Project
MUSE®
Scholarly journals online

INTRODUCTION:
ENNIUS AND THE TRADITIONS OF EPIC

ANDREOLA ROSSI AND BRIAN W. BREED

The challenges involved in writing about Ennius's *Annales* hardly need restating. Of the works of Ennius (and he was apparently a prolific writer), we have only a list of titles and some fragments—for the *Annales* approximately 600 full or partial lines—that have been preserved mostly by later authors, especially grammarians.[1] Add to this our patchy knowledge of the social, political, and cultural context in which the *Annale*s was produced, and it becomes evident that any study of this epic will be more likely to raise questions and problems than to give clear and straightforward answers. The reader is thus entitled to ask why we should take the trouble to bring together a collection of papers about an author and a poem the study of which will inevitably involve a significant amount of guesswork.

When we organized the panel "Ennius and the Invention of Roman Epic" for the annual meeting of the American Philological Association in San Francisco in January 2004, our intent was clear. The last twenty years have witnessed a renewed, if still somewhat tentative, interest in the study of archaic Latin literature, spurred, in the first instance, by the appearance

---

[1] Copies of the *Annals* were circulating up to the Antonine period, which saw a revival of interest in archaic poets. Gellius attests to public readings in the theater (18.5.2): "Iuliano nuntiatur ἀναγνώστην quendam, non indoctum hominem, voce admodum scita et canora Ennii Annales legere ad populos in theatro" ("It was reported to Julianus that a certain reader, a not untrained man, with a highly skilled and sonorous voice was giving public readings of Ennius's *Annales* in the theater"). References by many later grammarians most likely depend on earlier citations rather than on a direct knowledge of the *Annales,* and the text seems to have been no longer in circulation by the time of Isidorus (end of the sixth century); see Jocelyn 1972a.987 and, for a complete survey of the history of the text, Skutsch 1985.8–46.

Arethusa 39 (2006) 397–425 © 2006 by The Johns Hopkins University Press

of Otto Skutsch's authoritative edition of the fragments of the *Annales*. In itself the culmination of a scholarly career with its roots in a great tradition,[2] the work of Skutsch, along with the important textual studies of Sebastiano Timpanaro and Scevola Mariotti, which represent the best of Italian philology,[3] have enabled investigations that look beyond metrics and stylistics, beyond arguments about placing fragments in their correct context, and beyond source hunting and influence tracing—all concerns that rightly dominated the study of the fragments of Ennius at one time. The fruits of these advances are now being reaped in an array of studies that, by the application of new theories and new methodologies, many of them influenced by intellectual currents in fields beyond classics, test conventional assumptions and traditional readings of early Roman literary production. It seemed to us, then, that the time was ripe for bringing together a number of specialists in the field of archaic Latin literature and Roman cultural studies in order to reassess Ennius's epic. In all the papers that follow, reassessment of the *Annales* results, above all else, from approaching the poem within a specifically Roman frame that encompasses the analysis of the *Annales'* relationship with older Latin preliterary traditions, the social and cultural context in which the text was produced, its role in the articulation of a historical consciousness in the life of the Roman community, and, eventually, its varied reception.

The contributors to this volume will give different and, at times, incompatible answers to the question of where Ennius's *Annales* stands today. Studies of the *Annales,* and of archaic Roman literature generally, are not defined by a unity of approach and methodology. To fashion a completely coherent and unified picture would mean denying the true state of affairs and giving up a real source of vitality for studies of this period. For this reason, in our role as editors, we have not attempted to hide disagreement or to reconcile differences. On the contrary, the purpose of this volume is to present the reader with the complex variety of approaches and readings that best characterize contemporary scholarship on the *Annales.* The eight papers collected here represent a sampling of the work being done both by younger scholars and by established voices in the field. Five of the papers are revised and expanded versions of presentations made originally at the meeting in San Francisco. The three other papers, by Habinek, Rüpke, and Wiseman, were commissioned specifically for this volume in order to carry the discussion beyond the constraints imposed on the original group by the conference-panel format and into the specific areas of expertise of these scholars, all of whom were already a part of the conversation through their previously published work.

---

[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.

[3] Although these two scholars did not publish a comprehensive edition of the *Annales,* their contributions to Ennian scholarship stand with the work of Skutsch. A full account of their numerous studies can be found in Suerbaum 2003, as part of a comprehensive bibliography for the twentieth century.

The controversies about Ennius and the *Annales* are diverse and numerous enough to prevent them all being addressed here. In the pages that follow, we first present a brief synopsis of Ennius's life. We do this not simply as a biographical exercise, but rather as a means of shedding light to the extent that we are able on the very sociology of literary production in mid-republican Rome. Our ability to understand that context eventually informs, even defines, our reading of the nature and the quality of the *Annales*. And yet we are also always conscious that, with this text, more even than with most other classical texts, our picture of the culture in which it was produced is filtered through layers of subsequent tradition and distorted by fragmentation at all levels. Without attempting to deny this fact, we can at least lay the groundwork for grappling with it by also looking briefly at the history of the reception of the *Annales*, both in antiquity and, more fully, in the last century or so of classical scholarship. Our picture of the *Annales* must constantly take account of the changing significance of "epic" at Rome, whether the figures trying to sort out what Roman epic is are Livius and Naevius and Ennius himself, or Cicero, Virgil, and Silius, or Wilhelm Kroll, Konrat Ziegler, and Skutsch, or more recent interveners such as Nevio Zorzetti, Sander Goldberg, and Thomas Habinek. When, with these guides, we come to face the ultimate question of for whom at Rome epic speaks—whether it is an aristocracy, one partisan faction or another, the state itself, even the *populus Romanus*—we arrive back at the question of the cultural climate in which the *Annales* was produced. Together, then, these preliminary comments will be, we think, a useful means of introducing the articles of our contributors, inasmuch as all of them deal, by necessity, with questions of the social context of the production of the *Annales* and its subsequent reception.

THE LIFE AND WORKS OF ENNIUS

As Ennius himself tells us, he was a native of Rudiae, a town of Calabria,[4] born in the year 239 B.C.E.[5] Messapian by birth, a descendant, he says, of Messapus the mythical horse tamer,[6] he was, nevertheless, probably from an Oscan-speaking family. The name of the poet's nephew, Pacuvius, is Oscan, and so is the name Ennius itself.[7] His education would have been Greek. This is hardly surprising. Strabo defines Rudiae as πόλεως Ἑλληνίδος (6.281), and Messapia boasted strong ties with the Greek world. Ennius's adoptive country, however, was Rome. Hence his famous claim to possess *tria corda*, "three hearts": Greek, Oscan, and, finally, Latin ("tria corda . . . Graece . . . Osce . . . Latine").[8]

When and under what circumstances Ennius came to Rome are not altogether clear. Tradition has it that, while serving in the military in Sardinia in 204, he made the acquaintance of the then quaestor M. Porcius Cato on his way back from Africa and was brought to Rome by him.[9] This story is, however, reported only by Nepos.[10] The silence of other sources would not amount to much were it not for two facts. In the first place, Nepos probably gets Cato's quaestorship wrong; he dates it to 205 instead of the more likely 204, suggesting that he might be following an unreliable source.[11] At the same time, Nepos's account does not fit with the report of Aurelius Victor that Ennius taught Greek to Cato in Sardinia during the latter's praetorship, that is, in 198.[12] The two stories seem to be too similar (Cato, Ennius, Sardinia) for them both to be sound, and Ernst Badian, for one, has questioned the accuracy of Nepos's account of Cato's personal relationship with Ennius and his role in bringing him to Rome.[13] However, neither concern is truly decisive, and the majority position among scholars remains the acceptance of the story as reported by Nepos.[14] In any event, once our poet came to Rome, and the year 204 is still a likely candidate, he earned his living as a teacher[15] and lived on the Aventine Hill,[16] where he kept company with Ser. Sulpicius Galba, a neighbor (Cic. *Luc*. 51). In fact, at Rome, Ennius acquired social connections with many of the leading men of the city.

---

[4] On the (by no means certain) assumption that *Ann.* 525: "nos sumus Romani qui fuimus ante Rudini" ("We are now Romans who previously were Rudians") speaks with the poet's *ego.* The exact location of Rudiae is unknown. Strabo places it between Brundisium and Tarentum (6.281). Other sources place it more generally in Calabria or Messapia (Ovid *AA* 3.409: "Ennius . . . Calabris in montibus ortus," "Ennius . . . born in Calabrian mountains"). For a more detailed discussion regarding Ennius's birthplace, see Magno 1979.10–14.

[5] Gellius 17.21.43: "Claudium et Tuditanum consules sequuntur Q. 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 annalem scripsisse idque ipsum Ennium in eodem libro dicere" ("Q. Valerius and C. Mamilius succeeded Claudius and Tuditanus as consuls. M. Varro, in the first book of his *On Poets*, wrote that Ennius was born in that year and that he wrote the twelfth book of the *Annals* in his sixty-seventh year, and that Ennius himself says this in the same book"). For a discussion of the passage, see Skutsch 1985.674–76. Cf. also Cic. *Brut.* 72 and *Tusc.* 1.3.

[6] See *Ann.* 524, Servius at *Aen.* 7.691, Silius 12.393: "Ennius, antiqua Messapi ab origine regis" ("Ennius, from the ancient line of King Messapus").

[7] Skutsch 1985.749–50. The Latin praenomen Quintus might represent a calque on an original Oscan name (Skutsch 1985.1 n. 1). The story that he was awarded Roman citizenship by the son of M. Fulvius Nobilior and thereafter styled himself Quintus in honor of his benefactor (thus Cic. *Brut.* 79) runs aground on some serious chronological problems (Badian 1972.183–84).

[8] Gellius 17.17.1 = Skutsch *Operis inc. frag.* i. In addition to Skutsch 1985 ad loc., cf. Suerbaum 1968.140–42 and Jocelyn 1972a.991.

[9] Nepos *Cato* 1.4: "Sardiniam ex qua quaestor superiore tempore ex Africa decedens Q. Ennium poetam deduxerat, quod non minoris aestimamus quam quemlibet amplissimum Sardiniensem triumphum" ("Sardinia, from where at an earlier time when he was quaestor returning from Africa he had brought the poet Q. Ennius, a deed that we do not esteem less than any Sardin-

---

ian triumph, even the most grand"). Silius 12.393–414 dramatizes Ennius fighting in Sardinia. For a detailed analysis of Silius's account, see Casali's article in the present volume.

[10] And, following him, later by Jerome *Chron. a. a.* 1777; cf. Badian 1972.156 n. 1.

[11] Broughton 1951–52.1.310 n. 4 does not think that this is the case. He suggests rather that in Nepos's reference to Scipio's consulship ("quaestor obtigit P. Africano consuli") "*consuli* either refers to Scipio's status at the time of the election of quaestor or is used loosely for *proconsuli*."

[12] *De Viris Illustribus* 47.1: "In praetura Sardiniam subegit, ubi ab Ennio Graecis litteris institutus."

[13] Badian 1972.155–63. Badian believes the story of Ennius's association with Cato is a later scholarly fabrication designed to balance Cato's attacks on Fulvius Nobilior's exploitation of Ennius and to plug the hole left in Roman literary history by the departures from the scene of Livius and Naevius. He does, however, accept the story of Ennius's military service in Sardinia and so the possibility that his arrival at Rome can be dated to 204, both facts presumably based ultimately on the testimony of the poet himself (162–63).

[14] The story as reported by Nepos is accepted by, e.g., Suerbaum 1968.42, Jocelyn 1972a.993, Skutsch 1985.1, Goldberg 1989.256 n. 28, Gruen 1990.108 n. 138, and Goldberg 1995.114.

[15] Suet. *Gramm.* 1: "Antiquissimi doctorum, qui idem et poetae et semigraeci erant, Livium et Ennium dico, quos utraque lingua domi forisque docuisse adnotatum est—nihil amplius quam Graecos interpretabantur, aut si quid ipsi Latine composuissent praelegebant" ("The earliest teachers, who were themselves both poets and half-Greeks, I mean Livius and Ennius, who, it has been recorded, taught both in the home and publicly in both languages—they expounded nothing more fully than the Greeks, or they read aloud whatever they themselves had composed in Latin"); cf. also Festus 293 Lindsay, Jocelyn 1972a.991 n. 42.

[16] Varro *LL* 5.163, Jerome *Chron. a. a.* 1777. For the location of Ennius's house, see Badian 1972.164–68, with bibliography.

A prolific and varied literary career followed. Ennius worked in a number of canonical genres, including not only epic but also tragedy and comedy.[17] In addition, he wrote the generically unidentified *Scipio*; the *Epicharmus*, an account of the gods and the nature of the universe in trochaic septenarii; the *Euhemerus*, which popularized the theological doctrine of Euhemerus of Messene; the *Hedyphagetica,* a didactic work on gastronomy inspired by the brief epic of Archestratus of Gela; the *Protrepticus*, probably a collection of moral precepts; and the *Sota*, modeled on the poetry of Sotades of Maronea (ca. 280 B.C.E.), the inventor of cinaedic poetry. Some of these titles may name works that were included in the four books of *saturae* also credited to Ennius.[18] The chronology of the works is still today a subject of debate, but there is general agreement that the *Annales* must belong to the last part of the poet's career and could have been begun as late as Ennius's return in 187 from Aetolia, where he had accompanied M. Fulvius Nobilior on campaign.[19] At least two internal references seem to support the idea that the *Annales* is late. *Annales* 307 refers to M. Cornelius Cethegus, censor in 209 and consul in 204, as a man of a past generation (*qui tum vivebant homines*, "the men who were alive in those days"), and Gellius states that, according to Varro, Ennius claimed to have been sixty-seven years old (i.e., in 173 B.C.E.) at the time he wrote Book 12 of the *Annales*.[20] Gellius's reference is, in itself, problematic (Skutsch tentatively emends 12 to 18),[21] but in any event, it seems to further validate the late date for the composition of Ennius's epic.[22] Tradition put Ennius's death in the year 169, that is, immediately after the conclusion of the *Annales.*[23]

GOOD COMPANION, ELITE FRIENDS

In describing Ennius's position in Roman society, we have used the rather vague and non-committal term "connections" deliberately: the nature of the relationship between Ennius and the Roman political elite is far from clear and has been extensively debated. The issue is a touchstone for understanding the ideology of the poem, and even of Roman epic generally. Two sharply polarized positions have received the lion's share of support. On the one hand, the majority position, held by, e.g., H. D. Jocelyn, Badian, Mario Martina, and Skutsch, envisions Ennius as a client poet who promotes the prestige of his benefactors and who, in return, receives *beneficia* from them. Martina openly calls Ennius *poeta cliens*, and Badian defines the poet's position as based "on a footing of inferiority and clientship with his own generation of aristocrats."[24] Grounding their argument on the famous "Good Companion" passage in which, according to the grammarian Aelius Stilo, Ennius gave a portrait of himself in disguise,[25] Skutsch and Jocelyn arrive at similar conclusions. Skutsch recognizes (1985.450) in the passage a Hellenistic *topos* of the social inferior and his royal patron. Jocelyn labels Ennius an "engaging courtier" and compares the rapport between the poet/friend and the Roman aristocrat described in the Ennian passage to that of the scientists and poets who attended the military campaigns of their royal patrons in the Hellenistic age. He further reads the "Good Companion" passage as a possible reply to Cato's criticism of Fulvius for having brought Ennius along on his Aetolian campaign: the "Good Companion" passage promoted the idea that Ennius and the other clients of the leaders were no ordinary parasites, as Cato suggested, "but men of profound culture and moral integrity."[26] Naturally enough, the patron-client relationship they envision between Ennius and powerful Romans also informs these scholars' readings of the *Annales* as an encomiastic poem whose main purpose is to advance the prestige of Fulvius and his circle of friends.[27] To remain with our present passage, Badian, for example, sees Ennius's favorable depiction of Servilius as an attempt to gratify members of the Servilii family who were politically active during Ennius's life by celebrating their distinguished ancestor.[28]

---

[17] For Ennius as a dramatic poet, see Jocelyn 1972b, Suerbaum 2002.126–29.

[18] For Ennius as a satirist, see Waszink 1972.

[19] For a chronology of Ennius's works, see Suerbaum 2002.124–39.

[20] Gellius 17.21.43, quoted in note 5, above.

[21] Skutsch 1985 *sed. inc.* lxx, following Merula, Vahlen, and Valmaggi.

[22] Cf. also Jocelyn 1972a.997–99 for a full bibliography and analysis of the chronology of the *Annales* specifically. Some of the other evidence Jocelyn cites to date the *Annales* as a later production is, however, quite unconvincing.

[23] Cic. *Brut.* 78: "Q. Marcio Cn. Servilio consulibus mortem obiit Ennius" ("In the consulship of Q. Marcius and Cn. Servilius, Ennius died").

---

[24] Badian 1972.183, Martina 1979.74; cf. also Martina 1980. For a similar view, see also Suerbaum 2002.122–23.

[25] *Ann.* 268–86; cf. Gellius 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" ("They say that L. Aelius Stilo was accustomed to say that Q. Ennius had written these lines about himself and that it was a picture of the manners and the character of Q. Ennius himself"). Stilo's statement is generally accepted, but see Suerbaum 1968.142 n. 455 and his and Jocelyn's responses to Badian at Badian 1972.206.

[26] Jocelyn 1972a.993–94 (quote on 994). Gildenhard 2003.110 also reads the "Good Companion" passage as the poet's "'apologia' for himself and his pursuits," which "seems to be answering critics like Cato by highlighting the positive contributions that literary figures like himself can make to Roman aristocratic life."

[27] See, especially, Badian 1972.182, Martina 1979.20, Skutsch 1985.502.

Recently, Ingo Gildenhard has espoused a comparable, if more nuanced, view. He recognizes in epic "a weapon in the tussles among members of Rome's ruling elite over the control of 'history'" because epic offered the possibility of displaying the achievements of individual families, like the Servilii, outside the confines of family stories, the *imagines* displayed in atria, the laudations pronounced at funerals of one-time consuls and triumphators, and the other old-Roman components of *fama*. By contrast, an epic like the *Annales* displays elite achievements within the greater frame of Roman history sweeping all the way back to the origins of the city.[29] And yet Gildenhard remains confident that "the sort of immortality that Ennius offers in and through his poetry is rooted in his relationship to noble patrons and will have involved some kind of material compensation, even if both poet and patron are at pains to conceal this fact" (2003.105).

This reading of the *Annales* as an encomiastic, often partisan medium produced on the basis of clientship's quasi-economic system of services and rewards has not remained unchallenged. Sander Goldberg, in particular, casts doubt on the scholarly construct of Ennius the poet for hire. Goldberg looks at Ennius and sees a man of "respectable birth, an independent means of livelihood, and immense talent" who was able to move freely in high Roman circles (1995.132), something hardly possible for a client beholden to and identified with any closely circumscribed political faction. The relationship that Goldberg envisions between Ennius and Rome's military-political elite is not clientship, but neither is it a relationship of social equality. Instead, Goldberg attributes a "kind of countervailing power" to the poet, as represented, for instance, in the passage on the Good Companion (1995.120–23; quote p. 123). Ennius—and we paraphrase

---

[28] Either Cn. Servilius Geminus, consul of 217, who died in the battle of Cannae, or, as Badian believes, P. Servilius, consul of 252 and 248, who participated in the First Punic War (Badian 1972.174–80). For further discussion, see Gruen 1990.112, who also believes that Stilo's inference that Servilius's companion represents the poet indicates that the association between Ennius and the house of the Servilii was an understood presumption, but denies the idea that the poet inserted the passage specifically to praise them. As for the identity of the Servilius named in the passage, Skutch 1985.447–50 opts for the consul of 217 and, following Cichorius, attributes the fragment to the battle of Cannae where the consul died. He is thus forced to emend 7 to 8 in Gellius, on the grounds that the Second Punic War was narrated in *Annales* 8. A similar opinion is held by Jocelyn 1972a.994.

[29] Gildenhard 2003; the quote comes from pp. 111–12.

Goldberg here—is to his Roman friends more what Patroclus was to Achilles, or Achates to Aeneas, and less what a *poeta cliens* was to Alexander and the other Hellenistic Kings (1995.122). For his part, Thomas Habinek is ready to accept Goldberg's formulation, provided that the picture of the good companion's "countervailing power" is accepted not as an objective representation of actual practice in Ennius's environment but as an idealized picture of how the poet and the elite could benefit one another that is already distanced from Ennius's own day by being cast well into the historical past.[30] Key differences notwithstanding, Goldberg shares the willingness of Skutsch, Badian, and the others to embrace the Good Companion as a programmatic passage that, for him, casts indirect light on the purpose of the *Annales* by way of emphasizing the independence of the poet. As a consequence, Goldberg downplays the pro-Fulvian bias of the *Annales* and reads the epic as a work in which individual achievements are subordinate to the greater cause of Roman *gloria*. The *Annales*, then, is to be read as a national epic, "not a Fulvian, or Fabian, or Scipionic one."[31]

It was important in our brief survey of Ennius's life to define the nature of the controversy about the relationship between Ennius and his Roman friends. Whether more partisan or more national in orientation, Roman epic, it is fair to say, would not have taken the form it did in the *Annales* without Ennius's connections with the elite. The contributors to the present volume will discuss this issue in more detail and will, at times, strongly disagree with each other, and with us, too. But before we reach that point, let us now look briefly at who exactly Ennius's friends were.

We have already suggested that the account that Ennius was brought to Rome by Cato himself might best be taken *cum grano salis*. The sources present a complicated picture of the relationship between the two men. They must at least have known each other. Despite Cato's criticism of Fulvius for having brought Ennius with him to Aetolia,[32] in the *de Senectute,* Cicero has the now old Cato label Ennius *familiaris noster* (Cic. *Sen.* 10). Ennius, furthermore, apparently paid homage to Cato somewhere in his poetry. In the *pro Archia*, Cicero says that Ennius exalted Cato to heaven.[33] Unfortunately, Cicero does not bother to define the nature of this praise nor the occasion for it, leaving a gap that has been filled by various speculations. Jocelyn believes (1972a.995) that the work in question was the *Annales.* In an attempt to find a place for praise of Cato in the epic, Badian, somewhat unconvincingly, saw in the mysterious line "apud emporium in campo hostium pro moene," "at the market in the field in front of the enemy's walls" (*frag. spuria* xii), a reference to the Spanish city of Emporiae, the Greek settlement that provided a base for Cato's campaign in Spain in 195 during his consulship that led eventually to the pacification of the province.[34] For all its vagueness, Cicero's statement has been equally useful to those who do not hold to the partisan interpretation of the *Annales*. Erich Gruen, for instance, takes it as confirmation of his thesis that Ennius's poetic works were not simply meant to advance the agenda of a specific political party (1990.117). Rather, Ennius's praise of Fulvius's political foes, not only Cato, but also M. Aemilius Lepidus, shows that Ennius concentrated on patriotic rather than partisan themes.[35]

---

[30] Habinek 1998a.50–54, especially 50 with n. 49; see also Habinek 1990, esp. 170–74.

[31] Goldberg 1995.123. Cf. also Gruen 1990 for a similar interpretation (121): "The *Annales* grew out of that association, not to advance the dignity of particular families but, through them, to give a sense of national goals and successes," where "that association" means Ennius's relationship with the politically powerful.

[32] Cic. *Tusc.* 1.3: "oratio Catonis in qua obiecit ut probrum M. Nobiliori, quod is in provinciam poetas duxisset; duxerat autem consul ille in Aetoliam, ut scimus, Ennium" ("The speech of Cato in which he represented it as a reproach against M. Nobilior that he had taken poets with him into his province; and, in fact, as we know, when he was consul, he had taken Ennius to Aetolia"). Malcovati 1955 assigns this speech (148 M) to about 178.

In addition to Cato, a close association between Ennius and the Scipios is also well attested. In the *de Oratore* (2.276), Cicero reports a funny anecdote that shows the great familiarity between Ennius and Scipio Nasica, either the consul of 191 or his son who was consul in 162.[36] In general, those who are inclined to believe that Ennius performed the role of family encomiast to the Scipios are well served by the sources. Famously, Ennius celebrated Africanus in a work entitled *Scipio*, the encomiastic nature of which is widely accepted.[37] And yet, once again, the limitations of our evidence leave room for disagreement. Gruen argues that Scipio's triumph over Hannibal was a national triumph not necessarily subject to ownership by a faction and that the celebration of Scipio was a de facto celebration of Rome's glory (1990.109–10). We also hear from Cicero that it was believed that a marble statue of Ennius was placed on the tomb of the Scipios on the Via Appia outside the Porta Capena.[38] Valerius Maximus goes even further and, in what is probably a fabrication, claims that Scipio Africanus himself had given the order for the statue to be erected.[39] Whether the statue existed or not, even if the Scipios had tried to claim Ennius as "their" poet, it still would not necessarily follow that he was. With both Cato and the Scipios, therefore, it is difficult to move beyond describing a "connection" with Ennius to a more precise characterization of the relationship that everyone can accept.

---

[33] *Arch.* 22: "In caelum huius proavus Cato tollitur."

[34] Badian 1972.169–70. For a different view, see Skutsch 1985 ad loc., who rightly notes that the verse cannot have been a hexameter and is inclined to attribute the line to Naevius. See also M. Barchiesi 1962.529–30.

[35] See Cic. *Prov.* 20: "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 conlega, quo die censor est factus, homine inimicissimo, in campo statim rediit in gratiam, ut commune officium censurae communi animo ac voluntate defenderent?" ("Isn't it true that the famous M. Lepidus, who twice was consul and pontifex maximus, was praised not only by the testimony of memory, but also by the letters of the annals and by the voice of our greatest poet because on the very day that he was made censor, immediately on the campus, he came to an agreement with his colleague M. Fulvius, a man most hostile to him, so that they would uphold their common office of the censorship with a common spirit and will?"). On this, see Goldberg 1995.116.

[36] Badian 1972.170–72 holds the latter view, and he finds it "unconceivable that Ennius could have associated with a distinguished consular, a Patrician of almost his own age, on a footing of such easy familiarity" (172). For the opposite opinion, see Gruen 1990.110 n. 151, who thinks it "perhaps anachronistic" to assume with Badian that Ennius must have

But undoubtedly the most famous "friend" of Ennius was M. Fulvius Nobilior, and here we have more information. As the story goes, Fulvius asked the now well-established poet to accompany him to Aetolia in 189, whence he later returned as the conqueror of the city of Ambracia. Among the booty Fulvius brought to Rome from Ambracia were statues of the Muses and of Hercules playing the lyre. These were put on display on the Campus Martius either in a new temple or in an old temple to which a new portico was added. The building was subsequently known as the Aedes Herculis Musarum.[40] Our historical sources present Fulvius's military campaign in

---

been Nasica's teacher, like one of the Greek captives or slaves later generations of Roman aristocrats imported for the purpose.

[37] For the title, see Gellius 4.7.3. For discussion, see Suerbaum 2002.132–33.

[38] *Arch.* 22: "Carus fuit Africano superiori noster Ennius, itaque etiam in sepulcro Scipionum putatur is esse constitutus ex marmore" ("Our own Ennius was dear to the elder Africanus, and so he is believed even to have been represented in marble on the tomb of the Scipios"). Cf. also Livy 38.56.4.

[39] Both Cicero and Livy report the information as uncertain: Cicero uses the term *putatur*, Livy *dicuntur*. For Valerius Maximus (8.14.1) it becomes a positive assertion, to which he adds the tale that Scipio Africanus had himself given the order. For discussion of these passages, see Suerbaum 1968.210–12, Badian 1972.154–55.

[40] See Skutsch 1985.144–46 at *Ann.* 1. An inscription found in the vicinity of the temple (*CIL* 6.1307) probably comes from the pedestal of one of the statues: "M. Folvius M. f. Ser. n. Nobilior cos. Ambracia cepit."

terms that are far from heroic and describe how, upon his return to Rome, Fulvius met mounting opposition and criticism. The city was not taken by force; its surrender, rather, was produced under siege. When the citizens of Ambracia later sent a delegation to Rome to complain about the pillage of their city by Fulvius, the senate compensated them. Furthermore, in light of M. Lepidus's fierce opposition, Fulvius's triumph was postponed.[41] It was in this environment that, in 187 or 186, most likely at games sponsored by Fulvius, Ennius presented the *Ambracia,* possibly a *fabula praetexta*,[42] devoted to the siege. Only four lines survive; it is, however, to be assumed that the play put a favorable spin on Fulvius's accomplishment.[43] And the *Ambracia* was, of course, not the only work in which Ennius described Fulvius's Aetolian campaign. Book 15 of the *Annales*, originally the last book of Ennius's epic, provided a detailed and grand account of it.[44] Although fragments of this book are few, the climax of the narrative was most likely the description of the temple of Hercules of the Muses built by Fulvius after his triumph in 187.[45] There is, however, more to this ending than mere praise for a building plan. The celebration of the building complex becomes also a reflection on the poet's own work. In fact, this conjunction raises important questions about the *Annales* overall, its generic affiliations, and its place in the history of Latin literature.

A TEMPLE OF THE MUSES: ANNALS AND EPIC

The physical building and Ennius's literary monument relate to one another as sophisticated complements in numerous ways. For one thing, Ennius's epic is, at its heart, a blending of Greek and Roman traditions, and the temple complex served as a display space not just for the spoils of Fulvius's Greek conquests (among them, the statues of the Muses and of Hercules),[46] but also for a variety of objects that practically vibrate with Roman cultural energy. In the temple, Fulvius placed Numa's sacred *aedicula* of the Camenae, which had been housed in the temple of Honos and Virtus after having been struck by lightning (Servius *Auctus* at *Aen.* 1.8). And in the porticos of the temple, he set up *fasti* with an explanatory commentary (probably in the form of wall-paintings) that described the religious qualities of the days and likely contained references to temple dedication dates.[47] Also on display was a (presumably newly researched and compiled) year-by-year list of the consuls and censors. Each of these elements of programmatic display in the temple finds its analogue in the *Annales*. To the extent that the *Annales* followed a year-by-year, that is to say, annalistic, structure (which is hypothesized for the work, or at least for a portion of it), the epic can be said to give narrative expansion to the bare list of names of annual officeholders that was now to be seen on the temple.[48] Inasmuch as both the poem and that list ended, at least provisionally, with the year 189 and Fulvius's Ambracian victory, they each aimed at the same goal (even if they were also subject to later expansion). As suggested by Gildenhard, both Fulvius's temple and Ennius's epic construct a vision of Roman history that "combines a linear chronology with a sacral conception of time and military success" (2003.97). Moreover, Ennius's assimilation of the Camenae to the Muses powerfully reflects Fulvius's transference of Numa's sacred *aedicula* of the Camenae to the new complex of the Musaion, marking the integration of the past Roman tradition into a new Greek frame.[49] Overall, the temple displayed the association between martial prowess (Hercules) and poetic genius (Muses), just as the *Annales* employed poetic genius to sing of martial prowess.

---

[41] The major historical sources are Polyb. 21.27–31, Livy 38.3–10 (the campaign), Livy 38.43–44 (the delegation and the debate), 39.4–5 (the triumph).

[42] See Flower 1995.184–86, Manuwald 2001.163–66, Suerbaum 2002.129.

[43] See Aurelius Victor *de Viris Illustribus* 52.3: "quam victoriam per se magnificam Ennius amicus eius insigni laude celebravit" ("the victory that, glorious on it own, his friend Ennius celebrated with outstanding praise"). But see also Gruen 1990.117, who argues that Ennius's *Ambracia* not only provided an *apologia* for Fulvius's actions, it also "reached beyond political partisanship" and aimed "to rally opinion around a national victory."

[44] See, especially, *Ann.* 389–98, which describes heroic fighting in curious contrast to the horrific account given by Livy. On the topic, see Goldberg 1995.112–14.

[45] On the date of the temple, see Jocelyn 1972a.1006 n. 182, Martina 1981, Skutsch 1985.144, Gruen 1990.117 n. 187. The idea that *Annales* 15 ended with the celebration of the temple of Hercules of the Muses is now widely accepted, but for a skeptical view, see Jocelyn 1972a.1006.

The complementarity between temple and literary work, the details of which could certainly be elaborated, is widely accepted—not so its significance. It goes without saying that, for the many scholars who stress the close relationship between Ennius and Fulvius, the temple makes for an ending that is perfectly appropriate and can be interpreted as the ultimate tribute of a poet to his patron.[50] On the other hand, in line with their rejection of the construct of Ennius as *poeta cliens*, Goldberg and Gruen emphasize that both Fulvius's and Ennius's programs promoted artistic creativity in the service of the state rather than the individual and that one did not prompt the other but both temple and epic "shared roots in a broader cultural development at Rome."[51] In either case, if a description of the temple of the Muses is correctly reconstructed as the conclusion of the first fifteen books of the *Annales*, the question of the purpose of that celebration is effectively a question of the purpose of the *Annales* itself. The description of the temple looks capable of being nothing less than a manifesto of Roman epic poetics. For one thing, it is entirely possible that the ending was already in sight as part of the design of the epic in the poem's programmatic opening address to the Muses, Fulvius's newly imported goddesses. Thus the narrative of Roman history related in the poem has its end in the introduction to Rome of the very goddesses who inspire the production of that narrative. The *Annales* itself is thus in some sense the climax of Roman history.

---

[46] Pliny *Nat.* 35.66, Ovid *Fasti* 6.797–812.

[47] Macr. *Sat.* 1.12.16. On this topic, see Rüpke 1995a.331–68, Gildenhard 2003.95–96, and Rüpke in the present volume.

[48] See Rüpke 1993, Gildenhard 2003.

[49] Cf. *Ann.* 487: "Musas quas memorant nosce nos esse Camenas" ("Know that we whom they call the Muses are the Camenae") with Skutsch 1985 ad loc., who assigns this fragment to Book 15 and the description of the temple. In general, see Badian 1972.191–95, Gruen 1990.118, Gildenhard 2003.94–97.

We know, however, that Ennius continued his epic beyond this climax; he added an additional three books for a total of eighteen in the final edition. All along, the work appears to have followed an arrangement by triads.[52] Books 1 to 3 followed the history of Rome from Aeneas to the end of the regal period. Books 4 to 6 narrated the conquest of Italy and ended with the war against Pyrrhus. Books 7 to 9 were devoted to the Punic Wars, with the first Punic War, which had been retold by Naevius, probably just outlined.[53] Books 10 to 12 described the expansion of Roman power over mainland Greece, and Books 13 to 15 the Syrian War, with Fulvius's military expedition in Aetolia in Book 15. When Books 16 to 18 were added, they detailed the story of more recent fighting (three books for a bit more than ten years), fighting that was, in fact, rather lacking in long-term historical importance. One wonders, therefore, what would make Ennius sacrifice the epic-worthy teleology of ending with the temple. Pliny reports that Ennius took up his pen again to celebrate the achievements of the two brothers Caecilii Teucri, otherwise unknown.[54] Other possible reasons, often seen through the filter of patronage, have led to some ingenious, but not necessarily convincing, arguments. Skutsch theorizes that the Caecilii honored would have been the patrons of Ennius's fellow poet Caecilius, and so the continuation of the epic represents a respectful gesture on behalf of a *contubernalis* (1985.570). Badian relates Ennius's decision to an attempt to please Fulvius once more. This time, however, Ennius was coming to the rescue of A. Vulso, younger brother of Cn. Manlius, Fulvius's friend and political ally. The *Annales* thus was meant to celebrate and give a favorable account of A. Vulso's Istrian War, which he had began without proper authority and which he, in fact, nearly lost.[55]

---

[50] E.g., Jocelyn 1972a.998: "Ennius's poems climaxed with Fulvius's Aetolian success and clearly gratified the Fulvian family."

[51] Gruen 1990.118, Goldberg 1995.130–31 (quote on 131).

[52] So Jocelyn 1972a.1010, Skutsch 1985.5–6. One might also, however, detect traces of six-book units, especially because of the programmatic statements framing the boundary between Book 6 and Book 7 (see *Ann.* 206–10).

[53] Cicero (*Brut.* 75–76) is our authority that *rem,* "matter," in *Ann.* 206 referred to the First Punic War. See Skutsch 1985 ad loc.

In any event, the perceived need to ask why the poem ends as it does shows just how important it is to recognize which interpretive frame we are applying to the fragments of the *Annales*. From the point of view of an epic genre that expects the work to operate with a transhistorical vision and to aim at teleological completeness, the ending seems anticlimactic.[56] But if we think of the *Annales* as first and foremost the encomiastic product of patronage, it is less difficult to imagine that, as the poet's circumstances change, his work might adapt to keep up with events. In fact, it is worth considering whether the work might always have been conceived of not as an Aristotelian unity of beginning, middle, and end, but rather as a kind of chronicle, a serial without any predetermined endpoint. Roman history was, after all, an annual story that needed constant updating. On this score, too, a model for Ennius's poem was available in Fulvius's new temple of the Muses, in the form of the annual consul list that was to be updated as the history of Rome moved on.[57]

---

[54] Pliny *Nat.* 7.101: "Q. Ennius T. Caecilium Teucrum fratremque eius praecipue miratus propter eos sextum decimum adiecit annalem" ("Q. Ennius, out of admiration for T. Caecilius Teucer and, especially, his brother, added a sixteenth book of the *Annals* on their account").

[55] Badian 1972.185–87. Cf. also Martina 1979.37–43, who claims that Ennius was defending Vulso's unauthorized campaign against the Istrians in 178 when he mentioned their presence at Ambracia (cf. *Ann.* 397–98). Both claims are doubted by Skutsch (1985.559 and 570). See further Jocelyn 1972a.1021, who believes that the aging poet turns at the end of the *Annales* to celebrate a younger generation of Roman aristocrats who had been his students, while judiciously avoiding mention of the main figures involved in the events of the day because they were either not his patrons or they were the enemies of his patrons.

[56] On epic and closure see Hardie 1997b.

To judge by the extant fragments and by the reception tradition of the poem, however, epic would seem to be the dominant frame through which Ennius invites his readers to approach his *Annales.* In the proem to Book 1 of the *Annales,* Ennius presented himself, via a process of Pythagorean metempsychosis, as Homer reincarnated. This conceit resonated with the next generation of Roman poets and subsequently,[58] and for the longest time, classical scholarship has been too easily satisfied with that identification. From the historical perspective that saw Ennius as the Romans' own rough-hewn, early genius, the Homeric epics provided the perfect analogy for classifying the *Annales*. Quite a number of the fragments of the *Annales* support the idea that Homer is the poem's primary source and code model. To cite the most significant *comparanda*: the felling of trees of *Annales* 175–79 echoes *Iliad* 23.114–22, which describes the felling of trees for the funeral of Patroclus. The strenuous defense of the tribune Caelius against the Istrians (*Ann*. 391–98) matches Ajax's retreat in *Iliad* 16.102–11. The famous horse simile of *Annales* 535–39, which portrayed a prominent fighter entering battle, is modeled on the simile of *Iliad* 6.506–11, which describes Paris' return to battle. Diction, too, bears a Homeric influence, as do some type scenes (e.g., the council of the gods).[59] Ennius's choice of subject matter likewise forges a link to the Homeric past: by beginning with the Aeneas legend, his poem casts itself as the continuation of Homer, and its first major climax and defining moment comes in Book 6 when the Romans, as descendants of Aeneas, meet and overcome Pyrrhus, the descendant of Achilles.[60]

We do not know whether the prominence of these features of the *Annales* is a function of a pervasive "Homericism" in the narrative or whether it is the case that first Virgil and then the ancient commentary tradition simply focused on and so preserved for us a few key passages that are not truly representative. To be sure, Ennius seems to wear his Hellenizing tendencies openly and proudly. In his proem, the new *Homerus redivivus* aptly replaces the old Camenae with the Muses (*Ann.* 1), *carmina* with *poemata* (*Ann.* 12), and *vates* with *poeta* (*Ann.* 3). And, most significantly, he adopts the Greek hexameter to replace the old Saturnian line of his Roman predecessors. The Saturnian, from this point on, is used by other poets as a badge of cultural resistance precisely to counterbalance and oppose Ennius's Hellenistic efforts.[61] Ennius underscores the novelty of his achievements with a "proem in the middle" at the opening of *Annales* 7:[62]

---

[57] Cf. Gildenhard 2003.96 with n. 14 and Rüpke pp. 508–10 in the present volume.

[58] Cf. Lucil. frag. 401–10 Warmington and Jerome *Comm. in Mich*. 2.7; Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.50: *alter Homerus*.

[59] See, in general, Jocelyn 1972a.1014–17, which attempts to catalog first Homeric and then non-Homeric features in the extant fragments.

[60] The subsequent conquest of Ambracia, Pyrrhus's old capital, by Fulvius in 189 thus might represent a completion of the historical reversal of roles between Greeks and Trojans/Romans. Whether Ennius, in fact, pursued such implications in Book 15 is, however, entirely unknown.

> scripsere alii rem
> vorsibus quos olim Faunei vatesque canebant
> [cum] neque Musarum scopulos
> nec dicti studiosus [quisquam erat] ante hunc.
> Nos ausi reserare . . .
>
> Others have written of the matter in verses that once the Fauns and the seers used to sing . . . [when] neither the rocks of the Muses . . . nor [was there anyone who was] a lover of words before this man. We dare to open . . .

Ennius's claims in his two proems (to Books 1 and 7) to be both the new Homer and the first Roman *dicti studiosus* are, without a doubt, an exaggeration. Stephen Hinds rightly notes that we should read Ennius's Hellenizing innovations as "renegotiations of the same cultural move" that is present already in Livius Andronicus's *Odussia* (1998.63). What we can see is an attempt on Ennius's part to canonize the history of Latin literature in Enniocentric terms, as the poet proclaims himself, on the basis of his Homeric credentials, simultaneously founder, *pater*, and *telos* of a new Roman literature.

Ennius's attempt at self-definition had its effect. His ambiguous role as both *primus* and *telos* is echoed in Cicero, by far the most significant point of reception for the *Annales* prior to the *Aeneid*. In the *Brutus*, Cicero embraces Ennian teleology and implicitly compares Ennius's literary work to the sculpture of Polyclitus. Polyclitus superseded the artistry of his predecessors and of Myron, bringing it to virtual perfection (*Brut*. 70: "pulchriora Polycliti et iam plane perfecta, ut mihi quidem videri solent," "The works of Polyclitus are more beautiful and very nearly perfect, or so they seem to me"). Similarly, Ennius surpassed all previous Roman writers and stood as a new Polyclitus in relation to Naevius, the Myron of Roman literature (*Brut*. 75: "Bellum Punicum quasi Myronis opus delectat," "The *Bellum Punicum* is pleasing like a work of Myron").[63]

---

[61] See Goldberg pp. 441–42 in the present volume. For a bibliography on the Saturnian, see Suerbaum 2002.32–34.

[62] For the so-called proem in the middle, see Conte 1976.

And yet for Cicero, Ennius is not solely the *finis* of Roman literary production. When he adduces the example of Homer as another master who perfected what preceded him, Cicero also suggests for Ennius the role of founder, in this context quoting the lines from the proem to *Annales* 7.[64] Just like Homer in Greek literature, Ennius features in Cicero's reconstruction as the true beginning of Latin literature, even though he had predecessors who had laudable qualities of their own. From here it is not a far conceptual leap to the Ennius of the Augustan poets, who granted him the privileged status of *pater* of Latin literature.[65] Virgil, for his part, in the programmatic statement of *Georgics* 3, his own "proem in the middle," notoriously renegotiates the role of *primus* for himself. Just like Ennius before him, Virgil, too, claims to have been the first to import Greek Muses to Italy.[66] In language that openly evokes Ennius (see Hinds 1998.53–56), Virgil proclaims his newness in relation to his Roman epic ancestor, who retroactively becomes "old." He thus establishes a relationship to Ennius that is identical to the one Ennius had established with his own Roman epic ancestors, the Fauni of old times.

---

[63] Cic. *Brut.* 70–76. For a detailed discussion, see Goldberg 1995.5–12 and Hinds 1998.63–69.

[64] Cic. *Brut.* 71: "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 . . . ait ipse de se nec mentitur in gloriando" ("For nothing is simultaneously discovered and perfected; nor should we doubt that there were poets before Homer, which can be seen from the songs that are sung in his work at the banquets of the Phaeacians and of the nobles. But where are our ancient verses, which 'once Fauns . . .'; he says this about himself and does not lie in his boasting").

[65] Hor. *Epist.* 1.19.7, Prop. 3.3.6.

[66] *G.* 3.10–12: "Primus ego in patriam mecum, modo vita supersit, / Aonio rediens deducam vertice Musas; / primus Idumaeas referam tibi, Mantua, palmas" ("I will be the first, if only I have life enough, to bring back the Muses to my homeland returning from the Aonian mount; I will be the first, Mantua, to bring Idumaean palms to you").

With this daring move, Virgil advances the teleology of Latin literature beyond the *Annales*. He also moves the *telos* of Roman history beyond the 160s: he reaches the threshold of his own time and proclaims the age of Augustus the new culmination of Roman history (see Hardie 1993.103–05). In Augustan Rome, the roughness of "father Ennius," the shaggy poet, can be mapped onto the way the new "golden" city looked back on its own past as a humble village of thatch-roofed huts.[67] The very term *pater* as used by later authors is semantically ambivalent. Ennius as father of Latin literature is, on the one hand, a source of authority, but he becomes simultaneously the paradigm of primitivity.[68]

HELLENIZING ENNIUS

For the scholarly reception of the *Annales*, Ennius's adoption of a Homeric mantle supported all too well the traditional view of Latin literature as derivative and a byproduct of Greek culture and literature. Hence Friedrich Leo, in his authoritative history of Roman literature, fully endorsed Ennius's claim to be a *Homerus redivivus*. He does not, however, fail to recognize a Hesiodic-Callimachean influence in Ennius's use of the first person (Leo 1913.166), nor does he exclude other possible influences from Greek and Hellenistic poetry (1913.173). Leo's contemporary Kroll arrived at analogous conclusions. In his essay "Das historische Epos," he traces the origins of Roman epic in the following terms: after an initial period of "insecurity" ("Sie fühlten sich zunächst so unsicher") in which the Romans did not dare to imitate the hexameter and only produced works appropriate for porridge-eating barbarians, *pultiphagi barbari*, they finally turned to the Homeric epic and the tradition of Greek poetry with Ennius and his *Annales* (Kroll 1916.4–5). Kroll, too, acknowledges that "Ennius's dream" in the proem of the *Annales* had no precedent in Homer, but adds that there were other Greek models, Hesiod and Callimachus, who legitimized Ennius's bold innovation. At the same time, he does also recognize an element of novelty in Ennius's *Annales*: its historical subject matter. For Kroll, this Ennian innovation is partly indebted to Naevius, but it also unequivocally shows Ennius's role as court poet, or *Hofdichter*, who is hired to celebrate his patron's deeds, not unlike Choerilus of Iasus, who had been hired to praise Alexander (1916.6).

---

[67] Ovid *Tr.* 2.259: "Nihil est hirsutius illis," "There is nothing shaggier than them" (i.e., "Annalibus"); Prop. 4.1.61: "Ennius hirsuta cingat sua dicta corona" "Let Ennius crown his words with a shaggy crown." Cf., e.g., Ovid *AA* 3.113: "Simplicitas rudis ante fuit: nunc aurea Roma est," "Once there was uncouth simplicity; now Rome is golden"; also *Aen.* 8.310–69, esp. 347–48.

[68] Especially for Ovid, with his fondness for the *ars*/*ingenium* contrast: *Am.* 1.15.13–14, 19; *Tr.* 2.423–24.

The 1934 publication of a polemical little pamphlet entitled "Das hellenistische Epos: Ein vergessenes Kapitel griechischer Dichtung" by Ziegler (later republished in 1966 with a supplementary appendix on Ennius, significantly entitled "Ennius als hellenistischer Epiker") added a new element to the picture of Ennius's Greek models: Hellenistic historical epic. In *Epistles* 2.1, Horace had presented the notorious Choerilus in less than flattering terms as the representative exponent of the genre,[69] which thereafter had been either altogether ignored by scholars in a sort of conspiracy of silence or treated marginally as a mediocre genre that failed to get in line with the new Hellenistic (read Callimachean) poetics of *l'art pour l'art*.[70] Ziegler placed Hellenistic historical epic back on the radar screens of the history of classical literature. In doing so, he rightly challenged the notion that Callimacheanism was the one dominant poetics of the Hellenistic age and suggested that, on the contrary, different kinds of epic won the Hellenistic popularity contest: mythological, historical-regional, and historical-encomiastic epics.[71]

More problematic, however, is Ziegler's praise of the high aesthetic value of the genre. In the absence of any actual texts, his esteem is based on a weak analogic theory that is further vitiated by its simplistic philhellenic bias: Greek models are always superior to their Latin counterpart. Ziegler's argument goes more or less as follows: if Ennius's poetry is good, his models, i.e., Hellenistic historical epic, must have been better, just as Menander was better than Terence, and Callimachus was superior to Catullus and Propertius. So, too, the arguments by which he downplays to the point of eliminating any Callimachean influence on the *Annales* and, by contrast, elevates Hellenistic historical epic as the main model and missing link between Homer and Ennius (especially for the divine apparatus and battle scenes) fail to convince and have been rightly criticized.[72]

---

[69] *Epist*. 2.1.232–34 and 237–38: "Gratus Alexandro regi magno fuit ille / Choerilus, incultis qui versibus et male natis / rettulit acceptos, regale nomisma, Philippos / . . . idem rex ille, poema / qui tam ridiculum tam care prodigus emit" ("Pleasing to King Alexander the Great was the famous Choerilus, who for his uncouth and poorly formed verses got philips in return, the royal issue, . . . likewise, the king himself, the spendthrift who paid so much for such a laughable poem"). See, also, the negative comments of Curtius Rufus (8.5.6–8).

[70] For a bibliography on the topic, see Fantuzzi 1988.xxv–xxvii.

[71] On the topic, see further Guarducci 1929, Fantuzzi 1988.xxxiv–xlii. Cameron 1995.263–302 contests Ziegler's reconstruction of Hellenistic historical epic, especially in its guise as the antagonist against which Callimachus could define his own ivory-tower poetics. But see now Kerkhecker 2001, esp. 50–63, who, in response to Cameron, makes the case anew that the Hellenistic period was hardly an "eposfreie Zone" (60) and that Naevius and Ennius follow in the tradition of a "hellenistischen Regionalepik" (60).

The shared conviction that the *Annales* is all but the continuation of a specifically Greek tradition, whether Homer and Callimachus, Hellenistic encomiastic epic, or Hellenistic historiography,[73] generally characterizes studies of Ennius's *Annales* over the last two centuries—obvious differences in emphasis notwithstanding. Even Ennius's relationship with his Roman "friends" has, as we have seen, often been understood in terms of a model drawn from the Greek world: the Hellenistic ruler and his courtier. The influence of this Hellenizing impulse is still very strongly felt. In 1972, Peter Wülfing-von Martitz entitled his contribution to the volume of the Fondation Hardt *Entretiens* dedicated to Ennius, "Ennius als hellenistischer Dichter." As the title suggests, Wülfing-von Martitz views the *Annales* as an essentially Hellenistic poem both in form and style.[74] The philosophical content of the *Annales* has also received great attention as one of the important components of Ennius's Hellenism. Pythagorean and Empedoclean elements are present throughout the *Annales*, not just in the speech of the reincarnated Homer. Ennius's interest in integrating natural-philosophical elements into the poem shows the active influence that these philosophical schools, which flourished in southern Italy, the poet's native country, exercised on him. The result is his innovative conceptualization of Roman history within a larger philosophical frame and cosmic setting.[75]

---

[72] For an analysis of Ziegler's arguments, see Fantuzzi 1988.xlii–liii.

[73] For this last, see especially Norden 1915, who, for example, invoked Hellenistic historiography (otherwise known as tragic historiography) as the main model for Ennius's battle descriptions (157).

[74] See also von Albrecht 1999.63–74, whose comparison of the style of Ennius with that of Homer and Apollonius concludes that, in his adaptation of Homer, "Ennius follows Alexandrian theory and practice" (67). Cf. also Jocelyn 1972a.1014–17, Gratwick 1982.66–75, Skutsch 1985.7–8.

[75] Skutsch 1985.148. Burkert 1961 is more skeptical and believes that Ennius drew on Hellenistic sources rather than on teachings learned in his youth. On southern Italy as an important "contact zone" between competing cultures, see Feeney 1998.67. On Pythagorean and Empedoclean elements in the *Annales,* in addition to Burkert 1961, see Hardie 1986.69–83, with bibliography. See also Feeney 1991.99–128 on the blending of Greek religion with Roman religious practices in the *Annales*.

The philhellenic approach to the *Annales* has done quite a lot to uncover Ennius's Greek heart and to counter the impression of a deficiency of *ars* that dogged him in antiquity. The specific Romanness of the *Annales*, however, has tended to be either ignored or downplayed, as the epic was usually seen as a work that openly and polemically distanced itself from a Latin tradition, the tradition of the Fauni and *vates*. Apart from the all-important element of its Roman historical subject matter, the only formal Latin contribution to the *Annales* generally accepted was its title, which, until recently, was almost unanimously thought to be derived from the *Annales Maximi* (Skutsch 1985.6). Jocelyn, in his 1972 article, goes so far as to assert that, although Ennius did not follow the *Annales Maximi* in retelling all the events in strict chronology, parts of his work echoed both their style and content (prodigies, vows, dedications, establishment of colonies, etc.).[76]

NEW APPROACHES

A welcome, if precarious, revival in the study of early Latin literature initiated by Nevio Zorzetti challenges the notion of Roman literature as simply a derivative of the Greek by attempting to recover a native Roman prehistory for Roman literature.[77] The sources on the so-called *carmina convivalia* (the name is modern) have labored under the burden of their use by Niebuhr as evidence to legitimize his notoriously controversial ballad theory. It was therefore easy to dismiss any pre-literary Roman "song culture" as a good example of, in the words of Zorzetti, "pseudo-historical memory, invented in the later years of the Republic in order to present a more refined version of early Roman culture, by attributing to it characteristics of a Greek type."[78] In a paper that appeared, somewhat ironically, in a volume dedicated primarily to the culture and traditions of the Greek symposium, Zorzetti re-examined the ancient sources about the *carmina convivalia* and, from them, traced a development of Roman literary culture in three stages.[79] First, there was an early, aristocratic sympotic culture imported from Greece with an attendant poetic culture that was anonymous and based on praise and wisdom. This Zorzetti labels "the poetic tradition of the *vates*" (1990.300), which was followed by what he calls the "theatralization" of Roman culture. At this stage, Roman "public life absorbed a remarkable number of elements which had previously existed only within the closed tradition of *sodalitates* [e.g., of the Salii] and were not displayed in the public sphere. By this process the heroes, cults, and values of the *gentes* becomes the property of the state and the people" (Zorzetti 1990.302). It is at the third stage, then, that professionals dedicated to the production of poetry appear at Rome. As public life becomes more and more enriched, the culture of the *carmina convivalia* gives way to poetry that is now the sole purview of technically trained specialists. Epic could then be distinguished as being "one of the fields of specialization of the Hellenistic *technitai*" (Zorzetti 1990.305). But this did not happen without some opposition, as Cato's passage on the *Carmen de Moribus* seems to attest.[80]

---

[76] Jocelyn 1972a.1008–09. Cf. Skutsch 1985.6, Suerbaum 2002.135. Following Rüpke 1993, who views the *Annales Maximi* as a fraud perpetrated by modern scholarship, Gildenhard 2003 dismisses the idea that the *Annales* was modeled on them and argues that the *fasti* and the *onomasticon* displayed on the temple are the closest parallel to Ennius's *Annales*. On the topic, see also Rüpke in the present volume. On the *libri annales,* see, further, the probing study of the ancient sources and the modern scholarship in Frier 1999. On the topic, see also Wiseman in the present volume.

[77] Zorzetti 1990. Among more recent work, Habinek 2005 is the most ambitious and searching investigation into a pre-literary Roman song culture to date.

[78] Zorzetti 1990.290. For the genesis of Niebuhr's theory, along with a balanced assessment of its shortcomings and possible redeeming points, see Momigliano 1957.

Zorzetti's highly schematic and speculative reconstruction of the development of early Roman literature leaves many questions unanswered or only marginally addressed.[81] His studies are, however, representative of an important reorientation of approach to early Roman literature that is characterized by two shifts. First, there is a renewed interest in the pre-literary and oral traditions of Roman culture, their nature, the social context in which they develop, and their relationship to the development of Hellenized, professionalized literary practices, as well as the significant ways ancient sources construct this relationship.[82] And, secondly, there has been a redirection of focus from author to audience (and the different types of audiences) and from text and its analysis to the social context in and by which it is generated, circulated, and evaluated. We have already seen one important result of this shift in considering the renewed controversy surrounding the composition of the audience(s) for which the *Annales* was produced and the relationship between the author and his audience, as well as the interaction between the different social groups within the audience.

---

[79] The main sources are Cic. *Brut.* 75, *Tusc.* 1.3 and 4.3, and Val. Max. 2.1.10.

[80] Zorzetti 1990.294. See Gellius 11.2.5 = Cato *Carmen de Moribus* frag. 2 Jordan: "Poeticae artis honos non erat: siquis in ea re studebat aut sese ad convivia adplicabat, 'grassator' vocabatur" ("There was no honor for the poetic art. Anyone who applied himself to that activity or attached himself to dinner parties was called a 'grassator'"). According to Zorzetti, there is no contradiction between Cato's praise of the ancient tradition of *carmina convivalia* and this passage. Cato's criticism should not be read as a generalized criticism of poetry, but of professional poets.

[81] In addition to Zorzetti 1990, see also Zorzetti 1991. For detailed criticisms of Zorzetti's theory, see Cole 1991, Phillips 1991, Horsfall 1994. See also Goldberg and Sciarrino in the present volume, for contrasting takes on Zorzetti's banquet theory and on Cato's *Carmen de Moribus*.

As might be expected, this new emphasis on the dynamic interrelation between literary product and social context leaves no room for the one-dimensional view of the creation of Roman literature as a simple matter of translation and transference of Greek models. There is, rather, a new tendency to read the process of Hellenization of the middle republic as a phenomenon of active appropriation and reuse that finds its causes in the complex political and social dynamics of the time. Habinek, in particular, studies Roman Hellenization as a response to the social and cultural challenges facing the Roman elite during and immediately after the Second Punic War.[83] For him, Greek literature becomes an especially effective means of social dominance precisely because "it is alien and access to it can be regulated. It is a power that can be exercised at will, a symbolic form of capital that can be conserved or displayed as the circumstances demand" (Habinek 1998a.62). With this conjunction of a newly aware Roman audience for epic and the presence in Rome of a class of technically adept purveyors of Greek culture, we have come full circle from Ennius and his friends to the stew of traditions and social forces that make possible the invention of Roman epic.

The papers in the present collection bear witness to the lively debate stirred by these shifts of focus and approach and show the complexity and variety of readings that characterize the field of Ennian scholarship today. The differing approaches and conclusions of the first two essays clearly attest to that. Building on his previous important contributions to the study of Ennius's *Annales*, Sander Goldberg explores possible avenues for reconstructing the poem's contemporary reception. The retrospective biases, even the anachronisms, of our sources require extreme caution in their use in crafting a picture of the second-century literary environment, which makes Goldberg, for one thing, highly critical of Zorzetti's banquet theory. But the fragments of the work itself, particularly Book 16, which was prompted by current events, also reflect that contemporary environment. Focusing on the presentation of the otherwise unknown Caecilii in the Istrian War and on the censorship of 179, Goldberg argues anew for the absence of narrow aristocratic partisanship from the *Annales*. But he also makes the crucial point that, whatever the *Annales* represented for the original audience, we cannot assume that it represented the same thing for subsequent audiences. In fact, as he shows, because the *Annales* was not an instant success, it took the work of grammarians and other subsequent readers to make the nature of its content and the experimentalism of its style acceptable to the public, thus retroactively turning the *Annales* into Rome's national poem and analogue of Homeric epic.

---

[82] See Horsfall 1994; Goldberg 1995.43–46; Coarelli 1995, especially 207; Costa 2000.69–71, with 69 n. 247 for detailed bibliography; Rüpke 2000, 2001; Suerbaum 2002.41–42.

[83] Habinek 1998a. See also Feeney 1998.66–67.

Enrica Sciarrino's paper revisits the issue of Ennius's adoption of Greek models and positions Ennius's philhellenism within a discussion of the power relations of the wider socio-political context in which the *poeta* and his work operate. While the poets, beginning with Livius, she argues, derived prestige for their skills from an association between themselves and a Roman elite eager to have its military and, yes, cultural dominance put on display, as outsiders, the poets were in danger of being perceived as encroaching on the spheres in which that elite had tended to control the apportionment of honor and prestige for and by themselves. More confident than Goldberg that something clear can be seen in the sources, particularly with respect to Cato and his resistance to the trespassing of poets into elite spaces, Sciarrino analyzes how Ennius in the *Annales* succeeded better than his predecessors in crafting a sustainable role for the new Hellenized *poeta* at Rome.

One of Sciarrino's achievements is to tease out some of the implications of the early Roman literary environment in which poets were also teachers, a cultural fact that needs to be sharply distinguished from the status of the Alexandrian *poetae docti*. In a similar vein, Thomas Habinek's paper highlights one aspect of Ennius's status as *poeta* that he highlighted for himself in the poem and that was also picked up by the later tradition: the poet as the repository of wisdom. Habinek looks at an understudied fragment of the *Annales* (211–12) that, in a gesture of translation between Greek and Roman that is repeated a number of times in the poem, posits an equivalence between *sophia* and *sapientia*. While it might be tempting to see this as yet another manifesto of Hellenization whereby the higher art of *sophia* is imported through the offices of the poet to reform the Romans' rude and primitive *sapientia*, Habinek digs deeper. He shows that the *Annales* shares with Ennius's own dramatic works and satire, with comedy, and especially with the discourses of the republican political elite, as reflected, for instance, in Cicero's *Laelius de Amicitia*, an active interest in exploring the highly developed cultural significance of wisdom in its distinctively Roman guise as *sapientia*. It is by thus situating Ennius's epic in the broad cultural and intellectual currents of its second-century context (and not simply as part of the diachronic narrative of Roman epic's movement from Homer to Virgil by way of the *Annales*) that the poem's project of enabling such a transition is most visible. In Ennius, Habinek sees a Roman poet who casts Roman *sapientia* as the fulfillment of Greek potential, which is, perhaps, the most important aspect of the *Annales* in light of the broad Roman imperial project vis-à-vis the Greek world, not only in culture but also in politics.

For Jörg Rüpke as well, our ability to correctly position the *Annales* at the points of contact between Greek and Roman traditions and between various second-century intellectual currents is also of the utmost importance. In order to accomplish this in one particular area, Rüpke turns to the fragments and testimonia, not of the *Annales* itself, but of the *fasti* that were put on display by Fulvius Nobilior in his new temple of Hercules Musarum. On the basis of Rüpke's thorough and critical reading of all the testimonia regarding Fulvius's *fasti*, it emerges that these two texts, the epic and the calendar, are linked by more than the patronage relationship between the poet and the politician and by more than a shared interest in a general blending of the Greek and Roman. As Rüpke describes, the distinctive focus of Fulvius's calendar was on its historical development, and, in this area, Rüpke is able to identify specific, and fundamental, parallels with Ennius's historical epic. Rüpke is himself already closely associated with the idea that Ennius is properly to be identified as Rome's first annalistic historian. If Ennius is also, as Rüpke would not be uncomfortable assuming, to be identified as the author of Fulvius's calendar, the first Roman epicist and first Roman annalist can be credited with a quite broad contribution of Greek rationalism to the Romans' understanding of their own traditions. But even leaving the question of personal authorship aside, by using tools for the dissemination of knowledge that were just beginning to gain traction at Rome in the second century—writing, systemization, and historicization—for his diverse explorations of Rome's past and its relationships to the world it occupied, Ennius not only inaugurates the Roman epic tradition, he also stands at the head of what Rüpke rightly calls the "hot phase" of intellectual inquiry at Rome that leads not just to the classicizing and Hellenizing Roman epic of Virgil, but equally to the various antiquarian and historical researches that combined Greek rationalization with Roman tradition and that were both produced and consumed by diverse populations at Rome in the late republic and beyond.

With T. P. Wiseman's paper, we return to the distinctly Roman traditions that lie behind and within the *Annales*. Wiseman argues that, in situating Ennius's epic in its historical context, we should not neglect the traces of some older, weirder sources of authority for Ennius that are a far cry from the avant-garde Hellenism the poem displays so proudly. Looking once again at the proem to *Annales* 7, Wiseman asks who exactly were the "Fauns and prophets" who used to chant in Saturnians. It turns out that our sources say quite a lot about them. Unlike the *carmina convivalia* that, if they existed at all, were already a distant memory in the second century, an oral tradition of versified oracles, prophecies, and pronouncements of doom continued unabated at Rome into historical times, even under the emperors, who, though they might try to control the influence of the prophets, were never fully able to. Wiseman argues that Ennius, while distancing himself from the uncouth form of these *carmina* and vaticinations, nevertheless held to their authority as part of his self-definition as a poet active between Greek and Roman traditions.

For any literary work, it is a challenge to separate the social and cultural context in which and for which it was produced from its reception by later authors and the ever-changing place it occupies in literary canons. In the study of Ennius's *Annales,* this task is particularly important, at the same time as it is made exponentially more difficult by both the poem's fragmentary tradition and the hazy picture we have of the Roman society in which it was created. A certain amount of clarity arrives, however, with Cicero. Two of the articles in this volume look at Ennius through Cicero's lens and see, perhaps more than anything, an Ennius who, in his Ciceronian-validated role as the *pater* of Roman literature, becomes himself an indispensable source of *auctoritas*.

Developing this aspect of Cicero's reception of Ennius, Spencer Cole shows how Cicero and the characters of his dialogues use the cultural authority of Ennius in the *de Re Publica* and, especially, in the *Somnium Scipionis* to lend contentious claims about apotheosis the respectable patina of tradition. Somewhat ironically, it is Ennius, the evangelist for Hellenic art to the aficionados of Fauns and prophets, who, in this case, is made to supply an echt-Roman imprimatur for a Greek cultural phenomenon. Ennius is thus perfectly suited to Cicero's interest in steering the ambitions of the Roman elite towards service to the state. And through Ennius, he can hold out apotheosis as, in effect, the ultimate reward for good works on behalf of Rome.

Staying with Cicero, Elaine Fantham shows how he employs *Annales* 6, Ennius's account of the Romans' war against Pyrrhus, as an authoritative storehouse of republican exemplary behavior, freely quoting from this book more than from any other portion of the *Annales*. Fantham duly notes that Cicero's fondness for Ennius has restored to us many lines of Book 6 of the *Annales*, but in a sort of paradox, Cicero's selective quotation is also responsible for our inadequate and distorted knowledge of the epic, which is treated primarily as a repository of moral exempla. While also shedding new light on the other sources of the remaining fragments of *Annales* 6, Fantham provides a detailed analysis of the book as a subtext for the *Aeneid* by way of a citation by citation account of how this picture emerges, primarily from Macrobius. Her conclusion that, even in the emphasis on rhetoric (rather than on fighting itself) found in Cicero and in the tradition at large, it is possible to glimpse the truly epic character of the book takes us to the important topic of Ennius's epic successors.

Of course, this is a huge topic that merits a stand-alone treatment that we cannot provide. A new study of Virgil and Ennius is, for one thing, certainly called for. Ennius is never simply forgotten and sent into oblivion by his epic successors, and we can only highlight certain moments of his afterlife. Indeed, he, the advocate of Homeric metempsychosis, continues to live again—and we mean this literally—in the poems of his epic successors. In his paper, Sergio Casali focuses specifically on this very special type of reception of Ennius, examining how the persona of the poet Ennius is made a feature of Silius's epic metapoetics in the *Punica*, not only the Ennius of the *Annales*, but also Virgil and his Ennius. Silius writes Ennius into his text, presenting the old poet as a centurion fighting the Sardinian campaign. With acute new insight, Casali analyzes the dense Silian intertextuality with the *Aeneid* in this scene. He shows how, through his Ennius, Silius specifically explicates the implicit figuration of the Messapus of *Aeneid* 7 as a stand-in for Ennius (his descendant) through a series of interrelated similes of birds and divine poets. Silius's Ennius does not follow in the epic tradition of the warrior poet who enters the field of battle only to meet his death. By explicating the dense metapoetic implications of the divine intervention that leads to Ennius's rescue, Casali opens up new vistas of interpretation for Silius, for the *Aeneid*, and, by extension, for the *Annales*. In Silius, a very Callimachean-Virgilian Apollo decrees death and oblivion to Ennius's opponent Hostus, whom Casali intriguingly, though necessarily tentatively, sees as possible figure for the epic poet Hostius, the near contemporary of Ennius and author of a *Bellum Histricum,* who was, in fact, debarred from the epic success that the tradition marked out for Ennius and his *Annales*.

What is true for Silius, namely that Roman epic remained always conscious of its own tradition and of its descent from a point of origin, is equally true for Virgil, for all of Ennius's epic successors, and for Ennius himself. The invention of Roman epic with the *Annales* could only be seen as such in retrospect, of course. Perhaps part of the enduring capacity of Ennius's poem to play the role of epic touchstone at Rome can be attributed to its own consciousness of tradition: its relationship with and debt to Homer, to Naevius, and to both Greek and Roman ways of recording the past, whether highly formalized or seemingly ephemeral. The papers that follow show in abundant detail how, from the beginning, Roman epic always encoded within itself the notion of change with respect to the movement from the past to the present to the future. The *Annales* testifies to Roman epic's inherent capacity to remake itself in ever changing historical and cultural circumstances.

Amherst College
University of Massachusetts Amherst