## BOOK REVIEW

*Shaggy Crowns: Ennius'* Annales *and Virgil's* Aeneid. By NORA GOLDSCHMIDT. Oxford Classical Monographs. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. x + 258. Hardcover, $125.00. ISBN 978-0-19-968129-7.

In this study of the terms in which the *Aeneid* outdid and replaced the *Annales*, Nora Goldschmidt foregrounds two principal and related ideas. First is the idea that the primary area of competition between the two epics lay in control over Roman cultural memory, as situated in the mention of Rome's monuments and localities, of the Sicilian sites of the Punic Wars, and in historical *exempla*. Second is the idea that, much as the *Aeneid* innovated in terms of technique and style, it was deeply engaged in competition with the *Annales* over a claim to antiquity, to be the 'Ur-epos' of Rome—a claim that, Goldschmidt argues, Ennius had himself worked at and that underwrote the works' rivalry for authority over the past. It is thus that Goldschmidt explains, for example, the *Aeneid*'s adoption of a largely pre-Ennian narrative landscape and time and Virgil's use of obtrusive archaism. Such moves are all designed, in Goldschmidt's view, to suggest the *Aeneid*'s poetic priority and thus to appropriate the authority that Roman culture had previously invested in the *Annales*.

The idea of the function of the *Annales* as, for the earliest generations of its readers to whom we have access, primarily a form of memory of the past is one that Goldschmidt shares with two other recent studies of the *Annales*: Fabrizi 2012 and Elliott 2013.[1] What distinguishes Goldschmidt's work, and where she is at her best, is in her proposals about how to read the *Aeneid* in light of specific moments of interaction she discerns between the texts, sometimes with observation of later epic permutations of those moments. One of the book's highlights is Goldschmidt's reading (144–148) of the *Aeneid*'s final battle as an Ennian one, in which Aeneas, who had left Carthage "in lines evoking Ennian elephants, [and] has landed in Italy with a 'stranger army' (*advena . . . exercitus* (*Aen.* 7.38–9))" is ulti-

---

[1] Fabrizi, F. *Mores veteresque novosque: rappresentazioni del passato e del presente di Roma negli Annales di Ennio* (Pisa 2012); Elliott, J. *Ennius and the Architecture of the* Annales (Cambridge 2013).

mately replaced by Turnus, famously figured as a Punic lion at *Aen.* 12.4–9 (in contrast to the Italian imagery associated with Aeneas in Book 12), as the "Hannibal 'before Hannibal'" in this Ur-encounter between heroes *genitos diversis partibus orbis* (*Aen.* 12.708). She goes on to show how Silius' account of Zama echoes that final battle of the *Aeneid*, suggesting that Silius too reads the latter as a proto-Zama.

Goldschmidt's ambition of interpreting the relationship between the two poems requires her to posit that we have reliable access to a stable text, of whose possible, even probable, interpretations we are masters. Thus, despite appropriate expressions of caution in dealing with the hazards of fragmentary material, her use of the evidence for the *Annales* is in practice rather bolder than those expressions would imply, and this in turn has the potential to de-stabilize some of her readings in the eyes of at least some readers. Again, despite her primary interest in collective memory, she engages little with the prose historiographical texts (or any other media) we routinely associate with such memory and with which the epics were also in competition: the handful of cursory references to Livy generally represent comparanda on the level of narrative, with brief gestures towards the possibility of interaction among epic and historiographical texts only on pages 75 and 148, note 146, to the present reader's notice.

A brief overview of contents: the first chapter, "Reading Ennius in the First Century BC", offers a well-presented and enlightening review of the surviving reception of the *Annales* during the Republic and Julio-Claudian principate. Chapters 2–5 each examine the *Annales* (briefly) and then (at greater length) the *Aeneid* for either work's deployment of similar strategies. Chapter 2, '"Archaic" Poets', sets in motion the study's central question of how both poems implicitly stake a claim to antiquity, masked by technical innovation, and thus to authority over the past. Chapter 3, "Sites of Rome", discusses the recurrence in either text of Roman topography, especially as associated with Rome's foundation myths, as a means of exercising that claim. Chapter 4, "*Punica*", turns on either epic's engagement with the Punic Wars—either directly, in Ennius' case, or via the Sicilian sites associated with them, in Vergil's—with the idea that Virgil covertly invited recollection of earlier epic narratives (Naevius as well as Ennius) of these wars. Chapter 5, 'Epic examples', argues that Virgil evokes Ennian *exempla* in "deliberate perversion of . . . traditional exemplary presentation[s] canonized in the *Annales*" (176), in order to "clear[] space for [the *Aeneid*] as the new repository of *exempla imitanda posteris*" (191)—both as a vehicle for political criticism of the Republican past and tacitly to undermine the *Annales*' authority, so as better to establish its successor's pre-eminence.

The final appendix charts verbal recall between the *Aeneid* and the *Annales*. In line with the fact that the book's focus is Vergilian and not Ennian epic, the appendix is not reversible: it is keyed to lines of the *Aeneid* alone. No cross-referencing exists to indicate where a line of the *Annales* is relevant to more than one line of the *Aeneid*. The book concludes with a useful bibliography, a serviceable general index and index *locorum*. It is cleanly produced, and misprints are few and far between.[2]

JACKIE ELLIOTT

*University of Colorado Boulder,* jackie.elliott@colorado.edu

---

[2] I noted only *habilies* for *habiles* (109, n. 24); *occulis* for *oculis* (121, *Aen.* 5.438); "a specific and unequivocal points" (152); "specficially" for "specifically" (155, n. 27); "audience" for "audiences" (p. 174); *pectora* for *pectore* (191, n. 146); and in the appendix: *Hetor* for *Hector* (200, under *Aen.* 2.268-97); "compariosn" for "comparison" (203, under *Ann.* 319-20); *animia* for *anima* and *spiritu* for *spiritus* (216, under *Ann.* 535-9); *stat* for *stant* (218, under *Ann.* 612); "contetst" for "contest" (218, under *Ann.* 78–83).