elements of a list ('A, B and C'); it turns out that this phenomenon also occurs in Latin, though much less often than complete asyndeton ('A, B, C') or repeated coordination ('A and B and C'). But A.'s findings here are not as different from the *communis opinio* as he suggests, and the choice of 'Friends, Romans and countrymen' (*sic*, p. 192) as an example of English usage was unfortunate.

The book is clearly written with remarkably little jargon and is easy to understand despite the high density of information per page. It is also well organised and well equipped with aids to finding specific passages, including a highly detailed fifteen-page table of contents and three indices. Quotations are provided with translations when the reader particularly needs to grasp their content. Typographical errors are infrequent. A.'s last gift to scholarship is worthy of his memory.

University of Reading ELEANOR DICKEY
E.Dickey@reading.ac.uk
doi:10.1017/S0075435822000119

CYNTHIA DAMON and JOSEPH FARRELL, *ENNIUS' ANNALS: POETRY AND HISTORY*. Cambridge and New York: Cambridge University Press, 2020. Pp. xiii + 351. ISBN 9781108481724. £90.00/US$120.00.

As recalled by the two editors, C. Damon and J. Farrell, in the 'Introduction', the publication in 1985 of the edition of Skutsch gave rise to a great flowering of studies on the *Annals*, studies that all start from Skutsch in one way or another and above all share his basic assumptions. A turning-point came with Jackie Elliott's *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales* (2013), which radically questioned the very assumptions on which the edition of Skutsch was based. Now, this excellent conference volume presents itself as programmatically sceptical not only of Skutsch, but also of many of the main *idées reçues* concerning Ennius' poem. The desire to challenge commonplaces on the *Annals* is clearly the leitmotif of the fourteen contributions of which the volume is composed (plus an 'Afterword' by Mary Jaeger, which most effectively summarises the main themes of the book).

The book is divided into four parts. Part I, 'Innovation', opens with P. Glauthier, 'Hybrid Ennius: Cultural and Poetic Multiplicity in the *Annals*' (ch. 1), who deals with the ways in which Ennius exploits three images of multiple or hybrid bodies — the peacock of Book 1, the Discord of Book 7 and the decrepit body of the elderly poet in Book 16 — to underline the multiplicity and hybridity of his own poetic career, of the *Annals* themselves and of Romanness as a whole. V. Fabrizi, 'History, Philosophy, and the *Annals*' (ch. 2), studies the presence of philosophical themes in the *Annals* focusing on the two topics that seem of particular interest to Ennius: the doctrine of the four elements and the immortality of the soul. J. Farrell, 'The Gods in Ennius' (ch. 3), first focuses on Book 1, in which gods appear who are not only Homeric, but also Hesiodic, and possibly Callimachean, and then on later books, in which Ennius' interest in a more rationalising and Euhemeristic theology emerges. Farrell suggests that the evolution of Ennius' point of view on the gods can be read in parallel with the historical evolution of theological thought towards more sophisticated and rational forms.

Part II, 'Authority', comprises four essays. T. Biggs, 'Allegory and Authority in Latin Verse-Historiography' (ch. 4), studies the influence on the *Annals* of Ennius' epic predecessors, Livius Andronicus and Naevius, especially as regards the themes of historical allegory, which Biggs sees already used both in Livius and in Naevius, and of authority, that is, of the sources of poetic authority. J. Elliott, 'Reading Ennius' *Annals* and Cato's *Origins* at Rome' (ch. 5), focuses on the different ways in which Cicero read the two works, and on the apparently larger role played by anonymous collectivities (such as 'the Romans') in Ennius in comparison to Cato. C. Damon, 'Looking for *auctoritas* in Ennius' *Annals*' (ch. 6) notes that we have no evidence that Ennius resorted to the usual historiographic technique of questioning the versions of predecessors in the face of events that presented problematic aspects. If examples of this technique have simply been lost, this could mean that Ennius' authority among posterity was not considered to reside specifically in his activity as a historian. L. Spielberg, 'Ennius' *Annals* as Source and Model for Historical Speech' (ch. 7), considers the question of Ennius' authority by focusing on the way in which our sources quote or refer to the speeches contained in the *Annals*. She suggests that Ennius' value for posterity lay not so much in his authority as a historian but in his ability to represent the essence of Romanness.

Opening Part III, 'Influence', the analysis of Ennius' influence on subsequent literature leads S. M. Goldberg, 'Ennius and the *fata librorum*' (ch. 8), to question the traditional understanding of the *Annals* as the 'national epic' of pre-Virgilian Rome. From his analysis it emerges that the *Annals* soon became more famous and respected than actually read and known. To the question posed by its title, 'How Ennian was Latin Epic between the *Annals* and Lucretius?' (ch. 9), J. S. Nethercut replies: much less than our histories of Latin literature would suggest. In fact, it does not seem that the *Annals* established 'annalistic historical epic' as a genre of particular importance for the generations immediately following Ennius, nor that Ennius' style was dominant in Roman poetry of the times before Catullus. A. Haimson Lushkov, 'Livy's Ennius' (ch. 10), proposes to look with new eyes at the relationship between the *Annals* and Livy's work. Once again, Ennius' greatest influence seems to lie not so much in his activity as a historian, but in his ability to create a memorable language with which to speak about Roman history. A. J. Woodman, 'Ennius' *Annals* and Tacitus' *Annals*' (ch. 11), studies the possible presence of quotations from verses of Ennius in Tacitus. In the first place, he suggests that ten hexametric sequences in the *Annals* of Tacitus, starting with the famous incipit, are references not only to Sallust and the historiographical tradition, but also, more or less directly, to Ennius himself. Secondly, he points to other passages in which the verbal coincidences with Ennius suggest Ennian imitation by Tacitus, as for example in the case of the death of L. Piso *pontifex* (*Ann.* 6.10.3), which seems to echo the 'good companion' fragment.

Part IV, 'Interpretation', is the last. B. W. Breed, 'Ennius and Lucilius: Good Companion/Bad Companion' (ch. 12), studies the role of Lucilius in limiting later readers' perception of the hybridity of the *Annals* by introducing a clearer distinction between what is classifiable as satire and what is classifiable as epic. J. H. Clark, 'Ennius' *Annals* as Historical Evidence in Ancient and Modern Commentaries' (ch. 13), focuses on a fragment (*sed. inc.* fr. **62 [513] *Qui uincit non est uictor nisi uictus fatetur*), examining its reception in modern commentaries and recalling the need for a more careful consideration of the ancient context from which the fragment derives, in the case in question, Servius Danielis' commentary on Virgil's *Aeneid*. C. S. Kraus, 'Commenting on the *Annals*: Steuart, Skutsch, and Ennius' (ch. 14), begins with acute methodological considerations on commenting on fragmentary texts, to focus then on a comparison between the not very successful 1925 commentary of Ethel Mary Steuart and that of Skutsch. It cannot be said that Kraus's is a real 'rehabilitation', but her chapter does end with the statement that Steuart's is 'also the work of a learned scholar with a different voice and a heterodox vision of the poem. In a world where Skutsch's Ennius may no longer be our Ennius, who knows what will happen?' (295).

To sum up, this exemplary book is destined to open new avenues for the interpretation of the *Annals* and to mark a stage of essential importance for the study of an Ennius freed from prejudices and open to fresh perspectives.

University of Rome 'Tor Vergata' SERGIO CASALI
casali@uniroma2.it
doi:10.1017/S007543582200003X

MATHIAS HANSES, *THE LIFE OF COMEDY AFTER THE DEATH OF PLAUTUS AND TERENCE*. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 2020. Pp. xiv + 412, illus. ISBN 9780472132256. £71.50.

Plautus and Terence were popular in their own time but not regularly performed afterwards, and comedies of any authorship ceased to be performed by Augustus' time: such is the conventional wisdom reexamined in this volume. Mathias Hanses claims that New Comedy was consistently revived in public through the Flavian era (this study's limit); Cicero, satirists and love poets alluded to comedy's plots, characters and themes; and elites continued to write comedies and hear private recitals. There is a good case for continued public performance in chapter 1, but the intertextual evidence is less convincing.

The introduction establishes the volume's throughlines: comedy was considered a 'mirror of life'; as the plays aged, their fandom became increasingly elite; tragedy, comedy and mime were considered