

FORM, INTENT, AND THE FRAGMENTARY ROMAN HISTORIANS  
240 to 63 B.C.E.

By

GERTRUDE HARRINGTON BECKER

A DISSERTATION PRESENTED TO THE GRADUATE SCHOOL  
OF THE UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT  
OF THE REQUIREMENTS OF THE DEGREE OF  
DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

UNIVERSITY OF FLORIDA

2008

©2008 Gertrude Harrington Becker

To Andy

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Many have helped me on my journey through the long Ph.D. process. Writing is often a lonely and isolating task but I was lucky never to feel alone. For that I owe thanks to a multitude of friends who cheered me, colleagues who read my work, my department (and Dean) at Virginia Tech which allowed me time off to write, and parents who supported my every step. I also thank the many women who showed me it was possible to complete schooling and a Ph.D. later in life, in particular my mother, Trudy Harrington, and my mother-in-law, Judith Becker. Above all, I thank my family: my children, Matt, Tim, and Trudy for their regular brilliance; and my husband, Andy, who is my center, cornerstone, and rock, this year, the past 21 years, and more to come.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>page</u>
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS .....	4
ABSTRACT.....	7
1 EARLY ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY: PAST AND PRESENT .....	9
2 FOUNDERS AND FOLLOWERS: EARLY ROMAN ANNALISTS IN GREEK .....	37
<i>Annales</i> and Annalists.....	37
Fabius Pictor .....	48
Lucius Cincius Alimentus.....	54
Aulus Postumius Albinus .....	57
Gaius Acilius .....	62
3 ADAPTERS: THE LATIN ANNALISTS OF THE SECOND CENTURY .....	66
Lucius Cassius Hemina.....	67
Lucius Calpurnius Piso .....	75
Sempronius Tuditanus .....	84
Cnaeus Gellius.....	87
4 REVIVALISTS: ANNALISTS OF THE FIRST CENTURY.....	92
Quintus Claudius Quadrigarius.....	93
Valerius Antias .....	101
Licinius Macer .....	110
5 INNOVATORS IN ALTERNATIVE FORMS: CONTEMPORARY HISTORY, <i>RES</i> <i>GESTAE</i> , MONOGRAPHS, <i>COMMENTARII</i> .....	118
Caius Fannius.....	119
Sempronius Asellio.....	124
Porcius Cato Censorius.....	127
Lucius Coelius Antipater .....	133
Marcus Aemilius Scaurus .....	141
Publius Rutilius Rufus .....	143
Quintus Lutatius Catulus .....	146
Lucius Cornelius Sulla.....	149
Lucius Cornelius Sisenna .....	153
6 CONCLUSION.....	160
APPENDIX: CATALOGUE OF FRAGMENTARY ROMAN HISTORIANS .....	173

Fabius Pictor .....	173
Lucius Cincius Alimentus.....	173
Marcus Porcius Cato Censorius.....	174
Aulus Postumius Albinus .....	174
Gaius Acilius .....	174
Lucius Cassius Hemina.....	174
Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi .....	175
Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus.....	175
Sempronius Asellio.....	175
Sempronius Tuditanus .....	175
Vennonius .....	176
Caius Fannius.....	176
Lucius Coelius Antipater .....	176
Cnaeus Gellius .....	177
Marcus Aemilius Scaurus .....	177
Publius Rutilius Rufus .....	177
Quintus Lutatius Catulus .....	177
Lucius Cornelius Sulla.....	178
Quintus Claudius Quadrigarius.....	178
Valerius Antias .....	178
Lucius Cornelius Sisenna .....	179
Licinius Macer .....	179
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	180
BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH .....	199

Abstract of Dissertation Presented to the Graduate School  
of the University of Florida in Partial Fulfillment of the  
Requirements for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy

FORM, INTENT, AND THE FRAGMENTARY ROMAN HISTORIANS  
240 to 63 B.C.E.

By

Gertrude Harrington Becker

August 2008

Chair: Victoria Pagán  
Major: Classical Studies

In *de Oratore* (2.51-52), Antonius described the origins of Roman history—the earliest histories were compilations of *annales* recorded by the chief priest, and the historians were annalists. Despite Antonius' comments, however, not all historians in the Roman Republic were annalists. On the contrary, from the end of the First Punic War (240 B.C.E.) to the time of Cicero's consulship (63 B.C.E.), Roman historians used a variety of forms to write their history. This study undertakes an examination of those forms and their authors, both to assess intent and motivations, and to consider cultural and political contexts. Unfortunately, none of these histories has survived *in toto*, and for most only a handful of fragments remains.

Nonetheless, these fragments preserve intentional statements regarding form and demonstrate a wide range of forms such as *annales*, *res gestae*, contemporary history, monographs, and *commentarii*. Cato, for example, spoke dismissively of *annales*, with their inclusion of quotidian events from the *tabula apud pontificem maximum*, such as corn prices or eclipses. Asellio rejected the annalistic form; his history, *res gestae*, would more properly demonstrate how and why events happened. Sisenna, who wrote contemporary history, defended his methodology of choosing to relate in continuous narrative events outside the city of Rome. Though few other programmatic statements survive, implicit estimations of forms are

apparent in the choices historians made. Pictor and Calpurnius Piso, for example, found the *annales* form appropriate for their histories; in that form they could attribute Rome's success to yearly progress overseen by annual magistrates. Antipater chose instead to focus on one particular period, the Second Punic War, in a monograph form. Later historians, such as Scaurus and Sulla, wrote *commentarii*, histories which justified and legitimized their public action.

The words of Cato, Asellio, and Sisenna as well as the implicit evidence from others reveal thoughtful reflection about suitable historiographical forms for the functions they assigned to their history. The multitude of historiographical forms counterbalances the impression that historiography was uniform and poorly conceived. In the years 240-63, Roman historiography—form, at least—was carefully chosen, rhetorically charged, and engaged in with purpose.



CHAPTER 1  
EARLY ROMAN HISTORIOGRAPHY: PAST AND PRESENT

Fabius Pictor's history of Rome, written late in the third century B.C.E., probably late during the Second Punic War, marks a beginning point in the traditional outline of Roman historiography.<sup>1</sup> His generation found it suitable to write the first histories of Rome not in their own language but in the language of the culturally prominent Greeks. And yet while Fabius and his contemporaries wrote in Greek, the form they choose for Rome's history was familiar to the Romans; focusing on the annual recording of magistrates and *res internae* and *res externae*, these first Roman historians are called annalists for the form they chose.

In *de Oratore* (2.51-52), Cicero's interlocutor Antonius described the origins of Roman history—the earliest histories were compilations of *annales* recorded by the chief priest, and the early historians were annalists. Despite Antonius' comments, not all those writing history in the Republic, however, were annalists. On the contrary, during the years from the end of the First Punic War (240) to the time of Cicero's consulship (63), the Romans used a multiplicity of forms in both prose and poetry to write their history.

These forms were not solely restricted to Latin annals, but included annals in Greek as well as poetic forms such as epics (both the grand nation-shaping epics of Naevius and Ennius, and lesser epics on specific campaigns such as the *Bellum Histricum* by Hostius), Roman tragedies called *fabulae praetextae*, *commentarii*, monographs, *annales* in verse, and short historical poems. Even the so-called annalists were not all alike; some chose to begin their histories from starting points other than *ab urbe condita*. Moreover, Romans used the term *annales* itself in

---

<sup>1</sup> All dates in this dissertation are B.C.E., unless otherwise designated.

different ways, signifying both annual lists as well as histories, and even poetry.<sup>2</sup> Indeed the first Roman historical writing can be claimed by Naevius, who wrote a history of Rome in epic form, the *Bellum Punicum*, and a historical tragedy, *Clastidium*. Though the Romans in theory often viewed history as a well-defined genre, in practice they found and employed a variety of literary means for preserving their history.

The purpose of this study is to undertake a comprehensive examination of the fragmentary historians in the years 240 to 63 and their varied literary prose forms, to assess their intent and motivations for the forms used, and to consider their relationship to Roman cultural and political contexts. Unfortunately, none of these texts has survived *in toto*, and for most of the authors of this period, only a handful of fragments remains. A study of the development of Roman historiography, however, cannot rest wholly on complete texts. An examination of these fragments is critical.

Though much has been written about the early Roman historians, there still does not exist a monograph in English that considers all the fragmentary historians nor one that considers their evaluations of historiographic form. My work is chiefly concerned with the development of historiography seen in the decisions made by Roman authors in their choice of literary medium. What compelled a historian in the Roman Republic to write his history in annalistic form? Why did one write monographs, and another write *commentarii*? And, particularly, what were their estimations of these forms? While much of this study will be empirical, theories regarding form and function of history as perceived by the Romans will have a place. A focus on form does not preclude or ignore other important and complementary aspects of history writing, such as style and subject matter. Rather all three will be intertwined. This study does not undertake a

---

<sup>2</sup> Verbrugghe 1989 examines the use and meaning of the term *Annales* in Roman authors. A lengthier discussion of the term follows in Chapter Two.

philological examination of the fragments or an account of the transmission of the texts. Nor does it offer commentary on the fragments. Instead, my goal is to illuminate the historians and their choices against a backdrop of Rome and in the context of developing historiography. In exploring the Roman authors' choices in historical form (and conventions and traditions of each), we may discover their motivations. These may include a competition for historical validity or credibility in the Roman Republic, or a recognition of the adequacies and inadequacies of particular forms for narrative discourse. For some authors, these forms may have a pragmatic goal—to reflect political stance. Conversely, Roman writers may have selected a particular form for its literary possibilities. Form might reveal motivation or, at least, a sense of the historian's purpose in writing history.

The historians themselves, in various programmatic statements, recorded their own concerns regarding form, and their comments regarding what and how they chose to write and what they chose to reject are illuminating. Cato, for example, the first to write Roman history in Latin prose, spoke dismissively of the *Annales*; it did not please him to record those things written down on the *tabula apud pontificem maximum*, such as expensive corn prices or eclipses of the sun and moon.<sup>3</sup> Sempronius Asellio likewise rejected the annalistic style and declared it unsuitable for writing history. For Asellio, writing of battles and consuls and triumphs did not constitute historiography, but only stories for children. Asellio, moreover, distinguished between

---

<sup>3</sup> Cato *Orig.* IV,1 Chassignet (= Gell. *NA* 2.28.6). All fragments in this dissertation derive from the Chassignet editions, whether from her edition of Cato as here, or below from her three volumes, *L'annalistique Romaine*, vols. I (1996/2003), II (1999/2003), and III (2004), each of which includes a concordance to Peter 1914. The numbering system in this dissertation is hers, and total figures for numbers of fragments listed are Chassignet's. Consequently, in corresponding footnotes, Chassignet's edition is listed first, followed by other editions in chronological order with their tallies of fragments. Abbreviations throughout the dissertation and appendix follow abbreviation conventions of *OCD*; abbreviations of journals in the bibliography follow *L'annee philologique*.

forms of historical writings. He recognized a difference between writing *annales*, an unembellished list of events, and writing *res gestae*. His history would do more than list; it would more properly demonstrate how and why events happened.<sup>4</sup> Any intentional statement regarding form made by the historian Lucius Cornelius Sisenna does not survive; in a one fragment, however, Sisenna appears to defend his methodology of choosing to relate in continuous fashion events happening outside the city of Rome. By writing a continuous narrative Sisenna would not confuse his readers by *vellicatim aut saltuatim scribendo*.<sup>5</sup> Aulus Postumius Albinus, who wrote in Greek a century before Sisenna, similarly offered justification for the decisions that shaped his writing. Postumius, infamously, prefaced his history with a plea for leniency from his readers if he made mistakes in the Greek; *homo Romanus natus in Latium*, Postumius reminded them, and thus the Greek language was somewhat foreign to him.<sup>6</sup> In addition to these historians, doubtless other writers of prose attempted to clarify their choice of form and subject matter; when they did not or when those fragments do not survive, the process of examining historical form becomes more complicated—but not impossible.

Limitations on the scope of this study have compelled the exclusion and inclusion of much that would complement this work. Missing in this study are the above-mentioned histories in poetic form—including epics, tragedies addressing Roman themes, *praetextae*, *annales* in verse, short epics, and short historical poems. A later project might successfully study the poetic historical forms that flourished during the Republic. Fragments of *praetextae* written by Naevius, Ennius, Pacuvius, and Accius exist. The Neronian *Octavia*, the only extant complete *praetexta*, would provide a useful comparison as a later example. Such a project would be

---

<sup>4</sup> Sempronius Asellio frag.1-2 (= Gell. *NA* 5.18.7 and 5.18.9).

<sup>5</sup> L. Cornelius Sisenna frag. 129 (= Gell. *NA* 12.15.2).

<sup>6</sup> A. Postumius Albinus frag. 1b (= Gell. *NA* 11.8.3). Gellius quotes Postumius in Latin, though the original would have been in Greek.

problematic, since extremely few fragments have survived. The most significant of the poetic histories are the earliest ones: the epic poem of Naevius, the *Bellum Punicum*, published around 215, and Ennius' *Annales*, a history of Rome in dactylic hexameter, published post 169.

This dissertation begins with Fabius Pictor and his *annales* in Greek, written sometime late in the Second Punic War, and ends with first century historians who reinvent the *annales* tradition. This time period commences with the great political and social upheavals at the end of the first war Rome undertook with Carthage (240) and concludes with the equally tumultuous consulship of Cicero in 63. That year, in retrospect, was to usher in change as well—Julius Caesar became *pontifex maximus*, and the future Augustus was born.

Excluded by the time frame are Sallust (86-35), Cornelius Nepos (c. 110-24), and Livy (59-17 C.E.), as well as the poets of the Augustan age who engaged regularly and creatively with Roman history; their story is told elsewhere.<sup>7</sup> The antiquarian work of Varro (116-27) will be useful throughout but only as evidence for the early historians; his surviving works are not explicitly historical. Varro's great lost work in forty-one books, *Antiquitates rerum humanarum et divinarum*, as well as his briefer lost history on the Roman people, *de gente populi Romani*, would surely have contributed to my study of early Roman writers of history. His study of the Latin language, *de lingua Latina*, will be useful in this study.

I limit my study to Roman authors, and this leaves out one of the greatest historians of Rome, the Greek Polybius, who wrote at Rome under the patronage of Scipio Aemilianus. Prominent in the Achaean Confederation opposed to Rome, Polybius (c. 200-c.118) served as hipparch of that confederation. But after the Roman victory over Perseus at Pydna in 168, Polybius came to Rome as one of the thousand Achaeans deported and held across Italy without

---

<sup>7</sup> Most recently, for example, in the wide-ranging collection of essays in Levene and Nelis 2002.

trial until the year 150. Polybius was one of the luckier hostages; he became friendly with Scipio Aemilianus, the son of the victor at Pydna, L. Aemilius Paullus. Scipio arranged for Polybius to serve out his time in Rome. Polybius later accompanied Scipio Aemilianus to Spain (150), and to Carthage during its siege (146), possibly playing a role even in the settlement of Achaea after the sack of Corinth. In Rome in the company of Scipio, Polybius wrote minor works that have not survived, including a history of the Numantine War. Polybius may have been present at Numantia in 133. His greatest work, a universal history meant to show Rome's rise to power during the years 240 down to 146, survives only partially. Books 1-5 of forty original books survive whole; only quotations and abridgments preserve bits of the remaining books. His methodology was new, and ultimately influential on early Roman historians. A geographical framework allowed him to tell the story of Rome's ascendance from west to east, and a chronological framework of Olympiads firmly set Roman history into a more universal history. As in the case of Varro above, Polybius will not be completely absent from this study. The form and motivations that shaped his historical approach and methodology, influenced by the Hellenistic historians, will in turn influence the writing of his contemporaries in Rome.<sup>8</sup>

My study considers the diverse historical writings by form, and within that framework, by chronology. This introduction provides a survey of scholarship on the fragmentary historians, our sources for them, and a historical and literary context for the historians. Chapters 2 through 5 treat practitioners and particular historical forms. Chapter 2 focuses on the annalistic form and its earliest proponents, the so-called Greek annalists.<sup>9</sup> Chapter 3 examines the annalists of the second century, including Lucius Cassius Hemina, later admired by antiquarians, Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi (cos. 133), the enemy of the Gracchi, Sempronius Tuditanus (cos. 129),

---

<sup>8</sup> Cf. Walkbank 1957, and Astin 1967: 3-4, and 14-20.

<sup>9</sup> The fragments of the annalists in Greek are found in Chassignet 1996/2003.

and the verbose Cnaeus Gellius.<sup>10</sup> Chapter 4 looks to annalists of the first century including Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, Valerius Antias and Licinius Macer, collectively known more for Livy's use of them rather than their own merits.<sup>11</sup> Chapter 5 takes on alternative forms of history such as contemporary history, *res gestae*, monographs, and *commentarii*, pursued by Fannius, Sempronius Asellio, Coelius Antipater, and Lucius Cornelius Sisenna, among others.<sup>12</sup> Thus Chapters 2-5 differ from one another in both form and perspective. Chapter 6, the conclusion, provides a synthetic view of the historians, their forms, intent, and contexts. An appendix provides a catalogue of authors of historical works produced in the years between the end of the First Punic War (240) and the consulship of Cicero (63). The historians are arranged chronologically. Each author is presented with bibliographic information: surviving fragments in the major editions, significant *testimonia* in chronological order from primary sources that refer chiefly to the author's historiographical work, entries from *RE*, references to magistracies in *MRR*, secondary studies on the author as a historian, and lastly, a selective bibliography of secondary sources which contain works that offer extended treatment of the author or are considered canonical. The remainder of this introduction provides background material on the extensive scholarship on these early historical writings.

The study of early Roman historical writings is not new. Various works treat the early historians, for example, in terms of biography, extant works, and credibility (Beloch 1926, Balsdon 1953, Badian 1966, Rawson 1976, Wiseman 1981, Wiseman 1983, Rawson 1985,

---

<sup>10</sup> Chassignet 1999/2003 collects the fragments of the annalists Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi, Lucius Cassius Hemina, Caius Sempronius Tuditanus, Vennonius, Cnaeus Gellius, and Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus. Vennonius and the equally shadowy Servilianus will receive only the scantest attention in this work.

<sup>11</sup> Fragments of each are in Chassignet 2004.

<sup>12</sup> See Chassignet 1999/2003 for the fragments of Fannius, Lucius Coelius Antipater, and Sempronius Asellio. Sisenna's fragments are in Chassignet 2004. The *commentarii* are also in Chassignet 2004.

Cornell 1986a and b, Cornell 1995). Among these, the classic introduction to the early Roman historians is Badian. He offers a chronological survey of the historians, and provides biographical information and perfunctory comments on the literary and historical merits of their surviving fragments. Because it is only a short chapter, some 26 pages, in a longer work on the Roman historians, Badian's work serves as an accessible entry-point. Rawson, likewise, devotes just one chapter to early historiography in her book on intellectual life in the Roman Republic. In an eighteen-page chapter on Republican historiography and allied subjects, Rawson limits her comments on the early historians to four pages. More recent surveys include Wiseman 2007 on the historiography of Rome's prehistory, Beck 2007 on Rome's early tradition, and Levene 2007 on the historiography of the late Republic.<sup>13</sup> On the whole, these representative pieces which survey the historians are valuable for the straightforward information they supply in an empirical, though often cursory, approach. Their strength lies in their clear accessible listing of historians; brevity is their weakness.

Some early historians have been treated individually, however, including Lucius Cincius Alimentus (Verbrugghe 1982), Cato (Astin 1978), Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi (Forsythe 1994), C. Licinius Macer (Frier 1975, Walt 1997) and Lucius Cassius Hemina (Rawson 1976, Santini 1995). The stand-alone article by Rawson, "The First Latin Annalists" (Rawson 1976) which treats not all the Latin annalists, but rather deals chiefly with Lucius Cassius Hemina, is more detailed than her comments on the historians *en masse*; it provides a more detailed analysis of one author's work through a comparative study of his fragments to those of Lucius Calpurnius Piso and Gn. Gellius. Verbrugghe's similarly careful study of L. Cincius Alimentus (Verbrugghe 1982) is another representative article on an individual annalist. He proposes the

---

<sup>13</sup> Other useful but older surveys of early Roman historiography include Beloch 1926, Frank 1927, and McDonald 1954 and 1975.



addition of five more fragments to the small corpus of Cincian fragments, and argues based on this larger body of material that Cincius was not merely a rehash of Fabius Pictor. The paucity of fragments still hinders clear conclusions, but Verbrugghe suggests that even these few can demonstrate differences, and hence purpose, in these two early historians. Forsythe's monograph on Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi (Forsythe 1994) is one of a very few book-length studies, to date, on any of the early historians, with the exception of Cato. Its length alone affords to Forsythe opportunities to engage comprehensively with Calpurnius' history. After two chapters on Piso's background and career, Forsythe turns to a detailed discussion of Piso's fragments (approximately 45 survive). Forsythe's review of these fragments constitutes over 350 pages—though only a handful of Piso's fragments are of any significant length. Forsythe puts Piso at the start of Roman annalistic tradition, and attributes to him a variety of historiographical innovations that were pursued by his followers. Again empirically based, these close readings of an author's surviving corpus by Rawson, Verbrugghe and Forsythe offer now not just biographical facts and head counts of surviving fragments, but posit interpretations of an author's stylistic or historical merits. These are a boon to my present work.

The scholarship on the credibility of the early historians is livelier and more confrontational (Leeman 1963, Cornell 1986a, Wiseman 1979, 1981, and 1983, Woodman 1988, Cornell 1995, Oakley 1997, and Forsythe 2005), because of a compelling debate on both the purposes of the early historians and their use of source material. Wiseman and Cornell chiefly engage in this dispute as the pole points, with Wiseman arguing that the historians imaginatively, and in conjunction with their rhetorical training in *inventio*, greatly elaborated on their slim sources. Wiseman does not see this as entirely negative; he reads the historians with a sanguine view of their reliability. In this he is supported, for example, by Oakley 1997 and Woodman

1988. These turn to the rhetorical education that would have been the common denominator for the earliest historians. That training allowed the addition of plausible, if not necessarily true, materials to an argument. Leeman's grand work, *Orationis Ratio* (1963), points out the desire not only to teach but also *delectare* and *movere*.<sup>14</sup> Woodman 1998 makes a persuasive case for the application of rhetorical models to narrative history by the historians.

Cornell, on the other hand, contends that the skeletal structure of early Roman history is constant and similar in all the early historians, and that they were respectful of received history. Thus the early historians must be treated as credible. Cornell is not naive, but prefers to accept the skeletal material documented by these historians. This debate and line of argument between Cornell and Wiseman is particularly clear in their discussions of the historical tradition and Rome's foundation myths (Cornell 1986b, Cornell 1995, and Wiseman 1995). Wiseman, in characteristic wide-ranging arguments, posits the myth of Remus, for example, as the creation of political and ideological debate in the fourth century. Wiseman brings to his argument a range of material, historical, archaeological, theoretical, and is often compelling. Wiseman himself operates as he says the early historians did—when there is need or room for plausible interpretation in the face of scanty evidence, a historian has a duty to see it. “All we have, to understand the past, is evidence and argument—what survives, and what we make of what survives.”<sup>15</sup> Wiseman further defends his methodology by asserting that every hypothesis is a creative act. Breath-taking at times, Wiseman's works reflect a well-read historian engaging with his material in as many ways as he can, rather than being stymied by the paucity of evidence.

---

<sup>14</sup> Leeman 1963: 87.

<sup>15</sup> Wiseman 1994: xii; see also Wiseman 1994: 6, for Wiseman's quotation of Syme on constructive fiction in writing (modern) history.

Three major editions of the fragments of the historians now exist.<sup>16</sup> The earliest collection of the fragments of the historians is Peter, *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* (1914); this edition, with commentary in Latin, is a revision of his 1870 *Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. A seminal work, Peter's collection in two volumes includes the remains of every fragmentary Roman historian from the Republic through the Empire. For over one hundred years, Peter's was the only collection of these fragments. It was based, however, on work done primarily during the nineteenth century, and even though it was heavily revised in 1914, it is, nonetheless, out of date since it misses much of the recent work done especially on the early historians. As recently as 1999, Frier criticized Peter's edition as "the weakest of all scholarly reference works still in standard use."<sup>17</sup>

More recently, two new editions have been produced which include updates on the accumulated knowledge of the historians, new fragments, and commentary in languages other than Latin. Beginning in 1996 Chassignet published three volumes of fragments from the period of the Republic entitled *L'Annalistique Romaine: Tome I: les annales des pontifes, l'annalistique ancienne* (1996/2003); *Tome II: l'annalistique moyenne* (1999/2003); and *Tome III: l'annalistique récente, l'autobiographie politique* (2004). Chassignet's volumes are noteworthy for the clarity of presentation, lucid and concise summaries of the life, work, and reception of each historian, the fragments and French translations of these, and updated scholarship. Moreover, Chassignet's introduction in *Tome I* offers a readable and restrained examination of Roman historiographical forms as well as scholarship on them. The major difference in terms of

---

<sup>16</sup> Each of the editions provides each historian's biography, as well as information on the historical text (e.g., length, date, publication, fragments, and so on), as well as information on reception of the historian's work by both the ancients and moderns. This structure (and content) has been my model in my work.

<sup>17</sup> Frier 1979/1999: 16.

fragments between Chassignet and Peter has to do with Chassignet's acceptance of fragments deriving from *Origo Gentis Romanae*, which Peter had declared inauthentic.

In 2001 and 2004 Beck and Walter produced a two-volume collection of the fragments of historians of the Republic in *Die früher römischen Historiker I, von Fabius Pictor bis Cn. Gellius*, and *Die früher römischen Historiker II, von Coelius Antipater bis Pomponius Atticus*. Beck and Walter's edition includes commentary and translations of the fragments in German. Unlike Peter or Chassignet, Beck and Walter's volumes, however, are not comprehensive; they, in fact, do not include every historian. Missing, for example, are Vennonius and Fabius Maximus Servilianus, as well as Q. Lutatius Catulus, M. Aemilius Scaurus, and Sulla.

This dissertation relies primarily on the Chassignet volumes of the fragments of the historians.<sup>18</sup> The Chassignet volumes offer the most complete collection of the Roman historians, including historians who used different forms. These volumes surpass Peter (1914) by providing more recent and updated scholarship on the historians. Peter remains useful, especially for its lengthy biographies of each historian, but Chassignet includes newer fragments and newer scholarship. Reviews of Chassignet have, on the whole, been positive. Beck, for example, commented: "Peter has been replaced, and no further edition of the texts will be needed."<sup>19</sup> Until the edition of the fragments currently being worked on by the English team led by Cornell is published, Chassignet's volumes will be the best access point to all the fragmentary historians regardless of form.<sup>20</sup>

---

<sup>18</sup> As mentioned earlier, Chassignet's editions include a concordance of fragments to Peter as well as to relevant editions of individual historians such as, e.g., Licinius Macer and L. Cassius Hemina.

<sup>19</sup> Beck 2005: 3.

<sup>20</sup> Led by Tim Cornell, a team of English scholars is working on publication of *Fragmentary Roman Historians*. Other editors include E. Bispham, J. W. Rich, and C. J. Smith. There is no

This scholarship has created a foundation on which my own work can rely. They in turn relied on the work of ancient scholars and authors who were interested in the fragmentary historians—those Roman texts that preserve the words of the historians, and thus are our source for the fragments of the historians of the Republic. The fragments of the early historians derive chiefly from few sources. In many cases, all we know of a particular author comes from testimony or commentary in an ancient source. At other times, a writer is quoted or cited in some fashion, thus providing us with a greater probability of more direct connection to an original text. Among the sources that most frequently describe our early historians are (in chronological order) Cicero, Livy, Plutarch, and Aulus Gellius. Myriad other Roman authors, from, e.g., Pliny the Elder to Macrobius, Priscian, and Nonius Marcellus, also quote, excerpt or paraphrase early historians either less often or at less length. In addition to the grammarians, notices also appear in commentaries such as Servius. How and why these principal sources preserved our historians is a good place to start.

Cicero's remarks on Roman historiography are among the most important primary sources on the development of history in Rome.<sup>21</sup> Found in the main in *de Oratore*, and to a lesser degree in his letters, in particular his letter to Lucceius (*Fam.* 5.12), these comments take as their common complaint the dearth of master historians in Rome. None of Cicero's works was intended as a treatise on historiography. In the form of a dialogue, set in the year 91, *de Oratore*, which survives whole, confronted the topic of political and rhetorical training of an orator. Cicero's chosen date of 91 for this dialogue allowed him to situate his interlocutors, Marcus Antonius and L. Licinius Crassus, in the years prior to Rome's entry into civil war. Crassus

---

date set for its publication. It will be the first edition in English of the corpus of the fragmentary historians of the Roman Republic.

<sup>21</sup> On Cicero and historiography, see Leeman 1963, Rawson 1972: 33-45, Brunt 1980a, Woodman 1988: 70-117, Brunt 1993: 181-210, and Feldherr 2003.

himself died in 91. The Social War and turmoil between Marius and Sulla would soon follow, and Antonius was killed in 88 by Sulla. In the *de Oratore*, to which we will turn again in Chapter 1, Crassus made a case for a broad and wide-ranging education for an orator, one not confined merely to technique and skill; additionally, an orator's moral character (the doctrine of the *vir bonus*) was of great importance. Antonius, in less than complete opposition, promoted a training that was more closely tied to oratorical technique and experience. In Book 2, historiography entered the dialogue when Antonius offered it as an example of a field, not having any precepts or theories of its own, that should be treated with oratorical skills. In 2.51-64, Antonius decried the state of history writing in Rome—no one in Rome, he claimed, applied eloquence to anything other than his time in court or in the Forum (2.55). Cicero (through his interlocutor) presents not only a history of Roman historiography but also his theories on the proper writing of history.

These theories are found as well in a famous letter of Cicero, *Fam.* 5.12, composed in 55, the same year as the *de Oratore*, but months earlier. In it, Cicero urged his friend Lucceius to continue his history of Italy, which treated the Social War and the conflict between Marius and Sulla, with a separate monograph on Cicero himself. That monograph, Cicero suggested, could begin with the Catilinarian conspiracy and end with his return from exile. Underneath Cicero's often discomfiting plea for Lucceius both to immortalize him for perpetuity and provide him with authority and fame while he still lived, one can discern Cicero's astute comments about how one could write history. For instance, Cicero observed a difference between events that were appropriate for continued narrative, and those that might lend themselves more to attention given over to *uno in argumento unaque in persona*—himself of course (5.12.2). Such focus allowed greater scope for greater elaboration (*ornatiora*). Cicero also called for history—and his own

experiences—to be recounted with artistry and style. *Variatio* of events mixed with pleasure would entertain a reader (*delectationem lectoris*) far more than the monotony of *annales* (*ordo ipse annalium mediocriter nos retinet quasi enumeratione fastorum*). Cicero preferred for the dramatic acts of his life to be separated out from a more (boring) form of history (5.12.2).

Most of Cicero's references to particular named historians, rather than historiography as a whole, are very short, usually no more than a phrase or two. Cicero's remarks often speak little to the content written by the historian and more on the *exornatio* (or lack thereof). His descriptions of them are valuable, however, because he directs his comments to the literary style of the historian, a facet he found still missing in Roman historiography even in the last century of the Republic. Thus, Cicero preserves for us names of historians, brief comments on their (lack of) style, and his own theories on how history was to be written. While Cicero's remarks are his own, they provide some small glimpse into the reputation or received opinions of these writers by one educated member of the politically and socially enfranchised class in the first century. Indeed, this type of window into the late Republic has always been one of the great advantages to Cicero's works in general; the perspective he does share has also at times served to mitigate faults in Cicero. Here, for example, Cicero's disdainful comments on the historians cut off fuller descriptions of them that might have directly benefited our study of them. We have some view of these historians, and at the same time we are deprived further information.

Many early historians, especially Valerius Antias, Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, and Licinius Macer, appear as sources in Livy's great history of Rome, *Ab urbe condita*, written at the end of the first century, and into the first C.E. Livy's work addressed the history of Rome from its foundation to Livy's own time in one hundred and forty two books. Of these, only Books 1-10 and 21-45 survive complete. Fragments of others exist, and *Periochae*, written in the third or

fourth century C.E., provide summaries of the lost books, except for Books 136 and 137. Livy's chronicle begins with Aeneas' flight to Italy, and the subsequent foundation of Rome by his descendants, Romulus and Remus. Book 142 told of Drusus' death in Germany in 9. Livy perhaps continued as far as the Teutoburg Forest Disaster in 9 C.E., perhaps intending a narrative comprising 150 books, but his death prohibited the completion (12/17 C.E.).<sup>22</sup> If the last books on the Augustan years had survived, we might know better how much influence Augustus had on Livy.<sup>23</sup> The surviving books, Books 1-10, the first decade, recount Rome's history through the last Samnite war in 289; and Books 21-45 treat from 218-167, the Second Punic War to the defeat of Macedonia in 167 at Pydna.

For a history of such a great scale, Livy was obliged to use many literary sources, though he rarely consulted available documentary materials. Both Livy's use and his distrust of his literary sources, those historians of the generation before him, are widely known.<sup>24</sup> On the whole, Livy found his predecessors to be less than credible, especially Antias, and yet he often included their versions of events.<sup>25</sup> For example, despite Antias' tendency to exaggerate death figures, Livy mentions them consistently, and he uses Antias' reports of invented battles too.<sup>26</sup> It was, perhaps, common enough practice for ancient historians to make use regularly of available literary histories in addition to primary sources.<sup>27</sup> On the other hand, Livy rejected the stories of his sources enough, or at least registered doubt in them, to earn some grudging praise as a

---

<sup>22</sup> On the publication of Livy, see Luce 1977.

<sup>23</sup> For a basic summary of the problem, see Luce 1977 on the relationship between Augustus and Livy as well as Syme 1959.

<sup>24</sup> A study of Livy's sources begins with Walsh 1961, Luce 1977, and Oakley 1997.

<sup>25</sup> See, for instance, Oakley's survey of Livy's notices to his sources in Books 6-10 in Oakley 1997: 13-15. Further, see Oakley 1997: 21-109 on the annalistic tradition. Oakley 1997: 89-92 is particularly harsh on Antias.

<sup>26</sup> Casualty figures, e.g., Antias frag. 25 (= Liv. 26.49.1-2). A more complete list can be had in Oakley 1997: 89-90. On fictional battles, see e.g., Antias frag. 31(= Liv. 30.29.7).

<sup>27</sup> Oakley 1997: 13.



critic.<sup>28</sup> His skepticism about his sources begins even in his recording of Rome's foundational tales—both those of Romulus and Remus' mother (1.4.7-8) and Romulus' death (1.16). From our standpoint of modern “objective” history writing, Livy's methodology is both meritorious and suspect at the same time.

Livy's use of the early historians is widespread. For the first decade Livy appeared to favor Antias (in spite of Antias' figures), Macer, and Claudius Quadrigarius (Books 6-10). He based Books 21-45 in large part on these same sources, adding Polybius and Coelius Antipater to them when his narrative reached the rise of Rome. Direct references to work of Cato and L. Calpurnius Piso are few, and his use of them is ambiguous.<sup>29</sup>

Livy's choice of form is also significant. In writing an annalistic history of Rome, which progressed year by year, and focused on magistrates, internal and external events, and other events of importance such as portents, he reverted to a traditional historiographical form. In the decades before Livy, Sallust had turned away from the annalistic form and had instead written two monographs. Livy picked up the *Annales* form again, and through his remarkable storytelling skills, he rescued the annalistic form and made it respectable again. Ironically, in looking for those often derided as mere “annalists” and minor writers, we find them preserved in a historian who preferred their same form. And ironically, we find the annalists in the *Annales* of one who was an outsider of sorts—a non-senator from Padua.

In preserving the early historians, Livy also surpasses them, and thus our reaction to these historians is necessarily shaped by Livy's evaluation of them. An emphasis on style and elaboration of scene, event and personality earned him praise from Quintilian for his *lactea*

---

<sup>28</sup> E.g., Oakley 1997: 89 speaks of Livy's “barely concealed contempt” for Antias' inflated figures.

<sup>29</sup> Oakley 1997: 13-16.

*ubertas*.<sup>30</sup> His history is possibly the one Cicero had been waiting for—a history told by a good storyteller and stylist.

In the first century C.E., Plutarch (ca. 50 -120), a Greek biographer and philosopher, came to Rome from Chaeroneia. A prolific writer, Plutarch compiled a corpus of two hundred twenty-seven works, as listed in the fourth century C.E. Catalogue of Lamprias. Over one hundred and twenty survive.<sup>31</sup> Among them are his many essays, the *Moralia*, on a variety of topics—these fill sixteen Loeb volumes. His essays range from advice to political, rhetorical and antiquarian tracts. Rarely in the *Moralia* does Plutarch cite an early Roman historian or poet. Rather, his sources for the essays on Roman themes are the antiquarians, and in particular Varro, used often in *Quaestiones Romanae*. Plutarch also makes use of Livy, Polybius and Dionysius, as well as sources such as Aristides, who, for example, is cited extensively in the spurious *Parallela Minora*. One exception to Plutarch’s habit of not using the early historians is found in *de fortuna Romanorum*, which once cites the historian Antias (323 C).

Other Plutarchean works are not helpful either for examining the Roman historians. Plutarch’s *Lives of the Caesars* does not survive complete. Only his biographies of Galba and Otho remain, and these, as well as the lost volumes on the emperors from Augustus to Vitellius, fall outside the time frame of this study.

Valerius Antias, Cato, Claudius Quadrigarius, Fabius Pictor, Fannius, Postumius Albinus, Sempronius Tuditanus all do appear in some fashion, however, in Plutarch.<sup>32</sup> Plutarch is best known for his series of biographies in Greek called *Parallel Lives*, nineteen matching pairs of biographies of famous Greek and Roman political figures, and four treatments of single figures.

---

<sup>30</sup> Quint. *Instit.* 10.1.32.

<sup>31</sup> Russell 1993: xxiii-xxix compiles the complete list of Plutarch’s works, surviving and lost.

<sup>32</sup> Helmbold and O’Neil 1959: 1-76; s.v. each author.

These lives treated many significant Romans of the Republic, beginning with Romulus, and spanning Roman history until Julius Caesar. Plutarch's sources for these biographies were both Greek and Latin, though questions remain about Plutarch's facility with Latin. Notices to his sources suggest some familiarity with them on a sliding scale from first hand understanding and reading of them to mere acquaintance.<sup>33</sup> Plutarch himself remarks in his *Life of Demosthenes* (I) that he came to learn Latin very late in his life. In the *Parallel Lives*, however, Plutarch cited over twenty different Greek and Roman authors, some more often than others, and the early annalists appear often. Two fragments, for example, from uncertain books of Cato survive in Plutarch's life of *Cato Minor*.<sup>34</sup> Plutarch also refers to Cato's *de Agricultura* and letters as well. On the other hand, some references to early annalists by Plutarch constitute only a passing comment or small notice. Tuditanus, for one, is mentioned only once.<sup>35</sup>

Plutarch's credibility as a source for our writers of Roman history rests ultimately on our trust in his quotations, and less on his reliability as a historian. Plutarch's approach to history writing is laid out, famously, in the introduction to his *Life of Alexander the Great*. Interested more in the character of men than their achievements, Plutarch put forward the disclaimer that he was writing biography, not history. Stories revealing character interested Plutarch more than records of accomplishments on the battlefield.<sup>36</sup> He wrote not political or military history, but composed narratives about the virtues and exemplars of famous and worthy men. His

---

<sup>33</sup> On Plutarch and his sources for the *Parallel Lives* as well as his relationship with Rome, see first Jones 1971, as well as Stadter 1965, and on quotations in Plutarch, see especially Helmbold and O'Neil 1959.

<sup>34</sup> Cato frag. 129 Peter (= Plut. *Cat. Min.* 10/342a) and Cato frag. 130 Peter (= Plut. *Cat. Min.* 14/344b). Chassignet's edition of Cato includes only fragments from the *Origines* and does not include fragments from unknown books.

<sup>35</sup> Tuditanus frag. 6 (= Plut. *Flam.* 14.2-3).

<sup>36</sup> Plut. *Alex.* 1.

relationship to both his subjects and to the city of Rome greatly colored his depictions of them.<sup>37</sup> Though Plutarch used a wide range of sources, he was not always scrupulous in reflecting these. When a source suggested a less than savory characteristic of an individual or portrayed Rome in a less than flattering light (for example, in the *Romulus*), Plutarch passed over that evidence. Plutarch's intentions to create memorable and chiefly honorable portraits of his figures allowed him a certain amount of freedom in using and naming his sources (or even reading them for that matter); he was not ultimately concerned with correct historical detail.<sup>38</sup> Hence what we learn of the early Roman historians and poets in Plutarch is never complete and always intentionally filtered.

One of our best sources for the early Roman historians is the late miscellanist, Aulus Gellius who lived in the second century C.E. during the age of the Antonines. He was a scholar, linguist, and antiquarian, interested in etymologies, antiquities, and language. Like other literary figures of his age such as Fronto, Gellius' passions indicated erudition and culture, and a profound interest in archaic language and institutions. Though he might have been born in Africa and spent most of his life in Rome, his travels in Greece and time spent in Athens resulted in a collection of entertaining stories, anecdotes and more, entitled *Noctes Atticae*, published around 180 C.E. in twenty books, and based on notes on readings undertaken during his time there. Most of *Noctes Atticae* survives; missing are the preface, all of Book 8 and the end of Book 20. His work demonstrated a wide range of interests, preeminent among them a delight in grammar.

Because of his interest in archaic Latin, Aulus Gellius preserves many fragments of the early historians. In fact, for example, nearly half of the preserved fragments of Q. Claudius

---

<sup>37</sup> On Plutarch and Rome, see Jones 1971.

<sup>38</sup> Jones 1971:85.

Quadrigarius come from Aulus Gellius. He also cited or referred to Sempronius Asellio, Postumius Albinus, Cato, and Coelius Antipater. Next to Quadrigarius, Gellius cited most frequently Sallust and Cato.<sup>39</sup> Gellius' usefulness lies in his range of materials and the sources he employed.

Yet Gellius was neither a historian nor particularly interested in Roman history or Roman historiography. Though he preserved Asellio's trenchant comments on the difference between *res gestae* and *annales*, on the whole Gellius preferred the study of language to history.<sup>40</sup> Thus deficiencies, at least for my study, abound. His inclusion of Asellio's programmatic intent, for example, did not lead to a discussion of Roman historiography or of events in Roman history or even of the merits of Asellio as an annalist. Rather, Gellius preserved Asellio because of Gellius' interest in the particular words *historia* and *annales*. Gellius had little interest in the content of Asellio's history itself.<sup>41</sup> Passages from other Roman historians cited there evince the same interests of Gellius; throughout his work, these sources were used more for purposes of language study and the odd grammatical usage than for their stories. Gellius' references, then, do little for us in assessing the historical import or credibility of the early Roman annalists. They are nonetheless of utmost importance in preserving some of their grammatical tendencies through which we might tease out their stylistic qualities.

In addition to Gellius, the grammarians Priscian, Nonius, and Macrobius, contain fragments of the early historians. The grammarians belong to a period of cultural rebirth and renovation in the fourth century C.E., a revival of both the empire and literature.<sup>42</sup> During this

---

<sup>39</sup> The definitive work on Aulus Gellius remains Holford-Strevens 2003 (revised edition); on Gellius and history, see Holford-Strevens 2003: 241-260.

<sup>40</sup> Asellio frags. 1-2 (= Gell. NA 5.18.8-9).

<sup>41</sup> Holford-Strevens 2003: 245.

<sup>42</sup> On the grammarians and fourth century society, see Kaster 1997.

century before the sack of the city of Rome in 410 C.E., grammarians as well as other commentators wrote extensively on Roman literature, most often focusing on style and form, rather than content. Chief among these is Nonius Marcellus, born in the first part of the fourth century C.E., perhaps in Africa, who wrote a twenty-book treatise on grammar and antiquarianism. The first part of this work, *De Compendiosa Doctrina*, is a series of explanations of grammatical rules supported by examples from Roman authors. In including these citations, Nonius preserved many otherwise lost passages from early historians such as Quadrigarius and Sisenna.<sup>43</sup>

Macrobius, of the late fourth and early fifth century C.E., continued the literary revival of the fourth century. His range of works demonstrated an interest in grammar, history, scholarship, and antiquarianism. *Saturnalia*, his seven-book work in dialogue form written long after its dramatic date, recounts several days' worth of erudite and learned conversation and dialogue by an influential group of Romans who came together during the Saturnalia in 384 C.E. Among the discussion topics are religion, philosophy, and literature, including numerous citations from the early historians.<sup>44</sup> Priscian lived more than a century after Macrobius, writing and working in Constantinople in the beginning of the sixth century C.E. His principal work, *Institutio de Arte Grammatica*, became the authoritative textbook on grammar for the Middle Ages, preserving in it many quotations from both prose and poetic authors.<sup>45</sup>

Each of these grammarians preserves fragments of the early historical historians, yet not out of a keen interest in the history recounted. Rather, as in the case of Aulus Gellius, the grammarians were more interested in grammatical idiosyncrasies, neologisms, and archaisms.

---

<sup>43</sup> Kaster 1997: 417-418.

<sup>44</sup> von Albrecht 1997: 1485-1491. On fragments in Macrobius, see Marinone 1975.

<sup>45</sup> Kaster 1997: 346-348.

Thus their interests and concerns do not fully contextualize our historians. Nonetheless, they afford some small glimpse into the style and subject matter of the early (and mostly lost) works of the historians. The grammarians, in particular, demonstrate a paradox found in working with the early historians—in searching for the earliest historians we find them in fact in some of the latest Latin sources. A study of Latin literature ironically chases its own tail, looking for the beginning in the end.

Roman historiography developed against the rich backdrop of the middle to late Roman Republic, in particular from the end of the First Punic War (240) to the consulship of Cicero (63). During these years, Rome experienced tremendous change on many fronts. For the Roman historians, context and reaction to contemporary events shaped their choice of a medium for history writing. Romans would accordingly not only write of the Roman past but shape how that history was written as well. An overview of this period emphasizes change and innovation across all manner of fields. Above all, Rome seemed to expend its energies on expansion and creation of both power and empire.<sup>46</sup> By the fourth and early third century, Rome engaged in a long series of wars to consolidate first the Italian peninsula under her rule, and warfare remained a common theme throughout the Republic.

---

<sup>46</sup> Thorough examinations of the Roman Republic can be found in the second edition of *Cambridge Ancient History* VII, 2: “The Rise of Rome to 220 B.C.”; VII: “Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 B.C.” and IX: “The Last Age of the Roman Republic, 146-43 B.C.” and the bibliographies therein. See also Scullard 1980; Crawford 1993; Boatwright et al. 2004 and Flower 2004. On the last century of the Republic, see Syme 1939; Seager 1969; Crawford and Beard 1985/1999; Wiseman 1986; Brunt 1988; and Gruen 1995/reissue of 1974. On economy of the Republic see Crawford 1985; on religion, see Beard, North and Price 1998; on literature and culture and intellectual life, see Kenney 1982; Rawson 1985; Gruen 1992; and Fantham 1996. On Rome’s wars, imperial ambitions, army and provinces, see Richardson 1976; Lazenby 1978 and 1996; Harris 1979 and 1984; Gruen 1984 and 1992; Richardson 1986; and Goldsworthy 1996 and 2000. On Rome’s slave system, see Bradley 1989; on Roman society, see Fantham et al. 1994; Kleiner and Matheson 1996; and Treggiari 2002. On Republican politics, class relations and social conflicts, and citizenship see Lacey and Wilson 1970; Brunt 1971; Sherwin-White 1973; Shatzman 1975; and Nicolet 1980.

The later third, second, and first centuries followed this trend, but Rome engaged primarily in warfare outside the Italian peninsula as it became a Mediterranean power. After the defeat of Pyrrhus in 275 and a series of successful wars against a series of enemies across roughly one hundred and thirty years, Rome eventually became the dominant state in the Mediterranean. War was waged against the Carthaginians three times, in 264 -241, 218 -210, and 149 -146. In the east, the Romans met the Illyrians on the battlefield in wars in 229 and 219, and the Macedonians in three wars beginning in 215 and ending with victory at Pydna in 168. Rome defeated the Syrians as well in this period (192-189), destroyed Corinth (146), was bequeathed the kingdom of Pergamum (133), and finally took, in the west, Numantia in the same year to consolidate most of Spain under her rule. Before the turn of the century, on the northern frontier, Marius would defeat the Cimbri and the Teutones (113-101). To the south Rome engaged in war with Jugurtha of Numidia (112-105) as well.

The first century witnessed campaigns versus Mithridates in the east (90-85, and again 74-63), and against the Parthians (culminating in a disastrous defeat in 53). External warfare, now a staple to the Romans, turned fratricidal in this last century of the Republic beginning with the Gracchi, and only ending with Octavian's defeat of Antony at Actium (31). The latter part of these wars falls outside the timeframe and scope of this study.

Rome's changes, however, were not confined to the military sphere. The same two hundred years from the outset of the First Punic War in the third century to civil war in the first century witnessed developments in many areas, which are as significant as any in the military or political realm. Precipitated by warfare and consequences of these wars, changes in Roman social and political life were the norm across these years. The movement of peoples, the increasing inclusion and growing influence of non-Romans in Roman life, and political divisions



and tensions as Rome wrestled with the logistics of ruling an empire, contributed to a constantly changing culture. A ruling elite, the *nobiles*, came to the forefront, the wealthy grew richer from spoils of war, formerly small landholdings became concentrated in the hands of the few, the poor remained disenchanted, notable individuals from Cato to Sulla made their mark, and a Mediterranean economy was born.<sup>47</sup> The city of Rome itself experienced significant physical growth and change too; a host of private and public building projects, such as frequent dedication of temples by victorious generals, reflected Rome's growing wealth.<sup>48</sup>

More importantly for this study, Rome's first literature was produced in this time period as well.<sup>49</sup> Despite a seeming occupation with war, Roman literature flourished, beginning with Livius Andronicus' performance of a play and then a translation of the *Odyssey* in the 240's. Among the problems to be worked out in the aftermath of creating a Mediterranean empire was the relationship of Rome to Greece, not just in a political but literary sense as well. Greece, past and present, stood as a literary model; Greek authors, especially those of the contemporary

---

<sup>47</sup> The rise of the *nobiles* is laid out in Gelzer 1969. On Cato, see Astin 1978; on Sulla, Badian 1970. Other magistrates are detailed in Broughton 1952 and 1986.

<sup>48</sup> On Republican architecture, see Ward-Perkins 1977.

<sup>49</sup> General treatments of the literature of the Republican period appear in Kenney and Clausen 1982; Rawson 1985; Fantham 1996; Conte 1995; and von Albrecht 1997. Bibliographies there consider both individual Roman authors as well as genre. Goldberg 2005 examines the problem of Rome's literary development, focusing on readers and not just writers. See Habinek 1998 on the politics of Latin literature. On Ennius, see Skutsch 1985; on Naevius see Barchiesi 1962. On Roman comedy see Duckworth 1952; Wright 1974; and Konstans 1983. On Plautus, one might begin with Handley 1968 and Slater 1985. Beare's 1964 work on the Roman stage discusses both comedies and tragedies. For Terence see Norwood 1923; Forehand 1985; and Goldberg 1986. Pacuvius and Accius have not yet received a general treatment; therefore Beare 1964 is useful. On Roman satire and Lucilius, consult Knoche (trans. Ramage) 1975; Coffey 1989; and Boyle and Freudenberg 2002. On oratory during the Republic see Leeman 1963 and Kennedy 1972. For historical context behind the Scipionic circle, see Astin 1967 on Scipio Aemilianus, and *contra*, Parker 1996. For literature beyond the temporal parameters of this work: Ross 1969 treats the neoteric poets, as does Wiseman 1974. Many studies of Catullus are worthwhile including Wheeler 1934; Ross 1969; Quinn 1972; Wiseman 1969 and 1985. A study of Lucretius' didactic poetry should begin with Kenney 1977, as well as West 1969; Clay 1983; and Segal 1990.

Hellenistic world, were the teachers and masters in all literary genres, the Romans the students. In the years after Rome's entry into the Mediterranean, debate over this relationship flourished. Much has been made of the hostility and resentment between Cato and his alleged anti-Greek stance and Scipio Aemilianus, his alleged infatuation of all things Greek, with his so-called Scipionic circle. While the polarization between the two was not as significant as it has been characterized, the debate over the role of Greek literary models was considerable, and it enriched the literary environment of the middle Republic. Postumius Albinus' comments about his less than perfect Greek used in his history belong to this time period and this debate.

Consequently, in the third century, Livius and his successors Naevius and Ennius composed tragedy and comedy derived from Greek models, and yet both Naevius and Ennius also wrote *praetextae* on Roman, and not Greek, historical themes. Naevius and Ennius similarly addressed Rome's foundation story and history elsewhere: Naevius composed the *Bellum Punicum* in Saturnians, a native Roman meter, and Ennius followed with his *Annales* in the more traditional epic hexameter borrowed from the Greeks. These two works, especially the historical poem modeled on the annual lists kept by the *pontifex maximus*, were to become authoritative and representative works of their genres, and influenced historiography as well. In the third century, other writers participating in the development of Roman tragedy and comedy from Greek models included Pacuvius, Caecilius Statius, and Plautus whose comedies are the earliest full works to survive. In the same period, Roman oratory developed as seen in the speeches of Appius Claudius Caecus.

The second century saw the introduction of other genres into Roman literature. The significant writers of the second century include Terence, the writer of comedies, Accius, a tragedian, as well as Lucilius, the inventor of the wholly Roman genre of satire (according to

Quintilian 10.1.93) and Cato, Rome's first historian in Latin. Roman historiography thus begins in earnest with Cato's history, the *Origines*, in Latin. Prior Roman writers, such as Fabius Pictor, had recorded Roman history in Greek in annalistic form, and Cato's rejection of both Greek language and annalistic form purportedly demonstrated his rejection of Greek culture. That rejection was not complete as is seen in Cato's use of Greek foundation stories as models; indeed Ennius and Naevius earlier had relied on Greek models when writing their Roman stories. The separation between Roman author and Greek model was never rigid. The relationship between Rome and Greece, even on a literary level, underlay much during the middle to late Republic.

In the first century, Roman authors continued to experiment with Greek genres, all the while creating distinctly Roman literature. Lucretius would produce an elegant didactic epic expounding Epicureanism, and Catullus and the *poetae novi* would write exquisite *nugae* in a variety of meters adapted from Greek. Cicero composed not only speeches devised and delivered on the model of Demosthenes according to the rules of Greek rhetoric but also philosophical dialogues on the model of Plato—even translations of lost Stoics and Epicureans—on Greek philosophy, education, oratory. And at the end of the first century, the Augustan age (outside the temporal limits of this work) witnessed the masterpieces of, for example, Horace in his odes, modeled on the Greek odes of Alcaeus and Sappho, and Vergil in his national epic and nod to Homer, the *Aeneid*.

From the late third to the first century, Rome created both an empire and a literary tradition—through competition, conquest, imitation, adoption and adaptation. Roman historians responded to these changes in a variety of ways as they crafted their works. How they composed their histories had everything to do with context, and their understanding of both Rome's

position and its literary tradition. But the early historians were also influenced by their education, and specifically by their perception of the functions, purposes, and forms of history. To be sure, when the Romans first wrote their own histories, beginning with Fabius Pictor, they were not writing without knowledge of earlier Greek historical models or earlier Roman attempts to record their history.

Literary sources—as well as the historical and literary background—supply a preliminary background, context for, and a lens through which I examine the forms used in historical writings of the Republic. By the first century, Rome had created an empire as well as a literary and historiographical tradition to record, memorialize, and represent itself. Rome's great historians at the end of the Republic, Sallust, and Livy, serve as end points in the Republican search for historical form. But there is danger in depicting earlier writers as mere forerunners, and danger in teleological thinking that posits Sallust and Livy as what the earlier writers should have been. The early annalists were, on the contrary, instrumental in shaping the form that Livy would employ. Similarly, early writers of monographs and contemporary history influenced Sallust's perception of, and his use of, those particular forms. If Livy was Rome's the best annalist, the personification of Cicero's hope for a historian with style, the other annalists need not be the worst. Rather, a contextual examination, comprehensive in scope, of the historians and their forms, may well produce a surprising result—that Roman history was in good hands prior to the first century.

In the years 240-63, the Romans historians intentionally utilized diverse forms. Who, how, and for what end? These questions are the topics of the following chapters.

CHAPTER 2  
FOUNDERS AND FOLLOWERS: EARLY ROMAN ANNALISTS IN GREEK

Of the many types of Roman historiography, the most common form was *annales*. Between Fabius Pictor's first annalistic history of Rome, published as late as 202 and Livy's 142-book history composed late in the first century, a great number of historians employed the annalistic form for their particular histories of Rome. This chapter begins with a look at the form itself, followed by an examination of its earliest practitioners, the annalists in Greek, Fabius Pictor, L. Cincius Alimentus, A. Postumius Albinus, and Gaius Acilius, and their estimation of this form—a form that came to be synonymous with Roman history.

***Annales* and Annalists**

The term *annales* is at the very center of Roman history and historiography. Early moderns called many of the histories from the Roman world annals.<sup>50</sup> Moderns speak of the early annalists, a term used often to mean almost any Roman writing history prior to Sallust and Livy.<sup>51</sup> The ancients themselves spoke of *annales* to mean not only prose chronicles of Rome's history but also its historical tradition. Hence the term *annales* has come to refer to both the works and the tradition of historiography itself in Rome.<sup>52</sup>

A number of problematic issues present themselves in a discussion of *annales* and their creators. First of all, the related terms annalistic and annalist are used in ways that are not Roman but the creation of moderns.<sup>53</sup> Secondly, uses of the term *annales* by Romans themselves are varied. *Annales* could indicate the *Annales* of Ennius—a work not in prose, it recounted in verse Rome's early years. Numerous poets imitated Ennius' form, writing their own version of *annales* in dactylic hexameter, often not well. Additionally, ancient authors did not limit the title

---

<sup>50</sup> Verbrugghe 1989: 199-200; see his list of “moderns.”

<sup>51</sup> Verbrugghe 1989: 200.

<sup>52</sup> Marincola 1999: 288.

<sup>53</sup> Chassignet 1996/2003:VII.

*annales* to a certain prose form, but called the works of several Roman historians both *historia* and *annales*.<sup>54</sup> Moreover, works that now we call *Annales*, such as those of Tacitus, did not have that name in antiquity.<sup>55</sup> Lastly, the existence of the *annales maximi* complicates the topic as well. What the *annales maximi* included or excluded, their form, their history, and even their publication are still matters of much lively debate.<sup>56</sup>

Nevertheless, *annales* in antiquity most often referred to a historical work in prose, which maintained some chronological format. Emphasizing the root word, Roman authors believed that treatment of events in a year-by-year fashion was an essential characteristic of the form. Beyond that characteristic, ancient treatment of *annales* differed widely. A number of citations from Roman authors serve as examples of usages of the term.<sup>57</sup> Paramount among them is Cicero's use of the word in the *de Oratore*. Passages from Servius auctus, Isidore, Verrius Flaccus, as well as Sempronius Asellio, offer further elucidations of the term. From these, a general picture of essentials and differentia of *annales* might emerge.

The most full Ciceronian usage of the term *annales* is in the *de Oratore*, Cicero's dialogue on the ideal training of an orator. In this dialogue, Antonius described early Roman history as *nihī aliud nisi annalium confectio*. His denigrating tone towards Roman historiography aside, his understanding of the term *annales* has become one of the most cited from antiquity. More fully, history was a compilation of *annales* (*de Oratore* 2.51-52):

---

<sup>54</sup> Verbrugghe 1989: 197. Verbrugghe also provides a comprehensive appendix (appendix IV) of references to general histories by author.

<sup>55</sup> Verbrugghe 1989:197.

<sup>56</sup> Marincola 1999: 289. The starting point in scholarship on the *annales maximi* is Frier 1979/1999. See also Cichorius 1894: 2248- 2255, Rawson 1971, Drews 1988, and Flach 1992.

<sup>57</sup> These citations are fully discussed below, and include Cic. *De or.* 2.51-54; Servius auct. *ad Aen.* I. 373; Isid. *Orig.* 1.44.4; Verrius Flaccus as cited in Gell. *NA* 5.18.1; and Sempronius Asellio in Gell. *NA* 5.18.6-9.

cuius rei memoriaeque publicae retinendae causa ab initio rerum  
Romanarum usque ad P. Mucium pontificem maximum res omnis  
singulorum annorum mandabat litteris pontifex maximus referebatque in  
album et proponebat tabulam domi, potestas ut esset populo  
cognoscendi, eique nunc annales maximi nominantur.

An unpacking of this passage is crucial for our understanding of the development of Roman historiography. We learn that, for the sake of preserving public memory, the *pontifex maximus* (chief priest) recorded all the events of a single year in writing, by putting them on a white notice board for display. Moreover, we discover that since the beginning of Rome up until the time of the *pontifex maximus* Publius Mucius (Scaevola, cos. 133), each *pontifex maximus* had undertaken this task. The function of the work is clear: by consigning events to writing, and not just memory, history would be preserved.<sup>58</sup> Further, by displaying the white board, probably in the Forum, the *pontifex maximus* ensured that the people of Rome would be able to access this material. Simply put, *annales* were those events listed on the *tabula dealbata* (a term derived from Servius auctus, below).

A number of points in this passage deserve our attention. Here and in the following lines, Cicero, through the mouth of Antonius, treats both the development of Roman historiography as well as the conventions of the annalistic form. In the beginning history writing for the Romans was just a collection of annals, a kind of annual report of key events. Yet the Romans were not the only ones who began their attempts at preserving history in writing this way. Antonius explained that the Greeks themselves wrote similarly at one time: *Graeci quoque ipsi sic initio scriptitarunt* (2.51). The iterative verb suggests that Antonius recognized the repeated action of

---

<sup>58</sup> On the intersections of history and memory in Rome, and the importance Rome attached to preserving its past, see Small and Tatum 1995, Farrell 1997, and Gowing 2005. The “culture of memory” and historiography’s place in it is attracting much recent attention. See, for example, Timpe 1996, Walter 2004, Hölkeskamp 2006, and Flower 2007.

habit or custom in Greek writing of history. Whether in Greece or in Rome, historiography started with a simple task of compiling and preserving annual records.

Following this recording of annual events came a second phase of historiography in Rome, during which authors wrote somewhat like those early collections of annals: *hanc similitudinem scribendi multi secuti sunt* (2.53). According to Antonius, these authors left behind only *monumenta* of times, people, places, and deeds *sine ullis ornamentis* (2.53). Cicero's intended audience for this treatise on oratory would have understood *sine ullis ornamentis* to mean that these writings were simple, plain narrative; lack of rhetorical embellishments (*ornamenta*) implied clarity, one of three goals in *narratio*, a central virtue of an orator's speech. When Antonius, however, suggested similarities between the early Roman historians Cato, Pictor, and Piso, and early Greek ones, his comments muddy the waters. He appeared no longer to be speaking solely of the annalistic form, but of history writing in general. The Greek historians mentioned, Pherecydes, Hellanicus, and Acusilas, were all early historians indeed, yet none of the three can properly be called an annalist. Pherecydes was a mythographer and ethnographer, while Hellanicus and Acusilas wrote genealogies. Moreover, Cato cannot be called an annalist either.

While not speaking strictly of *annales*, Cicero's Antonius does offer interesting comments about early Roman history writing. He faulted Cato, Pictor, and Piso for their want of distinctive style or speech in their histories, but proposed that their inadequacies were not entirely their fault because they did not know the ways by which speech might be adorned: *qui neque tenent, quibus rebus ornetur oratio* (2.53). Lastly, Antonius distinguished between Antipater, who added a *maiolem sonum* to history, and all the others who were merely *narratores*, and not *exornatores rerum* (2.54). Though speaking of writing history, Antonius used terms and phrases appropriate



to oratory. This is due to context—Antonius’ remarks were part of a lengthy discourse on history writing as a proper field for orators to master, and *de Oratore* itself concerned oratorical training.<sup>59</sup>

Cicero’s treatment of *annales* suggests the annalistic form covers events year by year, is written plainly and with brevity. It also implies that history writing should be better than what passed for historical writing in Cicero’s day. Cicero hoped that from a simple starting point of the simple narration of a collection of events might come a true form of history to Rome, and that Roman historiography might progress as successfully as Greek historiography had. Cicero’s treatment of *annales*, and indeed, of history writing in general, however, focused less on historiographical form and content, and more on style.<sup>60</sup>

In *de Oratore* Cicero offered no substantive criteria for judging the content of *annales*, and what might be considered normative for this form. Servius auctus’ commentary on *Aeneid* 1.373 fills that gap with details of the kinds of events that traditionally were appropriate for *annales*.

Ita autem annales conficiebantur: tabulam dealbatam quotannis pontifex maximus habuit, in qua praescriptis consulum nominibus et aliorum magistratuum digna memoratu notare consueverat domi militaeque terra marique gesta per singulos dies. (*ad Aen.* I. 373.)

The *pontifex maximus* preserved those items worthy to remember consisting of accomplishments at home and in the army, at land and at sea. Servius auctus conceived of the *annales*, preserved on the *tabula dealbata*, as a running record of public events, both civil and military, at home and abroad. Isidore (*Orig.* 1.44.4) followed suit: *quaeque enim digna*

---

<sup>59</sup> Woodman 1988: 70-116 addresses the context of this particular passage in his Chapter 2 on “Theory: Cicero.” Woodman 1988: 82-83 claims that previous scholarship on this Ciceronian passage emphasizes Cicero’s comments on the laws of historiography and, in doing so, overlooks that these are subordinate to Antonius’ real concern, the *exaedificatio*. Brunt 1993 similarly examines the rhetorical context of Cicero’s remarks. On orators named in *Brutus*, see Sumner 1972.

<sup>60</sup> Leeman 1963: 173 and Woodman 1988: 83-95, as well as Verbrugge 1982: 210.

*memoriae domi militaeque, mari ac terrae per annos.* Additional material of *annales* can be surmised from Cato's rejection of *annales*, in which he registered his displeasure with the topics that he claimed that the form traditionally preserved: the price of grain, grain shortages, eclipses and other omens.<sup>61</sup> Sempronius Asellio, discussed below, similarly found such lists wanting.<sup>62</sup>

Further elucidation on content derives from Servius auctus and Isidore, again, and Verrius Flaccus, all of whom posited a contrast between *historia* and *annales*. In doing so, they underscored the similarities and differences between the two forms. For Servius auctus, history indicated events that people witnessed or could have witnessed. On the other hand, *annales* comprised events and deeds that happened before the present time. Servius auctus claimed:

historia est eorum temporum quae vel vidimus vel videre potuimus, dicta apo tou historein, id est videre; annales vero sunt eorum temporum, quae aetas nostra non novit. (*ad Aen.* I. 373.)

Isidore's distinction (*Orig.* 1.44.1-5) between the two terms uses Servius auctus' words, minus the Greek, as the conclusion to his comments on the three kinds of history. A diary preserves what happens each day, *annales* compile *res singulorum annorum*, and history is *multorum annorum vel temporum est cuius diligentia annui commentarii in libris delati sunt*.

Aulus Gellius similarly preserved this, on the difference between *historia* and *annales*:

"Historiam" ab "annalibus" quidam differre eo putant, quod, cum utrumque sit rerum gestarum narratio, earum tamen proprie rerum sit "historia", quibus rebus gerendis interfuerit is, qui narret (*NA* 5.18.1).

History differed from annals in that, while both were narrations of events, history more properly was a narration of those deeds and events in which the one who is telling the story participated. Gellius continued, nothing that Verrius Flaccus related in his fourth book of *de significatu verborum* that this was the opinion of many men. According to Gellius, Verrius

---

<sup>61</sup> Cato *Orig.* IV.1.

<sup>62</sup> Sempronius Asellio frag. 2.

Flaccus, though doubtful about this definition, agreed that it was a reasonable distinction, since *historia* in Greek indicated *rerum cognitionem praesentium* or knowledge of current events.<sup>63</sup> A history would mean the direct participation in events by the author. One with less first hand experience of the matters, presumably, would write *annales* of things past.

Gellius' own treatment of the term (*NA* 5.18.6) rejected this distinction, and recognized instead shared content, the *res gestae*, of *historia* and *annales*, but noted a different form:

Ita "historias" quidem esse aiunt rerum gestarum vel expositionem vel demonstrationem vel quo alio nomine id dicendum est, "annales" vero esse, cum res gestae plurium annorum observato cuiusque anni ordine deinceps componuntur.

History is the setting out or explanation of deeds but *annales* indicates events of many years brought together with some observance to the order of each year. Gellius allowed for a difference between *historia* and *annales*, based not on content but on form which emphasized the chronological structure.

Perhaps the most interesting treatment of *annales* lies in a description by the historian Sempronius Asellio, also preserved by Aulus Gellius. Two remarks in particular illuminate Asellio's understanding of the conventions of the form. Firstly, Gellius records this testimony of Asellio:

"Verum inter eos", inquit "qui annales relinquere voluissent, et eos, qui res gestas a Romanis perscribere conati essent, omnium rerum hoc interfuit. Annales libri tantummodo, quod factum quoque anno gestum sit, ea demonstrabant, id est quasi qui diarium scribunt, quam Graeci ephemerida vocant. Nobis non modo satis esse video, quod factum esset, id pronuntiare, sed etiam, quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent, demonstrare." (*Gell. NA* 5.18.8)<sup>64</sup>

---

<sup>63</sup> Verrius Flaccus in *Gell. NA* 5.18.2.

<sup>64</sup> Sempronius Asellio frag. 1.

Asellio distinguished between writers of *annales* and those who wrote of *res gestae*, seeing a difference in content as well as form. Books of annals told only of what was done and in what year it happened; Asellio believed this was much like writing a diary. Asellio's own methodology separated him from those historians he valued less. He would do more than just say what happened, but would elucidate by what plan and by what reason things were done. Undoubtedly influenced by Polybius, Asellio's approach to history writing was that history was to be based on a deeper analysis of events.

Asellio explained further his historiographical choice. These remarks attend less to content, style or form, and more to the purpose of history writing:

"Nam neque alacriores" inquit "ad rempublicam defendendam neque signiores ad rem perperam faciendam annales libri commovere quicquam possunt. Scribere autem, bellum initum quo consule et quo confectum sit et quis triumphans introierit, et eo libro, quae in bello gesta sint, non praedicare autem interea quid senatus decreverit aut quae lex rogatione lata sit, neque quibus consiliis ea gesta sint, iterare: id fabulas pueris est narrare, non historias scribere." (Gell. NA 5.18.9)<sup>65</sup>

Asellio declared annalistic writing to be useless in motivating readers to defend their country or preventing them from doing wrong. Annals were not capable of moving readers either for good or for ill. Asellio prescribed to history a function beyond the mere preserving of stories; Asellio wanted his readers to use history, and not view it as entertainment. Further, Asellio charged that to write about under whose consulship a war began and ended and who entered the city triumphantly, and in this book to write of what things were done in what war, but not to mention what the senate decreed and what law or proposal was introduced, nor to recount with what plans things were done—this then was to write *fabulas*—stories—for children, and not to write history.

---

<sup>65</sup> Sempronius Asellio frag. 2.

In sum, treatments of *annales* by Cicero, Servius auctus, Isidore, Verrius Flaccus and Sempronius Asellio reveal some common ground. In prose *annales* generally indicated a literary work that, influenced by the annual lists kept by the *pontifex maximus*, described events in year-by-year format or adhered to a strong chronological structure. Content of *annales* comprised accomplishments and deeds, both internal and external, at home and abroad; subject matter generally consisted of events along the lines of those recorded in the pontifical chronicles. The focus of annalists, to the disappointment of Sempronius Asellio, for example, remained on the “what” and less the “how.” Most usages in these authors also understood *annales* as indicating events of a remote past in which the author did not participate, *historia* indicating more recent events, and ones which an author witnessed. Stylistically, *annales* differed from *historia* in that their authors treated their subjects with few embellishments—or none at all, as Cicero complained.

Not all *annales* in the Republic were written in prose. *Annales* in verse also influenced the Roman use of the term. Ennius’ *Annales*, a hexameter account in eighteen books of the history of Rome, written up until just before his death in 169, drew on the pontifical chronicles (*annales*) and contributed to the annalistic form as well. Ennius regularly inserted magistracies, triumphs, campaign victories and defeats, doings of the Senate and more. Moreover, he structured his epic on a chronological framework. In doing so, Ennius provided for his poem a structure which was familiar to the Romans as well as facts which “lent his text an extra-textual authority, since they suggest (ed) that his *annales* had been organized along the year-by-year model of the pontifical chronicles.”<sup>66</sup> Ennius was not the first to write from material drawn from the pontifical

---

<sup>66</sup> Beck 2005: 3. Gildenhard 2003 poses a different but compelling argument: that Ennius’ closest model in Rome’s memorial culture was Fulvius Nobilior’s temple to Hercules (which

chronicle, as he wrote after Fabius Pictor, but the reputation and impact of his epic provided credibility for the annalistic structure.<sup>67</sup>

Modern uses and conceptions of the terms *Annales* and annalists are equally complex. In the nineteenth and twentieth century, the term annalist usually indicated a historian of little merit.<sup>68</sup> The term was applied to suggest a historian whose history added little to the study of Rome. This attitude was so prevalent that entries in canonical reference works, e.g., *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (s.v. annals, annalists) speak of it. Further, annalist signified any and all of the fragmentary historians writing before Livy regardless of the historiographical form employed. Recently debate around a proper definition of the term has been fruitful. Firstly, Verbrugge has looked for a definition that rests on the ancient uses of the word, as I have.<sup>69</sup> Secondly, Chassignet's three-volume edition of the fragmentary historians, each entitled with some version of the term *Annales*, has been rightly criticized for appearing to make uniform the disparate forms the fragments utilized.<sup>70</sup> Such critical reviews continue to emphasize the necessity of seeing individuality, competing approaches, and unique aims in the early historians. Indeed Marincola has called for a recognition of flexibility in historical genre.<sup>71</sup> Borrowing from contemporary genre studies, and consistent with literary development in the middle to late Republic, an understanding of historiography's generic instability (pessimistically named) or

---

incorporated a calendar, temple dedications, lists of magistrates and more). This argument has been happily taken up; see Goldberg 2006 and Sciarrino 2006.

<sup>67</sup> On Ennius, see Skutsch 1985, in particular, the introduction on Ennius' sources of the *Annales*. Skutsch believed Ennius modeled his *Annales* (including the title) on the *Annales maximi*, which we know certainly did not exist in a literary form (if ever) when Ennius was writing.

<sup>68</sup> See Cornell 1986a, esp. 55-57.

<sup>69</sup> Verbrugge 1989.

<sup>70</sup> For example, see Beck 2005. Beck and Walter's own two-volume edition of the fragmentary historians is called *Die frühen römischen Historiker*, thus neatly avoiding the term.

<sup>71</sup> Marincola 1999.

generic fluidity (more positively titled) affords a more open appraisal of the fragmentary historians at work, and this has been a guiding framework for this study.<sup>72</sup>

Also complicating our understanding of the terms *annales* and annalist are the *annales maximi*, the records of the pontifical chronicles traditionally said to have been published by the *pontifex maximus* P. Mucius Scaevola in 80 books. This work has long been held as having provided a skeleton of material for the early Roman historians which they then fleshed out. Frier, and more recently Rüpke, along with a number of others, have worked to minimize that historiographical notion. Frier does so by noting that the *annales maximi*, derived from the stuff of the *tabulae*, the whitened boards, were only one source among many which the historians used. Frier 1979/1999 argued that Servius auctus (*ad Aen.* 1.373) does not state explicitly that the 80 volumes were published by Scaevola, and indeed that most knowledge of the *annales maximi* is derived from the Augustan writer Verrius Flaccus.<sup>73</sup> He saw instead the material of the white boards compiled at the end of each year in a *liber annalis*, which presumably was available to those who wanted to consult documentary evidence, and Scaevola ended this custom. The first use of the term *annales maximi* comes from Cicero *de Oratore* 2.52, who notes only that deeds and events were posted on the white boards up until the time of Scaevola, without crediting him with any publication. Frier called Scaevola's edition of the *annales maximi* in 80 volumes a "phantom of modern scholarly speculation" and worried that the chronicle has been cast too much and too often as the one main source of the annalistic tradition and its form.<sup>74</sup> Rüpke, more recently, goes even further and hypothesizes that the publication of the *annales maximi* was "a gargantuan fraud of literary history," that Scaevola merely wrote a

---

<sup>72</sup> For recent surveys on contemporary genre studies, see Dowd et al. 2006, Frow 2006 (and the older Beebe 1994).

<sup>73</sup> Frier 1979/1999: 21-22.

<sup>74</sup> Frier 1979/1999: 272.

competing history, publishing a work on Rome under the title *annales maximi*.<sup>75</sup> At best a “stylized version of the original contents of the chronicle,” a published version of the *annales maximi* appears not to have been utilized by the fragmentary historians.<sup>76</sup>

Annalist here signifies a historian who wrote of *res internae* and *externae*, of magistrates and corn prices and prodigies and more; the annalist writes of material that might have been recorded in the pontifical chronicles. Thus my construct “annalist” simply marks a historian who proceeded year-by-year, and wrote *ab urbe condita*. Such use of the term annalist does not indicate ignorance of the rich debate regarding the source material which might later have been published as the *annales maximi*, which shaped ancient understanding of *annales*. The annalist stands in sharp contrast to those who wrote *res gestae*, *commentarii*, and monographs.

Though there is no word in Latin for writers of *annales*, there are a number of Roman authors whom the Romans themselves associated with annalistic writing. Today their work survives only in fragments, but a sense of their historiographical aims can be gleaned from the meager remains.<sup>77</sup> Did the first historians of Rome write in annalistic fashion for a particular reason? What was their purpose? Why did each choose to construct their history of Rome on an annalistic framework?

### **Fabius Pictor**

The first histories of Rome by Romans were written in annalistic form at the end of the Second Punic War. Cicero *de Oratore* (2.52) named Cato, Fabius Pictor and Lucius Calpurnius Piso Frugi as Rome’s early historians. Fabius Pictor is indeed the earliest annalist, but Cato avoided the form during the 160’s, and Piso, an annalist, served as consul well after Pictor in

---

<sup>75</sup> Rüpke 1993; quotation is from Gildenhard 2003: 94.

<sup>76</sup> Frier 1979/1999: 272.

<sup>77</sup> On the early annalists in general and the formation of the annalistic tradition, see Badian 1966, Cornell 1986a and 1986b, Forsythe 2000: 1-11, Forsythe 2005: 59-77, Beck 2007, and Wiseman 2007.



133. Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 1.6.2) similarly names Pictor, and adds Alimentus as one of the earliest writers sketching the history of Rome, and relates that Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus were both at work during the Second Punic War. Writing in Greek, these Romans strove to serve a broad audience—both a Greek audience as well as an educated upper class in Rome; in doing so, they desired to present themselves as versed in Greek culture and as participants in a larger intellectual world. The Second Punic War was very likely the catalyst for their writing.

Both Livy (2.40.10) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Ant. Rom.* 7.71.1) describe Fabius Pictor as Rome's earliest historian.<sup>78</sup> Fabius' work, the first history of Rome written by a Roman, was published around 210, and possibly as late as 202.<sup>79</sup> An old patrician family, the Fabii had received notice in Roman life as early as 304, when one Fabius painted a newly dedicated temple to Salus on the Quirinal, hence earning the name Pictor, which was retained by his descendants.<sup>80</sup> Of Fabius' life we know a general outline. His date of birth is uncertain, perhaps as early as 270 or as late as 240.<sup>81</sup> As evidenced in his fragments, he battled against the Ligurians in 233, and the Gauls in 225.<sup>82</sup> He became a senator before the Second Punic War. He also participated in the battle of Lake Trasimene.<sup>83</sup> On the recommendation of his cousin, Fabius

---

<sup>78</sup> Liv. 2.40.10 = frag. 21. Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 7.71.1 = frag. 20. Studies (and biographies): Münzer 1909: 1836-1841; Gelzer 1933: 129-166; Timpe 1972: 928-969; Verbrugghe 1979: 2157-2173; Frier 1970: 114-143; Frier 1979/1999: 227-254; von Albrecht 1997: 299-301; Beck and Walter 2001: 55-61; and Chassignet 1996/2003: LIV-LXXIII.

<sup>79</sup> Chassignet 1996/2003: LVI summarizes the debate regarding the date of publication; one school has Fabius publishing after the Second Punic War, another during the Second Punic War. Chassignet herself believes it more probable that publication was during the war.

<sup>80</sup> Chassignet 1996/2003: LIV.

<sup>81</sup> Chassignet 1996/2003: LV. Frier 1970: 116 suggests a birthdate of 260; Frier 1979/1999: 231 and Verbrugghe 1979: 2163 both suggest around 270; and Beloch 1926: 95 prefers a date of 240.

<sup>82</sup> Pictor's involvement with the Ligurians: Plin. HN 10.71 = frag. 29. On the Gauls, Eutr. 3.5 = frag. 30.

<sup>83</sup> Liv. 22. 7.1-4 = frag. 32.

traveled to Delphi to consult the oracle on behalf of the Roman Senate after the debacle at Cannae in 216.<sup>84</sup> Little is given by way of explanation for the choice of Fabius to visit the oracle; perhaps an interest in Greece, his Greek language skills, his good standing in the Senate, and his relationship to Fabius Verrucosus (Cunctator) were sufficient.<sup>85</sup>

Fabius wrote only one work, but the date of its publication is as unclear as his birth and death dates.<sup>86</sup> Cicero called it *Graeci annales*, a characterization that highlights its main components: that Fabius wrote in Greek and that he wrote in an annalistic form.<sup>87</sup> Today only thirty-two fragments of that work survive.<sup>88</sup> Fragments that survive in Latin attest to a translation of Pictor, quite possibly carried out by one of his own relatives. The Latin translation of Pictor can be dated very early.<sup>89</sup>

Pictor's decision to tell the story of Rome in Greek is often a primary focus of scholarship on him. No history of Rome had yet been written by a Roman, although Greeks had already done so at least tangentially, particularly Timaeus of Tauromenium who treated the history of Greeks in the west down to the first Punic War.<sup>90</sup> Pictor was thus on his own, charting a course through waters that were not unknown, but Greek. Pictor's contemporary, Naevius, was writing

---

<sup>84</sup> Chassignet 1996/2003: LV, from Plut. *Fab.* 18.3 and Liv. 22.57.4 and 23.11.1-6.

<sup>85</sup> Badian 1966: 2 posits that Fabius' interest in Hellenic culture was the springboard, suggesting that he "must have been known" for it.

<sup>86</sup> Frier 1979/1999 devotes chapter 11, "Fabii Pictores," to an attempt to date Pictor's *floruit* and his history. He concludes that Pictor's *annales* were produced in the last decade of the third century (p. 239).

<sup>87</sup> Cic. *Div.* 1.43 = frag. 3.

<sup>88</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1996/2003: 16-54; Peter 1914: 5-39; Peter 1914: 112-116 (Latin fragments); *FGrH* no. 809; Frier 1970: 152-225; Beck and Walter 2001: 62-136. Thirty-two are collected in the 1996/2003 edition by Chassignet; similarly, Beck and Walter collect thirty-two fragments, and Peter 1914 collects twenty-eight. Since Pictor wrote in Greek, Jacoby also assembled his fragments as well in *FGrH* no. 809.

<sup>89</sup> On the Latin translation of Fabius Pictor, see Münzer 1909: 1841-1843; Peter 1914: LXXV-LXXXI; Gelzer: 1933:148; Frier 1970: 121-128; Frier 1979/1999: 246-253; Beck and Walter 2001: 60-61, and Chassignet 1996/2003: LVIII-LX.

<sup>90</sup> On Timaeus, see Brown 1958 and Momigliano 1977.

a Latin historical poem of Rome while Pictor created his prose history. Latin naturally was the language of oratory in Rome (Appius Claudius' speeches, for example), as well as funeral speeches (e.g., Caecilius Metellus for his father).<sup>91</sup> In both prose and poetry, Latin was in use. But Pictor did not choose to write in Latin or to create a historical style in Latin; he would leave that for others. Writing in Greek made sense because Greek was the language of the cultured elite, and Greek would provide a more accessible medium to convey a history of Rome to the world outside the city itself. In fact, the discovery of a second century inscription in Taormina which includes Fabius Pictor in a list of Greek historians suggests that Pictor's book might have enjoyed some widespread popularity.<sup>92</sup> But, more importantly, Pictor's decision to write in Greek allowed him access to the language and conventions of historiography.

Writing history was a Greek undertaking, and thus the ambitious endeavor that the Roman Pictor undertook utilized their terms and their notions of how history was crafted. In the third century, history writing was done in Greek even by non-Greeks. Manetho wrote Egypt's history in Greek, Berossus wrote Babylonian history in Greek, and a Greek translation of the Bible was created by the Jewish people. The Greeks in turn wrote histories of other civilizations in Greek; for example, Menander of Ephesus wrote Phoenician history, or at least a history of Tyre, in Greek. Indeed, local history in Greek was a central component of Greek historiography and in some ways Pictor's history of Rome was just an offshoot of this.<sup>93</sup> Though Pictor was writing a history of his own society, his history in Greek was intended to relate Rome's growth and

---

<sup>91</sup> von Albrecht 1997: 364; Momigliano 1990: 91.

<sup>92</sup> Manganaro 1974. See also Dillery 2002: 1-23 on how the inscription grouping demonstrates differences between Pictor and other non-Greek writers of local history in Greek (i.e., Manetho and Berossus).

<sup>93</sup> So Frier 1979/1999: 206.

development to the rest of the world.<sup>94</sup> He would naturally and perhaps necessarily employ Greek historical methodologies and principles.

When Pictor began writing his history, many Greek historiographical models were available to him. Already the Greeks had crafted histories in many forms—foundation stories, genealogies, “tragic history,” universal history, even biography, and local histories (e.g., Attidography). No tradition of yearly chronicles, however, was part of that historiography.<sup>95</sup>

Why did Pictor reject these options? The answer may lie in Pictor’s *Romanitas*. Pictor’s choice of form appears relatively simple. As a Roman, Pictor would have been familiar with the tradition of outlining significant events of each year. The pontifical annals, long in existence by this point, offered not just material, but also a structure that would have been appropriate for Rome’s history, and acceptable, and uniquely native.

Unfortunately, no fragment containing any programmatic intent of Pictor survives, nor does any fragment that manifests Pictor’s decision to choose or reject an annalistic format. Indeed, the annalistic form is not always readily apparent. Though described as *Annales* by Cicero (*Div.* 1.43), and referred to similarly by Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 1.6.2), the extant fragments (none of which is a direct quotation from Pictor) suggest that Pictor’s history was not quite like the pontifical annals.<sup>96</sup> Unlike the pontifical annals, Pictor’s work did not treat each year or period at similar length. For instance, Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 1.6.2) relates that Pictor (and Alimentus later) treated Rome’s foundation at great length, cursorily treated the following years, and returned to a more detailed study in their handling of the Punic Wars. The surviving fragments bear witness. Fragment 7c declares that Fabius’ story about the twins, Romulus and

---

<sup>94</sup> Badian 1966: 3; Gelzer 1934: 50 (= 1964: 98).

<sup>95</sup> Jacoby 1949: 176-178.

<sup>96</sup> Badian 1966: 3, footnote 12, agrees with Bömer’s (1952) categorization of Pictor as an annalist *contra* Gelzer 1934: 50.

Remus, comes in his first book, as one would suppose. Further, in fragment 23, Gellius (*NA* 5.4.1-5) preserves an etymology from the fourth book of the *Fabii annales*, which he called *bonae atque sinceræ vetustatis libri*.<sup>97</sup> The derivation of the word in question is not of great significance. More interesting is Gellius' remark that Fabius' words come from his *libro quarto* in a narrative about an event which took place after the Gauls had captured Rome. This date suggests that by the fourth volume of his history, Fabius Pictor had already reached the year 390.

Numerous fragments of Pictor discuss Aeneas or stories related to his arrival (e.g., frags. 1, 3, 6), the founding of the city (frags. 7a and b and c), tales from the regal period (e.g., Sabine women in frag. 9, Tarpeia in frag. 10, Lucretia in frag. 17), as well as the kings (e.g., Tarquin in frag. 12, Servius Tullius in frag. 13). More recent events, closer to Pictor's time, appear in fragments 27 and 28 (on Hamilcar), 29 (battle with Ligurians, ca. 238), 30 (encroaching Gauls in 225), 31 (Hasdrubal's ambition), and 32 (Lake Trasimene, 217). Pictor appears to have not written beyond his journey to Delphi in 216.<sup>98</sup>

Pictor's fragments provide some evidence about the scope, nature, and style of his history. Indeed, though these fragments represent a small fraction of Pictor's history, a sense of his historiographical aims can be discerned, and they contain elements which would become characteristic of Roman annalistic style. Pictor began *ab urbe condita*, proceeded in a chronological fashion, emphasized matters of local significance (customs, institutions, etiologies,

---

<sup>97</sup> Though Gellius calls Fabius *grammaticus*, and hence some would not credit this fragment to him, others have found it useful for its content. Peter classifies this fragment as part of the Latin translation of Pictor (frag. 6 Latin Peter), but Jacoby and Frier both accept this fragment as Pictor.

<sup>98</sup> That Pictor himself wrote up the embassy is recorded by Appian *Hann.* 27.116. Frier 1970: 224 accepts this passage as a fragment, but, on the whole, this passage is not so regarded (e.g., Peter 1914, Beck and Walter 2001 and Chassignet 1996/2003 exclude it from their collections) because it merely refers to Pictor writing it up and does not provide any information about Pictor's narrative of it. On fragments vs. epitomes, see Brunt 1980b.

etymologies, topography), regularly provided names of standing consuls or generals, inserted biographical material, lauded heroic action, displayed Roman patriotism, and privileged Rome. Other fragments demonstrate Pictor's knowledge of Greek historiographical conventions. Fragment 8, for example, reports the colonization of Rome in the first year of the eighth Olympiad. Even here, however, Pictor was merely translating for his Greek audience a Roman chronology.

Fabius Pictor's insistence on history as inquiry and his connecting of politics and morality remained signal characteristics of later historians. Cincius Alimentus, Fabius' contemporary, and Acilius and Postumius Albinus followed this lead; all three were senators who took up history writing, and did so in Greek. Senatorial historiography thus forms the opening chapter of Roman historical writing, a field which long remained a suitable occupation for the Roman politician.

### **Lucius Cincius Alimentus**

The biography of Pictor's contemporary, Lucius Cincius Alimentus, derives almost solely from Livy. From a plebeian family, Cincius participated late in the Second Punic War in a variety of capacities.<sup>99</sup> He served as praetor in 210, and was given the task of protecting Sicily with two legions.<sup>100</sup> In 209, after the siege at Syracuse, Cincius was named propraetor for Sicily.<sup>101</sup> Although he was given further responsibilities in the next year, 208, including the

---

<sup>99</sup> Münzer 1899: 2556. See also Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXIII. Studies (and biographies): Hertz 1842; Peter 1914: CI-CXVI; Bardon 1952: 30-31; Heurgon 1964; Badian 1966: 6; Frier 1970: 143-151; Frier 1979: 206-207; Verbrugge 1982; Meister 1990: 148-149; von Albrecht 1997: 302; Beck and Walter 2001: 137-138; Suerbaum 2002: 370-372; Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXIII-LXXIX.

<sup>100</sup> Liv. 26.23.1; 26.28.3; 26.28.11; 27.5.1; Broughton 1952 I: 279. All references to Broughton 1952 refer to page number, and not year.

<sup>101</sup> Liv. 27.7.12; 27.8.16.

siege of Locri, the arrival of Hannibal hindered his task, and he returned to Rome.<sup>102</sup> He was sent immediately to Venusia under the consul T. Quinctius Crispinus.<sup>103</sup> Livy reports that Cincius was to assist in preparation of defensive measures, but before this he was captured by Hannibal.<sup>104</sup> This extraordinary event was to prove useful to Cincius in his history—from Hannibal himself Cincius learned about the events of the war (frag. 10).<sup>105</sup> After Zama, Cincius probably was freed.<sup>106</sup>

Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 1.6.2) also named Cincius as one of the earliest historians of Rome. According to Dionysius, Cincius' history, much like Pictor's, related both ancient and more recent events. Cincius dealt only cursorily with events further removed. Few fragments, only thirteen, of Cincius' history survive.<sup>107</sup>

According to these few fragments, Cincius' history addressed the founding of Rome (frag. 6), the story of Romulus and Remus (frag. 5), Tarpeia (frag. 7) and the death of Maelius (frag. 8), all from Rome's early years. Later fragments record Cincius' participation in the Second Punic War, in particular his capture and his subsequent opportunity to learn from Hannibal himself about the Carthaginian crossing of the Rhone (frag. 10). Etymological stories (e.g., on Faunus, frag. 2) round out the rest. The latest surviving material in Cincius' history refers to his capture

---

<sup>102</sup> Liv. 27.25.14; 27.26.5; 27.28.13.

<sup>103</sup> Liv. 27.29.3.

<sup>104</sup> Liv. 31.38.3 = frag. 10.

<sup>105</sup> Liv. 21.38.3-5.

<sup>106</sup> Liv. 30.37.3-6.

<sup>107</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1996/2003: 54-59; Peter 1914: 40-43 (7 frags.); *FGrH* no. 810; Beck and Walter 2001: 137-147 (13 frags). Frier 1970: 226-237 also collects Cincius' fragments (7). Verbrugge 1982 argued successfully for the later addition of five fragments to Cincius' corpus; Peter had not accepted two of these because he doubted the authenticity of their source, the now widely accepted *Origo Gentis Romanae*. Three others were concerned with etymology, a field which Peter concluded belonged more properly to a grammarian's work, and less a historian's. Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXV- LXXVIII offers a précis of the concerns regarding Cincius' fragments, including the possible identification of Cincius with another L. Cincius, who was a contemporary of Varro.

by Hannibal; Cincius probably wrote his history some time after his release.<sup>108</sup> Two brief remarks, both preserved in *Origo Gentis Romanae* (frags. 3 and 4), tell us that Cincius' history was at least two books long. Fragment 3 states that the prescription against moving the household gods was written in the second book of Cincius. Fragment 4 relates that the story of Tiberius Silvius was recorded in the first book of Lucius Cincius and the third book of Lutatius. Both fragments are ultimately unhelpful in allowing us to gauge the length of the work.

Other *testimonia* do, however, provide information on Cincius' credibility. Livy 7.3.7 (frag. 9) calls Cincius *diligens talium monumentorum auctor*.<sup>109</sup> Elsewhere, Livy (21.38.2-5 = frag. 10) makes use of Cincius' firsthand information about the numbers of troops of Hannibal that crossed into Italy. Livy suggests that Cincius would have convinced him *maxime* except for the fact that he probably included the Gauls and Ligurians in his figures. Hence Cincius' uniqueness as an eyewitness is useful to Livy but is tempered by skepticism of Cincius' incorrect numbers. Nevertheless, Livy returns to Cincius again for numbers lost by Hannibal after he crossed the Rhone, numbers which Livy reports that Cincius *ex ipso autem audisse Hannibale*.

Cincius' surviving fragments tell us little about his choice of form, or more properly, his decision to use that form or his estimation of it. That he wrote as an annalist is discernable in his association with Fabius Pictor (frags. 1, 5, 7), and his imitation of Pictor in topics. The subjects of the fragments are indeed appropriate for what would become the norm for an annalistic history—they recount foundation stories, include etymological passages which touch on religious and local institutions, interject autobiographical material, and conclude with

---

<sup>108</sup> Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXV.

<sup>109</sup> That Cincius might demonstrate a special interest in monuments has led Frier 1970: 226 to assign this fragment to Cincius the antiquarian and not the historian; Verbrugge 1982: 320 attributes it to the historian. Peter's collection does not include it but Beck and Walter's edition does.



contemporary events, as Pictor himself did. Ultimately, the paucity of fragments limits our understanding of the scope and or nature of Cincius' history. Why he chose to write *annales* is never clearly stated.

A gap of over forty years exists between the first annalists of the Hannibalic period and the next practitioners of the form. In those intervening years, no Roman historian wrote of Rome's ascension in the Mediterranean in any full-length narrative. When that rise was documented, it was told not in an annalistic form, but in other forms, the historical letters of the Cornelia Scipiones, *praetextae* of Ennius, Pacuvius and Accius, and the epic *Annales* of Ennius. The next Roman annalists include figures such as Gaius Acilius, translator in 155 for the visiting Greek philosophers in the Senate meeting over the Oropus controversy, and Aulus Postumius Albinus, urban praetor in 155 who presided over the Senate meeting, and later consul in 151.<sup>110</sup> When Gaius Acilius and A. Postumius Albinus took up the annalistic format again in their histories, still written in Greek, they were by no means rejecting the forms just listed. Those forms were suitable for different purposes, but their own histories reflected the tradition set by Pictor and Cincius and continued yearly in the pontifical annals. And while Latin was the choice of language for epic and *praetextae*, the historical letters of the Cornelia Scipiones had been written in Greek.<sup>111</sup> And Polybius himself, the great Greek historian of the age, wrote in Greek. Writing Roman history in Greek was still possible—though reaching the end of its time.

### **Aulus Postumius Albinus**

Aulus Postumius Albinus<sup>112</sup> came from a distinguished patrician family, including an ancestor who had fought at Lake Regillus.<sup>113</sup> Son of A. Postumius Luscus (cos. 180, censor

---

<sup>110</sup> Broughton 1952 I: 454.

<sup>111</sup> Frier 1970: 238-241.

<sup>112</sup> Full name derives from Liv. 45.4.7; see also *Fasti Cap.*, for the year 151.

174), the younger Postumius enjoyed a rigorous Greek education in his childhood, in part due to his own father's similar interests.<sup>114</sup> Polybius (39.1.3) disdainfully describes Postumius' zeal to acquire both Greek culture and language. His patrician background and his father's own political career allowed him a military and political career at Rome. Charged with the task of persuading Perseus to capitulate to the Romans, he served as a young man under L. Aemilius Paullus in Greece in 168.<sup>115</sup> Although Postumius was unsuccessful in these efforts, Aemilius Paullus later put him in charge of guarding Perseus and his son Philip at Amphipolis.<sup>116</sup> A gap of some thirteen years follows; no sources describe this time. Postumius appears again as *praetor urbanus* in 155, and in that role, because the consuls were occupied outside of Rome, he presided over the session in the Roman Senate which received the delegation of philosophers from Athens concerning Oropus.<sup>117</sup> The three philosophers, Carneades, Diogenes, and Critolaus, were well treated by Postumius, due to his passion for all things Greek, and indeed the Senate found on their behalf.<sup>118</sup> During this same year, Postumius also advocated longer detention of the Achaean hostages, thus perhaps demonstrating loyalty to the actions of his father who had led the delegation after Pydna which had sent the hostages to Rome.<sup>119</sup> Polybius, one of the hostages, recounts that Postumius presided over the proceedings in such a way that he

---

<sup>113</sup> Polyb. 39.1.2. Studies (and biographies): Peter 1914: CXXIV-CXXVI; Frier 1970: 253-262; Beck and Walter 2001: 225-227, and Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXIX-LXXXI. See also Münzer 1953: 903-908. Frier 1970 was most helpful for the following sketch of Postumius' life.

<sup>114</sup> Broughton 1952 I: 387, and 404. For a stemma of Postumius' family, see Münzer 1953: 915, and Frier 1970: 254.

<sup>115</sup> Liv. 45.4.7.

<sup>116</sup> Liv. 45.28.11.

<sup>117</sup> Broughton 1952 I: 448. On the embassy from Athens, see Cic. *Acad.* 2.137, Gell. *NA* 6.14.8-10, and Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 22-23. On the consuls, P. Cornelius Scipio Nasica and M. Claudius Marcellus, see Frier 1970: 248 and Broughton 1952 I: 448.

<sup>118</sup> Frier 1970: 251-252.

<sup>119</sup> Polyb. 33.3.3-8. On Postumius' father, cf. Frier 1970: 256-258 and Münzer 1953: 925-929.

manipulated the vote.<sup>120</sup> Three options were placed before the Senate: release of the hostages, opposition to this, or postponement of release until a later date. Postumius, Polybius argued, offered only the choice of freeing the hostages or not, thus effectively creating a majority of those opposed to liberation at the present time. Postumius' actions in this matter may well explain Polybius' harsh words towards Postumius.<sup>121</sup>

Postumius later helped to arrange peace with Attalus II and Prusias in 154, and served as consul in 151.<sup>122</sup> In his consulate he and his consular colleague, L. Licinius Lucullus, were thrown into jail by the tribunes because they had mistreated troops so severely.<sup>123</sup> He later retired to Thebes rather than participate in the battle at Phocis, and yet was the first to write to the Senate describing the Roman victory.<sup>124</sup> Polybius remarks that Postumius pretended to be ill to avoid fighting at Phocis. Nevertheless, says Polybius, his missive to Rome supplied enough detail so that Postumius appeared to have actually participated.

In 146 after the sack of Corinth, Postumius was part of the delegation of ten men, perhaps even the head of the delegation, who were commissioned by L. Mummius to assure Roman control of newly conquered Greece, and to put the new province in order.<sup>125</sup> If he was chief of this delegation, Postumius took up the position which his father had held some twenty years earlier after Pydna. Postumius received statues created in his honor at Corinth, Olympia, and

---

<sup>120</sup> Polyb. 33.3.3-8.

<sup>121</sup> Frier 1970: 258 states that Polybius wrote that Postumius blocked the release of the Achaeans for "perverse reasons."

<sup>122</sup> Polyb. 33.13.4.10. Broughton 1952 I: 450 and 454.

<sup>123</sup> Liv. *Per.* 48.16.

<sup>124</sup> Polyb. 39.1.10-11.

<sup>125</sup> Frier 1970: 259-259 notes that though Polybius describes the commission and their work, he never names Postumius as part of it: e.g. 39.3.3 and 39.3.9. Cicero, in *Att.* 13.30.2, noted Polybius' reticence. From Atticus Cicero later learned the names, including Postumius, whose statue at Corinth Atticus himself saw, *Att.* 13.32.3.

Delphi.<sup>126</sup> Though a philhellene, Postumius Albinus was demonstrably a loyal citizen of Rome—no amount of respect for Greek culture changed his commitment to Roman policies that placed Rome as the conqueror and Greece as the defeated.

Polybius recorded that Postumius tried to write both a poem and a pragmatic history in Greek.<sup>127</sup> Only four fragments of that history remain.<sup>128</sup> Of these, fragments 1a) and 1b) recount that Postumius, in his preface to his history, asked his readers to forgive him for his inelegant writing due to his inexperience with Greek.<sup>129</sup> Fragment 2 (Servius auct. *Aen.* 9.707) concerns the etymology of Baiae, which Servius auctus declares Postumius wrote in *de adventu Aeneae*. This reference might refer to the poem that Postumius wrote. Fragment 3, on the battle between Ascanius and Mezentius and Lausus, similarly derives from *de adventu Aeneae*, according to Ps. Aurelius Victor (*OGR* 15.1-4).<sup>130</sup> The last fragment, fragment 4, relates a remark of Postumius describing Brutus in his first book. Since both Cato and Polybius commented on Postumius' preface, at least that piece was published by Cato's death in 149, and the rest by Polybius' death in 118.<sup>131</sup>

These fragments do little to enlighten a reader about the nature, scope, or aims of Postumius' history. Fragment 1 does offer some information about historiographical form—

---

<sup>126</sup> Cic. *Att.* 13.32.3.

<sup>127</sup> Polyb. 39.1.3.

<sup>128</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1996/2003: 59-61; Peter 1914: 53-54 (2 fragments); Peter 1914: 53 (1 Latin fragment); *FGrH* no. 812; Frier 1970: 273-279; Beck and Walter 2001: 228-231 (4 fragments).

<sup>129</sup> Frag. 1a) = Polyb. 39.1.4. Frag. 1b) = Gell. *NA* 11.8.2-3.

<sup>130</sup> Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXXII accepts both fragments as suitable material for an early book in Postumius' prose history. Frier 1970: 264 argues that a poetic work on Aeneas by Postumius would had to have been mentioned by the scholiasts to the *Aeneid* as a precedent, and hence Frier saw these two fragments as part of a prose work by Postumius, but not belonging to the pragmatic history mentioned by Polybius. Peter 1914 accepts Servius auctus but does not accept the fragment preserved in *Origo*; Peter consistently does not accept any fragment of any historian deriving from this source. Beck and Walter 2001 accept both.

<sup>131</sup> Frier 1970: 263.

Polybius remarked that Postumius attempted to write a pragmatic, meaning serious, history.<sup>132</sup> To Polybius, a pragmatic history signified one that privileged more contemporary events and avoided types of history such as genealogies and foundation stories.<sup>133</sup> This would intimate that Postumius' history differed from those of his predecessors Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus. The extant fragments, unfortunately, do not demonstrate this. Moreover, perhaps Polybius' comment was not to be taken as truth but further degradation of Postumius.<sup>134</sup> The two fragments from *de adventu Aeneae*, if they are part of his history, and a third concerning Brutus imply a history which was annalistic, began *ab urbe condita*, emphasized foundational stories, and focused less on contemporary events. In this respect, Postumius wrote a history that modeled itself on the histories of Pictor and Cincius. The terms employed to describe Postumius' history are not helpful in determining either form or purpose. Whereas Polybius called it a pragmatic history, Aulus Gellius described Postumius' work as *res Romanas*, Servius auctus and Ps. Aurelius Victor used the phrase *de adventu Aeneae*, and Macrobius spoke of Postumius' *annali primo*.<sup>135</sup>

Although few fragments remain, Postumius is well known, chiefly for the chiding he received from his contemporaries, Polybius and Cato, both historians. Postumius' own words for his inadequacies are no longer extant, but Polybius, Gellius, and Cato all preserved his request for pardon from his audience for his inelegant Greek. Such a plea allows us to assume an audience for Postumius of upper class educated Romans and/or Greeks, for whom Pictor and

---

<sup>132</sup> Polybius' choice of word *enecheiresen* means simply "to attempt" or "to take on," but in the context of Polybius' dislike of Postumius might be construed as meaning that Postumius failed at writing a serious history.

<sup>133</sup> Polyb. 9.1-2.

<sup>134</sup> Frier 1970: 262 states that Polybius' words on Postumius' form being pragmatic are "highly ironic."

<sup>135</sup> Respectively, in frag. 1a, frag. 1b, frag. 2, frag. 3, and frag. 4.

Cincius Alimentus had written as well.<sup>136</sup> Gellius, drawing from Cornelius Nepos, provided Postumius' charming disclaimer: *nam sum homo Romanus natus in Latio*.<sup>137</sup> Cato, in particular, was displeased with Postumius' decision to write in Greek when no one had pressured him to do so (although had the Amphictionic Council demanded it Cato might have been more lenient).<sup>138</sup> Cato's argument implied that, in the mid-second century, Postumius had a choice of language in which to write his history. Historiography in Rome was changing—Cato himself was working on the first Roman history in Latin.

Postumius' choice of historiographical form gets lost in the din raised over his inadequate language skills. Polybius remarked that Postumius not only did not have mastery of the language but he also did not have mastery of the treatment or arrangement (*kata ton cheirismen oikonomias*), which may imply a lack of ability in Greek historiographical conventions. Regardless, Postumius' history seems not to have greatly influenced later writers. Cicero says Postumius wrote a *historia* in Greek (not *annales*), and called him *litteratus* and *disertus*, presumably for his speeches which Cicero might have known.<sup>139</sup> Dionysius of Halicarnassus does not mention him, whether unknown or unremarkable, we cannot say.

### Gaius Acilius

Lastly, Gaius Acilius, a contemporary of Postumius, wrote a history in Greek too, and he is traditionally grouped with those Roman writers in Greek not just for language choice but also for

---

<sup>136</sup> Polyb. 39.1.6 preserves Cato's opinion, part of which can be found as well in Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 12.6.

<sup>137</sup> Gell. *NA* 11.8.5. = frag. 1b. Gellius claims that this line was derived from Cornelius Nepos on Postumius. The citation in Latin suggests that a Latin translation of Postumius' Greek history may have been in circulation. See also Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXXIII. Fragment 4 (on Brutus) is similarly in Latin, and adds weight to the argument that a Latin version might have existed. Peter 1914: CXXV argued against a Latin version, but Chassignet, Beck and Walter and Frier 1970 all accept a Latin version in circulation.

<sup>138</sup> Cato's rejoinder is preserved in Polyb. 39.1.6, who doubtless agreed with Cato. For more on Cato's reaction to Postumius, see Gruen 1992: 257.

<sup>139</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 81.

historiographical form. He is traditionally called an annalist. Of Gaius Acilius' life we know little for certain, including his name which appears differently.<sup>140</sup> Of his career, we know only that he was a senator who served as interpreter for the Athenian philosophers during their embassy to Rome and visit to the Senate in 155, the same meeting which Postumius presided over as *praetor*.<sup>141</sup>

Eight fragments survive of Acilius' history.<sup>142</sup> These include foundation stories (frags. 1 and 3), an etymological passage associated with Aeneas (frag. 2 on Cimmerium), and fragments closer in time to Acilius' own period (e.g., frags. 5, 6 and 7 having to do with Hannibal or the Hannibalic war). No fragments on Rome's history between the period of the kings and the Punic Wars survive. The content of the latest fragment dates to 184. Thus these fragments comprise the same kind of topics and scope as the earlier Greek annalists, including perhaps the autobiographical tendencies of the earlier annalists. Fragments 7 and 8 display some slight evidence of enmity between Acilius and the Scipios and Cato.<sup>143</sup> Fragment 7 (= Liv. 35.14.5-12) relates the dialogue between Scipio and Hannibal, one which does not portray Scipio in a positive light. Fragment 8 (= Dion *Ant. Rom.* 3.67.5) appears to exaggerate purposely expenses associated with a building project of Cato in 184. Another fragment attests to Acilius' interest in Greek culture (frag. 1 on Rome as a Greek foundation); perhaps this can be read not just as

---

<sup>140</sup> Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXXVI cites, for example, "Acilius" in Cic. *Off.* 3.115, yet "Akillios" in Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 3.67.5 (= frag. 8). Acilius' *cognomen* is not mentioned anywhere. Studies (and biographies): Peter 1914: CXXI-CXXIII; Bardon 1952: 70-71; Badian 1966: 6-7; Frier 1970: 267-272; Frier 1979: 208-209 and 249-50; Meister 1990: 148-149; von Albrecht 1997: 302; Beck and Walter 2001: 232-233; Suerbaum 2002: 375-376; Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXXVI-LXXXVIII.

<sup>141</sup> Gell. *NA* 6.14.9: *Et in senatum quidem introducti interprete usi sunt C. Acilio senatore*. Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 22.5 describes Acilius with praise.

<sup>142</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1996/2003: 62-65; Peter 1914: 49-52 (6 fragments); *FGrH* no. 813; Frier 1970: 280-295; Beck and Walter 2001: 234-241 (8 fragments).

<sup>143</sup> Frier 1970: 270-271.

indicative of Acilius' erudition and membership in elite Roman society but also as indicative of Acilius' knowledge of historiographic convention. These fragments manifest what had become traditional material and form for *annales*.

Despite this, contradictory titles are given to his work. Fragment 3 (= Cic. *Off.* 3.115) states that Acilius *Graece scripsit historiam*. Acilius' work is called *Annales Acilianos* in fragment 6 (= Liv. 25.39.11), and *Graecos Acilianos libros* in fragment 7 (= Liv. 35.14.5). Historiographic form is not explicitly addressed by Acilius in the surviving fragments, and unsurprisingly, whether history, *annales* or books, Acilius' history, due to a paucity of fragments, adds little new to our understanding of the conventions of *annales*. Nor does Acilius himself, in the extant fragments, divulge any purpose for his history, any estimation of the form (or language) he used, or any indication of how his history differed from his contemporary Postumius or those Greek annalists before him. It was significant enough to be translated by a certain Claudius, possibly the historian Claudius Quadrigarius.<sup>144</sup> Acilius' history was known to many who preserved his fragments: Cicero, Dionysius, Plutarch, Strabo, and Livy (through the Latin version). Nonetheless, he remains a shadowy figure.

Cato, as we saw, thought little of the *Graeci annales*. His famous insult of Aulus Postumius Albinus' Greek skills may have hastened the end of Roman history writing in Greek. Fabius Pictor and the other Greek annalists, however, had begun to shape both Roman history and Roman historiography. These annalists had set in place essential characteristics of Roman historiography—history was to be didactic, annalistic, cognizant of Greek historiography, written by the senatorial class, and centered on the political. Roman history would proceed in an

---

<sup>144</sup> Peter 1914: CXXII and von Albrecht 1997: 375 claim there is no evidence to support this identification but others, especially Frier 1979/1999 do accept it. See Chapter 3 for Claudius Quadrigarius.



annalistic form *ab urbe condita*, seek out foundation stories and *aetia* and hence look to provide respectability for the noble classes and particular families.<sup>145</sup> Writing history was, in the third and middle of the second century, the responsibility of those who participated in Roman politics. Through their histories, senators could record their experiences, pass down their stories to a younger generation, and hence glorify the nation of Rome. The annalistic form provided a native and workable structure for this formidable task.

---

<sup>145</sup> On the phenomenology of etiogology in early Roman historiography, see Poucet 1985.

CHAPTER 3  
ADAPTERS: THE LATIN ANNALISTS OF THE SECOND CENTURY

In the second century, historians elaborated on the themes of the earlier annalists, at times using their form, and at other times rejecting it. The first history of Rome written in Latin, Cato's *Origines*, incomplete at his death in 149, rejected the annalistic form and addressed the history of Rome using a thematic scheme. He also recounted the origins of other Italian cities as well as Rome. Annalistic history, however, continued to be the form of choice for authors in the second century such as Lucius Cassius Hemina Lucius, Calpurnius Piso Frugi, and Sempronius Tuditanus.<sup>146</sup> Cnaeus Gellius, too, chose to write *annales*, filling possibly thirty-three books that differed from Cato's not only in form but also in size. Possibly filling in gaps in his sources, Gellius accorded more space to the early years of Rome in his lengthy study. This approach to history writing was mimicked by others, and the "expansion of the past," as Badian has called it, became a regular, if not scrupulous, characteristic of some of the historians from the Roman Republic.<sup>147</sup> These historians are (and were) accused of filling out the past, creating one where there was no source material on which a history might be based.<sup>148</sup>

Against the backdrop of annalistic history, the second century witnessed innovations in Roman historiography. A focus on recent or contemporary history appears, for example, in the history of G. Fannius (cos. 122), who displayed his antipathy to the Gracchi in his history.<sup>149</sup> Coelius Antipater, writing around 120, took as his single subject a history of the Second Punic

---

<sup>146</sup> On historians of the second century in general, see Balsdon 1953, Badian 1966: 7-18, and Forsythe 2000.

<sup>147</sup> Badian 1966: 11.

<sup>148</sup> On the debate over the credibility of the historians, see Cornell 1995, who is accused of trusting the annalists too much, and Wiseman 1979, who argued that the annalists practiced invention. A brief précis of the debate and its repercussions on historiography scholarship can be found in Kraus and Woodman 1997: 5-6.

<sup>149</sup> Badian 1966: 14.

War and hence inaugurated the form of the historical monograph in Rome.<sup>150</sup> The late second century Sempronius Asellio wrote *res gestae*, more a history of his own time, and, disparaging the annalistic form, he claimed that his history did more than list events and magistrates.<sup>151</sup> Roman historiography was developing new practices: an interest in contemporary events, a desire to explain rather than list, and an effort to connect history to present politics (e.g., the Gracchan crisis), not just those of the past. This type of history (local, contemporary, monographs) will be taken up in Chapter 4. Despite other options, however, the annalistic form flourished in the second century.

Many historians produced *Annales* in the second century.<sup>152</sup> Of these, four, Cassius Hemina, L. Calpurnius Piso, Sempronius Tuditanus, and Cn. Gellius, demonstrate best the enduring conventions and appeal of the form. This chapter looks to these historians, whose works considerably influenced others, were deemed reputable or meaningful by the Romans themselves, and whose works survive in great numbers or whose historiographical concerns we can discern. Specifically, in these historians we will look for their use of the annalistic form, and when possible, their perception of that form and its functions.

### **Lucius Cassius Hemina**

In the mid second century, it was still possible to write Rome's history in Greek as Acilius and Postumius proved, or tried to prove. Nevertheless, Cato was about to put an end to history writing in Greek. His *Origines*, the first history of Rome in Latin, offered the possibility of

---

<sup>150</sup> von Albrecht 1997: 381.

<sup>151</sup> Sempronius Asellio frag. 2. As earlier, all fragments in this dissertation come from Chassignet.

<sup>152</sup> Two historians of the second century whose works are barely known are Vennonius, known by name only, and Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus (cos. 142). Vennonius' annalistic work survives in only two fragments which tell us little of the work's scope; likewise Servilianus' work is little known, surviving in only three fragments. Because we know so little about them, they are passed over here but are included in the appendix.

writing history in Rome's native tongue. Alongside Cato at the head of history writing in Latin, at least chronologically, stands L. Cassius Hemina.<sup>153</sup> A near contemporary of Cato, Hemina also produced a history of Rome. Little is known of his life. History writing, following Fabius' model, was done by Roman men of the upper-class, typically by those who held political office at some level. No such political career can be discovered, however, for Cassius Hemina, but the cultural model for historians before and after presumes one. Additionally, both his name Cassius and *praenomen* Lucius (as named by Priscian in fragment 28) suggest familial ties to the *gens* of the Cassii Longini. This family served Rome faithfully, producing seven consuls and two censors between the years 171 and 73.<sup>154</sup>

Hemina's work is called *annales* fourteen times by five different authors.<sup>155</sup> Other authors, however, describe Hemina's work as *historiae*; three authors in seven fragments use this appellation, while the grammarian Nonius calls Hemina's history both *annales* and *historiae*.<sup>156</sup> Hemina's work consisted of four, or possibly five, books. Consistent with the annalists before him, Hemina's history began with the earliest stories of Rome and continued to his time. These volumes begin with the pre-Romulean period in Book 1, followed by the period of the kings and the early Republic in Book 2, the First Punic War in Book 3, and the *Bellum Punicum posterior*

---

<sup>153</sup> Studies (and biographies): Martha 1902/3: 108-113; Peter 1914: CLXV-CLXXIII; Bardon 1952: 73-77; Rawson 1976: 690-702; Forsythe 1990; von Albrecht 1994: 304-305; Santini 1995: 11-70; Chassignet 1998; Beck and Walter 2001: 242-245; and Chassignet 1999/2003: IX-XVI.

<sup>154</sup> Forsythe 1990: 326. On the political offices of the Cassii Longini, see Broughton 1952 I: 416, 439, 449, 507, 510, 550, II: 9, 109. Forsythe 1990: 326 sees a connection to this aristocratic family. Beck and Walter 2001: 242 do not, however, rule out a plebeian-friendly tone in Hemina's history. Frag. 28 = Prisc. *Inst.* 9, p. 482 H.

<sup>155</sup> Chassignet 1999/2003: XI. Pliny the Elder (frag. 40), Aulus Gellius (frag. 12), Servius auctus (frag. 25), Priscian (frag. 28, 32, 33, 34, 35) and Nonius (frag. 20, 24, 27, 31, 36, 39) describe Hemina's work as *annales*.

<sup>156</sup> Chassignet 1999/2003: XI. Macrobius, Diomedes, and Nonius title the work *historiae* in fragments 9, 13, 14, 19, 23, 37, and 38. Nonius calls the work *annales* in frags. 20, 24, 27, 31, and 39; he titles them *historiae* in frags. 9, 13, 19, 37, and 38.

in Book 4. The content of Book 4 is, however, problematic. Despite its title, at least three of Hemina's fragments, fragments 40, 41, and 42, date to the years after the war with Hannibal. These could belong to a fifth and separate book (although Hemina might have included material after the Second Punic War in his last book); there is no reference to a fifth book.

The date of publication rests on the title given to Book 4, *Bellum Punicum posterior*, as recorded in fragment 34 (= Prisc. *Inst.* 7, p. 374 H), which suggests that the third Punic War had not yet begun at the time of his writing.<sup>157</sup> The inference is that Hemina did most of his writing prior to 149.<sup>158</sup> Fragment 42 provides a end date of the fourth secular games of 146, carried out while Cassius Hemina was alive; possibly Hemina was writing a fifth volume between 149 and 146.<sup>159</sup>

Chassignet collects 43 fragments of Cassius Hemina, and these bear witness to Hemina's upholding of the conventions of annalistic history.<sup>160</sup> These fragments consider foundation stories associated with Rome (e.g., frags. 6 and 8 on Aeneas, frag. 14 on Romulus and Remus),

---

<sup>157</sup> Priscian tells us that Cassius Hemina inscribed the fourth book of his annals with the title *Bellum Punicum posterior* (*sic*).

<sup>158</sup> This premise is accepted by Peter 1914: CLXV, Chassignet 1999/2003: XII-XIII, and Santini 1995. Rawson 1976: 70-1-702 and Forsythe 1990 add a different end point; Forsythe makes the argument for a date for publication as late as 120, based on comparisons with allegedly similar fragments of L. Calpurnius Piso, whose work he wants to date to the post censorship years of Piso. In particular, Forsythe 2000: 334 wants to date fragment 20 to the agrarian disputes around the time of Tiberius Gracchus. Chassignet 1999/2003: 103 prefers an early date from the Struggle of the Orders. Cornell 1995: 451 similarly is not convinced by Forsythe's 1990 argument to date the *plebitas* fragment to the time of Ti. Gracchus though Beck and Walter 2001: 262 find it not unreasonable. Forsythe 1990: 328 also notes that we have no evidence that the phrase *Bellum Punicum posterior* was Hemina's.

<sup>159</sup> Frag. 42 = Censorinus *DN* 17.11.

<sup>160</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1999/2003: 2-16; Peter 1914: 98-111 (40 fragments); Beck and Walter 2001: 246-281 (43 fragments), and Santini 1995: 72-105 (43 fragments). The difference between Peter and the more recent editions of fragments of Hemina is, firstly, the inclusion of a fragment from *Origo Gentis Romanae* (Peter consistently doubted the authenticity of this work in his collection of the historical fragments) and, secondly, the decision to separate out three distinct mentions of lines of Cassius Hemina in Nonius p. 510 L; Peter had grouped this all as one fragment.

etiologies (e.g., frag. 4 on the origin of *fana*), etymologies, particularly of town names (e.g., frags. 3 and 4), and an interest in religious institutions (frags. 15 and 16). The history has a strong chronological structure, naming key figures such as Aeneas and Romulus and Remus, as above, as well as Numa and Tarquinius Superbus. Yet Hemina's work seems to differ from those *annales* before him in that his surviving fragments show very little interest in political or military concerns of Rome. No fragment treats any war, battle, alliance, federation or even diplomatic overtures made by Rome, with the exception of fragment 24 which cites Marcius' first arming of the proletariat in 280.<sup>161</sup>

Instead, more than half of the extant fragments concern Hemina's use of vocabulary or grammatical constructions deemed uncommon or of interest to later grammarians. Twenty-three of the fragments derive from the grammarians Solinus, Nonius and Priscian, who noted Hemina's particular use of words such as *ilico* (frags. 9-11), *censere* (frag. 19), *plebitas* (frag. 20), *proletari* (frag. 24), *fremere* (frag. 25), *demolire* (frag. 26), *denasci* (frag. 27), *cymbalissare* (frag. 30), *litterosus* (frag. 31), *messui* (frag. 32), *nostratis* (frag. 33), *eabus* (frag. 35), *consedo* (frag. 36), *utrasque* (frag. 37), a feminine version of *finis* (frag. 38), and *lacte* (frag. 39). Priscian also found of interest two grammatical usages by Hemina of the comparative (frag. 34 *posterior*), and the deponent (frag. 43 *adhortati*). Thus twenty-five fragments, fifty-eight percent of Hemina's preserved work, survive for their archaic vocabulary and not for their content.

---

<sup>161</sup> Frag. 24 = Nonius p. 93L. The text of this fragment is corrupt; the manuscript codd. reads *praecox*. Beck and Walter 2001: 267 use *praeco*, whereas Chassignet 1999/2003: 10 prefers *praetor*. Peter's text (1914: 105) uses *praeco*, and Santini 1995: 94 reads *pro consule*. See Santini's commentary on the manuscript variations (Santini 1995: 176). All are in agreement over a possible date for the fragment; the Marcius named appears to be the consul of 281, Q. Marcius Philippus. The arming of the proletariat would have been part of Rome's initiative versus Pyrrhus in 280 (perhaps celebrated by Ennius in *Annales* vv. 183-185 V2).

Grammatical usages most commonly conserve just a few words out of context; as such, vocabulary and a few grammatical constructions allow us to say little, with certainty, about Hemina's style. A few longer fragments, however, provide material with which to assess his style. Leeman noted approvingly the sophistication of fragment 14, the "complicated phrase-pattern" of fragment 16, and the *oratio obliqua* with *accusativus cum infinitivo* in fragment 40.<sup>162</sup>

Although most fragments provide little concerning the content of Hemina's history, the fragments preserving Hemina's use of *plebitas* (frag. 20) and *proletari* (frag. 24) may indicate a focus on the plebeian class in his history, as Beck and Walter have conjectured.<sup>163</sup> Fragment 31's chance remark from Hemina's third book, "*homo mere litterosus*," has been interpreted to mean a disdainful attitude towards those authors who were merely "bookish" and not politically involved, as presumably historians ought to be.<sup>164</sup> Certainly Priscian's preservation of the title of Hemina's book four, *Bellum Punicum posterior*, in his discussion of uses of the comparative is of vital importance. Yet, as is common in the grammarians, Priscian's interest lay only in the word *posterior*, and not, unfortunately, in the content of Hemina's book four.

Despite the relatively little content that survives from Hemina's history in the grammarians, we can pose a few comments about both content and his interests from other fragments, and perhaps his intentions behind history writing. Yet, as is the case with the annalists in Greek, there are no extant verbatim quotations which detail Hemina's ambitions for his history, his motivations, nor his assessment of the annalistic form. Simply put, we have no

---

<sup>162</sup> Leeman 1963: 72. Leeman uses Peter's collection of fragments, hence frags. 14, 16, and 40 in Chassignet 1999/2003 = frags. 11, 13, and 37 Peter. Martha 1903: 113 finds fault, however, with Hemina's style but Bardon 1952: 76 sees instead progress in Latin in "l'organisation savante" of frag. 13 Peter (= frag. 16 Chassignet).

<sup>163</sup> Beck and Walter 2001: 242.

<sup>164</sup> So argues Rawson 1976: 691, who thought this fragment might hint at "Polybian and other historiographical controversies."

words from Hemina himself concerning his choice of form in which he wrote his history. What we do have is Hemina's apparent independence.

Of particular interest in assessing Hemina is his disagreement with earlier historians in at least two instances: the portent of the sow and thirty piglets appearing to Romulus and Remus in Rome, and the nature of the Penates, which Hemina likens to gods from Samothrace. Hemina thus demonstrates at least some independent thinking, maybe even conscious disagreement with Rome's history available at the time, and thereby provides to us a motive for his own alternative history of Rome.

Fragment 14, for example, on the origin of the shrine to the Lares Grundiles, of which no traces remain, not only preserves one of the rare occurrences in Latin literature of this aspect of the Lares,<sup>165</sup> but might also act as a case study for Hemina's willingness to diverge from the historical tradition. In this fragment preserved in Diomedes, the citizens of Rome witness the equal dividing of power between Romulus and Remus. A *monstrum* then happened: a sow feeding thirty pigs, and Romulus and Remus created a shrine to the Lares Grundiles. Hemina thus assigned the foundation of the cult of Lares Grundiles to Romulus and Remus who (rather than Aeneas) saw the sow and thirty piglets. According to both Fabius Pictor and Cato, it was Aeneas and his men who witnessed the sow and thirty pigs; Cato said the site was Lavinium, Fabius Pictor argued for Alba.<sup>166</sup> Hemina's etiology may have served as the impetus here; in a search for the origin of the shrine of the Lares Grundiles, he cites upon the famous portent of the

---

<sup>165</sup> Frag. 14 = Diomedes, p. 379 L. The notice to Hemina is part of Diomedes' more full discussion of the use of the word *grundio*. *Grundiles* appears elsewhere only in Nonius 114.31 and Arnobius 1.15. No physical evidence of a shrine to the Grundiles survives nor indeed does such a shrine have an entry in either Richardson 1992 or Claridge 1998.

<sup>166</sup> Fabius Pictor frag. 5a; Cato, frag. 14a. Cf. Rawson 1976: 697.



pigs.<sup>167</sup> More significantly, in fragment 14, Hemina's approval of the joint rule of Romulus and Remus might reflect a prefiguration of the consulship.<sup>168</sup> For our purposes, this fragment showcases Hemina's willingness to diverge from the other accounts of the same story. Elsewhere, Hemina also differed from Cato on, for example, the size of land given by Latinus (frag. 8).<sup>169</sup>

A number of other facets to Hemina's work survive in his fragments. Although Hemina was once dismissed as *dimidiatus Cato* and relegated to a footnote, recently scholars have tried to rehabilitate him.<sup>170</sup> They rest their case on Hemina's apparent interests in, among other subjects, religion (monuments, institutions, and rites), euhemerism, and Greek culture. These fragments survive in a variety of sources for a variety of reasons; these preservers found Hemina a reliable source himself.

Religious matters (institutions, monuments, shrines) are a topic of at least eight fragments of Hemina. These fragments consider Numa's religious laws (frags. 15 and 16), the etiologies of the shrines to Ara Maxima (frag. 5) and to Lares Grundiles (frag. 14), the etymology of the word *fana* (frag. 4), the origin of the Penates (frag. 7), and the discovery of the Sybilline books (frag. 40).

---

<sup>167</sup> Hence Rawson 1976: 697 describes Hemina's work here as part of his love of "rash etymologies."

<sup>168</sup> Chassignet 1998: 327, Rawson 1976: 698-699, and Santini 1995: 152.

<sup>169</sup> Hemina (frag. 8 = Solin. 2.14) says five hundred *iugera*, Cato (frag. 8 = Serv. *ad Aen.* 11.316) says IIDCC.

<sup>170</sup> Klinger 1965: 66 declared Hemina *dimidiatus Cato*. Of late, Rawson in 1976 examined Hemina as well as L. Calpurnius Piso and Gn. Gellius, and called Hemina "the most interesting of our trio" (1976: 690). Forsythe 1990, a long article, and Santini 1995, a monograph on the fragments with commentary, have directed more careful attention to Hemina's fragments, though Forsythe 1990:341 still relegates Hemina to a tier below, emphasizing Hemina's patterning of at least his first book after the second and third books of Cato's *Origines*.

Hemina also displays a keen interest in etymologies and etiologies; these concern Roman religion, as above, toponymy (frag. 2 on Aricia and frag. 3 on Crustumium), and institutions or customs (frag. 17 on Servius Tullius' creation of the *nundinae*, and frag. 21 on the first intercalary). Most of the fragments which contain etiologies or etymologies relate to the early years of Rome's history. Hemina's methodology in these fragments consists of presumably posing the question regarding the origin and then providing an answer of either an individual or an event.<sup>171</sup> Hemina's curiosity regarding the origins of Rome fits with previous annalists' similar attention to the same matters. Hemina's interest in etiologies and etymologies signals an inclination towards antiquarianism which was also shared by previous annalists.

Hemina also demonstrated an interest in Greek culture. His fragments on the Penates (in which he used Greek terms and not Roman versions of them), the origin of Aricia (frag. 2), and Homer and Hesiod (frag. 12) suggest a willingness to include the Greeks in a Roman history.<sup>172</sup> Further, from the Greeks (and Ennius as well), Hemina might have picked up an interest in euhemerism. The belief that great men became gods was popular across the Mediterranean world, especially in the former Hellenistic kingdoms. Fragments on Saturn (frag. 1), Faunus (frag. 4), and fragment 8 from Solinus, which treats the identification of Aeneas as Pater Indiges, suggest a deep interest in euhemerism.

Let me close with a few final comments about Hemina. Of interest is that he chose to write in annalistic form while his contemporary Cato rejected that format; carrying on the received traditions of *Annales*, Hemina included etymologies and etiologies in his work, and

---

<sup>171</sup> A fuller discussion of Hemina's techniques and functions in etiologies and etymologies can be found in Chassignet 1998.

<sup>172</sup> Other fragments such as those on Aeneas being allowed to pass through the Greeks unharmed (frag. 6), and Diomedes giving the Palladium to Aeneas (frag. 8) also indicate Hemina's willingness to incorporate Greek history into his Roman narrative, although, of course, it would be difficult to avoid these subjects in a discussion of Aeneas.

displayed a chronological structure. Notable too is that Hemina displayed independence with regards to content. His last book, if it was devoted to the second Punic War, might indicate a movement towards monographs, as in Coelius Antipater's monograph on the Punic War.<sup>173</sup>

Unfortunately, only one of Hemina's surviving fragments derives from a historian, fragment 22 from Appian, which suggests that perhaps Hemina's history was not well received by his own peers. Pliny the Elder describes Hemina as *vetustissimus* (frag. 40) and *antiquissimus auctor* (frag. 29) but does not refer directly to the work by Hemina. Livy, Cicero, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus either do not know him or do not use him openly.<sup>174</sup> Plutarch does not mention him either, which makes Appian not only the only historian to cite Cassius, but also the only Greek writer to do so.<sup>175</sup> The absence of a broader reception of Hemina's history may mean simply that Hemina's work was not good or at least not as good as what followed him, or perhaps not widely known. In the competition for historical validity, Hemina looks to have lost.

### **Lucius Calpurnius Piso**

The history by L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi enjoyed a better reception. Cited by historians as well as collectors of knowledge, Piso structured his history of Rome on a clearly annalistic frame. Few verbatim quotations survive, however, and there remains no statement by Piso of his

---

<sup>173</sup> So Chassignet 1999/2003: XVI contends, though she notes that Santini 1995: 33-34, in particular, sees less of an innovation in Hemina's book four focus and more of a proof that the difference between *annales* and *historia* would not be marked until Coelius Antipater.

<sup>174</sup> Forsythe 1990: 344 posits Hemina as the source for later historians. Rawson 1976: 690, footnote 3, mentions Meyer's "isolated suggestion" that Hemina was the source behind Diodorus Siculus, an argument which Chassignet 1999/2003: XV finds unconvincing. Forsythe 1990: 344 goes so far as to say that "much of the information contained in the history was incorporated" into the works of Hemina's successors.

<sup>175</sup> Appian is so late that there was very likely a middle man between the two who read Hemina, and Appian drew his information from him. Unfortunately, we do not know whether Appian read Hemina directly nor do we know what his source might have been.

intentions, historiographical aims, or purpose of his recording of Roman history in that form. No preface survives.

L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi Censorius lived and flourished around the same time as Cassius Hemina and at the end of Cato's life. Though all three were writing Roman history contemporaneously—more or less—, Cato's history covered Italy as well as Rome and rejected the annalistic form, Cassius Hemina emphasized religious matters, and Calpurnius Piso picked up and focused on other traditional content of *Annales*, the political and the military affairs. Calpurnius Piso came from a plebeian family that was to become heavily involved in Roman politics; Cn. Piso and L. Piso Caesonius served as consuls, in 139 and 148. Calpurnius Piso himself served as tribune of the plebs in 149, was author of the *lex Calpurnia de pecuniis repetundis* in 149, consul in 133, censor in 120, and praetor at an unknown date.<sup>176</sup> Calpurnius Piso was thus a historian as well as an important politician, and an accomplished orator.<sup>177</sup>

Piso wrote one work, called the *Annales* in sixteen fragments; it is called *Historiae* in one citation, *Commentarii* in another, and *Epitomae* once as well. In seven books, Piso recounted Roman history from pre-history until his time, at least until 146, the last date attested in the surviving fragments (frag. 42 = Censorinus *DN* 17.11). Piso related prehistory and the period of the kings in the first book, the Republic down to 304 in the second and third books, and the remaining books (four through seven) detailed Piso's own time. A possible eighth book might

---

<sup>176</sup> Studies (and biographies): Peter 1914: 120-138; Latte 1968: 837-847; von Albrecht 1994: 378-379; Forsythe 1994; Beck and Walter 2001: 282-285; and Chassignet 1999/2003: XIX-XXVIII. See Broughton 1952 I: 459 for Piso's tribuneship, 492 for consulship, and 523 for censor. On Piso and the *lex Calpurnia*, see Cic. *Brut.* 27.106 and *Off.* 2.21. Piso's creation of the *lex Calpurnia* was one of the most significant acts of his career; this law was the first of the so-called "recovery" laws. Richardson 1987 recounts its creation and its purpose.

<sup>177</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 106.

have treated events after 146, in particular his consulship (133), and censorship (120), as argued by Forsythe.<sup>178</sup>

Forty-eight fragments of Piso survive.<sup>179</sup> These include citations by the historians Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Livy, and Plutarch, the encyclopedists Varro and Pliny the Elder, grammarians or similarly minded authors including Priscian, Gellius, Censorinus and Macrobius, as well as Tertullian, Cicero, Arnobius, and Lydus. The majority of the fragments, seventeen, derive from the encyclopedists, those collectors of knowledge, and from the historians, thirteen fragments. Piso's history attracted more attention for its content than for its style. In contrast to Cassius Hemina whose work was the source for many citations by grammarians on unique uses of language and vocabulary, Piso seems not to have found much favor among the grammarians. Only two fragments concern Piso's vocabulary choices (frag. 19 from Priscian regarding *allicuit*, and frag. 20, also from Priscian, on *ignosciturum*). Moreover, as we saw earlier, only one fragment of Cassius Hemina is cited by a historian, and only four by the encyclopedist Pliny the Elder; Piso's work was more attended to by the mainstream of Latin authors.

Almost half of the extant fragments of Piso treat material from Rome's prehistory or the period of kings, from Book 1 of Piso's history. Among those fragments are stories relating to etymologies (e.g., frag. 1 on the origin of Italia, frags. 2 and 3 on Cimmerium), the creation of Roman legends, institutions or places (e.g., frag. 7 on Tarpeia, frag. 8 on the Lacus Curtius, frag. 9 on games for Jupiter Feretrius, frag. 11 on the Janus Gate, frag. 18 on Tarquin's temple to Jupiter on the Capitoline, and frag. 22 on the statue of Cloelia), and practices of early Roman

---

<sup>178</sup> Forsythe 1994: 32-36 promotes a date of publication after 120, based on correlations between Pisonian fragments and those of Cassius Hemina. Chassignet 1999/2003: XXV does not commit, though she views as reasonable the supposition that Piso took up writing after he finished his *cursus honorum*.

<sup>179</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1999/2003: 18-39; Peter 1914: 98-111 (40 fragments); Forsythe 1994: 426-497 (49 fragments); and Beck and Walter 2001: 286-329 (43 fragments).

kings (e.g., frag. 10 on Romulus' spare drinking and frags. 12 and 15 on Numa's calling down lightning).

Piso's fragments reveal an annalistic framework; in fact, Forsythe claims Piso to be the first historian to make extensive use of the then recently published *annales maximi*.<sup>180</sup> In asserting this, Forsythe agrees to the traditional (since Mommsen) story of publication of the *annales maximi* by P. Mucius Scaevola (Piso's consular colleague of 133) in eighty books.<sup>181</sup> The published volumes were based on the whitened tablets which contained annual entries made by the *pontifex maximus* including the names of the consuls and other magistrates, and religious matters and events, including portents and prodigies, as well as domestic and military events, such as triumphs.<sup>182</sup> According to Forsythe, Piso appears to have made use of this collection of material; his seven-volume history rests on a traditional chronological format, and contains material that Forsythe believes was available to him only through the pontifical *annales maximi*.<sup>183</sup> Of particular note is one fragment that cites both Piso and the *annales maximi*, and thus brings to the forefront the question of Piso's relationship to this source. Fragment 28 (= *OGR* 18.3) chronicles the death of Aremulus Silvius, an Alban king, who, according to the fourth book of the *annales maximi* and the second book of Piso's "epitomes," was struck by lightning, caught up in a tornado, and tossed into the Alban lake. Such a prodigious moment, placed in Piso's book two, which recounted the early Republic, could have come from pontifical records which would have contained such prodigies. Other Pisonian fragments might have derived from the detailed pontifical records, including Piso's version of Tullus Hostilius' death by lightning

---

<sup>180</sup> Forsythe 2000:8 says that Piso was the first historian "to utilize fully the potential" of the *annales maximi*.

<sup>181</sup> On the *annales maximi*, their compilation, history, materials, see Frier 1979/1999, and refer to the earlier discussion in Chapter 1.

<sup>182</sup> Servius auct. *ad Aen.* 1.373.

<sup>183</sup> Forsythe's discussion of Piso and the *annales maximi* can be found in Forsythe 1994: 53-73.

(frags. 12 and 15). To Forsythe, Piso “seems to be the first” to record this story of his death.<sup>184</sup> Both stories, both concerning prodigies, might have had their source in the pontifical records.

Elsewhere the annalistic form, and material suitable to pontifical records, continue to appear itself in Piso’s later fragments, those dealing with the Republic. Several citations speak of political posts by year (e.g., frag. 29 on consuls, frags. 30 and 31 on curule aediles, frag. 39 on consuls in the 600<sup>th</sup> year, frag. 42 on consuls for the 608<sup>th</sup> year). Still other fragments relate military matters, a common hallmark of annalistic history. These include fragments, for example, on the creation of the first navy (frag. 32) and on victorious commanders with details, some important, some not, of triumphs (e.g., frag. 34 on the myrtle crown of Papirius Maso, cos. 231, frag. 37 on the triumph of Gn. Manlius Vulso in 186, and frag. 33 on the introduction of elephants to the circus after the victory of Metellus over the Carthaginians at Panormus in 250). Triumphal notices were a common feature of pontifical records, and Piso’s work perhaps draws directly on the published *annales maximi*.<sup>185</sup> Moreover, Forsythe contends that Piso is the first Roman historian whose extant work records specific data on triumphs.<sup>186</sup> Such precise information suggests that the recording of triumphs was important and integral to his history, and more importantly, that Piso found this material from “documentary sources, such as the *annales maximi*.”<sup>187</sup>

Piso’s fragments regarding the secession of the plebs (frag. 24) and the election of the tribunes (frag. 25) are the “earliest surviving annalistic data on the early history of the plebeian tribunate.”<sup>188</sup> Both are preserved in Livy. Fragment 24 (= Liv. 2.32.3) offers a variant for the

---

<sup>184</sup> Forsythe 2000: 9.

<sup>185</sup> Forsythe 1994: 370.

<sup>186</sup> Forsythe 1994: 370-371.

<sup>187</sup> Forsythe 1994: 370.

<sup>188</sup> Forsythe 2000: 10.

site of the secession of the plebs, one site Livy did not credit. Unrest in Rome because of tension between the classes and great indebtedness led to the first secession of the plebeians and the institution of the plebeian tribune in 494. Fragment 25 (= Liv. 2.58.1), similarly refers to the establishment and evolution of the tribunate; in it Piso details the expansion of the number of tribunes from two to five. Written during the Gracchan age, a period during which the tribunate was the focus of much controversy, these fragments provide important material for conjecturing how contemporaries of the Gracchan revolution revisited the Roman past.

That Piso was cited by historians and encyclopedists points to his reputation as an authority in Roman history. Indeed, Pliny the Elder named him twice a *gravis auctor* (frags. 12 and 41). He is cited by different authors as proof for the authenticity of a statement that stands counter to a previous story. For example, Plutarch tells his reader that Numa did not die a quick death but rather was consumed little by little due to old age and disease, “as Piso reports.”<sup>189</sup> Livy, on the other hand, expresses distrust in Piso several times. In fragment 18, Livy prefers the numbers of talents put forward by Fabius Pictor for Tarquin’s construction of the temple to Jupiter on the Capitoline over Piso’s figures.<sup>190</sup> Additionally, Livy alerts his readers that his story regarding the site of the secession of the plebs, *Mons Sacer*, was more general (*frequentior*) than the story and site Piso posited.<sup>191</sup> In fragments 29 and 31, Livy again, struggles with Piso. In fragment 29, Livy attempts to report the consuls for the year 305, but found Piso unhelpful. Livy’s and Piso’s names of consuls for the year do not match up, and Livy suggests that either those names escaped from Piso’s memory as he composed his *Annales* or perhaps he

---

<sup>189</sup> Frag. 14 = Plut. *Num.* 21.7.

<sup>190</sup> Frag. 18 = Liv. 1.55.7-9, in particular *eo magis Fabio, praeterquam quod antiquior est, crediderim...quam Pisoni.*

<sup>191</sup> Frag. 24 = Liv. 2.32.3.



purposefully left them out, believing them not accurate.<sup>192</sup> In fragment 31, Livy attempts to reconcile information about the office of curule aedile held by Quintus Fabius, as recorded by the historians Licinius Macer and Tubero, with the list of curule aediles for that same year preserved in Piso. In this instance, Livy recognizes Piso's authority due to his status as one of the oldest of the annalists (*vetustior annalium auctor*).<sup>193</sup>

Just as some ancient historians admired and some suspected Piso's content, his literary style was both praised and condemned. Aulus Gellius, for example, declared that Piso told a story of Romulus *simplicissima suavitate et rei et orationis* (frag. 10 = Gell. NA 11.14.1-2). Elsewhere, Gellius similarly praised Piso's ability to tell a story *pure et venuste*.<sup>194</sup> But, Cicero, conversely, decried Piso's history as among those *annales sane exiliter scriptos*.<sup>195</sup> He also found in Piso, along with Cato and Pictor, ignorance of how to adorn their writing:

Hanc similitudinem scribendi multi secuti sunt, qui sine ullis ornamentis monumenta solum temporum, hominum, locorum gestarumque rerum reliquerunt; itaque qualis apud Graecos Pherecydes, Hellanicus, Acusilas fuit aliique permulti, talis noster Cato et Pictor et Piso, qui neque tenent, quibus rebus ornetur oratio - modo enim huc ista sunt importata - et, dum intellegatur quid dicant, unam dicendi laudem putant esse brevitatem.  
(Cic. *De or.* 2.53)

Cicero placed Piso with both Cato and Fabius Pictor at the head of Roman history writing, and as such, valued Piso's contributions to recording that history. But Piso was merely a *narrator*. In *de Legibus*, Cicero disparaged Piso's style, lumping him together with Fabius, Fannius, and Vennonius, and calling them *tam exile*.<sup>196</sup>

---

<sup>192</sup> Frag. 29 = Liv. 9.44.2-4.

<sup>193</sup> Frag. 31 = Liv. 10 9.12.

<sup>194</sup> Frag. 30 = Gell. 7.9.1-6.

<sup>195</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 106.

<sup>196</sup> Cic. *Leg.* 1.6-7.

Yet neither Piso's content nor style is as interesting as Piso's choice of form, not because it was new or unusual, but because it was timely. Although we have no statement by Piso regarding his choice of historiographical form, we do have context, and that context may illuminate his choice.

Piso was no armchair historian; like other historians before him, he was an active politician, serving as praetor, tribune, consul and censor. And he did do during one of the most engaging political and literary time periods in Roman history, from the 150's to 130's. During these years lived and flourished such towering figures as Cato (at the end of his life), Scipio Aemilianus, Lucius Mummius, Tiberius and Gaius Gracchus, and Appius Claudius Pulcher. Cassius Hemina, Polybius, Sempronius Tuditanus, and Fannius all wrote history during these years. Polybius' work ends in 146, coincidentally the end of both Cassius Hemina's and Piso's histories. During these years Rome utterly defeated Carthage, asserted herself over Macedon, conquered both Greece and Spain, making provinces of them all, acquired Pergamum, and put down slave revolts. In a period of roughly twenty years, Rome became a vast empire, and came into intimate contact with the Hellenistic world.

In these same years, Piso was active in Roman politics, and was also probably writing history. The last attested date in his fragments, 146, the date of the secular games and the fall of Carthage and Corinth, comes shortly after his first key office. Tribune and author of a recovery law in 149, Piso was involved in politics at the beginning of the last war between Rome and Carthage and at work on his history during the opening up of the Hellenistic world to Rome. Later, during one of the Republic's key years, 133, Piso became consul. That year saw the death of Tiberius Gracchus, the bequeathing of the city of Pergamum to Rome by Attalus III, and Roman victory at Numantia in Spain. Additionally, in 133 Piso himself put down the slave

rebellion led by Eunus in the Sicilian city of Enna. It was a rich time to be writing Rome's history.

If Piso continued to write after 146, as Forsythe argues plausibly, there exists the possibility that Piso and Scaevola, serving as consuls in the same year in 133, might have discussed the pontifical chronicles recorded on the *tabula dealbata* and possible publication. Cicero tells us that these *tabulae* had continued from early days up until the time of Scaevola. If we follow the once traditional view that Scaevola published the *annales maximi*, we might easily envision the two of them discussing these as a source for history. If we credit Rüpke's argument that Scaevola wrote his own history and called it the *annales maximi*, again, we might speculate on the two discussing historiography or sources available. Perhaps, the two of them, both historically minded (though often political rivals—Scaevola was once Tiberius Gracchus' ally and advisor), might have conversed about Scaevola's project. Piso perhaps even countenanced the need for publication of the pontifical chronicles. To Piso had fallen the obligation to record those consuls and magistrates which the *annales maximi* would make accessible. Cassius Hemina's work appears not to have been concerned with the details such lists would have preserved, and Cato had previously determined not to write a history of Roman names. Moreover, Piso's distrust of the Gracchi, perhaps seen in his distaste of Spurius Maelius (frag. 26), might have compelled him to write a history that memorialized those faithful magistrate citizens of Rome, who served the Republic rather than jeopardized it. And if Scaevola merely stopped the recording of events on the *tabula dealbata* (Cic. *De or.* 2.52) and did not publish the *annales maximi*, Piso might have nonetheless found a way to access that material, the *libri annales* as Frier called them, wherever they were stored. Annalistic history, supported by the rich material in the pontifical records later, was surely the appropriate form for Piso. Novelty

does not appear to suit Piso's personality (nor a man named Frugi); a wariness about the Gracchi, seen in Cicero, coupled with the moralizing tone of now famous fragment 41 in which he provides a date for the beginning of moral depravity in Rome, suggest that Piso would not be the sort of historian to employ an innovative approach to historiography but would rather find the traditional and familiar form of the annalistic form to be proper for his work.<sup>197</sup>

### Sempronius Tuditanus

Piso's contemporary and fellow politician, Sempronius Tuditanus, also used the annalistic form for a history of Rome.<sup>198</sup> A politician and orator like Piso, Tuditanus' *cursus honorum* included the offices of quaestor in 145, aedile in 135 or 136, praetor in 132, and consul in 129.<sup>199</sup> Son of one of Mummius' legates to Greece in 146, Tuditanus likewise traveled to Greece that year as an officer. Other significant military actions included his victory in his consulate over the Illyrian tribe, the Iapydes, with help from Decimus Iunius Brutus; Tuditanus celebrated the triumph on October 1, 129.<sup>200</sup> A statue of Tuditanus in Aquilea also commemorated his victory.<sup>201</sup>

---

<sup>197</sup> Cic. *Tusc.* 3.48 and *Font.* 39. For Piso's date for the beginning of moral depravity see fragment 41 (= Plin. *HN* 17.244). Pliny's discussion concerns the growth of trees as portents, and mentions a fig tree that sprang up in the censorship of M. Messala and C. Cassius, *a quo tempore pudicitiam subversam Piso gravis auctor prodidit*. The year was 154. Piso's interest in censorial sort of notices supports the argument that he composed his history after his term in the office of censor.

<sup>198</sup> Studies (and biographies): Peter 1914: CCI-CCIII; Münzer 1923: 1441-1443; Beck and Walter 2001: 330; Chassignet 1999/2003: XXVIII-XXIII.

<sup>199</sup> Cic. *Att.* 13.6.4 for quaestor and aedileship, *Att.* 13.30.2 and 13.32.3 for praefecture, and *Rep.* 1.14 for consulate. Broughton 1952 I: 470 (quaestor), 489-490 and footnote no. 4 for aedile, 498 for praetor, and 504 for consul. Cicero admired his *elegantia* as an orator, *Brut.* 95.

<sup>200</sup> Liv. *Per.* 59.20 and App. *Ill.* 10.

<sup>201</sup> On two fragments from Hostius' *Bellum Histricum* which preserved part of the inscription on Tuditanus' statue: *ILLRP* 335 with commentary by Degrassi; and Morgan 1973. Further on the statue base's inscription, as recorded by Pliny the Elder, see Plin. *HN* 3.129 and *ILLRP* 334; Bücheler 1908; and Birt 1920. On his triumph: *Fast. Capit. C.I.L.* I<sup>2</sup>, p. 48; 176.

Tuditanus wrote two historical works, according to the fragments that survive. One, called *Libri Magistratum*, looks to have been a list that might have employed documentary material, and comprised at least thirteen books. Only two fragments survive of this work.<sup>202</sup> It apparently served as counter-argument to the *Libri de potestatibus* authored by the pro-Gracchan M. Iunius Gracchanus.<sup>203</sup> The title of the second work, a history, by Tuditanus is unattested. Only seven fragments of this work survive.<sup>204</sup>

Each of the seven fragments of the untitled history in Chassignet's edition derives from a different source. None of them preserves actual words of Tuditanus but report topics that Tuditanus recorded in his history, including prehistory (frag. 1 on Aborigines and frag. 2 on the etymology of Caieta), the period of the kings (frag. 3 on the institution of the *nundinae* by Romulus), the early Republic (frag. 4 on the creation of the tribunate), and the middle Republic (frag. 5 on the death of Regulus and frag. 7 on the discovery of the Numaeian books). Tuditanus' history must have been lengthier than Piso's; fragment 7 remarks that the discovery of the

---

<sup>202</sup> Peter 1914: 146-147 (frags. Sempron. Tudit. 7 and 8 Peter). Sempron. Tudit. Frag. 7 Peter comes from Macrobius *Sat.* 1.13.21, and Sempron. Tudit. Frag. 8 Peter derives from M. Messalla *de auspiciis* apud Gell. *NA* 13.15. 4. Chassignet 1999/2003 does not include them but preserves only fragments from Tuditanus' unnamed second work; she believes the first work was merely a list and not literary.

<sup>203</sup> Chassignet 1999/2003: XXXI and Beck and Walter 2001: 330. On the hostility between Tuditanus and Gracchanus, see Münzer 1923: 1442. These works on *libri* by Tuditanus and Gracchanus have recently been posited as best demonstrating the beginning of an interest in antiquarianism among Roman authors; see Sehlmeier 2003.

<sup>204</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1999/2003: 40-43; Peter 1914: 143-147 (six fragments); Beck and Walter 2001: 331-339 (eight fragments). To Peter's numbers, Chassignet adds a citation from Ps. Aurelius Victor *OGR*, a source Peter regularly did not include. Beck and Walter add not only the *OGR* citation, but also include Peter's fragment 8 from M. Valerius Messalla (cos. 53) which Peter had assigned to the *Libri Magistratum*. Beck and Walter do not contest assigning the fragment to the *Libri* but include the fragment with the historical fragments because it might offer information regarding the intellectual profile of the author. That fragment poses the inability of a praetor to elect either a consul or praetor because a higher authority cannot be elected by a lower authority, "as shown in the thirteen book of the commentary of Tuditanus." Cichorius 1902: 588-595 argues that Tuditanus produced only one work, the *Libri Magistratum*, and that all fragments belong to this.

Numaeon books (in 181) fell in the thirteenth book of Tuditanus' history, but in the first book of Piso's.<sup>205</sup>

Pliny the Elder, Plutarch, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus cite Tuditanus, but the remainder of the fragments come from grammarians or miscellanists (e.g., Gellius). Dionysius ranks Tuditanus among the most learned (*logiotatoi*) of the historians; excepting Dionysius' remark, we have no other judgment from the ancients on Tuditanus' merit.<sup>206</sup>

The fragments of Tuditanus preserve no preface or remarks regarding his intentions, purpose, nor choice of form. This is no longer surprising; as with the earlier historians, any comments about the choice of form is largely to be divined from the few remaining fragments. In the case of Tuditanus, the fragments offer little, but a surprising twist might allow us some room to speculate on Tuditanus and annalistic form. What we have seen is that the fragments comprise topics that are traditional in other annalists. Tuditanus wrote an annalistic history—yet when he looked for his own exploits to be recorded and immortalized, Tuditanus did not favor an annalistic form, but instead looked to poetry.

At the request of Tuditanus, the poet Hostius composed an epic to immortalize Tuditanus' victory over the Iapydes and his subsequent triumph in 129. Hostius' work, the *Bellum Histricum*, survives only in approximately six lines.<sup>207</sup> It appears to have been an historical epic, written in hexameters, focusing on the military campaigns of the Istrian war of Tuditanus.<sup>208</sup> It is

---

<sup>205</sup> Frag. 7 = Plin. *HN* 13.84-88.

<sup>206</sup> Frag. 1 = Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 1.11.1.

<sup>207</sup> von Albrecht 1997: 380 and Cichorius 1908: 183 and 190. The fragments of Hostius are collected in Courtney 1993.

<sup>208</sup> The subject of Hostius' *Bellum Histricum* is not universally agreed upon, and this, of course, affects the notion of Tuditanus commissioning it. The Istrian war of the epic might refer to the battles of 178 or to those of 129, the battles which Tuditanus participated in. On the whole, most scholars believe that the campaigns of 129 are a more suitable topic, since Ennius covered those of 178, and Hostius probably would have avoided competition with Ennius. Cf. Courtney 1993:

telling that in the second century a Roman historian, author of a work in the Roman annalistic form, might have preferred a poetic genre to provide immortality. Perhaps because Roman historiography was still in its infancy, with only Cato, Piso, and Cassius Hemina writing Roman history in Latin before him, Tuditanus thought epic might be more successful. Perhaps epic was a more appropriate form to sing of battles. Whatever Tuditanus' reasons were, his choice allows us to wonder if he was not fully confident in the value and authority of the historical form he himself was using for his history of Rome.

### Cnaeus Gellius

Last among the second century annalists of note is Cnaeus Gellius, whose fame here rests more on the size of his history than its quality. Nonetheless, Gellius is useful in depicting new characteristics of annalistic history at the waning years of the second century. His use of them might imply a choice of *annales* for its flexibility; the annalistic form offered him both convention and innovation.

Cnaeus Gellius lived sometime after Piso, Cassius Hemina, and around the same time as Coelius Antipater and Gaius Fannius, two non-annalistic historians. His dates are not certain; Cicero places him between Fabius Pictor and Coelius Antipater, and closer to Coelius.<sup>209</sup> A further notation by Cicero, however, has Gellius after Coelius, but a reading of Gellius' fragments suggests that he was probably a contemporary of Coelius and Fannius.<sup>210</sup> Gellius

---

52, and Casali 2006: 593. Vinchesi 1984: 59 finds a "rapporto clientelare" between Hostius and Tuditanus, and argues for a date of post 129.

<sup>209</sup> Frag. 21= Cic. *Div.* 1.55: *omnes hoc historici Fabii Gellii sed proxume Coelius*. Wiseman 1979: 142 emends the text to read *sed maxume*, and Chassignet 1999/2003: XLIX retains that reading as it portrays Cn. Gellius as a contemporary of Fannius, as Cicero had in *Leg.* 1.6. Studies (and biographies): Peter 1914: CCIV-CCX; Bardon 1952:77-80; Badian 1966: 11-13; Wiseman 1979: 20-23; Rawson 1976: 713-717; von Albrecht 1997: 383; Walt 1997: 85-87; Beck and Walter 2001: 347-348; Chassignet 1999/2003: XLIX-LIV.

<sup>210</sup> Cic. *Leg.* 1.6. In particular, frag. 6 (= Solin. 1.8-9) which implies knowledge of the Social War, allows a date contemporaneous with Coelius Antipater and Fannius.

might have held the position of *triumvir monetalis*, but he was not the Cn. Gellius against whom Cato delivered a speech.<sup>211</sup>

Gellius' history, supported by a strong chronological framework, might have reached ninety-seven books.<sup>212</sup> No date of publication is agreed upon. Various hypotheses see Gellius writing between 140 and 130, or 130-90, or more generally after the publication of the *annales maximi*.<sup>213</sup> The last attested event in Gellius' history is the secular games of 146; in what book this fell remains unknown.<sup>214</sup>

Despite the great size of Gellius' work, only thirty-five fragments survive.<sup>215</sup> These derive chiefly from Charisius (eleven fragments), Dionysius of Halicarnassus (six fragments), and Pliny the Elder (five fragments). Livy does not cite him. Gellius treated Roman history of each period at great length, very probably augmenting a skeletal framework of magistrates with inventive fiction. The period of the kings is covered at least in Books 2 and 3.<sup>216</sup> The next datable fragment, fragment 24, however, detailing the instituting of the *dies atri* (in 389), fell in Book

---

<sup>211</sup> Crawford 1974 dates the *triumvir* (no. 232) to 138; Rawson 1976: 713 and Wiseman 1979: 20 believe this politician to be the historian. Münzer and Peter 1914: CCVI do not, calling the *triumvir*, the adversary of Cato, and the historian all one and the same man. Cato's adversary is to be found in Cato frag. 206 Malcovati. Rawson 1976: 713, Wiseman 1979: 20 and Chassignet 1999/2003: L find that the date for Cato's adversary is too early, but find it reasonable to believe that the historian could possibly be his son (who was also the *triumvir*).

<sup>212</sup> Frag. 30 = Charisius *Gramm.* I, p. 68B. That figure is contested by Münzer 1910: 998 and Rawson 1976: 714. Peter 1914: CCVI and Bardon 1952: 79, however, see a consistency with the length of Livy's history.

<sup>213</sup> Chassignet 1999/2003: LI provides a summary of this debate. Frier 1979/1999: 210 prefers a date of 140-130, Wiseman 1979: 142 opts for 130-90, Badian 1966: 12 sides with a date after the publication of the *annales maximi*. Chassignet 1999/2003: LII would rather see a beginning to the writing between 130 and 120, with continued writing, due to the great length of the work, after the publication of Coelius Antipater's *Bellum Punicum*.

<sup>214</sup> Frag. 29 (= Censorinus *DN* 17.11).

<sup>215</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1999/2003: 71-83; Peter 1914: 148-157 (34 fragments); and Beck and Walter 2001: 349-367 (35 fragments).

<sup>216</sup> Frags. 11-19.



15.<sup>217</sup> Cn. Gellius covered only just over two hundred years in twelve books. Fragment 24 (=Macrob. *Sat* 1.16.21-24) explicitly tells the reader that Gellius discussed the *dies atri* in his Book 15, while Cassius Hemina wrote about it in the second book of his Histories. What Hemina covered in two books, Cn. Gellius covered in fifteen. Moreover, Cn. Gellius had reached only the year 216 by Book 33, leaving some sixty books more to cover the period from the Second Punic War down to his day.<sup>218</sup> Perhaps Cn. Gellius had at his disposal pontifical records, though no longer being recorded on the whitened boards. Presented with this material in its barest form, Cn. Gellius might have found it attractive to elaborate on the bare bones outline of Roman history, and thus created a history where little hard evidence had survived.<sup>219</sup>

The fragments cover a range of material from pre-history to 146 on topics from earliest legends until events of Cn. Gellius' own time. Unfortunately, many of Cn. Gellius' fragments are extant only because Charisius was interested in the grammatical peculiarities found in Gellius. Beyond the sheer length of Cn. Gellius, and his grammatical oddities, however, we might mention several other defining characteristics. Firstly, the early books of Cn. Gellius focused on legends not only of Rome but also of wider Italy, perhaps in conscious imitation of Cato's early books on Italian cities and customs. Indeed Cn. Gellius has been viewed as an (unsuccessful) imitator of Cato.<sup>220</sup> Cn. Gellius appears knowledgeable about Italian history more

---

<sup>217</sup> Frag. 24 = Macrob. *Sat*. 1.16.21-24.

<sup>218</sup> Frag. 27 = Charisius *Gramm.* I, p. 69 B.

<sup>219</sup> This predilection led Badian 1966: 11 to see in him and Piso "the expansion of the past." Wiseman 1979: 22 deduces in Cn. Gellius a "*horror vacui*", and proposes that Gellius found it "intolerable" that the *annales maximi* afforded only names and dates of consuls and little else. Gellius, therefore, Wiseman sees, filled in the rest. Rawson 1976: 714 insists that neither Gellius nor the other annalists made much use of the *annales maximi*. Her earlier work (Rawson 1971) specifically takes on the topic of the use of these materials.

<sup>220</sup> Chassignet 1999/2003: LIII. *Contra*: Rawson 1976: 715, who finds in Cn. Gellius none of Cato's serious interest in the "geography, ethnography, agriculture, laws, customs and characteristics" of the people of Italy.

broadly, though the fragments preserve no stories beyond Italy itself, particularly central Italy. His fragments address the Sabines (frag. 6 in which Megales teaches the Sabines augury and frag. 10 on the origin of the Sabines), the Etruscans (frag. 6 on Marsyas and Tarcho), and the Marsi especially, whose stories are recounted three times in fragments 6, 7, 8. His interest in these peoples suggests an Italian heritage for Cn. Gellius, which is possible, for the Gellii are not seen in Rome until the second century.<sup>221</sup>

Additionally, an enthusiasm for precision marks Cn. Gellius; several fragments incorporate specific dates, demonstrating a concern for chronology.<sup>222</sup> Missing from Gellius is a pre-occupation with monuments, in which he differs from almost all the earlier historians, including Piso. Nor does Cn. Gellius possess the heavy-handed moralizing tone of Piso. Instead he seems to be content to tell good stories, of inventors and discoverers, such as Sol, the son of Ocean (frag. 4) who discovered medicine in minerals, and Toxius (frag. 3), who discovered building with mud. As such these fragments echo an element of euhemerism found in the other early annalists, especially Cassius Hemina.

Nonetheless, Cn. Gellius is worthy of note if only due to the vast size of his history, elaborating apparently more and more as the history progressed towards his own day. In his eagerness to fill out the framework of Roman history, his enthusiasm appears to have led to his “expansion of the past,” as Badian named it. Where he might not have found evidence, Cn. Gellius, perhaps relying on rhetorical practices of plausibility, added his own materials. Annalistic history no longer had to be a mere listing of events or names, but would be a framework for narrative, even entertainment.

---

<sup>221</sup> On Gellius’ lineage, see Rawson 1976: 715.

<sup>222</sup> E.g., frags. 11, 18, and 20.

In the second century Roman historians began to use a variety of forms, yet the annalistic form remained a favorite. *Annales* in Greek were still composed, but historiography in Latin was well underway, and was written first in the annalistic form in Latin by Lucius Cassius Hemina and Lucius Calpurnius Piso. Hemina's work treated religious matters at length, including etymologies and etiologies; little is known about Hemina himself, but it appears that he held no magistracies, and thus is the exception for writers of annalistic history in the second century. Calpurnius Piso, however, a politician with a long career, focused on the political and military, *res internae* and *res externae*. Sempronius Tuditanus, likewise a politician, recorded Rome's history in *Annales* but when it came time to have his own deeds commemorated, he apparently looked to poetry to do so. Lastly, Cnaeus Gellius composed a lengthy history, which provided a depth, if not veracity, to Rome's past. Four historians, then, in the later second century each adapted this form, writing in Latin rather than Greek, and utilized it for his own purposes. None of these historians left a preface; in none of them is preserved any intentional statement regarding historiographic aim. Yet something of their goals and their opinion of the form can be derived from the material which remains extant, and the context in which they wrote. All found the annalistic form a flexible medium which allowed them to emphasize various aspects of Roman history.

## CHAPTER 4 REVIVALISTS: ANNALISTS OF THE FIRST CENTURY

In the first half of the first century prior to 63, the annalistic form coexisted alongside other historiographical forms. In addition to *annales*, there were *commentarii*, and one contemporary history which was almost a monograph. These works continued to help set the stage for later types of historiography; Sallust's monographs appear after Cicero's consulship, as do Cornelius Nepos' universal history and Caesar's *commentarii*.

The use of *annales* in the first century, however, was not entirely expected. Between the second century and the early first century annalists, almost a generation had passed without anyone writing annals. The annalistic form had fallen out of favor in the competition with histories that focused on a particular time or a particular methodology. Thus the writing of Roman history in annalistic form in the first century amounted to a revival of the tradition. These historians of the first century would renew the form, bringing a focus on documentation, new sources, an interest in narrative and entertainment, as well as a non-senatorial perspective.

In the first century, the traditional annalistic form shaped the works of the three major historians, Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, Valerius Antias, and Licinius Macer, known more for Livy's use of them rather than their own merits.<sup>223</sup> Licinius Macer famously discovered the linen

---

<sup>223</sup> On the first century historians, see, Badian 1966: 18-23, Ogilvie 1965: 7-17, Wiseman 1981: 375-393; Conte 1994: 122, and von Albrecht 1997: 384-389. Aelius Tubero wrote *Historiae* sometime in the first century; both Lucius Aelius Tubero and Quintus Aelius Tubero have been at times identified as the author, though current scholarship holds Quintus, the son of Lucius, as the author of a history at least fourteen books long. It was published well after the consulship of Cicero and thus after the end point of this dissertation's parameters (a *terminus post quem* of 46-44 is indicated in Tubero frag. 4). As the youngest of four historians of the first century whom Livy uses, Tubero presented a different kind of history. Unlike his first century predecessors, Tubero wrote a *historia* rather than *annales*. On Tubero, see Badian 1966: 22-23, von Albrecht 1997: 388, and Chassignet 2004: LXXVI-LXXXI.

books, a previously unknown or unused source.<sup>224</sup> Valerius Antias' history might have filled some seventy-five books, thus demonstrating received characteristics of Roman history writing: the annalistic form, the expansion of the past, and a focus on more recent events (possibly two-thirds of his work dealt with more recent years). Quintus Claudius Quadrigarius' history won praise from Fronto, or rather his style of writing did.<sup>225</sup> Additionally, Quadrigarius' work is of interest for its variation in annalistic form; rather than begin *ab urbe condita*, Quadrigarius chose a different starting point—the sack of Rome by the Gauls in 390.

### Quintus Claudius Quadrigarius

Q. Claudius Quadrigarius is the first annalist of the first century.<sup>226</sup> Velleius Paterculus (2.9.6) describes him as *aequalis Sisennae*, but calls Rutilius Rufus and Valerius Antias *aequales* of Sisenna as well. As noted by Badian, Rutilius Rufus served as praetor in 118 and Sisenna held the same post some forty years later in 78, scarcely making the two of them *aequales*.<sup>227</sup> Quadrigarius may be assumed to have flourished somewhere between the two. Not part of the *gens* Claudia as his *cognomen* demonstrates, Q. Claudius Quadrigarius probably came from Italian municipal aristocracy.<sup>228</sup> He held no offices nor undertook a military career.

---

<sup>224</sup> Badian 1966: 22, and Frier 1975: 79-97.

<sup>225</sup> Fronto *ap.* Gell. *NA* 13.29.2.

<sup>226</sup> Studies (and biographies): Peter 1914: CCLXXXV-CCCIV; Zimmerer 1937; Klotz 1942; Walsh 1961: 110-137; Badian 1966: 18-21; Frier 1979/1999: 122-126; Timpe 1979; Bastian 1983; von Albrecht 1997: 385; von Albrecht 1989: 86-101; Beck and Walter 2004: 109-111; Chassignet 2004: XXIII-XXXVIII.

<sup>227</sup> Badian 1964: 429. Fronto's testimony (Fronto *Ep.* p. 134, van den Hout) is equally unhelpful. He places Quadrigarius between Fabius Pictor and Valerius Antias in a list based on style and not on chronology.

<sup>228</sup> Chassignet 2004: XXV. Badian 1966: 18 adds that he might have come from northern Italy because his fragments show a knowledge of that topography. For Badian, Q. Claudius Quadrigarius is probably not the same Clodius mentioned by Cicero (*Leg.* 1.6-7). In Cicero's chronological list of Roman historians, Clodius appears just before Macer. This Clodius is described by Cicero as similar to the ancient historians in their languor and clumsiness. Badian 1966: 21 argues that though chronologically in the right place, Cicero's Clodius cannot be

Quadrigarius thus stands apart from the tradition of senatorial historiography, and at the same time revived tradition by bringing back the *annales*.

Quadrigarius wrote one work of history, called *annales* almost everywhere.<sup>229</sup> Ninety-seven fragments survive, with forty-seven of them found in Aulus Gellius.<sup>230</sup> Nonius preserves a further twenty-four fragments. Another twelve fragments are extant in Livy, who used him extensively along with Valerius Antias. Twenty-three books are attested.<sup>231</sup> Book 1 treats the siege of Rome by the Gauls (frags. 1-6), the war with Pyrrhus and the onset of the First Punic War (frags. 40-42) fall in Book 3, the disaster at Cannae occurs in Book 5 (frag. 52), and the consulate of Q. Fabius Maximus (213) is found in Book 6 (frags. 56-57). Chassignet finds events from the years 197-169 very likely in Book 7 (frags. 62-63 and 68), the Achaean war, and war versus the Lusitanian Viriathus in Book 8 (frags. 69 and 70), and the battle of Numantia in 133 in Book 9 (frag. 76). Book 13 recorded the end of the second century and the beginning of the first (frag. 77), while Book 18 included the siege of Grumentum in the Social Wars (frag. 81). Book 19 covered the siege of Piraeus by Sulla (frags. 82a and 82b), the election of Marius to his seventh consulate (frag. 83), and such events as battle at Sacriportum and taking of Praeneste (frag. 85). What the remaining books contained is obscure, although a hypothesis poses the death of Sulla as a possible endpoint of the history.<sup>232</sup> Equally unclear is the date of publication; a date post Sulla is all that is certain. The attention paid to Quadrigarius' own time

---

Quadrigarius; their literary styles are not the same. *Contra* Wiseman 1979: 117 (and note 29) who declares "it is not easy to see who else Cicero could be referring to."

<sup>229</sup> There are few exceptions; two are found in frag. 48 (= Prisc. *Inst.* 6, p. 232 H) and frag. 72 (= Diom. 1, p. 383 K), both of which name his work *historiae*.

<sup>230</sup> Editions: Chassignet 2004: 13-75; Peter 1914: 205-237 (96 fragments); Beck and Walter 2004: 112-167 (97 fragments).

<sup>231</sup> Badian 1966:18 does not rule out the possibility of a twenty-fourth book in which he proposes Quadrigarius continued to about 70.

<sup>232</sup> E.g. Zimmerer 1937: 8. Chassignet 2004: XXVIII declares the suggestion unverifiable.

is more certain; he devotes only nine books to the years from 390 to 133, a span of about two hundred and sixty years. The remaining twelve books cover a shorter period, the years 133 to circa 80, at correspondingly greater length.

Two aspects of Quadrigarius' work are intriguing: form and style. Content is less so; Quadrigarius devoted more space to his own time, and in doing so passed quickly over key periods of Roman history, such as the Punic Wars, and important events such as the trial of the Scipios.<sup>233</sup> Moreover, the paucity of fragments, most of them peculiar words and word choices, limit a clear look at Quadrigarius' content. Its form is annalistic to be sure, following standard conventions of such, but he avoids the traditional starting point of the foundation of Rome; Quadrigarius began his history with the sack of Rome by the Gauls in 390. That much is fairly clear; at least six fragments associated with his telling of that event are all placed by Gellius in *Q. Claudio primo Annali* (frags. 1-6). Why Quadrigarius chose to begin with 390 is not as clear-cut. If the author of these annals can be identified with the Clodius of Plutarch in *Numa* 1.1 who commented on the untrustworthy nature of source material prior to the sack of Rome in 390, perhaps we have the explanation for Quadrigarius' starting point. In *Numa* 1.1, a certain Clodius, author of *Elenchos Chronon*, argued that all records of Roman history were lost when the Gauls sacked the city. Furthermore, this Clodius contends, those ancient records which now tell of that time prior to the sack are mere forgeries, made up to please particular persons by inserting them among the noble families where they did not belong.<sup>234</sup> Plutarch's Clodius was not the only one to assert the loss of the pre-390 sources. Livy (6.1.1-2) later also maintained that many of the sources pre-dating 390 (*quae in commentariis pontificum aliisque publicis*

---

<sup>233</sup> Badian 1966: 19; he finds Quadrigarius' lack of attention to events like this indicative of a history without purpose.

<sup>234</sup> Plut. *Num.* 1.1-3.

*privatisque erant*) were lost in the burning of the city.<sup>235</sup> If Plutarch's Clodius and Q. Claudius Quadrigarius were the same man, Quadrigarius might have written a similar introduction to his history.<sup>236</sup> A proem to his history does not, however, survive. In one Quadrigarius perhaps stated that he found his sources for the regal years and early Republic less than credible.<sup>237</sup> Claudius Quadrigarius is indeed the only annalist who did not begin *ab urbe condita*.

If Quadrigarius can be associated with Clodius, such a stance towards questionable sources would provide insight into his methodology of writing history—that he conducted research and evaluated sources, rather than merely compiling information.<sup>238</sup> Moreover, a rejection of unconvincing source material would mark Quadrigarius' history as substantially different from those annals before his. An annalistic form revised, and sources well considered, then provide function and purpose for his history.

The backdrop for Quadrigarius' decision to reject the pre-390 material might have been a debate in the first century about the authenticity of ancient records. Cicero (*Brut.* 62) and Livy (8.40.4-5) both reflect the Plutarcean Clodius' concerns, less over the inaccuracy of early records, but more over the possible contamination and tampering of early records by plebeians

---

<sup>235</sup> Whether those sources included the pontifical chronicle is not known; Livy said only *pleraeque* and gave no further specifics. Similarly the "ancient records" of Clodius are not clearly identified, and in Plutarch's quotation they lack an antecedent. Yet Frier 1979/1999: 122-123 notes that the pontifical chronicle (later famously published as the *annales maximi*) is in fact called "the ancient records" in Dionysius (*AR* 7.1.6), thereby suggesting that the *annales maximi* were being referenced here.

<sup>236</sup> Frier 1979/1999: 122-123. Frier sees the two as "naturally associable," and hypothesizes that the *Elenchos Chronon* was "a preliminary exposition" which explained the omission of the early years.

<sup>237</sup> So Frier 1979/1999: 123-125. Indeed Quadrigarius' ignoring of this material fits with modern estimations of the importance of the *annales maximi* in the annalistic tradition. See further Rawson 1971 and Drews 1988.

<sup>238</sup> Among those most in favor of this argument is Frier 1975: 92-95.



with political hopes. Funeral eulogies, *laudationes*, were Cicero's prime suspect in the falsification of records, and thus in Rome's history:

quamquam his laudationibus historia rerum nostrarum est facta mendosior; multa enim scripta sunt in eis quae facta non sunt: falsi triumphi, plures consulatus, genera etiam falsa et ad plebem transitiones, cum homines humiliores in alienum eiusdem nominis infunderentur genus. (Cic. *Brut.* 62)

Livy similarly expresses unease with *laudationes*: *uitiatam memoriam funebribus laudibus reor falsisque imaginum titulis, dum familiae ad se quaeque famam rerum gestarum honorumque fallente mendacio trahunt; inde certe et singulorum gesta et publica monumenta rerum confusa.* The resulting (and purposeful) confusion is seen not only in histories of individuals but also, Livy complains, in the accounts of public events.

Moreover, the debate over authenticity of historical records in the first century also reflected tensions between patricians and plebeians, as well as *optimates* and *populares*. Plutarch's Clodius certainly rebuked the plebeians, as does Cicero. Quadrigarius' omission of the years before 390 and implied denunciation of the tainted sources may constitute support of the patrician class as well.<sup>239</sup> A refutation of plebeian aspirations would root the non-senatorial Quadrigarius on the side of the *optimates* during the contentious years at the beginning of the first century. Fragment 80 (= Gell. *NA* 1.7.9) supposes a dedicatee at the beginning of book eighteen who belonged to the patrician class.<sup>240</sup> Timpe draws attention to the term *bonitas* in that fragment, which he describes as a virtue possessed by a patron (*Patronstugend*). Such a reading posits Quadrigarius as a client to an unknown patrician, very possibly from the Claudii,

---

<sup>239</sup> Frier 1975: 153 sees a patrician bent in Quadrigarius, as does Timpe 1979: 110.

<sup>240</sup> Timpe 1979: 110. Timpe cites Hellegourac's 1963: 484 for his work on Latin vocabulary and party politics in the Republic.

and supports the hypothesis that Quadrigarius found early records untenable and even uncongenial.<sup>241</sup>

With doubt cast on the authenticity of records, even the ancient ones including the pontifical chronicles, first century annalists, including Quadrigarius, relied less on these sources, and turned more to their more reliable older counterparts, the annalists before them, and their *veteres annales*.<sup>242</sup> Their traditions were deemed more reliable than questionable ancient sources. In fact, the *annales maximi* are not once cited in the fragments of the annalists of the first century (nor are they named in Livy).<sup>243</sup> Therefore, first century annalists turned to different documentary sources to support the annalistic tradition. One of those sources is the *libri lintei* of Licinius Macer, to whom we will turn shortly.

Quadrigarius' fragments reveal research and use of a variety of sources. Quadrigarius used some material from earlier annalists, among them Acilius, according to Livy 25.39.11, in which a Claudius, probably Quadrigarius, is said to have translated the Greek books of Acilius into Latin. Additionally, like the other annalists of his century, Claudius bolstered his narrative with reference to documentation.<sup>244</sup> His non-senatorial origin, however, might have made access to such material more difficult than for his predecessors.<sup>245</sup>

---

<sup>241</sup> For example, Walsh 1961: 120 wonders if Claudius was displeased with the anti-Claudian character of the early tradition. More strongly, Wiseman 1979: 57-76 demonstrates the existence of a pro-Claudian tradition; while Quadrigarius is not named as author, and is indeed too early, Wiseman suspects, he surely would have participated in the shaping of that tradition.

<sup>242</sup> Frier 1979/1999: 158-159. Liv. 10.9.12 calls Piso *uetustior annalium auctor*; see also Liv. 4.20.8. Chassignet 2004: XXXII cites Bredehorn 1968: 91-92, who also believed Quadrigarius troubled about the veracity of his sources, and posed the *acta* of the Senate as a documentary source.

<sup>243</sup> Frier 1979/1999: 152.

<sup>244</sup> Frier 1979/1999: 150.

<sup>245</sup> Chassignet 2004: XXXIII.

In addition to Quadrigarius' tweaking of the annalistic form, his style also compels attention. It regularly won him praise from the ancients. Gellius *NA* 9.13.4 commended his narrative of Manlius Torquatus (frag. 10b), calling it *purissime atque inlustrissime simplicique et incompta orationis antiquae suavitate*.<sup>246</sup> In the same place Gellius remarked that the philosopher Favorinus also found the passage on Manlius moving, and declared that his mind was stirred by no less emotion than if he had been witnessing the event firsthand. Gellius (*NA* 14.1.4) additionally has a character in his work identify Quadrigarius as *optumus et sincerissimus scriptor* for his excellent story of Sulla's failure to burn a wooden tower in Piraeus (frag. 82a).<sup>247</sup> Gellius offered still another estimation concerning Quadrigarius' style in *NA* 13.29. In a discussion of Quadrigarius' phrase *cum multis mortalibus* versus the phrase *cum multis hominibus*, Gellius' friend admires Quadrigarius' version. Moreover, he calls Quadrigarius a man *iudicii elegantissimi* whose language is *modesti atque puri ac prope*. Gellius' use of Quadrigarius is extensive; forty-seven of Quadrigarius' fragments derive from Gellius' delight in them. Fronto deemed his writing *lepide*.<sup>248</sup>

Livy certainly used Quadrigarius and thereby conferred on him a certain fame. Twelve of Quadrigarius' fragments are found in Livy.<sup>249</sup> In the first decade of Livy, Quadrigarius is a chief source for Livy, who cites him four times in the second pentad. Quadrigarius appears once by name in the third decade (frag. 37 = Liv. 25.39.11-17), and in the fourth decade shows up seven times (frags. 62-68). Quadrigarius is not cited explicitly in the fifth decade. These fragments provide source material for Livy's narratives on military campaigns including the Hannibalic War. Livy primarily cites Quadrigarius (calling him Claudius) for casualty figures (e.g., frags.

---

<sup>246</sup> Frag. 10b = Gell. *NA* 9.13.4-19.

<sup>247</sup> Frag. 82a = Gell. *NA* 15.1.6.

<sup>248</sup> Fronto, *Ep.*, p. 134, van den Hout.

<sup>249</sup> Frags. 10a, 14, 18, 34, 57, and 62-68.

62-64), yet casts doubt on his numbers by including figures proposed by other annalists such as Valerius Antias. In other fragments, too, Livy explicitly questions the historian's information. In 6.42.4-5 (frag. 10a), for example, Livy is troubled by the fact that Quadrigarius placed the hand-to-hand battle of T. Manlius against an unnamed Gaul in the year 367. Displaying distrust in Quadrigarius, Livy announces his inclination to believe other accounts that date the event six years later. That instance was not the only time Livy registered apprehension with this source. In at least four of the twelve fragments in Livy, Livy himself openly discloses misgivings about Quadrigarius' information.

When Livy relies on Quadrigarius, he does not always name his source.<sup>250</sup> For example, the story of Titus Manlius Torquatus, whose date from Quadrigarius Livy had rejected in 6.42, does appear later in 7.10. There, Livy's source is not named, but a comparison between his story and Quadrigarius' version as preserved in Gellius (frag. 10b) demonstrates that Livy drew heavily from Quadrigarius for his account. Elsewhere, however, Quadrigarius appears to take a back seat to Valerius Antias when Livy uses them both.<sup>251</sup> Quadrigarius remained an important but suspect source for Livy.

Estimations of Quadrigarius vary significantly among modern scholars as well. Moderns find his style more carefully considered than other annalists' style, but not always successful. Badian, for example, spoke of Quadrigarius' "impudent ineptitude" in the matter of his exaggerated casualty figures, and discovered nothing original in Quadrigarius nor any profound

---

<sup>250</sup> On Livy's use of Quadrigarius in further detail, for which this manuscript cannot provide, see Walsh 1961: 114-137. Refer also to Chassignet 2004: XXXIV-XXXV and footnote 173, for further citations on Livy and Quadrigarius, including Klotz 1940: 24-78.

<sup>251</sup> See Walsh 1961: 133-134 and further citations there. Klotz 1940: 42 in particular cites Quadrigarius as secondary to Antias.

principled objective.<sup>252</sup> Though Leeman found nothing commendable in Quadrigarius' style, what Quadrigarius wrote was less successful than how he wrote.<sup>253</sup> Some modern scholars fault him for manipulating the facts, for being excessively patriotic, and for being uncritical. Others are less harsh; Timpe, in particular, sees him as a product of his age. According to Timpe, Claudius was less a historian and more a man of letters.<sup>254</sup>

### Valerius Antias

The first century annalist Valerius Antias shares many similarities with Q. Claudius Quadrigarius. Like Quadrigarius, Valerius Antias' background remains obscure. His *cognomen* suggests an affiliation with or an origin in Antium, and through that a status as a *municipalis*. He held no offices nor had a military career. There survives no real evidence of a connection with the *gens* Valeria but, on the model of Quadrigarius, Antias could have had a client relationship with some branch of that family, since his history elevated the Valerian family in many instances.<sup>255</sup>

When Antias lived and published his history is likewise uncertain. He does not appear in Cicero's list of Roman historians (*Leg.* 1.6-7, published in 52). Fronto's testimony, as in the case of Quadrigarius, is of little help; Antias follows Quadrigarius, but since Fronto grouped

---

<sup>252</sup> Badian 1966: 19. He also calls Quadrigarius' use of traditional literary devices "far from naïve or indiscriminate" though showing signs of "inadequate polish." Nor did Badian find in Quadrigarius any social or factional bias. Henderson 1957: 83, however, sees Quadrigarius as a supporter of the *populares* in her reading of frag. 56 (= Gell. *NA* 2.2.13) in which the *imperium* of the consul is superior because it derives from the people (*imperium quod populi esset*). Frier 1979/1999, Walsh 1961, and Timpe 1979 all find a patrician tone to Quadrigarius.

<sup>253</sup> Leeman 1963: 80-81 found the art of *inventio* more developed in the later annalists than *elocutio*, although Quadrigarius did not pass the "borders of comparative honesty." Quadrigarius' style, according to Leeman, is "jolty and jerky and almost static."

<sup>254</sup> Chassignet 2004: XXXVII, and Timpe 1979: 103-105.

<sup>255</sup> Studies (and biographies): Münzer 1891: 54-71; Münzer 1897; Peter 1914: CCCV-CCCXXXIII; Volkmann 1948: 2313-2340; Walsh 1961: 115-151; Badian 1966: 21; Cloud 1977; Frier 1979/1999: 188-189 and 150-152; Timpe 1979; Wiseman 1979: 112-117; von Albrecht 1997: 385-386; Wiseman 1998: 75-89; Chassignet 2001; Forsythe 2002; Beck and Walter 2004: 168-171; and Chassignet 2004: LXIII-LXXV.

Roman historians more by style and less by chronology, such a marking adds little.<sup>256</sup> Velleius Paterculus (2.9.6) describes both Quadrigarius and Antias as contemporaries of Sisenna.

Fragment 65, the last datable fragment, provides a *terminus post quem* of 91.<sup>257</sup>

Traditionally scholars have preferred a publication date after Sulla's death.<sup>258</sup> Newer arguments for the publication of Antias, however posit a later date, a *terminus post quem* of 66, and some range as late as 46. Through a close reading of Livy (4.23.1-3), in which Livy cites Antias, Licinius Macer, and Q. Tubero, it seems likely that Antias was writing about the year 464, after Macer and before Tubero. Macer, whom we will consider later, committed suicide in 66 after being prosecuted for maladministration; his history was probably not finished at his death (Livy, for example, uses Macer only in his first decade), and published shortly after.<sup>259</sup>

Tubero likely wrote towards the end of Caesar's life; an anachronistic reference to three bands of Lupercal runners during Romulus and Remus' time suggests a date after the institution of the third band in 45.<sup>260</sup> Antias thus was working on his history between 66 and 46.<sup>261</sup> That Cicero does not mention him in his *de Legibus* (written in 52) suggests a late date for Antias' publication, although Cicero's distaste for non-senatorial historians may also explain his

---

<sup>256</sup> Fronto *Ep.*, p. 134, van den Hout.

<sup>257</sup> Frag. 65 = Plin. *HN* 34.14. Pliny records Antias' notice of a sale by the heirs of the orator Lucius Crassus (who died in 91; see Cic. *De or.* 3.1)

<sup>258</sup> E.g., Peter 1914: CCLXXXV; Volkmann 1943: 2313; Walsh 1961: 115; Ogilvie 1965: 12; Badian 1966: 35; Timpe 1979: 97; Oakley 1997: 89.

<sup>259</sup> Forsythe 2002: 101.

<sup>260</sup> Q. Aelius Tubero frag. 4 (= Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 80.1-3). See also Forsythe 2002: 101.

<sup>261</sup> Forsythe 2002: 102 opts for a broader frame of 70 to 40, and Wiseman 1979: 121 goes as far as 43, the date Octavian married Clodius' daughter. Clodius would have represented a culmination for the vein of Claudian contempt Antias exhibited and the politically polar opposite of the Valerii who were always constitutional. Chassignet 2001 and Cloud 1977 both agree with a later date. Chassignet 2001: 63 proposes a publication date of 52-50. Cloud 1977: 225-227 proposes a very late date; he calls Antias a Caesarian author, and even has him writing in the 30s.

absence.<sup>262</sup> And in the *Brutus* (written in 46) Cicero appears to have read Antias; Cicero's inclusion of M'. Valerius among the earliest orators probably derives from Antias. Sometime between 52 and 46 Cicero read Antias. And while a late date for the publication puts Antias beyond the parameters of this dissertation, the lingering uncertainty over the late publication mandates the discussion of Antias here. Moreover, Antias remains regularly grouped with the younger annalists who served as Livy's sources.<sup>263</sup>

Antias' history survives in sixty-seven fragments.<sup>264</sup> These witness to a history that treated Rome from its origin (frags. 1-14) down to the first century in at least seventy-five books (frag. 64).<sup>265</sup> Its considerable size dwarfs all of the histories of the fragmentary historians, annalists or otherwise, except for Cn. Gellius.<sup>266</sup> In addition to the founding of the city and the period of the kings, fragments treat the early years of the Republic (frags. 18-22), the Punic Wars (frags. 23-31), and the second century (frags. 32-64).<sup>267</sup> Recent scholarship has assisted in clarifying uncertainties regarding the arrangement of Antias' history. Fragment 58, for example, is the last datable fragment that also includes an indication of the book in which it belonged.<sup>268</sup> This fragment, cited by Aulus Gellius 6.9.12 as falling in Book 22, appears to allude to the quaestorship of Tiberius Gracchus in 136, suggesting that Antias covered the years from 136

---

<sup>262</sup> Chassignet 2004: LXV, and in particular, Badian 1966: 20.

<sup>263</sup> Timpe 1979: 97 groups him with the "jüngerer Annalistik."

<sup>264</sup> Editions: Chassignet 2004: 104-150; Peter 1914: 238-275 (66 fragments); Beck and Walter 2004: 172-240 (67 fragments).

<sup>265</sup> Frag. 63 (= Gell. NA 6.9.17).

<sup>266</sup> Chassignet 2004: LXIX points out that compared to Livy, this number of books does not need to be treated as extraordinary.

<sup>267</sup> Chassignet 2004: LXVIII lays out the scheme.

<sup>268</sup> Of Antias' sixty-seven fragments, only these indicate book citations: frags. 7-8, 9b, 15-17, and 58-63.

down to 91 in some fifty-three books.<sup>269</sup> Such a degree of attention paid to contemporary times is unprecedented. In view of this fact, Münzer presented a startling statistic—the ratio between time spent on the ancient epoch versus modern times comes to 1/4 in Livy and 1/30 in Antias.<sup>270</sup> Fragment 58, however, now is seen as referring not to 136 but rather to the peace treaty after Caudine Forks in 321.<sup>271</sup> Antias' Book 22 would then have reached the year 321 rather than the year 136, meaning that the remaining fifty-three books covered a longer span of time and devoted less time to the more contemporary period. This scenario seems more reasonable because no other annalist devoted so many books to present time. Other fragments, once difficult to place, have found homes now.<sup>272</sup> Fragment 61 (= Gell. *NA* 6.9.9) is reported by Gellius to have been excerpted from Book 45, and alludes to a trial of *perduellio* and a day arranged for an assembly by the praetor M. Marcius. Because the *praenomen* Marcus was rare in the Marcii family, and the only known praetor with such a name was M. Marcius Ralla who served in 204, fragment 61 allows us then to assume that Antias treated the year 204 in Book

---

<sup>269</sup> Chassignet 2004: LXIX provides the date of 136 for Gracchus' office, but Broughton *MRR* I: 485 prefers a date of 137. Forsythe 2002: 105-106 disagrees with a date of 136/7 for frag. 58, and affirms instead that the fragment alludes to peace after Caudine Forks in 321. Thus Forsythe finds a more plausible disposition of material across the seventy-five books, with fifty-three books treating over two hundred-twenty years. Another hypothesis, less successful, posed by Münzer, suggested that Gellius' placement of frags. 61 and 63 in books XLV and LXXV, was incorrect, and they correctly belong in books XV and XXV. Priscian's mention of a seventy-fourth book, however, makes such an identification difficult. That two different sources, Gellius and Priscian, both speak of books numbering in the seventies provides some certainty.

<sup>270</sup> Münzer 1897: 479. Chassignet 2004: LXX notes that Münzer associates material in Antias' books XLV and LXXV with Livy's books CXII and CLXXXVII, while Walt 1997: 304 matches Antias' book LXXV with Livy's CXCVI. Nevertheless, the figures still demonstrate Antias' greater emphasis on the contemporary period than Livy. Cato, however, as Chassignet 2004: LXXI challenges, devoted four out of seven books to contemporary times.

<sup>271</sup> Forsythe 2002: 104-105.

<sup>272</sup> See primarily Forsythe 2002: 104-108 (on seven different fragments) and Wiseman 1998: 75-89.



45.<sup>273</sup> Fragment 62 (= Prisc. *Inst.* 9, p. 489 H) cites a seventy-fourth book, and is generally interpreted as referring to a ritual purification ceremony dating to 120. Fragment 63, from Book 75, traditionally has been associated with Q. Marcius Rex's presiding over the Senate immediately after his son's funeral in 118.<sup>274</sup> Thus arranged, Antias' lengthy work treated Roman history on a scale much like Cn. Gellius had done in the second century. More interestingly, in their handling of the third and second centuries, Antias is much like Livy in his own extensive annals.

There is little doubt that Antias wrote in the annalistic form. Only six fragments preserve a title to his work; two use the title *Annales*, two *Historia*, and two *Historiae*.<sup>275</sup> Five instances of its title survive in Gellius who used all three variations without differentiation. One explanation for the various titles accorded his history is that Antias treated the "l'époque la plus ancienne" in the form of *Annales* and the more recent period in the form of *historia*.<sup>276</sup> Yet Gellius used the title *Annales* when referring to Antias' Book 45, and *historia* when alluding to Antias' recounting of Romulus.<sup>277</sup> Antias' own title for his work does not survive. His work very likely received the description *historia* as part of the distrust in annalistic sources in the late Republic which Quadrigarius had perceived.<sup>278</sup> Additionally, the infamy of certain works called *Annales*, such as the *cacata charta*, the *Annales* of Volusius, and others, might have imparted a less than desirable association with the title.<sup>279</sup> In terms of form, as an annalist, Antias preserved annalistic

---

<sup>273</sup> Münzer 1897: 470, and Forsythe 2002: 104.

<sup>274</sup> Peter 1914: 274, and Forsythe 2002: 104.

<sup>275</sup> *Annales*: frags. 17 (= Prisc. *Inst.* 7, p. 347 H) and 61 (= Gell. *NA* 6.9.9); *Historia*: frags. 3 (= Gell. *NA* 7.7.6) and 22 (= Gell. *NA* 3.8.1-4); *Historiae*: frags. 58 (= Gell. *NA* 6.9.12) and 63 (= Gell. *NA* 6.9.17).

<sup>276</sup> Chassignet 2004: LXXI.

<sup>277</sup> Respectively referring to frag. 61 and frag. 3.

<sup>278</sup> Frier 1979/1999: 218.

<sup>279</sup> Catullus 36: *Annales Volusi, cacata charta*; Frier 1979/1999: 218.

traditions such as beginning *ab urbe condita*, treating the early years of Rome, proceeding chronologically from beginning to end, providing etymologies and etiologies (e.g., frags. 1-3), names of magistrates (e.g., frag. 20) and details of *res internae* and *externae*.

Whereas Gellius was fond of Quadrigarius and preserved almost half of his fragments, he is less sanguine about Antias. Gellius preserves only eight of Antias' fragments. Antias' style did not charm Gellius or the other grammarians as previous annalists had. In fact, the grammarians are silent on Antias. Antias rather was known to the ancients, and primarily to Livy, for content and not style (hence Fronto's declaration of his style as *invenuste*).<sup>280</sup> Plutarch, Dionysius, and Pliny the Elder, for example, used his work.<sup>281</sup> Livy, of course, constitutes our major source for Antias, preserving thirty-three of Antias' fragments. With a history seventy-five books long, Antias offered much (and recent) material to his successors.

Livy's use of Antias is well documented.<sup>282</sup> Antias appears, mentioned by name and thus both credited and culpable, in the first, third, fourth, and fifth decades of Livy, and even in the *Periochae*.<sup>283</sup> In the third decade, Livy follows Antias on the campaigning in Italy after Cannae, alongside Coelius Antipater, and more extensively at the end of the decade (five times in Book 39). In the fourth and fifth decades, Livy used Antias for details on western affairs and Italian affairs (e.g., frag. 35 on casualty figures for Marcellus' battle at Como). Livy's use of Antias was not, however, without critical judgment. A paradigmatic example records Livy's concern with

---

<sup>280</sup> Fronto *Ep.*, p. 134, van den Hout. Leeman 1963: 81-82 agrees with Fronto's assessment. He describes Antias' style as a kind of "chancery style, heavy, elaborate and artificial."

<sup>281</sup> E.g., Plutarch: frags 5, 9a, and 13; Dionysius: frag. 4; Pliny the Elder: frags. 9b, 12, 16, 65, and 67. These direct citations of Antias by name are only part of the use of Antias by these historians. See further Chassignet 2004: LXXIV and Peter 1914: CCCXXVI.

<sup>282</sup> See Klotz 1940: 278-280; Walsh 1961: 121-122, 127, 133-153; Wiseman 1979: 113-118, and Oakley 1997: 89-90.

<sup>283</sup> First decade: frags. 20 and 21; third decade: frags. 24-25, 27-31; fourth decade; frags. 32-37, 39-50; fifth decade: frags. 40, and 51-55; and *Periochae*: frag. 64.

the veracity of Antias' history. In fragment 25 (= Liv. 26.49.1-5), Livy is unable to discern reliable figures for hostages (and more) after the sacking of New Carthage, and is forced to offer estimates from two historians, Silenus and Antias. Livy's frustration with his historical sources is evident in his proclamation in fragment 25, *adeo nullus mentiendi modus est*, directed more at Antias than his Greek source. Further, Livy finds no agreement among his sources for amount of money taken, and finally, perhaps exasperatedly, settles for suggesting that figures halfway between two extremes are closest to the truth (*si aliquis adsentiri necesse est, media simillima ueri sunt*).<sup>284</sup> Elsewhere, Livy accused Antias of lying (frag. 10), expressed uncertainty with his source (frag. 20), and accused Antias of making things up *impudenter* (frag. 30).

In addition to skepticism leveled against Antias by Livy, Antias' possible writing of fifty-three books encompassing a mere forty years, indeed the sheer volume of the history, has produced suspicion that he filled out those years by inventing, stretching, and even falsifying material. That suspicion is not unfounded when examining aspects of Antias' history such as casualty figures, though trustworthy casualty figures are notoriously difficult to come by.<sup>285</sup> Antias additionally employed the rhetorical method of *inventio*, including plausible, if not verifiably true, material to elaborate on a story. The training of a historian in Rome, even a non-senatorial one such as Antias, would have included a study of rhetoric, and thus the addition of narrative for ornamentation would not have been viewed as unusual. And yet Cicero, that lover of ornamentation and history with style, also declared that the one base rule of history writing

---

<sup>284</sup> Liv. 26.49.6, which immediately follows upon frag. 25 but is not included in the fragment.

<sup>285</sup> Not all have found Antias guilty of exaggeration. LaRoche 1977, 1984, and 1988 examines Antias' figures in an unconvincing attempt to rehabilitate him.

was not to lie, to tell the truth.<sup>286</sup> Apparently, Antias did not always do so. “Plausibly detailed mendacity” served Antias.<sup>287</sup>

The most egregious examples of Antias’ willingness to fabricate are found in the invention of documents and facts (even undocumented consulships). In his tale of the burning of the books of Numa, for example, Antias cited a Senate document that ordered the burning (frag. 16= Plin. *HN* 13.87). Nowhere else is that document cited. Similarly in Livy’s account of battles in 464 (3.4-5), a fictitious prorogation appears to have been derived from Antias as well.<sup>288</sup>

A result of Antias’ creative scholarship was his favoring of the *gens* Valeria with whom he might have had a client relationship. Thus, for example, he created a senatorial ancestor for himself, L. Valerius Antias, who held a post during the Second Punic War. He invented at least one consulship for the Valerius who was present when the Magna Mater statue was received in Rome.<sup>289</sup> He may even have been the author of the version of the same story in which not Quinta Claudia, but Valeria, greeted the goddess on her arrival in Rome.<sup>290</sup> Moreover, elements of the Valerian tradition surface in key moments of early Roman history from the treaty between Romulus and the Sabines to Coriolanus in 488.

Traced first by Münzer in 1891, Valerius Antias appears responsible for the highlighting of the Valerian *gens* which is found in a variety of authors including Plutarch, Dionysius, and

---

<sup>286</sup> Cic. *De or.* 2.62: *Nam quis nescit primam esse historiae legem, ne quid falsi dicere audeat.*

<sup>287</sup> Badian 1966: 21.

<sup>288</sup> Forsythe 2002: 110.

<sup>289</sup> See Liv. 29.11.3; 29.11.8, 29.14.5; and 30.23.5. On fictitious consulships of Marcus Valerius Laevinus and legates in the Valerian tradition, see Wiseman 1979: 57-61 and 114-15, as well as his notes there. Broughton 1952 I: 277 notes one consulship for Laevinus in 210.

<sup>290</sup> In the hostile Claudian tradition, pro-Valerian passages, actions and deeds often are present. On the Valerian tradition, and its corollary, this hostile Claudian tradition, see sources in the next note. For a tabular view of the ups and downs of the Claudian and Valerian families in the 60s and 50s, when Wiseman sees Antias still writing, see Wiseman 1979: 132.

Livy.<sup>291</sup> In Antias' privileging of the Valerii, he provided a function and purpose for his work, which would have been published not too long after Claudius Quadrigarius, at most 30 years. If Antias is indeed the author or keeper of the hostile Claudian tradition and pro-Valerian tradition, his work can be viewed less as a literary exercise and more as a politically charged attempt at magnifying the historical importance of one family and even historical validity. In the publication of Antias' work, we find historiography competing—for credibility, validity and ultimately for gain, personal and public.

Quadrigarius' and Antias' choice of form, the *annales*, thus makes perfect sense. The annalistic form by convention kept Rome at the center, but could also track the efforts of individuals and families on behalf of that city. Both historians demonstrate Rome's glory, and at the same time showcase the enduring legacy and contributions made by specific families across a long stretch of time. Yet this is not to say that either Quadrigarius or Antias wrote a history that was a biography of a family; both men amply displayed a broader Roman patriotism throughout their works. The annalistic form provided a means to write of Roman history, to provide a full and ample narrative, and contextualize contributions within a larger scheme. If we can say that Antias, in particular, wrote to praise a family, the annalistic form is appropriate and effective because it allows a longitudinal study rather than the compact period a monograph would necessitate. The portrait of an enduring family in an enduring Rome would sit well with a Roman audience. The annalistic form added *gravitas*. Further the use of a traditional and authoritative format itself provided credibility to two historians who came from a non-senatorial background.

---

<sup>291</sup> Münzer's 1891 dissertation *de Gente Valeria* (Berlin) was followed by his article in 1897, and more recently reaffirmed by Wiseman 1979: 113-139 and especially Wiseman 1998: 75-89, who examines twelve appearances of the Valerian family in early Republican history, and finds the hand of Antias in each.

## Licinius Macer

Licinius Macer, on the contrary, had no such need to assert credibility. From a distinguished plebeian family, Licinius Macer was the first senator since the second century to write a history of Rome *ab urbe condita* in the annalistic form. Father of the poet and orator Calvus and descendant of the public-serving Licinii, Macer was *triumvir monetalis* in 84, quaestor at an unknown date, tribune of the plebs in 73, praetor in 68, and provincial governor the next year. In 66 he was prosecuted for extortion in his administration of his province (Cic. *Att.* 1.4.2), and shortly after being found guilty (though defended by Licinius Crassus), he committed suicide (Val. Max. 9.12.7).<sup>292</sup>

Little survives today of Macer's history. Only twenty-six fragments remain from a work that numbered at least sixteen books.<sup>293</sup> The extent of each book is unclear; allusions to the history's arrangement yield few solid conclusions. Book 1 is cited four times for material having to do with the foundation of Rome and the regal period, and Book 2, cited by Priscian (frag. 21), alludes to Pyrrhus. Livy does not mention Macer after the year 299 (frag. 20).<sup>294</sup> Fragment 23 in Priscian mentions a sixteenth book but the content and date cannot be ascertained. Priscian's citation of Book 2 for the fragment regarding Pyrrhus is difficult. Considering Macer's keen interest in the regal years, it is unlikely that he covered Roman history from the regal years to 272 in just one book. Though Macer was an orator as well, Cicero faults him for his *loquacitas*, and thus it is scarcely likely that Macer raced through early Republican history in just one book,

---

<sup>292</sup> Studies (and biographies): Peter 1914: CCCL-CCCLXV; Münzer 1926: 419-435; Ogilvie 1958, Frier 1975; Frier 1979/1999: 153-158; Hodgkinson 1997; Walt 1997; Beck and Walter 2004: 314-317; and Chassignet 2004: L-LXIII. On his offices, see Broughton 1952 II: 110 and 138.

<sup>293</sup> Editions: Chassignet 2004: 89-103; Peter 1914: 298-307 (25 fragments); Walt 1997: 196-211 (26 fragments); Beck and Walter 2004: 318-345 (26 fragments). Frag. 23 (= Prisc. *Inst.* 10, p. 525H) cites a sixteenth book.

<sup>294</sup> Frag. 20 = Liv. 10.9.10-11.

though Cicero did not speak of the content or scope of the work.<sup>295</sup> Yet, a cursory attention to the early years could suggest an arrangement in which Macer devoted most of the remaining books to his own period. If, however, Macer did treat the later years of the Republic, the fact that Livy does not use Macer remains a problem particularly in the light of Livy's explicit allusion to Macer's new documentary sources.<sup>296</sup>

Licinius Macer's history followed conventional patterns of the *annales* form. All references to his history title it *Annales* with the exception of one in Macrobius, who uses the term *historia*.<sup>297</sup> Macer treated Rome's pre-history (as only annalists had done) and regal period, listed triumphs and military events, and recorded regularly the magistrates of each year (e.g., frags. 14-18). An antiquarian interest is unmistakable in the Romulean fragments in which he displayed an interest in early institutions (e.g., frag. 7 on the establishment of the dictatorship).<sup>298</sup> Intentional statements regarding his choice of form do not survive: no proem, prelude or dedication provides Macer's own reasons for using the annalistic form.

His sources, however, suggest not only a reason why he adopted the *annales* form, but motivations behind his writing. A senator with presumably better access to documentation than his contemporaries Quadrigarius and Antias, Licinius Macer discovered the so-called *libri lintei*,

---

<sup>295</sup> Cic. *Leg.* 1.6-7. The paucity of historical fragments of Macer inhibits a sure estimation of his style; the grammarians show little interest in him. Only seven out of twenty-six fragments are found in the grammarians. Leeman 1963: 82-83 therefore does not judge Macer's prose style but notes a probably connection to "popular Hellenism" in Rome. Cicero's term *loquacitas* is one often applied disparagingly to Greeks. Note too that Macer's son Calvus was part of a group of poets, including Catullus, who favored and followed Hellenistic models and examples. On Licinius Macer as an orator, see Cic. *Brut.* 238. Fragments of Macer's speeches are collected in Malcovati 1979: 357-358.

<sup>296</sup> On the arrangement of Macer's books, see Walt 1997: 105-118 and Chassignet 2004: LV-LVI (who notes that after book twenty Livy chiefly followed Polybius).

<sup>297</sup> Citations of the title *annales*: frags. 8, 9, 22, 23. In frag. 26 (= Ioann. Malal. *Chron.* 7, p. 179-180 Dind [= p. 285-287 Migne]) Macer is called a *chronographos*. Macrobius alone uses *historia* in frag. 2 (= Macrob. *Sat.* 1.10.17).

<sup>298</sup> Walt 1997: 169-183 finds antiquarianism a central feature; frag. 7 = Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 5.74.4.

the linen books, in the Temple of Juno Moneta.<sup>299</sup> As *triumvir monetalis*, Macer had access to the temple where he found preserved on linen lists of senior magistrates. No one had seen them or used them before. The surviving fragments of Macer do not tell us about the books; we do not know how they came to the temple, how they were preserved, or why the information on them sometimes diverged from other sources.<sup>300</sup> Nowhere but Livy and once in Dionysius are the linen books mentioned.<sup>301</sup> Macer believed them authentic, and against the backdrop of debate and concern over the veracity of other earlier sources such as the *annales maximi* and the annalistic tradition itself (as evidenced by Quadrigarius), he used this new source to provide credibility for his history. No sure evidence remains that Macer intended to refute Quadrigarius' skepticism, yet his use of the linen books suggests that his history of Rome was to be more trustworthy. In this case, form plus source can suggest purpose and function once again.

Livy cites Macer seven times in the first decade; three of these citations include a reference to both the linen books and Macer.<sup>302</sup> A fourth mention (Liv. 4.13.7) does not name Macer but refers only to the linen books. According to Livy (4.20.8), the linen books were *libri magistratum*, and Macer's regularly cited source. Macer found them in the Temple of Juno Moneta, which was dedicated in 344 (Liv. 7.28.6). Around 270, the temple became home to the Roman mint, probably not out of any cult reasons but due merely to the location of the temple on

---

<sup>299</sup> On the *libri lintei*, see Ogilvie 1958, Palmer 1970, Frier 1975, Frier 1979/1999: 153-158, and Sailor 2006. Hodgkinson 1997: 23-34 traces the scholarship on them from Niebuhr in 1811 through Mommsen, Soltau, Münzer, Klotz, Ogilvie, Badian, Frier, Wiseman, and Oakley, noting that early skepticism of the *libri lintei* has given way to cautious acceptance. Walt's monograph on Macer was not available to Hodgkinson. Walt also accepts the *libri*.

<sup>300</sup> Walt 1997: 83-84 (and Frier 1975: 88) recognizes the sacredness of the linen books; their material, location, and Dionysius' description of them as holy books suppose a religious context. Meadows and Williams 2001 see instead a connection with the censors.

<sup>301</sup> Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 4.2. References in Livy are discussed in the following paragraph.

<sup>302</sup> Frags. 14, 15, and 16.



the arx.<sup>303</sup> The linen books contained a list of magistrates; surviving references to the linen books record only magistrates within the period 444-428.<sup>304</sup> Presumably the list carried on down to Macer's time. Whether the linen books actually date to the fifth century or were a later copy is unclear; difficulties include the question of the preservation of the linen material itself.<sup>305</sup> Possibly the linen books were a copy placed in the temple after its dedication, and thus date to 344, or after its conversion to a mint.

Macer's motives for use of the linen books can be best understood from the few instances the books are cited in Livy. The signal characteristic about the linen books is their independence from and yet support of the annalistic tradition. In each case in Livy, the linen books are notable in that they augment in some manner the annalistic tradition and pontifical records. For example, in Livy 4.7.10-12 (= frag. 14), Macer provided the names of the *consules suffecti* of 444, elected to replace the previous consular tribunes who had been forced to abdicate; these same *consules suffecti* in 444 also served to ratify a treaty made with Ardea. Yet these men do not appear in any other annalist before Macer, nor does the treaty with Ardea. A closer study, however, reveals that Macer sought to integrate his new material into the annalistic tradition and the traditional lists and not to reject that tradition. When the names from his linen books did not coincide with the names supplied by the *fasti*, Macer created a compromise position.<sup>306</sup>

---

<sup>303</sup> Thomsen 1961: 291. For a recent survey on the temple itself, its topographic location, and its connection to the mint and why the *libri lintei* were placed there, see Meadows and Williams 2001. Meadows and Williams posit that a complex of buildings in the northwest end of the Forum and on the Capitoline, connected by the Tabularium which served as the censors' office, brought together the creation, production and storage of coins and measures and weights, and more than that, Rome's history in the form of the *libri lintei*. The censors' job overseeing the *mores* of Rome, in addition to their regular assessment of wealth, they propose, might not preclude the keeping of other documents such as the *libri lintei*.

<sup>304</sup> Frier 1975: 88.

<sup>305</sup> Frier 1975: 88 and Frier 1979/1999: 155.

<sup>306</sup> The specifics of this argument can be found at Frier 1975: 88-90.

Elsewhere in Livy, the linen books and the *veteres annales* work in tandem and the one confirms the other (e.g., frag. 16= Liv. 4.20.8). The *libri lintei* acted as an independent source confirming and attesting to the accuracy of the pontifical chronicle and the annalistic tradition they supported.<sup>307</sup>

This indeed turns out to be the motivation for Macer's history. In the Sullan years, Macer's contemporary Quadrigarius had rejected the reliability of the annalistic tradition, and, as we have noted, began his history with the sack of Rome in 390. Macer, conversely, started his history *ab urbe condita*, and found a new documentary source to supplement and moreover guarantee the accuracy and credibility of the very sources Quadrigarius had faulted. In the first century, Rome would benefit from a history, written by a senator, which drew its material from a new source that confirmed the veracity of the older material.<sup>308</sup> In addition, Macer surely was displeased that Quadrigarius (if we can make the connection between him and Plutarch's Clodius) charged plebeian families with tampering of historical sources and inserting themselves into Rome's great families. As a member of the plebeian Licinii, who had, in fact, held magistracies in the years prior to 390 and thus not included in Quadrigarius' history, Licinius Macer would have wanted to set the record straight, as it were, for his family and for the plebeians.<sup>309</sup> He did this by employing a new source for his history and, further, by singing the

---

<sup>307</sup> Not all are sanguine about the authenticity of the *libri lintei*; see Chassignet 2004: LIX, note 295, for a list of those who doubt their authenticity and have concerns over their date. Tubero's uncertainty in Livy 4.23.3 (*Licinio libros haud dubie sequi linteos placet: Tubero incertus veri est*) is concerned more with their reliability and less their authenticity; cf. Ogilvie 1958: 46.

<sup>308</sup> Macer also drew on a literary source, the annals of Cn. Gellius, with whom he is associated three times (frag. 10, 12-13) as preserved in Dionysius. Macer may have used Gellius because of his lengthy description of early Rome. As noted in Chapter 2, Cn. Gellius covered a mere two hundred some years in twelve books.

<sup>309</sup> Frier 1975: 95. On pre-390 magistracies of the Licinii, see Broughton 1952 I: 15 (year 493, two Licinii as tribunes of the plebs) and I: 24 (year 481, Sp. Licinius as tribune of the plebs). Frier 1975: 95 even suggests that Macer ended his history in 287, and thus his work dramatically

praises of the Licinii. Livy (7.9.3) indeed criticizes him for doing just that: *propriae familiae laus leuiorem auctorem Licinium facit*.<sup>310</sup>

Macer's championing of his family and the plebeians is more clearly displayed outside the annals in his actions versus the Sullan restrictions on tribunician *potestas* and in his speeches, one of which Sallust (*Hist.* 3.48) purports to preserve. Whether or not this speech, which has Macer emphatically advocate plebeian rights, correctly characterizes Macer is unknown. The speech's oratorical style appears to be consistent with Cicero's estimation of Macer—not an inspiring presence but excellent at arranging and organizing a speech (*Brut.* 238). Sallust has Macer begin his speech (*Hist.* 3.48 Maur.) with a notice that he did not have enough time to elaborate on the past (great) history of the plebs. Macer continues with a vehement attack on the aristocracy and calls Sulla's domination *servitium*.<sup>311</sup> Additionally, fragments of two actual speeches, one the *Oratio pro Tuscis*, and another against Rabirius, manifest sympathy with ideas of the *populares*, and suggest that Sallust's portrayal of Macer as plebeian-championing and *populares*-supporting, is not wholly untrue.<sup>312</sup>

---

differed from other histories in that it treated and emphasized plebeian accomplishments during the Struggle of the Orders.

<sup>310</sup> Peter 1914: CCCLXI, "(Licinii) *animum spirat*."

<sup>311</sup> On Sallust and Macer, see Earl 1961: 107-108; Syme 1964: 200-201, 207, 209; Ogilvie 1965: 7-12, and Frier 1975: 95.

<sup>312</sup> Chassignet 2004: LII-LIII. Peter 1914: 307 includes a fragment from the speech on behalf of the Etruscans in his collected fragments of Licinius Macer (frag. 26 Peter = Prisc. *Inst.* 10, p. 532 H). Both Beck and Walter 2004 and Chassignet 2004 exclude this speech fragment from their editions of the fragments of his *annales*. See instead Malcovati 1979: 357-358 for the speech fragments. Henderson 1957: 85 sees in all the Sullan annalists, Macer included, the "polite *popularis* orthodoxy of the seventies—an ideal supremacy of the People, with no detriment to the authority of a benevolent State." Most scholarship on Licinius Macer has taken the position that Macer's experience as a tribune of the plebs is consistent with the portrayal of Macer in Sallust, and that the historian very likely shared those same beliefs. Hodgkinson 1997: 1-6 summarizes the scholarship. Walt 1997, while not rejecting the view of Macer as a *popularis*, rightly confines her study of the historian to the fragments themselves. She argues, correctly, that the fragments do not attest to a historian protecting the rights of plebeians but rather

The salutary combination of a new source and a cause to champion provided clear motives for Macer's history. In a new history, written by a senator in the annalistic form, Macer could tell the story of Rome (and his *gens*) from its beginnings with accuracy. The annalistic form, rooted in Rome, traditional and proper, was the correct form for the senator Macer. Well received by the historians Livy and Dionysius (*Ant. Rom.* 1.7.3) and used by others including Macrobius and the author of *Origo Gentis Romanae*, Macer's history succeeded in its purpose.<sup>313</sup>

The annalists of the first century, Claudius Quadrigarius, Valerius Antias, and Licinius Macer, produced different *annales*, each with a specific motivation. Quadrigarius, the first annalist in two generations to use the form, wrote a history of Rome which began in 390—the date after which he believed he had reliable sources. Antias' history, much longer, treated those early years, and throughout his history elevated the Valerian *gens*, with which he might have had a client relationship. Licinius Macer, the only senator of the three, and probably writing between Quadrigarius and Antias, bettered them by doing more—in covering more time, employing a new source, and extolling his *gens*. He wrote a history that he believed was based on accurate sources, the linen books, which upheld the annalistic tradition and the pontifical chronicles, and

---

demonstrate a historian who was interested in antiquarianism and the establishment of institutions and rituals. That aspect of Macer is not, however, under attack here. Her position that a politician's views need not necessarily be replicated in the history he writes is on track—but perhaps more so for the modern historian. Certainly Roman historians, from Fabius Pictor on (and especially Cato and certainly the authors of the *commentarii*) wrote at least with their own experiences (if not their ideology) apparent in their historical works. Walt's point that the fragments of Macer's history do not equivocally depict him as a raging defender of plebeian rights is, however, substantially correct; that does not rule out, however, Macer's *popularis* stance which his political activities had demonstrated. Hodgkinson 1997: 35-44 treats the breadth of Macer's political activities and finds in them evidence of Macer's support of the *populares*. Moreover, Hodgkinson 1997: 57-65 notes the political agitation of earlier members of the Licinii *gens*, some of whom also served in the tribunate, and sees in them a long standing commitment to support of the plebs.

<sup>313</sup> In length and scope, Macer rendered at least Gellius "obsolete," so Wiseman 1979: 22.

further praised his family. Since those Licinii had held positions in early Rome, Macer chose to begin *ab urbe condita*.

A cursory glance at the existence of three annalists working across about three decades in the first century would assume that they duplicated each other. Yet these three annalists found unique motivations for using the annalistic form. Whether they wrote out of praise of a family's long time service to Rome or the use of a new source or rejection of others, the *Annales* were the preferred medium for each historian. In the first century, just before Livy produced his annals of Rome, the annals which would render obsolete all others, historians had revived the traditional form.

CHAPTER 5  
INNOVATORS: WRITERS OF CONTEMPORARY HISTORY, *RES GESTAE*,  
MONOGRAPHS, *COMMENTARII*

In the second and first centuries, the Romans practiced other types of historiography alongside *annales*. During the second century, while some wrote annals in Greek and some in Latin, historians such as G. Fannius, Sempronius Asellio, Cato, and L. Coelius Antipater judged the annalistic form as deficient, and took up different forms, contemporary histories, *res gestae*, and monographs, as alternative means of both preserving and shaping history. In the first century, the historians M. Aemilius Scaurus, P. Rutilius Rufus, Q. Lutatius Catulus and Sulla took up another new form, *commentarii*, and L. Cornelius Sisenna wrote contemporary history. Against the backdrop of mid-to late-Republican Rome, these historians chose a variety of new forms with which to write Rome's history.

As we have seen, the Romans viewed annals differently from other forms of history, in content, form, and style. Among later sources, Isidore claimed that *inter historiam autem et annales hoc interest, quod historia est eorum temporum quae vidimus, annales vero sunt eorum annorum quos aetas nostra non novit* (Isid. *Etym.* 1.44.4). Servius auctus and Verrius Flaccus, also late, commented similarly.<sup>314</sup> Aulus Gellius, too, distinguished between the two, *annales* and *historia*, proposing that annals contained the history of a period not experienced by the author, while *historia*, on the other hand, was about events in which the narrator participated.<sup>315</sup> The ancients also perceived a difference in style. *Annales* recorded events in chronological sequence, normally *ab urbe condita*, usually focusing more on the early years and beginnings, in narrative fashion but without elaboration and connections. *Historia* meant contemporary history, while *res gestae*, which briefly sketched the origins of Rome and focused on current events, fell

---

<sup>314</sup> Servius auct. *ad Aen.* I.373 and Verrius Flaccus in Gell. *NA* 5.18.2.

<sup>315</sup> Gell. *NA* 5.18.1.

in between *annales* and *historia*. Monographs treated one topic. The forms differed from *annales* in that they focused on a shorter period of time, emphasized the mechanisms of cause and effect, and aimed for literary polish. The above-mentioned historians pursued these goals by turning their backs on the annalistic format. Their perceptions of the advantages of these different forms survive in some cases, particularly in the words of Asellio, Cato, and Sisenna.

### Caius Fannius

A certain Caius Fannius wrote a history sometime around the last quarter of the second century; his identity is unclear.<sup>316</sup> In the *Brutus*, Cicero distinguishes between C. Fannius, son of Caius, and C. Fannius, son of Marcus.<sup>317</sup> The former, according to Cicero, was a tribune of the plebs and consul (in 122); the latter was the son-in-law of Laelius and the author of the *Annales*. Cicero appears to have misrepresented these men; current scholarship holds that C. Fannius, son of Marcus, was all three: the son-in-law of Laelius, the consul of 122, and also the annalist.<sup>318</sup>

Fannius thus held a privileged position in Roman society. Connected to Laelius, consul in 140, and to the so-called Scipionic circle that included Polybius, he was encouraged to study under Panaetius, the Stoic philosopher, by his father-in-law.<sup>319</sup> Connected also to Tiberius

---

<sup>316</sup> Studies (and biographies): Peter 1914: CXCIII-CXCIX; Bardon 1952: Badian 1966: 14-15; von Albrecht 1997: 379-380; Beck and Walter 2001: 340-341; Suerbaum 2002: 425-427; and Chassignet 1999/2003: XXXIII-XL.

<sup>317</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 99-100.

<sup>318</sup> On the complexities of this identification, see Chassignet 1999/2003: XXXIII-XXV, especially footnote 150, which concisely lays out the ancient texts and modern interpretations. The confusion arises in Cicero's use of the patronymics; he calls the tribune of the plebs (who later became consul) the son of Marcus in *Att.* 16.13a, yet in the *Brutus*, he calls him the son of Caius. Elsewhere, the son of Marcus is Laelius' son-in-law (in *Amic.* 3 and *Brut.* 100, and in *Att.* 12.5b.3). The existence of a Caius Fannius who served as part of a senatorial commission to Crete in 113 appears to have confused Cicero. The consul of 122 was indeed the son of Marcus, as shown in an inscription found in 1851 (*CIL* I<sup>1</sup> 560 = I<sup>2</sup> 658 = VI, 1, 306 = *ILLRP* 269). Cicero corrected his mistake in *ad Att.* 12.5b.3, calling the son-in-law of Laelius the historian. As Laelius' son-in-law, Fannius was accorded the post of speaker in two of Cicero's dialogues in the *de Amicitia* and the *Somnium Scipionis*.

<sup>319</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 101.

Gracchus with whom he participated in the assault on Carthage in 146, Fannius received backing from Gracchan supporters during his campaign for the consulship in 122.<sup>320</sup> Indeed Fannius was elected primarily due to the backing of Caius Gracchus. In the year Fannius acted as consul (with Cn. Domitius Ahenobarbus as co-consul), Caius Gracchus was tribune. In his program of reform, Caius Gracchus proposed to offer citizenship to the Latins and Latin status to the Italian allies. Ultimately this plan destroyed the collaboration between Fannius and Gracchus; Fannius turned against him and delivered a stinging condemnation of his friend's plans in a speech called *de sociis et nomine Latino*.<sup>321</sup> Cicero called this speech *sane et bonam et nobilem* (*Brut.* 99), and even labeled it the best of its time.<sup>322</sup>

Fannius' sole work, entitled, curiously, *Annales*, is of particular importance because its scope was markedly different from those of the annalists before him. Nine fragments remain.<sup>323</sup> Four fragments specifically title Fannius' work *Annales*.<sup>324</sup> The few fragments with identified content (three of them are preserved for their style) treat only events from Fannius' own time.<sup>325</sup> To have been accorded the title *Annales* by the ancients, the work must have provided at least an overview of the foundation of Rome, regal period, and early Republic in keeping with annalistic

---

<sup>320</sup> Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 4.5. Fannius was also praetor, though the date is uncertain. It is usually dated sometime between 133 and 127 (cf. Broughton 1952 I: 509, footnote 2.).

<sup>321</sup> Fragments of this speech are collected in Malcovati 1979: 142-144.

<sup>322</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 100: *oratio autem vel optima esset illo quidem tempore orationum omnium.*

<sup>323</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1999/2003: 44-47; Peter 1914: 139-141 collects 9 as well; Beck and Walter 2001: 342-346 include eight fragments, excluding the fragment deriving from Cic. *Att.* 12.5.3 which refers to an epitome of Fannius made by Brutus.

<sup>324</sup> Frags. 1, 2, 3, 5.

<sup>325</sup> Fragments treating grammatical issues: frags. 2, 3, and 8. Badian 1966: 14 notes that all datable events in Fannius' fragments date to his life; see also Münzer 1909: 1990. Chassignet 1999/2003: XXXVII holds that lack of evidence does not mean Fannius limited his work to the Gracchan period.



tradition, though none of that now remains.<sup>326</sup> The length of the history is not known. The only indications of books in the fragments are two references to an eighth book, both of which provide little sure information about content of that volume and the progress of Fannius' work to that point.<sup>327</sup> One of those references, fragment 3 on Fannius' use of alternate forms of Drepanum, might suggest, however, that in Book 8 Fannius might have been examining the First Punic War or at least the site of that naval disaster of 249 and later victorious siege of 241. Later fragments referring to the Gracchan age show that his history continued to his present time.

Fannius' concern with contemporary events marks him as a non-traditional annalist and more of a contemporary historian. Indeed Fannius recalls Cato, who several decades earlier had dispensed with writing about the early period of Roman history, and moved on to topics of more interest to him. For Fannius, contemporary history, and especially the Gracchi, with whom he had a special relationship, was significant. Some figures are helpful: four out of Fannius' nine fragments (frags. 4, 5, 6, and 7) describe events and/or people dating to the Gracchan age, three other fragments are preserved only for diction, and the remaining two fragments speak of Fannius' intentions and his reception.

Two of the four fragments relating to contemporary period (frags. 4 and 5) mention Tiberius Gracchus by name. Fragment 4 (=Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 4.5) preserves Fannius' description of Tiberius Gracchus' courageous role in the sacking of Carthage, including Fannius' statement that he himself was right behind Tiberius as he scaled the walls. Fannius praises his friend, and at the same time, comes off well himself. Plutarch's preservation of the story is in keeping with the Plutarchean practice of depicting his protagonists as larger than life, mostly through the use

---

<sup>326</sup> Badian 1966: 14 does not doubt that Fannius' history began at the beginning, but suggests that Fannius probably covered this period in a "few perfunctory sentences."

<sup>327</sup> Frag. 2 = Charisius *Gramm.* I, p. 158B, and frag. 3 = *Schol. Veron. Ad Verg. Aen.* 3.707.

of stories and anecdotes such as this. Fragment 5 offers less regarding the specific content in Fannius' work and affords more of a look at Fannius' style. In it (= *Brut.* 81), Cicero tells us that Fannius preserved a speech of Q. Metellus Macedonicus, and many other speeches, including one against Tiberius Gracchus.<sup>328</sup> This fragment, unfortunately, contains no value judgment of Fannius regarding Ti. Gracchus, though its content may reflect Fannius' strained relationship with the Gracchi. Elsewhere Cicero (*Brut.* 101) offers some information allowing a cursory evaluation of Fannius' work; he describes Fannius' history as not inelegantly written.

The fragments concerning Fannius' own period offer frustratingly little solid information regarding his role in the turbulent years of the Gracchi. They do not substantiate an about-face by Fannius; little in them supports either Fannius' late real-life rejection of the Gracchi, nor, on the other hand, do the fragments prove he was a Gracchan partisan.<sup>329</sup> Significantly, fragment 1 contains Fannius' remark that men grow wiser in their old age; if this fell in the preface of the history, it might be a justification of Fannius' actions of turning away from Tiberius Gracchus, and an indication of the aims and intentions of his history.

More importantly with regard to form, Cicero's statement in *Brutus* 81 suggests that Fannius' history was innovative in more than just focusing on a single period; Fannius livened his history by including speeches of his key figures. Such additions suggest that Fannius was familiar with this convention of Greek historiography. It may also suggest that Fannius was

---

<sup>328</sup> Frag. 5 (= Cic. *Brut.* 81): *Q. Metellus, is cuius quattuor filii consulares fuerunt, in primis est habitus eloquens, qui pro L. Cotta dixit accusante Africano; cuius et aliae sunt orationes et contra Ti. Gracchum exposita est in C. Fanni Annalibus.*

<sup>329</sup> The debate on the relationship between Fannius and the Gracchi is rich. Bardon 1952: 106-107 particularly argues that Fannius was a supporter of the Gracchi, and that position is clear in his history. See *contra*, Chassignet 1999/2003: XXXIX, who finds in the remaining fragments no clear indication of his position either way. On the fragments proving Fannius to be a partisan of the Gracchi, start with Badian 1966: 14, who sees Fannius as writing the first account of the victorious enemies of the Gracchi and thus beginning the tradition hostile to them.

influenced by his contemporary, the Greek historian Polybius, who was friendly with many of the same elite men of Rome. Polybius' part in the so-called Scipionic circle would have brought him into contact with Scipio Aemilianus' friend Laelius, and from there with Laelius' son-in-law, Fannius.

During the second century, while Romans worked out their own ways to write history, Polybius was surely one of the great influences. When Polybius lived and wrote in Rome, from 168 until his death in 120, he must have known the work of contemporary Roman annalists, including Cassius Hemina, L. Calpurnius Piso, Sempronius Tuditanus, and the writers of Greek annals, A. Postumius Albinus and Gaius Acilius. With the exception of his acidic words on Postumius' deficiencies in Greek, however, we have no estimation from Polybius regarding any of the other Roman annalists of the period. His influence is hard to gauge, due chiefly to the paucity of fragments of these historians. Yet in the case of Fannius, the non-traditional annalist, Polybius' mark is clear. Fannius appears to be perhaps the first Roman annalist to include whole speeches in his history, much as Polybius had.

Sallust speaks of Fannius' truthfulness, and Cicero records that Brutus made an epitome of Fannius' history.<sup>330</sup> Fannius did not completely transform the annalistic form; in the first century, annalistic historians would return to the model of addressing the regal period more fully. Fannius' influence on other forms of history is greater—while technically not the first monograph in Roman history, but more a contemporary history, it set the stage for the alternative forms, particularly the monograph form, taken up soon after by Coelius Antipater who will be discussed below.

---

<sup>330</sup> Sall. *Hist.* 1. 4 Maur. Cic. *Att.* 12.5b (= frag. 9) discusses the epitome made by Brutus.

## Sempronius Asellio

Around the same time as Fannius, Sempronius Asellio similarly wrote a kind of history, called *res gestae*, which fell somewhere between annalistic history and pure contemporary history. Von Albrecht calls Asellio the founder of this genre.<sup>331</sup> Sempronius Asellio's life is not well known.<sup>332</sup> His birth and death dates are unknown, although a birth date may be estimated from the fact that he served at Numantia in 134/133 under Scipio Aemilianus as a military tribune.<sup>333</sup> He was perhaps born around 160. A possible connection with Scipio Aemilianus suggests that he too might have been part of, or connected in some way, with the so-called Scipionic circle.<sup>334</sup> Its influence, particularly that of Polybius, can be seen in Asellio's preface in which he laid out the differences in forms between *annales* and *historia*. Asellio's history is also important both for the observations he made about history, and for his philosophy of history which he espoused in that preface. Asellio's comments, in fact, are among the few prefatory statements surviving in the fragmentary historians. With Asellio, finally, perceptions of form are explicitly declared.

Only fifteen fragments of Asellio are extant of a work that comprised fourteen books.<sup>335</sup> Aulus Gellius calls it *res gestae*, but also *historia*.<sup>336</sup> Charisius, Nonius, Priscian, and Servius

---

<sup>331</sup> von Albrecht 1997: 361.

<sup>332</sup> Studies (and biographies): Peter 1914: CCXLII-CCXLV; Bardon 1952: 113-115; Badian 1966: 17-18; von Albrecht 1997: 380-381; Suerbaum 2002: 435-437; Chassignet 1999/2003: LIV-LVII; Beck and Walter 2004: 84-86. On the *gens*, see Badian 1968.

<sup>333</sup> Frag. 7 (= Gell. NA 2.13.1-4).

<sup>334</sup> On Scipio Aemilianus, see Astin 1967.

<sup>335</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1999/2003: 84-89; Peter 1914: 179-184 (14 fragments); Beck and Walter 2004: 87-99 (15 fragments). A variant in a manuscript of frag. 11 from Charisius (= *Gramm.* II, p. 254B) uses the number XL for one of Asellio's books; all modern scholars discredit that reading and suggest XI instead. Their argument posits that the last datable event in Asellio (frag.11 regarding the death of Drusus in 91) occurs in Book XIV. If Asellio did write XL books, then he would have to have covered the years after 91 in another twenty-six books. See Bardon 1952: 114 and Chassignet 1999/2003: LVI.

<sup>336</sup> *Res gestae*: in frags. 7, 11, and 12; *historia* in frag. 6.

auctus describe his work as *historiae*.<sup>337</sup> No fragment or reference by the ancients calls Asellio's work *annales*. Asellio himself seems to have called it *res gestae*.<sup>338</sup> The last datable event in the surviving fragments (frag. 12) refers to the death of Drusus in 91. Publication probably occurred shortly after.

Of those fifteen fragments, very few need concern us. The majority recounts grammatical usages which Gellius found of interest (e.g., frags. 4 and 5). One fragment details an etymology on *Norica castella* (frag. 10). Of far more interest, however, are Asellio's perceptions of historiographical form contained in two fragments preserved by Gellius in a section typical of *Noctes Atticae*. It considers the meaning of the word *historia*, in particular versus *annales*, and used Asellio's prefatory remarks to illustrate the term. We have already considered Asellio's understanding of history. It is worthwhile looking at it again for another purpose: that of reading it in the context of Asellio's other fragments. I quote again from fragment 1 of Asellio (= Gell. NA 5.18.7-8):

“Verum inter eos”, inquit “qui annales relinquere voluissent, et eos, qui res gestas a Romanis perscribere conati essent, omnium rerum hoc interfuit. Annales libri tantummodo, quod factum quoque anno gestum sit, ea demonstrabant, id est quasi qui diarium scribunt, quam Graeci ephemerida vocant. Nobis non modo satis esse video, quod factum esset, id pronuntiare, sed etiam, quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent, demonstrare.”

Asellio defined *annales* as books that merely recount and record events which happen each year, much like what the Greeks would call a diary. Such a historiographic aim was not sufficient for Asellio, who believed it was not enough only to report what happened, but also to show for what purpose and with what plan these things were done. Here Asellio recalls Polybius who had

---

<sup>337</sup> *Historia* in Charisius: frag. 13; Nonius frags. 3 and 5; Priscian frag. 4, and Servius auctus in frag. 15.

<sup>338</sup> Frag. 1 (= Gell. NA 5.18.7-8).

urged the same approach in his own history of Rome. A history which provided interpretations of the past as well as reason, purpose, cause and effect of that past was for Asellio *satis*. He would do more than just list; in claiming his use of this methodology, Asellio sought to separate himself from other historians.

Aulus Gellius preserved further comments of Asellio on the difference between *historia* and *annales* in the same section (frag. 2 = Gell. NA 5.18.9), also quoted here again:

"Nam neque alacriores" inquit "ad rempublicam defendundam neque segniores ad rem perperam faciundam annales libri commovere quicquam possunt. Scribere autem, bellum initum quo consule et quo confectum sit et quis triumphans introierit, et eo libro, quae in bello gesta sint, non praedicare autem interea quid senatus decreverit aut quae lex rogatiove lata sit, neque quibus consiliis ea gesta sint, iterare: id fabulas pueris est narrare, non historias scribere."

Asellio now moved beyond the question of historiographic form and content to the question of the purpose and function of writing history. In his eyes, annalistic writing was useless in motivating or moving readers. History's purpose lay beyond the mere preserving of stories; Asellio wanted his readers to use history, and not view it as entertainment. The goal of *docere*, though not specifically claimed by Asellio, was a significant part of history's aims. Finally, Asellio declared that to write about under whose consulship a war began and ended and who entered the city having been awarded a triumph, and in this book to write of what things were done in what war, but not to mention what the senate decreed and what law or proposal was introduced, nor to recount with what plans things were done—this then was to write *fabulas*—stories—for children, and not to write history. Asellio concerned himself with investigation, and

not entertainment. Asellio viewed history as a guide for moral life and action, not so much in the manner of Polybius but instead of Isocrates.<sup>339</sup>

With the exception of Cato, Asellio is the first Roman historian whose observations on form, content, and purpose of history writing survive. His perceptive remarks on the differences between writing annals and writing history are now part of the discourse on historiographic form. In context, however, Asellio's grand ambitions appear not to have made his history any better; no ancient historian cites him, but Cicero includes him in a list with Cn. Gellius and Claudius Quadrigarius.<sup>340</sup> Grammarians on the whole have preserved Asellio for us. Nonetheless, Asellio is significant in demonstrating that what, according to Asellio, passed as annalistic writing at his time, roughly 120-90, consisted chiefly of recorded events with little elaboration or interpretation of these, and at least he and Cato saw deficiencies in that sort of history. An acquaintance with Polybius through Scipio Aemilianus might have been the inspiration for Asellio's ambitious aim to reject and surpass writers of *annales*. Unfortunately, while Polybius' methodology appears to have shaped Asellio's work, it appears that Asellio may have lacked Polybius' skill in writing that history.

### **Porcius Cato Censorius**

And what about Cato? Cato properly belongs to this chapter on alternative forms of history writing, since he was the first Roman historian explicitly to find fault with the annalistic form. In the fourth book of the *Origines*, Cato railed against *annales*, claiming they concentrated on recording how often grain was expensive, and how often eclipses obscured the sun or moon.<sup>341</sup>

---

<sup>339</sup> On Isocrates and history, see the fundamental work of Welles 1966. In his concern for utility, Asellio also recalls Thucydides' belief (1.22) in the usefulness of his history for statesmen.

<sup>340</sup> Cic. *Leg.* 1.6.

<sup>341</sup> Frag. IV, 1 (= Gell. *NA* 2. 28.6). As usual in this dissertation, all fragments derive from Chassignet's volumes, this one from her edition of Cato, Chassignet 1986/2002.

Cato instead composed a history that related more than the foundation of Rome. Annalists had focused their histories on Rome, neglecting the position of Rome in the wider world. Cato's history was markedly different for his insistence on grounding Roman history in its *imperium* (Italy) and including foreign history, even while he continued to exhibit the patriotism which is a hallmark of Roman historians.

Cato's larger than life personality needs no recounting here. A politician, military man, and orator, Cato championed Rome and cautioned her as well from the time of his first political position as military tribune in Sicily in 214 until his death in 149. His most famous post as censor in 184 has shaped much of his reputation, rightly so. He rebuked Rome and feared Rome's excesses. His hostility to Hellenism is infamous, yet incorrect; Greek slaves educated his children, he himself spoke Greek, and his literary works bear the hallmark of both Greek models and a Greek education.<sup>342</sup>

Creator of Latin prose, first to write Roman history in Latin, Cato the Elder produced a broadly ranging variety of works in all of which Livy found eloquence.<sup>343</sup> These include his collected speeches, perhaps over 150 of them; two unpublished works, one a history for his son's education, the other a notebook of treatments for illnesses; writings to his adopted son Marcus Porcius Cato Licinianus, including the *ad Filium* which provided books on separate topics again for his sons' education; three monographs, *De agricultura*, *De re militari*, and one on civil law;

---

<sup>342</sup> On Cato and his relationship to Greece, see Astin 1978: 157-181 (Chapter 8 on "Cato and the Greeks"), especially the extensive bibliography devoted to this subject in footnote 1, p. 158. Studies: Astin 1978.

<sup>343</sup> Liv. 39.40.7.



*Carmen de moribus*; a collection of sayings; and the *Origines*, a history of Rome.<sup>344</sup> Only the *De agricultura* survives at length.

Cato was not the first to write the history of Rome, but those before him had done so in Greek. Cato was also not the first to write in Latin, but those who wrote in Latin before him were writing verse. Both Cato's literary accomplishments and the resulting influence on every writer of prose after him are vast. A brief survey of his historical work is thus in order.<sup>345</sup>

The *Origines* consisted of seven books.<sup>346</sup> The first treated Aeneas and foundational stories of Rome up through the period of the kings. Books 2 and 3 treated foundational stories of other Italian cities; Book 4, with a new preface, dealt with the First Punic War, Book 5 covered the Second Punic War, and Book 6 discussed Rome's history through Cato's time. A fragment belonging in Book 2 was written after 168; the last datable fragment of the whole work relates an event from 149, the year of Cato's death.<sup>347</sup> Only about one hundred and thirty five fragments survive, coming from all seven books.<sup>348</sup> Questions of composition and structure abound. Nonetheless, those fragments can tell us much about the form, content, and style of the *Origines*.

Cato's rejection of the annalistic form is well known. His displeasure with writing about trivial matters such as corn prices and eclipses, which served as a preface for Book 4, was probably prompted by the writings of Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus, which he might have

---

<sup>344</sup> Astin 1978: 182-188. See also the survey of Cato's works in von Albrecht 1997: 394-396. In *Brut.* 65 Cicero claimed to know and have read over 150 speeches.

<sup>345</sup> This dissertation focuses on the lesser-known historians of the Roman Republic, and thus Cato, who enjoys an extensive bibliography, will receive a less than satisfying amount of attention. The intent here is merely to provide some evidence of his influence on the other fragmentary historians.

<sup>346</sup> Badian 1966: 7. The reconstruction here of books and content is his.

<sup>347</sup> Frag. VII, 1. The outline of the contents of each book derives from Nepos *Cato* 3.3.

<sup>348</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1986/2002: 1-56 collects 135 fragments; Peter 1914: 55-97 has 125 fragments plus an additional eighteen uncertain fragments.

considered unsatisfactory.<sup>349</sup> Cato also broke with the custom of glorifying Roman individuals by purposely omitting the names of leaders (*duces*).<sup>350</sup> Furthermore, Cato not only threw out the content common to *annales* and omitted the names of leaders but also rejected the strictly chronological format. Cornelius Nepos informs us of the manner in which Cato told his stories of the deeds of the kings, the origins of the Italian cities, and the First and Second Punic Wars: *atque haec omnia capitulatim sunt dicta*. Some have argued that *capitulatim* essentially means in summary fashion, along the lines of *kephalaiodos* used by Polybius, while others have suggested that Nepos means that Cato ordered his books by topic (geographically) rather than by year.<sup>351</sup> In either case, Cato was not an annalist. Cato is, however, an excellent example of the interaction between prose and poetry in Rome and indeed the development of literature in general. Despising the material from the pontifical chronicles, later to be published as the *annales maximi*, Cato nonetheless was influenced by a form of *annales*, the *Annales of Ennius*.<sup>352</sup> In the 150's, when Cato was creating new directions in Roman historiography, he borrowed from both Greek historiographical prose conventions and Latin poetry. In fact, Cato

---

<sup>349</sup> Cato's "preface" to Book 4 is often viewed as proof that the *Origines* was written in two stages, with Books 1-3 as one part on foundations, and then Books 4-7 on the history of the Republic. Astin 1978: 219 calls the two-stage hypothesis unsatisfactory, and merely an attempt to explain the disjunctions between the first three books and the rest. We have no direct evidence from Cato himself that he disliked Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus' work; we do, of course, know his quibbles with writing annals in Greek and his words for A. Postumius Albinus, whom he faulted for his poor Greek, but more for his shoddiness in general.

<sup>350</sup> Nepos *Cato* 3.3 ....*atque horum bellorum duces non nominavit, sed sine nominibus res notavit.*

<sup>351</sup> E.g. Astin 1978: 212 argues for "in summary fashion," while Badian 1966: 8 argues for the term to mean "by topic." Chassignet 1986/2002: XV-XVI summarizes the two polar positions.

<sup>352</sup> On Cato's debt to Ennius, see Goldberg 2006: 444-446 and Sciarrino 2006:466-469.

may have begun his work with a hexameter echo.<sup>353</sup> Goldberg recently remarked of Cato: “Like Ennius, he made Greek forms and Greek conventions do Roman work.”<sup>354</sup>

Unlike the Greek annalists before him, Cato wrote of the origins of Italy’s many peoples. This foundational material in Books 2 and 3 mirrored the foundational stories of Rome found in the annalists and even in Cato, but there was surely no such treatment of Italian cities in other Latin histories at this time. On the other hand, the genre of foundation stories was not unknown to the Romans; not a Roman creation but a element of Greek historiography, the recounting of *ktiseis* was important there, and almost a genre itself.<sup>355</sup> The title of Cato’s work demonstrates this influence of Hellenistic historiography. In fact, this title provides evidence for the supposition that the first three books were written as a unit, and the following books a later addition.

More importantly, the inclusion of *ktiseis* in Cato established that Cato’s history was rooted in the context of both Greek and Roman historiography. Following the conventions of both, Cato wrote of Rome’s foundations as Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus had already done in Greek prose and Ennius and Naevius in Latin verse.<sup>356</sup> Annalists would continue to write foundation stories throughout the period of the Republic. Following conventions of Greek historiography, Cato included speeches. What was innovative, however, in Cato was the inclusion of his own speeches. In doing so Cato brought to the forefront one of the central aspects of later history writing in the form of the *commentarii*, that is the memorializing—and justifying—of self in political autobiographical history.

---

<sup>353</sup> Cardinali 1987.

<sup>354</sup> Goldberg 2006: 444.

<sup>355</sup> So Astin 1978: 227-228 on the genre of *ktiseis* and its influence on Cato.

<sup>356</sup> In fact, Fabius Pictor is very likely the source for Cato for the foundational stories. See Astin 1978: 224.

In many other ways, however, Cato's history of Rome in Latin did not change the ways Romans would write history. No later historians included speeches of his own in their works (perhaps because none served in politics at quite the same level). Nor did subsequent Roman historians follow Cato's practice of not naming magistrates and key leaders. And no other historian would include the early history of other Italian cities. Cato was exceptional.

But one cannot discount the tremendous influence of Cato on Roman historiography. In addition to the political and autobiographical flavor which would become commonplace for *commentarii*, Cato's treatment of Italian cities in the first three books and his handling of the First Punic War in Book 4, for example, prepared the way for the monograph form of Coelius Antipater. His perspective on history and the writing of history from a senatorial point of view solidified one of the most important aspects of historiography in Rome—that history writing was done by men with experience. Moreover, Nepos' biography speaks of Cato writing his history as an old man (*senex*); Cato's fragment 2 provides a justification for writing in his leisure—that the leisure of famous and great men ought to be no less subject to account than their activities. For Cato, history writing filled that leisure time, and became an activity which was useful, and not wasteful, because it provided Romans with a history which was didactic and moralistic. Cato's emphasis on the moral value of history would accompany almost every history written by a Roman after him, especially in the works of men such as Calpurnius Piso, Sempronius Asellio, and Livy and Sallust much later. The moral value he accorded to history was part and parcel of the function Cato assigned to history. Cato believed that individualism was not Rome's strength, and by his suppression of names of leaders, by his inclusion of plural foundations, Cato honored Rome as the product of a community. Future historians would similarly both view Rome's accomplishments as the efforts of many and promote a didactic goal to their works.

By founding Latin prose, Cato created a vocabulary and style for Latin historiography. While his fragments are often short or paraphrases, nevertheless, the quality of his literary style is apparent. Plain and unadorned, Cato's style is not without rhetorical flourishes and experimentation in still developing Latin prose.<sup>357</sup> Cato's most influential contribution to Roman historiography, however, was writing Roman history in Latin.

### Lucius Coelius Antipater

During the second century another historiographical innovation occurred—the creation of the Roman historical monograph by L. Coelius Antipater. Older than Sisenna and a contemporary of Fannius (cos. 122), Coelius was born between 180 and 170.<sup>358</sup> About his family little is known; although his Greek *cognomen* hints at freedman status, neither he nor his father was one. Coelius appears not to have held any political posts, and thus broke the historiographical tradition that had only *clarissimi viri*, men experienced in politics and military matters, writing history.<sup>359</sup> Chronologically, he is the first historian not to be a politician. In that sense, Coelius was an innovator too, and model for many later professional historians who also played no role in Roman politics. Historiography up to this point had belonged to the senatorial elite. Coelius was, however, not completely disconnected from Roman politics. He was a

---

<sup>357</sup> von Albrecht 1997: 397-399. Cicero, in *Leg.* 1.6-7, groups Cato with other historians whose style he calls *exilis*. Elsewhere in *De or.* 2. 53 and *Brut.* 66, Cicero finds fault with Cato's style, particularly its deficiencies in ornamentation. Sallust, on the other hand, appreciated Cato's *brevitas* (*Sall. Hist.* 1. 4 Maur.) and called him *disertissimus*. For a careful look at representative examples of Cato's style see Courtney 1999: 41-91.

<sup>358</sup> Vell. 2.9.6: *Vestutior Sisenna fuit Coelius*; *Cic. Leg.* 1.6: *Fannii autem aetati coniunctus Coelius Antipater*. Studies (and biographies): Gensel 1900: 185-194; Peter 1914: CCXI-CCXXXVII; Bardon 1952: 102-103; Badian 1966: 15-17; Herrmann 1979; von Albrecht 1997: 381-383; Suerbaum 2002: 430-435; Chassignet 1999/2003: XLI-XLIX; and Beck and Walter 2004: 35-39.

<sup>359</sup> Chassignet 1999/2003: XLII.

rhetorician and an orator; he was friendly with, and a teacher of, L. Crassus, one of the great orators of the day and one of Cicero's heroes.<sup>360</sup>

He wrote one work—of great significance because it is the first work of history in Latin which took on the treatment of one limited topic rather than all of Roman history *ab urbe condita*. His treatment of one topic, the historical monograph, foreshadowed Sallust's use of the form. Coelius' work treated the eighteen years of the Second Punic War in seven books. Only sixty-eight fragments of this work are extant today.<sup>361</sup> Coelius' history is called by three different names: *historia*, *annales*, and *Bellum Punicum*.<sup>362</sup> Nonius' use of the term *annales* is understandable due to the chronological outline Coelius retained, yet fragments and testimony reveal no evidence of any material or stories from the work which date outside of the Second Punic War.

Coelius' monograph is limited to the eighteen-year period of the Hannibalic war, 218-201. Its content, as revealed in surviving fragments, drew upon sources such as Fabius Pictor and Silenus, the Greek historian who accompanied Hannibal and drew up the Carthaginian history of the same war.<sup>363</sup> Coelius knew Cato's work too.<sup>364</sup> He consciously made use of the varied sources available to him, including *laudationes*, at least in the story of the death of the consul M. Claudius Marcellus in 208 in fragment 36 (= Liv. 27.27.11-4). Livy provides some information about Coelius' research methodology. According to Livy, Coelius offered three different

---

<sup>360</sup> Cic. *De or.* 2.54.

<sup>361</sup> Editions: Chassignet 1999/2003: 50-70; Peter 1914: 158-177 (67 fragments); Herrmann 1979: 17-44 (67 fragments); Beck and Walter 2004: 40-83 (67 fragments).

<sup>362</sup> The work is described as *historia* in Aulus Gellius (frag. 27), Charisius (frags. 10, 12, 16, 24, 25), Festus (frag. 66), Priscian (frag. 22), Servius auctus (frags. 59 and 61), and *Schol. Leidens.* (frag. 52). Nonius alone uses *annales* in frags. 8, 9, 23, 37, 45, 48, and 50-53. Cicero calls it *Bellum Punicum* just once in frag. 2.

<sup>363</sup> Pictor as a source for Coelius, frag. 57 (= Cic. *Div.* I.55); Silenus as Coelius' source, frag. 11 (= Cic. *Div.* 1.49).

<sup>364</sup> Frag. 27 (= Gell. *NA.*10. 24); cf. Macrobian *Sat.* 1.4.26.

sequences for the death of Marcellus; one account was the traditional version, one from the *laudatio* by Marcellus' son, and a third account which Coelius himself researched and established. Thus, in Coelius we see explicit attention to research and sources, an uncommon commitment in earlier historians. Coelius' careful attention to research is signal; previous historians such as Fabius Pictor through Sempronius Asellio drew upon their own experiences in the political or military affairs of Rome. Their own *auctoritas* gave weight to their works.<sup>365</sup> Lacking that, Coelius endeavored to impose authority on his work through careful research. In doing so, Coelius imitated Greek historians' more visible interest in research (the word *historia* being based on the Greek word for inquiry), and brings to mind his contemporary, Polybius.

While many fragments (thirty-six out of sixty-eight) survive because of the by now familiar interest of the grammarians in linguistic usages, extant fragments offer detail regarding the war, including Hannibal's route across the Alps, the election of Q. Fabius Maximus dictator, and Hannibal's march towards Rome.<sup>366</sup> Other details include the dream of Hannibal (the devastation of Italy), the battle at Lake Trasimene, and the battle of Cannae, all from Book 1 and Maharbal's *bon mot* to Hannibal in Book 2.<sup>367</sup> Fragments one through twenty-five (plus frag. 67) come from Book 1, and cover the death of Hamilcar Barca (frag. 3) and Hannibal's entrance into Italy via the Alps down to Trasimene.<sup>368</sup> Fragments from Book 2 (frags. 26-28, 31-32, 34-35) address Rome's aims with regard to Carthage in 216-211.<sup>369</sup> Other allusions to books place the expedition of Scipio to Africa in Book 6, and in Book 7 the capture in 203 of Syphax, former

---

<sup>365</sup> On *auctoritas* as a purposeful goal of writing history, see Fornara 1983: 47-90. See also Marincola 1997: 141, especially pages 133-148 on "experience."

<sup>366</sup> Hannibal's route is found in frag. 15 (= Liv. 21.38.5-6), Q. Fabius dictator in frag. 21 (= Liv. 22.31.8), and Hannibal's march in frag. 35 (= Liv. 26.11.8-11).

<sup>367</sup> Respectively, frag. 11; frags. 20a and 20b; frag. 21; frag. 22; frag. 27.

<sup>368</sup> Herrmann 1979: 46-47.

<sup>369</sup> Herrmann 1979: 47.

ally of Rome.<sup>370</sup> Coelius served as a significant source, along with Polybius, for Livy's books on the Hannibalic war; ten of Coelius' fragments are found in Livy. Livy followed Coelius for disasters at Lake Trasimene and Cannae, for the Spanish campaign, and in general for Hannibal's operations.<sup>371</sup> Brutus made an epitome of it.<sup>372</sup> Hadrian thought more highly of him than of Sallust.<sup>373</sup> Plutarch, Pliny, and Fronto all used or knew his work.<sup>374</sup> Valerius Maximus titled him *certus Romanae historiae auctor*.<sup>375</sup> Cicero cited Coelius extensively, particularly on dreams, in *de Divinatione*.<sup>376</sup>

Though the monograph form itself was new to Rome, it was common in Greek, particularly Hellenistic, historiography, and Coelius found there his model.<sup>377</sup> In Rome, the model existed, but only in poetry; Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* addressed the same time period as Coelius but did so in verse form. Hellenistic historiography favored monographs which focused on a central theme and could support a vivid narrative full of drama and tension.<sup>378</sup> Silenus, for example, wrote a counterpart to Coelius which centered on the character of Hannibal; others wrote of Alexander the Great. Coelius in turn concentrated on Scipio Africanus but also

---

<sup>370</sup> Frags. 46 and 47 on Scipio, and frag. 52 on Syphax' horse which threw him, leading to his capture.

<sup>371</sup> On Livy's use of Coelius, see Walsh 1961: 124-132, and Luce 1977: 178-179.

<sup>372</sup> Cic. *Att.* 13.8.

<sup>373</sup> SHA *Hadr.* 16.6.

<sup>374</sup> Plutarch follows Coelius in several cases, for example on the death of Flaminius due to neglect of religion in *Fab.* 4 (frag. 20); Pliny does many times as well, e.g., frag. 13 (= Plin. *HN* 3.132), and Fronto too, e.g., *Ep. ad Caes.*, p. 132 van den Hout. See also Herrmann 1979: 2-53, von Albrecht 1997: 383 and Chassignet 1999/2003: XLVII. Herrmann 1979: 53 argues that Silius Italicus, Appian, and Dio Cassius also follow Coelius at times in their own narratives.

<sup>375</sup> Val. Max. 1.7.6 (echo of frag. 58 from Cic. *Div.* 1.56).

<sup>376</sup> Frag. 11 (= Cic. *Div.* 1.49), frag. 20 (= Cic. *Div.* 1.77-78), frag. 41 (= Cic. *Div.* 1.48), frag. 57 (= Cic. *Div.* 1.55), and frag. 58 (= Cic. *Div.* 1.56).

<sup>377</sup> On Hellenistic historiography and monographs, see Verdin 1990.

<sup>378</sup> Timaeus' *Histories* would be one example, another is Cleitarchus' study of Alexander the Great; often such histories have been called examples of "tragic historiography." These histories were dramatic, even sensational narratives. On "tragic history," see Ullmann 1942, Walbank 1960, and Wiseman 1979: 3-8 and 27-40.



emphasized Hannibal and his forces.<sup>379</sup> Coelius' attention to Hannibal and his careful use of sources (even impartial in his use of Silenus) marks him as different from those historians produced by Rome up to that point.

The first professional historian in Rome, Coelius was also the first to explicitly pay attention to the literary style of his history.<sup>380</sup> While Coelius might recall Polybius in the emphasis he placed on his own research, the Roman was not only interested in events and their cause or moral lessons to be absorbed, but also interested in the stylistic merits of his work, as well a rhetorician in second century Rome might be and as many Hellenistic historians were.<sup>381</sup> It was Coelius' historiographic style which made him remarkable, according to Cicero.<sup>382</sup> Several times over, and often at length, in *de Legibus*, *Brutus*, *Orator*, and *de Oratore*, Cicero spoke of Coelius, at times praising him faintly, at other times calling him the best historian Rome had yet seen. In *Orator* 229-230, Cicero criticized Coelius for remarks in his preface in which he promised not to transpose words (hyperbaton) for the sake of rhythm unless necessary. Unfortunately, Cicero's remarks about the preface do not tell us whether Coelius continued on and addressed his choice of form. Cicero explicitly finds fault with him for his naiveté, his belief in transparency, and his ignorance of the custom that neither speakers nor authors in his time used the plea of necessity. Worse, says Cicero, was that if Coelius found it necessary to use transposition, he nevertheless did not need to confess it. Furthermore, continues Cicero, Coelius did indeed transpose words. He also justified himself to Lucius Aelius, the dedicatee of the

---

<sup>379</sup> Walsh 1967: 131 believes Hannibal to be the "focal point" of Coelius' work.

<sup>380</sup> Unfortunately, Coelius' own words are recorded only by the grammarians, and thus are usually very brief excerpts without context; Cicero and Livy do not provide any direct quotations from Coelius. Professional historian here means one whose chief occupation was writing history; the other historians had written history as an avocation.

<sup>381</sup> Leeman 1963: 74 describes Coelius' work as *opus oratorium*.

<sup>382</sup> See the ensuing discussion of Cicero and Coelius below. On Coelius' style, particularly as set against other historians, see Leeman 1963: 74-76.

work, in hopes of his indulgence, and failed to round off his sentences neatly. Cicero condemns his style for faults from which other writers, such as the Asiatics, also suffered. Cicero does not mince words.

Elsewhere, however, Coelius and his style come off better. In *de Oratore* 2.52, Cicero's interlocutor Antonius marked Coelius as different and superior to men such as Cato, Pictor, and Piso who wrote simple records of facts and events without ornamentation. Those writers regarded brevity as their works' real merit. Against this context, Cicero set Coelius, *vir optimus*, who added a *maiolem sonum vocis* to history writing. Coelius was the *ornator rerum*. Yet Coelius here, too, had his failings—no diversity of reflections to set off his narrative, no marshalling of words or smooth flow of style to polish off his work.<sup>383</sup> Rather, Coelius was *homo neque doctus*, and even *neque maxime aptus ad dicendum*. But, finishes Cicero's speaker Catulus, at least he was better than those who came before him. Ironically, Coelius' student, L. Crassus, was a principal interlocutor in *de Oratore*. In *Brutus* 102, Coelius is *luculentus* for his times, and a man well educated in the law. Lastly, in *de Legibus* 1.6, Cicero commends Coelius who *inflavit vehementius*, and demonstrated some strengths, although his works were *agrestis* and *horridas*, and lacked polish and practice.<sup>384</sup> Coelius, at least, made clear to those who came after him that they should write with care. What Cicero was looking for in Roman historiography was some nicer conflation of style and form, and Coelius was the first to show concern for this aspect of history writing.

---

<sup>383</sup> Leeman 1963: 74-75.

<sup>384</sup> These judgments may well reproduce rivalry among Antonius, Catulus and Crassus, who were political competitors in these years.

Coelius often, however, demonstrated a lack of restraint. His numbers are exaggerated, the pictures he paints larger than life, the dreams and portents emotional.<sup>385</sup> He elaborated to evoke tension even where the facts may not have supported him. Livy says that most Greek and Latin authors believed that Scipio's sea voyage to Africa was without troubles, except for Coelius alone who depicted it as beset by both all sorts of terrors from the sea and sky and a storm that drives Scipio away from Africa. Coelius also has Scipio's men, without orders of their leaders, make for the shore unarmed *haud secus quam naufragos*.<sup>386</sup> Livy's incredulity is clear.<sup>387</sup> Yet, Coelius' apology for his use of hyperbaton demonstrates a commitment to use of rhetorical techniques, or at least principles. Additionally, these elements were not missing in Hellenistic historiography, and Coelius borrowed from them. Coelius' Hellenistic models would have provided the legitimacy to use an exuberant style; the Asiatic style which Cicero found fault with was embraced by Hellenistic historians, thus allowing Coelius to add speeches and dreams and exaggerations. Fronto's description of him, *Ennium studiose aemulatus*, suggests that Coelius paid attention to poetic practices too.<sup>388</sup>

Coelius secured a place in Roman historiography as the first to emphasize stylistic concerns and the first to explicitly address those concerns in a historical work.<sup>389</sup> Moreover, Coelius inaugurated a historiographical form new to Rome, the monograph, which would become one more option for Romans in which to record, create, write, and present their history.

---

<sup>385</sup> Leeman 1963: 75. An example of this lack of restraint is found in, e.g., his description of Italy when Scipio headed off to Italy in frag. 46 (= Liv. 29.25.1-4).

<sup>386</sup> Frag. 47 (= Liv. 29.27.13-15).

<sup>387</sup> Fornara 1983: 59 finds Coelius guilty of the charge that he wrote a work sacrificing "history to art", and "even the art was rudimentary."

<sup>388</sup> Fronto *Ep.*, p. 56 van den Hout.

<sup>389</sup> In, e.g., frags. 2 and 36.

Yet another different sort of history writing grew up at the end of the second century. Its impetus was neither the desire to treat a single period of Roman history, as monographs did, nor yet to discuss contemporary history, nor to examine Rome *ab urbe condita* as the annalists did; rather, its motivation was the need to legitimize and justify public actions, usually political and military ones. *Commentarii* are thus on the edges of history writing, perhaps closer to autobiography and biography than traditional histories.<sup>390</sup> Since the form offered an alternative way of recording history in Rome, however, it deserves attention, and it also can offer a further and deeper understanding of the context of the years from 133 to 80, a period of individual men with great ambition and appetites for power.

*Commentarii* were private journals of sorts, even memoirs.<sup>391</sup> In the form's origins, *commentarii* were like notebooks, a place for jotting down the raw material that could later be written up more formally.<sup>392</sup> *Commentarii* provided sources for history, rather than finished pieces, although that was often just pretence. Sometimes the form is likened to the Greek *hypomnemata*, organized materials kept by generals during campaigns, Alexander the Great, for example, as well as by rulers. The form offered a venue to explain actions, and in Roman hands, to continue to influence the political landscape. It was a form of public history. Moreover, it provided a means to create a permanent memory of an individual. Memorializing was not unique to the autobiographical literary form in Rome. Busts and images of ancestors were honored, statues of great men were erected in public places, sponsorship of public buildings allowed an outlet for publicity as well, inscriptions publicly extolled accomplishments, and

---

<sup>390</sup> Kraus 2005: 254 calls history, biography, and autobiography *genera proxima*. On memoirs and autobiography, see Riggsby 2007.

<sup>391</sup> On the *commentarius* form, see Bömer 1953; Gelzer 1963; and von Albrecht 1997: 412-413, and more generally on memoirs and Roman perception of history, see Bates 1983.

<sup>392</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 267. Cicero states that Caesar's aim in his *commentarii* was to furnish others with material with which to write history.

portraiture became individualistic. But none of those well-kept traditions, even inscriptions, offered written narrative—*commentarii* did.

In the years from the Gracchi to Sulla, prominent men used the *commentarii* form, transforming it from notebook to literary work. These men perhaps included Caius Gracchus, as well as the dictator Sulla, author of a substantial autobiography, and in between, M. Aemilius Scaurus, P. Rutilius Rufus, and Q. Lutatius Catulus. All held the consulship, yet all four of these men faced difficulties in their careers.<sup>393</sup> Little survives from their *commentarii*, in some cases far less than the slim collections of the fragments of earlier historians. In this case, even more necessarily, the thin information regarding their *commentarii* needs to be joined with their context so that a clearer view of their perceptions of the merits and deficiencies of this historical form might be coaxed out.

Caius Gracchus' work no longer survives. Plutarch, however, preserves notice of a pamphlet written by Caius concerning motives for his brother Tiberius' reforms, and Cicero too knew of its existence.<sup>394</sup>

### **Marcus Aemilius Scaurus**

More remains of the *commentarii* written by Marcus Aemilius Scaurus, born around 162 in an impoverished patrician family, who became the most influential politician of his years. Proud and immensely powerful, Scaurus was instrumental in using the form to serve more than a storage house for historical materials. Sufficiently egotistical to write memoirs of his own life, he told the story of his political activities in his work. M. Aemilius Scaurus undertook the *cursus*

---

<sup>393</sup> Riggsby 2007: 270.

<sup>394</sup> Plut. *Ti. Gracch.* 8 and Cic. *Div.* 1.18.36 and 2.19.62. Cicero knew also of Caius' orations, and praised his grandeur, wisdom, and weightiness in his discourses (Cic. *Brut.* 125-126). The fragments of C. Gracchus' speeches are collected in Häpke 1915.

*honorum* as a *novus homo*, and enjoyed great success.<sup>395</sup> In fact he became the most powerful senator of his time, and was *princeps senatus* for over twenty-five years. Cicero claimed that by “his nod he almost ruled the world.”<sup>396</sup> He began his career in military service in Spain, was quaestor in Sardinia in 125, curule aedile in 122, praetor in Africa in 119, consul in 115, author of both a sumptuary law and one on freedmen in that year, victorious over the Ligurians, Taurians and Carnians in his consulship year as well, censor in 109, and *curator annonae* in 104. Scaurus also served in 112 on the senatorial commission which dealt with struggle for power between Jugurtha and his brother in North Africa, and he helped to broker a peace with Jugurtha in 111.<sup>397</sup>

Today only seven fragments of that work remain.<sup>398</sup> Extant fragments demonstrate that the work was called *de vita sua*, and that it was three books long.<sup>399</sup> Addressed to Lucius Fufidius, the work was composed late in Scaurus’ life and published probably right after his death.<sup>400</sup> Preserved by grammarians, the skimpy fragments which survive speak mostly to particular stylistic choices by Scaurus; little by way of content can be deduced. Nonetheless, two fragments are of interest. They reveal a man who was self-made despite the difficult financial straits of his early life (frag.1), and a man who instilled and insisted upon discipline in his army

---

<sup>395</sup> Frag. 1 refers to Scaurus’ impoverished family; Chassignet 2004: LXXXVIII calls his aristocratic family “ruinee.”

<sup>396</sup> Cic. *Font.* 24.

<sup>397</sup> Studies (and biographies): Klebs 1893: 584-588; Badian 1966: 23; Bates 1986; Suerbaum 2002: 440-443; and Chassignet 2004: LXXXVIII-XC. Epigraphical notices: *CIL*<sup>2</sup>, p. 49 = Degrassi, *Inscr. Ital.* XIII, I, p. 85; *CIL*<sup>2</sup>, p. 150 = Degrassi, *Inscr. Ital.* XIII, 1, p. 274-275.

<sup>398</sup> Editions: Chassignet 2004: 161-163, and Peter 1914: 185-186 (7 fragments). Beck and Walter do not include the authors of *commentarii* in their volumes on the early historians, except for P. Rutilius Rufus, who is included because he also wrote a history.

<sup>399</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 112. Three fragments witness to the work’s title: frags. 1, 3, and 4.

<sup>400</sup> Suerbam 2002: 442; Chassignet 2004: XCI. Fufidius’ identification is not known.

(frag. 7).<sup>401</sup> Cicero's remark in *Brutus* 112 informs us more generally about the work. He calls the volumes of Scaurus' work *utiles*, and in a comparison to the life and education of Cyrus declares that Cyrus' life should not be preferred to *Scauri laudibus*. By Cicero's account, Scaurus' *de vita sua* was a self-promoting explication, even an encomium, of his life's activities. More telling is Cicero's comment that despite its usefulness, no one read Scaurus' work (*quos nemo legit*), preferring to read Cyrus even though it was less appropriate for Roman customs and ways. One supposes that, if published earlier, Scaurus' *commentarii* might have been compelling reading during the lifetime of Scaurus, and it might have exerted an influence on Rome's politicians. Once Scaurus was gone, however, his panegyric no longer carried great weight.

### **Publius Rutilius Rufus**

The same fate did not befall the *commentarii* of the same period, written by Publius Rutilius Rufus, whose career overlapped (and threatened) that of Scaurus. Born around 154, he was military tribune at Numantia in 133 under Scipio Aemilius, and legate under Q. Metellus in 109-107 during the war against Jugurtha. In between military actions, he undertook a career as orator and lawyer in Rome, served as praetor in 118, and ran unsuccessfully in 115 for consul against M. Aemilius Scaurus whom he accused of *ambitus*, and who in return prosecuted him. He served finally as consul in 105, and undertook military reforms out of the urgency due to war with the Cimbri and Teutones. In Asia in 94, he governed the province as legate of Scaevola, alienated the Senate at home, and was prosecuted in 92 by a coalition of Marius and *equites* under *res repetundae* when he returned.<sup>402</sup> Found guilty, Rutilius left the city in exile and took

---

<sup>401</sup> Frag. 1 = Val. Max. 4.4.11. Frag. 7 = Frontin. *Str.* 4.3.13.

<sup>402</sup> Rutilius' trial took place sometime between 94 and 92. Cf. Alexander 1990: 50 who proposed 92, and *contra* Kallet-Marx 1990: 128-129, who argues for an earlier date between 94 and 92.

up residence in Smyrna. At home the *optimates* deemed his trial outrageous and Rutilius' "Metellan" circle decried it. This trial eventually served as a catalyst for attempted reforms of the *quaestiones perpetuae*.<sup>403</sup>

A student of the Stoic Panaetius, Rutilius wrote a history of Rome in Greek and a *commentarius* in Latin.<sup>404</sup> In exile, Rutilius occupied his leisure time in appropriate literary pursuit, writing Roman history, just as Cato had filled his leisure time. He also recorded and justified his own political activities, as M. Aemilius Scaurus had done late in his life too. His autobiography might have been prompted, in fact, by Scaurus' writing of his own; such a motivation explains Rutilius' choice of form, and might offer an explanation for why Rutilius wrote two different kinds of history. Rutilius' *History* in Greek highlighted the depth of his education and erudition. Rutilius moved in Roman literary society with Laelius, Panaetius, Poseidonius and Lucilius, along with Q. Aelius Tubero and Caius Fannius.<sup>405</sup> His *History* was written in Greek for his Greek reading audience in Smyrna, his home during exile. A few fragments, possibly eight, remain, and these suggest a history which recounted contemporary events, which by this point had become a favorite form of history writing. Although Athenaeus and Plutarch knew this work, little with certainty is known of its content.<sup>406</sup> A current theory holds that this Greek history could have been a translation or adaptation of his autobiography.<sup>407</sup>

---

<sup>403</sup> Studies (and biographies): Münzer 1914: 1269-1280; Suerbaum 2002: 443-447; Peter 1914: CCLIV-CCLVIII; Hendrickson 1933; Beck and Walter 2004: 100-102; Chassignet 2004: X-XVI and XCIV-XCVI. On Rutilius' trial and its impact, see Kallet-Marx 1990. Cicero *Brut.* 115 declared that the trial of the innocent Rutilius shook the republic. Cicero's own friendship with Rutilius colored his view. Badian 1957: 34-70.

<sup>404</sup> Badian 1966: 23 echoes Cic. *De or.* 1.231 when he calls Rutilius the "Roman Socrates."

<sup>405</sup> Chassignet 2004: XIII; Suerbaum 2002: 443.

<sup>406</sup> Athen. 4.66, p. 168D; Plut. *Pomp.* 37.3 (= Rutilius Rufus *Hist.* frag. 5). Editions of Rutilius' *History*: Chassignet 2004: 1-5; Peter 1914: 187-188 (4 fragments); Beck and Walter 2004: 103-108 (7 fragments).

<sup>407</sup> E.g., Badian 1966: 24.



Rutilius Rufus' *de vita sua* is similarly not well known, but was, nonetheless, influential. Written in Latin, rather than Greek, and thereby aimed at an audience at home in Rome, it filled at least five books.<sup>408</sup> Nine fragments survive; as usual, the majority of these concern grammatical choices of the author, and thus grammarians preserve most of the fragments, with Charisius recording six of them.<sup>409</sup> Disappointed by his exile, Rutilius used the *commentarii* form to attack enemies: fragment 1 from Book 1 disparages Q. Pompeius (cos. 141), and fragment 13 denounces Marius who had played a role in exiling him, along with L. Valerius Flaccus. Rutilius' contribution to the *commentarius* form was its overtly apologetic tone.

According to all reports, Rutilius was a man of integrity, *tristus et severus* in his style of speaking.<sup>410</sup> His works, both the *History* and *de vita sua*, became sources for Cicero, Sallust, and Plutarch, particularly their accounts of Marius, Pompey and Q. Metellus.<sup>411</sup> While few fragments survive, that he was read and used by authors such as Sallust, Plutarch, Cicero and Livy underscores his significance in shaping the history of his own period.

Of particular import for this dissertation's interest in form are Tacitus' comments on biography. In the preface to the *Agricola*, Tacitus described Rutilius' *de vita sua* and Scaurus as representative of works produced in a time when it was permissible to write biography to record examples of virtue. Tacitus remarked (*Agric.* 1.2-3) that many considered it a mark of the honest confidence in integrity, and not merely culpable arrogance, for men of action to become their

---

<sup>408</sup> Frags. 5 and 6 mention a fifth book; no other fragment mentions a later volume.

<sup>409</sup> Editions: Chassignet 2004: 164-169; Peter 1914: 189-190 (9 fragments) .

<sup>410</sup> Cicero *Brut.* 113. A fuller picture of Rutilius (and Scaurus) appears in Cicero's *Brut.* 113 in his discussion of their oratorical abilities. Scaurus and Rutilius were by nature *vehemens et acer*, with Rutilius representative of the Stoic style of oratory, and Scaurus representative of the old school. Cicero met Rutilius in Smyrna in 78, and later recounted a conversation with him in *Brut.* 85; this discussion focuses on a story Rutilius repeated to Cicero demonstrating the oratorical skills of Laelius and Galba in particular, whom Rutilius had known well.

<sup>411</sup> Badian 1966: 24-25; Suerbaum 2002: 447; Chassignet 2004: XCVI.

own biographers. Tacitus mentioned that Rutilius and Scaurus were instances of such. Moreover, both men, Tacitus claimed, were not censured for doing so, nor was the truth of their narrative questioned.<sup>412</sup> Embittered himself, Tacitus sought to justify his desire to transmit to memory the virtues of Agricola in a period “cruel and hostile to virtue.”<sup>413</sup> Ironically, the *commentarius* form as political autobiography was rarely free of self-justification. Rutilius’ own writing of two forms of history neatly highlights the disparity between the two. The *commentarius* in his hands, and especially Sulla to come, served more as political *apologia* than history.

### **Quintus Lutatius Catulus**

Q. Lutatius Catulus, b. 150, and a near contemporary of Scaurus and Rutilius, similarly utilized different historical forms, writing a *Communis Historia* and *de consulatu suo et de rebus gestis*, as well as speeches and even poetry.<sup>414</sup> Like Scaurus and Rutilius, Catulus was deeply involved in Roman political and military matters. A member of a noble family, he was connected by marriage to the best families; he married a sister of Caepio (cos. 106). He ran unsuccessfully three times for consul, ultimately winning in 102 through the aid of Marius.<sup>415</sup> He was defeated by the Cimbri on the Adige, but rebounded to defeat the Cimbri at the momentous battle of Vercellae with the aid of both Marius and Sulla in 101. Catulus and Marius

---

<sup>412</sup> Tac. Agric. 1.2-3: *Sed apud priores ut agere digna memoratu prouum magisque in aperto erat, ita celeberrimus quisque ingenio ad prodendam virtutis memoriam sine gratia aut ambitione bonae tantum conscientiae pretio ducebantur. Ac plerique suam ipsi vitam narrare fiduciam potius morum quam adrogantiam arbitrati sunt, nec id Rutilio et Scauro citra fidem aut obtreptioni fuit: adeo virtutes isdem temporibus optime aestimantur, quibus facillime gignuntur.* On the preface to the *Agricola*, see Sailor 2004: 139-177.

<sup>413</sup> Tac. Agric. 1.4: *saeva et infesta virtutibus tempora.*

<sup>414</sup> Studies (and biographies): Münzer 1927: 2072-2079, Peter 1914: CCLXII-CCLXIV; Suerbaum 2002: 447-453; Bardon 1950: 145-164; Bardon 1952: 115- 124 and Chassignet 2004: XVI-XIX. Questions abound about Catulus’ writings, including the connections among them, the identification of the author, and more. Chassignet 2004: XIX-XXII provides a bibliography for recent scholarship on these issues which concern us less than the forms Catulus chose to use.

<sup>415</sup> Broughton 1952 I: 567. Broughton believes that he also served as praetor, probably by 109.

were awarded a triumph for their success, but when Marius received more credit, Catulus withdrew his friendship, and became one of his significant enemies. In 87 Catulus stood against Marius and Cinna, and upon Marius' return and his prosecution of Catulus, Catulus committed suicide. Catulus suffered from Marius' enmity just as Rutilius had earlier.<sup>416</sup>

Catulus was a learned man, more so than Scaurus and Rutilius, at least in the range of his interests.<sup>417</sup> Two epigrams are all that survive of his poetry; speeches survive as well, including a funerary oration on his mother Popillia.<sup>418</sup> That speech is remarkable in that it was the first funeral speech delivered in Rome for a woman.<sup>419</sup>

Twelve fragments, two of them supplying a title, survive from Catulus' history which encompassed at least four books and which considered the history of Rome from its origins, including the settlement of Aeneas at Lavinium.<sup>420</sup> The title, *Communis Historia*, could have indicated a more general history, since fragments discuss more than the origins of Rome.<sup>421</sup> His history was appreciated by the antiquarians, including Varro and the author of the *Origo Gentis*, who preserve many of the fragments.<sup>422</sup> Catulus himself was interested in antiquarianism. His fragments cover some of the same stories and material contained in the early annalists.

---

<sup>416</sup> Marius, who had much to defend and justify, and time to do it in, did not apparently write a *commentarius*.

<sup>417</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 132 calls him *eruditus*.

<sup>418</sup> Catulus' epigrams are collected in Courtney 1993: 75-78; his speeches in Malcovati 1979: 218.

<sup>419</sup> Cic. *De or.* 2.44.

<sup>420</sup> Editions of Q. Lutatius Catulus' *Comm. Hist.*: Chassignet 2004: 6-12; Peter 1914: 192-194 (7 fragments). The settlement of Aeneas at Lavinium comes from frag. 5 of his history, and not from his *commentarius*.

<sup>421</sup> E.g., frag. 11 on the foundation of Naples. Peter 1914: CCLXVII sees it as a general history, but Bardon 1952: 122 sees it as a work unifying the Italian world with the Greek world.

<sup>422</sup> Ps. Aurelius Victor *OGR* preserves frags. 2, 4, and 5-7 of Catulus' *Comm. Hist.*

Catulus also wrote an autobiographical work in the form similar to the one used by both Scaurus and Rutilius. Cicero called it *liber de consulatu et de rebus gestis*.<sup>423</sup> Not only is the content of this work little known, but the form itself as well. Only three fragments survive.<sup>424</sup> Cicero's label suggests it was a combination of contemporary history and *commentarius*, and thus perhaps unlike Scaurus' and Rutilius' political autobiography. Fronto, in fact, described the work as *Catuli litterae*.<sup>425</sup> Nevertheless, the work exhibited elements characteristic of political autobiography, among these its apologetic tone, first person voice, and treatment of only personal experiences.<sup>426</sup> No Latin author preserves Catulus; the three fragments extant (not direct quotations) are in Plutarch's Greek life of Marius. Cicero added in the *Brutus* that Catulus' book (and his speeches) demonstrated *incorrupta sermonis integritas*, and that this work was written in the clear, lucid style Xenophon was known for. Nonetheless, this smooth style did not mean Catulus' work was widely read, at least in Cicero's time. Cicero's friend Brutus admits in *Brutus* 133 that he did not know the book at all, never mind not having read it, and Cicero claimed it was no better known than the three books of Scaurus (which Brutus also did not know). Such a joining of the two, however, lends support to the claim that Catulus and Scaurus shared a similar form. The works shared an apologetic note.

The surviving fragments of Catulus in Plutarch's life of Marius were concerned with events from 102-101, specifically Catulus' victory at Vercellae in July 101 over the Cimbri.

---

<sup>423</sup> Cicero *Brut.* 132. Literally the title implies a work about Catulus' year as consul in 102.

<sup>424</sup> Editions of Catulus' *liber de consulatu*: Chassignet 2004: 170-171; Peter 1914: 191-192.

<sup>425</sup> Fronto *Ep.*, p. 124 van den Hout.

<sup>426</sup> Suerbaum 2002: 450.

Catulus' disparaging description of Marius' actions—even accusing Marius of malice towards him—became part of a tradition hostile to Marius.<sup>427</sup> Catulus, in his account, performed better.

### Lucius Cornelius Sulla

Lastly, the use of the *commentarii* as political apology flourished in the hands of Sulla.<sup>428</sup> Sulla's remarkable career will not be rehearsed here.<sup>429</sup> Though few fragments of his *commentarius* remain today, it is apparent that Sulla used the form in the same manner as Scaurus, Rutilius, and Catulus did—with an eye to explanation, justification, and legitimization.

As with Catulus' work, Sulla's memoirs are preserved chiefly by Plutarch in his life of the dictator. Various authors call Sulla's work by different names, including *hypomnemata*, *historia*, *res gestae*, and even *praxeis*.<sup>430</sup> Twenty-three fragments are extant from a work that included at least twenty-two books.<sup>431</sup> Seventeen fragments come from Plutarch. The size of the work indicates that Sulla must have begun writing it before his retirement from politics; indeed no other *commentarius* competes with it for sheer length or size. Topics covered by Sulla included his participation in the war against the Cimbri, his defeat in his first campaign for praetor, the capture of Nola, the sedition of P. Sulpicius Rufus in 88, Sulla's actions against Greece and Mithridates, Rome's civil war, and even a premonition concerning his own death.<sup>432</sup> Where

---

<sup>427</sup> Frag. 1 (= Plut. *Mar.* 25.6-8). Chassignet 2004: XCVII. A number of scholars believe that Plutarch knew Catulus not directly but through Sulla's memoirs; these include Peter 1914: CCLXVI and Bardon 1952: 120. Marasco 1984: 83-84 opts for Poseidonius as Plutarch's source for Catulus.

<sup>428</sup> The *Commentarii* of Julius Caesar fall outside the temporal span of this work.

<sup>429</sup> Studies (and biographies) of Sulla, see Fröhlich 1900: 1522-1566; Keveaney 1982; and Seager 1994. For studies of Sulla's *commentarius*, see Peter 1914: CCLXX- CCLXXX; Valgiglio 1975, Pascucci 1975, Lewis 1991, Scholz 2003 and Chassignet 2004: XCIX-CIV.

<sup>430</sup> The term *hypomnemata* is used in frags. 11-14, 17-18, and 23 by Plutarch; Cicero uses *historia* in frag. 9, Aulus Gellius prefers the title *libri rerum gestarum* in frags. 2 and 3, and Plutarch uses *praxeis* in frag. 1.

<sup>431</sup> Editions: Chassignet 2004: 172-184; Peter 1914: 195-204 (21 fragments). Frag. 23 tells us of the length of the work.

<sup>432</sup> Frags. 4-6; 7; 9-10; 12; 14-18; 20-21; and 23, respectively.

these fell in Sulla's *commentarii* is not always clear—Sulla wrote his work in Latin and a freedman, L. Cornelius Epicadus, reworked it, in Greek.<sup>433</sup> Two fragments indicate something of the structure of the work. Fragment 17 (= Plut. *Sull.* 17.1- 4) records that Sulla wrote of victory at Chaeroneia in 86 in his tenth book. This means that Sulla covered the last years of his life, i.e., the civil war, proscriptions, and dictatorship, in twelve more books. Fragment 23 (= Plut. *Sull.* 37.1-3) preserves Sulla's prophecy in Book 22 of his own death.

Intentions behind Sulla's use of the *commentarii* form are twofold and complementary. First, Sulla's work was intended, at least at one point, as a storage place for facts, for raw material to be incorporated later in a fuller history. According to Plutarch, Sulla's dedication of his volumes to his friend, Lucullus, a man of great culture and later great wealth, was done so in the hopes that he would put Sulla's autobiography in order and arrange it better.<sup>434</sup> Lucullus, however, never reworked the material into a proper history. Sulla's prefatory comments may have been wishful thinking in the manner that Cicero hoped his friend Luceius would write his history, or more a realistic nod to the haste with which Sulla composed his work. He would have written twenty-two volumes extraordinarily quickly, and such speed compelled him merely to collect notes, records, and reminiscences. Any long narrative, deep explication or polished speech would have been nearly impossible, though he granted some periods of his career more coverage, particularly his last years.<sup>435</sup> Such a lengthy work compiled in a short time implies a work true to the original notion of *commentarii*—notes of sorts in which to gather material for a fuller history.

---

<sup>433</sup> Suet. *Gram.* 12.1-2. Debate flourishes about this; some say Sulla wrote his *commentarius* originally in Greek, and his Greek freedman recast it, presumably also in Greek. Others, such as Chassignet, however, believe that Sulla wrote it originally in Latin, based on Plutarch's comments about the memoir. I find her argument more convincing. See Chassignet 2004: C-CI.

<sup>434</sup> Frag.1 (= Plut. *Luc.* 1.4).

<sup>435</sup> Lewis 1991: 511.

Yet, in the manner of his contemporaries, Sulla used the autobiographical form for more; his own words demonstrate that he intended his autobiography to present and perpetuate his perception of his actions, and within that, to manifest as overarching theme for his life his *felix* character.<sup>436</sup> His purpose, which was not unique to his autobiography but shared by each author of *commentarii* in this period, was to shape the image of himself which would become part of Rome's history. He would instruct others of his accomplishments and leave a legacy at the same time. Thus his work carried a defensive tone just as Scaurus' work had and Rutilius' as well. That much is clear in Plutarch, who included Sulla's defense of his actions during the war against Mithridates (87-80). On the charge that Sulla might have been favoring certain enemies over others, Plutarch declared that Sulla in his own memoirs argued that his favors were perfectly innocent.<sup>437</sup>

Moreover, Sulla's representation of his actions and his career very likely imitated not only the *commentarii* as produced by Scaurus (whose widow Sulla had married) and Rutilius but also the deep-set Roman tradition of the *laudatio funebris*. Such speeches rehearsed the deceased's *cursus honorum* and *res gestae*, as well as lineage, ancestry, and attendant virtues.<sup>438</sup> The political autobiography in fact very likely grew out of this accepted Roman custom. That Sulla's work included his *cursus honorum* can be deduced from the details known by Velleius Paterculus who knew of six generations of Sulla's family, and from Aulus Gellius, who preserved mention of an ancestor of Sulla, P. Cornelius, the *flamen dialis* of the third century, in

---

<sup>436</sup> Scholz 2003 argues that Sulla's work was, in fact, a literary exercise characterizing Sulla through his "strong affinity to *felicitas*."

<sup>437</sup> Frag. 18 (= Plut. *Sull.* 23.1-5).

<sup>438</sup> On the *laudatio funebris*, see Crawford 1941, Kierdorf 1980, Wiseman 1994: 1-36, and Suerbaum 2002: 518-523. Pliny (*HN* 35.8), Cicero (*Brut.* 62), and Livy (8.11.4) all speak to the untrustworthy character of the *laudatio*.

a verbatim quotation.<sup>439</sup> The inclusion of material such as this in Sulla's work implies that some coverage was accorded to his lineage and ancestry.<sup>440</sup> And so the form of the political autobiography was expanded to include not just justification of one's actions but also presentation of one's presumably virtuous and noble ancestors.

The success of the political autobiography in the early first century needs to be set in context. Few Roman historians from this time period wrote in any other form. Sisenna was probably at work writing a contemporary history. Annalistic historiography had earlier ceased; Antias and Valerius had yet to publish. Scaurus, Rutilius, Catulus and Sulla represented *factiones* which dominated Rome after the Gracchan period. In a linear step, their version of history was a further point along a line of history writing from Cato's inclusion of his own speeches, despite his dislike of Hellenistic individualism, to Fannius' explicit notice of his aversion to the Gracchi and then to Sulla's listing of his family's accomplishments. Each of these historian-politicians inserted himself into his history, and paved the way for history which included autobiography.

Moreover, autobiography in political life was not unknown to the Romans. Recording of achievements by means of speeches, orations, laudatory inscriptions, memoirs (such as the *hypomnemata* of Alexander the Great and the apologia of Aratus of Sicyon), and the plastic arts had been done by the Mesopotamians, Egyptians, Greeks, Hellenistic kings, and more recently, even Hannibal himself.<sup>441</sup> Romans similarly committed to posterity accounts of their accomplishments and virtues by both literary and non-literary means. The *laudatio funebris* delivered at the funeral provided a biography of an exalted man; these funerary speeches were

---

<sup>439</sup> Vell. 2.17.2, and frag. 2 (= Gell. NA 1.12.15-16).

<sup>440</sup> Lewis 1991: 512-514, *contra* Sullan scholars who propose that Sulla passed quickly over his parentage, education and formative years, writing little if any on those topics.

<sup>441</sup> For a general overview of autobiography in the ancient world see Misch 1950. On Hannibal's memorial to himself, see Liv. 28.46 and Polyb. 3.33.



likely preserved in family archives and provided source material for the family's history. Yet while the *laudatio* praised an individual, it did so in the context of the family, the fundamental unit of Roman society, and thus took place within a private context. Funerary inscriptions, epitaphs in both prose and poetry, and honorary (and political) inscriptions, however, advanced the concept of recording the deeds of an individual in public. The rhetoric of a *laudatio* and the intimate context were absent from these inscriptions, but the intention—of presenting an account of one's *res gestae*—was the same. The vowing of temples, the names on public buildings, as well as triumphal processions, commemorated and immortalized the achievements of distinguished families of Rome.<sup>442</sup> Autobiography was not far removed in intent from these means: all looked to achieve the same end: some form of immortality. Indeed historiography in Rome itself was tied up with the urge to memorialize and meld, and promote, patrician families and national history.

### **Lucius Cornelius Sisenna**

The period which produced these *commentarii* of Scaurus, Rutilius, Catulus and Sulla was one of great energy, frenetic politicking, and ambitious men. It was not, however, the home to great history writing, with the exception of the work done by L. Cornelius Sisenna. Termed by Rawson as “the most important historical work in Latin” written in the first half of the first century, Sisenna's history treated both the Social War and the subsequent civil war up to the time of Sulla's death.<sup>443</sup>

---

<sup>442</sup> On Roman chronicling of *res gestae* by means of *laudationes*, buildings, processions, and art, see Misch 1950: 208- 230.

<sup>443</sup> Rawson 1991: 363. Badian 1962: 212 notes his recognition as the greatest historian of the age; cf. Cicero, below, in comments from *Brutus*.

L. Cornelius Sisenna was descended remotely from an Etruscan family, and his family had held citizenship for several generations.<sup>444</sup> Born around 118, his political career consisted of possible quaestorship in 89, praetorship (both *urbanus et peregrinus*) in 78, and possible pro-praetorship in Sicily in 77.<sup>445</sup> His oratorical career included the defense of Verres with Hortensius in 70; additionally he had a brief military career as legate under Pompey in charge of Macedon and Greece in the pirate campaign of 67, during which he died.<sup>446</sup> He might have been an Epicurean, poet, and translator.<sup>447</sup>

Sisenna's *Historiae* included Sulla's civil war, at least the years 91-82, and perhaps to Sulla's death in 78.<sup>448</sup> One hundred and forty-four fragments are extant, from a work of at least twenty-three books.<sup>449</sup> Fronto calls his style *longinque*.<sup>450</sup> While fragments 1-3 of Sisenna relate

---

<sup>444</sup> Studies (and biographies): Niese 1901: 1512-1513; Peter 1914: CCCXXXIV-CCCXLIX; Badian 1962a; Badian 1962; Rawson 1991: 363-388; Beck and Walter 2004: 241-245; Chassignet 2004: XXXVIII-XLIX.

<sup>445</sup> On his offices, see Badian 1964: 430; on participation in Social War, see Plut. *Luc.* I.7; on praetorship, see *CIL* I<sup>2</sup>, 2, 589 = *ILLRP* 513, and Broughton 1952 II: 86 (who tentatively calls Sisenna a patrician but with a question mark). Badian 1962: 212 calls him of "good praetorian (and probably patrician) family." On the possible pro-praetorship, see Rawson 1991: 372. Broughton 1952 II: 90 thinks Sisenna might have been governor of Sicily instead.

<sup>446</sup> Rawson 1991: 367-368; Chassignet 2004: XL-XLI; and Broughton 1952 II: 148. For Sisenna's speeches, see Malcovati 1979: 305-307. Cicero did not know his speeches directly, suggesting that Sisenna did not publish them. On Sisenna in Macedon and Greece, see Dio 36. 1. Bardon 1952: 255 calls him a soldier (and thereby explains the number of battle scenes).

<sup>447</sup> Sisenna may have had a literary career beyond historian. Some scholars propose that he translated the Milesian stories of Aristides; see Chassignet 2004: XLII. Rawson 1991: 369-371 is dead set against an identification of Sisenna, the translator of the Milesian tales, with Sisenna the historian. The passage from Ovid (*Trist.* 2.443-444) generally cited as proof is part of Ovid's list of Latin authors, but these are mostly poets, not historians. Cic. *Div.* 1.99 notes influence on Sisenna by an unnamed Epicurean. That would make Sisenna the only historian we know who was an Epicurean.

<sup>448</sup> Vell. 2.9.5 calls it *opus belli civilis Sullanique*. Frag. 134 provides a possible endpoint of 82. The title *Historiae* is witnessed in many of Sisenna's fragments, such as frags. 6, 7 and 13-16.

<sup>449</sup> Editions: Chassignet 2004: 50-88; Peter 1914: 276-297 (143 fragments); Barabino 1967: 67-239 (144 fragments); Beck and Walter 2004: 247-313 (144 fragments). Frag. 134, dating to the year 82, is the last fragment to record a book.

<sup>450</sup> Fronto *Ep.*, p. 132 van den Hout.

to the early years of Roman history (possibly from a *prooemium*), the other extant fragments center on the social and civil wars.<sup>451</sup> Book 1 (frags. 5 and 6) related troubles in 91 during the tribunate of Drusus, Book 2 (frags. 8-9) further covered the year 91, Book 3 (frag. 10) addressed the end of 91 and the beginning of 90, and Book 4 treated events of 90 and 89.<sup>452</sup> Publication probably occurred after the death of Sulla. Sisenna's history of the wars drew on Sulla's *commentarii* as well as his own experiences in Italy.<sup>453</sup> His sources are, however, not as clear as his probable aim for his history. Sallust, who begrudgingly admired him, called him *optume et diligentissime omnium*, and yet rebuked him for his partisan handling of Sulla's activities.<sup>454</sup> Sisenna openly displayed political interests throughout his work. Trials, speeches, a favoring of the optimates, are all part of his history; many political trials appear to be those under the Varian law, approved in late 91 or early 90 at the beginning of the Social War, and used by the *equites* for political gain.<sup>455</sup>

---

<sup>451</sup> Nonius, perhaps mistakenly, once titles the work *ab urbe condita*, and this title has been explained as perhaps pertaining to a *prooemium* which undertook a cursory look at the origins of Rome. Others suggest the title belongs to an *excursus* either on the model of *archeologia* such as Thucydides wrote or as an embedded section of the *Historiae*. Nonius' name of the work survives in Sisenna's frag. 3 (= Nonius, p. 185, 11 L). On the debate, see Chassignet 2004: XLIII. Rawson 1991: 388, among others, find the notion of a *prooemium* in the style of Thucydides taken up by Sisenna to be untenable, and considers virtually impossible a connection between Sisenna and Sulla's proem. Chassignet 2004: XLIII argues for a *prooemium* which utilized early legends as an effort towards Sullan propaganda. No proem survives.

<sup>452</sup> Frags. 5 and 6 make up Book 2; Book 3 appears in frag. 10. Chassignet 2004: XLVII argues that Book 4 included the end of the year 90 and 89, yet others believe that it treated only 89 with only references to 90; see her footnote 232.

<sup>453</sup> Rawson 1991: 375 and Badian 1966: 25. Sisenna gains and loses authority depending on where he was during these years, particularly the 80's. Badian 1964: 427 sees him in Rome.

<sup>454</sup> Sall. *Iug.* 95. 2: *L. Sisenna, optume et diligentissime omnium, qui eas res (sc. Sullae res) dixere persecutus, parum mihi libero ore locutus videtur.*

<sup>455</sup> Rawson 1991: 366. On the *lex Varia*, see Gruen 1965. On Sisenna's trials under the Varian law see Calboli 1975: 160-218; Calboli echoes Barabino in finding references in the slim fragments to trials of e.g., M. Aemilius Scaurus (e.g., frags. 13, 15, 22, and 51).

Perhaps a patrician himself, Sisenna's support for the optimates stands out in his work. Two fragments support this. Fragment 134 might echo his admiration of Sulla: *multi populi, plurimae contiones dictaturam omnibus animis et studiis suffragaverunt*.<sup>456</sup> Elsewhere, Sisenna speaks of his opinion that wicked and bold men have always worked against the honors and fortunes *huius ordinis*, presumably the senatorial class.<sup>457</sup> Fragments also point out other interests, such as an interest in military matters; these show careful knowledge of topography, siege engines and machines (e.g., frags. 19 and 44), and military and naval terms (e.g., frags. 78, 79, 80).<sup>458</sup> Sisenna found his way into Sallust, and Livy; Varro and Tacitus knew him as well.<sup>459</sup> Varro's work on the writing of history took Sisenna's name as the title, but too little of it survives to demonstrate how and why he discussed Sisenna.<sup>460</sup>

Like Coelius Antipater, Sisenna was concerned with style. Indeed most of Sisenna's fragments survive today in the grammarians who note Sisenna's *inuitata verba*.<sup>461</sup> Nonius alone preserves 123 out of 144 fragments. Sisenna created a writing style full of archaisms, military terms, analogies, neologisms, adverbs ending in *-im*, and "rare and obsolete words";<sup>462</sup> his history entertained as well as informed. Sallust admired him, and chose to begin his history where Sisenna left off. Though Cicero does not mention him in *de Oratore* (presumably in order

<sup>456</sup> Frag. 134 = Nonius, p. 750, 8L. On the "tendenza filosillana" of Sisenna, see Calboli 1975: 156-160.

<sup>457</sup> Frag. 96 = Nonius, p. 153, 1L. On Sisenna and the optimate (too simplistic a term) see equally Rawson 1991: 366-367 and Badian 1966: 27.

<sup>458</sup> On topography, see Rawson 1991: 372.

<sup>459</sup> Rawson 1991: 364. Cf. also Chassignet 2004: XLIX. Liv. *Per.* 62 uses him, Tacitus *Hist.* 3.51 cites him, and Sallust *Hist.* 1.4 Maur mentions Sisenna.

<sup>460</sup> Gell. *NA* 16.9.5.

<sup>461</sup> Badian 1966: 26, drawing on Cic. *Brut.* 259-260.

<sup>462</sup> Leeman 1963: 85. Briscoe 2005: 71-72 provides a list of words appearing for the first or only time in Sisenna and archaisms. Additionally, Briscoe notes Sisenna's fondness for adverbs ending in *-im* and supplies a list of these too. Lebek 1970: 58 argues that Sisenna does not archaize.

to preserve the authenticity of its dramatic date), in the *de Legibus* he declared Sisenna the best of Roman historians to that time, although noting Sisenna's deficiencies (and indeed room for a better historian—himself).<sup>463</sup> Among Sisenna's faults, Cicero found a puerile view (*in historia puerile quidam consecatur*), as well as a desire to imitate Cleitarchus, the Hellenistic historian and chief example of the style of so-called tragic history. Dismissive of Cleitarchus, Cicero also found fault with Sisenna's limited reading of Greek historians. Elsewhere Cicero reiterated this evaluation of Sisenna. In *Brutus*, Cicero addresses Sisenna's oratorical skills, calling him *doctus*, devoted to his studies, *bene Latine loquens*, yet not industrious. On the other hand, in his history writing, Cicero marked him first again of all historians. Once again, Cicero left room for a better historian (and a better style) who would remedy how far current historiography was *a summo*.<sup>464</sup>

In turbulent and unsettling times, Sisenna chose to write in a dramatic style suiting his topic in the manner of tragic history as fashioned by Cleitarchus, the historian of Alexander the Great. His history would then have been full of dramatic moments, perhaps among them Sulla's campaign in Campania (frags. 72 and 73) and Marius' flight from Rome (frag. 127).<sup>465</sup> Other dramatic episodes in the tradition of the Social War may also be traced back to Sisenna's account.<sup>466</sup> Sisenna appeared skeptical of dreams and portents; fragment 3 has Aeneas die next to the Numicius river, not disappearing, and fragment 5 follows Cicero's assertion that Sisenna, because of influence from an unnamed Epicurean, believed no credence should be given to dreams. Yet Cicero also notes, in fragment 5, that Sisenna included portents of statues sweating

---

<sup>463</sup> Cic. *Leg.* 1.7.

<sup>464</sup> Cic. *Brut.* 228.

<sup>465</sup> Rawson 1991: 379, and Barabino 1967: 138.

<sup>466</sup> Rawson 1991: 378-380.

and blood flowing and shields eaten by mice at the beginning of the Marsic War.<sup>467</sup> Stylistically, these enrich his work, though tragic history was not the only branch of history to use portents and dreams; earlier annalists as well as Coelius had done so as well and portents were part of the pontifical chronicles. Sisenna's inclusion of these, as a historical *topos* or as a nod to Sulla's belief in dreams, demonstrates Sisenna's awareness of historiography in Rome.

Sisenna's care for stylistic matters produced a history full of rich language and sounds, archaism, neologisms, analogies, and alliteration, as well as technical terms.<sup>468</sup> Sisenna similarly demonstrated concern for historiographical form. Both implicitly and explicitly, Sisenna offered an opinion about form. His work was entitled *Historiae* consistently, and following on the heels of Sempronius Asellio's distinction drawn between *annales* and *historia*, the title suggests that Sisenna carefully chose a historiographical form defined as interested in reasons and causes rather than one which merely related events and deeds.<sup>469</sup> Sisenna's starting point, too, manifests an interest and awareness of new forms available to Roman historians. Like Coelius, he undertook a history of a particular set of events, avoiding a history *ab urbe condita*. Sisenna began with the death of Drusus in 91, which was the end point for Asellio's history.<sup>470</sup> Continuations were not uncommon in Greek historiography; Sisenna's continuation of Asellio

---

<sup>467</sup> Frag. 3 (on Aeneas) = Nonius, p. 185, 11 L. Frag. 5 (= Cic. *Div.* 1. 99) demonstrates Sisenna's use of portents and dreams despite his skepticism of them which is recorded just prior to the fragment: *Quod quidem somnium Sisenna cum disputavisset mirifice ad verbum cum re convenisse, tum insolenter, credo ab Epicureo aliquo inductus, disputat somniis credi non oportere.*

<sup>468</sup> On Sisenna's use of analogy, see Rawson 1991: 384-386.

<sup>469</sup> Sempronius Asellio frag. 1.

<sup>470</sup> Sempronius Asellio frag. 12.

was, however, the first in Roman historiography.<sup>471</sup> And in a compliment to Sisenna, Sallust chose to begin his history where Sisenna had left off.<sup>472</sup>

Moreover, Sisenna structured his history not rigidly by chronology but rather by theme or topic. Gellius preserved a verbatim quotation from Sisenna (from Book 1, according to Nonius): *nos una aestate in Asia et Graecia gesta litteris idcirco continentia mandavimus, ne vellicatim aut saltuatim scribendo lectorum animos impediremus.*<sup>473</sup> Not only did Sisenna group material by theme but by geography as well (as Cato had done). This ordering of his material categorizes Sisenna as more than an annalist; he was a writer of *historia* and one who claimed to pay attention to style. In content, style, and form, Sisenna was a remarkable historian for the period. Not quite as perfect as Cicero's imagined ideal, Sisenna was, nevertheless, an innovative historian, shaping content through attention to both style and form.

Alternative forms of writing history flourished in the second century in Rome alongside *annales*. Their use of alternative forms demonstrates many things: their awareness of Roman and Greek historiography, an educated audience, an intellectual and social atmosphere in both second and first century Rome, and a charged political climate. In these times they used specific historiographical forms to shape perceptions of Rome—and themselves. Authors of these histories declared their intentions, found the annalistic format lacking in some way, and turned to different forms, forms more amenable for what they envisioned the purpose of their particular history of Rome.

---

<sup>471</sup> Rawson 1991: 373.

<sup>472</sup> Sall. *Hist.* 1. 4 Maur. On Sallust's preface as a traditional historical exordium which paid compliment to Sisenna by beginning where he ended, see McGushin 1992: 69-71.

<sup>473</sup> Frag. 129 (= Gell. *NA* 12.15.2). Nonius prefaced this quotation in a section on the word *saltuatim* with its source in Book 1, Nonius, p. 247, 7L. That the writing of history included an expectation of chronological order, as opposed to Sisenna's methodology, can be seen later, in, e.g., Plin. *Ep.* 1.1: *collegi non servato temporis ordine—neque enim historiam componebam.*

## CHAPTER 6 CONCLUSION

During the Roman Republic, Roman historians employed a number of forms to write their histories: *annales*, *res gestae*, contemporary history, monographs, and *commentarii*. Set in the context of political and military growth and literary development, Roman historians recorded, discovered, shaped and understood the rise of Rome by trying out a variety of historiographical forms to best present Rome's story.

The Roman fragmentary historians used these different forms to provide structure to their unique histories of Rome. These histories, produced in the period from 240 to 63, do not, however, survive intact. From the annalist Fabius Pictor, writing at the end of the Second Punic War, to the annalist Licinius Macer, writing just before Cicero's consulship, histories from the Republican period are preserved only in fragments. In the case of some of these authors, a great number of fragments remain which allow a careful examination of the author's work. For example, one hundred and forty-four fragments are extant from L. Cornelius Sisenna's history of at least twenty-three books. On the other hand, only four fragments survive of the history penned by the Hellenophile and senator A. Postumius Albinus. Paucity of fragments and lack of sure biographical information seriously impede an examination of these authors. Nevertheless, fragmentary works such as these cannot be overlooked in favor of only the more substantial histories of Rome which follow. These incomplete histories both created and shaped Roman historiography and Roman history.

No real preface for any of these historians survives. Indeed, Tore Janson's work on Latin prose prefaces makes no mention of the fragmentary historians of the Republic.<sup>474</sup> Missing from their histories—at least from their fragments—are the introductions crucial to understanding

---

<sup>474</sup> Janson 1964.



Sallust, Livy, and Tacitus. Whether the *topoi*, which regularly filled the prefaces of later Roman and earlier Greek historians, found a place in a preface of one of the fragmentary historians is not known.<sup>475</sup> Perhaps Roman Republican historians, aware of their historiographical predecessors and trained in rhetoric, prepared prefaces, stand-alone or integrated, for their works—but none survives. Did they consider and address *topoi* such as *laudatio historiae*, reason for choice of subject, and their own attitudes towards history?

Reasons for and authorial estimations of particular historiographical forms are, thus, not easy to determine; few explicit motives and fewer intentional statements survive in their meager fragments. Hence the difficulty of this study—an account of how Roman historians used these forms, why they did so, and their own estimations of them. My work has been concerned with form to the extent that we can infer something about the reason for the historian's choice and his accompanying rejection of other ways of writing history. For an author's use of form reveals motivation, demonstrates to some extent what goals he aimed for, what part that history played in the Roman cultural context, and how the author viewed history.

Of the many historians examined in this work, only a mere handful of statements survive which allow a glimpse at choices they made regarding historiographical form. Cato manifested a displeasure with the traditional content of *annales*, which appear to be primarily events he deemed trivial. Sempronius Asellio, at greater length, distinguished works that were *annales* from those of *res gestae*, the latter being the work of a better historian, or so he intimated. Further remarks by Asellio, who noted the lack of inspiration *annales* imparted to their readers, are the only such surviving remarks regarding the purpose of history by a fragmentary historian. Coelius Antipater's preface apologized for his use of hyperbaton, an explicit nod to the

---

<sup>475</sup> On these *topoi* in prefaces of later Roman historians, see Janson 1964: 66-67.

significance of style, if not content and form, in a history. L. Cornelius Sisenna promised not to confuse his readers by jumping around a narrative, presumably by working more thematically and less chronologically. A. Postumius Albinus pleaded for leniency when he chose to write his annals in Greek, a language he believed was conventional for *annales* but one in which he was not at home. Sulla's preface registered a hope that his dedicatee would come in and fix up and arrange his *commentarius*.

Others left less obvious indications about their choice of form. Estimations have to be dug out from the remaining fragments and joined with contexts before we can say anything about a particular historian and form. Sometimes we are reduced to speculation—speculation founded on a close reading of the fragments and an understanding of context, literary, cultural, and political. That is what I have tried to do.

In sum, the evidence from the works of Roman historians from the years 240-63, rejects the picture of historiography in the Roman Republic as uniformly annalistic. It also questions the perception that Roman historiography prior to the second half of the first century was poorly conceived.

Towards the end of the Second Punic War, Roman history began to take form in Fabius Pictor and Cincius Alimentus. Cicero (*Div.* 1.43) described Pictor's work as *Graeci annales*; Dionysius concurred (*Ant. Rom.* 1.6.2). Near contemporaries, Pictor and Alimentus wrote in Greek and described Rome's history *ab urbe condita*, including, as well, stories relating to Rome's prehistory. Influenced by Greek historiographic models of local history, Roman historiography thus began in the Greek language, shaped by Greek conventions, but structured around a native format: the chronological material found in sources such as the annual records posted by the priests. How much these authors used the lists later to be published as the *annales*

*maximi* has been debated; more clear is the evidence in their fragments that these early authors chose to write Rome's history in a wide longitudinal, chronological sweep. The works of Pictor and Cincius, both senators, included etymologies, etiologies, the establishment of institutions and customs, names of magistrates, material such as family or personal accomplishments, and praise of Rome. These components and their senatorial perspective would regularly appear in the Roman historians who followed them.

From neither of these first Roman historians do we have any fragment announcing programmatic intent or a thoughtful exposition regarding historiographical form, much less the hoped for preface or proem. Indeed such introductions would be well received by us—without them, however, we can nevertheless justly suppose that Pictor and Cincius Alimentus both saw their histories as ultimately useful: they were the first Romans to write a history of Rome in continuous prose and hence saw a need for a written account. Their histories' purpose was utility—in presenting a Roman perspective, in preserving Rome's memory, in creating more literary, narrative, readable treatments of historical records. Thus these two historians established the practice for annalists to come.

Some forty years later two other senatorial Romans produced histories of Rome similar to those of Pictor and Cincius Alimentus. A. Postumius Albinus and Gaius Acilius wrote in Greek, covered Rome's pre-history and foundations, and treated Rome's history up to their time. In their choice of language both these authors demonstrated a literary context in which Hellenistic culture and literature continued to find an audience in the first half of second century Rome, as it had in the earlier generation. Postumius' prefatory comment about his deficiencies in Greek, however, suggest a literary culture in which Roman authors need not be versed in Greek to such

a degree, and this may be a harbinger of things to come, as Roman authors would look to create their own models and forms in both prose and poetry.

While Hellenistic culture and literature would remain a potent influence in Rome for generations to come, by mid-second century historiography in Rome had begun to change. The driving force in that change was Cato, who wrote Rome's first history in Latin by 150. The fragments of Cato's *Origines* preserve a programmatic statement not only about the content of his work, but form too. When Cato scorned the mundane material (i.e., grain prices and eclipses) that he found in the *annales*, he implied that in the first half of the second century, historians largely focused on those events preserved in the pontifical chronicles.<sup>476</sup> His explicitly historiographic statement manifested a deep concern; for Cato both the form and the content of *annales* were deficient. His work brought to Rome a new kind of history—one that offered foundation stories beyond Rome's, displaced individuals in preference to community, and promised a narrative not bound to strict chronology. For him, history had a purpose beyond merely recording and memorializing the past. He would showcase Rome, her humble magistrates, and her *collective* past, against a larger world.

As we have seen, Cato's history did not mean an end to history written *ab urbe condita* nor to histories which continued to proceed chronologically, list magistracies, and so on. The second century, in fact, was the context for a number of annalistic histories. These were produced by senators such as L. Cassius Hemina, L. Calpurnius Piso, Sempronius Tuditanus, and Cn. Gellius. These men saw in the annalistic format a surprising flexibility for emphasizing or privileging particular interests. Hemina and Tuditanus, for example, showed less interest in political or military concerns and more interest in, respectively, religious affairs and antiquarianism. In their

---

<sup>476</sup> Cato frag. IV, 1.

hands, annalistic form did not mean that they were restricted to equal rigid and sequential examinations of a particular prescribed set of topics, though it might have needed a senator as author (hence Hemina's comment in frag. 16, possibly deriding *homo mere litterosus*). Lucius Calpurnius Piso (cos. 133) returned to political and military matters, and in his examination of the secession of the plebs in 494 and the election of tribunes by the *comitia tributa* manifested an important aspect and function of Roman historiography—the desire to read and represent present politics in their predecessors, a means of understanding the present by reading the past, a function regularly associated with history and the writing of history. He seems to have emphasized the now common sentiment that we better understand the present if we can know the past. Cn. Gellius, writing sometime later than these three, wrote in chronological fashion at great length. He, perhaps most strongly, rejected the Catonian form of historiography. If Cato had thought that Rome's history ought to have overlooked the mundane, incidental, and trivial, Gellius' history indeed must have looked to find them a place.

From none of these four do we have a preface or programmatic statements; again, no introduction with authorial intent survives, and no explicit comment about form is part of their surviving corpus. But what each did with his history showcased a commitment to writing of Rome *ab urbe condita*, including pre-history, foundational stories, etymologies, and etiologies. Within that annalistic framework, each forged his own version of Rome's history. Significantly, these Romans wrote in an annalistic format in the years after Cato's negative remarks on the form and its common content, and in doing so demonstrated a certain engagement with the historiographic process—whether that be contrariness, independence, or even merely imitation of predecessors. These four persisted in the annalistic form even when the powerful voice of Cato argued against it.

What these Romans may have seen in the annalistic form, beyond its structure, its flexibility, and its nod to native traditions, was that a work of *Annales* reviewed the past, allowed a better understanding of the present, but at the same time looked forward. An annalistic structure, by virtue of its insistence on a yearly chronicle, always presupposed another year to come. In this sense, annalists may be seen as celebrating Rome's ability to succeed, prosper, and endure—into the future. The rhetorical force of the annalistic form was about the future, as well as the past. Its relentless structure compelled an author forward.

In that second century, others beyond Cato employed alternative historiographical forms. This made historiography in the second century part of a rich literary culture in which historians considered form (and content) as part of the purpose in their writing. Set against this backdrop, history writing in this period looks to have been part of a lively discourse. How to write history in the second century? Cato criticized the stuff of annals, several historians ignored his criticisms, writing *Annales* for their own purpose, and still others followed his lead to use new forms, such as Sempronius Asellio, Fannius to a certain degree, Coelius Antipater, and even Sisenna in the first century. Asellio's preface remains the most clear prescript on the writing of history in the second century. His determination to write differently from his predecessors supplies one lens through which to see historians deliberating about their craft.

Though Fannius' history is indeed called *Annales*, his work appeared to focus on more contemporary events. Consul in 122 and son-in-law of Laelius, his privileged position in Rome underscores key elements of historiography in the second century—political experience and a senatorial perspective—but Fannius, through his contact with the Scipionic circle, included a new element: an interest in literature. Sempronius Asellio was similarly marked; his connection with the so-called Scipionic circle likewise brought him into a group that would have encouraged

a more literary approach to history writing. Asellio's astute comments on the differences between historiographical forms are our best evidence for debate and development in Roman historiography in the second century. Soon after Asellio, Coelius Antipater also took up a form which was decidedly not annalistic; he embraced a monograph form to tell the story of the Hannibalic War. Importantly, Coelius left indications of a careful evaluation of sources. He also broke free of another tradition associated with historiography in Rome. He was not a senator, had no political experience that we know of, and thus may have been Rome's first professional historian. Lacking that senatorial perspective might have freed him from the obligation to trace Rome's history through great families and individuals. He could instead devote his literary skills to a narrative of one significant event.

In the first century, other forms flourished too, such as the *commentarii* of M. Aemilius Scaurus, P. Rutilius Rufus, Q. Lutatius Catulus, and Sulla, and the contemporary history of Sisenna. Here too the annalistic form endured, in the works of Q. Claudius Quadrigarius, Valerius Antias, and Licinius Macer. In their *commentarii* Scaurus and Rufus paraded their accomplishments, and justified their actions. Catulus similarly took up a defense of his life, and Sulla's use of the autobiographical form afforded him the opportunity to demonstrate at length his own *res gestae*. Sisenna wrote almost a monograph, focusing on the Social War, and continuing Asellio. At the same time, Valerius Antias and Claudius Quadrigarius provided histories of Rome that celebrated Rome's glory days and, while doing so, championed the families of the Valerii and Claudii. History written *ab urbe condita* allowed great scope for demonstrating enduring contributions by the noble families. In Macer, on the other hand, we see a focus on sources in addition to content. In his search for an accurate account of Rome, he found new more credible sources, he hoped, and trusted in them. Macer is outstanding for his

evaluation of sources, something not always visible in the other historians. As in the second century, the historians of this time overlap closely; the authors of the *commentarii* wrote their works and participated in Roman politics at the very same time during which Quadrigarius and Antias wrote their *annales* and did not participate in politics. The death dates of Licinius Macer and L. Cornelius Sisenna fall about a year apart, a few years prior to the consulship of Cicero.

The production of so many histories, some written very closely together, implies a competition for authority—competition for the “truest” or best narrative. Whether explicitly articulated or not, a work of history could repudiate, or intend to repudiate, the histories written before them. Roman authors asserted autonomy and truth or a different perspective in the production of each new history. What the fragmentary historians wrote about is not my primary topic, but what they did write—narratives of humble origins, glory days, and accounts of great men—in turn reflected and shaped values (usually of the privileged elite) and participated in creating a national identity, which was, in turn, renegotiated in each new history.

As a genre and discipline, historiography in the Roman Republic was many things. Historiography grew in emerging and even competing forms; it was undertaken by both professional and amateur; both the ruling elite (e.g., Cato) and the lower born (e.g., Valerius Antias) engaged with it; it was both a literary and nonliterary practice; it used forms which would become canonical and those which would fade away; it was both structured and fluid; it asserted autonomy and yet was beholden to custom. Censorship of sorts, or perhaps inhibition, did raise its ugly head; witness Cato’s dismissal of annals.

Historiography still belonged primarily to men of the senatorial class; through history writing—often after a career was over—they could continue to pursue a claim to *auctoritas*. In contrast to poetry, the problematic association of literature with the lowly born does not rise



here. Unlike poetry, those Romans who wrote these histories were native born, upper class. Nor are there Roman historians whose work was the result of patronage; no Ennius is among the fragmentary historians, though possibly Quadrigarius and Antias were attached to some noble families (and Polybius—a Greek historian). No record traces any real patronage of historians, either undertaken by private individuals or state sponsored. History writing was not always literature—a literary salon of historians, formal or informal, either in the second or first century, did not exist. Creating a text and creating literature did not always go hand in hand, as Cicero made quite clear. No evidence of literary training survives for most of the historians, though some, like Catulus and Cato, wrote more than history, and others, like Fannius and Asellio, were friendly with the Scipionic circle. Most held the highest office possible in the Republic. Some were orators too. History writing was not a profession for most; unlike the poets of the third and second centuries, these historians did not make a living, nor usually need to, through their writing.

In general, the fragmentary historians were not theoretical historians.<sup>477</sup> They did not pose a problem, trace its development, track the institutions and customs that supported it in order to understand a general theme. More empirically minded, these historians collected material, even data as it were, but did not venture beyond to examine larger, more generic issues. Polybius did, of course, in his examination of how and why Rome rose. Asellio might have come close. Coelius Antipater's focus on the Hannibalic War might have similarly posed a problem and addressed it. So too Sisenna on the Social War. The others, however, do not appear to have examined, for instance, larger matters such as the nature of the relationships between those in

---

<sup>477</sup> On theory and ancient history, see Cameron 1990, Morley 1999, 2000, and 2004. Recent examinations of the fruitful intersections of theory and ancient historiography can be found in Bentley 1997 and Munslow 2000. More generally on history and theory see White 1984 and 1987.

power (e.g., Rome, patricians, families) versus those not (provinces, plebeians, slaves). They did not, at least in the surviving fragments, look for connections and patterns or shape their narrative around a particular theme. Nor did they leave us explicit accounts of their conceptions of history, their models, or what they perceived the functions of history to be. Equally, they left no patent look at their assumptions and methodologies. They were not regularly skilled (or concerned) with using sources and rarely left any indication of evaluation of sources (with the exception of Coelius Antipater, Claudius Quadrigarius, perhaps, and Licinius Macer); the remaining fragments rarely speak of the historians' work with either credible or compromised evidence. The stylistic qualities of their histories are not admired by our sources; one can hardly claim them as practitioners of literature. They possessed a stronger interest in representation of narrative than in interpretation of narrative. Asellio implicitly acknowledged the use of this approach when he chided historians for merely telling stories to children rather than asking questions. The historians did not often articulate an understanding about the construction of historical knowledge. How they perceived their role in creating that knowledge is on the whole not apparent.

Many of the historians were primarily memorializers. History was not conceived by them as a force for change or a way to predict the future. Historiography was one means by which to remember and record. In the Republican period there were many ways in which to immortalize, whether in literature (prose and poetry), *monumenta*, or in the arts. The fragmentary historians offered one traditional way, employing various forms within the genre for the writing of history. As a repository of memory, *annales* could supplement *fasti*, monographs could celebrate achievements of particular period, *commentarii* could laud individual men. If the fragmentary historians did not explicitly speak of their conceptions of the purpose of history and the creation

of historical knowledge, their use of suitable historiographical forms represents their best theoretical practice.

While this paints a rather unfavorable picture of the fragmentary historians, it is important to counterbalance this with an acknowledgment of their contributions to Roman historiography. Too often the view of Roman historiography prior to the second half of the first century and the master works of Sallust, Caesar, Cornelius Nepos and Livy casts the early historians as uniform, deficient, and lacking care for historiography itself. Moreover they are portrayed as liars, entertainers, or just missing style. As evident from the previous paragraphs, these statements indeed do have their basis. This is not an attempt to wholly rehabilitate them. Nevertheless the fragmentary historians of the Republic as an entity ought to be recognized at least for their occasionally explicit and more often implicit interest in form. Their (few) intentional statements and the employment of disparate forms demonstrate both a concern about the form and a knowledge of options. The words of Cato, Asellio, Sisenna, and Postumius Albinus on form, and the methodologies of Coelius Antipater, Quadrigarius and Macer tell us of thoughtful reflection. Tuditanus' commissioning of an epic poem to relate his glories, and his rejection of a prose form, also—somehow—reflects thought about what history can do. They wrote history for different purposes, some more selfish than others. Indeed some wrote history as senators because that was an appropriate use of leisure time or a way to preserve *auctoritas* and a certain social standing. Certainly others wrote history to entertain. They did not, however, unthinkingly write only annals. Rather, collectively, these fragmentary historians tried out a variety of historiographical forms and made conscious choices suitable for the functions they assigned to their history of Rome, and to the functions they assigned to history *per se*. In doing so, these historians shaped the forms which would later be taken up and used by more well-known and

widely read and more carefully transmitted Romans such as Sallust, Caesar, Livy, Cornelius Nepos, and the later historians of the empire. Sisenna continued Asellio, Sallust's *Histories* begin at Sisenna's conclusion, Sallust's monographs echo Coelius Antipater, Livy and Tacitus produced more lasting versions of Roman annals, and Varro titled a work after Sisenna.<sup>478</sup>

The very multitude of historiographical forms and their practitioners across two hundred years in the Roman Republic counterbalances the impression that historiography in Rome was largely a desert. Roman historiography, in the years 240-63, may not have pleased Cicero, may be found at fault by us in a variety of areas, but at least we can say that history writing—form, at least, and by a few—was a process carefully considered, rhetorically charged, engaged in with purpose, and broadly conceived. Historiography, we could say, was not entirely in bad hands.

---

<sup>478</sup> *Logistorici* or *Sisenna vel historia*. See Varr. *Logist.* P. 256 Riese (*ap.* Gell. *NA* 16.9.5).

APPENDIX  
CATALOGUE OF FRAGMENTARY ROMAN HISTORIANS

This catalogue contains authors of historical works produced in the years between end of the First Punic War (240) and the consulship of Cicero (63). They are arranged chronologically. Each author is presented with bibliographic information in this order: first are the surviving fragments in the major editions (by page number, and not fragment number). Significant *testimonia* from primary sources that refer chiefly to the author's historiographical work (and less to a political or military career) and which are not included in the fragments are listed next. The *testimonia* are in chronological order. Entries from *RE* follow, along with references to magistracies in *MRR* by page number (and not year). Lastly, secondary studies on the author as a historian follow in chronological order, page numbers supplied when necessary. The selective bibliography of secondary sources contains only those works that offer extended treatment of the author or are considered canonical.

**Fabius Pictor**

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 5-39; Peter 1914: 112-116 (Latin fragments); *FGrH* no. 809; Frier 1970: 152-225; Beck and Walter 2001: 62-136; Chassignet 1996/2003: 16-54.

**Testimonia:** Polyb. 39.1-5; Cic. *De or.* 2.51; *Leg.* 1.6; Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 1.6.2; Liv. 22.57.5; Plin. *HN* 71; Plut. *Fab.* 18.3; Eutr. 3.5; Oros. 4.13.6.

**RE:** Münzer, *RE* VI, 2 (1909), 1836-1841, Fabius no. 126.

**MRR:** none.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: LXIX-C; Gelzer 1933/1964; Gelzer 1934/1964; Bung 1950; Alföldi 1965: 123-175; Badian 1966: 2-6; Frier 1970: 114-143; Timpe 1972: 938-969; Manganaro 1974: 389-409; Frier 1979: 227-254, 322-323; Verbrugge 1981: 236-238; Meister 1990: 145-148; Momigliano 1990: 80-108; Petzold 1993; Wiseman 1995; Carulli 1996; von Albrecht 1997: 299-301; Beck and Walter 2001: 55-61; Suerbaum 2002: 359-370; Chassignet 1996/2003: LIV-LXXIII.

**Floruit:** second half 3<sup>rd</sup> century.

**Lucius Cincius Alimentus**

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 40-43; *FGrH* no. 810; Frier 1970: 226-237; Beck and Walter 2001: 139-147; Chassignet 1996/2003: 54-59.

**Testimonia:** Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 1.6.2; Liv. 26. 23.1; 26.28.3; 26.28.11; 27.5.1; 27.7.12; 27.8.16; 27.25.14; 27.26.5; 27.28.13; 27.29.1-6; 30.37.3-6.

**RE:** Münzer and Cichorius, *RE* III, 2 (1899), 2556-2557, Cincius no. 5.

**MRR:** none.

**Studies:** Hertz 1842; Peter 1914: CI-CXVI; Bardon 1952: 30-31; Heurgon 1964; Badian 1966: 6; Frier 1970: 143- 151; Frier 1979: 206-207; Verbrugge 1982; Meister 1990: 148-9; von Albrecht 1997: 302; Beck and Walter 2001: 137-138; Suerbaum 2002: 370-372; Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXIII-LXXIX.

**Floruit:** end of 3<sup>rd</sup> century; praetor 210.

### Marcus Porcius Cato Censorius

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 55-97; Chassignet 1986/2002: 1-56.  
**Testimonia** (major): Cic. *Brut.* 66; 89; 294; *Cato* 3, 38; *De or.* 2.51; *Leg.* 1.6; *Tusc.* 1.3; Sall. *Hist.* 1.4 Maur; Nep. *Cato* 3.3; Liv. 34.15.9; 45.25.2; Plut. *Cat. Mai.*  
**RE:** Gelzer and Helm, *RE* XXII, 1 (1953), 108-165, M. Porcius no. 9.  
**MRR** I: 307, 327, 330, 339, 354, 374.  
**Studies:** Peter 1914: CXXVII-CLXIV; Chassignet 1986/2002: VII-XXX; Suerbaum 2002: 380-418; Suerbaum 2004 (comprehensive bibliography, 1900-1999).  
**Floruit:** 234-149.

### Aulus Postumius Albinus

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 53; Peter 1914: 53-54 (Latin fragments); *FGrH* no. 812; Frier 1970: 273-279; Beck and Walter 2001: 228-231; Chassignet 1996/2003: 59-61.  
**Testimonia:** Polyb. 33.13.4; 34.1.10-11; Cic. *Att.* 13.32.3; *Brut.* 81; Liv. 45.4.7; 45.28.11; Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 12.6.  
**RE:** Münzer, *RE* XXII, 1 (1953), 90-908, Postumius no. 31.  
**MRR** I: 448, 450, 454.  
**Studies:** Peter 1914: CXXIV-CXXVI; Bardon 1952: 70-73; Badian 1966: 6-7; Frier 1970: 246-267; Frier 1979: 207-208; Meister 1990: 149; von Albrecht 1997:303; Suerbaum 2002: 372-374; Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXIX-LXXXV.  
**Floruit:** mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century, praetor 155, cos. 151.

### Gaius Acilius

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 49-52; *FGrH* no. 813; Frier 1970: 280-295; Beck and Walter 2001: 234-241; Chassignet 1996/2003: 62-65.  
**Testimonia:** Liv. *Per.* 53; Plut. *Cat. Mai.* 22.5; Gell. *NA* 6.14.9.  
**RE:** Kleb, *RE* I, 1 (1893), 250-251, Acilius no. 4.  
**MRR:** none.  
**Studies:** Peter 1914: CXXI-CXXIII; Bardon 1952: 70-71; Badian 1966: 6-7; Frier 1970: 267-272; Frier 1979: 208-209 and 249-50; Meister 1990: 148-149; von Albrecht 1997: 302; Beck and Walter 2001: 232-233; Suerbaum 2002: 375-376; Chassignet 1996/2003: LXXXVI-LXXXVIII.  
**Floruit:** mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century; served in Senate 155.

### Lucius Cassius Hemina

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 98-111; Santini 1995: 72-105; Beck and Walter 2001: 246-281; Chassignet 1999/2003: 2-16.  
**Testimonia:** none.  
**RE:** Cichorius, *RE* III, 2 (1899), 1723-1725, Cassius no. 47.  
**MRR:** none.  
**Studies:** Martha 1903: 108-113; Peter 1914: CLXV-CLXXIII; Bardon 1952: 73-77; Rawson 1976: 690-702; Forsythe 1990; von Albrecht 1994: 304-305; Santini 1995: 11-70;

Chassignet 1998; Beck and Walter 2001: 242-245; Suerbaum 2002: 418-421; Chassignet 1999/2003: IX-XVI.

**Floruit:** mid 2<sup>nd</sup> century.

### Lucius Calpurnius Piso

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 120-138; Forsythe 1994: 409-426; Beck and Walter 2001: 286-329; Chassignet 1999/2003: 18-39.

**Testimonia:** Lucil. *Sat.* 20.3; Cic. *Brut.* 106; *De or.* 2.53; *Leg.* 1.6; *Caecin.* 17-18; *Verr.* 2.3.195; 2.4.56; *Off.* 2.75; *Tusc.* 3.48; *Font.* 39; Liv. 9.44.1-4; Val. Max. 2.7.9; 4.3.10; 2.7.9; Vell. 2.2.2; Tac. *Ann.* 15.20.3; Frontin. *Str.* 4.1.26; Oros. 5.9.6.

**RE:** Cichorius and Münzer, *RE* III, 1 (1897), 1392-5, Calpurnius no. 96.

**MRR:** I: 459, 483, 492, 523.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CLXXXI-CXCII; Bardon 1952: 103-105; Forsythe 1984; Rawson 1991: 257-267; Baudou 1993; Forsythe 1994; v. Albrecht 1997: 905; Forsythe 2000: 8-10; Beck and Walter 2001:282-285; Suerbaum 2002: 421-425; Chassignet 1999/2003: XIX-XXVIII.

**Floruit:** tribune 149, cos. 133, censor 120.

### Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 117-118; Chassignet 1999/2003: 17.

**Testimonia:** Dion. *Ant. Rom.* I.7. 3; Liv. *Per.* 53.3; 54.7; Val. Max. 2.7.11.

**RE:** Münzer, *RE* VI, 2 (1955), 1811-1814, Fabius no. 115.

**MRR** I: 474, 477, 480.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CLXXVII-CLXXVIII; Pepe 1975:95-108; Chassignet 1999/2003: XVI-XIX.

**Floruit:** mid to late 2<sup>nd</sup> century, cos. 142.

### Sempronius Asellio

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 179-184; Chassignet 1999/2003: 84-89; Beck and Walter 2004: 87-99.

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Leg.* 1.6; Charis. GL. 1,195, 18f.K.

**RE:** Klotz, *RE* II, A, 2 (1923), 1362-1363, Sempronius no. 16.

**MRR** I: 491.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CCXLII-CCXLV; Bardon 1952: 113-115; Badian 1966: 17-18; Badian 1968: 1-6; von Albrecht 1997: 380-81; Suerbaum 2002: 435-437; Chassignet 1999/2003: LIV-LVII; Beck and Walter 2004: 84-86.

**Floruit:** late 2<sup>nd</sup> to early 1<sup>st</sup> century, trib. mil. 133.

### Sempronius Tuditanus

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 143-147; Beck and Walter 2001: 331-339; Chassignet 1999/2003: 40-43.

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Att.* 13.33.3; 13.4.1; 13.30.2; 13.32.3; Cic. *Brut.* 95; Liv. *Per.* 59.20; Pliny *HN* 3.129; App. *Ill.* 10; M. Messala *de auspiciis* ap. Gell. *NA* 13.15.4; Macrob. *Sat.* 1.13.21.

**RE:** Münzer, *RE* II A, 2 (1923), 1441-1443, Sempronius no. 92.

**MRR:** I: 470, 489-490, 504.

**Studies:** Cichorius 1902: 588-595; Peter 1914: CCI-CCIII; Bardon 1952: 105-106; von Albrecht 1997: 380; Forsythe 2000: 10-11; Beck and Walter 2001: 330; Chassignet 1999/2003: XXVIII-XXXIII.

**Floruit:** late 2<sup>nd</sup> to early 1<sup>st</sup> century, cos. 129.

### Vennonius

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 142; Chassignet 1999/2003: 48-49.

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Leg.* 1.6; *Att.* 12.3.1.

**RE:** Gundel, *RE* VIII, 1A (1955), 790, Vennonius no. 1.

**MRR:** none.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CC; Bardon 1952: 108; Badian 1966: 18; Suerbaum 2002: 430; Chassignet 1999/2003: XL- XLI.

**Floruit:** late 2<sup>nd</sup> century, contemporary of Fannius and Antipater.

### Caius Fannius

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 139-141; Beck and Walter 2001: 342-346; Chassignet 1999/2003: 44-47.

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Brut.* 99-101; *Att.* 12.5b.3; 16.13a; *Amic.* 3; 7; Sall. *Hist.* 1.4 Maur.

**RE:** Münzer, *RE* VI, 2 (1909), 1987-1991, Fannius no. 7.

**MRR** I: 516.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CXCIII-CXCIX; Bardon 1952: Badian 1966: 14-15; Cassola 1983: 86-96; von Albrecht 1997: 379-380; Beck and Walter 2001: 340-341; Suerbaum 2002: 425-427; Chassignet 1999/2003: XXXIII-XL.

**Floruit:** cos. 122.

### Lucius Coelius Antipater

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 158-177; Herrmann 1979: 17-44; Chassignet 1999/2003: 50-70; Beck and Walter 2004: 40-83.

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Brut.* 102; *De or.* 2.52-54; *Att.* 13.8; *Leg.* 1.6; *Orat.* 229-230; Val. Max. 1.7.6; Fronto p. 57 van den Hout; S.H.A. *Hadr.* 16.6.

**RE:** Gensel, *RE* IV, 1 (1900), 185-194, Coelius no. 7.

**MRR:** none.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CCXI-CCXXXVII; Bardon 1952: 102-103; Badian 1966: 15-17; Herrmann 1979; von Albrecht 1997: 381-383; Suerbaum 2002: 430-435; Chassignet 1999/2003: XLI-XLIX; and Beck and Walter 2004: 35-39.

**Floruit:** late 2<sup>nd</sup> century, contemporary of Fannius.



## Cnaeus Gellius

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 148-157; Beck and Walter 2001: 349-367; Chassignet 1999/2003: 71-83.

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Leg.* 1.6; *Div.* 1.55.

**RE:** Münzer, *RE* VII, 1 (1910), 998-1000, Gellius no. 4.

**MRR:** none.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CCIV-CCX; Bardon 1952: 77-80; Badian 1966: 11-13; Rawson 1976: 713-717; Wiseman 1979: 20-23; von Albrecht 1997: 383; Walt 1997: 85-87; Beck and Walter 2001: 347-348; Suerbaum 2002: 429-430; Chassignet 1999/2003: XLIX-LIV.

**Floruit:** contemporary of Fannius and Antipater.

## Marcus Aemilius Scaurus

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 185-186; Chassignet 2004: 161-163.

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Brut.* 112; *Sest.* 101; Sall. *Iug.* 25.4; Plut. *Fort. Rom.* 4.138c; Suet. *Vir. Ill.* 11; 72.3; Val. Max. 3.2.18; 3.7.8; 5.8.4; 6.5.5; 8.5.2; Tac. *Agr.* 1.2-3; Frontin. *Str.* 4.1.13; Quint. *Inst.* 5.12.10.

**RE:** Klebs *RE* I, 1 (1893), 584-588, Aemilius no. 140.

**MRR** I: 517, 519, 526, 531.

**Studies:** Pais 1901: 51-60; Peter 1914: CCXLVII-CCL; Bardon 1952: 109; Henderson 1958; Badian 1966: 23; G. Flammini 1977: 37-47; Bates 1983: 121-162; Bates 1986; von Albrecht 1997: 383; Suerbam 2002: 441-442; Chassignet 2004: LXXXVIII-XC.

**Floruit:** cos. 115, d. 89.

## Publius Rutilius Rufus

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 187-188 (*Hist.*) and 189-190 (*de vita sua*); *FGrH* 815; Beck and Walter 2004: 103-108 (*Hist.*); Chassignet 2004: 1-5 (*Hist.*) and 164-169 (*de vita sua*).

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Brut.* 113; *De or.* 1.227-231; Tac. *Agric.* 1.2-3.

**RE:** Münzer *RE* I, A, 1 (1914), 1269-1280, Rutilius no. 34.

**MRR** I: 494, 527, 547, 549, 552, 555.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CCLIV-CCLXI; Hendrickson 1933; Bardon 1952: 110-113; Badian 1966: 23-25; Bates 1983: 163-205; Kallet-Marx 1990; von Albrecht 1997: 383; Suerbaum 2002: 443-447; Beck and Walter 2004: 100-102; Chassignet 2004: X-XVI and XCIV-XCVI.

**Floruit:** b. 160, cos. 105, exile after 94.

## Quintus Lutatius Catulus

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 191-192 (*de consulatu*) and Peter 1914: 192-194 (*Hist.*); and Chassignet 2004: 170-171 (*de consulatu*) and Chassignet 2004: 6-12 (*Hist.*).

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Arch.* 6; *Brut.* 112; 132; *De or.* 2. 28, 2.44, 3.194; *Tusc.* 5.56; Fronto *Ep.* p.124, van den Hout; Plut. *Mar.* 25.6; Suet. *Gramm.* 3. 5B.

**RE:** Münzer, *RE* XIII, 2 (1927), 2072-2082, Lutatius no. 7.

**MRR** I: 567

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CCLXII-CCLXIV; Bardon 1950: 145-164; Bardon 1952: 115-124; Bates 1983: 206-225; von Albrecht 1997: 383; Suerbaum 2002: 447-453; and Chassignet 2004: XVI-XIX.

**Floruit:** cos. 102, d. 87.

### Lucius Cornelius Sulla

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 195-204 and Chassignet 2004: 172-184.

**Testimonia:** Sall. *Iug.* 95.3; Suet. *Gramm.* 12.1-2.

**RE:** F. Fröhlich, *RE* IV, 1 (1900), 1522-1566, L. Cornelius no. 392.

**MRR** II: 14; 39, 66, 74, 79.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CCLXX-CCLXXX; Bardon 1952: 149-157; Badian 1966: 25; Bates 1983: 226-313; Lewis 1991; Brennan 1992; Suerbaum 2002: 453-456; Chassignet 2004: XCIX-CIV.

**Floruit:** 138-79.

### Q. Claudius Quadrigarius

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 205-237; Beck and Walter 2004: 112-167; Chassignet 2004: 13-49.

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Leg.* 1.6-7; Plut. *Num.* 1.1 (Klodius); Gell. *NA* 9.13.4; Fronto *ap.* Gell.13.29.2; Fronto *Ep.* p. 134, van den Hout.

**RE:** Niese *RE* II, 2 (1898), 2859, Claudius no. 308.

**MRR:** none

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CCLXXXV-CCCIV; Zimmerer 1937; Klotz 1942; Walsh 1961: 110-137; Badian 1966: 18-21; Frier 1979: 122-126; Timpe 1979; Bastian 1983; von Albrecht 1989: 86-101; von Albrecht 1997: 385; Beck and Walter 2004: 109-111; Chassignet 2004: XXIII-XXXVIII.

**Floruit:** 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 1<sup>st</sup> century.

### Valerius Antias

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 238-275; Beck and Walter 2004: 172-240; Chassignet 2004: 104-150.

**Testimonia:** Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.3; Vell. 2.9.6; Fronto *Ep.* p. 134, van den Hout.

**RE:** Volkmann, *RE* VII A (1948), 2313- 2320, Valerius no. 98.

**MRR:** none.

**Studies:** Münzer 1891: 54-71; Münzer 1897; Peter 1914: CCCV-CCCXXXIII; Walsh 1961: 115-151; Badian 1966: 21; Cloud 1977; LaRoche 1977; Frier 1979: 188-189 and 150-152; Timpe 1979; Wiseman 1979: 112-117; LaRoche 1984; LaRoche 1988; von Albrecht 1997: 385-386; Wiseman 1998: 75-89; Chassignet 2001; Forsythe 2002; Beck and Walter 2004: 168-171; and Chassignet 2004: LXIII-LXXV.

**Floruit:** 1<sup>st</sup> quarter 1<sup>st</sup> century.

### Lucius Cornelius Sisenna

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 276-297; Barabino 1967: 67-239; Beck and Walter 2004: 247-313; Chassignet 2004: 50-88.

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Brut.* 228; 259-260; *Leg.* 1.2.6, 1.7; Sall. *Iug.* 95.2; Vell. 2.9.5; Tac. *Dial.* 23.2; Fronto *Ep.* 132 Van den Hout.

**RE:** Niese, *RE* IV (1901), 1512-1513, Cornelius no. 374.

**MRR:** none.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CCCXXXIV-CCCXLIX; Bardon 1952: 251; Candiloro 1963; Leeman 1963: 83-86; Badian 1966: 25-26; Barabino 1967; Rawson 1979/1991; Fornara 1983: 70-71; Sensal 1997; von Albrecht 1997: 311-312; Beck and Walter 2004: 241-245; Chassignet 2004: XXXVIII-XLIX.

**Floruit:** praetor 78, d. 67.

### Licinius Macer

**Fragmenta:** Peter 1914: 298-307; Walt 1997: 196-211; Beck and Walter 2004: 318-345; Chassignet 2004: 89-103.

**Testimonia:** Cic. *Brut.* 238; *Leg.* 1.6-7; Dion. *Ant. Rom.* 1.7.3; Sall. *Hist.* 3.48 Maur.

**RE:** F. Münzer, *RE* XIII, I (1926), 419-428, Licinius no. 112.

**MRR** II: 110, 138.

**Studies:** Peter 1914: CCCL-CCCLXV; Ogilvie 1958, Badian 1966: 22; Frier 1975; Frier 1979: 153-158; Hodgkinson 1997; von Albrecht 1997: 387-388; Walt 1997; Beck and Walter 2004: 314-317; and Chassignet 2004: L-LXIII.

**Floruit:** trib. 73, praetor 68, d. 66.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Alexander, M.C. 1990. *Trials of the late Roman Republic, 149 B.C. to 50 B.C.* Toronto.
- Alföldi, A. 1971. *Early Rome and the Latins.* Ann Arbor.
- Astin, A.E. 1967. *Scipio Aemilianus.* Oxford.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1978. *Cato the Censor.* Oxford.
- Astin, A.E., Walbank, F. W., Fredericksen, M.W., and Oglivie, R.M., eds. 1989. *Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 B.C.* Vol. 8 of *The Cambridge Ancient History.* 2<sup>nd</sup> edition. Cambridge.
- Badian, E. 1962. "Waiting for Sulla." *JRS* 52: 47-61. Reprinted in *Studies in Greek and Roman History.* 1964. 206-234.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. "Where was Sisenna?" *Athenaeum* XLII: 422-431.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. *Studies in Greek and Roman History.* Oxford.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1966. "The Early Historians." In T.A. Dorey, ed., *Latin Historians.* London.1-38.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1968. "The Sempronii Aselliones." *PACA* 11: 1-6.
- Balsdon, J.P.V. D. 1953. "Some Questions about Historical Writing in the Second Century B.C." *CQ* 47: 158-64.
- Barabino, G. 1967. "I frammenti delle *Historiae* di Lucio Cornelio Sisenna." In *Studi Noniani.* Eds. G. Barabino and F. Bertini. Genoa. 67-251.
- Bardon, H. 1950. "Q. Lutatius Catulus et son cercle littéraire." *LEC* 18: 145-164.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1952. *La Litterature latine inconnue. Tome I: L'Epoque republicaine.* Paris.
- Barchiesi, M. 1962. *Nevio epico: Storia interpretazione edizione critica dei Frammenti del primo epos latino.* Padua.
- Bastian, S. 1983. *Lexikon in Q. Claudium Quadrigarium.* Hildesheim.
- Bates, R. 1983. *Memoirs and the Perception of History in the Roman Republic.* Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986. "Rex in Senatu. A Political Biography of M. Aemilius Scaurus." *PAPhS* 130: 251-288.

- Beard, M. and Crawford, M. H. 1985. *Rome in the Late Republic: Problems and Interpretations*. Ithaca, NY.
- Beard, M., North, J., and Price, S. 1998. *Religions of Rome*. 2 Vols. Cambridge.
- Beare, W. 1964. *The Roman Stage*. London.
- Beck, H. 2005. Review of Martine Chassignet, *L'Annalistique Romaine. Tome III: L'Annalistique Récente. L'Autobiographie Politique*. *BMCR* 2005.05.01.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "The Early Roman Tradition." In J. Marincola, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Malden, MA. 259-265.
- Beck, H. and Walter, U. 2001. *Die frühen römischen Historiker I, von Fabius Pictor bis Cn. Gellius*. Darmstadt.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. *Die frühen römischen Historiker II, von Coelius Antipater bis Pomponius Atticus*. Darmstadt.
- Beebee, T. 1994. *The Ideology of Genre*. University Park, PA.
- Beloch, K.J. 1926. *Römische Geschichte bis zum Beginn der punischen Kriege*. Berlin.
- Bentley, M., ed. 1997. *Companion to Historiography*. London.
- Birt, T. 1920. "Eine Siegesinschrift und geographische Karte des Tuditanus." *RhM* LXXIII: 306-321.
- Bispham, E. 2006. "Literary Sources." In N. Rothstein and R. Morstein-Marx, eds., *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. Malden, MA. 29-50.
- Boatwright, M., Gargola, D. and Talbert, R. 2004. *The Romans from Village to Empire*. Oxford.
- Boëthius, A., and Ward-Perkins, J. B. 1970. *Etruscan and Roman Architecture*. Hammondsworth.
- Bömer, F. 1952. "Naevius und Fabius Pictor." *SO* 29: 34-53.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1953. "Der Commentarius. Zur Vorgeschichte und literarischen Form der Schriften Caesars." *Hermes* 81: 210-250.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1953/4. "Thematik und Krise der römischen Geschichtsschreibung in 2. Jh. V. Chr." *Historia* 2: 189-209.
- Boyle, A J, and Freudenberg, K. 2002. "Satires of Rome: Threatening Poses from Lucilius to Juvenal." *TLS* 5177: 32.

- Bradley, K. 1989. *Slavery and Rebellion in the Roman World, 140 B.C.-70 B.C.* Bloomington, IN.
- Braund, S. H. 1992. *Roman Verse Satire.* Oxford.
- Bredhorn, U. 1968. *Senatsakten in der Republikanische Annalistik. Untersuchungen über den römischen Senat bei den annalistischen Vorgängen des Livius unter besonderer Berücksichtigung der römischen Ostpolitik zwischen 205 und 171 v. Chr.* Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Marburg.
- Brennan, T.C. 1992. "Sulla's Career in the Nineties: Some Reconsiderations." *Chiron* 22: 103-158.
- Briscoe, J. 2005. "The Language and Style of the Fragmentary Republican Historians." In T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge, and J. Adams, eds., *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose.* Oxford. 53-72.
- Broughton, T.R.S. and Patterson, M.L. 1951-2 (vol. I-II), 1986 (III). *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic.* New York and Atlanta.
- Brunt, P.A. 1971. *Social Conflicts in the Roman Republic.* New York and London.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980a. "Cicero and Historiography." In E. Manni, ed., *Philas Charin: Miscellanea di studi classici in onore di E. Manni.* Rome. 309-340.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980b. "On Historical Fragments and Epitomes." *CQ* n.s. 30: 477-494.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. *The Fall of the Roman Republic and Related Essays.* Oxford.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. *Studies in Greek History and Thought.* Oxford.
- Bücheler, E. 1908. "Saturnier des Tuditanus cos. 625/129." *RhM* LXIII: 321-328.
- Bugh, G., ed. 2006. *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World.* Cambridge.
- Cameron, A., ed. 1990. *History as Text: The Writing of Ancient History.* Chapel Hill.
- Cardinali, L. 1987. "Le Origines di Catone iniziavano con un esametro?" *SCO* 37: 205-15.
- Calboli, G. 1975. "Su Alcuni Frammenti di Cornelio Sisenna." In S. Boldrini et. al., *Atti del convegno 'Gli storiografi latini tramandati in Frammenti* (Urbino 9-11 maggio 1974). *Studi Urbinati di storia, filosofia e letteratura* XLIX N.S. B no. 1. Urbino. 151-221.
- Casali, S. 2006. "The poet at war: Ennius on the field in Silius's *Punica*." *Arethusa* 39: 569-593.

- Cassola, F. 1983. "I Fanni in età repubblicana." *Vichiana* n.s. XII: 86-96.
- Chassignet, M. 1986/2002. *Caton, Les Origines: texte établi, traduit et commenté*. Paris.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996/2003. *L'annalistique Romaine, tome I: Les annales des pontifices et l'annalistique ancienne*. Paris.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. "Étiologie, étymologie, et éponymie chez Cassius Héminia." *LEC* LXVI: 321-335.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999/2003. *L'annalistique Romaine, tome II: L'annalistique moyenne*. Paris.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2001. "Les *Annales* des Valérius Antias sont-elles une œuvre d'époque césarienne?" *CEA* 37: 55-63.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. *L'annalistique Romaine, tome III: L'annalistique récente, L'autobiographie politique*. Paris.
- Cichorius, C. 1894. "*Annales maximi*." *RE* I, 2: 2248-2255.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1899. "Cassius no. 47." *RE* III, 2: 1723-1725.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1902. "Das Geschichtswerk des Sempronius Tuditanus." *WS* XXIV: 588-595.
- Cichorius, C. and Münzer, F. 1897. "Calpurnius no. 96." *RE* III, 1: 1392-5.
- Clay, D. 1983. *Lucretius and Epicurus*. Ithaca.
- Cloud, J. D. 1977. "The Date of Valerius Antias." *LCM* 2: 225-227.
- Coffey, M. 1989. *Roman Satire*. London.
- Conte, G. B. 1994. *Latin Literature: A History*. Baltimore. Translated by J.B. Solodow.
- Cornell, T.J. 1986a. "The Value of Literary Tradition concerning Archaic Rome." In K. A. Raaflaub, ed., *Social Struggles in Archaic Rome*. Berkeley. 52-76.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986b. "The Formation of the Historical Tradition of Early Rome." In I. S. Moxon, J. D. Smart, A. J. Woodman, eds., *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*. Cambridge. 67-86.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome*. London and New York.
- Courtney, E. 1993. *The Fragmentary Latin Poets*. Oxford.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. *Archaic Latin Prose*. Atlanta.
- Crawford, M.H. 1974. *Roman Republican Coinage*. London.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1978. *The Roman Republic*. Cambridge, MA.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. *Sources for Ancient History*. Cambridge.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic, Italy and the Mediterranean Economy*. London.
- Crawford, O. 1941. "Laudatio Funebris." *CJ* 37.1: 17-27.
- Crook, J. A., Lintott, A., and Rawson, E., eds. 1994. *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 9. Cambridge.
- Dillery, J. 2002. "Quintus Fabius Pictor and Greco-Roman Historiography at Rome." In J. Miller, C. Damon, and K. S. Myers, eds., *Vertis in Usum: Studies in Honor of Edward Courtney*. Leipzig. 1-23.
- Dorey, T.A., ed. 1966. *Latin Historians*. London.
- Dowd, G., Stevenson, L., and Strong, J., eds. 2006. *Genre Matters*. Bristol.
- Drews, R. 1988. "Pontiffs, Prodigies, and the Disappearance of the *Annales Maximi*." *CPh* 83: 289-299.
- Duckworth, G. E. 1952. *The Nature of Roman Comedy, a Study in Popular Entertainment*. Princeton.
- Earl, D. C. 1961. *The Political Thought of Sallust*. Cambridge.
- Edwards, C. 1996. *Writing Rome: Textual Approaches to the City*. Cambridge.
- Eigler, U., Gotter, U., Luraghi, N., Walter, U., and Berneder, H., eds. 2003. *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*. Darmstadt.
- Erasmio, M. 2004. *Roman Tragedy*. Austin.
- Fantham, E., Foley, H., Kampen, N., Pomeroy, S., and Shapiro, H., eds. 1994. *Women in the Classical World*. Oxford.
- Fantham, E. 1996. *Roman Literary Culture from Cicero to Apuleius*. Baltimore.
- Farrell, J. 1997. "The Phenomenology of Memory in Roman Culture." *CJ* 92.4: 373-383.



- Feldherr, A. 2003. "Cicero and the Invention of 'Literary' History." In U. Eigler et al., eds., *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*. Darmstadt. 196-212.
- Flach, D. 1992. *Einführung in die römische Geschichtsschreibung*. Darmstadt.
- Flammini, G. 1977. "Marco Emilio e i suoi Frammenti." *AFLM* X: 37-47.
- Flower, H. I. 1995. "Fabulae praetextae in Context: When were Plays on Contemporary Subjects Performed in Republican Rome?" *CQ* 45: 170-190.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. "Memories of Marcellus. History and Memory in Roman Republican Culture." In U. Eigler et al., eds., *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*. Darmstadt. 39-52.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. 2004. *The Cambridge Companion to the Roman Republic*. Cambridge.
- Fornara, C.W. 1983. *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Berkeley.
- Forsythe, G. 1984. *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Pennsylvania.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. "The Political Background of the *Lex Calpurnia* of 149 B.C." *AW* 17: 109-119.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1990. "Some Notes on the History of Cassius Hemina." *Phoenix* 44: 326-344.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman Annalistic Tradition*. Lanham, MD.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. *Livy and Early Rome: A Study in Historical Method and Judgment*. Stuttgart.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. "The Roman Historians of the Second Century B.C." In C. Bruun, ed., *The Roman Middle Republic: Politics, Religion, and Historiography c.400-133 B.C.* Acta Instituti Romani Finlandiae. Vol. 23. Rome. 1-11.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002. "Dating and Arranging the Roman History of Valerius Antias." In V.B. Gorman and E.W. Robinson, eds., *Oikistes, Studies in Constitutions, Colonies and Military Power in the Ancient World*. Leiden. 99-112.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. *A Critical History of Early Rome: from Prehistory to the First Punic War*. Berkeley.
- Frank, T. 1927. "Roman Historiography before Caesar." *AHR* 32.2: 232-240.

- Frier, B. W. 1970. *Roman Historiography from the Annales Maximi to Cato Censorius*. Ph.D. Dissertation. Princeton University.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1975. "Licinius Macer and the *consules suffecti* of 444 B.C." *TAPA* 79-97.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1979/1999. *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*. Rome. Reprint Ann Arbor.
- Fröhlich, F. 1900. "L. Cornelius no. 392 Sulla." *RE* IV, 1: 1522-1566.
- Frow, J. 2006. *Genre*. London.
- Gabba, E. 1981. "True History and False History in Classical Antiquity." *JRS* 71: 50-62.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. "Literature." In M. Crawford, ed., *Sources for Ancient History*. Cambridge. 1-79.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. *Dionysius and the History of Archaic Rome*. Berkeley.
- Gelzer, M. 1933. "Römische Politik bei Fabius Pictor," *Hermes* 68: 129-166 = *Kleine Schriften* III. Wiesbaden. 51-92.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1934. "Der Anfang römischer Geschichtsschreibung." *Hermes* 69: 46-55 = *Kleine Schriften* III: 93-103. Wiesbaden.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1962-64. *Kleine Schriften*. Vols. I-III. Wiesbaden.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1963. "Caesar als Historiker." In Gelzer, *Kleine Schriften* II. Wiesbaden. 307-335.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1969. *The Roman Nobility*. Oxford. Translated by R. Seager.
- Gensel, P. 1900. "Coelius no. 7." *RE* IV, 1:185-194.
- Gentili, B. 1975. "Storiografia Greca e Storiografia Romana Arcaica." In S. Boldrini et al. eds., *Atti del convegno 'Gli storiografi latini tramandati in Frammenti* (Urbino 9-11 maggio 1974). *Studi Urbinati di storia, filosofia e letteratura* XLIX N.S. B no. 1. Urbino. 13-60.
- Gildenhard, I. 2003. "The 'Annalist' Before the Annalists: Ennius and His *Annales*." In U. Eigler et al., eds., *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*. Darmstadt. 93-114.
- Goldberg, S. 1995. *Epic in Republican Rome*. Oxford.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and its Reception*. Cambridge.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. "Ennius After the Banquet." *Arethusa* 39: 427-447.

- Goldsworthy, A. 1996. *The Roman Army at War, 100 B.C.-A.D. 200*. Oxford.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. *The Punic Wars*. London.
- Gowing, A. 2005. *Empire and Memory: The Representation of the Roman Republic in Imperial Culture*. Cambridge.
- Gruen, E. 1965. "The *Lex Varia*." *JRS* 55.5: 59-73.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974/1995. *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic*. Berkeley.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. Berkeley.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1992. *Culture and National Identity in Republican Rome*. Ithaca.
- Gundel, H. 1955. "Vennonius no. 1." *RE* VIII, A: 790.
- Gusdorf, G. 1980. "Conditions and Limits of Autobiography." In J. Olney, ed., *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*. Princeton. 28-48.
- Habinek, T. N. 1998. *The politics of Latin literature: writing, identity, and empire in ancient Rome*. Princeton.
- Handley, E.W. 1968. *Menander and Plautus: A Study in Comparison*. London.
- Häpke, N. 1915. *C. Semproni Gracchi Oratoris Romani Fragmenta Collecta et Illustrata*. Munich.
- Harris, W.V. 1979. *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome, 327-70 B.C.* Oxford.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. 1984. *The Imperialism of Mid-Republican Rome*. Rome.
- Harrison, S., ed. 2005. *A Companion to Latin Literature*. Malden, Ma.
- Helmbold, W.C. and O'Neil, E.N. 1959. *Plutarch's Quotations*. Baltimore.
- Henderson, Jr., C. 1958. "The Career of the Younger M. Aemilius Scaurus." *CJ* 53. 5: 194-206.
- Henderson, J. 1998. *Fighting for Rome: Poets and Caesars, History and Civil War*. Cambridge.
- Henderson, M. I. 1957. "*Potestas Regia*." *JRS* 47.5: 82-87.
- Hendrickson, G. 1933. "The Memoirs of Rutilius Rufus." *CP* 28.3: 153-175.
- Herrmann, W. 1979. *Die Historien des Coelius Antipater: Fragm. u. Kommentar*. Meisenheim.

- Heurgon, J. 1964. "L. Cincius et la loi du clavus annalis." *Athenaeum* XLII: 432-437.
- Hertz, M. 1842. *De Lucii Cincii*. Berlin.
- Hodgkinson, M. 1997. *C. Licinius Macer and the historiography of the early republic*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Exeter.
- Holford-Strevens, L. 2003. *Aulus Gellius, An Antonine Scholar and His Achievement*. Oxford.
- Hölkeskamp, K. 2006. "History and Collective Memory in the Middle Republic." In N. Rothenstein and R. Morstein-Marx, eds., *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. Malden, MA. 478-495.
- Hornblower, S., ed. 1994. *Greek Historiography*. Oxford.
- Jacoby, F. 1949. *Atthis: The Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*. Oxford.
- Jones, C. P. 1971. *Plutarch and Rome*. Oxford.
- Kallet-Marx, R. 1990. "The Trial of Rutilius Rufus." *Phoenix* 44.2: 122-139.
- Kaster, R. A. 1997. *Guardians of Language: The Grammarian and Society in Late Antiquity*. Berkeley.
- Keaveney A. 1982. *Sulla: The Last Republican*. London.
- Kenney, E. J. 1977. *Lucretius*. Oxford.
- Kenney, E.J., and Clausen W.V. eds. 1982. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature: Volume Two: Latin Literature*. Cambridge.
- Kierdorf, W. 1980. *Laudatio Funebris. Interpretationen u. Unters. zur Entwicklung d. röm. Leichenrede*. Meisenheim am Glan: Hain.
- Klebs, E. 1893. "Acilius no. 4." *RE* I, 1: 250-251.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1893. "Aemilius no. 140." *RE* I, 1: 584-588.
- Kleiner, D. and Matheson, S. 1996. *I Claudia: Women in Ancient Rome*. New Haven, CT.
- Klotz, A. 1940. *Livius und seine Vorgänger*. Stuttgart.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1942. "Der Annalist Q. Claudius Quadrigarius." *RhM* 91: 268-285.
- Knoche, U. 1975. *Roman Satire*. Bloomington, IN. Translated by E. Ramage.

- Kraus, C.S. and Woodman, A.J. 1997. *Latin Historians. Greece and Rome: New Surveys in the Classics*. Oxford.
- Kraus, C.S., ed. 1999. *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*. Leiden.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2005. "Historiography and Biography." In S. Harrison, ed., *A Companion to Latin Literature*. Malden, MA. 241-256.
- Lacey, W. and Wilson, B. 1970. *Respublica: Roman Society and Politics according to Cicero*. Oxford.
- LaRoche, R. A. 1977. "Valerius Antias and His Numerical Totals." *Historia* 26: 358-368.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1984. "Valerius Antias as Livy's Source for the Number of Military Standards Captured in Battle in Books 1-X." *C & M* 35: 93-104.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1988. "Valerius Antias: Livy's Source for the Number of Military Standards Captured in Battle in Books XX-XLV." *Latomus* 47: 758-771.
- Latte, K. 1960. "Der Historiker L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi." *Sitzungsberichte der deutschen Akademie der Wissenschaften. zu Berlin. Klasse fuer Sprache, Literatur und Kunst* 7: 3-16.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1960. *Römische Religionsgeschichte*. Munich.
- Lazenby, J.F. 1978. *Hannibal's War: A Military History of the Second Punic War*. Warminster.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. *The First Punic War: A Military History*. London.
- Lebek, W. 1970. *Verba Prisca*. Göttingen.
- Leeman, A.D. 1963. *Orationis Ratio: The Stylistic Theories and Practice of the Roman Orators, Historians, and Philosophers*. Amsterdam.
- Leo, F. 1913. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur I: Die archaische Literatur*. Berlin.
- Levene, D. S., and Nelis, D.P. 2002. *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*. Leiden.
- Levene, D.S. 2007. "Roman Historiography in the Late Republic." In J. Marincola, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Malden, MA. 275-289.
- Lewis, R.G. 1974. "Catulus and the Cimbri, 102 B.C." *Hermes* 102: 90-109.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. "Sulla's Autobiography: Scope and Economy." *Athenaeum* 79: 509-519.
- Luce, T. J. 1977. *Livy: The Composition of His History*. Princeton
- Malcovati, E. 1979. *Oratorum Romanorum fragmenta liberae rei publicae*. Padua.
- Manganaro, G. 1974. "Testi e monumenti. Una biblioteca storica nel Ginnasio di Tauromenion e il P. Oxy. 1241." *PP* 29: 389-409.
- Manuwald, G. 2001. *Fabulae praetextae: Spuren einer literarischen Gattung der Römer*. München.
- Marasco, G. 1984. "L'Apologia di Q. Lutazio Catulo e la tradizione sulla guerra cimbrica." *GFF* VII: 75-84.
- Marincola, J. 1997. *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*. Cambridge.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1999. "Genre, Convention, and Innovation in Greco-Roman Historiography." In C.S. Kraus, ed., *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts*. Leiden. 281-323.
- \_\_\_\_\_, ed. 2007. *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Malden, MA.
- Marinone, N. 1975. "Frammenti di Storiografi Latini in Macrobio." In S. Boldrini et al., eds., *Atti del convegno 'Gli storiografi latini tramandati in Frammenti'* (Urbino 9-11 maggio 1974). *Studi Urbinati di storia, filosofia e letteratura* XLIX N.S. B no. 1. Urbino. 493-527.
- Maurenbrecher, B. 1893. *C. Sallustii Crispi Historiarum Reliquiae*. 2 Vols. Stuttgart.
- May, J. M. and Wisse, J. 2001. *Cicero: On the Ideal Orator*. Oxford.
- McDonald, A. H. 1954. "The Roman Historians." In *Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship*. Ed. M. Platnauer. Oxford. 384-412.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1975. "Theme and Style in Roman Historiography." *JRS* 65: 1-10.
- McGushin, P. 1992. *Sallust. The Histories*. Oxford.
- Meadows, A., and Williams, J. 2001. "Moneta and the Monuments: Coinage and Politics in Republican Rome." *JRS* 91: 27-49.
- Mellor, R. 1999. *The Roman Historians*. London.
- Misch, G. 1950. *A History of Autobiography in Antiquity*. Westport, CT.
- Momigliano, A. 1966. *Studies in Historiography*. London.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1977. *Essays in Ancient and Modern Historiography*. Oxford.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1990. "Fabius Pictor and the Origins of National History." In Momigliano, A., *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. Berkeley. 80-108.
- \_\_\_\_\_. ed. 1990. *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*. Berkeley.
- Morgan, M.G. 1973. "Pliny, *NH* III.129: The Roman Use of Stades and the Elogium of C. Sempronius Tuditanus." *Philologus* 117: 29-48.
- Morley, N. 1999. *Writing Ancient History*. Ithaca.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2000. *Ancient History: Key Themes and Approaches*. London.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. *Theories, Models and Concepts in Ancient History*. London.
- Moxon, I.S., Smart, J.D. and Woodman, A.J. 1986. *Past Perspectives: Studies in Greek and Roman Historical Writing*. Cambridge.
- Munslow, A. 2000. *The Routledge Companion to Historical Studies*. London.
- Münzer, F. 1891. *De Gente Valeria*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Berlin.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1897. "Zu den Fragmenten des Valerius Antias." *Hermes* 32: 469-474.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1899. "Cincus no. 5." *RE* III, 2: 2556-2557.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1909. "Q. Fabius Pictor no. 126." *RE* VI, 2: 1836-1841.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1909. "C. Fannius no. 7." *RE* VI, 2: 1987-1991.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1910. "Gellius no. 4." *RE* VII, 1: 998-1000.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1914. "Rutilius no. 34." *RE* II, 1, 1: 1269-1280.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1923. "Sempronius no. 92." *RE* II A, 2: 1441-1443.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1926. "Licinius no. 112." *RE* XIII, 1: 419-428.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1927. "Lutatius no. 7." *RE* XIII, 2: 2072-2082.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1953. "Postumius no. 31." *RE* XXII, 1: 903-908.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1955. "Fabius no. 115." *RE* VI, 2: 1811-1814.

- Nicolet, C. 1980. *The World of the Citizen in Republican Rome*. Berkeley. Translated by P. S. Falla.
- Niese, B. 1898. "Claudius no. 308." *RE* II, 2: 28.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1900. "Cornelius no. 374." *RE* IV: 1512-1513.
- Oakley, S.P. 1997. *A Commentary on Livy: Books VI-X. Vol. 1: Introduction and Book VI*. Oxford.
- Ogilvie, R. M. 1958. "Livy, Licinius Macer and the Libri Lintei." *JRS* 48: 40-46.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1965. *A Commentary on Livy Books 1-5*. Oxford.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1980. *Roman Literature and Society*. Sussex.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. Review of B. Frier, *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition*. *JRS* 71: 199-201.
- Olney, J., ed. 1980. *Autobiography: Essays Theoretical and Critical*. Princeton.
- Pais, E. 1901. "I Frammenti all' autobiografia di M. Emilia Scauro e la 'lex Varia de maiestate'." *Rendiconti della Reale Accademia dei Lincei*. Classe. di Scienze Morali, Storiche, e Filologiche. Ser. 5, X: 51-60.
- Pais, E. 1918. *Dalle Guerre Puniche a Cesare Augusto*. 2 Vols. Rome.
- Palmer, R. 1970. *The Archaic Community of the Romans*. Cambridge.
- Paratore, E. 1975. "La leggenda di Enea nei frammenti di Sisenna." In S. Boldrini et al., eds., *Atti del convegno 'Gli storiografi latini tramandati in Frammenti'* (Urbino 9-11 maggio 1974). *Studi Urbinati di storia, filosofia e letteratura* XLIX N.S. B no. 1. Urbino. 233-296.
- Parker, H. 1996. "Plautus vs. Terence: Audience and Popularity Re-Examined." *AJP* 117 (4): 585-617.
- Pascucci, G. 1975. "I 'Commentarii' di Silla." In S. Boldrini et al., eds., *Atti del convegno 'Gli storiografi latini tramandati in Frammenti'* (Urbino 9-11 maggio 1974). *Studi Urbinati di storia, filosofia e letteratura* XLIX N.S. B no. 1. Urbino. 283-296.
- Pepe, L. 1975. "L'annalista Q. Fabio Massimo Serviliano." In S. Boldrini et al., eds., *Atti del convegno 'Gli storiografi latini tramandati in Frammenti'* (Urbino 9-11 maggio 1974). *Studi Urbinati di storia, filosofia e letteratura* XLIX N.S. B no. 1. Urbino. 95-108.
- Peter, H. 1870. *Historicorum Romanorum Fragmenta*. Leipzig.



- \_\_\_\_\_. 1914. *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*. 2 Volumes. Leipzig. Reprint Stuttgart.
- Petzold, K.-E. 1999. *Geschichtsdenken und Geschichtsschreibung: Kleine Schriften zur griechischen und römischen Geschichte*. Stuttgart.
- Potter, D. 1999. *Literary Texts and the Roman Historian*. London.
- Poucet, J. 1985. *Les Origines de Rome. Tradition et histoire*. Brussels.
- Quinn, K. 1972. *Catullus: An Interpretation*. London.
- Rawson, E. 1971. "Prodigy Lists and the Use of the *Annales Maximi*." *CQ* 65 n.s. 21: 158-169.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. "Cicero the Historian and Cicero the Antiquarian." *JRS* 62: 33-45.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1976. "The First Latin Annalists." *Latomus* 35:4 689-717. Reprinted in E. Rawson, *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers*. 1991. London. 245-271.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1979. "L. Cornelius Sisenna and the Early First Century B.C." *CQ* 29: 327-346. Reprinted in E. Rawson, *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers*. 1991. London. 363-388.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. *Intellectual Life in the Late Roman Republic*. Baltimore.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1991. *Roman Culture and Society: Collected Papers*. London.
- Reinhardt, T., Lapidge, M. and Adams, J., eds. 2005. *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*. Oxford.
- Rhodes, P. J. 1990. "The Atthidographers." In H. Verdin et al., eds., *Purposes of History*. Leuven. 73-81.
- Richardson, J. S. 1976. *Roman Provincial Administration, 227 B.C. to A.D. 117*. London.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1986. *Hispaniae: Spain and the Development of Roman Imperialism, 218-82 B.C.* Cambridge.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. "The Purpose of the *Lex Calpurnia de Repetundis*." *JRS* 77: 1-12.
- Richardson, L., Jr. 1992. *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*. Baltimore.
- Riggsby, A. 2007. "Memoir and Autobiography in Republican Rome." In J. Marincola, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Malden, MA. 266-274.
- Ross, D. 1969. *Style and Tradition in Catullus*. Cambridge, MA.

- Rothstein, N. and Morstein-Marx, R., eds. 2006. *A Companion to the Roman Republic*. Malden, MA.
- Rüpke, J. 1993. "Livius, Priesternamen und die *annales maximi*." *Klio* 75: 155-179.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. "Ennius' *Fasti* in Fulvius' Temple: Greek Rationality and Roman Tradition." *Arethusa* 39.3: 489-512.
- Sailor, D. 2004. "Becoming Tacitus." *CA* 23.1: 139-177.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2006. "Dirty Linen, Fabrication and the Authorities of Livy and Augustus." *TAPA* 136.2: 329-388.
- Santini, Carlo. 1995. *I Frammenti di L. Cassio Emina: Introduzione, Testo, Traduzione e Commento*. Pisa.
- Scholz, P. 2003. "Sullas *commentarii*—eine literarischen Rechtfertigung. Zu Wesen und Funktion der autobiographischen Schriften in der späten Römischen Republik." In U. Eigler et al., eds., *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*. Darmstadt. 172-195.
- Sciarrino, E. 2006. "The Introduction of Epic in Rome: Cultural Thefts and Social Contests." *Arethusa* 39.3: 449-469.
- Scullard, H.H. 1980. *A History of the Roman World, 753-146 B.C.* London.
- Seager, R., ed. 1969. *The Crisis of the Roman Republic: Studies in Political and Social History*. Cambridge.
- Seager, R. 1994. "Sulla." In J.A. Crook, A. Lintott and E. Rawson, eds., *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Vol. 9. Cambridge. 165-207.
- Segal, C. 1990. *Lucretius on Death and Anxiety: Poetry and Philosophy in De Rerum Natura*. Princeton.
- Sehlmeyer, M. 2003. "Die Anfänge der antiquarischen Literatur in Rom. Motivation und Bezug zur Historiographie bis in die Zeit von Tuditanus und Gracchanus." In U. Eigler et al., eds., *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*. Darmstadt. 157-171.
- Shatzman, I. 1975. *Senatorial Wealth and Roman Politics*. Brussels.
- Sherwin-White, A.N. 1973. *Roman Citizenship*. Oxford.
- Skutsch, O. 1968. *Studia Enniana*. London.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. *Annales (of Ennius)*. Oxford.
- Slater, N. 1985. *Plautus in Performance: The Theatre of the Mind*. Princeton.
- Small, P. and Tatum, J. 1995. "Memory and the Study of Classical Antiquity." *Helios* 22.2: 149-177.
- Stadter, P. 1965. *Plutarch's Historical Methods: An Analysis of the Mulierum Virtutes*. Cambridge, MA.
- Stockton, D. 1979. *The Gracchi*. Oxford.
- Strzelecki, W. 1963. "Naeuius and the Roman Annalists." *RFIC* 91: 440-458.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. *Bellum Punicum*. Teubner: Leipzig.
- Suerbaum, W., ed. 2002. *Handbuch der Lateinischen Literature der Antike: Erster Band: Die Archaische Literature von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod*. Munich.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2004. *Cato Censorius in der Forschung des 20. Jahrhunderts. Eine kommentierte chronologische Bibliographie für 1900-1999 nebst systematischen Hinweisen und einer Darstellung des Schriftstellers M. Porcius Cato (234-149 v. Chr)*. Hildesheim.
- Sumner, G.V. 1972. *The Orators in Cicero's Brutus: Prosopography and Chronology*. Toronto.
- Syme, R. 1939. *The Roman Revolution*. Oxford.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1959. "Livy and Augustus." *HSCP* 64: 27-87.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1964. *Sallust*. Berkeley.
- Thomsen, R. 1961. *Early Roman Coinage III*. Copenhagen.
- Timpe, D. 1972. "Fabius Pictor und die Anfänge der römischen Historiographie." *ANRW* 1. 2: 928-969.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1979. "Erwägungen zur jüngeren Annalistik." *A&A* 25: 97-119.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1996. "Memoria und Geschichtsschreibung bei den Römern." In H. J. Gehrke and A. Möller, eds., *Vergangenheit und Lebenswelt. Soziale Kommunikation, Traditionsbildung und historisches Bewusstsein*. Tübingen. 277-299.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2003. "Erinnerung als Lebesmacht und Geschichte als Literatur: Bilanz und Ausblick." In U. Eigler et al. eds., *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius: Gattungen, Autoren, Kontexte*. Darmstadt. 287-316.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. *Antike Geschichtsschreibung: Studien zur Historiographie*. Darmstadt.
- Treggiari, S. 2002. *Roman Social History*. London and New York.
- Ullmann, B. L. 1942. "History and Tragedy." *TAPA* 73: 25-53.
- Valgiglio, E. 1975. "L'Autobiografia di Silla nelle biografie di Plutarco." In S. Boldrini et al., eds., *Atti del convegno 'Gli storiographi latini tramandati in Frammenti* (Urbino 9-11 maggio 1974). *Studi Urbinati di storia, filosofia e letteratura* XLIX N.S. B no. 1. Urbino. 245-281.
- van den Hout, M. 1988. *M. Cornelius Fronto Epistulae*. Leipzig.
- Verbrugge, G. P. 1979/80. "Three Notes on Fabius Pictor and his History." In E. Manni, ed., *Miscellanea di Studi Classici in onore di E. Manni*. Rome. 2157-2173.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. "Fabius Pictor's 'Romulus and Remus'." *Historia* 30: 236-238.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1982. "L. Cincius Alimentus—His Place in Roman Historiography." *Philologus* 126: 316-323.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. "On the Meaning of *Annales*, on the Meaning of Annalist." *Philologus* 133: 192-230.
- Verdin, H. 1990. *Purposes of history: Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2<sup>nd</sup> Centuries B.C.* Louvain.
- Vinchesi, M. 1984. "Il *Bellum Histricum* di Ostio, epos storico ennianeggiante." In V. Tandoi, ed., *Disiecti Membra Poetae, studi di poesia latin in frammenti*. Vol. 1. Foggia, Italy. 35-59.
- Vollmer, F. 1892. "*Laudationum Funebrium Romanorum Historia et Reliquiarum Editio*." *JCP Supplementband XVIII*: 454-457.
- von Albrecht, M. 1997. *A History of Roman Literature from Livius Andronicus to Boethius with Special Regard to Its Influence on World Literature*. Vol. 1, revised by the author and G. Schmeling, translated with assistance of Frances and Kevin Newman. Vol. 2, revised by G. Schmeling and the author, translated with the assistance of Ruth R. Caston and Francis R. Schwartz. Leiden.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1989. *Masters of Roman Prose*. Leeds. Translated by N. Adkin.
- Walbank, F. W. 1957-1959. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. Oxford.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1960. "History and Tragedy." *Historia* 9: 216-234.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1972. *Polybius*. Berkeley.
- Walbank, F.W., Astin, A.E., Fredericksen, M.W., Oglivie, R.M., and Drummond, A., eds. 1989. *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Volume 7, Part 2. Cambridge.
- Walsh, P. G. 1961. *Livy. His Historical Aims and Methods*. Cambridge.
- Walt, S. 1997. *Der Historiker C. Licinius Macer: Einleitung, Fragmente Kommentar*. Stuttgart and Leipzig.
- Walter, U. 2004. *Memoria und res publica: Zur Geschichtskultur im Republikanischen Rom*. Frankfurt.
- Ward-Perkins, J. B. 1977. *Roman Architecture*. New York.
- Warmington, E.H. 1961. *Remains of Old Latin. Vols. I-IV*. Cambridge.
- Warren, J. 1998. *The Past and its Presenters. An Introduction to Issues in Historiography*. London.
- Welles, C. B. 1966. "Isocrates' View of History." In Luitpold Wallach, *The Classical Tradition: Literary and Historical Studies in honor of Harry Caplan*. Ithaca. 3-25.
- West, D. 1969. *The Imagery and Poetry of Lucretius*. Edinburgh.
- Wheeler, A. L. 1934. *Catullus and the Traditions of Ancient Poetry*. Berkeley.
- White, H. 1984. "The Question of Narrative in Contemporary Historical Theory." *History and Theory* 23.1: 1-33.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore.
- Wiseman, T.P. 1969. *Catullan Questions*. Leicester.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1974. *Cinna the Poet and Other Roman Essays*. Leicester.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1979. *Clio's Cosmetics*. Leicester.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. "Practice and Theory in Roman Historiography." *History* 66: 375-393.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1983. "The Credibility of the Early Annalists." *LCM* 8: 20-22.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1985. *Catullus and His World. A Reappraisal*. Cambridge.

- \_\_\_\_\_. 1987. *Roman Studies: Literary and Historical*. Liverpool.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1993. "Lying Historians: Seven Types of Mendacity." In C. Gill and T.P. Wiseman, eds., *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World*. Austin, TX. 122-146.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1994. *Historiography and Imagination: Eight Essays on Roman Culture*. Exeter.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1995. *Remus: A Roman Myth*. Cambridge.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1998. *Roman Drama and Roman History*. Exeter.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002a. "History, Poetry, and *Annales*." In D. S. Levene and D. P. Nelis, eds., *Clio and the Poets: Augustan Poetry and the Traditions of Ancient Historiography*. Leiden. 331-362.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2002b. Review of Gesine Manuwald, *Fabulae praetextae: Spuren einer literarischen Gattung der Römer*. *BMCR* 2002.06.13.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 2007. "The Prehistory of Roman Historiography." In J. Marincola, ed., *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*. Malden, MA. 67-75.
- Woodman, A.J. 1988. *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography*. London.
- Wright, J. 1974. *Dancing in Chains: The Stylistic Unity of the Comoedia Palliata*. Rome.
- Zimmerer, M. 1937. *Der Annalist Qu. Claudius Quadrigarius*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Munich.

## BIOGRAPHICAL SKETCH

Trudy Harrington Becker was born in Fall River, Massachusetts. The oldest of seven children, Trudy grew up in Boston where she graduated from Boston Latin School, the oldest public high school in the United States. She earned a B.A. in classical studies and history from the College of the Holy Cross in 1983. She received an M.A. in classics from the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill in 1985 and an M.A. in history from Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University (Virginia Tech) in 1990.

After completing her M.A. in history, Trudy joined the faculty at Virginia Tech in 1991 as an instructor in the humanities program, which would eventually become part of the Department of Interdisciplinary Studies. She also became part of the classical studies program, teaching introductory classes in Greek and Roman civilization and persuading many students to become classical studies majors and minors. In addition, Trudy has taught many ancient history courses for the History Department across the last decade. In 2008 Trudy was promoted to Senior Instructor. Trudy's assignment at Virginia Tech has been primarily teaching, and she has received many awards for her teaching excellence, including the university-wide Alumni Award for Teaching Excellence in 2007. Trudy is an avid proponent of education abroad; currently she co-directs the College of Liberal Arts and Human Science's Spring Semester Program in Riva San Vitale, Switzerland, and she regularly leads short summer programs to Rome.

Trudy and her husband, Andy Becker, associate professor in classical studies at Virginia Tech, have three children: Matt and Tim (18-year-old twins) and Trudy (age 14).