

Ch. 5 ('Movement in the City') is one of the more successful parts of the book, thanks to its unified theme and clearer organization. The chapter considers the associations of walking and running in the public spaces of Rome, imagery of flowing or pressing crowds that convey the density of Rome's population, the act of descending from Rome's hills and rituals associated with entering the city. The chapter showcases one of J.'s strengths, namely the way that he easily conflates the metaphorical with the literal, and the mental with the physical (see, for example, at 181, where he demonstrates how the philosophical tradition of the 'view from above' was a perfect match for Rome's hilly topography).

The next two chapters treat religious experience in the Roman world, and in the city of Rome in particular. Ch. 6 ('Roman Religions') is centrally concerned with describing the 'inner world' of religious experience — what religious practice 'felt like' for the Romans — while ch. 7 ('The Divine Encounter') discusses Roman interactions with sacred spaces, both at home and abroad. The latter chapter makes the intriguing argument that it was a distinctively Roman experience to encounter (and even seek out) the presence of the divine while travelling in foreign lands, particularly in the Greek East, and that this experience was less a point of emphasis in the city of Rome itself. The chapters argue for an ineffable 'sacredness' as a defining quality of Roman religious experience (the word 'numinous' is a recurring shorthand) that challenges the more common scholarly view that ancient polytheism had more to do with ritual performance than state of mind.

The final three chapters are mostly stand-alone treatments. Ch. 8 ('Patina and Palimpsest') offers one of the more appealing, and novel, arguments in the book: namely that despite the Roman obsession with antiquity and age, they did not seem to derive any aesthetic pleasure from looking at old, crumbling buildings. Ch. 9 ('Interiors') explores what Romans thought interior spaces felt like, or should feel like, considering everything from caves to coffered ceilings. And a final chapter ('Monuments') examines the Roman aesthetic of monumentality, height and grandeur. This chapter is the only one that focuses on the physical remains of ancient Rome, with special attention paid to Trajan's Forum and Markets, and the Pantheon.

On the whole, the book manages to be both panoramic and finely detailed, which is no small accomplishment. Many of the close readings are quite compelling, particularly when J. is unpacking a passage from one of his favourite authors, such as Lucretius or Virgil. Given the scale of the book, it is not completely surprising that J. does not always situate his many astute observations in the context of scholarly debates on the subject: this is a work where the *index locorum* is over twice as long as the bibliography. Yet one also gets the sense that this reticence is not merely a matter of convenience but also a conscious choice. J. is clearly willing to engage in scholarly debate where he so chooses, and one of the book's more or less explicit goals is to dial back the new historical and ideological approaches to Roman literature that have dominated in the last several decades in favour of a restoration of a more aesthetic mode of interpretation. Nonetheless, many readers will inevitably find sections where they would have enjoyed more direct engagement with broader conversations. In the end, *God, Space and City* is expansive, eclectic, assertive, impressive and occasionally disorienting — exactly, I suppose, what ancient Rome must have felt like to those who wandered her streets.

Trinity University
tosulliv@trinity.edu

TIMOTHY M. O'SULLIVAN

doi:10.1017/S007543581500115X

V. FABRIZI, *MORES VETERESQUE NOVOSQUE. RAPPRESENTAZIONI DEL PASSATO E DEL PRESENTE DI ROMA NEGLI ANNALES DI ENNIO* (Pubblicazioni della Facoltà di lettere e di filosofia dell'Università di Pavia 125). Pisa: Edizioni ETS, 2012. Pp. 252. ISBN 9788846734549. €22.00.

N. GOLDSCHMIDT, *SHAGGY CROWNS: ENNIUS' ANNALES AND VIRGIL'S AENEID*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. x + 258. ISBN 9780199681297. £55.00.

The boom in Ennian studies continues with these revised dissertations, one focusing on the *Annales*, the other on its reception. Both contribute in useful ways to the interpretation of the poem as more than just a collection of fragments; to do so, both rely heavily on Skutsch's reconstruction, which has

recently been fundamentally challenged (J. Elliott, *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales* (2013)). Whether, and to what extent, the challenge will undermine these and similar interpretive efforts remains to be seen.

Fabrizi argues that the *Annales* is deeply informed by an ethical perspective that emphasizes constant innovation within a traditional context. This thesis is developed over five chapters, each focusing on a moment of enlightened self-definition on the part of the Roman state. Such moments, which span the entire poem in its original, fifteen-book form, include Aeneas' dealings with the inhabitants of Latium, several occurrences during Romulus' régime, the entirety of Rome's epochal encounter with King Pyrrhus, the experience of the Punic War period, and subsequent Roman operations in Ambracia and against Antiochus. F.'s choice of these focal points is hardly surprising, but that fact does not lessen the interpretive insight that she brings to them all.

F. reads the *Annales* as the story of how the Romans transformed themselves from defeated Trojan refugees and victims of the victorious Greeks into a nation more capable and fit to rule than the descendants of those who had defeated their ancestors. Her interpretation emphasizes the moral and ethical elements of the story: Roman success is the result of maintaining the *pax deorum*, conducting faithful diplomacy and relying on intelligent perspicacity, rather than on mere military force. This perspective is especially striking in episodes that concern Aeneas, who (as F. argues in ch. 1) established himself in Italy without warfare, and especially Romulus (ch. 2), whom later authors tend to remember primarily as a bellicose figure. Were they misrepresenting the Ennian Romulus, or depending on some other tradition? Although the uncertainties are many, F. has no difficulty supporting her argument with perceptive readings of the text; still, many conflicting forces influenced the pattern of survival. We owe the famous auspication episode (*Ann.* 72–91 Sk), for instance, like most longer, securely placed fragments, not to chance but to the fact that quoting it served someone's interest; and it is not difficult to see why Cicero in *De divinatione* might cherry-pick a passage from Ennius celebrating Romulus as an augur instead of a soldier. Briefer passages that survive in the lexicographical tradition, even if firmly assigned to a book, are usually more difficult to associate with a particular episode, and one must be wary when F. accepts Skutsch's confident verdict that a fragment which survives because of Nonius' interest in the archaic adverb *fortunatim* (*Ann.* 102–3 Sk) 'almost certainly' concerns a pact between Romulus and Titus Tatius. Nevertheless, even if Skutsch's interpretation is already breathtaking in its specificity, F. manages to expand upon it by bringing to bear additional supporting evidence (99–101) in the form of an episode in Livy (40.46.9–10) which cites the pact between Romulus and Tatius as a precedent for the reconciliation of Ennius' patron Fulvius Nobilior with a political enemy, M. Aemilius Lepidus. This is typical of F.'s contribution: while generally basing her analysis on Skutsch, she does not merely accept his (or anyone else's) reconstruction in particulars, but often strengthens it with new information of both philological and literary-critical import.

Especially impressive is F.'s discussion of Ennius' intergeneric engagement with epic and tragedy in connection with Pyrrhus. The king of Epirus and descendant of Aeacus enters the *Annales* as the Romans' 'primo nemico d'oltremare', ennobled and burdened by the ambiguous Aeacid legacy of Ajax as would-be successor of Achilles in the Epic Cycle, in Pindar and in tragedy. In contrast to Pyrrhus as a hereditary throwback to avatars of physical heroism who ultimately fail, an emphasis on *sapientia* — already, on F.'s argument, crucial to Ennius' conception of Romulus (138) — aligns the Romans with a more successful Odyssean paradigm.

Chs 4 and 5 concern the Punic War period and after, and stress the extent to which the second half of the epic becomes more explicitly Homeric, rather than less so, as one might have expected. Illuminating is F.'s discussion of the specifically epic pedigree of Ennian *Discordia* (155–63) as an overture to this development, which she sees as continuing in the subsequent introduction (in Book 8 or 9, according to Priscian) of an explicitly Cyclopean figure plausibly identified as Philip V of Macedon (*Ann.* 319–20 Sk) (172–7), and in Book 15, particularly in the famous passages that Ennius modelled on the defence of the Greek ships by Polypoetes and Leonteus (*Il.* 12.127–53; cf. *Ann.* 15 fr. 4 Sk) and (again) by Ajax (*Il.* 15.102–11; cf. *Ann.* 391–98 Sk), but also in the apparent identification of an actual rainbow as the mythological Iris (*Ann.* 399 Sk) (cf. 192–8). The point of these unexpectedly hyper-Homeric gestures in Ennius' treatment of events that occurred within his own lifetime is precisely, F. argues, to drive home the completeness with which the Romans have reversed the situation in which their Trojan ancestors found themselves when the story began, and the completeness with which Ennius himself has supplanted Homer in telling that story.

F.'s chief contribution is a compelling interpretation of the *Annales* not merely as a formal artifact, but as a story with a moral and ethical point, and not necessarily the one that later representations of Ennius' epic would have suggested as the most obvious one. Her arguments, while seldom if ever actually dispositive, are always coherent, never (in my view) implausible and often persuasive. As an interpretation of the *Annales* as reconstructed by Skutsch, they both make sense and present a more interesting conception of the poem than one finds in, for instance, Skutsch himself, Flores *et al.* and the standard literary-historical accounts.

Goldschmidt's contribution is not really a study of Ennius *per se*, but an intertextual analysis of the *Annales* and the *Aeneid*. This can obviously not be a straightforward essay of its kind. As G. observes, any Vergilian would give a lot to be in a position to do for Ennius what Knauer has done for Homer and Nelis for Apollonius, but the highly fragmentary state of the *Annales* simply does not permit such a totalizing perspective. Therefore, she writes, 'this book attempts something fundamentally different' (7). In one way, that is true: the book does not present a single, unified conception of this crucial poetic relationship, but rather a series of essays on different aspects of the relationship. Nevertheless, when it comes to specific episodes and other elements, G. generally does proceed almost as if we knew just as well as Vergil what Ennius' poem was like. Her working assumptions, which she lays out in ch. 1, 'Reading Ennius in the First Century B.C.', are two. First, and more conventionally, she accepts Eduard Norden's effort to reconstruct parts of the *Annales* on the basis of Vergil's imitation, and Skutsch's extension of that effort, almost as written. This, in theory, permits the critic to focus directly on how Vergil engaged with his model in particular instances. Second — and this is where some of the more interesting implications of reception theory come into play — G. argues that even if there is a lot about the *Annales* itself that we do not know, we have a good deal of information about how the poem was regarded in the first century B.C.; and, she infers, it was presumably to this conception of the *Annales* that Vergil was reacting, as well as to the poem itself. In respect of the first assumption, of course, the possibility of falling into circular argumentation is an almost constant threat. G. is aware of that, but addresses the issue in a manner that seems to me more apotropaic than convincing. In contrast to F., for instance, she brings little new information to bear on the likely form of the poem that Vergil was imitating. And in respect of the second assumption, even if I agree (as I do) that Vergil is likely to have been reacting to earlier readings of Ennius as well as to Ennius himself, I am not so confident that we can reliably tell the difference between them, or in some cases even be very specific about what these readings were. For these reasons, I find the general premises of this study more than usually open to question.

Still, there is value in particular lines of approach, or at least in some of them. Chs 2 and 3, on "Archaic" Poets' and 'Sites of Rome', seem to me the most successful parts of the book. In the former, G. takes up the familiar issue of poetic succession and gives it a new spin. Taking her bearings from Hardie on literary parricide and Hinds on projected obsolescence, she points out complementary instances in which Vergil 'appropriates ... Ennius' "oldness"' (65) to fashion the *Aeneid* as an "archaic" poem', but one 'endowed with a new, more urbane, antiquity' (66). The following chapter begins by discussing Ennian interactions with Roman and Italian *lieux de mémoire* and continues with a suggestive and original discussion of Vergil's Ennian Tiber. The tour of the Palatine that concludes this chapter is somewhat less rewarding, perhaps just because one has taken this tour so many times already. The final two chapters are more of a mixed bag, and are neither as original nor as persuasive as the previous two. The one (ch. 4, 'Punica') considers Ennian reflections of the wars with Carthage, but the section on Sicily is as much about Naevius as Ennius in a way that momentarily blurs the usually clear focus of G.'s argument; and the sections on *Aeneid* 7 and 9, when they try to venture beyond a synthesis of previous work, are the most speculative parts of the book. The last section, however, on Ennius, Turnus and Zama, triangulates Ennius, Vergil and Silius in an interesting and attractive way. Ch. 5, 'Epic Examples', accesses recent work on exemplarity, builds on the observation that the *Annales* deals with many figures (Horatius Cocles, the Decii Mures, Q. Fabius Maximus *et al.*) who became mainstays of the exemplary tradition, and finds in this evidence that Vergil's emphasis on *exempla* is in dialogue with that of his great epic predecessor. This must be true, but G. was not able to go very far beyond this basic observation in what I found a rather weak final instalment to a book that is usually stimulating, if not always convincing.

To return in conclusion to the question I raised at the beginning, if it becomes necessary to revise the prevailing opinion about the form of the *Annales*, how will the impact of these two books be affected? I believe that, on balance, F.'s general conclusions are likely to stand, or at least to serve

as a continuing point of reference for others interested to understand and explain the ethos of the *Annales*. As I have noted, she does something actually to strengthen one's sense that Skutsch's conception of the passages with which she deals is likely to be right; and if in some cases it is not, F.'s ethical conception of the poem is by no means entirely dependent on specific formal considerations, certainly not in all its aspects. G.'s interpretations on the other hand, even at their most interesting, are also more open to question — even if most readers continue to equate the poem with Skutsch's reconstruction of it. Nevertheless, they are definitely worth taking seriously. Different readers will no doubt assess this or that argument in either of these books more or less favourably than I, but scholars of Ennius (and of Vergil and of Latin poetry in general) will find things to admire in both. For the rest, may this *aetas Enniana* long endure!

University of Pennsylvania
jfarrell@sas.upenn.edu
doi:10.1017/S0075435815000520

JOSEPH FARRELL

J. ELLIOTT, *ENNIUS AND THE ARCHITECTURE OF THE ANNALES*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2013. Pp. xiv + 590. ISBN 9781107027480. £75.00/US\$110.00.

Jackie Elliott's eagerly awaited monograph, based on her 2005 Columbia doctoral thesis, represents a fundamentally important contribution to scholarship which will — and should — influence any future work on Ennius' *Annales*. Chiming in with recent movements in the presentation of authors preserved solely or primarily in citation fragments (notably Tim Cornell *et al.* (eds), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* (2013)), E. makes a detailed case for the importance of taking into account the ways in which the preoccupations of the citing sources, and indeed later editors, can fundamentally shape our view of how the 'complete' version of a lost text may have looked.

The monograph falls into five chapters backed up by extensive and meticulous appendices. Ch. 1, 'Ennius and the Annalistic Tradition at Rome', interrogates traditional assumptions about the nature of the *Annales*. Taking inspiration from the observation by Ingo Gildenhard that Ennius may well have written 'annales' before the existence of historical 'annales' in Rome as we have come to know them, E. starts by unpacking the biases associated with assumptions about the poem's so-called 'annalistic' presentation drawn from its title. Looking again at the distribution of the fragments, E. argues that the shape and pace of the poem would have been rather different from the arid year-by-year accounts of consular records with which Ennius' epic has traditionally been associated. Ennius would have been much more innovative than previously thought in the use of time and divine machinery, which can be shown to play a part in the poem's action beyond the early so-called 'mythological' books. Ch. 2, 'The Vergiliocentric Sources and the Question of the Evidence: Ennius and the Epic Tradition of Greece and Rome', and ch. 3, 'The Pre-Vergilian Sources', each move to look at a different set of quoting sources for the epic, showing how the various preoccupations of these authors might distort our perceptions. In ch. 2, E. argues that in quoting passages primarily for their use of shared Homeric and other language, formulae and imagery, the 'Vergiliocentrics' are in danger of making us over-privilege the poem's rôle in the epic tradition, whereas earlier audiences might have found a more generically fluid entity. Although E. is consciously taking a 'reading' (79) in the reception history of the poem, the implicit division between 'epic' and 'history', important to E.'s argument in the following chapters, can suggest a rather one-dimensional view of the post-Ennian epic tradition at Rome. While the immediate citation environment of these sources is narrowly literary or linguistic in focus, 'epic' and 'history' are not easily separable entities in Virgil (just as they are not in Ennius), nor were they necessarily presented as such in the Servian commentary if taken as a whole. Turning to the pre-Vergilian sources, Cicero, as we learn in ch. 3, reads the *Annales* from a multitude of complex dialogic perspectives (to which E. does justice) as 'essentially historiographical' (195), while Varro exemplifies a grammatical tradition making up 38 per cent of citation sources (144), which had 'no interest in the text as a work of literature' (144): primarily interested in language, these sources, though they might make the poem seem more linguistically quirky, can be seen as relatively free from distortions of content.

The final chapters move towards gauging what the poem itself may have looked like. Ch. 4, 'The *Annales* as Historiography: Ennius and the Invention of the Roman Past', attempts to synthesize the Homeric and historiographical aspects of the *Annales*, providing an important corrective to the