



Project
MUSE®

Scholarly journals online

ENNIUS AFTER THE BANQUET

SANDER M. GOLDBERG

Though Ennius's *Annales* stood tall in the Roman cultural landscape, what the poem was in origin and what it became in retrospect were not necessarily the same thing. Creating a text is neither identical to nor always coextensive with creating "literature." The former task requires the talents of an author. We are told that, at Rome, the latter took some carelessness, in particular the carelessness of Crates of Mallos, the Pergamene scholar who arrived on a diplomatic mission in the early 160s, stepped into a drain, and broke his leg. He spent his convalescence lecturing on the fine points of Greek literary exegesis and, in the process, apparently awakened his Roman audiences to the possibility that they too might have some literature worth studying. Under Crates' influence, says Suetonius, Romans of the later second century were inspired to popularize certain poems that were not yet widely known and, in doing so, both laid the foundations of grammatical study in Latin and cultivated an interest in that special set of socially and aesthetically marked texts that we (and they) call "literature." Prominent among these works was the *Annales*, which the otherwise unknown Q. Vargunteius brought to public attention through public recitations that attracted large audiences.¹

1 Suet. *Gramm.* 2.3–4: "carmina parum adhuc divulgata . . . diligentius retractarent ac legendo commentandoque etiam ceteris nota facerent: ut C. Octavius Lampadio Naevi Punicum bellum . . . ut postea Q. Vargunteius Annales Enni, quos certis diebus in magna frequentia pronuntiabat" ("They carefully reviewed poems that had as yet not been widely circulated . . . and by reading and commenting upon them made them known to the rest of the population as well. So Gaius Octavius Lampadio did in the case of Naevius's *Punic War* . . . so Quintus Vargunteius later did in the case of Ennius' *Annals*, which he used to recite

Suetonius's account of these developments makes for occasionally dubious history: neither the precise service Vargunteius performed for Ennius's poem nor Crates' contribution to that service is at all certain. What matters for our purpose, however, is less the specific nature of Vargunteius's role in popularizing the *Annales* than the fact that *this* poem should ever have required *that* help. Ennius's achievement may itself have limited the appeal or hastened the eclipse of Naevius's *Bellum Punicum*, the other epic on Suetonius's list of targeted works, but it comes as a surprise to be told that the greatest poem of the Roman republic once languished among *carmina parum . . . divulgata*. Did its eventual status really owe as much to later scholarly intervention as to original poetic genius? It was no doubt a "classic" for later generations, but what do we know about the *Annales*' contemporary reception?

The testimony is elusive and equivocal. Perhaps the most deflating example of the interpretive problem it presents is a famous passage from Cicero's *Tusculan Disputations* that appears to suggest that Ennius's epic career originally met with criticism as well as praise (*Tusc.* 1.3):

Sero igitur a nostris poetae vel cogniti vel recepti. quamquam est in *Originibus* solitos esse in epulis canere convivas ad tibicinem de clarorum hominum virtutibus, honorem tamen huic generi non fuisse declarat oratio Catonis, in qua obiecit ut probum M. Nobiliori, quod is in provinciam poetas duxisset; duxerat autem consul ille in Aetoliam, ut scimus, Ennium. quo minus igitur honoris erat poetis, eo minora studia fuerunt, nec tamen, si qui magnis ingeniis in eo genere exstiterunt, non satis Graecorum gloriae responderunt.

Poets thus received late recognition or welcome from our countrymen. Although we find in the *Origines* that guests at dinner were accustomed to sing to the pipe about the deeds of famous men, Cato's speech in which he criticized M. Nobilior for taking poets to his province (the consul

before a large audience on specific days," trans. Kaster 1995.5). See Kaster's discussion 1995.58–68. The translations that follow are my own.

For "literature" as a quality less of texts than of attitudes toward texts, see Fish 1980.10–11, Eagleton 1983.202, Guillory 1993.63–71. *Litterae* seems to mean "literature" in this sense at Cic. *SRosc.* 46, *Att.* 4.10.1, *Tusc.* 1.3, *Fin.* 1.4, and something similar at *Div. Caec.* 39 and *Verr.* 2.1.47. Further discussion in Goldberg 2005.4–43, 81–85.

had, in fact, as we know, taken Ennius to Aetolia) nevertheless declares that there was no honor in this activity. And so, the less poets were honored, the less attention was paid to them, although those whose great talent enabled them to stand out in that activity nevertheless matched the glory of the Greeks.

Cicero is illustrating here what became a commonplace of Roman literary history, that is, that literary culture came relatively late to the Romans' bellicose ancestors.² The terms of his assertion, however, prevent him from being as clear a witness to that phenomenon as we might wish.

The argument in the *Tusculans*—and it is important to recognize that this is an argument, not an exposition—conflates and distorts what are three quite distinct levels of witness. Behind everything are the facts, whatever or if ever they were, regarding banquet songs in archaic Rome and Ennius's presence in Aetolia. Then there is what Cato in the second century said in his *Origines* about those songs and what he said in a speech attacking Fulvius Nobilior, and, finally, there is Cicero's combination of Cato's statements for his own purpose a century and more after their original articulation. Though some of the words in the passage are probably Cato's, the association of ideas is certainly Cicero's, which means that these relics of second-century polemic are preserved in a matrix of first-century argument. They are all too well integrated into that argument, and the success of their integration makes Cicero's account hopelessly jumbled and unhistorical.

Cicero himself almost certainly has the *Annales* in mind when connecting the archaic *carmina* and Fulvius's patronage of Ennius, as is clear from the fuller version of this argument about literary progress at *Brutus* 71–76, where Cicero explicitly treats the archaic *carmina* mentioned in Cato's *Origines* as the first step in epic's rise. Cicero also knew, of course, that *Annales* 15 celebrated Nobilior's Aetolian campaign and climaxed with his restoration of the Aedes Herculis Musarum, and since Cato's hostility to Fulvius was well documented, it was easy to imagine Cato objecting to the patronage of Ennius that made the book possible.³ The problem with

2 The idea appears in Porcius Licinus 1 (Courtney 1993.82–86), followed famously by Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.156–59, as well as Livy 7.2.3 and eventually Suet. *Gramm.* 1.1.

3 J. E. G. Zetzel points out to me that Cicero's statement at *Tusc.* 1.3 could be taken to mean that the speech attacking Fulvius itself declared that there was no honor in creating the old banquet songs either. I return to this possibility below. Note that Cato's approval

this line of reasoning is that the encomiastic tendencies of *Annales* 15 were probably not at issue in Cato's speech attacking Fulvius Nobilior. Chronological considerations make that association at least problematic, and most likely impossible. Cato did not scruple in his speech to recall the contested Aetolian triumph of 187, but his immediate target was Fulvius's censorship of 179.⁴ The speech is therefore dated to 178. We think the *Annales* project began about 184, after Ennius's return from Ambracia, but we also know that it was never the poet's sole occupation. He continued to write plays and satires into the 170s, as well as a hexameter poem about fish (*Hedyphagetica*). He also had to research some five hundred years of Roman history in the course of writing his epic and to develop a satisfactory technique for creating viable hexameters in Latin. If, as everyone believes, Ennius wrote his epic in chronological sequence, with a significant break in the writing after Book 6, Book 15, marking the end of the original sequence, probably did not circulate until the later 170s. If this is right, the action that aroused Cato's disdain in 178 would therefore not have been the writing of an epic in praise of Fulvius Nobilior.⁵

The provocation more likely came from the production of a play, Ennius's *praetexta* drama *Ambracia*, which was staged either in conjunction with Fulvius's triumph or at the votive games he held the following year.⁶ The *Scipio* in honor of Africanus had already presented an unsettling precedent for Latin encomiastic verse, and early books of the *Annales* may have further raised Ennius's profile and stoked the fires of Cato's indignation, but the play would have attracted his particular attention because of its conspicuous public role in the controversy of 187. Panegyric displays of this type might have been thought suitable for Hellenistic dynasts, but they were not appropriate for Roman consuls.⁷ Cato's target in his speech would

of the archaic *carmina*, though widely assumed in modern scholarship, is not explicitly attested in any ancient source.

4 So Malcovati 1955.57 and now widely accepted, though the possibility of an earlier speech on the consulship and/or triumph cannot be excluded. See Astin 1978.110 n. 22, Sblendorio Cugusi 1982.294–96.

5 The dating of *Annales* 1–15 is problematic, with dates of composition well into the 170s most commonly favored, since it is difficult to imagine fifteen hexameter books researched, written, and circulated in little more than five years. See Suerbaum 1968.114–20 and Skutsch 1985.2–5. Ennius's contemporaries would have known him primarily as a dramatist.

6 Flower 1995.184–86, Manuwald 2001.163–66.

7 Gildenhard 2003.110. The laudatory *Scipio* is almost certainly later than 187, but predates the *Annales*. See the judicious discussion by Courtney 1993.26–30.

thus have been not the poet, as Cicero certainly implies (*minus honoris erat poetis*) because his argument requires it, but the conduct of a consul whose wealth and influence had suborned poetry and tried to make it into a political weapon. If so, memory of the *praetexta* has been eclipsed in Cicero's account, a casualty of his own, first-century rhetoric and of the greater prestige that the *Annales* itself eventually bestowed on the epic genre. Cicero's integration of material from the speech of 178 and the history Cato wrote some twenty years later is thus significantly misleading if taken as evidence for the reception of poetry a century earlier. His anachronistic argument does not say what we would most like it to say.

What of Cato's own writings? Is there evidence among the fragments to suggest that epic was a contested or in some way problematic genre in the 180s or 170s? The banquet songs mentioned in the *Origines* are equally unhelpful with this question. Cicero's chronological compression at *Tusculans* 1.3 obscures what other citations, which have change over time as a central theme of their argument, make clear about the original passage: Cato had associated those *carmina* with the practice of generations long before his own ("multis saeculis ante suam aetatem," *Brut.* 75; cf. *Tusc.* 4.3: *apud maiores*). He did not know them at first hand, and whether his observation about the *maiores* was based on specific evidence or he was simply inferring the songs' existence (as we do) from the plausibility of their existence remains unclear.⁸ Another fragment from another context, however, does preserve a comment on the low status of poets, and that passage may even be echoed in the language of *Tusculans* 1.

Aulus Gellius, explaining the changed sense of the adjective *elegans*, cites a work by Cato he calls the *Carmen de Moribus* and then continues his discussion with additional, seemingly random quotations from that work as they occur to him. The key excerpt as usually cited in discussions of archaic poetry is given below in italics, but its immediate surroundings (however *sparsim et intercise*) also require consideration (Gellius 11.2.5 = Cato *Carmen de Moribus* 2 Jordan):

Praeterea ex eodem libro Catonis haec etiam sparsim et
intercise commemimus: "Vestiri" inquit "in foro honeste
mos erat, domi quod satis erat. equos carius quam coquos

8 Good discussion of this problem by Horsfall 1994. Momigliano 1957.109–11, however skeptical of Niebuhr's theory of heroic lays, did not doubt the survival of Roman *carmina* into the fourth century. See now Goldberg 2005.4–7.

emebant. *poeticae artis honos non erat. siquis in ea re studebat aut sese ad convivia adplicabat, 'grassator' vocabatur.*"

I recall these other sayings random and piecemeal from the same book by Cato: "It used to be the custom," he says, "to dress respectably in public, modestly at home. They paid more for horses than for cooks. *Poetic art was not respected. Anyone who applied himself to that activity or attached himself to dinner parties was called a 'grassator.'*"

Grassator, "vagabond" or "bandit" in common usage, is often given a more specific sense with the help of Festus, who glosses *grassari*, the verb behind *grassator*, as "to flatter." This would suggest that, in Cato's view, poetry was at some point in Rome's past considered little better than flattery and poets, therefore, little more than fawners or parasites.⁹ How should we understand such a remark, and what may have been its basis in fact?

Context may, despite appearances, provide a clue. The *Carmen de Moribus* is known only from this one chapter in Gellius. It was probably not an original work at all but a collection of dicta drawn from other sources, a *carmen* in the sense of a "prescription" or "refrain."¹⁰ This particular set of dicta presents three subjects (dress, food, entertainment) united by a

9 Paulus Festus 86 Lindsay: "grassari antiqui ponebant pro adulari. grassari autem dicuntur latrones vias obsidentes; gradi siquidem ambulare est, unde tractum grassari, videlicet ab impetu gradiendi" ("The ancients used *grassari* in the sense of *adulari*. *Grassari* also describes highwaymen: if *gradi* is 'to walk,' from which *grassari* is derived, it should be from the violence of their approach"). Thus Rüpke 2001.57: "nicht als 'Wegelagerer,' sondern als 'Schmeichler.'" Peruzzi 1998.159–60 prefers a specific sense, "(poeta) itinerante," which seems like special pleading. Paulus Festus's *autem* clearly acknowledges the more usual meaning, but "mugger" (so Habinek 1998a.37–38) makes little sense in Cato's context and would not motivate Paulus Festus's comment, though Habinek, following Zorzetti 1990.294, is probably right to equate Cato's *poetica ars* with Greek *techne*. Gruen 1992.71–72 suggests, less probably, that Cato's distinction is between types of poetry.

10 So Livy 3.64.10: *rogationis carmen*, "electoral rule"; Cic. *Orat.* 1.245: *magistri carmen*, "a schoolmaster's refrain"; Sen. *Con.* 2.2.8: *quasi carmen*, "like a tag." The model would have been the so-called *carmen* of Appius Claudius Caecus (Cic. *Tusc.* 4.4; cf. Val. Max. 7.2.1). Scholarship has been silent on this obvious possibility. See Astin 1978.185–86 for the standard view. Gellius's quotations preclude the *a priori* assumption of (most recently) Zorzetti 1991.313–15 that *carmen* in archaic contexts must mean "poetry."

common theme: archaic austerity is in each case implicitly compared with something else, no doubt with modern extravagance. An original context is easily supplied. The moral position and style of presentation in each statement are familiar from Cato's many speeches and pronouncements concerning the conspicuous consumption so prevalent among his contemporaries. He was an active participant in the sumptuary debates of the day, famous for complaining, among other things, that it was hard to save a city where a fish cost more than an ox and a handsome boy more than a fertile field.¹¹ The obvious inference to be drawn from the moral litany Gellius quotes is that, in Cato's present, the suppressed counter to each statement was that poetry *was* receiving respect and poets were *not* called vagabonds or flatterers. Cato may have liked that state of affairs no more than he liked the price of fish, but he clearly believed that *some* kind of poetry was all too well established by his own day. This claim is entirely compatible with Cicero's argument that poetry came late to the *maiores*. It does not, however, indicate that anyone except perhaps Cato would have called contemporary poets *grassatores*, much less counted Ennius among them.

One way to reconcile Cato's slur on contemporary poets with his testimony about archaic songs is to understand a tension in the second century between the "amateur" poetry of banqueters and the products of those who, Ennius among them, wrote in one way or another for hire. Cato would then be extolling the archaic custom and protesting the introduction of paid entertainment. There are two difficulties with this line of thought. First, Polybius's vivid picture of the *convivia* that ensnared young Scipio's peers and drew Cato's fire is clearly not portraying the kind of *convivium* that scholars have in mind when they posit a sympotic venue for the performance of early epic in either archaic (e.g., Zorzetti) or historical (Rüpke) times.¹² Yet Roman banqueting customs are not directly attested until the

11 Cato ap. Plut. *Cat. Ma.* 8.2, Polyb. 31.25.4–6, with another version at Diod. 37.3.5–6. Polybius's context is the decadence that came into vogue among young Roman aristocrats after Pydna. Cf. Cato's attack on M. Lepidus (96 Malcovati) for erecting statues to two Greek cooks (worth four talents each, according to Diodorus) and his own claim to modest living in the speech *de Sumptu Suo* (174 Malcovati). For his role in the sumptuary debates of the second century, see Astin 1978.91–97, Gruen 1992.69–72. The dubious morality associated with aristocratic banquets lingers in Livy's description of Sex. Tarquinius's ill-fated dinner party at 1.57.6–9.

12 Zorzetti 1990.292–95, Rüpke 2001.49–53. Rüpke's attempt to identify traces of a sympotic environment in the surviving fragments of epic is especially problematic (50–53). Cf. Horsfall 1994.70–73 (with an important caution), Costa 2000.68–71.

second-century sumptuary debates bring them to prominence.¹³ While there may well have been cultured symposia in second-century Rome, Cato's testimony from the *Carmen de Moribus*, shaped as it is by the rhetoric of public debate and the special indignation that respectable age reserves for licentious youth, neither confirms nor denies their existence.

Second, it is not clear that Cato himself particularly valued the *carmina* of archaic banqueters and, like Cicero, regretted either their disappearance or that of the custom that may have produced them. Nothing about Cato's attitude can be safely inferred from Cicero's *quamquam* at *Tusculans* 1.3 or from any other statement about the *carmina convivalia*. The regret over their loss at *Brutus* 75 reflects Cicero's frustrated desire to use them as evidence for his evolutionary argument about Roman poetry. Cato, who had no such desire, may well have expressed no such regret. He may instead, as we will see, simply have contrasted the ephemeral quality of the old songs with the new kind of history represented by his *Origines*, which provided a more enduring record of Roman achievement. The songs themselves certainly left no substantive trace, and they cannot be connected in any meaningful way with the second-century problem of Ennius's poem and its reception.

The prospects are not better for reconstructing a more general "song culture" that may have informed the early epic tradition at Rome. No link between archaic musical practice and later literary developments is ever explicit in the sources. Nevio Zorzetti, for example, tried hard to find in the banquet songs "a lyric tradition of hymns performed in the *convivium* and devoted to praise of the heroes of the city," but he could only make this claim by turning the *laudes* of Cato's testimony into *elogia* and then equating *elogia* with hymns.¹⁴ The main problem with arguing in this

13 The discovery of Greek banqueting equipment in domestic contexts in central Italy of the eighth century does not in itself indicate that the institution of the Greek *symposion* came with it. Social practice is difficult to deduce from limited material evidence. Details in Rathje 1990, with useful comments by Horsfall 1992.791–98, Zorzetti 1991.312–15. Note that Fisher 2000.356–69 now questions the specifically aristocratic connotations of the *symposion* at Athens, at least by the fifth century.

14 Zorzetti 1991.314 and n. 15: "Instead of *laudes*, one might call them *elogia*, with the word used by Cato to define the Greek poems in honor of Leonidas: *Orig.* 83 Peter." Cato in that latter passage is referring not to poems but to laudatory inscriptions, i.e., *tituli*. Cf. Cic. *Fin.* 2.116, *Sen.* 61 (only the *elogia* of *Sen.* 73 are elegiac poems). The closest Roman parallel to Cato's usage would be the Scipionic *elogia*, written first in prose, then in Saturnians and eventually elegiacs, but they are not specifically related to music or to oral performance. See Courtney 1995.216–29, with further references there.

way is that the songs *de clarorum virorum laudibus* were evidently sung in turn around the table like *skolia*, not performed like hymns or like any other kind of narrative poem.¹⁵ Nor, reaching still further back into Roman tradition, is there much justification for identifying these practices with a Roman *mousike* and claiming Numa as “the great musical founder of the city.” The passage Zorzetti cites in support of this idea does not actually say this (Cic. *de Orat.* 3.197):¹⁶

nihil est autem tam cognatum mentibus nostris quam numeri atque voces . . . quorum illa summa vis carminibus est aptior et cantibus, non neglecta, ut mihi videtur, a Numa rege doctissimo maioribusque nostris, ut epularum sollemnium fides ac tibiae Saliorumque versus indicant; maxime autem a Graecia vetere celebrata.

And nothing is, in fact, so akin to our natural feelings as rhythms and the sounds of voices . . . Their enormous power is more closely connected with poems and songs, and not, I think, neglected by our very learned king Numa, or by our ancestors in general, as the lyre- and the flute-playing at ritual banquets as well as the verses of the Salii indicate. But it was ancient Greece that most frequently practiced music and song.

At this point in the technical discussion that ends *de Oratore*, Cicero is addressing the effect of rhythm on even the *vulgus*, and he illustrates the general point of rhythm’s appeal with an example from music. The subject of the passage is thus the power of song, not its history. Numa is recalled not as a founder but as a practitioner, and he is singled out by name among

15 Cic. *Brut.* 75: *cantitata a singulis convivis* (“sung by each guest in turn”); *Tusc.* 4.3: *deinceps qui accubarent canerent* (“those at table sang in succession”). Their relation to the banquet songs sung, according to Varro (*de Vita Populi Romani* frag. 84 Riposati = Nonius 107–08 Lindsay), by (choruses of?) *pueri modesti* is uncertain, though the evidence is generally taken to be complementary and all derived from Cato. See Riposati 1939.187–92, Zorzetti 1990.292–93, Peruzzi 1998.139–40.

16 The translation is by May and Wisse 2001.285. The claim appears at Zorzetti 1991.315. The thoughtful responses to Zorzetti’s argument by Cole 1991 and Phillips 1991 have not received the attention they deserve.

the *maiores* because of his specific association with the Salii, which is just one, though perhaps the oldest, of Cicero's examples.¹⁷

These rituals are, of course, distinct from the aristocratic banquets at which *laudes* were sung, and the *autem* of Cicero's conclusion even implies a significant difference between Roman and Greek practice. *Mousike* has proved to be a difficult concept even in Greek contexts, and its importation into a Roman one has not so far been very helpful. Though music was no doubt a significant component in Roman life, the evidence for Roman music remains distinct from the evidence for Roman literary activity.¹⁸ The kind of argument by analogy that claims a song culture for archaic Rome provides too insecure a foundation for further literary arguments. Epic came to Rome only after those banquets had become a distant memory.

Not every approach to the question of Ennius's contemporary reception, however, must lead to such negative conclusions. A more fruitful line of argument can be developed by focusing on Ennius's career as a second-century phenomenon and using what we know of his contemporary culture to elucidate it. The *Annales'* very existence might be cited as proof of its appeal, but we can do better than that. The famous "Good Companion" passage from Book 8 (*Ann.* 268–86), in which Aelius Stilo saw an Ennian self-portrait, has been read with some justice as evidence for the poet's place in aristocratic society,¹⁹ and the poem's chronological structure, if not actually its title, may reflect an aristocratic, or at least "Fulvian" approach to the Roman past. The *Annales Maximi*, a priestly chronicle arranged by consular year, was probably not the model for Ennius that scholars once supposed: those *Annales* are now widely believed to owe more to nineteenth-century

17 For Numa and the Salii, Plut. *Numa* 13. The *Carmen Saliare* is a particularly good example for Cicero since, by his day, its text, already studied intently by Aelius Stilo and Varro, was largely incomprehensible (cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.86, Quint. 1.6.40), so that its power clearly lay particularly in its rhythm.

18 Wille 1967.105–57, Horsfall 2003.31–47. Contrast the quality of the evidence (and the kind of argumentation it requires) with what is available to Hellenists, e.g., Ford 2002.24–45, Kowalzig 2004. For the benefits and pitfalls of comparing archaic Greek and Roman cultures, see Raafaub 1986.29–37.

19 Gellius 12.4.5: "L. Aelium Stilonem dicere solitum ferunt Q. Ennium de semet ipso haec scripsisse picturamque istam morum et ingenii ipsius Q. Enni factam esse" ("They say that Lucius Aelio Stilo used to say that Quintus Ennius wrote this about himself and that it is a portrait of Quintus Ennius's own character and temperament"). See Gildenhard 2003.109–11, Habinek 1998a.50–54, Goldberg 1995.121–24; cf. also Sciarrino pp. 464–66 in the present volume.

historiographic presumptions than to republican *pontifices*.²⁰ If Ennius had a structural model, it was more likely to have been the *fasti* compiled and prominently displayed by Fulvius Nobilior around his remodeled temple of Hercules Musarum, an association that might certainly make the poem look like an extension by other means of Fulvius's cultural agenda.²¹ That possibility, however, does not, in turn, support the assumption either that Ennius's poem was an exclusively aristocratic possession or that the senatorial elite was the sole focus of the poet's interest.

Individual books may first have circulated separately, but the *Annales* was designed to be read in larger units. Books 1–6 introduced the poet's mission and took the Roman story from the arrival of Aeneas in Italy to Pyrrhus's withdrawal from there. Book 7, which opened with a second programmatic preface, launched a further collection of *Annales*, including the Punic Wars and the series of conflicts with Greece and the Greek east that culminated with Nobilior's Aetolian campaign. The description of his triumph in Book 15 and his rededication of the Muses' temple gave the entire project a sense of closure by uniting its main artistic and political preoccupations. Ambracia had been Pyrrhus's capital, thus confirming the moral victory of Book 6 and establishing Rome's position in the Greek world. The new temple, with its portico of the Greek Muses and *aedicula* of the Camenae, represented the very amalgamation of poetic traditions, imported and native, that Ennius's own poem had so successfully forged.²² He, too,

20 Verbrugge 1989.195–99 notes the extremely weak foundation for scholarly conjectures about *Annales Maximi*. See also Frier 1979.173–78, whose latent skepticism about the annalistic tradition becomes explicit in his preface to the second edition, 1999.vi–xi. The first surviving instances of consular dating outside documentary contexts appear in Ennius's poem (*Ann.* 290, 304–06). So for Rüpke in the present volume (p. 510), Ennius himself is “the first annalist.” See also Gildenhard 2003.94–97, citing the traditional view of Skutsch 1985.6, which goes back to Diomedes *GL* 1.483–84 Keil. See for that, Wiseman's discussion in the present volume, pp. 513–14.

21 Rüpke 1995a.342–45 argues for the *fasti* as a Fulvian creation; see further his contribution to the present volume. Gotter 2003.120–23 develops the connection with Ennius, but note the demonstration by Gildenhard 2003.100–01 that the fragments of Ennius's poem do not show signs of any specifically “annalistic” style. The distinction between “poetic” and “official” styles is, in any case, problematic. Cf. Goldberg 1995.76–82 on Naevius.

22 The new portico of the Muses attached by Fulvius to the existing temple of Hercules probably came to Rome as spoils from Ambracia, while the *aedicula*, originally located outside the Porta Capena, was long associated with Numa. See Goldberg 1995.130–31 and, esp., Rüpke 1995a.332–39. The dedication is best associated with the events of 187, though it is sometimes dated to Fulvius's censorship in 179. The temple, however, does not figure in

explicitly identified the Muses with the Camenae, and he was a gracious winner in his metrical victory over Naevius.²³ If the work finished—or had remained finished—this way, a “Fulvian” reading of the poem would be hard to resist. But it did not. Ennius went on to write three more books, and their addition demands reconsideration of the entire enterprise.

The preface to Book 16, in which the poet spoke of renewing his labors in old age (*Ann.* 401–06), indirectly attests to the success of whatever was the original design: only an appreciative audience demands an encore. If, as seems likely, what Ennius’s audience got was something like what it wanted, the content of the new book should provide some indication of their expectations.²⁴ Two subjects are known. According to Pliny, whose information almost certainly came from the proemium, Ennius was moved to write Book 16 by the bravery of Titus Caecilius Teucer and his brother in the Istrian War of 178–77.²⁵ Nothing is known of these Caecilii, though it is extremely difficult *not* to identify them with the two brothers named Aelius, military tribunes of the third legion, whose courage is well attested by Livy.²⁶ Ennius’s Caecilii must also have been *tribuni militum*, which itself has implications for the perspective of this book and thus its appeal to readers.

The Istrian War stands out in the record for the failure of its consular leaders and the compensatory valor of its tribunes, the equestrian officers who formed the backbone of the legionary structure in the middle years of the republic. These were the men who prevented defeat and eventually secured victory, and they figure prominently in Livy’s account of the

Livy’s catalogue of censorial projects (40.51), and Fulvius’s censorship eventually became a subject of *Annales* 16, as discussed below. Skutsch 1985.144–46 and 553 is inconsistent in discussing this problem.

- 23 *Ann.* 487: “Musas quas memorant nosce nos esse Camenas” (“Learn that we, whom they call Muses, are the Camenae”). Ennius’s refusal to eclipse Naevius’s *Bellum Punicum* by retelling his story in Book 7 tempers his technical triumph over the meter he associates with Fauns and soothsayers (“quos olim Faunei vatesque caneant,” *Ann.* 207).
- 24 Books 16–18 probably circulated as a unit, but the fragments of 17 and 18 are meager and their content largely unknown. See Suerbaum 1968.144–46 and Skutsch 1985.563–65.
- 25 Pliny *Nat.* 7.101: “Q. Ennius T. Caecilium Teucrum fratremque eius praecipue miratus propter eos sextum decimum adiecit annalem.” For a discussion on this passage, see also Skutsch 1985.569–70. Treatment of the conflict in Istria is confirmed by the Illyrian names discernible in lines 407 and 408.
- 26 Livy 41.1.7, 3.6–8, 4.3. Skutsch 1985.556–59 argues against their identification with Ennius’s Caecilii, but see Suerbaum 1968.148–51 and Badian 1972.196–99. Skutsch’s further hesitation (p. 564) to associate them with the Istrian War at all is predicated on the assumption that all significant events between 187 (the end of Book 15) and 179 had to be included in Book 16, but that is hardly certain.

Istrian campaigns. Their courage must have provided a welcome distraction from the venality and arrogance of their commanders, men like A. Manlius Vulso, the consul of 178, who abandoned his province to invade the Istrian peninsula for personal gain, and his successor C. Claudius Pulcher, whose zeal in replacing Manlius had more to do with humiliating him than resolving the military crisis his selfish actions had created.²⁷ This was a war whose virtues, such as they were, lay outside the senatorial class, and so the prominence Ennius gave to the conflict through the deeds of the Caecilii looks beyond the confines of that one elite group and extends the appeal of the *Annales'* narrative to a wider audience.²⁸

The second episode thought to belong to this book would have had a similar effect. This was the reconciliation of the two censors of 179, M. Aemilius Lepidus and M. Fulvius Nobilior, an event that later generations took as a moral exemplum. Cicero, citing the incident as a model of public spirit, attests the story for Ennius (Cic. *Prov.* 20):²⁹

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?

Was not Marcus Lepidus, who was consul twice and pontifex maximus, praised not only by the witness of memory but even by the annals of history and by the voice of the finest poet because, on the day he was elected censor, he

27 Livy 41.1–5, 6.1–3, 7.4–10 (Manlius Vulso), 41.10.1–5, 11.1 (Claudius Pulcher). Neither continued his career without blemish. Manlius vanishes from the record after 177. Claudius, as censor in 169, narrowly avoided condemnation on a charge of *perduellio*. His request for prorogation was vetoed; see Broughton 1951–52.2.424.

28 The suggestion of Badian 1972.185–87 that Book 16 was commissioned to rescue, albeit indirectly, the reputation of Manlius Vulso, brother of Nobilior's consular colleague, has little to recommend it.

29 The *summus poeta* must be Ennius. The chronological scheme of the poem sets the episode in Book 16. Its eventual status as moral paradigm (cf. Val. Max. 4.2.1, Gellius 12.8.5) may be due to Ennius's treatment. The public issues at stake are set out in the speech Livy gives to Metellus Creticus in his version of the episode (40.45.6–46.15).

promptly reconciled in the Campus with his colleague Marcus Fulvius, his most bitter foe, in order to conduct the common obligations of the censorship with common spirit and good will?

Their bitter rivalry represented the worst and ultimately the best of mid-republican partisan politics. Fulvius had twice intervened to keep Aemilius from the consulship, and Aemilius, in turn, nearly prevented, and indelibly tarnished, Fulvius's Aetolian triumph. Yet their reconciliation was real, a landmark effort in that ongoing conflict between personal prerogative and civic responsibility so characteristic of the republic.³⁰ Aemilius and Fulvius went on to conduct the census with extraordinary integrity (*fideli concordia*, Livy 40.51.1) and sponsored a remarkable set of public works projects, including a famous basilica, shops and porticos, harbors and bridges (Livy 40.51). Such intense building might suggest the usual *noblesse oblige*, but another set of activities presents an important complicating factor.

In the course of cleaning and restoring the temple of Capitoline Jupiter, Aemilius removed all the private statues and trophies that, over time, had come to clutter its colonnades. He and Fulvius together also reasserted state ownership of public land and reinstated free access to the numerous shrines and public areas that had gradually been appropriated by wealthy individuals for their private use. These reclamations of public spaces and public prerogatives struck not just at the exercise of aristocratic privilege, but at the identification of personal interest with the public good and the ongoing effort of ambitious individuals to distort the past in their pursuit of the future.³¹ The censors of 179 were not unique in combating these tendencies. There was a recurring need at Rome to reassert the preeminence of the group over the aspirations of individuals: the problem was less a matter of who received honors than of who authorized them. During his censorship in 184, Cato had consistently opposed the display of unearned trophies and the erection of unauthorized statues. The censors of 158 would systematically remove from the Forum all the honorific statues not expressly authorized by the senate or people, and

30 On Fulvius's interventions, Livy 34.47.7 and 38.35.1, and for Aemilius's retaliation, Livy 39.4.3. For the tensions of the period, see Gruen 1990.69–72 and Goldberg 1995. 127–28.

31 Livy 40.51.3, 51.8. Aemilius was himself accused of profiting personally from the construction of a mole at Tarracina (51.2), though this was graft on a comparatively small scale by republican standards. Aemilius also did significant construction of temples at his own expense in the year of his censorship (52).

they actually melted down the statue that Sp. Cassius had erected in his own honor before the temple of Tellus.³² Ennius's focus on the censorship of 179, the only clearly domestic episode attested for the *Annales*, thus shares with his admiration for the Caecilii the celebration of values and achievements that force a reader beyond the narrow confines of aristocratic, partisan interests.

Whether the poem took this inclusive line from the beginning or whether it became prominent only with Book 16 remains uncertain, though the fragments suggest a general tendency to value communal over individual achievements. When the consul Manlius Torquatus orders the execution of his own son for fighting contrary to orders, he justifies his cruelty with precisely such a declaration: "moribus antiquis res stat Romana virisque," "Rome's affairs rest on its traditional character . . . and on its men" (*Ann.* 156). The very imbalance of the line, an Ennian mannerism, declares its moral.³³ In time, the *Annales* as a whole certainly came to be read from this generalized perspective. Thus the epitaph made famous by Varro (Ennius *Varia* 15–16 Vahlen):³⁴

aspicite, o cives, senis Enni imaginis formam.
hic vestrum panxit maxima facta patrum.

Gaze, fellow citizens, on old Ennius's sculpted face.
He sang of your fathers' greatest deeds.

Cives explicitly sets the poet within his community, while *vestrum facta patrum* is deliberately broad, suggesting the deeds not just of great Romans but of all Romans.

32 Cato 98 Malcovati ("Ut praeda in publicum referatur"), 97 Malcovati ("Ne spolia figerentur nisi de hoste capta"), and for the statues in the Forum, Pliny *Nat.* 34.30. Scipio was famous for refusing such honors (Livy 38.56.12), a fact to which Ennius apparently alluded in his *Scipio* (*Operis inc. frag.* 3–4 = *Varia* 1–2 Vahlen). For the political significance of honorific statues and their reception, see Gruen 1992.118–23, Sehlmeier 1999.142–74.

33 An echo of the line at Livy 8.7.16 identifies it with the consul of 340 B.C.E., who had the additional cognomen "Imperiosus," and an event of the Latin War. Skutsch 1985.318 notes a similarly significant stylistic imbalance in 456. Another is likely in 233.

34 Quoted by Cic. *Tusc.* 1.34. The source was probably Varro's *de Poetis*. Ennian authorship is doubtful and its association with a bust that may have been displayed before the tomb of the Scipios is more doubtful still. See Courtney 1993.42–43, Goldberg 1995.16–18. *Panxit*, a necessary emendation for the *pinxit* of the mss., is rare in the sense "sing, compose" and deserves more attention than it has received. It is probably intended here to echo *Ann.* 293 (*tibia Musarum pangit melos*, "The pipe sings the Muses' songs") and may keep traces of its more common set of meanings, "fix, establish." I thank Philip Horky for calling my attention to its significance.

The *Annales*' initial appeal, however, may well have been limited, for there is some evidence of counter-Ennian tendencies in the years following its appearance. Its innovations were certainly resisted in some quarters. The *Bellum Punicum* retained an audience into Horace's lifetime, and resentment of Ennius's new Hellenizing efforts in diction and meter may linger in the claim that, after Naevius's death, the Romans forgot how to speak Latin.³⁵ Enough reactionary bravado certainly endured into the post-Ennian world to produce the so-called *Carmen Priami*, which appealed not to Ennius's Muses but to the *veteres Casmenas*, thus tacitly repudiating in what purported to be Saturnian verse Ennius's elaborate synthesis of epic traditions.³⁶ It was not alone. In the 130s, Decimus Brutus Callaicus dedicated a grand new temple to Mars that featured a monumental statue by Scopas and a dedicatory inscription by Accius—in Saturnians. Trochaic, rather than the new dactylic rhythms, remained common in didactic poetry.³⁷ At the very least, these counter-Ennian tendencies suggest that his eclipse of the old aesthetic was neither complete nor immediate.

Less technically committed readers had another, practical reason to lose interest in Ennius's poem: its content was quickly overtaken by events. Memory of the Hannibalic war dimmed with the years and with the fading reputation of the Scipios.³⁸ The poem's conclusion was even less appealing. The chastisement of Aetolians and Istrians that the *Annales* celebrated so earnestly soon paled before Aemilius Paullus's victory in Macedonia, which opened a new chapter in the political and cultural life of Rome by both securing Rome's dominance in the east and stimulating an unprecedented westward migration of Greek cultural influences. The developments

35 So Norden 1915–18.145, citing the Naevian epitaph of Gellius 1.24: “obliti sunt Romae loquier lingua Latina.” Cf. Hor. *Epist.* 2.1.53–54: “Naevius in manibus non est et mentibus haeret / paene recens?” (“Isn’t Naevius in our hands and clinging to our memory as if recent?”).

36 Its single surviving line is quoted by Varro *LL* 7.28: “veteres Casmenas cascām rem volo profareī” (“I wish the ancient Camenae to tell a hoary tale”). The false archaism of *Casmena* and the lack of word boundary after the fifth syllable (the so-called *caesura Korschiana*) indicate a late imitation of the old epic style. See Cole 1969.19–21, Timpanaro 1978. Wiseman’s attribution of the poem to “an oral culture” (p. 522 in the present volume) therefore seems unlikely to me.

37 Porcius Licinus’s literary history and Accius’s *Pragmatica* were trochaic poems. So, apparently, was Ennius’s *Scipio*. For Brutus’s temple, Pliny *Nat.* 36.26, Cic. *Arch.* 27 with Schol. Bob., Val. Max. 8.14.2.

38 Ennius’s *Scipio* no doubt enhanced Africanus’s original reputation, but the Scipionic legend that eventually restored his fame after the trials of the 180s was the work of Polybius’s generation. See Walbank 1967.

that Ennius in the 170s represented as the pinnacle of Roman achievement thus turned out to be little more than its prelude. Glorification of what so quickly became old news could easily have meant oblivion. It might certainly explain why Q. Vargunteius found the poem *parum divulgatum*.

Yet the *Annales* was also technically and ideologically ahead of its time, which was why Vargunteius's intervention could secure its future. What Crates, or more accurately, the awakening to literary culture that Crates' visit came to symbolize, aroused among Romans was a demand for "literature," that is, for texts that could bear the burden of national identity while standing up to the scrutiny of grammarians and poets. Crates had Homer to explicate. What could Roman disciples claim as texts to justify their own comparable efforts? The *Annales* quickly emerged as a poem singularly appropriate to such needs. Its Homeric echoes might recall and encourage Greek styles of literary explication. Its innovations in meter and diction might, with a little juggling, support a Pergamene style of euphonic criticism, while its invitation to the inclusive reading of past achievements, the kind of reading reflected in the Ennian epitaph, suited very well the ideological requirements of this new generation.³⁹

The association with Homer certainly impressed Lucilius, who paired the *Iliad* and *Annales* in the kind of technical discussion that might have engaged Crates,⁴⁰ and while the satirist's own poetic debt to Ennius may be limited or only tangential, his echoes of the Ennian tradition are beyond question. In gravitating to the dactylic hexameter, Lucilius was responding at least in part to the metrical capabilities Ennius pioneered, and even if the council of the gods that tries Lentulus Lupus in his second satire is not a specifically Ennian parody, it was Ennius who gave that kind of epic convention its Roman resonance.⁴¹ Ennian echoes in the poetry of the 120s, whether here

39 For Crates' style of exegesis, see Pfeiffer 1968.234–46, Garbarino 1973.2.356–63, Nagy 1998.215–28. For a sample of his euphonic doctrines and the discussion they aroused among Greeks, see Janko 2000.120–29. The fragments, along with introduction and commentary, are now available in Broggiato 2001. How a Roman under Pergamene influence would have approached discussion of Ennius is a topic that would repay attention.

40 Lucilius 401–08 Warmington on the distinction between "poesis" and "poema."

41 The council that decided the fate of Ilia in the first book of Ennius's *Annales* (frag. xxx–xliv) may have provided the inspiration for Lucilius's trial (5–46 Warmington), but certainty is impossible. Naevius's *Bellum Punicum* may also have described a divine council (frag. 29, 30 Morel), and such a scene is an epic commonplace. See Barchiesi 1962.425–27, Wigodsky 1972.105–07, Timpanaro 1994.206–18. The famous "virtus fragment" (1196–1208 Warmington) may play on the *virtus* extolled by a figure like Ennius's Pyrrhus (*Ann.* 183–90).

in Lucilius or among epic *epigoni* like Hostius and then Furius of Antium are, in any case, unsurprising, and Ennius's influence on later poetry is, of course, well established.⁴² Rather more surprising is the replication of Ennius's ideological appeal as early as the 150s in the work of Cato.

Though the organization and intent of Cato's *Origines*, that landmark of his old age, remain problematic, its fragments suggest an approach to the Roman past that was of a piece with this community-oriented view of Ennius.⁴³ Not only does Cato's first known line ("Si quæ homines sunt, quos delectat populi Romani gesta describere," "Whoever those men are who are pleased to write about the deeds of the Roman people," frag. 1 Peter) suggest the *maxima facta patrum* of Ennius's epitaph, but the preface as a whole recalls Ennian values. Like Ennius, he made Greek forms and Greek conventions do Roman work. Cato, for example, introduced his Latin history into what had been, even when practiced by Romans, a Greek field of endeavor with a strikingly Greek allusion. Products of *otium*, he claimed, are as worthy of attention as any other activity of distinguished men. This appropriation of Xenophon's argument for τὰ ἐν ταῖς παιδείαις πραττόμενα in the *Symposion* was not simply a demonstration to men like Postumius Albinus (cos. 151), who continued to write Roman history in Greek, that Greek ideas could be perfectly well expressed in Latin.⁴⁴ By fleshing out this originally Greek declaration with distinguished Roman precedents, Cato integrated—as Ennius did in his own literary endeavor—a Roman project into the wider world of letters. The preface, as we currently understand it,

So Goldberg 2005.166–68. Many of the Ennian echoes claimed for Lucilius by Marx 1904.100, however, are probably nugatory, as Skutsch 1985.11–12 rightly observes.

42 Courtney 1993.52 is probably right to identify Hostius's *Bellum Histricum* with events of 129. Its fragments reveal an emulation (rivalry seems less likely) with Ennius that makes Casali's identification of him with the Hostus of Silius 12.403–14 attractive, if not demonstrable (see Casali pp. 591–93 in the present volume). Furius was a *familiaris* of Lutatius Catulus, cos. 102 (Cic. *Brut.* 132). For Ennian echoes in the late republic, see Goldberg 2005.28–38.

43 According to Nepos *Cato* 3.3: *Senex historias scribere instituit*. The seven books of *Origines* end with events of 149, the year of Cato's death, and are widely accepted as a product of the 150s.

44 *Orig.* frag. 2 Peter; cf. Xenoph. *Symp.* 1.1. The source, Cic. *Planc.* 66, does not distort Cato's words, sentiment, or their apparent debt: "clarorum hominum atque magnorum otii" may even replicate Xenophon's τῶν καλῶν κάγαθῶν ἀνδρῶν ἔργα (*Symp.* 1.1). See Gruen 1992.60–61 and further references there. The similarly worded references to Scipio's *otium* at *Rep.* 1.27 and *Off.* 3.1 fit this context. Albinus apologized for writing in Greek (Gellius 11.8) and was ridiculed for doing so by both Polybius (39.12) and Cato (Plut. *Cat. Ma.* 12), but Cic. *Brut.* 81 nevertheless calls him *litteratus et disertus*.

also distinguished between the *clarorum virorum laudes* that Cato associated with the activities of the city's elite and those *populi Romani gesta* he claimed as the proper subject of history.⁴⁵ Behind that distinction lay a determination to replace the casual recollections of the *carmina convivalia* with the formalities of history and the manipulations of family memory with the permanence of a written record. History, he suggests, was no longer to be the exclusive possession of the aristocrats whose *laudes* once lay at its core. It was the common legacy of all who could understand Latin.

For Cato, as for Ennius, Rome's greatness was the result of collective, not individual achievements. He was proud to point out that the Roman state, unlike leading communities of the Greek world, required no one great lawgiver but was the incremental product of community experience.⁴⁶ An emphasis on group achievements probably also lay behind Cato's notorious decision to eliminate the names of military commanders from his history, though he preserved the name of a Carthaginian elephant and lingered over the exploits of a third-century tribune.⁴⁷ This tribune, like Ennius's Caecilius, transcends the deeds of the more socially distinguished—Cato compares him favorably to the Spartan king Leonidas—precisely because his material rewards are so meager, and he easily becomes a symbol of unselfish civic devotion. Tradition claimed that Ennius came to Rome in 204 B.C.E. as Cato's protégé.⁴⁸ Half a century later, we again see Cato doing Ennius an important service, recording, if not actually creating, the kind of interest that helped secure the poet's greatest work for later generations.

What do we learn from this exercise in source criticism and motive guessing? Is it really any more helpful to speculate on the appeal of *Annales* 16 and the thought sequence of the *Origines'* preface than to resurrect the

45 Cugusi 1994 argues convincingly for this line of thought in Cato's preface. Astin 1978.221–25 represents the more traditional, minimalist view of Cato's purpose. The verbal similarities in the material numbered frag. 2 and frag. 4 in Cugusi and Sblendorio Cugusi 2001.290 (frag. 2, 118 Peter) support assignment of the *carmina convivalia* testimony to the preface; there is no direct support for its more common assignment to Book 7.

46 Cato ap. Cic. *Rep.* 2.2 (not included by Peter or Chassignet). See Cugusi 1994.

47 Pliny *Nat.* 8.11 (frag. 88 Peter): "Certe Cato, cum imperatorum nomina annalibus detraxerit, elephantum qui fortissime proeliatu esset in Punica acie Syrum tradidit . . ." Cf. Nepos *Cato* 3.4; Gellius 3.7 (frag. 83 Peter) preserves the story of the heroic tribune. Whether Cato actually named him, and whether his name was Caedicius, are matters of dispute. See most recently Gotter 2003.117–19.

48 Nepos *Cato* 1.4. Badian 1972.154–63 questions this testimony—probably unnecessarily. See Gruen 1990.107–08.

carmina convivalia and the music of Numa? If we cannot avoid speculative reconstruction of *some* kind when working from the evidence of fragments, how or why should we limit the bounds of that speculation? The problem, I believe, turns not on the place of imagination in the exercise of scholarship but on the place of evidence in the exercise of imagination.⁴⁹ A few guiding principles seem to me to be worth championing. First of these is the need to distinguish the circumstances of literature's creation from those of its reception. Though many chapters in the literary history of Rome are based on the response of Roman readers as well as the production of Roman writers, nowhere is reception's power to shape the record more apparent than in the mid-republic, whose legacy owes so much to the antiquarian researches and literary polemics of the first century. To use that testimony, it must often be pulled apart, contextualized, and weighed separately before trust can be put in its synthesis.

There is also, from the practical side, much to be said for focusing on Ennius's *Annales* as a second-century phenomenon. We know just a little about the Saturnian aesthetic that Ennius rejected and even less about what he admired, tucked away, and transferred from his predecessors' workshop to his own.⁵⁰ Yet even that is considerably more than we know about the state of things before Andronicus and Naevius rose to prominence as shapers of Latin verse. The "song culture" that may lie behind epic's early history at Rome remains a construct of interest, but it stands today largely as a fiction, and whether eventually identified as a fiction of the twentieth century C.E. or the first century B.C.E., it is unlikely to elucidate either the creation or the reception of Ennius's poem. Whatever archaic tradition preceded the *Annales* remains beyond recovery.

A final point seems quite obvious, yet is perhaps most in need of making. This is the importance of historical perspective. When cultural change is rapid, as it was in second-century Rome, the passage of time is so significant that no continuity of attitudes and knowledge and no uniformity of meaning and memory can be assumed from generation to generation, or even from decade to decade. A synchronic approach to the evidence becomes especially problematic under these conditions. In the case of Ennius, the

49 In disparaging "the hypercritical philologists," Zorzetti 1990 *passim* tilts largely at ghosts and strawmen. Contrast the much richer discussion of Hinds 1998.34–47, whose treatment of "philological fundamentalism" focuses on more substantive targets.

50 Hinds 1998.52–74 is especially good on the relation of Ennius to his predecessors. See also Goldberg 1995.58–110.

Annales meant one thing when new in the 170s, probably something a little different by the 150s, and certainly other things quite different still for the generations immediately before Virgil. And what Ennius would come to mean as a literary figure and his *Annales* as a poem for those later Romans whose own literary sensibilities were to be honed on the study of Virgil's achievement would require still another kind of analysis. The *Annales* was and long continued to be a work of importance, but not necessarily of the *same* importance, which is itself one reason why it remains, even in its now frustratingly fragmentary state, so worthy of our continued attention.

University of California, Los Angeles