Introduction

In this book, I examine how our modern accounts of Ennius' *Annales* have originated. I have sought to analyse, first, the consequences of how ancient sources transmit the fragments to us; and, second, the causes (where I thought I could discern them) and the consequences of editors' decisions, especially those of Otto Skutsch, whose work represents perhaps the principal point of access to the *Annales* today, at any rate for the world of Anglophone scholarship. I have not sought to carry out editorial work myself, and this study has nothing at all to add in terms of textual criticism: for the fragments and their immediate contexts, I rely fully on the text as Skutsch established it,[1] with occasional glances across to the more recent Italian edition of Enrico Flores and his co-editors.[2] Likewise, for the quotation-contexts of the fragments, I rely on the standard editions of the quoting authors. While thus relying on their work, I have availed myself of freedoms that editors themselves have not always chosen to exercise: in particular, the freedom to consider at leisure and to articulate the nature of editorial choices; and the freedom to entertain competing constructions of the evidence, where – whatever doubts and limiting considerations they may entertain along the way – editors of fragments are eventually constrained by the nature of their task to privilege a single coherent account.[3]

[1] Unless otherwise specified, it is to Skutsch's 1985 Oxford edition of the *Annales* that all line-numbers refer.

[2] Flores *et al.*, Vols. 1–5 (2000–8) represent the most recent editorial work on the *Annales*. The editors present their work as a revision of Skutsch, in which they correct philological errors, flaws of textual criticism and inaccurately cited sources and scholarly attributions. They describe themselves as in the main relying on Skutsch and on other earlier editors for the basic evidence but as re-thinking both readings and the ordering of fragments. See pp. 1–2 of their introduction (Vol. 1). Rev. Goldberg 2009: 637–55.

[3] Stephens 2002: 67–88 well describes how editors of fragments in particular have traditionally used a laconic style and professional terminology that tends to represent their carefully measured conclusions

Many of the observations and hypotheses of this study have their basis in a catalogue I made of the fragments of the *Annales*, re-organised according to their sources, in chronological order according to the date of the source (or as near to it as our imperfect knowledge allows). These sources, which today constitute our sole means of access to the poem, number 46 and range in date from the first century BCE (with, among others, Varro and Cicero) to the eighth century CE (with, for example, Paulus) and very occasionally beyond.[4] The catalogue frees the fragments from the organisational principles of modern editors – principles which represent an already mapped trajectory through the poem's scattered remains, conveying the editor's insight and erudition but, by the same token, and necessarily, representing a set of preconceptions about what the text might have looked like, that I found it helpful to work without. The catalogue, by contrast, makes the ancient evidence available in a form that offers no direction as to where the lines belong in the text, beyond what the sources themselves offer in terms of book-numbers. This leaves readers free to come to their own conclusions about the fragments' interrelationship and to observe the forces promoting their survival. The format makes the influence of individual sources on our record more visible than they usually are, by revealing to the simple glance which sources are responsible for the survival of the greatest numbers of fragments and by making everything that a given source has to say in quoting the *Annales* available in one location. The catalogue is available in the form of Appendix 5 at the end of the present volume pp. 348–558), and I hope that it will serve as a resource for those wishing to engage with the fragments of the *Annales* via a medium more neutral than a fully-fledged edition, regardless of how they view the arguments between these covers.

Readers of this study will notice that my approach to the *Annales* differs substantially from that of Skutsch in terms of interests pursued,

as final (especially to a readership that does not fully share the editor's own technical skills) and to render increasingly obscure the provisional nature of even those decisions an editor ultimately chooses to take. Recent editors, however, in a modern and more elastic coda to the venerable tradition of *prolegomena*, are in increasing numbers publishing monograph-length explanations of their editorial choices; e.g. Zetzel 2005; Heyworth 2007; and Kaster 2010.

[4] The tally of 46 separates Augustine from Cicero, even though it is clear that Augustine's quotations derive directly from texts of Cicero. Likewise, it separates Paulus from Festus (not to mention various ps.-Proban authors from each other). It includes all sources that provide material attributed to the *Annales* in Skutsch's edition, however little (the *Glossarium Philoxenum*, the *Commenta Bernensia in Lucanum* and the Renaissance scholars G. Valla and H. Columna, who provide at best a single line of obscure origin, stand at the low ebb); and excludes sources that provide us exclusively with lines that Skutsch has included in his edition but placed among the *operis incerti fragmenta* or the *dubia*. It also includes Persius and his scholiast (counted together as a single source) – even though it cannot be ascertained that the one line of direct quotation they appear to transmit (*Op. inc.* ii) belongs to the *Annales*; for, besides this line, they provide precious, if still difficult, evidence about the proem to the *Annales*.

methodology and conclusions about the text. In fact, some of the preoccupations of this study were generated by my response to his articulation of the poem and the questions with which it left me. It therefore seems to me useful in the course of this Introduction to define my approach to the text in contradistinction to his. Indeed, throughout the study, where it is clear to me that my views are conceived in response to his, I have thought it best to note this. The risk of doing so is that my work may sometimes appear polemical; the risk of not doing so is that I obscure a significant dynamic of this study and leave it to my readers themselves to figure out the details of my position *vis-à-vis* Skutsch. Skutsch himself often preferred to avoid mentioning the work of other scholars where he disagreed with them.[5] There is gentility in this approach,[6] and it yields a kind of shorthand that some readers may appreciate, but the result is also cryptic, the more so as time passes, and in my search to understand the genesis of his views on the poem I found it frustrating to have to trace by effort, or be left to come across by chance, the intersection of his thoughts with those of others. It is not least this that motivated me to adopt a different course. I hope that the disagreements that inevitably result from differences in approach and in scholarly history and context will not be construed as disrespect or ingratitude, even where I have been direct in stating them. Those differences, as I understand them, lie chiefly in that I have tried to apply to the interpretation of the *Annales* as a whole some of the advances the twentieth century saw both in the understanding of ancient historiography and in the development of reception theory and the study of fragments. For the rest, I am keenly aware that I am dependent on Skutsch not only in the normal sense, for access to the text of the *Annales*, but also because his work was a stimulus to mine in a way that no other edition could have been. I have read his edition far more often and more thoroughly than I have read any other.

Skutsch was, to begin with, a textual critic of distinction, and he usefully extended his work on the text of the fragments of the *Annales* to the contexts in which they are found. This work was abetted by his interest in questions of prosody, and here both the strength and the weakness of the thorough

[5] Examples of this are his insistence on the structural articulation of the books of the *Annales* in triads (Skutsch 1985: 5–6), in clear but unstated opposition to the view of his father, Franz Skutch (F. Skutsch 1905: 2610); and the omission of H. Fuchs' name from Skutsch's discussion of the history of the Pythagoreanism of the proem (Skutsch 1959: 114–16), noticed by Suerbaum 1968: 88, n. 273: 'Die These [von H. Fuchs, dessen Name aber absichtlich von O. Skutsch nicht genannt wird] . . .' Even as Skutsch refers back to Suerbaum's 1968 discussion in his 1985 edition (p. 149), he continues to omit Fuchs' name. For notice of this practice of Skutsch's, see also Goldberg 2009: 637.

[6] For full and sympathetic description of Skutsch's character, see Goold 1994: 473–89. Horsfall 1988 (unpaginated) gives a bibliography of Skutsch, supplemented at Horsfall 1988: ix.

systematisation that characterises Skutsch's work become evident: for he formulated a system of metrical rules specific to the *Annales* and subsequently used these rules to support his textual conjectures, postulating that Ennius adhered strictly to the norms as he, Skutsch, elaborated them.[7] Sebastiano Timpanaro, one of the few scholars who dedicated a similar amount of attention to the text as did Skutsch and was capable of judging and countering his prescriptions, warned early on that Ennius' practice was likely to have involved more variation than Skutsch allowed for.[8] Comparative philology and etymology were major preoccupations, and Skutsch does a great deal to illuminate the linguistic forms that surface in the fragments. Finally, Skutsch was interested in Ennius as a source for Roman history. His edition is notable for what Flores *et al.* term its *spessore storico*[9]: he is more committed than any other editor has been to finding historical referents for the fragments, which he does by postulating parallels between extant fragments of the *Annales* and the works of those historians who cover comparable periods of Roman history, principally Polybius and Livy. On all this territory his work is unrivalled, and those seeking guidance in these terms would be hard pressed to find a more careful and learned guide.

Skutsch's work shaped my inquiry principally by making me aware of questions about the text that he did not tackle. First is the question to which I have already drawn attention, namely, of how the sources for the fragments direct our readings of the text through the principles of selection that they employ and through their particular biases and interests. In accordance with the principles of the scholarly tradition in which he worked,[10] Skutsch treats the sources as essentially transparent and equivalent to one another in value, and his task as the methodologically uncomplicated one of compilation and historical investigation. Indentation and italicisation alone formally distinguish material offered by sources not purporting to quote the *Annales* directly, such as Lucretius, *DRN* 1.120–27 (Skutsch's frg. 1.iv),

[7] Cf. Jocelyn 1991: 748.
[8] Timpanaro 1988: 5. For further summary assessment of Skutsch's editorial activity, see Flores 2000: 7–9; also Goldberg 2009: 637–8.
[9] Flores *et al.* 2006: 415.
[10] Cf. Breed and Rossi 2006: 398, n. 2: 'The famous dedication to the shades of Franz Skutsch, Fraenkel, Lindsay, and Housman speaks eloquently of how Otto Skutsch wished *The* Annals *of Q. Ennius* to be seen in the light of the history of classical scholarship.' For an illuminating description of Skutsch's scholarly trajectory, his character and his working methods, see Horsfall 1991: 103–7. Horsfall suggests that Skutsch does not properly belong to the tradition of Bentley and Housman but rather, despite his training, to the Italian tradition represented by Timpanaro, Mariotti, Traina and Tandoi, because his interests lie principally in linguistics, prosody and metrics.

Propertius 3.3.8 (his frg. XIV.x) and Cicero, *Prov. Cons.* 20 (his frg. XVI.viii) from lines expressly quoted under Ennius' name or judged by the editor to belong to the *Annales*.[11] Identical formal markers are used to set off the evidence of Servius ad *Aen.* 1.20 and *Aen.* 1.281 or of Macrobius at *Sat.* 6.2.32 (= frgs. VIII.xv, VIII.xvi and XV.iv), yet their evidence is arguably of a very different status from that of Lucretius, Propertius and Cicero. It is in general clear that Skutsch did not consider it part of his editorial brief to provide guidance as to how one might differentiate among sources or evaluate the evidence on offer. Skutsch's edition was published late enough, in 1985, to have taken on board at least some modern work on the methodological complications of dealing with fragments;[12] but Skutsch worked on his edition for almost fifty years before he saw its publication,[13] and throughout he remained committed to the working practices of his youth. As a result, his edition was, so to speak, born old.[14] This is true both in respect of its approach to the relationship between the fragments and their sources and with regard to the understanding of ancient historiography, in which the twentieth century saw highly relevant advances.

Many of the pages that follow are concerned with how the nature of our evidence affects our interpretation of the text: Chapter 1 introduces in a general way the question of the evidence and of what, on the basis of the ancient evidence, we can say we reliably know about different aspects of the text (such as the implications of its title, the use of time in the poem and the distribution of divine intervention in the narrative); Chapters 2 and 3 are

[11] On the tendentiousness of the first of these re-writings, see Volk 2002: 105–7; on the tendentiousness of the last, see Zetzel 2007: 1–16.

[12] E.g. Brunt's important article, 'On historical fragments and epitomes' (Brunt 1980a). Since that time, awareness of the study of fragments as an exercise in indirect observation has flourished, and I have benefited a great deal from explorations of the hazards of working with fragments, particularly of the historiographical tradition. I have especially profited from the many valuable contributions in Most 1997; Toher 1989: 159–72; Lenfant 1999: 103–21, on what our impressions of Herodotus would be if he had survived only in the quotations of later authors (cf. Kannicht in Most 1997: 67–77, Dover 2000: xvii–xix and Mastronarde 2009: 63–76, with his Appendix at *ibid.* 461–96, for experiments in the reconstruction of extant Greek dramatic works from their indirect traditions); also Pelling 2000: 171–90; and Dover, Arnott, Henderson and Storey in Harvey and Wilkins 2000. I have found Katherine Clarke's work on Posidonius and Strabo and Liv Yarrow's 2006 study, which deals with a range of fragmentary authors dating to the end of the Republic, particularly stimulating, not least because of the overlap in their work between concerns about dealing with fragmentary authors and concerns about the interpretation of works that are in one sense or another universalising.

[13] Skutsch's edition (originally to be a complete edition of the fragments of Ennius) was commissioned by Oxford University Press in 1939, at Eduard Fraenkel's suggestion (Jocelyn 1991: 748). The work seems to have been essentially complete by 1971 (*ibid.*: 749).

[14] The phrase (quoted by Flores 2000: 7) 'nata già vecchia' was used by Timpanaro of Vahlen's second (1903) edition. The description applies equally well to Skutsch's edition, likewise published at the close of a scholarly career.

wholly dedicated to analysing those sources that account for the greatest number of surviving lines and that have had the most profound impact on modern interpretations of the poem and the modern understanding of its place in literary history.

It should be said at the outset that, where Skutsch for his part aims to be encyclopaedic, even taking into account authors such as Lucretius and Propertius who (as noted above) make no claim to cite Ennius directly, this study is consciously far from comprehensive in its coverage of the ancient evidence for the text. Among those authors who quote the fragments of the *Annales* directly and who are my primary focus, I have in the body of this study concentrated on those who seem to me the most complex and influential, while neglecting others – although in Appendix 5 I summarise each of them and occasionally have something further to say. I have, however, on the whole excluded from discussion the reception of Ennius in authors who had full access to his work and who developed articulated conceptions of him but who generate no fragments as such. This set of authors is legion: it includes Lucretius, Propertius, Livy, Vergil, Ovid, Lucan, Silius and the post-Vergilian tradition generally; and each of these has something different to tell us about what the *Annales* meant from a different perspective and to a different generation of readers. All these authors have indeed had a hand in determining how the fragments of the *Annales* are edited and read, and study of them in these terms is indeed highly germane to the project I have undertaken here, which views all our access to the *Annales* essentially as reception and is concerned to describe the terms in which that reception operates.[15] Some readers will therefore feel their marginalisation as a serious limitation. Yet the coherence of the present study rests in part on the distinction between those authors who provide direct access to the text today by openly quoting the *Annales* and those who engage with the work more indirectly. Cicero belongs to both categories, but I have included him here by virtue of his participation in the first. If I were to include any one author who belonged to the second category alone, there would be no rationale for excluding any other author of that group. This is not to say that more general points about the reception of the *Annales* will not occasionally serve as a complement to the more particular focus I employ, and in the argument of Chapter 5 in particular the reception

[15] The ancient reception of the *Annales* in particular has attracted increasing attention in recent years, and Prinzen 1998, Fantham 2006: 549–68; Goldberg 2006: 427–47; Zetzel 2007: 1–16 all precede me in articulating and exploring this interest. See further the material listed in n. 16 (p. 7). Prinzen is synthetic, but his interest is in explicit ancient verdicts on Ennius rather than in the interpretative consequences of how the fragments reach us (my main thrust).

of the *Annales* in epic and historiography will have a significant if general presence; but it is not my purpose at any point in this study to deal with the complex literary agendas of authors alluding to the *Annales*.[16] Instead, I aim to come to grips with our most direct evidence for the text: to understand how it frames our view of the poem, where its limitations lie and to consider whether that evidence admits of viable and attractive possibilities of reconstruction and interpretation, beyond those promoted in editions and interpretative work to date.

After the ancient evidence, the second area in which my approach and assumptions, and consequently my findings, are different from Skutsch's is the understanding of the poem's historiographical aspect. Skutsch takes a strongly positivist approach. In the effort to arrive at a definitive picture, he matches fragments with events known from the pages of the prose historians on the basis of what are often very slight hints or similarities in wording (see his commentary, *passim*). To him, the loss of Ennius represents above all a loss of a source for the facts of the Roman past.[17] Where the order of his presentation of the fragments differs from that of J. Vahlen's edition (Leipzig 1903), it is often where he has newly identified a historical referent and consequently relocates the fragment at that point in the narrative where he judges its chronological place to have been; for among the convictions that govern his view of the poem is the idea that events are narrated quite strictly in chronological order (an assumption generated in part by the poem's title and by assumptions of its primitive nature, the latter born not least from vested first-century assessments of the poem;[18] but one also generally typical of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century editors, regardless of which work they were reconstructing).[19] Skutsch's approach is thus to stretch any shred of positive evidence to the limits of its capacity in the effort

[16] Among the interest today in the partial and refracted images that survive in later authors invested in re-working their predecessors for their own immediate purposes (in the wake of Hinds 1998 and Kerkhecker and Schwindt 2001), there has been a considerable amount of attention to Ennius in particular: see e.g Hinds 1998: 52–74; Kerkhecker 2001: 39–95; Casali 2006: 569–93; Cole 2006: 531–48; Fantham 2006: 549–68; Goldberg 2006: 427–47; Casali 2007: 103–28; Gildenhard 2007: 73–102; Zetzel 2007: 1–16; Hardie 2007: 129–44; Houghton 2007: 145–58; Elliott 2008: 241–72; Elliott 2009a: 531–41; Elliott 2009b: 650–3.

[17] See, again, the commentary *passim*, with particular instances at p. 348 (the sequence of negotiations between Heraclea and Ausculum) and p. 444 (the disposition of the Roman army at Cannae) of Skutsch's Ennius as a 'witness' (p. 348) to history, a reliable retailer of historical detail. For the most general statement of Skutsch's view of Ennius as an historian of quasi-pragmatic stamp, see the introduction to his inaugural lecture at University College, London, delivered in 1951 (Skutsch 1968: 1–2) partially quoted in Ch. 1, n. 82, p. 43.

[18] Cf. Hinds 1998: 52–74.

[19] See W. Strzelecki's and H. T. Rowell's re-organisation of the fragments of Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, which had formerly been subjected to strict chronological assumptions (Strzelecki 1935; Rowell 1947:

to locate as many of the fragments as possible within the matrix of our existing historical knowledge, and his methodical working practices and erudition mean that he made considerable advances in these terms. His work is appreciated not least for the guidance he thus provides in suggesting what our decontextualised and often incoherent fragments describe.

In assessing what we can say we reliably know about the reference of the fragments and their organisation, I have adopted almost the opposite brief from Skutsch: that is, to err on the side of scepticism. The motivation for this lies not least in observing the generic conventions highlighted (as I see it) by our sources, together with the role these conventions play in determining the terms in which Ennius describes historical persons and events. These conventions defy our ability to distinguish the description of one battle from the description of another and make problematic the assumption that any given descriptive detail is a unique identifier or relates to any given historical particularity.

The aim of my study of the sources is in part to trace the contours of our ignorance by highlighting the isolation of the historical moments and the partiality of the sources from which our knowledge of the text emerges. Hand in hand with this goes the task of considering which principles have guided reconstructions to date and the question of what makes a given principle a good guide. I have mentioned above some of the larger claims I make, regarding the use of time in the epic (complex, within a generally chronological framework) and the role of the gods (significant actors throughout). The real motivation for such claims lies not exclusively in the evidence of the fragments; for, broken as it is, that evidence is equally capable of supporting radically different accounts of the narrative. The motivation lies instead in the conceptual framework the reader adopts for his or her vision of the work. I have tried in particular to think about how the poem positioned itself in respect of the various genres with which it engaged and to read the fragments in the light of their literary historical situation, as best we can appreciate it. The question of the poem's relationship to literary, and in particular historiographical, tradition is thus a central preoccupation of this study.

The question of genre turns out to overlap with the question of sources in multiple ways, because our sense of the poem's relationship to the various genres we understand as relevant is in significant part the product of how our evidence about the text reaches us. This is most strikingly true of our

21–46). Their work is based on nothing more radical than recourse to the ancient evidence. More recently, Katherine Clarke has shown a similar set of assumptions to have been at work in Kidd's reconstruction of Posidonius' *Histories* (Clarke 1999a: 154–92, with her Appendixes A and B).

perspective on the poem's position in the epic tradition. The detailed information on Ennius' relationship to Vergil and Homer that reaches us via Macrobius – who alone is responsible for the survival of more than 10 per cent of our extant lines – has largely determined our sense of the place of the *Annales* in the epic tradition. Had Book 6 of the *Saturnalia* not survived, Ennius' use of the Greek hexameter would still define him as a point of transition between the epic traditions of Greece and Rome. Far more obscure to us, however, would be the mechanics of Ennius' relationship to Homer and Vergil, the detail and consistency with which he replicated Homer on both small and large scale and was in turn replicated by Vergil; and it is our knowledge of this aspect of his text that does most today to substantiate and explain the literary historical rank that antiquity attributed to Ennius. I have used the collective term 'Vergiliocentric' to refer to that set of sources that quotes the *Annales* in explanation of Vergil's language and motifs, of which Macrobius is the principal representative. The Vergiliocentrics represent by far the most impressive coherent body of sources for the text. As a body, they are articulate (they quote in sense-units) and persuasive, and this means that their influence on our sense of the *Annales* is perhaps even more powerful than is implied by the already hefty 20 per cent of our record they statistically represent. Chapter 2 is dedicated to exploring the weight within the overall record and the anatomy of these sources and to detailing the interpretative consequences of their intervention.

The snapshot offered by the Vergiliocentric sources is the broadest and most detailed view of the poem we have, and the result is that it holds a quasi-monopoly on posterity's sense of how the *Annales* mattered in literary history. To suggest that this effect is disproportionate would be to have in view an aim that is both practically and theoretically impossible: it would be to imagine possible an unbiased form of access to a pristine text, untouched by readers, and in particular by Vergil and by the ancient scholarly tradition on his works. The publication of the *Aeneid* wrought a colossal change in the fortunes of the *Annales*, to the extent that, from our vantage-point in history, it constitutes the crucial point of interference both in the transmission and the reception of the *Annales*. By dwelling on that moment of intervention, I have sought, among other things, to privilege an awareness that the reading of the *Annales* yielded by the Vergiliocentrics, however valuable, is, like any other, both limited and contingent. For all its impact today, the Vergiliocentric sources' tacit explanation for Ennius' ancient literary rank necessarily represents a distortion of the *Annales* from the viewpoint of its original audience, because it is clearly a view from a post-Vergilian retrospect.

There are only four pre-Vergilian sources for the *Annales*, but these four include by far the richest of all, Cicero, who is single-handedly responsible for the survival of 15 per cent of today's fragments of the *Annales*. None of Cicero's quotations give us any sense at all of the macroscopic engagement with Homer that the Vergiliocentrics consistently reveal; instead, this reader's interest in the text is time and again an interest in its value as a document of Rome's past and as a testament to her core identity. This if anything is what unifies Cicero's quite various and at times even contradictory articulations of what the *Annales* amounted to, which shift dramatically among Cicero's various texts and speakers. To the extent that Cicero is a representative reader, it was for their description of Rome's past and present, and their revelation thereby of Rome's enduring character, that the *Annales* mattered to its ancient audience, until it was subsumed by the *Aeneid*; for after the publication of the *Aeneid* there is scarcely any sign at all of interest in the *Annales* as a work of history.[20] Chapter 3 examines the full spectrum of Cicero's approaches to the *Annales*, in order to arrive at as complete an account as possible of how the *Annales* functioned as historiography at essentially the earliest moment at which we can access the ancient reading of the text. Overall, the intricacy and variety of views on offer in this single, complex reader highlight the hazards of operating with too monolithic a concept of what it meant for the *Annales* to have represented 'history'. Chapter 3 also explores our other three opportunities for a pre-Vergilian glimpse of the *Annales*: those offered by Varro, the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* – if that is in fact a source – and the author of the *Bellum Hispaniense*.

Chapters 2 and 3 thus focus primarily on our most substantial and coherent sources and on the generic traits enmeshed in the type of evidence they provide. These chapters are framed by two that aim first to contextualise and then to extrapolate from the argument they (Chapters 2 and 3) make. Chapter 1 introduces the issues of genre and of historiography by looking at the poem's relationship to the annalistic tradition, which the work's title and the use of consular dating, just occasionally evident in the fragments, invites us to read as relevant. I argue first in Chapter 1 that the chronological progression routinely inferred from the title is, in any strict sense, *a priori* unlikely in a poem written in macroscopic as well as microscopic imitation of Homer. That imitation implies episodic construction and the use of flashback, whether through ecphrasis or through the use of multiple

[20] Gellius can read for content or at least sense; and a reader of Orosius of the fifth or sixth century CE added in supralinear form Ennian descriptions of or comments on the events Orosius narrates. See Appendix Tables A5.10 and A5.42, respectively, pp. 413–27 and pp. 553–4, for further details.