo* is imported from *Sat.* 6.1.50 and prints *Ennius in sexto [decimo]: . . . tamen . . .* See Skutsch 1985: 32–3, 339–40 (his reading follows Strzelecki's lead) and Kaster 2010: 52 for the issues involved.

Macr. *Sat.* 6.2.27: 'itur . . . ornos' [*Aen.* 6.179–82]. Ennius in sexto: 'incedunt . . . frondosai'.

VI: *Ann.* 203–4 tum cum corde suo divom pater atque hominum rex
effatur

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.10: 'conciliumque vocat divum pater atque hominum rex' [*Aen.* 10.2]. Ennius in sexto (VI *PTA*): 'tum cum corde suo divum pater atque hominum rex effatur'.

VI: *Ann.* 205 vertitur interea caelum cum ingentibus signis

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.8: 'vertitur interea caelum et ruit Oceano nox' [*Aen.* 2.250]. Ennius libro sexto (VI *PTA*): 'vertitur interea caelum cum ingentibus signis'.

VII: *Ann.* 232 non semper vostra evortit: nunc Iuppiter hac stat

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.19: 'nequa meis dictis esto mora: Iuppiter hac stat' [*Aen.* 12.565]. Ennius in septimo: 'non semper vestra evertit: nunc Iuppiter hac stat'.

VII: *Ann.* 233 fortibus est fortuna viris data

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.62: 'audentes fortuna iuvat' [*Aen.* 10.284]: Ennius in septimo: 'fortibus est fortuna viris data'.

VII: *Ann.* 242 explorant Numidae, totam quatit ungula terram
VIII: *Ann.* 263 consequitur. summo sonitu quatit ungula terram
XVII: *Ann.* 431 it eques et plausu cava concutit ungula terram

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.22: 'quadrupedante putrem sonitu quatit ungula campum' [*Aen.* 8.596]. Ennius in sexto: 'explorant *N*umidae: totam quatit ungula terram'. idem in octavo: 'consequitur, summo sonitu quatit ungula terram'. idem in septimo decimo 'it eques et plausu cava concutit ungula terram'.

VIII: *Ann.* 258–60 multa dies in bello conficit unus
. . .
et rursus multae fortunae forte recumbunt:
haud quaquam quemquam semper fortuna secuta est

Macr. *Sat.* 6.2.16: multa dies variusque labor mutabilis aevi rettulit in melius: multos alterna revisens lusit et in solido rursus fortuna locavit' [*Aen.* 11.425–7]. Ennius in octavo: 'multa dies in bello conficit unus et rursus multae fortunae forte recumbunt: haudquaquam *quemquam* semper Fortuna secuta est'.

VIII: *Ann.* 266 hastati spargunt hastas. fit ferreus imber

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.52: 'ac ferreus ingruit imber' [*Aen.* 12.284]. Ennius in octavo: 'hastati spargunt hastas, fit ferreus imber'.

VIII: *Ann.* 288 nunc hostes vino domiti somnoque sepulti

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.20: invadunt urbem somno vinoque sepultam [*Aen.* 2.265]. Ennius in octavo 'nunc hostes vino domiti somnoque sepulti'.

IX: *Ann.* 311 lychnorum lumina bis sex

Macr. *Sat.* 6.4.17: inseruit operi suo et Graeca verba, sed non primus hoc est ausus; auctorum enim veterum audaciam secutus est. 'dependent lychni laquearibus aureis' [*Aen.* 1.726], sicut Ennius in nono: 'lychnorum lumina bis sex', et Lucretius in quinto [295] '. . . pendentes lychni', et Lucilius in primo [15 M]: '. . . clinopodas lychnosque ut diximus σεμνῶς ante pedes lecti atque lucernas'.

X: *Ann.* 344–5 *Pergama*
quae neque Dardaniis campis potuere perire
nec quom capta capi nec quom combusta cremari

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.60: 'num ‹Sigeis occumbere campis, num› capti potuere capi? num incensa cremavit Troia viros?' [*Aen.* 7.294]. Ennius in decimo cum de Pergamis loqueretur: 'quae neque Dardaniis campis potuere perire nec quom capta capi nec quom combusta cremari'.

XIV: *Ann.* 376 labitur uncta carina, volat super impetus undas

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.51: 'labitur uncta vadis abies' [*Aen.* 8.91]. Ennius in quarto decimo: 'labitur uncta carina, volat super impetus undas'.

XIV: *Ann.* 379–80 quom procul aspiciunt hostes accedere ventis
navibus velivolis

Macr. *Sat.* 6.5.10: 'despiciens mare velivolum' [*Aen.* 1.224]. Laevius (Livius *corr. Ribb.*) in *Helena* [II C]: 'tu qui permensus ponti maria alta velivola'. Ennius in quarto decimo: 'cum procul aspiciunt hostes accedere ventis navibus velivolis'. idem in *Andromache* [III J] 'rapit ex alto naves velivolas'.

Serv. *Aen.* 1.224: velivolum duas res significat, et quod velis volatur ut hoc loco, et quod velis volat ut Ennius 'naves velivolas' [*Androm.* III J and/or *Ann.* 379–80], qui et proprie dixit.

XIV: *Ann.* 384 horrescit telis exercitus asper utrimque

Macr. *Sat.* 6.4.6: 'tum ‹late› ferreus hastis/horret ager' [*Aen.* 11.601–2]. horret mire se habet; sed et Ennius in quarto decimo: 'horrescit telis exercitus asper utrimque'. et in *Erectheo* [143 J]: 'arma †arrigunt†, horrescunt tela'. et in *Scipione* [*Var.* 14 V]: 'sparsis hastis longis campus splendet et horret'. sed et ante omnes Homerus [*Il.* 13.339]: ἔφριξεν δὲ μάχη φθισίμβροτος ἐγχείῃσι μακρῇς.

XV: *Ann.* 391–8 undique conveniunt velut imber tela tribuno:
configunt parmam, tinnit hastilibus umbo,
aerato sonitu galeae, sed nec pote quisquam
undique nitendo corpus discerpere ferro.
semper abundantes hastas frangitque quatitque.
totum sudor habet corpus, multumque laborat,
nec respirandi fit copia: praepete ferro
Histri tela manu iacientes sollicitabant.

Macr. *Sat.* 6.3.2–4: Homerus de Aiacis forti pugna ait [*Il.* 16.102–11]. hunc locum Ennius in quinto decimo [XV *RFA*: XII *NPT*] ad pugnam C. Aelii[65] tribuni his versibus transfert: 'undique . . . sollicitabant'. hinc Vergilius eundem locum de incluso Turno gratia elegantiore composuit [*Aen.* 9.806–14].

XVI: *Ann.* 411 concidit et sonitum simul insuper arma dederunt

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.24: 'corruit in vulnus. sonitum super arma dederunt' [*Aen.* 10.448].[66] Ennius in sexto decimo: 'concidit, et sonitum simul insuper arma dederunt'.

[65] This is Merula's conjecture, based not least on Livy 41.7, 4.3, for the paradosis *Caelius*. For discussion, see Kaster 2010: 52 and Chapter. 1, pp. 63–4, esp. n. 151.

[66] Our texts of Vergil, along with one Macrobius-manuscript (P), have *dedere*.

XVI: *Ann.* 415–16 interea fax
occidit Oceanumque rubra tractim obruit aethra

Macr. *Sat.* 6.4.19: et quod dixit 'nec lucidus aethra siderea polus' [*Aen.* 3.585] Ennius prior dixerat in sexto decimo: 'interea fax occidit oceanumque rubra tractim obruit aethra'.

XVI: *Ann.* 417 tunc timido manat ex omni corpore sudor

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.50: 'tum gelidus toto manabat corpore sudor' [*Aen.* 3.175]. Ennius in sexto decimo: 'tunc timido manat ex omni corpore sudor'.

XVII: *Ann.* 428 tollitur in caelum clamor exortus utrimque

Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.21: 'tollitur in caelum clamor, cunctique Latini' [*Aen.* 11.745]. Ennius in septimo decimo: 'tollitur in caelum clamore exortus utri*m*que'.

XVII: *Ann.* 432–4 concurrunt veluti venti, quom spiritus Austri
imbricitor Aquiloque suo cum flamine contra indu
mari magno fluctus extollere certant

Macr. *Sat.* 6.2.28: 'diversi magno (adversi rupto *Verg.*) ceu quondam turbine venti confligunt Zephyrusque Notusque et laetus Eois Eurus equis' [*Aen.* 2.416–8]. Ennius in septimo decimo: 'concurrunt veluti venti cum spiritus Austri/imbricitor Aquiloque suo cum flamine contra/ind*u* mari magno fluctus extollere certant'.

?11: *Ann.* 453 et Tiberis flumen ‹flavom› vomit in mare salsum

Macr. *Sat.* 6.4.3: 'mane salutantum totis vomit aedibus undam' [*G.* 2.462]. pulchre 'vomit undam' et antique. nam Ennius ait: 'et Tiberis flumen ‹flavom›[67] vomit in mare salsum'.

??: *Ann.* 535–9 et tum, sicut equos qui de praesepibus fartus
vincla suis magnis animis abrumpit et inde
fert sese campi per caerula laetaque prata

[67] Skutsch (and Flores *et al.*) insert this, following Ilberg, who, however, placed it after *et*.

celso pectore; saepe iubam quassat simul altam,
spiritus ex anima calida spumas agit albas

Macr. *Sat.* 6.3.7–9: Homerica descriptio est equi fugientis in haec verba: '. . .' [*Il.* 6.506–11 = 15.263–8]. Ennius hinc traxit: 'et tum sicut equus qui de praesepibus fartus/vincla suis magnis animis abrumpit et inde/fert sese campi per caerula laetaque prata/celso pectore; saepe iubam quassat simul altam,/spiritus ex anima calida spumas agit albas'. Vergilius: 'qualis ubi abruptis fugit praesepia vinclis . . . ' [*Aen.* 11.492], et cetera [*ibid.* 493–7]. nemo ex hoc viles putet veteres poetas, quod versus eorum scabri nobis videntur. ille enim stilus Enniani saeculi auribus solus placebat, et diu laboravit aetas secuta ut magis huic molliori filo adquiesceretur.

TESTIMONIA

Macr. *Sat.* 6.2.30: sunt alii loci plurimorum versuum quos Maro in opus suum cum paucorum immutatione verborum a veteribus transtulit . . . [31] in principio *Aeneidos* tempestas describitur et Venus apud Iovem queritur . . . hic locus totus sumptus a Naevio est ex primo libro *Belli Punici* . . . [32] item de Pandaro et Bitia aperientibus portas locus acceptus est ex libro quinto decimo Ennii, qui induxit Histros duos in obsidione erupisse porta et stragem de obsidente hoste fecisse [cf. Verg. *Aen.* 9.672–83; Hom. *Il.* 12.127–45].

OPERIS INCERTI FRAGMENTA

Op. inc. 28 festra

Macr. *Sat.* 3.12.8–9: [8] . . . item Antonius Gnipho, vir doctus cuius scholam Cicero post laborem fori frequentabat, Salios Herculi datos probat in eo volumine quo disputat quid sit fest*ra*, quod est ostium (*M*: hostia *NPT*: hostium *BURFA*) minusculum (mun– *TMBV*) in sacrario. quo verbo etiam Ennius usus est. [9] idoneis ut credo auctoribus certisque rationibus error qui putabatur uterque defensus est. siqua sunt alia quae nos commovent, in medium proferamus, ut ipsa collatio nostrum, non Maronis, absolvat errorem.

cf. Paul. Fest. 80: FESTRAM antiqui dicebant quam nos 'fenestram';
Ps.-Placid. F 42 L: festram fenestram.

TABLE A5.25: Ps.-Macrobius (from a text dating to ?1st half *c.* 5?); *De Verbo* ('Excerpta Bobbiensia', *GLK* 5.634–54); ed. M. Passalacqua, *Tre testi grammaticali bobbiesi* (1984).

The *De Verbo* fragment from Bobbio, which compares the Latin to the Greek verb, is not Macrobius' work, though it may be based on it.[68] The 3 fragments below survive in this treatise alone. Only 1 of them (*Ann.* 482) is a complete hexameter. (A lacuna in the text that survives at Paris can be completed by reference to the Bobbio *De Verbo* fragment.) A book-number is supplied for 1 of the 3 lines (*Ann.* 352).

II: *Ann.* 124 tractatus per aequora campi
?XIII: *Ann.* 482 contempsit fontes quibus ex erugit aquae vis

Ps.-Macr. *Exc. Bob.* 41 'De formis verborum: de frequentativa' (*GLK* 5.651): huius forma verba nonnumquam uno gradu, nonnumquam duobus derivantur, ut 'scribo scripto scriptito', 'cano canto cantito', 'salio salto saltito'. . . sunt tamen quaedam eius verba quae in '–so' exeunt, ut 'video viso', 'pello pulso', cum plerumque in '–to' soleant exire . . . 'pulto' sunt qui accipiant pro eo quod est 'pulso' et ἀττικισμόν quendam latinitatis existiment, ut apud illos θάλασσα θάλαττα, πλάσσω πλάττω; sed 'pultare' est saepe pulsare, sicut 'tractare' saepe trahere et 'habitare' saepe habere. Coelius in primo [16 P]: 'illis facilius est bellum tractare', hoc est diu trahere; Ennius: 'tractatus per aequora campi'. 'eructo' etiam a quo principali veniat quaeritur, et est a verbo 'erugit'. Ennius: 'contempsit fontes quibus ex erugit aquae vis'.

Ps.-Macr. *Exc. Par.* 21 'De formis vel speciebus verborum: de frequentativa' (*GLK* 5.626): 'frequentativa forma compendio latinitatis obsequitur, cum uno verbo frequentationem administrationis ostendit. haec forma non numquam uno gradu, non numquam duobus derivatur, ut 'cano cando cantito' . . . 'pulto' sunt qui accipiant pro eo quod est 'pulso' et ἀττικισμόν quendam latinitatis existiment, ut apud illos θάλασσα θάλαττα, πλάσσω πλάττω; sed 'pultare' est saepe 'pulsare', sicut 'tractare' saepe 'trahere'.

[68] Leofranc Adrian Holford-Strevens, 'Macrobius, Ambrosius Theodosius', *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth. Oxford University Press 2003. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. University of Colorado Boulder. 28 August 2008 www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview Main&entry t111.e3853. A comparable treatise by Macrobius himself, the *De verborum Graeci et Latini differentiis vel societatibus*, survives in extracts made at Bobbio (*ibid.*), as well as by Eriugena.

'eructat' frequentativum est a principali ‹'erugit'. Ennius: 'contempsit fontes quibus ex› erugit aquae vis'.

cf. Paul. Fest. 73: ERUGERE semel factum significat quod 'eructare' saepius. illud enim perfectae formae est, hoc frequentativae.

x: *Ann.* 352 fiere

Ps.-Macr. *Exc. Bob.* 'De infinito modo' (*GLK* 5.645): omne infinitivum activum praesentis temporis in '–re' desinit, ut 'amare', 'monere', 'audire', 'legere'. unde etiam a 'fio' 'fiere' esse deberet, sed licet usus aliter obtinuerit ('fieri' enim nunc dicitur), Ennius tamen in x *Annalium* 'fiere' dixit, non 'fieri'. regula autem iam superius dicta est; name omne imperativum activum addita '–re' syllaba fit infinitum, ama amare mone monere audi audire lege legere.

TABLE A5.26: 'PORPHYRIO' (Pomponius Porphyrio) (?c. 5 CE); ed. A. Holder (1894; repr. Hildesheim 1967); see Wessner 1895:; *RE* 21.2 (1952), 2412–6 (Helm); Herz.-Schm. § 446; Kaster, *OCD* 2003, s.v.; Kalinina 2007, rev. J. E. G. Zetzel: http://ccat.sas.upenn.edu/bmcr/2009/2009–02–06.html.

The redaction in which 'Porphyrio''s work is extant dates to *c.* 200 years after his own lifetime in the early third century CE. This redaction is the sole or primary source of three Ennian hexameters (*Ann.* 494–5 and 612). I make it the primary source also for the corrupt and obscure *Ann.* 477, since it alone supplies the quotation proper.[69] Besides this, our text on Hor. *Ars P.* 403 supports Cicero (*Div.* 2.116)'s transmission of *Ann.* 167 and, with its derivate 'Acro' (see Appendix Table A5.40 on Ps.-Acro, pp. 548–9), supports and extends Servius' (ad *Aen.* 7.622) transmission of *Ann.* 226 in its remarks on Hor. *Serm.* 1.4.60. A testimonium associated with Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.51 supports the fuller evidence of the Scholia to Persius (see Appendix Table A5.41, pp. 550–2) for the dream-encounter of 'Ennius' and 'Homer' in the proem to the *Annales* and the account of metempsychosis it entailed. Another testimonium, this one associated with Hor. *C.* 1.2.17, testifies to the marriage of Ilia to the river Anio in the *Annales*.

?VIII: *Ann.* 477[70] Bruttace bilingui

'Porph.' Hor. *Serm.* 1.10.30 CANUSINI MORE ‹BILINGUIS›: 'bilinguis' dixit quoniam utraque lingua usi sunt, sicut per omnem illum tractum Italiae, quoniam ex maiore parte Graeci ibi incoluerunt, quoniam ex maiore parte Graeci ibi incoluerunt, ex quo Magn*ae* Graeciae nomen accepit. ideo ergo et Ennius et Lucilius [1124 M] 'Bruttace bilingui' dixerunt.

Paul. Fest. 31 BILINGUES BRUTTACES: Ennius dixit quod Brutti et Osce et Graece loqui soliti sint. sunt autem Italiae populi vicini Lucanis.

[69] Skutsch explains the discrepancy between Paulus, who omits the quotation itself and whose lemma gives the phrase in the plural, and Porphyrio's quotation of the phrase apparently in the ablative singular, by (a) pointing to the frequency with which Paulus omits Festus' quotations, while keeping Festus' lemma; and (b) suggesting that the plural of Festus' lemma indicates a collective sense to Ennius' singular.

[70] *Ann.* 477 has a long history of inclusion in editions of the *Annales* (for doxography, as ever the fullest and most reliable information is in Flores *et al.* 2009: 138–9), but the grounds on which it finds itself there as opposed to among the Ennian *Op. inc.* (where e.g. Columna placed it) are hard to imagine and, as far as I know, have never been articulated.

??: *Ann.* 494–5 audire est operae pretium procedere recte
qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere voltis

'Porph.' Hor. *Serm.* 1.2.37: AUDIRE EST OPERAE PRETIUM PROCEDERE RECTE/QUI MOECHIS NON VULTIS UT OMNI PARTE LABORENT urbane abutitur Ennianis versibus 'audire est operae pretium procedere recte qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere vultis'; sed illud urbanius quod, cum Ennius 'vultis' dixerit, hic 'non vultis' intulerit.

Ps.-Acro *Serm.* 1.2.38 QUI MOECHIS: urbane abutitur Ennianis versibus; ille enim ait 'audire est operae pretium procedere recte qui rem Romanam Latiumque augescere vultis'. sed illud urbanius, quia cum Ennius 'vultis' dixerit, hic 'non vultis' intulerit.

Varro, *Men.* 542 A *ap.* Non. 478.16: NUTRITUR ET NUTRICATUR pro 'nutrit' et 'nutricat': Varro *Testamento* [542 A], περὶ διαθήκης: 'e mea φιλοφθονίᾳ natis, quos Menippea haeresis nutricata est, tutores do' * 'qui rem Romanam Latiumque alciscere vultis'.

Mar. Vict. 1.20 'De concursu et collisione vocalium' (*GLK* 6.67):[71] sed ut ad propositum revertamur, quidam superioribus tribus quartam speciem addiderunt, quam Graeci dicunt κρᾶσιν, id est cum unius litterae vocalis in duas syllabas fit communio, ut 'audire est operae pretium procedere recte'.

Mart. Cap. 3.272: mutant accentus adiunctis vocibus '–que', '–ve', '–ne' . . . ut 'Latiumque augescere vultis' et 'stimulove meum cor' apud Accium in *Pelopidis*.

??: *Ann.* 612 stant pulvere campi

'Porph.' Hor. *C.* 1.9.1 VIDES UT ALTA STET NIVE CANDIDUM S[ORACTE]: Thaliarchum ad laetiorem vitam hortatur, ut lusibus adulescentiae, quamdiu aetas permitti‹t, uta›tur. notandum autem quod neutro genere 'Soracte' dixerit, cum vulgo 'Sorax' dicatur. est autem hic mons in Faliscis. 'stet' autem 'plenum sit' significat, ut Ennius: 'stant pulvere campi' et Vergilius [*Aen.* 12.407–8]: 'iam pulvere caelum/stare vident' et in *Bucolicis* [7.53]: 'stant et iuniperi et castaneae hirsutuae'.

[71] Skutsch (1985: 653) notes that Marius Victorinus' comment and quotation are more likely to refer to Horace's iteration of the line rather than Ennius'.

TESTIMONIA

Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.50–52: Ennius et sapiens et fortis et alter Homerus,
ut critici dicunt, †leviter† curare videtur
quo promissa cadant et somnia Pythagorea.

'Porph.' Hor. *Ep.* 2.1.51 LEVITER CURARE VIDETUR: securus iam de proventu suae laudis est Ennius, propter quam ante sollicitus in principio *Annalium* suorum somnio se scripsit admonitum, quod secundum Pythagorae dogma anima Homeri in suum corpus venisset. facete autem 'somnia Pythagorea' dixit, ut ipsum etiam Pythagora‹m cum› sua sibi[met] metempsychosi *r*idere videatur.
LEVITER CURARE: secur*u*s esse.
ibid. 52 QUO CADANT: quam successum habeant. ostendere autem vult sine difficultate poetas veteres solere laudari.
SOMNIA PYTHAGOR‹EA: s›u*nt* libri *Annalium*.

Frg. 1.xxxix = 'Porph.' Hor. *C.* 1.2.17: ILIAE DUM SE N[IMIUM] Q[UERENTI]/I[ACTAT] U[LTOREM] V[AGUS]: Ilia auctore Ennio in amnem Tiberim iussu Amul[l]ii regis Albanorum praecipitata Antemnis [*Buecheler*: antea enim *codd.*] Anieni matrimonio iuncta est. atqui hic [sc. Horatius] loquitur quasi Tiberi potius nupserit. qu[a]erenti autem Iliae caedem Caesaris intellegendum.

OPERIS INCERTI FRAGMENTA

Op. inc. 21 bona (pars)

'Porph.' Hor. *Serm.* 1.1.61 AT BONA PARS HOMINUM: 'bona' nunc pro 'magna' dictum, ut saepe Ennius et alii veteres.

TABLE A5.27: CONSENTIUS (probably c. 5 CE); *GLK* 5.329–404; *RE* 4.911–12 (Goetz); Sch.-Hos. 4:2.210–13; *PLRE* 2, s.v. 3, p. 310; Kaster § 203; Herz.-Sch. § 702.

A single hexameter line attributed to Ennius survives only via Consentius' grammatical work, *De barbarismis et metaplasmis* (1 of 2 extant treatises by him that are excerpted from a much larger work, as references forward and backward beyond the bounds of what has survived testify). Consentius gives no book-number, and the line is corrupt. Consentius also contributes to the transmission of *Ann.* 587, for which the main source is Ausonius, and which circulates fairly widely in the grammatical tradition. Finally, he may be in contact with the tradition that transmits *Ann.* 613–14, though he himself does not quote it (see pp. 475–6, under Diomedes).

??: *Ann.* 579 huic statuam statui maiorum †orbatur† athenis

Consent. 'De scandendis versibus' (*GLK* 5.400): alius modus excusationis est, qui metaplasmorum vi et potestate contingit. de hoc pauca pertinentia satis ad rem praecepta dicemus, latius ea tantum exsecuturi, quae magis in usu sunt; illa vero quae raro eveniunt, evenire tamen possunt, exempli causa breviter demonstrabimus. ac primum scire debemus metaplasmos hos vel a poetis ipsis positos iam in ipsa scriptura fieri, vel nobis, cum ita scandendi aut pronuntiandi necessitas urgebit, faciendos relinqui. poetae faciunt metaplasmos, cum ipsi iam scripturam relinquunt corruptam, ut est 'relliquias Danaum' [*Aen.* 1.30] et 'tanton me crimine dignum/duxisti' [*Aen.* 10.668–9]: addidit enim unam litteram per metaplasmum 'l', item contra dempsit unam litteram per metaplasmum 'e'; sicut Lucilius [1243 M]: 'atque ore corupto':[72] dempsit enim unam litteram per metaplasmum 'r'.[73] et Ennius: 'huic statuam statui maiorum †orbatur †athenis'; et hic quoque per metaplasmum dempsit litteram 'r'. hoc cum evenit, nos in scandendo metaplasmum non facimus: habet enim iam illum lectionis ipsius metaplasmum scriptura, quae sic a poeta relicta est. atque in istis modis adiectionis et detractionis, nisi ipsi poetae corruperint dictionem, nos eam corrumpere metaplasmi potestate non possumus.

[72] Skutsch (1985: 719) reports that Heraeus thought Lucilius intended κορύπτω.
[73] Skutsch (*ibid.*) reports that *B* has superscript 's' above this 'r'.

TABLE A5.28: LACTANTIUS PLACIDUS (c. 5/6 CE); ed. Jahnke (1898); Herz.-Schm. § 614.

Under this name is transmitted a commentary on Statius' *Thebaid* dating in its original form to the *c.* 5 or *c.* 6.[74] The 2 fragments preserved in this commentary are assimilable to the type of formulaising line that Macrobius in particular preserves for us (see Chapter 2). They occur in no other source, however; neither does 'Lactantius Placidus' support the transmission of any other source for the *Annales*.

?XIV: *Ann.* 485–6 quomque caput caderet carmen tuba sola peregit
et pereunte viro raucum sonus aere cucurrit

Lact. Stat. *Theb.* 11.56 (egregius lituo dextri Mavortis Enyeus/hortator; sed tunc miseris dabat utile signum/suadebatque fugam et tutos in castra receptus:/cum subito obliquo descendit ab aere vulnus,/urgentisque sonum laeva manus aure retenta est,/sicut erat; fugit in vacuas iam spiritus auras,/iam gelida ora tacent: carmen tuba sola peregit): TUBA SOLA PEREGIT Ennius: 'cumque caput caderet, carmen tuba sola peregit, et pereunte viro raucum sonus aere cucurrit'.

??: *Ann.* 499 quom sese exsiccat somno Romana iuventus

Lact. Stat. *Theb.* 6.27: (clara laboriferos caelo Tithonia currus/extulerat vigilesque deae pallentis habenas/et Nox et cornu fugiebat Somnus inani): ET CORNU FUGIEBAT SOMNUS INANI 'inani cornu' idcirco dixit, quia illud noctis tempore totum diffuderat, quod idem poeta superius [2.144] manifestius asseruit dicens 'cornu perfuderat omni'. nam sic a pictoribus simulatur, ut liquidum somnum e cornu super dormientes videatur effundere [cf. DS *Aen.* 1.692]. sic Ennius: 'cum sese exsiccat somno Romana iuventus'.

[74] Robert A. Kaster '"Lactantius Placidus"' *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth. Oxford University Press 2003. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. University of Colorado Boulder. 13 July 2008 www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview Main&entry t111.e3554.

TABLE A5.29: *SCHOLIA VERONENSIA* (late c. 5 CE?); ed. C. Baschera (Verona 1999); also Thilo-Hagen, *Servii Grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*. Vol. 3.2 'Appendix Serviana: ceteros praeter Servium et Scholia Bernensia Vergilii commentatores continens' (Leipzig 1887; repr. Hildesheim 1986): 391–450; Baschera 2008: 207–15.

The poor state of the Scholia Veronensia is accounted for by the fact that we have them only in palimpsest, subjected to chemical treatment in the nineteenth century by Angelo Mai and others in his wake. These scholia are responsible for the transmission of 3 fragments (4 lines), 2 of them in bad shape. They also support Tertullian's transmission of *Ann.* 51 and Ps.-Probus (on *Ecl.* 6.31)'s transmission of *Ann.* 15–16 but are not otherwise involved in the transmission of the *Annales*.

VI: *Ann.* 195–6 aut animo superant atque asp rima
fera belli spernunt

Schol. Veron. *Aen.* 5.473: [HIC VI]CTOR SUP*ERANS ANIMIS TAUROQUE SUPERBUS*:[75] *D*[***]*sse cui superes* [***] *animus pugnandi vires*:| '[si su]perant fetus pariter frumenta sequentur' [*G.* 1.189]. Enn*ius in VI*: 'aut ani*mo* superant atque asp[****]rima (*Sk.*; asp[era p]rima *Baschera*) | – – – – – (*Sk.*; sequuntur nec *Baschera*) fera belli spernunt'. quod tamen Democritus [***] cuius ex gloria est [***] eficiat probat animos sibi post pugnam superesse. et ferunt Pollucem victo Amyco Bracchia (*Vahlen*; Bacchia *codd., Baschera*)| [***] | dominus [***] *appareret long* [***] | [***] esse victoria.|

??: *Ann.* 581 atque manu magna Romanos impulit amnis

Schol. Veron. *Aen.* 5.241–2: (et pater ipse manu magna Portunus euntem impulit): Ennius 'atque manu magna Romanos impulit amnis'.

??: *Ann.* 616 haec abnu(eram)

Schol. Veron. *Aen.* 10.8 (p. 443 Th.): [ABNUERAM: E]*nnius Anna[lium* ***] *haec abnu* ——

[75] Skutsch reports that this scholion is found in the lower margin of the page and that the ends of verses are marked with straight lines, lacunae with slanting ones; further, that it is on Mai's testimony alone that the idea that they were enclosed by angular hook-signs rests. See Skutsch 1985: 357–8, as well as Baschera 1999, for discussion of the textual situation here.

TABLE A5.30: PRISCIAN (c. 5^{ex}–c. $6^{1/3}$ CE); *GLK* 2–3 (entire); *RE* 22.2328–46 (Helm); Sch.-Hos. 4.2, 221–38; *PLRE* II s.v.2, 905; Kaster § 126; Herz.-Schm. § 703.

Priscian quotes 34 fragments (44 lines) of the *Annales* in his *Institutiones* (and repeats his citation of *Ann.* 104 in the *Partitiones* or *Praeexercitamina*). For 40 of these lines, he is the sole or the only significant source, the *Ars Anonyma Bernensis* in particular (which reproduces parts of *Ann.* 14, 390, 423, 430) being wholly dependent on him. Priscian is thus virtually exclusively responsible for about 7 per cent of the extant remains of the poem. For 22 of the 34 fragments dependent on him alone, he supplies book-numbers.[76] Priscian shares 3 fragments (4 lines) with other significant sources (*Ann.* 104, 125, 420); for only 1 of these (*Ann.* 420) does he (alone) transmit a book-number. Those other sources, which include Charisius, Servius, Pompeius and the *Explanatio in Donatum*, tend likewise to be of the grammatical tradition, although Isidore and the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* also know the famous *Ann.* 104. Priscian also contributes to the transmission of *Ann.* 8, for which the primary source is Varro (*LL* 5.59); *Ann.* 108, for which the primary source is Cicero (*Rep.* 1.64); the famous *Ann.* 167, for which the primary source is Cicero (*Div.* 2.116); and he in fact gives our most complete version of *Ann.* 451, which I have nevertheless listed under its other source, Servius, because of the more compelling reception history for the line the latter provides. Priscian also quotes *Ann.* 378, for which the primary source is Gellius; *Ann.* 60, for which the primary source is Charisius; and *Ann.* 429, for which the primary source is Nonius. Priscian cites Cicero's *Hortensius* as an (ultimate rather than a direct?) source, in the vicinity of his quotation of *Ann.* 108 at *Inst.* 6.66 (*GLK* 2.250); see Appendix Table A5.3 on Cicero, pp. 370–1.

1: *Ann.* 14 quom veter occubuit Priamus sub Marte Pelasgo

Prisc. 3.21 (*GLK* 2.97) (whence derives Aldhelm. *MGH AA* 15, p. 186.25 [Sk. 1985: 169]): etiam 'veterrimus' notandum, quod, cum in '–us' desinat eius positivus, tamen formam in '–er' terminantium servat in superlativo, 'veterrimus' quasi a 'veter' positivo, quod Capri quoque approbat auctoritas et usus antiquissimorum. Ennius 'cum veter occubuit Priamus sub Marte Pelasgo'. cuius etiam comparativum 'veterior' protulit Plautus in *Bacchidibus* [1150]: 'senem †tibi dedo illum veteriorem, lepide ut lenitum reddas'.

[76] The 9 fragments for which he does not give book-numbers are *Ann.* 14, 30, 520–1, 444, 445, 468, 491, 571, 573.

Ars Anon. Bern. (*GLK* 8.81): item 'vetus veteris veterrimus' quasi a 'veter' positivo. Ennius: 'cum veter occubuit Priamus sub Marte Pelasgo'.

1: *Ann.* 30 quos homines quondam Laurentis terra recepit

Prisc. 7.61 (*GLK* 2.337–8): 'Laurentis' etiam pro 'Laurens' dicebant. Ennius in *Annalibus*: 'quos homines quondam Laurentis terra recepit'. Naevius neutraliter 'hoc Samnite' protulit in carmine *Belli Punici* [38 B].

1: *Ann.* 104 o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne tulisti

Prisc. 12.23 (*GLK* 2.591): nominativo autem ideo non additur [sc. 'met'], ne dubitationem faciat, cum etiam verbum intellegi possit, si dicamus 'tumet'. itaque brevem *te* syllabam pro *met* ei [sc. nominativo 'tu'] addere solent auctores vel 'temet'. Lucretius in primo [269]: 'accipe praeterea quae corpora tute necesse est'. idem in eodem [102]: 'tutemet a nobis iam quovis tempore vatum'. Ennius: 'o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti'.

Explan. in Don. 2 'De scematibus' (*GLK* 4.565): eiusdem Enni versus est 'tute, Ta‹ti›, tibi tanta, tyranne tulisti'. omnes enim partes orationis ‹a› t littera principium sumunt. (*See* Explanatio in Donatum *in Appendix Table A5.17 on Donatus, p. 461, for* Ann. 229, *for lengthier quotation of this passage*.)

Pomp. *Comm.* 'De schematibus' (*GLK* 5.303): paromoeon est, quotiens ab isdem litteris diversa verba sequuntur, quo modo illud habes apud Vergilium [*Aen.* 3.183]: 'sola mihi tales casus Cassandra canebat'. ab ipsa littera inchoavit plurimas partes orationis. quale est illud, 'longo sale saxa sonabant'. antiqui integros versus ita faciebant ut 'o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti'. versus est Ennianus.

Isid. *Orig.* 1.36.14: paromoeon est multitudo verborum ex una littera inchoantium, quale est apud Ennium 'o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti'.

Rhet. Her. 4.18: compositio est verborum constructio ‹quae facit omnes partes oratio›nis aequabiliter perpolitas. ea conservabitur . . . si vitabimus eiusdem litterae nimiam adsiduitatem, cui vitio versus hic erit exemplo – nam hic nihil prohibet in vitiis alienis exemplis uti – 'o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti'. (*See Appendix Table A5.2 on* Rhetorica ad Herennium, *pp. 363–4 for fuller quotation of this passage*.)

Charis. 4.4 'De schemate lexeos' (*GLK* 1.282): parhomoeon est cum verba omnia similiter incipiunt, ut 'o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti'.

Prisc. *Partit.* 141, on *Aen.* 7.1 'tu quoque litoribus nostris Aeneia nutrix' (*GLK* 3.492): quot accidunt pronomini? sex, species genus numerus figura persona casus. cuius est speciei 'tu'? primitivae. fac ab eo derivativum. 'tuus tua tuum', et adverbium 'tuatim', et per epectasin tute te correpta ut 'o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti'. cuius est generis? communis trium generum: quomodo enim apud Graecos ἐγώ σύ οὗ trium generum sunt communia, sic et apud nos ego tu mei tui sui: numeri singularis, figurae simplicis, personae secundae, casus nominativi et vocativi. hic autem magis nominativus est, cum per apostrophen dicitur, quae exigit nominativum, et cum quoque coniunctum, quod ad alios nominativos relatum est, id est ut Misenus et Palinurus tu quoque.

Donat. *Art. Gr.* 3.5 (*GLK* 4.398): parhomoeon est cum ab isdem litteris verba sumuntur, ut 'o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti'.

Pomp. *Comm.* 'De soloecismo' (*GLK* 5.287–8): conlisio est quotiens altera pars in alteram similitudinem litterarum vel coeperit vel finierit, id est si ab ea parte inchoet alia pars orationis, in quam desiit illa, aut certe si ab ipsis syllabis inchoent multae partes, ut 'o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti', 'Lucius S‹a›enius senator in senatu litteras recitavit' [Sall. *Cat.* 30.1].

Mart. Cap. 5.514: homoeoprophoron est cum dicitur 'o Tite, tute, Tati, tibi tanta, tyranne, tulisti'.

Sacerd. (*GLK* 6.454): de aprepia. aprepia est absurda et indecens verborum structura ut 'o Tite tate tibi tanta'.

11: *Ann.* 125–6 volturus in †spineto† miserum mandebat homonem:
heu quam crudeli condebat membra sepulcro

Prisc. 6.15 (*GLK* 2.206): vetustissimi tamen etiam 'homo, homonis' declinaverunt. Ennius: 'vulturus in silvis miserum mandebat homonem. heu quam crudeli condebat membra sepulcro' (nam et 'vultur' et 'vulturus' et 'vulturius' dicitur).[77]

Charis. 1.17 (*GLK* 1.147): 'vulturius' M. Aemilius Scaurus *contra Quintum Caepionem actione II* [3 P], 'nefarius volturius, patriae parricida', Cicero *in Pisonem* [16] 'vulturius illius provinciae'; idem in eadem Scaurus [4 P]

[77] '*idem fere* Schol. cod. Bamb. Stat. *Theb.* 3.508; and *Cod. misc. Sangall.* 397 p. 121 . . . *mandabat membra* . . .' (Skutsch 1985: 275); neither of which I have been able to consult.

'vulturius rei publicae'. 'vultur' Maro *Aeneidos* VI [597]: 'immanis vultur obunco rostro', ut turtur; volturus Ennius 'volturus in spinet° supinum mandebat hominem'.

Ps.-Prob. (Att. Accad. Torino. 19 [1884] 446): quamvis antiqui homonis dixerunt ut Ennius 'vulturus in spine‹to› supinum mandebat homonem'.

Serv. *Aen.* 6.595: NEC NON ET TITYON Tityos Terrae secundum alios filius fuit, secundum alios a Terra nutritus: unde *poeta* elegit sermonem, quo utrumque significaret, nam 'alumnum' dixit. hic amavit Latonam, propter quod Apollinis confixus sagittis est et damnatus hac lege apud inferos, ut eius iecur vultur exedat: quamquam Homerus vicissim dicat duos vultures sibi in eius poenam succedere. sane in usu est vultur; licet Cicero 'vulturius' dixerit, quod quidem potest esse et derivatum: Ennius 'vulturus in campo (*HFC*; in silvis *ASM*) miserum (*ASRM*; supinum *HFC*) mandebat homonem'. declinatur autem 'hic Tityos, huius Tityi', sicut 'Delos, Deli'.

II: *Ann.* 132 adnuit sese mecum decernere ferro

Prisc. 10.12 (*GLK* 2.504): illud quoque sciendum, quod in 'ui' divisas terminantia praeteritum perfectum cum soleant corripere paenultimam, tamen vetustissimi inveniuntur etiam produxisse eandem paenultimam, in his maxime, quae a praesenti in '-uo' desinente divisas proficiscuntur, ut 'eruo, erūi', 'arguo, argūi', 'annuo, annūi'. Ennius in II: 'adnuit (*vel* ann.) sese (*om. pauci*) mecum decernere ferro'.

II: *Ann.* 133 ingens cura †mis cum† concordibus aequiperare

Prisc. 13.4 (*GLK* 3.3): sunt igitur in pronominibus modi declinationum quattuor. primus, qui in tribus primitivorum personis cernitur per obliquos casus – nam nominativus primae personae dissonus est a genetivo, tertiae vero deficit – ut 'ego mei', vel 'mis, tu tui' vel 'tis', 'sui' quod debuit secundum analogiam esse 'sui' vel 'sis', quod dubitationis causa, ne verbum esse putetur, recusaverunt proferre. nam ad Graecorum imitationem his quoque utimur duplicibus genetivis pronominum, apud illos enim ἐμοῦ et ἐμους Dorice et σοῦ et σοῦς et οὗ et οὗς dici solet. in ους autem desinens genetivus solet apud nos in 'is' definiri, ut Δημοσθένους 'Demosthenis', Ἑρμογένους 'Hermogenis', in ου vero in 'i': Πριάμου 'Priami', Κύρου 'Cyri'. sic ergo ἐμοῦ σοῦ οῦ 'mei tui sui', 'ἐμοῦς' δὲ 'σοῦς οὗς' 'mis, tis, sis'. sed propter supra dictam causam (*scil.* ne verbum esse putetur) tacitus est tertiae huiuscemodi genetivus. Ennius in II: 'ingens cura †mis cum† concordibus aequiperare'. 'mis' dixit pro 'mei'.

v: *Ann.* 162 cogebant hostes lacrumantes ut misererent

Prisc. 8.72–3 (*GLK* 2.428): 'integro integrasco'. idem [Terentius] in *Andria* [688]: 'vah perii, hoc malum integrascit'. et notandum, quod in passiva significatione positum est inchoativum, cum primitivum eius activum sit. similiter 'hio hisco', 'amo amasco', 'misereor miseresco' (sed magis a 'misereo' est, quo vetustissimi sunt usi, ut supra dictum est). Ennius in v *Annalium*: 'cogebant host*e*s lacrimantes ut misererent'. ex quo impersonale est 'miseret' et 'miseretur'.

vii: *Ann.* 217 urserat huc navim conpulsam fluctibus pontus
ix: *Ann.* 319–20 Cyclopis venter velut olim turserat alte
carnibus humanis distentus

Prisc. 8.50 (*GLK* 2.485–6): in '-geo' desinentia, 'l' vel 'r' antecedentibus, 'geo' in 'si' conversa faciunt praeteritum perfectum, ut 'indulgeo indulsi', 'fulgeo fulsi', 'algeo alsi', 'urgeo ursi', 'turgeo tursi', 'tergeo tersi', quod Probus et Charisius et Celsus et Diomedes comprobant et ipse omnibus validior usus. Iuvenalis in i [5.26–7]: 'sed mox et pocula torques/saucius et rubra deterges vulnera mappa'. idem in v [14.62]: 'vasa aspera tergeat alter'. Horatius in ii *Sermonum* [2.23–4]: 'posito pavone velis quin/hoc potius quam gallina tergere palatum'. Terentius in *Eunucho* [778–9]: 'egone? imperatoris virtutem noveram et vim militum,/sine sanguine hoc non posse fieri: qui abstergerem vulnera?' est enim quaternius iambus, qui stare non potest, nisi paenultima 'abstergerem' producatur. 'mulgeo' quoque 'mulsi' facit, quamvis differentiae causa quidam 'mulxi' protulerunt, quia 'mulceo' quoque 'mulsi' facit. Virgilius in iii *Georgicon* [400–1]: 'quod surgente die mulsere horisque diurnis/nocte premunt'. Ennius in vii *Annalium*: '*ur*serat huc nav*i*m compulsam fluctibus pontus'. idem in viiii (viii *z*) 'Ciclopis venter velut olim t*ur*serat alt*e*/carnibus humanis distentus'. Lucilius in xx [568 M]: 'purpureo tersit tunc latas gausape mensas'. idem in iiii [172 M]: 'obtursi ebrius'. syllaba vero naturaliter longa ante '-geo' posita, mutant '-geo' in '-xi' et faciunt praeteritum perfectum, ut 'lugeo luxi', 'augeo auxi', 'frigeo frixi'.

vii: *Ann.* 222 sulpureas posuit spiramina Naris ad undas

Prisc. 6.31 (*GLK* 2.222–3): in '-ar' Latina et Graeca inveniuntur et barbara generis masculini vel neutri vel omnis, quae accepta '-is' faciunt genetivum, ut 'hic Caesar Caesaris', 'hoc nectar nectaris', 'hic' et 'haec' et 'hoc par huius

paris', 'hic Aspar huius Asparis', 'Bostar Bostaris'. sed neutra, si derivativa sint, producunt 'a' in obliquis casibus: a lupa 'hoc lupanar huius lapanāris', a lacu 'lacunar lacunāris', a laqueo 'laquear laqueāris', a calce 'hoc calcar huius calcāris'. Horatius in II *Epistularum* [217]: 'et vatibus addere calcar'. Virgilius in VI [881]: 'seu spumantis equis foderet calcāribus armos'. 'Nār' quoque 'Nāris' monosyllabum similiter producit 'a' in genetivo et est proprium fluvii. nam si nasum velimus significare, 'haec naris huius naris' similem genetivo nominativum proferimus, sicut frequenter Ovidius ponit, ut in III *Metamorphoseon* [674–5]: 'panda . . . naris erat'. idem in VI [141]: 'defluxere comae, cum quis et naris et aures'. Lucanus in II [183–4] genetivum protulit 'hic aures, alius spiramina naris aduncae/amputat'. 'far' etiam 'fārris' positione habuit paenultimam longam, quod solum 'r' literam geminavit, et puto differentiae causa, ne verbum esse putetur secundae personae 'for faris' fatur'. et sciendum quod 'pār' et 'Nār' producitur in nominativo, ut Lucanus in IIII [482]: 'pār animi laus est, et quos speraveris annos'. et Virgilius in VII [517]: 'sulphurea Nār albus aqua'. sed 'Nār' servavit 'a' productam etiam in obliquis: Ennius in VII *Annalium*: 'sulphureas posuit spiramina Naris ad undas'.

VIII: *Ann.* 267 densantur campis horrentia tela virorum

Prisc. 9.43 (*GLK* 2.479–80): nec solum ea diversarum coniugationum inveniuntur verba, sed multa praeterea, ut 'strideo strides' et 'strido stridis', 'fulgeo fulgis' et 'fulgo fulgis', 'denseo denses' et 'denso densas' . . . a 'denso' Ennius in VIII (VII *Sang.*) *Annalium*: 'densantur campis horrentia tela virorum', a 'denseo' Virgilius in X [432]: 'extremi addensent acies'.

VIII: *Ann.* 297 Poenos Didone oriundos

Prisc. 6.19 (*GLK* 2.209–10): in '-o' productam desinentia Graeca sunt feminina et vel Graece declinantur, ut 'Manto Mantus'. Virgilius in X [199]: 'fatidicae Mantus et Tusci filius amnis', vel addita '-nis' faciunt genetivum, ut 'Dido didonis'. Accius [386 R]: 'custodem adsiduum Ioni adposuit virgini'. Pacuvius [403 R]: 'filios/† . sibi procreasse [dicitur] eundem per Calypsonem autumant (eundem filios/sibi p. p. C. a. *Ribb.*)'. Plautus in *Aulularia* [555–6]: 'quos si Argus servet, qui oculeus totus fuit, quem quondam Ioni Iuno custodem addidit'. quod autem 'Ionis' et 'Calypsonis' et 'Didonis' dicitur, ostendit hoc etiam Caesellius Vindex in *Stromateo* his verbis: 'Calypsonem'. ita declinatum est apud antiquos. Livius [17 W]: 'apud nympham Atlantis filiam Calypsonem'. Ennius in VIII: 'Poenos

Didone oriundos'. Accius in *Ione* [386 R]: 'custodem adsiduum Ioni instituit virgini'.

IX: *Ann.* 314 sed quid ego haec memoro? dictum factumque facit frux
XVI: *Ann.* 423 si luci si nox si mox si iam data sit frux

Prisc. 6.93 (*GLK* 2.278): In '-x' desinentia, si a verbis sint in '-go' desinentibus, ablata '-x', addita '-gis' faciunt genetivum, ut 'grego grex gregis'. Statius in I *Achilleidos* [372–3]: 'qualiter Idaliae volucres, ubi mollia frangunt/ nubila, iam longum caeloque domoque gregatae'; 'remigo remex remigis', 'lego lex legis', 'rego rex regis', 'coniungo coniunx coniugis', quod etiam in genetivo differentiae causa 'n' amittit, ne, si 'coniungis' dicamus, verbum putetur. nec mirum: Graecos enim in omnibus fere imitati Latini in hac quoque regula sequuntur. apud illos enim si in '-x' desinentia nomina habent verba cum 'g', nominum quoque genetivus per 'g' declinatur, λέγω Λέλεξ Λέλεγος, unde 'frux' etiam 'frugis' facit genetivum, quia ἀπὸ τοῦ 'φρύγω' Graeco verbo nascitur. Ennius in XVI (XVII *LK*) annali 'si luci si nox si mox si iam data sit frux'; idem in VIIII pro 'frugi homo' 'frux' ponit, quod est adiectivum: 'sed quid ego haec memoro? dictum factumque facit frux', id est frugi homo.

Whence: Ars Anon. Bern. (*GLK* 8.119): in '-ux' quot genera inveniuntur? tria, masculina, ut 'hic Pollux Pollucis', quod proprium est, *et appellativum*, ut 'hic dux ducis'; feminina, ut 'haec nux nucis', 'lux lucis', 'crux crucis'; commune duorum generum, ut 'hic et haec frux': pro 'frugi' Ennius 'frux homo' posuit; commune trium generum, ut 'hic et haec et hoc trux trucis' . . .

cf. Fronto, *De nepote amisso* 1.2.8: me autem consolatur aetas mea prope iam edita et morti proxuma. quam cum aderit, si noctis, si lucis id tempus erit, caelum quidem consalutabo discendens et quae mihi conscius sum protestabor.

X: *Ann.* 330–1 insignita fere tum milia militum octo
duxit delectos bellum tolerare potentes

Prisc. 1.38 (*GLK* 2.29–30): M obscurum in extremitate dictionum sonat, ut 'templum', apertum in principio, ut 'magnus', mediocre in mediis, ut 'umbra'. transit in 'n' et maxime 'd' vel 'c' vel 't' vel 'q' sequentibus, ut 'tantum tantundem', 'idem identidem', 'eorum eorundem', 'num nuncubi' et, ut Plinio placet, 'nunquis', 'nunquam', 'anceps' pro 'amceps'. 'am'

enim praepositio 'f' vel 'c' vel 'q' sequentibus in 'n' mutat 'm': 'anfractus', 'ancisus', 'anquiro', vocali vero sequente intercipit 'b': 'ambitus', 'ambesus', 'ambustus', 'ambages', nec non etiam in 'comburo combustus' idem fit. finalis dictionis subtrahitur 'm' in metro plerumque, si a vocali incipit sequens dictio, ut [*Aen.* 1.44]: 'illum exspirantem transfixo pectore flammas'. vetustissimi tamen non semper eam subtrahebant. Ennius in x *Annalium*: 'insignita fere tum milia militum octo duxit delectos, bellum tolerare potentes'.

x: *Ann.* 346 Leucatan campsant

Prisc. 10.52 (*GLK* 2.541): 'cambio' ἀμείβω ponit Charisius et eius praeteritum 'campsi', quod ἀπὸ τοῦ 'κάμπτω ἔκαμψα' Graeco esse videtur. unde et 'campso campsas' [camso camsas *pauci*] solebant vetustissimi dicere. Ennius in x (xi *GL*; *num. om. K*) 'Leucat*an* campsant'.

xi: *Ann.* 355 tum clipei resonunt et ferri stridit acumen
xiv: *Ann.* 375 litora lata sonunt

Prisc. 8.96 (*GLK* 2.445): 'sono sonas' et 'sonis'. Ennius in xi *Annalium*: 'tum clipei reson*u*nt *et* ferri stridit acumen'. Lucretius [3.156]: 'caligare oculos, sonere auris'.

Prisc. 8.37–8 (*GLK* 2.473–4): alia vero in '-ui' divisas praeteritum desinentia '-ui' in '-itum' convertunt in supino paenultima correpta: 'domui domitum', 'cubui cubitum', 'sonui sonitum', 'tonui tonitum' . . . haec tamen ipsa et secundum tertiam vetustissimi protulisse inveniuntur coniugationem, ut Ennius in xi *Annali* 'tu*m* clipei resonunt et ferri stridit acumen'; idem in xiiii (*plerique*: xiii *LZ*; viii *ed. Ascens.* 1516) 'litora lata sonunt'.

xi: *Ann.* 356 missaque per pectus dum transit striderat hasta

Prisc. 8.60 (*GLK* 2.419): a 'strido' quoque alii 'stridui', alii 'stridi' protulerunt. Ennius in *Annalium* xi: 'missaque per pectus dum transit striderat hasta'.

xii: *Ann.* 366–8 omnes mortales victores, cordibus vivis
laetantes, vino curatos somnus repente
in campo passim mollissimus perculit acris
xvi: *Ann.* 420 aestatem autumnus sequitur, post acer hiems it

Prisc. 5.17 (*GLK* 2.153): 'acer' et 'alacer' et 'saluber' et 'celeber', quamvis 'acris' et 'alacris' plerumque faciant et 'salubris' et 'celebris' feminina, in utraque tamen terminatione communis etiam generis inveniuntur prolata. Virgilius in VI [685]: 'alacris palmas utrasque tetendit'. idem in V [380]: 'ergo alacris cunctosque putans excedere palma'. Terentius in *Eunucho* [304]: 'quid tu es tristis? quidve es alacris?' Naevius in carmine *belli Punici* [33 B]: 'fames acer/augescit hostibus'. Ennius in XVI: 'aestatem autumnus sequitur, post acer hiems *it*'. idem in XII 'omnes mortales victores, cordibus vivis/laetantes, vino curatos somnus repente/in campo passim mollissimus perculit acris'.

Prisc. 6.39–40 (*GLK* 2.229–30): 'c' quoque antecedente supra dictam servant regulam, id est '-er' in '-ris' convertunt in genetivo, si sint communica vel in '-is' facientia feminina, ut 'alacer alacris', 'acer acris'. et sciendum quod in utraque terminatione utriusque generis inveniuntur haec ... Naevius in carmine *belli Punici* [33 B] 'fames acer/augescit hostibus'. Ennius in XII 'omnes mortales victores, cordibus vivis/laetantes, vino curatos somnus repente/in campo passim mollissimus perculit acris'.

Serv. *Aen.* 6.685: et sciendum antiquos et 'alacris' et 'alacer' et 'acris' et 'acer' tam de masculino quam de feminino genere dixisse. nunc masculino utrumque damus, de feminino 'alacer' et 'acer' numquam dicimus, licet Ennius dixerit 'aestatem autumnus sequitur, post acer hiems *it*'. nam deest (nam inde est *corr. Sk.*) alacer.

Explan. in Don. I 'De nomine' (*GLK* 4.491): quaeritur utrum 'acris' dicamus an 'acer'. Ennius enim dixit 'post acer hiems', item (? it', et *susp. Vahlen*) Horatius [*C.* 1.4.1] 'solvitur acris hiems'. item 'alacris' an 'alacer', Terentius [*Eun.* 304] 'quidve es[t] alacris' et Vergilius [*Aen.* 6.685] 'alacer (alacris *Verg.*) palmas utrasque tetendit'.

XIV: *Ann.* 382–3 nunc est ille dies quom gloria maxima sese
nobis ostentat, si vivimus sive morimur

Prisc. 10.8 (*GLK* 2.501): deponentia in '–rior' desinentia, 'orior' et 'morior', tam secundum tertiam quam secundum quartam coniugationem declinaverunt auctores, 'orior oreris' et 'oriris', 'morior moreris' et 'moriris'. Lucanus in IIII [275]: 'non gratis moritur, iugulo qui provocat hostem'. Ennius in XIIII *Annalium*: 'nunc est ille dies cum gloria maxima sese/nobis osten*ta*t, si vivimus sive morimur'. Terentius in *Eunucho* [432]: 'risu † emoriri omnes denique'. Virgilius in II *Aeneidos* [410–11]: 'telis/nostrorum

obruimur, oriturque miserrima caedes'. Lucilius in III [120 M]: 'conturbare animam potis est, quicumque adoritur'.

XIV: *Ann.* 385–6 infit: 'o cives, quae me fortuna fero sic
contudit indigno bello confecit acerbo . . .'
XVI: *Ann.* 410 ingenio forti dextra latus pertudit hasta
??: *Ann.* 520–1 viresque valentes
contu‹n›dit crudelis hiems

Prisc. 10.25–6 (*GLK* 2.517–18): 'n' vero ante 'do' habentia 'o' in 'i' mutant in praeterito perfecto et, si ante 'n' 'u' vel 'i' habuerint, amittunt 'n', ut 'fundo fudi', 'scindo scidi' . . . cetera vero servant 'n', ut 'pando pandi', 'defendo defendi', 'scando scandi', 'accendo accendi'. excipiuntur duplicantia principalem syllabam: 'pendo pependi', 'tendo tentendi', 'tundo tutudi' paenultima a plerisque correpta, a quibusdam autem etiam producta propter supra dictam rationem (id est ne vincatur in compositis ab eo temporibus syllabarum a praesenti praeteritum). Horatius in IIII *Carminum* correpte protulit [3.8]: 'quod regum tumidas contŭderit minas'; est enim 'contuderit' choriambus. idem in III [6.10]: 'non auspicatos contŭdit impetus/nostris'; est enim dactylus 'contudit'. Virgilius in VIII [664–5]: 'et lapsa ancilia caelo extŭderat'. solent autem composita servare simplicium tempora: 'cădo cecĭdi', 'concĭdo concĭdi', paenultima correpta; 'caedo cecīdi' 'concīdo concīdi', paenultima producta. vetustissimi tamen tam producebant quam corripiebant supra dicti verbi [id est 'tutudi'] paenultimam. Ennius in XIIII: 'infit: o cives, quae me fortuna fero sic/contŭdit indigno bello confecit acerbo'. ecce hic corripuit. idem in XVI: 'ingenio forti dextra latus pertŭdit hasta'. idem in *Annalibus* 'viresque valentes/contūdit crudelis hiems'. hic produxit paenultimam.

XV: *Ann.* 389–90 occumbunt multi letum ferroque lapique
aut intra muros aut extra praecipe casu

Prisc. 6.95 (*GLK* 2.281): in '–bs' vel '–ms' vel '–ps' desinentia interposita 'i' faciunt genetivum, ut 'urbs urbis', 'hiems hiemis', 'inops inopis'. notandum hic quoque quod, si 'e' ante '–ps' vel '–bs' sit et non sint monosyllaba, mutatur 'e' in 'i', ut 'princeps principis', 'municeps municipis', 'caelebs caelibis'. A capite solum composita ablata 's' et mutata 'e' in 'i' et addita '–itis' faciunt genetivum, ut 'anceps ancipitis', 'praeceps praecipitis', 'biceps bicipitis'. antiqui tamen 'ancipes' et 'praecipes' et 'bicipes' proferebant in

nominativo, et sic secundum analogiam sequebatur genetivus 'ancipes ancipitis', ut 'sospes sospitis'. Plautus in *Commorientibus* [1 Mo.]: 'saliam in puteum praecipes'. idem in *Rudente* [1158]: 'post altrinsecus est securicula ancipes, itidem aurea'. idem tamen vetustissimi etiam 'praecipis' genetivum, qui a nominativo 'praeceps' est, secundum analogiam nominativi protulerunt. Laevius in *Inone* (*L. Mueller*: *Inoe* BDGL: *Ione* cod. Vossii) [12 C]: 'seque in alta maria praecipem impos, aegra sanitatis ‹misit (Courtney)› herois'. Ennius in XV *Annali*: 'occumbunt multi letum ferroque lapique aut intra muros aut extra praecipe casu'.

Whence: Ars Anon. Bern. (*GLK* 8.122): antiqui 'ancipes' 'praecipes' 'bicipes' nominativo singulari declinabant et alio modo dicebant 'praeceps praecipis'. Ennius 'praecipe casu'; sic etiam vetustissimi 'supellectis' proferebant a nominativo.

Prisc. 6.65–6 (*GLK* 2.250): alia vero omnia eiusdem terminationis correptae similem habent genetivum nominativo, ut 'hic collus huius collis', 'haec puppĭs huius puppis', 'hic' et 'haec suavĭs huius suavis' 'hic' et 'haec civĭs huius civis'. excipiuntur 'hec lapĭs huius lapidis. vetustissimi tamen etiam 'huius lapis' protulerunt. Ennius in XV (V *B*) *Annali* 'occumbunt multi letum ferroque lapique'. 'hic sanguĭs huius sanguinis', quod veteres 'hoc sanguen' dixerunt. Cicero in *Hortensio* [102 G]: 'ut ait Ennius, 'refugiat timido sanguen atque exalbescat metu [*Alcmeo* 20 J]'.' idem in II *Annali* [1: 108 Sk.]: 'o genitor, o sanguen dis oriundum'.

XV: *Ann.* 399–400 arcus ubi aspicitur, mortalibus quae perhibetur
‹Iris›

Prisc. 6.74 (*GLK* 2.258–9): alia omnia eiusdem generis [i.e. masculini] Latina in '–us' desinentia secundae sunt declinationis, ut 'hic Virgilius huius Virgilii', 'somnus somni', 'lacertus lacerti', 'numerus numeri', 'sanctus sancti', 'ventus venti', 'cibus cibi', quamvis et 'huius cibus' antiqui protulisse inveniuntur. Plautus in *Captivis* [826]: 'tantus ventri commeatus meo adest in portu cibus'. excipitur 'arcus', quod differentiae causa quidam tam secundae quam quartae protulerunt. de caelesti enim [id est de Iride] Cicero dicens in III *De deorum natura* [51]: 'cur autem arci species non in deorum numero reponatur?' invenitur tamen apud veteres etiam feminini generis, secundum quod bene quartae est declinationis. Ennius in XV *Annali*: 'arcus ubi aspici*tur* mortalibus quae perhib*et*ur'.

XVII: *Ann.* 430 dux ipse vias

Prisc. 6.6 (*GLK* 2.199): eiusdem [id est primae] declinationis femininorum genetivum etiam in '–as' more Graeco solebant antiquissimi terminare, unde adhuc 'paterfamilias et 'materfamilias' solemus dicere et frequens hoc habet usus. Livius in *Odyssia* [14 W]: 'atque escas habemus mentionem', 'escas' pro 'escae'. ibidem [30 W]: 'nam divi Monetas filia docuit', 'Monetas' pro 'Monetae'. in eodem [27 W]: 'Mercurius cumque eo filius Latonas' pro 'Latonae'. Naevius in carmine *belli Punici* I [19 B]: 'inerant signa expressa, quo modo Titani,/bicorpores gigantes magnique Atlantes,/Rhuncus ac Purpureus, filii Terras' pro 'Terrae'. in eodem [20 B]: 'ei venit in mentem hominum fortunas' pro 'fortunae'. Ennius in XVII *Annali*: 'dux ipse vias' pro 'viae'. Cicero in IIII *Verrinarum* [2.2.136]: 'liberos, matres familias, bona fortunasque omnes'. dicitur tamen et 'pater familiae' et 'patres familiae' et 'familiarum' et 'familis'. Marcus Brutus *De Officiis*: 'itaque patres familiae domini sumus'. Sallustius in *Catilinario* [43.2]: 'sed filii familiarum, quorum e nobilitate maxima pars erat, parentes interficerent'. Cicero in *Frumentaria* [*Verr.* 2.3.183]: 'itaque ex his scribis, qui digni sunt illo ordine, patribus familiis, viris bonis atque honestis, percontamini . . .'.

Whence: Ars. Anon. Bern. (*GLK* 8.94):[78] *see Appendix Table A5.15 on Atilius Fortunatianus for* Ann. *31,* pp. 449–50.

?1: *Ann.* 444 o genitor noster, Saturnie, maxime divom

Prisc. 17.200–1 (*GLK* 3.205): tertia vero possessiva, etsi naturam habeat ut per vocativum dici possit, ut praedictum est: possumus enim etiam ad alienam possessionem dirigere sermonem, ut 'o genitor noster Saturn*ie* maxime divum' et 'Evandrie fili' vel 'Telamonie Aiax'; itaque quamvis quantum ad ipsam rerum naturam recte videatur posse dici 'o sue fili Evandri' et 'o sua uxor Evandri', ut si dicam 'Evandrie fili' et 'Evandria uxor', cum in hoc duae tertiae intellegantur personae possessoris et possessionis: usus tamen deficit, quomodo etiam apud Graecos teste Apollonio σφέτερε, cum rationabiliter possit dici, in usu tamen non invenitur. de hoc enim ἐν τῷ περὶ συντάξεως tertio clarius tractat.

?1: *Ann.* 445 optima caelicolum, Saturnia, magna dearum

[78] More of this passage is quoted under Atilius Fortunatianus, the principal source for *Ann.* 31, which the *Ars Anon. Bern.* also cites, misattributing it to Vergil.

Prisc. 17.166–7 (*GLK* 3.192): nec solum per genera et personas et numeros et casus et tempora, quae maxime declinabilibus accidunt, de quibus supra ostendimus, solent auctores variare figuras, sed etiam per omnia unicuique partium orationis accidentia, ut puta nomini accidunt species, genus, numerus, figura, casus. per eos igitur quinque modos inveniuntur variationibus, id est ἀλλοιότησιν, usi auctores. per species ut Ennius (*nomen tradit solus Vindob. S, addit e correctura Paris. R* [Sk.]): 'optima caelicolum, Saturnia, magna dearum'. 'magna' dixit pro 'maxima', positivum pro superlativo, cum aptissime superius 'optima caelicolum' dixisset. et Virgilius *Aeneidis* I [228]: 'tristior et lacrimis oculos suffusa nitentes', 'tristior' pro 'subtristis'. Homerus [*Il.* 2.701]: 'τόν δ' ἔκτανε Δάρδανος ἀνήρ', 'Dardanus' pro 'Dardanius', primitivum pro derivativo, unde Virgilius quoque in IIII *Aeneidis* [661]: 'hauriat hunc oculis ignem crudelis ab alto/Dardanus', et in II [618]: 'ipse deos in Dardana suscitat arma', pro 'Dardania'; simile huic est 'Romulus populus' et 'Romula gens' pro 'Romuleus' et Romulea'.

?VII: *Ann.* 468 et detondit agros laetos atque oppida cepit

Prisc. 8.46 (*GLK* 2.482): 'detondeo detondi'. vetustissimi tamen etiam 'detotondi' protulerunt. Ennius in *Annalibus*: 'et detondit [detotondit *fere omnes*] agros laetos atque oppida cepit'. at Varro in *Magno Talento* [246 A]: 'detotonderat forcipibus †vitariferis (vitiarium feris *Haupt*)'.

??: *Ann.* 491 exin per terras postquam celerissimus rumor

Prisc. 7.57 (*GLK* 2.334–5): 'hic' et 'haec celer' vel 'celeris' et 'hoc celere' 'ab hoc' et 'ab hac celeri'. Lucanus in I [662]: 'motuque celer Cyllenius haeret'. M. Cato *de re militari* [13 Iord.]: 'satis celeris sis in tempore'. Caecilius in *Epistathmo* [33 R]: 'si properas, escende huc meam navem, ita celeris est'. ex quo 'celerissimus' pro 'celerrimus' superlativum protulerunt. Cn. Matius in *Iliade* [4 C]: 'celerissimus advolat Hector'. Ennius in *Annalibus*: 'exin per terras postquam celerissimus rumor'. Livius in *Odissia* [43–4 W]: 'at celer hasta volans perrumpit pectora ferro'; unde superlativum Virgilius in XII [507]: 'et qua fata celerrima crudum'. Terentius in *Phormione* [179]: '† nullus es, Geta, nisi iam aliquod consilium celere reppereris'. Virgilius in III [243]: 'celerique fuga sub sidera lapsae'. idem in V [211]: 'agmine remorum celeri ventisque vocatis'. Lucanus in I [629]: 'et celeri venas movet improba pulsu'.

??: *Ann.* 571 interea fugit albus iubar Hyperionis cursum

Prisc. 5.44 (*GLK* 2.170): 'iubar' quoque tam masculinum quam neutrum proferebant. Ennius in *Annalibus*: 'interea fugit albus iubar Hyperionis cursum'. Calvus in *Epithalamio* [5 C]: 'hesperium ante iubar quatiens'. 'hoc iubar' dixit: si enim esset masculinum vel femininum, 'iubarem' dixisset.

??: *Ann.* 573 hos pestis necuit, pars occidit illa duellis

Prisc. 9.34 (*GLK* 2.470): supra dictis addunt quidam 'neco necavi' vel 'necui', sicut et Probus et Charisius et Diomedes, ideo quod participium praeteriti passivum et 'necatus' a 'necavi' et 'nectus' a 'necui' facit. Horatius in 1 *Epistularum* [7.87]: 'spem mentita seges, bos est enectus arando'. Livius *Ab Urbe Condita* XXI [40]: 'fame, frigore, illuvie, squalore enecti'. Cicero *Tusculanarum* I [10]: 'enectus siti Tantalus'. sed proprie 'necatus' ferro, 'nectus' vero alia vi peremptus dicitur. Ennius 'hos pestis necuit, pars occidit illa duellis'.

cf. Charis. 3.1 'De perfectis ordinum quattuor' (*GLK* 1.243): in primo ordine verborum perfectum tempus formae mutationem capit modis quattuor. primo, cum maior pars ita cadet nulla littera duce consonante, velut 'aro aras aravi', 'probo probas probavi', 'nota notas notavi'. in his vero decidit 'a' littera, velut 'sono sonas sonui', non 'sonavi'; 'tono tonas tonui'; Maro libro II [693] 'intonuit laevum'; 'frico fricas fricui' τρίβω, 'veto vetas vetui', 'seco secas secui', 'plico plicas plicui', 'domo domas domui', 'mico micas micui', 'neco necas necui'; et adiectis similiter praepositionibus, velut 'explico', 'conplico', 'perplico';

Diom. 1 'De speciebus temporis praeteriti perfecti' (*GLK* 1.364–6): [364] coniugationis primae temporis perfecti formae sunt quattuor, quae mutationem capiunt in hunc modum. *prima est* . . . [365] secunda forma est quae licentia antiquitatis vel consuetudinis 'a' libentius [**366**] vitat et in 'i' litteram puram desinit nulla duce consonante, ut est 'sono sonui', 'crepo crepui', 'tono tonui', 'frico fricui', 'veto vetui', 'seco secui', 'increpo increpui', 'plico plicui', 'cubo cubui', 'domo domui', 'mico micui', 'neco necui', quasi 'crepui'; verum tamen et 'necavi' legimus, ut 'nectus necatus', et hoc differre malunt, 'necui' quasi suffocavi, 'necavi' ferro occidi, unde 'necem' caedem appellamus; et adiectis praepositionibus 'intono intonui', 'explico explicui', 'conplico conplicui', 'replico replicui'.

TABLE A5.31: SCHOLIA BEMBINA (c. 4/5 – 6 CE); ed. J.F. Mountford (1934).

For the complex process by which these scholia were, over the course of generations, added to the Codex Bembinus of Terence, starting from soon after the time it came into existence in *c.* 4 or *c.* 5, see Zetzel 1975: 335–54 (with further bibliography). The scholia yield a single line attributed to Ennius (and subject to slight, necessary emendation by editors; see Flores *et al.* 2009: 408–11, as also for the line's full doxography). This line does not recur elsewhere in the record, neither do the scholia have anything further to contribute. Mountford (p. 126, n. 10) speculates that some of the quotations of Republican authors preserved by the scholia may ultimately derive from Asper. (His note represents a limitation of Wessner's more hazardous claim that the majority of the Scholia Bembina are ultimately to be attributed to Asper.)

??: *Ann.* 578 flamma loci postquam concussa est turbine saevo

Schol. Bemb. Ter. *Heaut.* 257 (p. 60 Mountford) INTEREA LOCI: 'loci' parhelcon; nam 'loci' omni significationi addi solet. Ennius: 'flamma loci postquam concussa *est* turbine (preturbine *codd.*) saevo'.[79]

[79] Mountford (*loc. cit.*) reads the scholion as implying that its source cites the fragment as an instance of the construction of *loci* with *postquam*. Editors who adopt the emendation here printed (which originates in Faernus' *c.* 16 work on Terence; see Flores *et al.* 2009: 409) disagree.

TABLE A5.32: CASSIODORUS (Magnus Aurelius Cassiodorus Senator) (c. 490–*c.* 585 CE); Herz.-Schm. § 712; O'Donnell 1979.

This single line, known only to Cassiodorus in the extant record, is the only line of the *Annales* he quotes.

??: *Ann.* 577 cum legionibus quom proficiscitur induperator

Cassiod. *De Orthographia* XI 'Ex Lucio Caecilio Vindice ista deflorata sunt' (*GLK* 7.207): 'cum' praepositio per 'c' scribenda est; 'quum' adverbium temporis, quod significat 'quando', per 'q' scribendum est discretionis causa, ut apud Ennium: 'cum legionibus quum proficiscitur i*ndu*perator'.

TABLE A5.33: *DE ULTIMIS SYLLABIS* (c. 6 CE?); *GLK* 4.219–64.

The anonymous *c.* 6 ps.-Proban grammarian (see the comments heading Appendix Table A5.18, p. 463, on the ps.-Proban commentaries on the *Eclogues* and *Georgics*) responsible for *De Ultimis Syllabis* supplies a single and corrupt fragment that appears nowhere else in the record. Despite the unpromising quotation-context (the grammarian's interest is in the length of the final *–a*), this fragment has long been elevated to status as part of the proem of the *Annales*,[80] on the basis of the apparent reminiscence in Lucretius, *DRN* 117–19, *Ennius . . ./detulit ex Helicone perenni fronde coronam/per gentes Italas hominum quae clara clueret*.[81] This reminiscence consists in the recurrence of *cluere* and the similarity in sense between Ennius' *populos* and Lucretius' *gentes* and is abetted by the striking phrase *res atque poemata nostra . . . clueb*u*nt*. The future tense that makes the phrase into a forecast of the poem's success is a sixteenth-century emendation (see Skutsch's discussion (1985: 167–9), rejecting the transmitted reading on good grounds). Lucretius is the source for the supplements *per* and *clara* (just as Lucretius has also been used to supply the alternative reading *‹perque› Italos* at the head of the fragment).[82]

1: *Ann.* 12–13 latos ‹per› populos res atque poemata nostra
‹ . . . . . clara› clueb*u*nt

<u>*De Ult. Syll.* 4.231 (*GLK* 4.231)</u>: neutro genere in casibus supra dictis [sc. nom., acc., voc.] sine ambiguitate brevis est [sc. syllaba finalis] Graecis Latinisque nominibus: per nominativum ut [Verg. *Ecl.* 8.69] 'carmina vel caelo p.', per accusativum ut [*Aen.* 8.220] 'arma manu', per vocativum [*Aen.* 2.241] 'o patria, o divom domus ‹Ilium et incluta bello moenia Dardanidum›'. Graecis etiam nominis exempla subiciamus: Ennius in primo *Annalium* (*Ilberg*: nam *codd.*)[83] 'latos ‹per› populos res atque poemata nostra ‹—clara› clueb*u*nt' (*I. Dousa, according to Merula's report*: -bant *codd., Timpanaro 1947: 33–77*). et in Vergilio [*Aen.* 12.518] 'Arcada piscosae cui circum flumina Lernae'.

[80] See Flores 2002: 26 for the doxography.

[81] Skutsch also cites Ov. *Trist.* 4.9.19 (*nostra per immensas ibunt praeconia gentes*) and Lucan 9.985–6 (*venturi me teque tegent: Pharsalia nostra/vivet, et a nullo tenebris damnabimur aevo*).

[82] For *per*, Skutsch also notices *Scen.* 366 V (attributed to the *Ambracia*), *per gentes cluebat*. For *clara*, Flores *et al.* 2002: 26 also notice Plaut. *Pseud.* 590–1, *facinora . . . quae post mihi clara et diu clueant*.

[83] '[T]he grammarian's manner of quoting makes it highly probably that *nam* is a corruption of *annali* and that the line began with *latos*' (Skutsch 1985: 167).

TABLE A5.34: ISIDORE (c. 7 CE); *Isidori Hispalensis Episcopi Etymologiarvm sive Originvm libri xx*, ed. W. M. Lindsay (2 vols.) (London 1911); *De natura rerum liber*, ed. G. Becker (Berlin 1857; repr. Amsterdam 1967); Henderson 2007; Scarcia 2008: 216–23.

Isidore is the sole or primary source for 8 quotations from the *Annales*, 7 in the *Origines*/*Etymologiae*, and 1 in the *De natura rerum*. 7 of these lines constitute a single hexameter; 1, however (*Ann.* 611), consists of only 2 words. Isidore attributes 7 of these lines to Ennius, the exception being *Ann.* 324. These 7 there is in general no means at all of placing in a particular book. Only *Ann.* 324 is placed by Skutsch: on the assumption that events were related in chronological order (and that typical reconstruction of the content of books [see Appendix Table A1.1] is roughly right), its subject-matter, the allotment of provinces to the consuls for 200 BCE, P. Sulpicius Galba and C. Aurelius Cotta, places it in Book 10. Isidore also contributes to the transmission of *Ann.* 31 (also quoted by Atilius Fortunatianus, the *Fragmentum de Metris*, Donatus, Pompeius and the Ars Anonyma Bernensis; see pp. 448–9, under Atilius), *Ann.* 104 (also quoted by Priscian, Pompeius, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium*, and others; see p. 508, under Priscian) and *Ann.* 167 (also quoted by Cicero, Quintilian, Velius Longus, Porphyrio, Diomedes, Priscian, etc.; see pp. 372–5, under Cicero).

X: *Ann.* 324 Graecia Sulpicio sorti data, Gallia Cottae

Isid. *Orig.* 1.36.3 'De schematibus': zeugma est clausula dum plures sensus uno verbo clauduntur. quae fit tribus modis. nam aut in primo aut in postremo aut in medio id verbum ponitur quod sententias iungit. in primo ut [Lucil. 139 M]: 'vertitur oenophoris fundus, sententia nobis', in medio: 'Graecia Sulpicio sorti data, Gallia Cottae', in postremo [Ter. *Andr.* 67–8]: 'namque hoc tempore/obsequium amicos, veritas odium parit'.

??: *Ann.* 505 labitur uncta carina per aequora cana celocis

Isid. *Orig.* 19.1.22 'De navibus': celoces quas Graeci κέλητας vocant, id est veloces biremes vel triremes, agiles et ad ministerium classis aptae. Ennius: 'labitur uncta carina per aequora cana celocis'.

CIL VIII suppl. 4 no. 27790 (*CLE* 2294): 'labitur uncta carina per aequora cana celocis'.

??: *Ann.* 508 dum clavom rectum teneam navemque gubernem

Isid. *Orig.* 19.2.12 'De partibus navium et armamentis': clavus est quo regitur gubernaculum. de quo Ennius: '*ut* clavum rectum teneam navemque gubernem'.

Quintil. 2.17.23–4: . . . noster orator arsque a nobis finita non sunt posita in eventu; tendit quidem ad victoriam qui dicit, sed cum bene dixit, etiam si non vincat, id quod arte continetur effecit. nam et gubernator vult salva nave in portum pervenire. si tamen tempestate fuerit abreptus, non ideo minus erit gubernator, dicetque notum illud 'dum clavum rectum teneam'.

??: *Ann.* 512 multa foro ponet et agea. longa repletur

Isid. *Orig.* 19.2.4 'De partibus navium et armamentis': agea viae sunt, loca in navi per qua ad remiges hortator accedit. de qua Ennius: 'multa foro pon*et et* ag*e*a longa replet*ur*'.[84]

cf. Paul. Fest. 9: AGEA via in navi, dicta quod in ea maxime quaeque res agi solet.[85]

??: *Ann.* 517 tonsillas apiunt, configunt litus, aduncas

Isid. *Orig.* 19.2.14 'De partibus navium et armamentis': tonsilla uncinus ferreus vel ligneus ad quem in litore defixum funes navis inligantur. de quo Ennius: 'tonsillas *a*piunt, configunt litus, aduncas'.

??: *Ann.* 558 vix solum complere cohum torroribus caeli

Isid. *Nat. rer.* 12.3: partes autem eius [sc. caeli] haec sunt: cohus axis clima cardines convexa poli hemisphaeria. cohus est quo caelum continetur. unde Ennius 'vix solum complere *cohum* t*o*rroribus caeli'. axis linea recta quae per mediam pilam caeli tendit.

cf. Paul. Fest. 34: COHUM lorum quo temo buris cum iugo conligatur, a cohibendo dictum. COHUM poetae caelum dixerunt, a chao, ex quo putabant caelum esse formatum;
Varro, *LL* 5.19: omnino e‹g›o magis puto a chao cho‹um ca›vum et hinc caelum, quoniam, ut dixi, 'hoc circum supraque quod complexu continet terram', cavum caelum. itaque dicit Androm‹ac›a [J; Androm‹ed› a

[84] See Skutsch 1985: 665–6 for discussion of the unsatisfactory text. He mentions without producing a testimonium of Osbern.

[85] Skutsch 1985: 665 cites and quotes a number of glosses on *agea* (in a variety of of spellings) and *ageator* that appear to derive either from Festus or from Isidore.

Goetz and *Schoell*] Nocti [96–7 J]: 'qu‹a›e cava caeli signitentibus conficis bigis' et Agamemno [*Iphig.* 188–9 J]: 'in altisono caeli clipeo': cavum enim clipeum; et Ennius item ad cavationem [*inc.* 319 J]: 'caeli ingentes fornices';
ibid. 134–5: instrumenta rustica quae serendi aut colendi fructus causa facta . . . sub iugo medio cavum, quod bura extrema addita oppilatur, vocatur 'coum' a cavo;
Diom. 1 'De speciebus temporis praeteriti perfect' (*GLK* 1.365): 'inchoo inchoavi': sic dicendum putat Iulius Modestus, quia sit conpositum a chao, initio rerum. sed Verrius et Flaccus in postrema syllaba adspirandum probaverunt. 'cohum' enim apud veteres mundum significat, unde subtractum incohare. Tranquillus quoque his adsentiens in libello suo plenissime edere incohata disseruit.

??: *Ann.* 572 inde patefecit radiis rota candida caelum

Isid. *Orig.* 18.36.1–3 'De equis quibus currimus': quadrigae et bigae et trigae et seiugae a numero equorum et iugo dicti. ex quibus quadrigas soli, bigas lunae, trigas inferis, seiugas Iovi, desultores Lucifero et Hespero sacraverunt . . . ideo autem rotis quadrigas currere dicunt, sive quia mundus iste circuli sui celeritate transcurrit, sive propter solem quia volubili ambitu rotat, sicut ait Ennius: 'inde patef*e*cit radiis rota candida caelum'.

??: *Ann.* 611 tetros elephantos

Isid. *Orig.* 10.270 'De vocabulis: T': (1) origo quorundam nominum, id est unde veniant, non pene omnibus patet. proinde quaedam noscendi gratia huic operi interiecimus . . . (270) 'teter' ab obscura tenebrosaque vita. 'teterrimus' pro fero nimium. 'tetrum' enim veteres pro 'fero' dixerunt, ut Ennius: 'tetros elefantos'.[86]

[86] Words (*tenuimus* and *ad inguinem*) appear after 'elephantos' in two different manuscripts, described by Skutsch 1985: 739–40. He argues that no faith should be placed in them. He also dismisses a gloss (CGL v 157.21) that resembles Isidore's text here, referring to an argument of Lindsay's.

TABLE A5.35: SERVIUS DANIELIS (by c. 8 CE); *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii* (3 vols.), eds. G. Thilo and H. Hagen (1881–1902); *Servianorum in Vergilii carmina commentariorum editionis Harvardianae*, edd. E. K. Rand *et al.* Vol. 2: *Aeneid* 1–2 (1946); Vol. 3: *Aeneid* 3–5 (1965); Barwick 1911: 106–45; Lloyd 1961: 291–341; Goold 1970: 101–17; Murgia 1974: 257–77; Zetzel 1981: 81–3; cf. Zetzel 2005: 2–9 (esp. 7), 75–8.

To the Danieline scholia on Vergil we owe 24 fragments (35 lines) transmitted by no other source. The longest of these fragments is 3 lines long. The scholia give book-numbers for only 4 of them (*Ann.* 18, assigned to Book 1; *Ann.* 223–4, assigned to Book 7; and *Ann.* 418 and 425–6, assigned to Book 16). For a further 4 fragments (5 lines), these scholia are our primary source (book-numbers provided for 2: *Ann.* 326–8, assigned to Book 10, and *Ann.* 435–6, assigned to Book 17).[87] Of the total of 28 quotations for which DS is the sole or primary source, 7 are given exclusively in the commentary on the *Georgics*, 20 exclusively in the commentary on the *Aeneid*, and 1 (*Ann.* 515–6) on both texts. (Where a line is quoted more than once on the same text, I have counted the quotation only once.) DS quotes the *Annales* most often with reference to the first book of the *Aeneid* (7 times in the case of fragments for which DS is the sole source: *Ann.* 446–7, 515–16 (also quoted on *Aen.* 11 and *G.* 1), 528, 533, 564–5; and once in the case of a fragment for which DS is the primary source, *Ann.* 555–6). The fourth book of the *Georgics* is in second place, with 4 quotations of the *Annales* for which DS is the sole source (*Ann.* 18, 223–4, 418, 425–6) and 2 for which DS is the primary source (*Ann.* 326–8, 435–6).

DS also contributes to the transmission of *Ann.* 236–7, for which the primary source is Gellius, and of which Nonius and Macrobius are also aware. These scholia give us our most accurate version of (part of) *Ann.* 95, which Macrobius, the primary source, provides as part of a 2-line fragment (*Ann.* 94–5); and, along with Quintilian, Macrobius and Diomedes, they know *Ann.* 164. Their awareness of *Ann.* 207 is evidently entirely dependent on Varro, *LL* 7.36, itself a source for this line subsidiary to Cicero. DS's mention of Varro when commenting on *Aen.* 11.306, where *Ann.* 513 is quoted (p. 535), may also be a mark of ultimate dependence on him, as also DS's shared interest with Varro in the definition and proper use of items of vocabulary (see e.g. the comments accompanying DS's quotation of

[87] Part of *Ann.* 65 is to be found at Fest. 136 and 364, at Paul. Fest. 6 and 53, and at Quintil. 1.6.12; part of *Ann.* 435–6 is to be found at Paul. Fest. 131.9; part of *Ann.* 504 is to be found at Cic. *Orat.* 157; and part of *Ann.* 555–6 is to be found at Ps.-Probus, *Ecl.* 6.31.

e.g. *Ann.* 18, 418 and 425–6, 458 and 576, 504, 515–16, 555–6). Elsewhere, DS shows itself aware of individual items of Ennian vocabulary that recur in quotations given in other sources (e.g. *mussare*, which recurs at *Ann.* 168, for which the primary source is Festus; and *flos* at *Ann.* 308, for which the primary source is Cicero).

1: *Ann.* 18 transnavit cita per teneras caliginis auras

Serv. *G.* 4.59 (hinc ubi iam emissum caveis ad sidera caeli/nare per aestatem liquidam suspexeris agmen): AESTATEM LIQUIDAM per ver serenum. DS: 'nare' pro 'volare', ut apud Ennium in primo: 'transnavit cita per teneras caliginis auras'. proprietas tamen vocis aptior est natantibus quam volantibus.

1: *Ann.* 28–29 Assaraco natus Capys optimus isque pium ex se
Anchisen generat

Serv. *G.* 3.35 (Assaraci proles demissaeque ab Ioue gentis/nomina): ASSARACI PROLES D. A. I. G. ponam, inquit, eorum statuas qui a Iove usque ad Asssaracum et ab Assaraco usque ad Augustum originem ducunt. Assaracus autem avus Anchisae, pater Capyis fuit. DS: et aliter: ex Iove et Electra, Atlantis filia, nascitur Dardanus, ex quo Erichthonius, cuius Trous, cuius Assaracus, cuius Laomedon et Capys. et Laomedontis Priamus, eius Hector et ceteri; at Capyis Anchises, cuius Aeneas, cuius Iulus, a quo Iulia gens stemmate descendit ad Caesarem. alii sic: per Assaracum Troianos dicit; nam Assaracus avus Anchisae. Ennius 'Assaraco natus Cap*y*s optimus isque pium ex se Anchisen generat'. ergo 'Assaraci (proles') Iulia familia, (quae) usque ad Augustum pervenit.

cf. DS *Aen.* 1.273, Serv. *Aen.* 6.777, DS *Aen.* 8.130: *these passages offer versions of the same genealogy, but contain no information pertaining to Ennius.*

1: *Ann.* 56 at Ilia reddita nuptum
?11: *Ann.* 452 isque dies †aut marcus† quam regna recepit

DS *Aen.* 3.333 (morte Neoptolemi regnorum reddita cessit/pars Heleno): REDDITA more veteri pro 'data' accipiendum est; 're–' ergo abundat. Ennius *Annalibus*: 'at Il*i*a reddita nupt*u*m', et alibi: 'isque dies †aut marcus† quam regna recepit' pro 'accepit'; aut 'reddita' quod Heleno debebatur imperium.

1: *Ann.* 61–2 cetera quos peperisti
ne cures

Serv. *Aen.* 9.653 (sit satis, Aenide, telis impune Numanum/oppetiisse tuis. primam hanc tibi magnus Apollo/concedit laudem et paribus non inuidet armis;/cetera parce, puer, bello; *Aen.* 9.652–6):[88] CETERA deinceps: et est adverbium. DS: CETERA] id est in ceterum. est autem Ennianum: 'cetera quos peperisti ne cures'.

1: *Ann.* 65 lupus femina feta repente

Serv. *Aen.* 2.355 (inde, lupi ceu/raptores atra in nebula, quos improba uentris/exegit caecos rabies catulique relicti/faucibus exspectant siccis): LUPI CEU hoc ad ferocitatem pertinet, 'nebula' ad noctem, 'catuli' ad liberos coniugesque. DS: LUPI CEU] ordo [tamen] est 'ceu lupi'. et hoc dictum est ab exemplo. sane apud veteres 'lupus' promiscuum erat, ut Ennius: 'lupus femina f*e*ta repente'. et bene belli negotium lupo comparavit, qui est in tutela Martis, dei bellici.

Fest. 364: 'RECTO FRONTE ceteros sequi si norit'. Cato in dissertatione consulatus [*Orat. Rel.* 1.25 Iord.]. antiquae id consuetudinis fuit, ut cum ait Ennius quoque 'a stirpe supremo' [*Ann.* 166] et 'Ilia dia nepos' [*Ann.* 60] et 'lupus feta' et 'nulla metus' [*Ann.* 562]. etiam in commentariis sacrorum pontificalium frequenter est hic ovis et haec agnus ac porcus. quae non ut vitia sed ut antiquam consuetudinem testantia debemus accipere.

cf. Fest. 136: *See Appendix Table A5.16 on Nonius for* Ann. *359–60* (p. 457). Paul. Fest. 53: *See Appendix Table A5.16 on Nonius for* Ann. *562* (p. 460). Paul. Fest. 6: AGNUS ex Graeco ἀμνός deducitur, quod nomen apud maiores communis erat generis, sicut et 'lupus', quod venit ex Graeco λύκος.

Quintil. 1.6.12: sed meminerimus non per omnia duci analogiae posse rationem, cum et sibi ipsa plurimis in locis repugnet. quaedam sine dubio conantur eruditi defendere, ut, cum deprensum est 'lepus' et 'lupus' similia positione quantum casibus numerisque dissentiant, ita respondent non esse paria quia 'lepus' epicoenon sit, 'lupus' masculinum, quamquam Varro in eo libro quo initia Romanae urbis enarrat 'lupum feminam' dicit, Ennium Pictoremque Fabium secutus [cf. Di. Hal. 1.79.6].

[88] Where the modern line-numbers differ from the ones Servius and DS have, I have given the modern number inside the brackets.

II: *Ann.* 121 quianam legiones caedimus ferro

Serv. *Aen.* 10.6 (caelicolae magni, quianam sententia uobis/uersa retro tantumque animis certatis iniquis?): . . . QUIANAM cur DS: quare Serv: Ennianus sermo est. DS: 'quianam legiones caedimus ferro?'

cf. Schol. Veron. *Aen.* 10.6 (Asper): ἀρχαισμός; iam in quinto notatur, ubi dixit [5.13] 'heu quianam tanti cinxerunt aethera nimbi?'

VII: *Ann.* 223–4 longique cupressi
stant rectis foliis et amaro corpore buxum

DS *G.* 2.449: NEC TILIAE LEVES AUT TORNO RASILE BUXUM 'buxum' lignum, non arborem dicit, quamvis Ennii exemplo et arborem potuerit dicere neutro genere; ille enim sic in septimo: 'longique cupressi stant rectis foliis et amaro corpore buxum'.

IX: *Ann.* 299 Livius inde redit magno mactatus triumpho

Serv. *Aen.* 9.641 (macte noua uirtute, puer, sic itur ad astra): MACTE magis aucte, adfecte gloria. et est sermo tractus a sacris: quotiens enim aut tus aut vinum super victimam fundebatur, dicebant 'mactus est taurus vino vel ture', hoc est cumulata est hostia et magis aucta. DS: 'macte' ergo pro 'mactus esto', vocativum pro nominativo posuit, ut Persius [3.28–9] 'stemmate quod Tusco ramum millesime ducis/censoremue tuum uel quod trabeate salutas mactus' pro 'millesimus' et 'trabeatus' et Vergilius [*Aen.* 3.382] 'vicinosque, ignare, paras inuadere portus' pro 'ignarus', et alibi [*Aen.* 7.685] 'quos Amasene pater' pro 'Amasenus': sic ergo et 'macte' pro 'mactus'. quod autem 'esto' non addidit, ab antiquitate descivit; nam veteres 'macte esto' dicebant. sed hoc secutus suam consuetudinem fecit: nam et alibi [*Aen.* 7.11] 'dives inaccessos ubi Solis filia lucos' et iterum [*Aen.* 4.263] 'dives quae munera Dido'. praetermisit cuius rei dives, cum veteres 'dives illius rei dicerent', quod ipse alibi [*G.* 2.468] 'dives opum variarum' et [9.26] 'dives pictai vestis et auri'. item cum veteres natalem diem vel locum vel tempus dicerent, ut Horatius [*C.* 1.21.10] 'natalemque, mares, Delon Apollinis' et Plautus in *Pseudolo* [179] 'natalem hunc mihi diem scitis esse', Vergilius his omissis dixit [*Ecl.* 3.76] 'Phyllida mitte mihi, meus est natalis, Iolla'. ergo et hic ita subtraxit; nam integrum est 'macte esto nova virtute puer'. 'mactus' autem apud veteres etiam 'mactatus' dicebatur, ut Ennius: 'Livius inde redit magn*o* mactatus triumpho'. et Lucilius lib. v. [225 M]

'macte, inquam, virtute simulque his versibus esto', et in pontificalibus sacrificantes dicebant deo 'macte hoc vino inferio esto'.

X: *Ann.* 326–8	aspectabat virtutem legionis suai expectans si mussaret [dubitaret] quae denique pausa pugnandi fieret aut duri ‹finis› laboris
XVII: *Ann.* 435–6	noenu' decet mussare bonos qui facta labore enixi † militiam peperere

DS *G.* 4.188 (fit sonitus, mussantque oras et limina circum): FIT SONITUS MUSSANTQUE ORAS 'mussant' hic murmurant: quae vox ponitur et in tacendi significatione, ut apud Ennium in XVII: '*non possunt* mussare bon*i* qui fact*a* labore enixi † militia*m* peperere', interdum et pro 'dubitare' ut 'mussat rex ipse Latinus quos generos vocet' [*Aen.* 12.657–8]. 'mussant' autem murmurant. Ennius in X sic ait: 'aspectabat virtutem legionis *suai ex*pectans si mussaret [dubitaret] quae denique *p*aus*a* pugnandi fieret aut duri ‹finis› labor*is*'.

Paul. Fest. 131: MUSSARE murmurare. Ennius 'in occulto mussabat' [*Ann.* 168]. vulgo vero pro 'tacere' dicitur, ut idem Ennius: 'non decet mussare bonos'.

Serv. *Aen.* 12.657 (mussat rex ipse Latinus/quos generos uocet): MUSSAT modo dubitat. DS: et cunctatur rex ipse, in quo summa rerum est. veteres 'mussat' pro 'timet': Ennius 'mussare' pro 'tacere' posuit. Clodius Tuscus [1.1 Fun.]: 'mussare' est ex Graeco, conprimere oculos: Graeci μῦσαι dicunt.

XIII: *Ann.* 370 salsas lamas

Serv. *Aen.* 2.173 (salsusque per artus sudor iit): . . . SALSUS SUDOR bene addidit 'salsus', ut significaret laborem futurum, ne forte alter in simulacro (DS: quilibet) umor intellegeretur. DS: SALSUS SUDOR] indicium commiti numinis fuisse dicitur. Probo sane displicet 'salsus sudor' et supervacue positum videtur. hoc autem Ennius de lamis dixit.

cf. Schol. Veron. *ibid.*: – – S]UDOR IIT hoc epitheton demonstrativum quo totius corporis sucus etiam gustu potuerit agnosci: '–que laborando manat de corpore sudor' [cf. Macr. *Sat.* 6.1.50: 'tum gelidus toto manabat corpore sudor' (*Aen.* 3.175). Ennius in sexto decimo: 'tunc timido manat ex omni corpore sudor' (*Ann.* 417)]. Probus malo epitheto putat usum poetam, critici vero naturalia [epitheta a poetis] nusquam inhoneste putant locari.

XVI: *Ann.* 418 matronae moeros complent spectare faventes
XVI: *Ann.* 425–6 hic insidiantes vigilant, partim requiescunt
succincti gladiis, sub scutis, ore faventes

DS *G.* 1.18 (adsis, o Tegeaee, fauens): . . . FAVENS pro 'volens' et per hoc propitius; 'favere' enim veteres etiam 'velle' dixerunt. Ennius: 'matronae moeros complent spectare faventes'. nonnumquam favere et pro 'tacere' ponitur, ut idem Ennius 'ore faventes' et Vergilius in quinto [71] 'ore favete omnes'.

DS *G.* 4.230 (prius haustu sparsus aquarum/ora fove fumosque manu praetende sequaces): ORE FAVE[89] FUMOSQUE MANU quia odores malos oderunt: ideo 'prius haustu sparsus aquarum'. 'ore fave' cum religione ac silentio accede. in XVI Ennius: 'hic insidiantes vigilant, partim requiescunt *succin*cti gladiis, sub scutis, ore faventes', id est volentes. ponitur eadem vox et pro velle apud eundem Ennium in XVI (XIII *W*) 'matronae melos complent spectare faventes', id est volentes.

cf. Paul. Fest. 78.15: FAVENTIA bonam ominationem significat. nam praecones clamantes populum sacrificiis favere iubent. 'favere' enim est bona fari, at veteres poetae pro 'silere' usi sunt 'favere'.

?I: *Ann.* 446–7 Iuppiter hic risit tempestatesque serenae
riserunt omnes risu Iovis omnipotentis

Serv. *Aen.* 1.254 (olli subridens hominum sator atque deorum): SUBRIDENS laetum ostendit Iovem et talem qualis esse solet cum facit serenum; poetarum enim est elementorum habitum dare numinibus, ut supra de Neptuno dictum est. DS: Ennius 'Iuppiter hic risit tempestatesque serenae riserunt omnes risu Iovis omnipotentis'. aut certe risit intellegens Iunonis dolos oblique accusari a Venere, ut est 'quae te, genitor, sententia vertit' [*Aen.* 1.237] et 'unius ob iram prodimur' [*Aen.* 1.251–2], sicut alibi [*Aen.* 4.128] 'atque dolis risit Cytherea repertis'.

?VII: *Ann.* 458 neque me decet hanc carinantibus edere chartis
??: *Ann.* 576 contra carinantes verba atque obscena profatus

[89] Despite DS here and ancient support for 'ore fave', 'ora fove' is the established reading today; see Mynors 1986: 287.

Serv. *Aen.* 8.361 (passimque armenta uidebant/Romanoque foro et lautis mugire Carinis): . . . LAUTIS MUGIRE CARINIS carinae sunt aedificia facta in carinarum modum, quae erant circa templum Telluris. 'lautas' autem dixit aut propter elegantiam aedificiorum, aut proper Augustum, qui natus est in curiis veteribus et nutritus in lautis carinis. DS: alii dicunt Carinas montem nominatum, quod ager suburbanus ante portam carus erat. alii lauta loca legatorum, quae in ea regione instructa accipere consuerant. alii quod ibi Sabini nobiles habitaverint, quorum genus invidere et carinare solebat. carinare autem est obtrectare. Ennius: 'contra carinantes verba atque obscena profatus'; alibi 'neque me decet hanc carinantibus edere chartis'. alii quod Romani Sabinis instantibus fugientes, eruptione aquae ferventis et ipsi liberati et hostes ab insequendo repressi (sint. aut) quia calida aqua lavandis vulneribus apta fuit, locus lautulus appellatus est.

cf. Paul. Fest. 41: CARINANTES probra obiectantes, a carina dicti, quae est infima pars navis; sic illi sortis infimae.
Gloss. Abstr. KA 16 (*CGL* VI 183): KARINANTES 'inludentes' vel 'inridentes'.

?XVI: *Ann.* 488–9 rex deinde citatus
convellit sese

Serv. *Aen.* 11.19 (arma parate, animis et spe praesumite bellum,/ne qua mora ignaros, ubi primum uellere signa/adnuerint superi pubemque educere castris,/impediat): . . . VELLERE SIGNA ADNUERIT SUPERI ne in mora sitis, cum captatis auguriis ad bellum exire coeperimus. 'vellere' autem proprie dixit, quia Romana signa figebantur in castris, et cum ad bellum eundum fuisset, captatis auguriis avellebantur e terra: nam alibi ea figi non licebat. sed in auguria etiam hoc habebatur, si avellentem facile sequerentur, adeo ut cum filio in Orodis bello sit Crassus occisus, qui iturus ad proelium avellere signa vix potuit. DS: quod etiam Flaminio contigit, qui cum imperasset signa tolli eaque non possent moveri, effosso solo in quo erant fixa, vi magna extrahi praecepit, et infeliciter apud Trasimennum pugnavit. alii 'vellere' movere accipiunt. Ennius: 'rex deinde citatus convellit sese', et in sacris 'convelli mensa' dicitur cum tollitur.

??: *Ann.* 504 idem campus habet textrinum navibus longis

DS *Aen.* 11.326 (bis denas Italo texamus robore naves): . . . TEXAMUS quidam 'texamus' proprie dictum tradunt, quia loca in quibus naves fiunt

Graece 'ναυπήγια', Latine 'textrina' dici. Ennius dicit: 'idem campus habet textrinum navibus longis'. navalia enim non esse ναυπήγια sed νεώρια.

Cic. *Orat.* 157: quid, quod sic loqui, 'nosse, iudicasse' vetant, 'novisse' iubent et 'iudicavisse'? quasi vero nesciamus in hoc genere et plenum verbum recte dici et imminutum usitate. itaque utrumque Terentius [*Phorm.* 384]: 'eho, tu cognatum[90] tuum non noras?' post idem [*ibid.* 390]: 'Stilponem, inquam, noveras?' 'siet' plenum est, 'sit' imminutum; licet utare utroque. ibidem:[91] 'quam cara sint, quae post carenda intellegunt,/quamque attinendi magni dominatus sient'. nec vero reprehenderim: 'scripsere alii rem' [*Ann.* 206]; [et] 'scripserunt' esse verius sentio, sed consuetudini auribus indulgenti libenter obsequor. 'idem campus habet' inquit Ennius, et in templis 'eidem probavit'. at 'isdem' erat verius, nec tamen 'eisdem' ut opimius. male sonabat 'isdem'. impetratum est a consuetudine, ut peccare suavitatis causa liceret. et 'postmeridianas quadrigas' quam 'postmeridianas quadriiugas' libentius dixerim et 'mehercule' quam 'mehercules'. 'non scire' quidem barbarum iam videtur, 'nescire' dulcius. ipsum 'meridiem', cur non 'medidiem'? credo, quod erat insuavius.

??: *Ann.* 507 haud temere est quod tu tristi cum corde gubernas
??: *Ann.* 568 quo tam temere itis

Serv. *Aen.* 9.327 (tris iuxta famulos temere inter tela iacentis/armigerumque Remi premit, *Aen.* 9.329–30): TEMERE passim, fortuito, neglegenter. DS: vel humi vel periculose, ut in consuetudine solemus dicere 'temerarios homines'. 'temere' significat et 'facile': Plautus [*Bacch.* 85]: 'magnus est hic fluvius, non hac temere transiri potest'.[92] significat et 'subito': Ennius 'quo[d] tam temere itis'. citat e Catone Charisius [*Haupt*: citate catomecariis *vel* catomerarariis *codd.*]'.[93] significat sine causa. Ennius '*h*aud temere est quod tu tristi cum corde gubernas'.

??: *Ann.* 513 qui vincit non est victor nisi victus fatetur

[90] Our texts have *sobrinum*.
[91] Sandys 1885: 173, on *ibidem*, notes that these lines fail to appear in any extant manuscript of Terence. Ribbeck places them among the *incerta* of Roman tragedy (*frg. trg. inc. inc.* 194–5 R).
[92] Our texts have *rapidus . . . potest*, as quoted by Charisius in the note below.
[93] Cf. Charis. 2.13 'De adverbio' (*GLK* 1.221): 'temere' pro 'facile' Plautus in *Bacchidibus*: 'rapidus fluvius est hic, non hac temere transiri potest'. Cato *De consulatu suo* [*Orat. Rel.* 1.11 Iord.]: 'si cuperent hostes fieri, temere fieri nunc possent'.

Serv. *Aen.* 11.305 (bellum importunum, ciues, cum gente deorum/inuictisque uiris gerimus, quos nulla fatigant/proelia nec uicti possunt absistere ferro; 304–6): INVICTISQUE VIRIS GERIMUS atqui supra legimus [9.599] 'bis capti Phryges'. sed 'invictis' adeo dicit quia sequitur 'nec victi possunt absistere ferro'. 'possunt' autem 'absistere' mire ait, ac si diceret: etiam si velint, eos a bellis discedere natura non patitur. DS: Ennius 'qui vi*n*cit non est victor nisi victus fatetur'. Varro et ceteri invictos dicunt Troianos quia per insidias oppressi sunt. illos enim 'vinci' affirmant qui se dedunt hostibus.

??: *Ann.* 515–16 ratibusque fremebat
imber Neptuni

Serv. *Aen.* 1.123 (laxis laterum compagibus omnes/accipiunt inimicum imbrem rimisque fatiscunt): IMBREM imber dicitur umor omnis ut Lucretius [1.715]: 'ex igni terra atque anima nascuntur et imbri', id est umore. DS: IMBREM] veteres enim omnem aquam 'imbrem' dicebant. Ennius 'imbrem' pro 'aqua marina': 'ratibusque fremebat imber Neptuni'.

DS *Aen.* 11.299 (uicinaeque fremunt ripae crepitantibus undis): FREMUNT RIPAE antiqui aquae sonitus 'fremitus' dicebant. Ennius: 'ratibusque fremebat imber Neptuni'.

DS *G.* 1.12 (tuque o, cui prima frementem/fudit equum magno tellus percussa tridenti,/Neptune): CUI PRIMA F. F. E. M. T. P. T. antiquissimi libri 'fudit aquam' plerique habuerunt, quoniam Neptunus fluminibus et fontibus et aquis omnibus praeest, ut ipse docet [*G.* 4.29]: 'aut praeceps Neptuno immerserit Eurus'; sed melius 'equum' propter armenta. in Corn. 'equm', in authentico 'aquam', ipsius manu 'equm'. Serv.: fabula talis est: cum Neptunus et Minerva de Athenarum nomine contenderent, placuit diis, ut eius nomine civitas appellaretur, qui munus melius mortalibus obtulisset. tunc Neptunus percusso litore equum, animal bellis aptum, produxit; Minerva iacta hasta olivam creavit, quae res est melior conprobata et pacis insigne. ut autem modo Neptunum invocet, causa eius muneris facit, quia de eius est dicturus in tertio: alioquin incongruum est, si de agricultura locuturus numen invocet maris. equum autem a Neptuno progenitum alii Scythium, alii Scyronem, alii Arionem dicunt fuisse nominatum. et ideo dicitur equum invenisse, quia velos est eius numen et mobile, sicut mare: unde etiam Castor et Pollux, quia eorum velocissimae stellae sunt, equos in tutela habere dicuntur. DS: sane hunc equum

cuiuscumque nominis alii apud Arcadiam, alii in Thessalia editum dicunt, in qua etiam montem altissimum ostendunt, ubi primum equus visus sit, in tantum, ut ob hanc causam a Thessalis Neptuno equestre certamen memorent institutum: unde apud Graecos ἵππιος Ποσειδῶν, a nobis equester Neptunus. alii hanc eandem de equo opinionem varie adserunt: nam primum equum et mox pullum equinum matre editum tradunt. quidam marem magis pullum initio editum volunt. nonnulli Saturno, cum suos filios devoraret, pro Neptuno equum oblatum devorandum tradunt: unde Illyricos quotannis ritu sacrorum equum solere aquis inmergere; hoc autem ideo, quod Saturnus umoris totius et frigoris deus sit. 'prima' autem multi pro 'olim' accipiunt, ut 'prima quod ad Troiam p. c. g. A.' [*Aen.* 1.24]. alii 'prima' ideo, quod post Scythium Arionem genuit. nonnulli vero ob hoc 'cui prima frementem fudit aquam' legunt, quod veteres murmura aquae 'fremitum' dicebant. Ennius 'ager oppletus imbrium fremitu' [*frg. trag. inc.* 394 J] et denuo 'ratibusque fremebat imber Neptuni', Vergilius in XI [299]: 'vicinaeque fremunt ripae c. u.'. ergo 'prima' pro 'primum', quia et Pegaso fontem in Boeotia icta eius ungula fudit: aut 'prima tellus', id est litus, ut 'primaque vetant considere terra' [*Aen.* 1.541].

??: *Ann.* 528 leves sequuntur in hastis

Serv. *Aen.* 5.37 (accurrit Acestes horridus in iaculis et pelle Libystidos ursae): HORRIDUS terribilis. DS: IN IACULIS in hastis. Ennius: 'levesque secuntur in hastis'.

??: *Ann.* 533 dictis Romanis incutit iram

Serv. *Aen.* 1.69 (incute vim ventis submersasque obrue puppes): INCUTE VIM VENTIS duplex sensus est. 'incute' enim, si 'inice' significat, ventis dativus est casus DS: hoc est, parva est eorum, etiam tu eis da magnam vim; Serv.: si autem 'fac', septimus casus est, et erit sensus 'fac vim Troianis per ventos'. DS: hoc est, per ventos vim in Troianos incute. Ennius: 'dictis Romanis incutit iram'.

??: *Ann.* 555–6 qui fulmine claro
omnia per sonitus arcet, terram mare caelum

DS *Aen.* 1.31: ARCEBAT prohibebat. significat autem et 'continet'. Ennius: 'qui fulmine claro omnia per sonitus arcet', id est continet.

Ps.-Probus, *Ecl.* 6.31: plane trinam esse mundi originem et Lucretius confitetur dicens 'principio maria ac terras caelumque tuere,/quorum naturam triplicem, tria corpora, Memmi,/tris species tam dissimiles, tria talia texta' [5.92–4]. ‹Ennius etiam in *Medea* 'quique tuo cum lumine mare terram caelum contines' [235 J]›[94]; et alio loco: 'omnia per sonitus arcet, terram, mare, caelum' [*Ann.* 556]. Afranius etiam in *Augure* [8–9 R]: 'modo postquam arripuit rabies hunc nostrum augurem,/mare caelum terram ruere ac tremere diceres'. consentit et Pherecydes, sed diversa adfert elementa: Ζῆνα inquit καὶ Ξθόνα καὶ Κρόνον, ignem ac terram et tempus significans, et esse aethera, qui regat, terram, quae regatur, tempus, in quo universa pars moderetur.

??: *Ann.* 564–5 nam me gravis impetus Orci
percutit in latus

Serv. *Aen.* 1.81 (haec ubi dicta, cavum conversa cuspide montem/impulit in latus): . . . CAVUM ordo est, conversa cuspide cavum montem in latus impulit. et alibi [2.52–2]: 'in latus inque feri curvam compagibus alvum/contorsit'. DS: alii 'in latus' pro 'latus' accipiunt. Ennius: 'nam me gravis impetus Orci percutit in latus'.

??: *Ann.* 607 teloque trabali

DS *Aen.* 12.294 (teloque orantem multa trabali/desuper altus equo grauiter ferit): TELOQUE ORANTEM MULTA TRABALI Ennius: 'teloque trabali'.

OPERIS INCERTI FRAGMENTA

Op. inc. 10 inter ponendum

Serv. *Ecl.* 9.23 (24) ('Tityre, dum redeo (brevis est via), pasce capellas, / et potum pastas age, Tityre, et inter agendum / occursare capro (cornu ferit ille) caveto.'): INTER AGENDUM dum agis. et honesta locutio est, si dicamus, inter cenandum hoc sum locutus. DS: Afranius: 'inter loquendum', Ennius 'inter ponendum'.

[94] This is Skutsch's suggestion (*exempli gratia*) for filling in the lacuna indicated by Baehrens.

Op. inc. 11 versat mucronem

DS *Aen.* 9.744 (at non hoc telum, mea quod ui dextera uersat,/effugies): . . . VERSAT librat, iactat. et est Ennianum: 'versat mucronem'.

Op. inc. 12 quis te persuasit

Serv. *Aen.* 10.10 (quis metus aut hos/aut hos arma sequi ferrumque lacessere suasit?): FERRUMQUE LACESSERE pro 'ferro se lacessere'. DS: ordo autem 'quis metus suasit aut hos arma sequi ferrumque lacessere'. non est enim 'hos suasit', ne fiat σολοικοειδές; quamvis inveniatur huiusmodi figura, ut 'Iuturnam misero fateor succurrere fratri suasi' [*Aen.* 12.813–4], et Ennius 'quis te persuasit'.

Op. inc. 15 avium volgus
Op. inc. 16 hastarum volgus

Serv. *Aen.* 1.190 (ductoresque ipsos primum, capita alta ferentis/cornibus arboreis, sternit, tum volgus, et omnem/miscet agens telis nemora inter frondea turbam): . . . TUM VULGUS bene 'vulgus' ductoribus interemptis. DS: Ennius: 'avium vulgus et hastarum' et alibi 'multitudinem et hastarum et avium'.[95]

DUBIA

Dub. 8 confrictique oleo, lentati et ad arma parati

Serv. *Aen.* 3.384 (ante et Trinacria lentandus remus in unda): . . . LENTANDUS aut lente tibi navigandum est; nam totam Siciliam circumiit: aut 'lentandus tibi emus est', id est flectendus: unde 'lentum vimen' dicimus, id est flexile. DS: et quidem 'lentandus' nove verbum fictum putant, sed in *Annalibus* legitur 'confri*ctique* oleo, lentati *et* ad arma parati' a verbo 'lentor'.

cf. DS *Aen.* 2.145 (his lacrimis uitam damus et miserescimus ultro): quidam 'miserescimus' pro 'miseremur', genus inchoativum volunt, ut 'horreo horresco', 'gelo, gelasco': aliter 'lentesco' inchoativum, nullo praecedente verbo; neque enim 'lento', ut sit 'lentesco'.

[95] This is the text as printed in the Harvard Servius and by Skutsch. Thilo-Hagen has: *Ennius: 'avium vulgus' et alibi 'hastarum', id est multitudinem et hastarum et avium*. Vahlen and Thilo are responsible for the re-organisation and emendation of the line.

TABLE A5.36: PAULUS FESTI (Paulus Diaconus) (c. 8 CE); ed. W. M. Lindsay (Leipzig 1913); *Sch.-Hos. § 341; Glinister et al.* 2007: esp. 49–68.

See Appendix Table A5.11 on Festus, p. 428. In Paulus alone are extant 13 fragments (14 lines) assigned to the *Annales* and 2 single-line fragments assigned to the Ennian *Op. inc.* In addition to the ways in which Paulus supports Festus and the two of them jointly support the transmission of Varro, Cicero and Ps.-Probus, Paulus shows knowledge of the use of feminine *armentas*, as it occurs at *Ann.* 604 (transmitted by Nonius) and of *mussare* as it is used not only at *Ann.* 168, which survives in Festus, but at *Ann.* 435, for which the primary source is DS. Paulus alone supports 'Porphyrio''s transmission of *Ann.* 477.

IV: *Ann.* 152 Volsculus perdidit Anxur

Paul. Fest. 20: ANXUR vocabatur quae nunc Tarracina dicitur Vulscae gentis, sicut ait Ennius: 'Vulsculus perdidit Anxur'.

VIII: *Ann.* 256–7 vel tu dictator vel equorum equitumque magister
esto vel consul

Paul. Fest. 507: VEL conligatio quidem est disiunctiva, sed non [ex] earum rerum quae natura disiuncta sunt, in quibus 'aut' coniunctione rectius utimur, ut 'aut dies est aut nox', sed earum rerum quae non sunt contra, e quibus quae eligatur nihil interest, ut Ennius 'vel tu dictator vel equorum equitumque magister esto vel consul'.

VIII: *Ann.* 289 summus ibi capitur meddix, occiditur alter.

Paul. Fest 110: meddix apud Oscos nomen magistratus est. Ennius, 'summus ibi capitur meddix occiditur alter'.

cf. *ibid.* 404: sufes dict<us Poenorum ma>gistratus at Oscor<um meddix tuticus>

?VIII: *Ann.* 473 consiluere

Paul. Fest. 51: CONSILUERE Ennius pro 'conticuere' posuit.

?VIII: *Ann.* 479 incedit veles volgo sicilibus latis

Paul. Fest. 453: SI‹CI›LICUM dictum quod semunciam secet.
SECESSIONES narrationes.
SICIL[IC]ES hastarum spicula lata. Ennius: 'incedit veles vulgo sicilibus latis'.

??: *Ann.* 526 Illyrii restant sicis sybinisque fodentes

Paul. Fest. 453: SYBINAM appellant Illyri telum venabuli simile. Ennius: 'Illyrii restant sicis sybinisque fod*e*ntes'.

??: *Ann.* 527 succincti gladiis, media regione cracentes

Paul. Fest. 46: CRACENTES graciles. Ennius: 'succincti gladiis, media regione cracentes'.

cf. Gloss. Abav. (= Abol.): cracentes: graciles;
Ps.-Placid. (Ansil. CA 22): cracentes: graciles, tabidos.

??: *Ann.* 544 inde loci lituus sonitus effudit acutos

Paul. Fest. 103: LITUUS appellatus quod litis sit testis. est enim genus bucinae incurvae, quo qui cecinerit dicitur 'liticen'. Ennius: 'inde loci lituus sonitus effudit acutos'.

??: *Ann.* 548 aut permarceret paries percussus trifaci

Paul. Fest. 504: TRI*F*AX telum longitudinis trium cubitorum, quod catapulta mittitur. Ennius: 'aut perma*r*ceret paries percussus tri*f*aci'.

??: *Ann.* 596 adgretus fari

Paul. Fest. 6: ADGRETUS, apud Ennium: 'adgretus fari' pro eo quod est 'adgressus' ponitur; quod verbum venit a Graeco ‹ἐγείρομαι, id est› surgo.

cf. id. 68: EGRETUS et ADGRETUS ex Graeco sunt ducta a surgendo et proficiscendo. unde et 'Nyctegresia' quasi 'noctisurgium';
CGL VI 378 (Ansil. EG 77): egretus egressus; V 21.17 = 64.2 (Ps.-Placid.) egregius (egretus? [Sk.]) erectus evigil.

??: *Ann.* 597 runata recedit

Fest. 316: ‹RUNA genus teli significat› . . . ‹ru›nas‹ . . . Ennius: '– – runat›a re‹cedit', id est proeliata›.

Paul. 317:[96] RUNA genus teli significat. Ennius: 'runata recedit', id est 'proeliata'.

[96] On the basis of some glosses he quotes, Skutsch suspects that two lemmata are through confusion combined in Paulus (see Skutsch 1985: 733), although he deems it probable that *runata* is indeed equivalent to *proeliata*.

??: *Ann.* 610 ambactus

Paul. Fest. 4: AMBACTUS apud Ennium lingua Gallica servus appellatur. AM– praepositio loquelaris significat 'circum', unde supra servius ambactus, id est circumactus, dicitur.

Gloss. Philox. AM 11: ambactus δοῦλος μισθωτὸς ὡς Ἔννιος;

cf. Gloss AA 842: ambacti servi, coloni, lixae; 843: ambactus: servus Gallice; Gloss. Ps.-Plac. 80: amb‹act›i servi.

??: *Ann.* 623 crebrisuro

Paul. Fest. 51: CREBRISURO apud Ennium significat vallum crebris suris, id est palis, munitum.

OPERIS INCERTI FRAGMENTA

Op. inc. 30 consiptum

Paul. Fest. 54: apud Ennium (cf. 254 R) pro 'conseptum' invenitur.

Op. inc. 31 insexit

Paul. Fest. 99: INSEQUE apud Ennium 'dic'. insexit 'dixerit'.

Op. inc. 35 daedala Minerva

Paul. Fest 59: DAEDALAM a varietate rerum artificiorumque dictam esse apud Lucretium [1.7] terram, apud Ennium Minervam, apud Virgilium [*Aen.* 7.282] Circen facile est intellegere, cum Graeci δαιδάλλειν significent 'variare'.

DUBIA

Dub. 13 bellicrep(am)

Paul. Fest. 31: BELLICREPAM SALTATIONEM dicebant quando cum armis saltabant, quod a Romulo institutum est, ne simile pateretur quod fecerat ipse cum a ludis Sabinorum virgines rapuit.

Dub. 14[97] Lepareses

Paul. Fest. 108: LIBYCUS campus in agro Argeo appellatus, quod in eo primum fruges ex Libya allatae sunt. quam ob causam etiam Ceres ab Argeis Libyssa vocata est.
LEPARESES Liparitani cives id est Liparenses.
LABES macula in vestimento dicitur, et deinde μεταφορικῶς transfertur in homines vituperatione dignos.
LATRARE Ennius pro 'poscere' posuit [cf. *Ann.* 481?].
LATITAVERUNT Cato posuit pro 'saepe tulerunt'.

[97] It is because of the surrounding quotation-context that Reizenstein suggested that both *labes* and *lepareses* belong to Ennius; see Skutsch 1985: 775.

TABLE A5.37: *Brevis Expositio Georgicorum* (c. 5 + – *c.* 8); *Servii grammatici qui feruntur in Vergilii carmina commentarii*, 'Appendix Serviana', eds. G. Thilo and H. Hagen, Vol. 3.2.191–320 (1902); Scholia Bernensia in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica, edd. L. Cadili, D. Daintree, M. Geymonat (Amsterdam 2003); rev. Reeve 2006: 345–6; Cadili 2008: 194–206.

We owe to the *Brevis Expositio* the preservation of 2 fragments (3 lines) of the *Annales*, for 1 of which it supplies a book-number. This text is closely linked to the Scholia Bernensia; the two comment on the same texts and appear to have at least some sources in common. Both certainly date to after *c.* 5, since both quote Philargyrius. The Scholia Bernensia are aware of 2 words of the 2-line fragment transmitted by the *Brev. Expos.*; so, too, both transmit a similarly worded testimonium; see Appendix Table A5.39, pp. 546–7.

IX: *Ann.* 316 praeda exercitus undat

Brev. Expos. G. 2.437 (et iuuat undantem buxo spectare Cytorum): UNDANTEM abundantem. Ennius in libro VIIII *Annalium*: 'praeda exercitus undat'.

?VII: *Ann.* 469–70 non si lingua loqui saperet quibus, ora decem sint
in me, tum ferro cor sit pectusque revinctum

Brev. Expos. G. 2.43: (non, mihi si linguae centum sint oraque centum . . .): LINGUAE Homericus sensus [cf. *Il.* 2.488] Graeci poetae, sicut et Ennius: 'non si lingua loqui saperet *quibus* ora decem sint *in me, tum* ferro cor sit pectusque revinctum'.

Schol. Bern. *ibid.*: NON MIHI et reliqua. Homericus sensus; sic etiam (nam et *corr. Hagen*) Ennius: 'ora decem'.

TABLE A5.38: The 'Donatian' commentary on Terence (c. 7–8??); *Aeli Donati qvod fertvr Commentvm Terenti. Accedvnt Evgraphi commentvm et Scholia Bembina*, ed. P. Wessner (Leipzig 1902; repr. Stuttgart 1902); Zetzel 1975: 339–42; Reeve 1979: 310–26.

We do not well know how to date the abridged and reconstituted scholia, recomposed from 2 sets of marginal scholia in manuscripts of Terence, that today constitute the commentary on Terence that passes under Donatus' name. They represent, however, the sole source of 5 fragments (5 lines) of the *Annales*: the commentary on the *Hecyra* quotes a line that recurs in mangled form in Servius' commentary on the *Aeneid* (see Skutsch 1985: 303, ad *exin Tarquinium*), while the commentary on the *Phormio* gives 4 1-line fragments that are available from no other source. It always names Ennius and twice gives a book-number. Besides this, the commentary on the *Phormio* supports Cicero (*Sen.* 1)'s transmission of *Ann.* 337; the commentary on the *Eunuchus* supports Cicero (*Acad. Pr.* 2.88)'s transmission of *Ann.* 4; and the commentary on the *Andria*, the *Adelphoe* and the *Phormio* supports Charisius' transmission of *Ann.* 11.

III: *Ann.* 147 exin Tarquinium bona femina lavit et unxit

'Donat.' Ter. *Hec.* 135 (ut ad pauca redeam, uxorem deducit domum): UXOREM DUCIT DOMUM 'uxor' dicitur vel ab ungendis postibus et fingenda lana, id est quod cum puellae nuberent, maritorum postes ungebant ibique lanam fingebant; vel quod lotos maritos ipsae ungebant. cuius rei Ennius testis est: 'exin Tarquinium bona femina lavit et unxit'.

Serv. *Aen.* 6.219 (corpusque lauant frigentis et unguunt): LAVANT FRIGENTIS ET UNGUUNT versus Ennii, qui ait: 'Tarquinii corpus bona femina lavit et unxit'.

VI: *Ann.* 201 sed ego hic animo lamentor

'Donat.' Ter. *Phorm.* 821 (in animo parare cupiditates): PARARE IN ANIMO C. vetuste (*Klotz*: venuste *codd.*) additum 'animo'. Ennius[98] in sexto (VI° *v*): 'sed ego (*OV*: sed et ego *RC*: sed quid ego *L*) hic animo lamentor'.

X: *Ann.* 343 regni versatum summam venere columnam

[98] Skutsch 1985: 362 reports that only one ms. (*V*) contains the name; in the others, there is a blank (*spatium vacat*).

'Donat.' Ter. *Phorm.* 287 (o/bone custos, salve, columen vero familiae): COLUMEN VERO FAMILIAE 'columen' culmen an 'columen' columna, unde 'columellae' apud veteres dicti servi maiores domus? Lucilius XXII [579–80 M]: 'servus neque infidus domino neque inutilis quoiquam (*Donati editt. veteres*: quanquam *codd, Marx*) Lucili columella hic situs'. Tubero [12 P]: 'hinc in millesimum annum eorum columine civitas continebatur'. Horatius contra pro columine 'columnam' [*C.* 1.35.13–14]: 'iniurioso ne pede proruas/stantem columnam'; Ennius X: 'regni versatum summam *venere* columnam'.

??: *Ann.* 500–1 omnes corde patrem debent animoque benigno
circum sum

'Donat.' Ter. *Phorm.* 1028 (faxo tali sum mactatum atque hic est infortunio): FAXO TALI SUM MACTATUM 'sum' modo (summo, *corr. Wessner*) pro eo quod est 'eum'. sic frequenter veteres. Ennius (eamus *V*): 'omnes corde patrem debent animoque benigno circum *sum*'.

??: *Ann.* 563 optima cum pulchris animis Romana iuventus

'Donat.' Ter. *Phorm.* 465 (enimvero, Antipho, multimodis cum istoc animo es vituperandus): ENIMVERO ANTIPHO MULTIS MODIS CUM ISTOC ANIMO ES 'cum istoc animo' pro 'huius animi'. Ennius: 'optima cum pulchris animis Romana iuventus'.

TABLE A5.39: Scholia Bernensia (c. 8);*Scholia Bernensia ad Vergili Bucolica atque Georgica*, ed. H. Hagen (Leipzig 1867; repr. Hildesheim 1967); *Scholia Bernensia in Vergilii Bucolica et Georgica*, edd. L. Cadili, D. Daintree, M. Geymonat (Amsterdam 2003); rev. Reeve 2006: 345–6; Teuffel, Vol. 2 §472.9; Cadili 2008: 194–206.

These scholia to the *Eclogues* and the *Georgics* are, in their comments on the *Georgics*, the source for 4 fragments (5 lines) that no other source knows. They also offer a testimonium to the description in the *Annales* of Romulus having the temple of Jupiter Feretrius built and decreeing games in its honour. The *Brevis Expositio* is a parallel source for this testimonium, and the closeness of the wording here is one indication of the relationship between these two sets of scholia (elsewhere visible, as regards the evidence they supply for the *Annales*, in the relationship of their notes on *G.* 2.119 [below] and *G.* 2.43 [see Appendix Table A5.37 on the *Brevis Expositio*, p. 543]).

VIII: *Ann* 293 tibia Musarum pangit melos

Schol. Bern. Verg. G. 4.72: (67–72: saepe duobus / regibus incessit magno discordia motu . . . / namque morantis / Martius ille aeris rauci canor increpebat, et vox / auditur fractos sonitus imitata tubarum): inde Ennius in VIII ait 'tibia Musarum pangit melos'. 'fractos' consonos.

X: *Ann.* 325 Acanth*us*

Schol. Bern. *G.* 2.119: ACANTHI Gnipho commentatur *Annalium* libro decimo hanc arborem in insula Cercina regionis Africae esse oportunam tincturae, quae in floris sui colorem lanam tinguat, unde vestis 'acanthia' appellatur.

cf. 'Brev. Expos.' *G.* 2.119: ACANTHI de qua Gnipho scripsit, quo in flore tincta vestis 'acanthia' dicitur.

?VII: *Ann.* 463–4 quom a carcere fusi
currus cum sonitu magno permittere certant

Schol. Bern. *G.* 1.512 (ut cum carceribus sese effudere quadrigae): CARCERIBUS ianuis. Ennius ait 'cum a carcere fusi currus cum sonitu magno permittere certant'.

??: *Ann.* 615 ab laeva rite probatum

Schol. Bern. *G.* 4.7 (in tenui labor; at tenuis non gloria, si quem/numina laeva sinunt auditque vocatus Apollo): LAEVA prospera. NUMINA LAEVA secundum haruspicinam dixit 'sinistrum' prosperum, ut in secundo [*Aen.* 2.693]: 'intonuit laevum', quia sinistra nostra dextera sunt ei et dextera nostra sinistra sunt ei, ut Ennius[99] ait 'ab laeva rite probatum'.

TESTIMONIA

Frg. 1.li = Schol. Bern. *G.* 2.384 (praemiaque ingeniis pagos et compita circum/Thesidae posuere, atque inter pocula laeti/mollibus in pratis unctos saluere per utres/nec non Ausonii, Troia gens missa, coloni): UNCTOS oleo. Romulus cum aedificasset templum Iovi Feretrio, pelles unctas stravit et sic ludos edidit ut caestibus dimicarent et cursu contenderent, quam rem Ennius in *Annalibus* testatur.

cf. 'Brev. Expos.' *G.* 2.384: MOLLIBUS IN PRATIS Romulus cum aedificaret (aedificasset *B*) templum Iovis, pelles unctas stravit et sic ludos edidit, ut et caestibus dimicarent et cursu contenderent, quam rem Ennius in *Annalibus* testatur. ideo autem 'in pratis', ne laederentur cadentes.

[99] Skutsch (1985: 741) reports that Cod. Bern. 165 confirmed this conjecture of Hagen's (for Cod. Bern. 167, 172, etc.'s *inmus*).

TABLE A5.40: Ps.-ACRO (Helenius Acron) (?c. 8 CE); ed. Keller (1902–4), with G. Noske, *Quaestiones Pseudoacroneae* (1969); A. Langenhorst, *De Scholiis Horatianis quae Acronis nomine feruntur*, diss. Bonn 1908; *RE* 7.2 (1912), 2840–44 (Wessner); Herz.-Schm. § 444.

The work of Helenius Acron, under whose name the scholia here in question long passed, has been dated to the later c. 2 CE, on the basis of the fact that Gellius shows no sign of knowledge of him, while 'Porphyrio' and Julius Romanus do. This makes him an older contemporary of Asper, whose line of work he shared. Acro's own work, a commentary on Terence and one on Horace, is lost. The commentary on Horace was the more famous, and traces of it are in evidence in various sets of Horatian scholia, including in 'Porphyrio' (see Appendix Table A5.26, pp. 501–3), and in material deriving jointly from Acro, 'Porphyrio' and Servius. The redaction we have may derive from work put together in *c.* 5 CE. It was printed under Acro's name in the fifteenth century and passed as his until the end of the nineteenth. Today, the scholia are usually acknowledged to contain a kernel of Acro's work, though not without controversy. There are few clues as to the date and origin of non-Acronian and non-Porphyrian material the scholia otherwise contain.[100]

This ps.-Acronian commentary on Horace's *Epistles* is our sole source for 2 complete Ennian hexameters. It also reproduces *Ann.* 494–5 on *Serm.* 1.2.38, probably in dependence on 'Porphyrio', who gives the same information. Some iterations of the scholia, again dependent on 'Porphyrio', with him support Servius' transmission of *Ann.* 225–6: Horace supplies a fuller version of the lines to which Servius alludes (in his comment on *Aen.* 7.622); the scholia confirm the lines as Ennian. The ps-Acronian scholia, however, do not reproduce Horace's quotation from the *Annales* as 'Porphyrio' does and even the lemma isolating Horace's quotation has fallen out of the text.

V: *Ann.* 160 bellum aequis [de] manibus nox intempesta diremit

[100] The contents of this paragraph are heavily dependent on R. A. Kaster 'Helenius Acro' *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth. Oxford University Press 2003. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. American Academy in Rome. 26 July 2008, www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview Main&entry t111.e2976; and Robert A. Kaster 'Pomponius Porphyrio', *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. Ed. Simon Hornblower and Anthony Spawforth. Oxford University Press 2003. *Oxford Reference Online*. Oxford University Press. University of Colorado Boulder. 13 July 2008, www.oxfordreference.com/views/ENTRY.html?subview Main&entry t111.e5225; and Herz.-Schm. § 444.

Ps.-Acro, Hor. *Epist.* 2.2.98 (carmina compono, hic elegos . . ./caedimur et totidem plagis consumimus hostem,/lento Samnites ad lumina prima duello): sensus: invicem odiosi sumus fallendo nos et mala carmina praedicantes, et hoc sine fine facimus, ut Romani quondam pugnavere cum hostibus Samnitibus usque ad noctem. unde Ennius 'bellum' inquit 'aequis [de] manibus nox intempesta diremit'. Samnitae gens, quae in centesimo fere et trecesimo miliario ab urbe Roma est, qui medii sunt inter Picenum et Campaniam, viles in proelio, ita nos in scribendis poematis.

??: *Ann.* 580 silvarum saltus latebras lamasque lutosas

Ps.-Acro, Hor. *Ep.* 1.13.10 (viribus uteris per clivos flumina lamas): 'lamas' lacunas maiores continentes aquam caelestem. Ennius: 'silvarum saltus latebras lamasque lutosas'. lama est aqua in via stans ex pluvia.

cf. Comm. Cruq. *ibid.*;
'Porph.' *ibid.*: LAMAS lama est vorago ἀπὸ τοῦ λαιμοῦ. nam λαιμὸς est ingluvies, unde Lamiae quoque dicuntur devoratrices puerorum;
Paul. Fest. 104: lacuna id est aquae collectio, a lacu derivatur, quam alii 'lamam', alii 'lustram' dicunt;
Gloss. Philox. LA 35: 'lamae' πηλώδεις τόποι;
CGL V 655.45: 'lama' lacuna; also Varro, *LL* 5.26: lacus lacuna magna ubi aqua contineri potest;
Paul. Fest. 107: lustra significat lacunas lutosas quae sunt in silvis aprorum cubilia.

TABLE A5.41: Scholia to Persius (c. 9);[101] *Commentum Cornuti*, eds. W. V. Clausen and J. E. G. Zetzel (2004); J. E. G. Zetzel, *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: the* Commentum Cornuti *and the Early Scholia on Persius* (2005).

The *variorum* character of the *Commentum Cornuti* is manifest here.[102] The first part of its notes on Pers. 6.9, recorded on p. 551, are unremarkable, and even the identification of 6.9 as a direct quotation from an Ennian poem – which one is left unclear – is slightly displaced (see Skutsch 1985: 750–1), a result of the process of transformation from marginalia to commentary. The notes on 6.10 'postquam destertuit esse' *e.q.s.*, however, offer the fullest, least treacherous and most informed access to the proem to the *Annales* to survive, especially as regards the content of 6.10.2 (10.3 and 10.4, which attempt to explain 'Quintus' variously as a numeral and as a *cognomen*, look like guesses). Some further access is supplied by a testimonium from the same collection, on Pers. *Prol.* 2; and from a note of 'Porphyrio's on Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.51 (see Appendix Table A5.26 on 'Porphyrio', p. 503). Lucretius' briefer and more complex allusion to Ennius' proem (*DRN* 1.120–6) is more prominent because of its literary status (Skutsch prints it upfront as a testimonium, while the scholia are relegated to brief mention in the commentary [Skutsch 1985: 151–2, 376, 750]), but the intrusion of Lucretius' own agenda, signalled by his clearly tendentious use of the term *rerum natura*, makes its intepretation and use as evidence more hazardous (see the citations in Chapter 3 n. 33, p. 147). It is thus worth noting the real value of what these scholia supply, even though they are responsible for the transmission of no securely attributed lines of the text. The surviving fragments labour to offer the slightest reflection of the proem the scholia sketch, despite the best efforts of editors: *Ann.* 11, *memini me fiere pavom*, preserved by Charisius and the remains of the Donatian commentary on Terence (see under Charisius, pp. 468–9), is, in terms of the fragments, the only certain token of the existence of the passage the scholiast here describes (see Chapter 3, pp. 144–51, on the role of the Varronian fragments in the reconstruction of the proem). Schol. Pers. 6.10.2 and Lucr. *DRN* 1.124–6 help us make sense of the Frontonian quotation-context of *Ann.* 2, *somno leni placidoque revinctus* (see Appendix Table A5.8 on Fronto, pp. 407–8), and to attribute to the proem a line that would otherwise look quasi-formulaic and therefore unplaceable.

[101] On the date, see Zetzel 2005: 136, with n. 15 there: c. 9 is Zetzel's date for the combination of ancient marginalia we know as the *Commentum Cornuti*; many of the individual ancient marginalia are probably much older (even pre-c. 5), although it is hard to say anything certain about their date of origin.

[102] See, besides the works cited in the heading above, Zetzel 1975: 335–54.

OPERIS INCERTI FRAGMENTA

Op. inc. 1[103] Lunai portum est operae cognoscite cives
Pers. 6.9–11: 'Lunai portum, est operae, cognosc*it*e cives'.
cor iubet hoc Enni postquam destertuit esse
Maeonides Quintus pavone e Pythagoreo.[104]

'*Commentum Cornuti*' ad Pers. 6.9 LUNAI PORTUM EST O. C. C.: (1) ordo: o cives, operae pretium est, id est delectabile est, portum in modum Lunae factum cognoscere. (2) 'Lunai' autem secundum antiquam declinationem dixit, ut Virgilius [*Aen.* 7.464]: 'furit intus aquai'.

ibid. 10: (1) COR IUBET HOC ENNI: hunc versum ad suum carmen de Ennii carminibus transtulit; merito ait 'cor iubet hoc Enni'.[105]
(2) POSTQUAM DESTERTUIT ESSE M. Q. P. E. P.: sic Ennius ait in annalium suorum principio, ubi se dicit vidisse in somnis Homerum dicentem fuisse quondam pavonem et ex eo translatam in se animam esse secundum Pytagorae philosophi definitionem, qui dicit animas humanas per palingenesiam, id est per iteratam generationem, exeuntes de corporibus in alia posse corpora introire. (3) ideo autem 'quintus' dixit propter eam opinionem quae dicit animam Pytagorae in pavonem translatam, de pavone vero ad Euphorbium, de Euphorbio ad Homerum, de Homero autem ad Ennium. (4) vel certe quod cognomento Ennius diceretur.

[103] Many editors, including Columna, Bergk, Mueller and Vahlen ascribe this hexametric line to the *Annales*; Flores *et al.* exclude it from their edition. The scholion says no more than it was taken *de Ennii carminibus*; in some part, it is the following note (on Pers. 6.10 [2] 'postquam destertuit', etc.) that creates the connection to the proem to the *Annales* in particular (where Columna and Vahlen place the line; Bergk and Mueller place it later in the narrative). Housman ascribes the line to Ennius' satires, arguing that the direct address and advice to readers is atypical of epic and germane to satire (Housman 1934: 50–51). But Ennius' experimentation with genre, including within the *Annales* (see e.g. the direct address at *Ann.* 494–5, with Skutsch's comments on the reasons for attributing it to the *Annales*; Varro's testimony [which reaches us through Gell. 17.21.43] that Ennius gave his own age in the *Annales*, alongside *Ann.* 522–3; and *Ann.* 34–50 [Ilia's dream], with Krevans 1993: 257–71, mean that the traits of the epic tradition as they are known to us from its earlier and later instantiations cannot be guaranteed as stable for Ennius' epic: the *Annales* remain, alongside Ennius' satires, a viable location for this fragment.

[104] Skutsch punctuates with a comma after *Maeonides*; see Skutsch 1985: 750, n.1.

[105] Although the lemma here is from Pers. 6.10, Skutsch (1985: 750) suggests, on the grounds of appearances in the mss., that the first part of the note pertains to Pers. 6.9 and only the latter to 6.10. He further suggests (*ibid.* n. 2) that the scholiast's explicit attribution of the words 'cor iubet hoc Enni' to Persius signifies that, while these words may represent a playful imitation of Ennius' style, they are not also a quotation from Ennius.

TESTIMONIA

Pers. *Prol.* 1–3: nec fonte labra prolui caballino
nec in bicipiti somniasse Parnasso
memini, ut repente sic poeta prodirem.

'*Commentum Cornuti*' ad Pers. *Prol.* 2 NEC IN BICIPITI SOMNIASSE PARNASO: (1) 'Parnason' Delphorum montem dicit, qui habet cacumina duo: Nison Libero sacrum, Cyrrham Apollini. (2) unde Lucanus [5.72–3]: 'cardine Parnasos gemino petit aethera colle,/mons Phoebo Bromioque sacer'. (3) tangit autem Ennium, qui dixit vidisse se somnium in Parnaso Homerum sibi dicentem quod eius anima in suo esse corpore. (4) 'bicipiti' autem pro duplicis cacuminis.

TABLE A5.42: OROSIUS-MANUSCRIPTS (c. 9–11 CE)

The real importance of the handful of unique fragments of the *Annales* preserved as supralinear additions in Ekkehart IV (*c.* 998–*c.* 1060)'s manuscript of Orosius (itself a *c.* 9 manuscript, containing Orosius' history of the world from Adam to the year 417) is that they show that an unknown reader, probably of *c.* 5 or *c.* 6 CE, was still able to quote Ennius for content, implying that this reader had access to a partial or full manuscript of the text (see Norden 1915: 79–89). This is by far the latest such evidence that exists. Otherwise, we have to reach back to the scholarly debates in Gellius to find evidence of readers who had access to more than just lines preserved within the tradition in which they were working; and even in Gellius, such evidence is sparse. If the ascription of the unattributed hexameters in the body of the text at Oros. *Hist.* 4.1.14 to Ennius is correct, it suggests that a source of Orosius' had culled Ennius' *Annales* for 'historical' content.
(*The report below is entirely dependent on Skutsch; I have not had access to these manuscripts.*)

V: *Ann.* 158 quom nihil horridius umquam lex ulla iuberet

Ekkehart IV, in the c. 9 codex Sangallensis 621, above the letters *–ruta in campo qui nunc*, at Oros. *Hist.* 3.9.5 (anno autem post hunc[106] subsequente Minucia virgo Vestalis ob admissum incestum damnata est vivaque obruta in campo qui nunc sceleratus vocatur):[107] Ennius 'cum nihil horridius umquam lex ulla iuberet'.

VI: *Ann.* 180–2 qui antehac
invicti fuere viri, pater optume Olympi,
hos ego vi pugna vici victusque sum ab isdem

Oros. *Hist.* 4.1.14 (re. the battle of Heraclea): sed Pyrrhus atrocitatem cladis quam hoc bello exceperat dis suis hominibusque testatus est adfigens titulum in templo Tarentini Iovis, in quo haec scripsit: 'qui antehac invicti fuere viri, pater optime Olympi, has ego *vi* pugna vici victusque sum ab isdem'. et cum a sociis increpitaretur cur se victum diceret qui vicisset

[106] The year was defined by the manuscripts at 3.9.1 as A.U.C. CCCCVIIII; Skutsch (1985: 319) suggests emending to CCCCXIIII.
[107] Skutsch (1985: 320) notes that Livy's equivalent narrative is at Liv. 8.15.7, for the year A.U.C. CCCCXVII.

respondisse fertur: ne ego si iterum eodem modo vicero sine ullo milite Epirum revertar.[108]

VII: *Ann.* 213 quantis consiliis quantumque potesset in armis

Ekkehart IV, in the c. 9 codex Sangallensis 621, above the line constituted by the letters – *tandos Alexandri actus direxerun* –, at Oros. *Hist.* 4.6.21 (post haec Carthaginienses cum Tyrum urbem auctorem originis suae ab Alexandro magno captam eversamque didicissent, timentes transitum eius in Africam, Hamilcarem quendam cognomento Rhodanum virum facundia sollertiaque praecipuum ad perscrutandos Alexandri actus direxerunt): Ennius 'quantis consiliis quantumque potesset in armis'.[109]

?VIII: *Ann.* 474–5 at non sic dubius fuit hostis
Aeacida Burrus

Supralinear addition in a hand not much later than the *c.* 9 ms. itself, to Cod. Sang. 621, at Oros. *Hist.* 4.14.3, above the line constituted by the letters *infidelissimus, ante aras iuraverat P. Cornelio Scipione et Publio* (odio Romani nominis quod patri Hamilcari [sc. Hannibal] cum esset novem annos natus fidelissime, alias infidelissimus, ante aras iuraverat P. Cornelio Scipione et Publio Sempronio Longo coss. *eqs.*): in bello dicitur in quo erat infidus animo longe leviori quam Pyrrus. de quo Ennius 'at non sic dubius fuit hostis Aeacida *B*urrus'.

[108] Skutsch (1985: 344) notes that Landolf. *Hist. misc.* 2.16 p. 31.3 Eyss. depends on Orosius.
[109] Skutsch (1985: 379) adds the information that Ekkehart's word *Ennius* juts out into the left-hand margin and *in armis* juts out into the right.

TABLE A5.43: *GLOSSARIUM PHILOXENUM* (not earlier than c. 6 CE); *Corpus Glossariorum Latinorum*, vol. 2 (1888), ed. G. Goetz; *Glossaria Latina* 11 (1926), ed. W. M. Lindsay *et al.*.

This glossary occasionally shows itself to be in contact with traditions that quote Ennius (see e.g. Appendix Table A5.10 on Gellius, pp. 421–2, under *Ann.* 322–3, or Appendix Table A5.40 on Ps.-Acro, p. 549, under *Ann.* 580). It backs Paulus' transmission of *Ann.* 610 (for the word *ambactus*), and here it supplies a word it attributes to Ennius that reaches us by no other means.

??: *Ann.* 608 aplustra

Gloss. Philox. AP 7 (*CGL* 2): APLUSTRA πτερὸν πλοίου ὥς Ἔννιος;
cf. AP 32 APLUSTRA ἄφλαστος καὶ τὸ ἄκρον τῆς πρώρας.
Paul. Fest. 9: APLUSTRIA navium ornamenta. quae quia erant amplius quam essent necessaria usu etiam amplustria dicebantur
Whence: Gloss. Abol. AP 5 (*CGL* 4): APLUSTRIA ornamenta navis.

TABLE A5.44: *COMMENTA BERNENSIA IN LUCANUM* (c. 9);[110] *M. Annaei Lucani Commenta Bernensia*, ed. H. Usener (Leipzig 1869; repr. Hildesheim 1967).

These scholia preserve a single hexameter they attribute to Ennius. They do not otherwise contribute to the transmission of the *Annales*.

??: *Ann.* 582 pila retunduntur venientibus obvia pilis

Comm. Bern. in Lucan. 1.6 INFESTISQUE OBVIA SIGNIS SIGNA PARES AQUILAS ET PILA MINANTIA PILIS: Ennii versus: 'pila retunduntur venientibus obvia pilis'.

[110] For the real complications of dating this material, cp. the situation with the scholia to Persius; and see esp. Werner 1994: 343–68, with much further bibliography.

TABLE A5.45: G. VALLA, ed. Juvenal, *Satires* (Venice 1486); Anderson 1965: 383–424.

In his 1486 edition of Juvenal, in his comment on *Satires* 7.134, the Renaissance scholar Giorgio Valla quotes an hexameter, otherwise unknown to our sources for the *Annales*, that he ascribes to Ennius. He does so in conjunction with mention of a 'Probus', whom he repeatedly cites in his edition. The manuscript in which Valla found this 'Probus''s comments recorded is no longer extant but may have been as old as *c.* 4 CE and certainly contained useful information (Anderson 1965: 383–424). There also exists an evidently related supralinear addition in a *c.* 9 codex of Juvenal (Cod. Leid. 82), that does not, however, for its part, name Ennius.

?VII: *Ann.* 462 et melior navis quam quae stlataria portat

G. Valla (ed. 1486) *ad* Juv. *Sat.* 7.134 'spondet enim Tyrio stlataria purpura filo': 'stlataria' Probus exponit illecebrosa. Ennius 'et melior navis quam quae stlataria portat', id est multisonalis quae dicitur vulgo batalaria.

Cod. Leid. 82, above *stlataria* at *Sat.* 7.134 and extending into the right-hand margin:[111] stlataria, id est quam portat navis stlataria. multisonans quae dicitur vulgo balataria (*sic*).
Ibid., apparently the same hand, in the left-hand margin: multisonans quae dicitur vulgo balataria.

[111] See Skutsch 1985: 620–1, with n. 8 there, for description of this scholion.

TABLE A5.46: H. COLUMNA (= G. Colonna), ed. *Q. Ennii fragmenta ab Hieronymo Columna conquisita, disposita et explicata* (Naples 1585); repr. F. Hesselio (Amsterdam 1707); Hahn 1960: 222–3; Mariotti 1971: 270 (with note); Skutsch 1985: 487–8.

One fragment reaches us through Columna's editions of the *Annales* alone. It may more properly belong among the *dubia*. Columna writes in his note on the line that Fabius of Aquinum sent it to him from Cosenza, where he found it in the work of an ancient annotator of Statius whose name was lost. Skutsch notes that Cosenza was the home of the forger Sertorius Quadrimanus (see Skutsch 1985: 487 for further details). Skutsch and Columna are not the only editors to accept the line into their editions: Vahlen (his *Ann.* 311), Steuart (her *Dub.* 15) and Warmington (his *Spur.* 4) do so, too, the latter two both sounding explicit notes of caution. Norden took Vahlen vociferously to task (Norden 1915: 78, n. 2), in particular for being sufficiently sanguine to place the line in a particular book (Vahlen's Book 9).

IX: *Ann.* 310 perculsi pectora Poeni

H. Columna, ed. *Q. Ennii fragmenta* (Naples 1585, p. 239; repr. Amsterdam 1707, p. 148): 'perculsi pectora Poenei'; hoc fragmentum mihi e Cosentia Fabius Aquinus misit. quod a quodam suo vetustissimo Statii interprete M.S. excerpsit. cuius nomen, cum in illius libri principio et fine multae desiderentur paginae, prorsus ignoratur. constat tamen ex collatione non esse Lactantium.

Bibliography

Abbreviations for journals are taken from *L'Année philologique*

Albrecht, M. von (1964) *Silius Italicus: Freiheit und Gebundenheit römischer Epik*. Amsterdam

(1969) 'Ein Pferdegleichnis bei Ennius', *Hermes* **97**: 333–45

Alonso Núñez, J. M. (1987) 'An Augustan world history: the "Historiae Philippicae" of Pompeius Trogus', *G&R* **34**.1: 56–72

(1990) 'The emergence of universal historiography from the fourth to the second centuries BC', in *Purposes of History*, eds. H. Verdin, G. Schepens *et al.* Leuven: 173–92

(2002) *The Idea of Universal History in Greece: From Herodotus to the Age of Augustus*. Amsterdam

(2003) 'Herodotus' conception of historical space and the beginnings of univer sal history', in *Herodotus and his World*, eds. P. Derow and R. Parker. Oxford: 145–52

Aly, W. (1936) *Livius und Ennius*. Neue Wege zur Antike. 2 Reihe, Vol. V. Leipzig

Anderson, W. B. (1965) 'Valla, Juvenal and Probus', *Traditio* **21**: 383–424

d'Anna, G. (1983) 'La 'fortuna' di Ennio. I: dal sec. II A.C. all' eta di Cesare', *C&S* **86**: 58–63

Ash, R. (2002) 'Epic encounters? Ancient historical battle narratives and the epic tradition', in *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, eds. David Levene and Damien Nelis. Leiden

Austin, R. G. (1971) *P. Vergili Maronis Aeneidos Liber Primus*. Oxford

Badian, E. (1966) 'The early historians', in *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey. New York: 1–38

(1972) 'Ennius and his friends', in *Ennius: sept exposés suivis de discussions*, Entretiens Hardt sur l'antiquité classique, Vol. XVII, ed. O. Skutsch. Vandoeuvres and Geneva: 149–208

Baehrens, E. (1886) *Fragmenta Poetarum Romanorum*. Leipzig

Barber, E. L. (1935) *The Historian Ephorus*. Cambridge

Barwick, K. (1911) 'Zur Serviusfrage', *Philologus* **70**: 106–45

(1936) 'Quintilians Stellung zu dem Problem sprachlicher Neuschöpfung', *Philologus* 91 NF **45**: 89–113

Baschera, C. (2008) 'Servius Danielinus and Scholia Veronensia: clues to their relationship', in *Servius: Exegetical Stratifications and Cultural Models*, eds. S. Casali and F. Stok. Brussels: 207 15

Baxandall, M. (1985) *Patterns of Intention: On the Historical Explanation of Pictures*. New Haven, CT and London

Beck, H. and U. Walter (2001) *Die frühen römischen Historiker*. Vol. 1. 2nd edn. Darmstadt

Berres, T. (1977) 'Ennius, *Ann.* 292f.V: Im Spiegel der Genetischen Aeneisbetrach tung', *RhM* **120**: 255 68

Bertini, F, Gatti, P. and C. Mordeglia (eds.) (2011) *Inusitata verba: studie di lessicografia latina raccolti in occasione del suo settantesimo compleanno*. Trento

Bing, P. (1988) *The Well-Read Muse: Present and Past in Callimachus and the Hellenistic poets*. Hypomnemata, Vol. XC. Göttingen

Boedeker, D. (2001) 'Heroic historiography: Simonides and Herodotus on Plataea', in *The New Simonides*, eds. D. Boedeker and D. Sider. Oxford: 120 34

Bömer, F. (1953 4) 'Thematik und Krise der römischen Geschichtsschreibung im 2. Jh. v. Chr.', *Historia* **2**: 189 209

(1957) 'Interpretationen zu den *Fasti* des Ovid', *Gymnasium* **10**: 112 35

Breed, B. and A. Rossi (2006) 'Introduction: Ennius and the traditions of epic', *Arethusa* **39**.3: 397 425

Brink, C. O. (1972) 'Ennius and the Hellenistic worship of Homer', *AJPh* **93**: 547 67

Brock, R. (1995) 'Version, "Inversions" and Evasion: Classical Historiography and the "Published" Speech', *Papers of the Leeds International Latin Seminar* **8**: 209 24

Brunt, P. A. (1980a) 'On historical fragments and epitomes', *CQ* NS **30**.2: 477 94

(1980b) 'Cicero and historiography', in *φιλίας χάριν: Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di Eugenio Manni*, Vol. 1, Rome: 311 40

Buchheit, V. (1963) *Vergil über die Sendung Roms: Untersuchungen zum Bellum Poenicum und zur Aeneis*. Heidelberg

Burde, P. (1974) *Untersuchungen zur antiken Universalgeschichtsschreibung*. Munich

Cadili, L. (2008) 'Scholia and authorial identity: the Scholia Bernensia on Vergil's *Georgics* and Servius Auctus', in *Servius: Exegetical Stratifications and Cultural Models*, eds. S. Casali and F. Stok. Brussels: 194 206

Cameron, A. (1966) 'The date and identity of Macrobius', *JRS* **56**: 25 38

(1995) *Callimachus and his Critics*. Princeton, NJ

Cardinali, L. (1988) 'Le *Origines* di Catone iniziavano con un esametro?', *SCO* **37**: 205 15

Casali, S. (2006) 'The poet at war: Ennius on the field in Silius' *Punica*', *Arethusa* **39**.3: 569 93

(2007) 'Killing the father: Ennius, Naevius and Virgil's Julian imperialism', in *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*, CPhS Suppl. 31, eds. W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers. Cambridge: 103 28

Chaplin, J. D. (2000) *Livy's Exemplary History*. Oxford

Cichorius, C. (1908) *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius*. Berlin

Clarke, K. (1999a) *Between Geography and History: Hellenistic Constructions of the Roman World*. Oxford
(1999b) 'Universal perspectives in historiography', in *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*, ed. C. S. Kraus. Leiden: 249–79
(2008) *Making Time for the Past: Local History and the Polis*. Oxford
Classen, C. J. (1992) 'Ennius: ein Fremder in Rom', *Gymnasium* **99**: 121–45
Clausen, W. V. (1963) 'Crater cratera creterra', *CQ* NS **13**.1: 85–7
Cole, S. (2006) 'Cicero, Ennius, and the concept of apotheosis at Rome', *Arethusa* **39**.3: 531–48
Conington, J. and H. Nettleship (1883) *The Works of Virgil*, 3 vols. 4th edn. London
Conte, E. B. (1984) *Virgilio: Il genere ei suoi confini*. Mulan
(1986) *The Rhetoric of Imitation: Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin poets*. Ithaca, NY
(1994a) *Latin Literature: A History*. Baltimore, MD and London
(1994b) *Genres and Readers: Lucretius, Love Elegy, Pliny's Encyclopedia*. Baltimore, MD
Cornell, T. J. (1986) 'Review of Skutsch 1985', *JRS* **76**: 244–50
(1989) 'The conquest of Italy', in *CAH*, Vol. VII.2. 'The Rise of Rome to 220 BC', eds. F. W. Walbank, A. E. Astin *et al.* 3rd edn. Cambridge: 351–419
(1995) *The Beginnings of Rome: Italy and Rome from the Bronze Age to the Punic Wars (c. 1000–264* BC*)*. London
(1996a) '*Annales maximi*', in *OCD*, eds. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth. 3rd edn. Oxford: 98
(1996b) 'Annals, annalists', in *OCD*, eds. S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth. 3rd edn. Oxford: 98–99
(2010) 'Universal history and the early Roman historians', in *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*, eds. P. Liddel and A. Fear. London: 102–15
Cornell, T. J., A. Fear and P. Liddel (2010) 'Introduction', in *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*, eds. P. Liddel and A. Fear. London: 1–13
Courtney, E. (2003) *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford
Crake, J. E. A. (1940) 'The annals of the *Pontifex maximus*', CPh 35.4: 375–86
Damon, C. (1997) *The Mask of the Parasite: a Pathology of Roman Patronage*. Ann Arbor, MI
David, J. M. (1997) *The Roman Conquest of Italy*. Oxford
Dillery, J. (2002) 'Quintus Fabius Pictor and Greco Roman historiography at Rome', in *Vertis in Usum: Studies in Honor of Edward Courtney*, eds. J. E. Miller, C. Damon *et al.* Munich and Leipzig: 1–23
Douglas, A. E. (ed.) (1966) *M. Tulli Ciceronis Brutus*. Oxford
Dover, K. (2000) 'Foreword: Frogments', in *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*, eds. D. Harvey and J. Wilkins. London: xvii–xix
Drews, R. (1988) 'Pontiffs, prodigies, and the disappearance of the *Annales Maximi*', *CPh* **83**.4: 289–99
Duckett, E. S. (1915) *Studies in Ennius*. Bryn Mawr, PA
Dunn, F. M. (1989) 'A prose hexameter in Seneca? (*Consolatio ad Marciam* 26.7)', *AJPh* **110**.3: 488–91

Dyck, A. R. (ed.) (1996) *A commentary on Cicero, De Officiis*. Ann Arbor, MI
(2004) *A commentary on Cicero, De Legibus*. Ann Arbor, MI
Edwards, C. and G. Woolf (eds.) (2003) *Rome the Cosmopolis*. Cambridge
Elliott, J. M. (2007) 'The voices of Ennius' *Annals*', in *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*, CPhS Suppl. 31, Cambridge: 38 54
(2008) 'Ennian epic and Ennian tragedy in the language of the *Aeneid*: Aeneas' generic wandering and the construction of the Latin literary past', *HSPh* **104**: 241 72
(2009a) 'Ennius' "Cunctator" and the history of a gerund in the Roman historio graphical tradition', *CQ* NS **59**.2: 531 41
(2009b) 'Livy's L. Papirius Cursor and the manipulation of the Ennian past', *CQ* NS **59**.2: 650 3
(2010) 'Ennius as universal historian: the case of the *Annales*', in *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*, eds. P. Liddel and A. Fear. London: 148 61
(forthcoming) 'Space and geography in Ennius' *Annales*', in *Geography, Topography, Landscape: Configurations of Space in Greek and Roman Epic*, eds. I. Ziogas and M. Skempis. Berlin
Errington, R. M. (1989) 'Rome and Greece to 205 BC', in *CAH*, Vol. VIII. 'Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 BC', eds. A. E. Astin, F. W. Walbank *et al.* 3rd edn. Cambridge: 81 106
Fantham, E. (2006) '"Dic si quid potes de Sexto Annali": the literary legacy of Ennius' Pyrrhic War', *Arethusa* **39**.3: 549 68
Farrell, J. (2008) 'Servius and the Homeric scholia', in *Servius: Exegetical Stratifications and Cultural Models*, eds. S. Casali and F. Stok. Brussels
Farrenkopf, J. (2010) 'Spengler, the modern West, and Roman decline', in *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*, eds. P. Liddel and A. Fear. London: 221 37
Fear, A. (2010) 'Orosius and Escaping from the the Dance of Doom', in *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*, eds. P. Liddel and A. Fear. London: 175 88
Feeney, D. C. (1984) 'The reconciliations of Juno', *CQ* NS **34**.1: 179 94
(1989) 'Review: Conte, G. B. (1986) *The Rhetoric of Imitation, Genre and Poetic Memory in Virgil and Other Latin Poets*. Ithaca.', *JRS* **79**: 206 7
(1991) *The Gods in Epic: Poets and Critics of the Classical Tradition*. Oxford
(2006) *On not forgetting the 'Literatur' in 'Literatur und Religion': Representing the Mythic and the Divine in Roman Historiography* (online). Available: www.princeton.edu/~pswpc/pdfs/feeney/030601.pdf
(2007) *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History*. Sather Classical Lectures, Vol. LXV. Berkeley, CA
Feldherr, A. (1998) *Spectacle and Society in Livy's History*. Berkeley, CA
Finley, M. I. (1985) *Ancient History: Evidence and Models*. London
Fleck, M. (1993) *Cicero als Historiker*. Beiträge zur Altertumskunde. Stuttgart
Fleischmann, S. (1983) 'On the representation of history and fiction in the Middle Ages', *H&T* **22**: 278 310

Flores, E. (ed.) (2000) Quinto Ennio, Annali; introduzione, testo critico con apparati, traduzione. *Vol. I:* Libri I VIII. Naples
(2003) Quinto Ennio, Annali. *Vol. III:* Libri IX XVIII. Naples
Flores, E., P. Esposito *et al.* (eds.) (2002) Quinto Ennio, Annali. *Vol. II:* Libri I VIII. Commentari. Naples
et al. (2006) Quinto Ennio, Annali. *Vol. IV:* Libri IX XVIII: Commentari. Naples
Flores, E., G. Jackson *et al.* (eds.) (2009) Quinto Ennio, Annali. *Vol. V:* Frammenti de collocazione incerta. Commentari. Naples
Flower, M. A. (1994) *Theopompus of Chios*. Oxford
Fornara, C. (1983) *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Berkeley, CA
Forsythe, G. (1994) *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman Annalistic Tradition*. Lanham, MD
Foucher, A. (2000) *Historia proxima poetis: l'influence de la poésie épique sur le style des historiens latins, de Salluste à Ammiens Marcellin*. Collection Latomus. Brussels
Fox, M. (2007) *Cicero's Philosophy of History*. Oxford
Fraenkel, E. (1922) *Plautinisches im Plautus*. Berlin
(1931) 'Livius', in *RE*, Suppl. 5, Stuttgart: 598 607
(1935) 'Cn. Naevius, der Dichter', in *RE*, Suppl. 6, Stuttgart: 622 42
(1945) 'Some aspects of the structure of *Aeneid* VII', *JRS* **35**: 1 14
(1950) *Agamemnon*. Oxford
(1957) *Horace*. Oxford
Fraenkel, E. and H. Fränkel (eds.) (1931) *Festschrift R. Reitzenstein*. Leipzig and Berlin
Franke, P. R. (1989) 'Pyrrhus', in *CAH*, Vol. VII.2. 'The Rise of Rome to 220 BC', eds. A. E. Astin, F. W. Walbank *et al.* 3rd edn. Cambridge: 456 85
Fränkel, H. (1935) 'Griechische Bildung in altrömischen Epen II', *Hermes* **70**: 59 72
Friedrich, W. H. (1941) 'Zur Altlateinischen Dichtung', *Hermes* **76**: 113 35
Frier, B. W. (1999) *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*. Papers and Monographs of the American Academy in Rome. 2nd edn. Ann Arbor, MI
Gabba, E. (1989) 'Rome and Italy in the second century BC', in *CAH*, Vol. VIII. 'Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 BC', eds. A. E. Astin, F. W. Walbank *et al.* 3rd edn. Cambridge: 197 243
Gaertner, J. F. (2010) 'The style of the *Bellum Hispaniense* and the evolution of Roman historiography', in E. Dickey and A. Chahoud (eds.), *Colloquial and Literary Latin I = Festschrift für J.N. Adans*. Cambridge: 243 57
Gale, M. (1994) *Myth and Poetry in Lucretius*. Cambridge
(2000) *Virgil on the Nature of Things: The Georgics, Lucretius, and the Didactic Tradition*. Cambridge
(2007) 'Lucretius and previous poetic traditions', in *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*, eds. S. Gillespie and P. Hardie. Cambridge: 59 75

Gelzer, M. (1933) 'Römische Politik bei Fabius Pictor', *Hermes* **68**: 129 66
(1934) 'Der Anfang römischer Geschichtsschreibung', *Hermes* **69**: 46 55
(1954) 'Nochmals über den Anfang der römischen Geschichtsschreibung', *Hermes* **83**: 342 8
Gercke, A. and E. Norden (1927) *Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft*, Vol. 1. 3rd edn. Leipzig and Berlin
Gigon, O. (1978) 'Lukrez und Ennius', in *Lucrèce*, Entretiens Hardt sur l'antiquité classique, Vol. XXIV, ed. O. Gigon. Vandoeuvres and Geneva: 167 96
Gildenhard, I. (2003) 'The "annalist" before the annalists: Ennius and his *Annales*', in *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius*, eds. U. Eigler, U. Gotter *et al.* Darmstadt: 93 114
(2007) 'Virgil vs. Ennius, or: the undoing of the annalist', in *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*, CPhS Suppl. 31, eds. W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers. Cambridge: 73 102
Gill, C. and T. P. Wiseman (eds.) (1993) *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Austin, TX
Ginsburg, J. (1981) *Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus*. Salem, NH
Glinister, F., C. Woods and M. H. Crawford (2007) *Verrius, Festus and Paul: Lexicography, Scholarship and Society*. BICS. Suppl. XCIII. London
Goldberg, S. M. (1989) 'Poetry, politics, and Ennius', *TAPhA* **119**: 247 61
(1995) *Epic in Republican Rome*. New York
(2006) 'Ennius after the banquet', *Arethusa* **39**.3: 427 47
(2009) 'A new Ennius', *Paideia* **64**: 637 55
Goldhill, S. (2002) *The Invention of Prose*. Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics, Vol. XXXII. Oxford
Goold, G. P. (1970) 'Servius and the Helen Episode', *HSPh* **74**: 101 68
(1994) 'Otto Skutsch 1906 1990', *PBA* **87**: 473 89
Gransden, K. W. (1997) *Aeneid, Book XI*. Repr. Cambridge
Gratwick, A. (1982) 'Ennius' *Annales*', in *CHCL*, Vol. II: 'Latin Literature', eds. E. J. Kenney and W. V. Clausen. Cambridge: 60 76
Graziosi, B. (2002). *Inventing Homer: The Party Reception of Epic*. Cambridge
Gruen, E. S. (1990) *Studies in Greek Culture and Roman Policy*. Leiden and New York
Gunderson, E. (2009) *Nox Philologiae: Aulus Gellius and the Fantasy of the Roman Library*. Madison, WI
Habinek, T. N. (1998) *The Politics of Latin Literature: Writing, Identity, and Empire in Ancient Rome*. Princeton, NJ
Hagen, H. (1873) 'Ennius und Livius', *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Paedagogik* **109**: 271 3
Hahn, E. A. (1960) 'The origin of the Greek accusative in Latin', *TAPhA* **91**: 221 38
Hardie, P. R. (1986) *Virgil's Aeneid: Cosmos and Imperium*. Oxford
(ed.) (1994) *Aeneid. Book IX*. Cambridge
(2007) 'Poets, patrons, rulers: the Ennian traditions', in *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*, CPhS Suppl. 31, eds. W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers. Cambridge: 129 44

Harris, W. V. (1989) 'Roman expansion in the West', in *CAH*, Vol. VIII. 'Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 BC', eds. A. E. Astin, F. W. Walbank *et al.* 3rd edn. Cambridge: 107 62

Harrison, S. J. (ed.) (1991) *Vergil, Aeneid X*. Oxford

(2002) 'Ennius and the prologue to Lucretius, *DRN* I.148', *LICS* **1.4**: 1 13

Hartog, F. (2010) 'Polybius and the first universal history', in *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*, eds. P. Liddel and A. Fear. London: 30 40

Harvey, D. and J. Wilkins (eds.) (2000) *The Rivals of Aristophanes: Studies in Athenian Old Comedy*. London

Häussler, R. (1976) *Das historische Epos der Griechen und Römer bis Vergil: Studien zum historischen Epos der Antike*. Heidelberg

Henderson, J. G. W. (1998) *Fighting for Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War*. Cambridge

(2001) 'From Megalopolis to Cosmopolis: Polybius or there and back again', in *Being Greek under Rome*, ed. S. Goldhill. Cambridge: 29 49

(2007) *The Medieval World of Isidore of Seville: Truth from Words*. Cambridge

Hendrickson, G. L. (1898) 'A pre Varronian chapter of Roman literary history', *AJPh* **19**: 285 311

Heraeus, W. (1930) 'Ein makkaronisches Ovidfragment bei Quintilian', *RhM* **79**: 253 78

Heyworth, S. J. (2007) *Cynthia: A Companion to the Text of Propertius*. Oxford

Hinds, S. (1998) *Allusion and Intertext: Dynamics of Appropriation in Roman Poetry*. New York

Holford Strevens, L. (1988) *Aulus Gellius*. London

(2003) *Aulus Gellius: An Antonine Scholar and his Achievement*. Oxford

Holford Strevens, L. and A. Vardi (eds.) (2004) *The Worlds of Aulus Gellius*. Oxford

Horsfall, N. (1971) 'Numanus Remulus: ethnography and propaganda in *Aen.*, ix, 598f.', *Latomus* **117**: 1108 16

(1980) 'Otto Skutsch: a Bibliography', *BICS* **27**: unpaginated

(1988) 'Supplementum bibliographicum', *BICS* Suppl. **51**: ix

(1991) 'Otto Skutsch: una commemorazione', *A&R* **36**: 103 7

(ed.) (2000) *Virgil, Aeneid VII*. Mnemosyne Suppl. CXCVIII. Leiden

Houghton, L. B. T. (2007) 'A letter from Petrarch', in *Ennius Perennis: The Annals and Beyond*, CPhS Suppl. 31, eds. W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers. Cambridge: 145 58

Housman, A. E. (1934) 'Ennius in Pers. VI.9', *CR* **48**.2: 50 1

Hulleman, J. G. (1855) *Disputatio Critica de Annalibus Maximis*. Amsterdam

Humphreys, S. C. (1997) 'Fragments, fetishes, and philosophies: towards a history of Greek historiography after Thucydides', in *Collecting Fragments: Fragmente sammeln*, Aporemata Vol. 1, ed. G. Most. Göttingen: 207 24

Ilberg, H. (1852) *Q. Enni* Annalium *libri Primi fragmenta emondata dispesita illustrate*. Bonn

Ingalls, W. B. (1971) 'Repetition in Lucretius', *Phoenix* **25**: 227 36

Jacoby, F. (1949) *Atthis: the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*. Oxford

Jocelyn, H. D. (1964) 'Ancient scholarship and Vergil's use of Republican Latin poetry I', *CQ* NS **14**.2: 280 95
(1965) 'Ancient scholarship and Vergil's use of Republican Latin poetry II', *CQ* NS **15**.1: 126 44
The Tragedies of Ennius: The Fragments Edited with an Introduction and Commentary. Cambridge
(1972) 'The poems of Quintus Ennius', in *ANRW*, Vol. 1.2, eds. H. Temporini, J. Vogt *et al.* Berlin: 987 1026
(1991) 'Otto Skutsch', *Gnomon* **63**: 746 9
Kalinina, A. (2007) *Der Horazkommentar des Pomponius Porphyrio: Untersuchungen zu seiner Terminologie und Textgeschichte*. Palingenesia, Vol. 91. Stuttgart
Kameke, H. von (1926) *Ennius und Homer: Versuch einer Analyse der Annalenfragmente*. Weida i. Thüringen
Kaster, R. A. (1988) *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley, CA
(ed.) (1995) *C. Suetonius Tranquillus, De grammaticis et rhetoribus*. Oxford
(2010) *Studies in the Text of Macrobius' Saturnalia*. Oxford
Keith, A. M. (2000) *Engendering Rome: Women in Latin Epic*. Cambridge
Kenney, E. J. (ed.) (1971) *Lucretius, De Rerum Natura III*. Cambridge
(2007) 'Lucretian texture: style, metre and rhetoric in the *De rerum natura*', in *The Cambridge Companion to Lucretius*, eds. S. Gillespie and P. R. Hardie. Cambridge: 92 110
Kerkhecker, A. (2001) 'Zur internen Gattungsgeschichte der römischen epik: das Beispiel Ennius', in *L'histoire litteraire immanente dans la poesie latine*, Entretiens Hardt sur l'antiquité classique, Vol. XLVII. Vandoevres and Geneva: 39 95
Kerkhecker, A. and J. P. Schwindt (eds.) (2001) *L'histoire littetraire immanente dans la poésie latine: huit exposés suivis de discussions*. Entretiens Hardt sur l'antiquité classique, Vol. XLVII. Vandoevres and Geneva
Keulen, W. H. (2009) *Gellius the Satirist: Roman Cultural Authority in Attic Nights*. Leiden
Kierdorf, W. (2002) 'Anfänge und Grundlagen der römischen Geschichtsschreibung', *Klio* **84**: 400 13
Kleve, K. (1990) 'Ennius in Herculaneum', *BCPE* **20**: 5 16
Klotz, A. (1927) *Kommentar zum Bellum Hispaniense*. Leipzig
Knox, P. E. (1989) 'Ruit Oceano Nox', *CQ* NS **39**.1: 265
(1996) 'Review article: Alan Cameron, *Callimachus and his Critics* (Princeton 1995)', *EMC* **15**: 413 24
Kornemann, E. (1911) 'Die älteste Form der Pontifikalannalen', *Klio* **11**: 245 57
Kraus, C. S. (1994a) *Livy, Ab urbe condita. Book VI*. Cambridge
(1994b) ''No second Troy': topoi and refoundation in Livy, Book V', *TAPhA* **124**: 267 89
Kraus, C. S., and A. J. Woodman (1997) *Latin Historians*. Greece and Rome. New Surveys in the Classics, Vol. XXVII. Oxford
Krevans, N. (1993) 'Ilia's dream: Ennius, Virgil, and the mythology of seduction', *HSPh* **95**: 257 71

Kroll, W. (1916) 'Das historische Epos', *Sokrates. Zeitschrift für das Gymnasialwesen, NF* **4**: 1 15
(1924) *Studien zum Verständnis der römischen Literatur*. Stuttgart
Lattimore, R. A. (transl.) (1951) *Homer, The Iliad*. Chicago
de Laurentiis, A. (2010) 'Universal historiography and world history according to Hegel', in *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*, eds. P. Liddel and A. Fear. London: 207 20
Lease, E. B. (1903) 'Livy's use of *arunt*, *erunt* and *ere*', *AJPh* **24**.4: 408 22
Lehmann, G. A. (1973) 'Weltherrschaft und Weltfriedensgedanke im Altertum', *Mitteilungen der Technischen Universität Braunschweig* **8**: 42 51
Lenfant, D. (1999) 'Peut on se fier aux "fragments" d'historiens? L'exemple des citations d'Hérodote', *Ktema* **24**: 103 21
Leo, F. (1889) 'Die beiden metrischen Systeme des Alterthums', *Hermes* **24**: 280 301
(1905) *Der Saturnische Vers*. Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philol. hist. Klasse, Vol. VIII.5. Berlin
(1913) *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. Berlin
Leumann, M. (1959) *Kleine Schriften*. Zürich
Levene, D. S. (1993) *Religion in Livy*. Mnemosyne. Suppl. CXXVII. Leiden
Levene, D. S., and D. P. Nelis (eds.) (2002) *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*. Mnemosyne Suppl. CCXXIV. Leiden
Liddel, P. (2010) '*Metabole politeion* as universal history', in *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*, eds. P. Liddel and A. Fear. London: 15 29
Lieberg, G. (1985) '*Poeta Creator*: some 'religious' aspects', *Papers of the Liverpool Latin Seminar* **5**: 23 32
Lindsay, W. M. (1901) *Nonius Marcellus' Dictionary of Republican Latin*. Oxford
Lintott, A. (1981) 'What was the *imperium Romanum*?', *G&R* **28**.1: 53 67
(1993) *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration*. London
Lloyd, R. B. (1961) 'Republican authors in Servius and the *Scholia Danielis*', *HSPh* **65**: 291 341
Loebell, J. W. (1841) 'Über die Epochen der Geschichtsschreibung und ihr Verhältnis zur Poesie', *Historisches Taschenbuch, NF* **2**: 282 372
Luce, T. J. (1971) 'Design and structure in Livy 5.32 55', *TAPhA* **102**: 265 302
(1989) 'Ancient views on the causes of bias in historical writing', *CPh* **84**: 16 31
Lundström, W. (1915) 'Nya Enniusfragment', *Eranos* **15**: 1 24
Mack, S. (1980) 'Vergil, *Aeneid* 2.250 2', *CQ* NS **30**.1: 153 8
Marincola, J. (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge
(1999) 'Genre, convention and innovation in Greco Roman historiography', in *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*. Mnemosyne Suppl. CXCI, ed. C. S. Kraus. Leiden: 281 324
(2007a) 'Odysseus and the historians', *SyllClass* **18**: 1 79
(2007b) 'Universal history from Ephorus to Diodorus', in *Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, Vol. 1, ed. John Marincola. Oxford: 171 9
Mariotti, S. (1971) 'Falsi Enniani di Girolamo Colonna?', in *Studi filologici e storici in onore di Vittorio De Falco*, ed. V. de Falco. Naples

(1991) *Lezioni su Ennio*. 2nd edn. Orig. publ. 1951. Urbino
Marshall, P. K. (ed.) (1990) *A. Gellii Noctes Atticae*, 2 vols. Repr. with corr. Leipzig
Martina, M. (1979) 'Ennio, *poeta cliens*', *QFC* **2**: 13 74
Mastronarde, D. (2009) 'The lost *Phoenissae*: an experiment in reconstruction from fragments', in *The Play of Texts and Fragments: Essays in Honour of Martin Cropp*. Mnemosyne Suppl. CCCXIV, eds. J. R. C. Cousland and J. R. Hume. Leiden: 63 76
Mayer, R. G. (1990) 'The epic of Lucretius', *Papers of the Leeds Latin Seminar* **6**: 35 43
Mazzoli, G. (1964) 'Il frammento enniano *laus alit artis* e il proemio al XVI libro degli *Annales*', *Athenaeum* NS **42**: 307 33
McDonald, A. H. (1957) 'The style of Livy', *JRS* **47**: 155 72
Meister, K. (1971) 'Die synchronistische Darstellung des Polybios im Gegensatz zur Disposition des Ephoros und Theopompos', *Hermes* **99**: 506 8
Mendels, D. (1990) 'The polemical character of Manetho's *Aegyptiaca*', in *Purposes of History*, eds. G. Schepens, H. Verdin *et al.* Leuven: 91 123
Merrill, W. A. (1918a) *Parallelisms and Coincidences in Lucretius and Virgil*. University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. **3**.3. Berkeley, CA: 135 247
(1918b) *Parallelisms and Coincidences in Lucretius and Ennius*. University of California Publications in Classical Philology, Vol. **3**.4. Berkeley, CA: 249 64
Miles, G. B. (1995) *Livy: Reconstructing Early Rome*. Ithaca, NY
Minyard, J. D. (1978) *Mode and Value in the De Rerum Natura: A Study in Lucretius' Metrical Language*. Hermes Einzelschriften, Vol. XXXIX. Wiesbaden
Moles, J. (1993a) 'Livy's preface', *PCPhS* **39**: 141 68
(1993b) 'Truth and untruth in Herodotus and Thucydides', in *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*, eds. C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman. Austin, TX: 88 121
Momigliano, A. (1966) *Terzo contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico*, **2** vols. Rome
(1986) 'Two types of universal history: the cases of E. A. Freeman and Max Weber', *StudClas* **24**: 7 17
(1987) *On Pagans, Jews, and Christians*. Middletown, CT
Monro, D. B. (1891) *Homeric Grammar*. 2nd edn. Oxford
Morford, M. P. O. (1967) *The Poet Lucan: Studies in Rhetorical Epic*. Oxford
Morgan, M. H. (1898) 'Hidden verses in Livy', *HSPh* **9**: 61 6
Moskalew, W. (1982) *Formular Language and Poetic Design in the Aeneid*. Mnemosyne. Suppl. LXXIII. Leiden
Most, G. W. (1997) *Collecting Fragments: Fragmente sammeln*. Aporemata, Vol. 1. Göttingen
Müller, L. (1884) *Quintus Ennius: eine Einleitung in das Studium der römischen Poesie*. St Petersburg
Murgia, C. E. (1974) 'The Donatian life of Virgil, DS, and D', *ClAnt* **7**: 257 77
Murley, C. (1947) 'Lucretius, *De Rerum Natura*, viewed as epic', *TAPhA* **78**: 336 46
Mynors, R. A. B. (ed.) (1986) *Virgil, Georgics, with a Commentary*. Oxford

Newman, J. K. (1967) *Augustus and the New Poetry*. Collection Latomus, Vol. LXXXVIII. Brussels
(1988) 'Ennius' *Annales*: innovation and continuity', *AJPh* **109**: 431 41
Niese, B. (1896) 'Zur Geschichte des Pyrrhischen Krieges', *Hermes* **31**: 481 507
Nonno, M. de (1983) 'Frammenti misconosciuti de Plozio Sacerdote', *RFIC* **111**: 245 8
Norden, E. (1915) *Ennius und Vergilius: Kriegsbilder aus Roms grosser Zeit*. Leipzig and Berlin
(ed.) (1927) *Aeneis Buch VI*. 3rd edn. Stuttgart and Leipzig
(1954) *Die römische Literatur*. 5th edn. Leipzig
(1958) *Die antike Kunstprosa vom VI. Jahrhundert v. Chr. bis in die Zeit der Renaissance*. **2** vols. 5th edn. Darmstadt
Northwood, S. (2007) 'Quintus Fabius Pictor: was he an annalist?', in *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald*, Monograph Series Akanthina, Vol. 2, ed. N. Sekunda. Gdansk: 97 114
O'Donnell, J. J. (1979) *Cassiodorus*. Berkeley, CA
O'Neal, W. J. (1988) 'Ennius as an historical source', *CB* **64**.2: 35 9
Oakley, S. P. (1985) 'Single combat in the Roman Republic', *CQ* NS **35**.2: 392 410
(1997) A Commentary on Livy, Books VI X. *Vol. 1: Introduction and Book VI*. Oxford
Ogilvie, R. M. (1965) *A Commentary on Livy, Books 1 5*. Oxford
(1981) 'Review: Frier, B.W. (1979) *The Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*. Rome', *JRS* **71**: 199 201
Otis, B. (1964) *Virgil: A Study in Civilized Poetry*. Oxford
Otto, A. (1890) *Die Sprichwörter und sprichwörtlichen Redensarten der Römer*. Leipzig
Paolis, P. de (1986 7) 'Macrobio 1934 84', *Lustrum* **28** 9: 107 254
Paratore, E. and L. Canali (eds.) (1978) *Virgilio, Eneide*. **6** vols. Scrittori greci e latini Rome
Parry, A. (1963) 'The two voices of Virgil's *Aeneid*', *Arion* **2**: 66 80
(ed.) (1971) *The Making of Homeric Verse: The Collected Papers of Milman Parry*. Oxford
Pasquali, Giorgio (1964) *Orazio lirico*. Ristampa xerografica, con introduzione indici ed appendice di aggiornamento bibliografico a cura di Antonio La Penna. Orig. publ. 1920. Firenze
Pease, A. S. (ed.) (1920) *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Divinatione Liber Primus*. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature., Vol. **6**, No. 2 3. Urbana, IL
(1923) *M. Tulli Ciceronis De Divinatione Liber Secundus*. Illinois Studies in Language and Literature, Vol. **8**, No. 2 3. Urbana, IL
Pelling, C. B. R. (2000) 'Fun with fragments: Athenaeus and the historians', in *Athenaeus and his World: Reading Greek Culture in the Roman Empire*, eds. D. Braund and J. Wilkins. Exeter: 171 90
(2006) 'Homer and Herodotus', in *Epic Interactions: Perspectives on Homer, Virgil and the Epic Tradition*, eds. M. J. Clarke, B. G. F. Currie *et al.* Oxford: 75 104

Perl, G. (1964a) 'Der Anfang der römischen Geschichtsschreibung', *F&F* **38**.6: 185 9
(1964b) 'Der Anfang der römischen Geschichtsschreibung', *F&F* **38**.7: 213 18
Peter, H. W. G. (1897) *Die geschichtliche Litteratur über die römische Kaiserzeit bis Theodosius I und ihre Quellen*, **2** vols. Leipzig
Pinsent, J. (1959) 'Antiquarianism, fiction and history in the first decade of Livy', *CJ* **55**.2: 81 5
(1977) 'Livy 6.3.1 (*caput rei Romanae*): some Ennian echoes in Livy', *LCM* **2**: 13 18
Porter, J. I. (1992) 'Hermeneutic lines and circles; Aristarchus and Crates and the exegesis of Homer', in *Homer's Ancient Readers: The Hermeneutics of Greek Epic's Earliest Exegetes*, eds. R. Lamberton and J. J. Keaney. Princeton, NJ: 67 114
Pöschl, V. (ed.) (1969) *Römische Geschichtsschreibung*. Darmstadt
Powell, J. G. F. (ed.) (1988) *Cato Maior de Senectute*. Cambridge
Prinzen, H. (1998) *Ennius im Urteil der Antike*. Stuttgart
Rambaud, M. (1953) *Cicéron et l'histoire romaine*. Collection d'études latines. Série scientifique, Vol. XXVIII. Paris
Rawson, E. (1971) 'Prodigy lists and the use of the *Annales Maximi*', *CQ* **21**.1: 158 69
(1972) 'Cicero the historian and Cicero the antiquarian', *JRS* **62**: 33 45
(1976) 'The first Latin annalists', *Latomus* **35**: 689 717
Reeve, M. D. (1979) 'The textual tradition of Donatus' commentary on Terence', *CPh* **74**: 310 26
(2006) 'Some Vergil scholia', *CR* **56**.2: 345 6
Rich, J. (2011) *Structuring Roman History: The Consular Year and the Roman Historical Tradition* (online). Available: http://research.ncl.ac.uk/histos/documents/2011.01RichStructuringRomanHistory143.pdf
Richardson, J. (1991) 'Imperium Romanum: empire and the language of power', *JRS* **81**: 1 9
(2008) *The Language of Empire: Rome and the Idea of Empire From the Third Century* BC *to the Second Century* AD. Cambridge
Rockwood, F. E. (ed.) (1966) *Cicero's Tusculan Disputations I and Scipio's Dream*. Norman, OK. Repr. Orig. publ. Boston 1903
Rosén, H. B. (1968) 'Die Grammatik des Unbelegten, dargestellt an den Nominalkomposita bei Ennius', *Lingua* **21**: 359 81
Rostagni, A. (1979) *Suetonio, De poetis e biografi minori*. Orig. publ. 1944 (Torino). New York
Rowell, H. T. (1947) 'The original form of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*', *AJPh* **68**.1: 21 46
Rüpke, J. (1993) 'Livius, Priesternamen und die *Annales Maximi*', *Klio* **75**: 155 79
(1995a) *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit: die Geschichte der Repräsentation und religiösen Qualifikation von Zeit in Rom*. Religionsgeschichtliche Versuche und Vorarbeiten, Vol. XL. Berlin and New York
(1995b) '*Fasti*: Quellen oder Produkte römischer Geschichtsschreibung?', *Klio* 77: 184 202

(2006) 'Ennius' *fasti* in Fulvius's temple: Greek rationality and Roman tradition', *Arethusa* **39**.3: 489–512
Russell, D. A. (1967) 'Rhetoric and criticism', *G&R* **14**.2: 130–44
(1979) '*De Imitatione*', in *Creative Imitation and Latin Literature*, eds. D. A. West and A. J. Woodman. Cambridge: 1–16
Sacks, K. (1981) *Polybius on the Writing of History*. Berkeley, CA
(1990) *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*. Princeton, NJ
Sailor, D. P. (2006) 'Dirty linen, fabrication, and the authorities of Livy and Augustus', *TAPhA* **136**.2: 329–88
Sandys, J. E. (ed.) (1885) *M. Tulli Ciceronis ad M. Brutum Orator*. Repr. Hildesheim 1973. Cambridge
Scarcia, R. (2008) 'Working hypotheses on the connection between Servius and Isidore of Seville', in *Servius: Exegetical Stratifications and Cultural Models*, eds. S. Casali and F. Stok. Brussels: 216–23
Schepens, G. (1977) 'Historiographical Problems in Ephorus', in *Historiographia Antiqua: Commentationes Lovanienses in honorem W. Peremans septuagenarii editae*., Leuven: 95–118
Schofield, M. (1986) 'Cicero for and against divination', *JRS* **76**: 47–65
Schöll, F. (1885) 'Zu Ennius und Quintilian', *RhM* **40**: 318–24
Schultz, G. (1887) 'Über das Capitel *De Versuum Generibus* bei Diomedes p. 506 ff. K', *Hermes* **22**: 260–81
Schultze, C. (2010) 'Universal and particular in Velleius Paterculus: Carthage versus Rome', in *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*, eds. P. Liddel and A. Fear. London: 116–30
Schwabl, H. (1976) 'Zeus nickt', *WS* **10**: 22–30
Sciarrino, E. (2004) 'A temple for the professional Muse: the *aedes Herculis Musarum* and cultural shifts in second century BC Rome', in *Rituals in Ink: A Conference on Religion and Literary Production in Ancient Rome*, eds. A. Barchiesi, J. Rüpke *et al.* Stuttgart: 45–56
(2006) 'The introduction of epic in Rome: cultural thefts and social contests', *Arethusa* **39**.3: 449–69
Scullard, H. H. (1989) 'Carthage and Rome', in *CAH*, Vol. VII.2. 'The Rise of Rome to 220 BC', eds. A. E. Astin, F. W. Walbank *et al.* 3rd edn. Cambridge: 486–572
Skard, E. (1933) *Ennius und Sallustius: eine sprachliche Untersuchung*. Oslo
Skutsch, F. (1905) 'Ennius', in *RE*, Suppl. V, Stuttgart: 2588–2629
Skutsch, O. (1959) 'Notes on metempsychosis', *CPh* **542**: 114–16
(1968) *Studia Enniana*. London
(1978) 'Shepherds in Epirus (Varro, *RR* 2.2.1)', *LCM* **3**: 261–2
(ed.) (1985) *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford
Solmsen, F. (1986) 'Aeneas founded Rome with Odysseus', *HSPh* **90**: 98–110
Stacey, S. (1898) 'Die Entwickelung des livianischen Stiles', *Archiv für lateinische Lexicographie und Grammatik* **10**: 17–82
Stadter, P. A. (1972) 'The structure of Livy's history', *Historia* **21**: 287–307

Starr, R. J. (1980) 'Velleius' literary techniques in the organization of his history', *TAPhA* **110**: 287 301
(1981) 'The scope and genre of Velleius' history', *CQ* **31**.1: 162 74
Steel, C. E. W. (2001) *Cicero, Rhetoric and Empire*. Oxford
Stephens, S. (2002) 'Commenting on fragments', in *The Classical Commentary: Histories, Practices, Theory*, eds. R. Gibson and C. S. Kraus. Leiden: 67 88
Strasburger, H. (1972) *Homer und die Geschichtsschreibung*. Sitzungsberichte der Heidelberger Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch historische Klasse, Vol. 1. Heidelberg
Strasburger, H., W. Schmitthenner and R. Zoepffel (eds.) (1982) *Studien zur alten Geschichte*, **2** vols. Collectanea, Vol. XLII. Hildesheim
Strzelecki, W. (1935) *De Naeviano Belli Punici carmine: quaestiones selectae*, Vol. LXV.2. Krakow
Suerbaum, W. (1968) *Untersuchungen zur Selbstdarstellung älterer römischer Dichter: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, Ennius*. Hildesheim
(1992) 'Zum Anfang der Bücher in der archaischen lateinischen Dichtung: Naevius, Ennius, Lukrez und Livius Andronicus auf Papyrus Rollen', *ZPE* **92**: 153 73
(1995) 'Der Pyrrhos Krieg in Ennius' *Annales* VI im Lichte der ersten Ennius Papyri aus Herculaneum', *ZPE* **106**: 31 52
Sumner, G. V. (1970) 'The truth about Velleius Paterculus: prolegomena', *HSPh* **74**: 257 97
Taplin, O. (1992) *Homeric Soundings: The Shaping of the Iliad*. Oxford
Tarrant, R. J. (1997) 'Aspects of Virgil's reception in antiquity', in *The Cambridge Companion to Virgil*, ed. C. Martindale. Cambridge: 56 72
Timpanaro, S. (1947) 'Per una nuova edizione critica di Ennio', *SIFC* NS **22**: 33 77, 179 207
(1978) *Contributi di filologia e di storia della lingua latina*. Ricerche di storia della lingua latina, Vol. XIII. Rome
(1988) 'Otto Skutsch's Ennius', *BICS* Suppl. **51**: 1 5
Timpe, D. (1972) 'Fabius Pictor und die Anfänge der römischen Historiographie', *ANRW*, Vol. 1.2, eds. H. Temporini, J. Vogt *et al*. Berlin: 928 69
Toher, M. (1989) 'On the use of Nicolaus' historical fragments', *ClAnt* **8**.1: 159 72
Vahlen, J. (ed.) (1903) *Ennianae poesis reliquiae*. 2nd edn. Leipzig
Vannicelli, P. (1987) 'L'economia della storie di Eforo', *RFIC* **115**: 165 91
(2001) 'Herodotus' Egypt and the foundations of universal history', in *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*, ed. N. Luraghi. Oxford: 211 40
Vasaly, A. (2002) 'The structure of Livy's first pentad and the Augustan poetry book', in *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, eds. D. S. Levene and D. P. Nelis. Leiden: 275 90
Vattuone, R. (1998) '*Koinai Praxeis*: Le dimensioni "universali" della storiografia greca fra Erodoto e Teopompo', in *L'ecumenismo politico nella coscienza dell' Occidente, Bergamo 18 21 Settembre 1995*, ed. L. Aigner Foresti. Rome: 57 96

Veyne, P. (1983) *Les Grecs ont-ils cru à leurs mythes? Essai sur l'imagination constituante*. Paris
Volk, K. (2002) *The Poetics of Latin Didactic: Lucretius, Vergil, Ovid, Manilius*. Oxford
Walbank, F. W. (1945) 'Polybius, Philinus, and the First Punic War', *CQ* **39**: 1 18
(1957) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*, **3** vols. Oxford
(1960) 'History and tragedy', *Historia* **9**: 216 34
(1967) *A historical commentary on Polybius*, Vol. **2**. Oxford
(1974) 'Synchronisms in Polybius: Books 4 and 5', in *Polis and Imperium: Studies in Honour of Edward Togo Salmon*, ed. J. A. S. Evans. Toronto: 59 80
(1975) '*Symploke*: its role in Polybius' *Histories*', *YCIS* **24**: 197 212
(1998) 'A Greek looks at Rome', *SCI* **17**: 45 59
Wardle, D. (2006) *Cicero on Divination: De Divinatione, Book 1*, transl. with an introduction and historical commentary. Oxford
Warren, M. (1885) 'Phillips Glossary: extracts from a glossary in the Phillips Library in Cheltenham', *AJPh* **6**.4: 451 61
Weippert, O. (1972) *Alexander-Imitatio und römische Politik in republikanischer Zeit*. Diss. Würzburg
Werner, S. (1994) 'On the history of the *Commenta Bernensia* and the *Adnotationes Super Lucanum*', *HSPh* **96**: 343 68
Wessner, P. (1895) *Neue Jahrbücher für Philologie und Pädagogik* **151**: 417 32
West, D. A. (1969) *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius*. Edinburgh
West, M. L. (ed.) (1966) *Hesiod, Theogony*. Oxford
Wheeler, S. M. (1999) *A Discourse of Wonders: Audience and Performance in Ovid's Metamorphoses*. Philadelphia
White, D. C. (1980) 'The method of composition and sources of Nonius Marcellus', *Studi Noniani* **8**: 111 211
Wigodsky, M. (1972) *Vergil and Early Latin Poetry*. Hermes Einzelschiften, Vol. XXIV. Wiesbaden
Wilkinson, L. P. (1963) *Golden Latin Artistry*. Cambridge
Williams, G. W. (1968) *Tradition and Originality in Roman Poetry*. Oxford
Williams, R. D. (ed.) (1960) *P. Maronis Vergili Aeneidos Liber Quintus*. Oxford
Wills, J. (1996) *Repetition in Latin Poetry: Figures of Allusion*. Oxford
Wiseman, T. P. (1979) *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*. Leicester
(1981) 'Practice and theory in Roman historiography', *History* **66**: 375 93
(1987) *Roman Studies: Literary and Historical*. Liverpool
(1994) *Historiography and Imagination: Eight Essays on Roman Culture*. Exeter
(2002) 'History, poetry and *annales*', in *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*, eds. D. S. Levene and D. P. Nelis. Leiden: 331 62
(2006) 'Fauns, prophets, and Ennius' *Annales*', *Arethusa* **39**.3: 513 29
(2010) 'Velleius mythistoricus', in *Ancient Historiography and its Contexts: Studies in Honour of A. J. Woodman*, eds. C. S. Kraus, J. Marincola *et al.* Oxford: 73 83

Witte, K. (1910) 'Über die Form der Darstellung in Livius' Geschichtswerk', *RhM* **65**: 270 305, 359 419
Wölfflin, E. (1895) 'Ein Fragment des Ennius', *RhM* **50**: 152
Woodcock, E. C. (1985) *A New Latin Syntax*. Bristol
Woodman, A. J. (1975) 'Questions of date, genre, and style in Velleius: some literary answers', *CQ* NS **25**.2: 272 306
(ed.) (1983) *Velleius Paterculus: The Caesarian and Augustan Narrative (2.41 93)*. Cambridge
(1988) *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. Portland, OR
Wreschniok, R. F. (1907) *De Cicerone Lucretioque Ennii imitatoribus*. Wroclaw
Wülfing von Martitz, P. (1972) 'Ennius als hellenistischer Dichter', in *Ennius: sept exposés suivis de discussions, Entretiens Hardt sur l'antiquité classique*, *Vol. XVII*, ed. O. Skutsch. Vandoevres and Geneva: 255 89
Yarrow, L. M. (2006) *Historiography at the End of the Republic: Provincial Perspectives on Roman Rule*. Oxford
(2010) 'Focalised universality: contextualising the genre', in *Historiae Mundi: Studies in Universal History*, eds. P. Liddel and A. Fear. London: 131 47
Zetzel, J. E. G. (1974) 'Ennian experiments', *AJPh* **95**.2: 137 40
(1975) 'On the history of Latin scholia', *HSPh* **79**: 335 54
(1981) *Latin Textual Criticism in Antiquity*. Salem, NH
(ed.) (1995) *Cicero, De Re Publica: Selections*. Cambridge
(1998) '*De Re Publica* and *De Rerum Natura*', in *Style and Tradition: Studies in Honor of Wendell Clausen*, eds. P. E. Knox and C. Foss. Stuttgart and Leipzig: 230 47
(ed.) (1999) *Cicero, On the Commonwealth and On the Laws*. Cambridge
(2005) *Marginal Scholarship and Textual Deviance: The Commentarium Cornuti and the Early Scholia on Persius*. BICS. Suppl. LXXXIV. London
(2007) 'The influence of Cicero on Ennius', in *Ennius Perennis: the Annals and Beyond*, CPhS Suppl. 31, eds. W. Fitzgerald and E. Gowers. Cambridge: 1 16
Ziegler, K. J. F. (1966) *Das hellenistische Epos: ein vergessenes Kapitel griechischer Dichtung*. 2nd edn. with appendix: 'Ennius als hellenistischer Epiker'. Leipzig
Zillinger, W. (1911) *Cicero und die altrömischen Dichter: eine literarhistorische Untersuchung*. Würzburg

Index

For RLS:
In gratitude and grief