Reviews

I. LITERATURE AND RECEPTION

J. N. ADAMS, *ASYNDETON AND ITS INTERPRETATION IN LATIN LITERATURE: HISTORY, PATTERNS, TEXTUAL CRITICISM*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2021. Pp. xxix + 751. ISBN 9781108837859. £130.00

This is the final book of a great Latinist: J. N. Adams died shortly after its publication. In contrast to his other recent books with their broad, sweeping themes — *Bilingualism* (2003), *Regional Diversification* (2007), *Social Variation* (2013), *Informal Latin* (2017) — this one focuses on an apparently small topic, the question of when Romans omitted conjunctions meaning 'and', 'but' or 'or' between words or phrases. (A.'s definition of 'asyndeton' does not include omission of sentence connectors.) Part of the answer is obvious: conjunctions are very frequently omitted in lists of three or more items, but much less often between pairs of two elements. This latter type, *asyndeton bimembre*, is what is tricky to explain and accordingly becomes the focus of the book. Thus the most famous example of Latin asyndeton, 'Veni vidi vici', is technically outside the scope of this work — though the discussion nevertheless encompasses this and many other longer examples.

The work focuses primarily on literary texts from the Archaic and Classical periods. Its evidential basis is a huge corpus of asyndetic pairs collected by a systematic hand search of selected laws and prayers, most early Latin poetry, Virgil, Catullus, Horace, Caesar's *Bellum Civile*, the Annalists, Sallust, and substantial portions of Cicero, Tacitus and Livy; significant amounts of Greek, Umbrian and Vedic data are also included as comparanda. A detailed text-by-text analysis of this evidence takes up about two-thirds of the book and reveals that the use of asyndeton fluctuated considerably, not only between but also within the work of individuals. The (highly complex) patterns revealed include a decline over time in the use of asyndeton; although given the Indo-European origins of *-que* A. sees no reason to believe that asyndeton is actually older than coordination (as many have hypothesised), it is certainly more common in earlier than in later Latin literature. Genre also played a significant role, especially in the late Republic and early Empire, when asyndeton was used above all in legal texts and secondarily in certain varieties of oratorical, political and historiographical prose.

The fruits of this careful study are anticipated in the first third of the book, which builds on that analysis to offer a more synthetic account of other factors that are or could be related to asyndeton. These have nothing to do with conveying speed or agitation (as often stated in comments on asyndeton); in fact it is likely that asyndetic pairs were pronounced with a pause before the second element, hence more slowly than coordinated pairs. One factor that matters is whether the two elements together form a complete set (e.g. *M. Antonius Q. Cassius, tribuni plebis* when there are exactly two tribunes) or not (e.g. *optimus maximus*, to which other laudatory adjectives could be added): A. states that pairs of the latter type are much more likely to use asyndeton, though as the distinction is often subjective he does not do much with it. The other factors include grammatical ones, such as pairs with a negative prefix (e.g. *inamabilis illepidus*), pairs of related words (e.g. *sumere consumere* or *pellerent pellerentur*), pairs of imperatives (e.g. *i arcesse*) and masculine/feminine pairs (e.g. *pueros virgines*). These turn out to take asyndeton to varying degrees, ranging from the imperatives (regularly asyndetic) to the masculine/feminines (usually coordinated). Two semantic factors are also investigated: pairs of opposites (e.g. *vita mors*) and family members (e.g. *liberos coniuges*); the former are more likely to use asyndeton than the latter, but semantic factors were probably never wholly responsible for asyndeton.

More relevant, in A.'s view, are structural factors, particularly the context. *Asyndeton bimembre* is most common in 'accumulations'; that is, when a larger list contains a pair of words, that pair is more likely to have internal asyndeton than when it occurs outside such a list. It follows that, in editing and commenting on Latin passages that may contain asyndeton, scholars should not simply consider how that pair of words is joined elsewhere, but also look at the context of the particular passage.

The section on structures also discusses the order in which paired words appear: in many (especially early) authors, the longer one usually appears last, but the tendency to place the semantically stronger word last is also important. There is also a lengthy discussion of 'end-of-list coordination', that is, the English tendency to put a conjunction between only the last two

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.