

Aetiological *Annales*: the Early Roman Histories

by

James Faulkner

B.A., McGill University, 2011

A thesis submitted to the

Faculty of the Graduate School of the

University of Colorado in partial fulfillment

of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Arts

Department of Classics

2014

This thesis entitled:  
Aetiological *Annales*: the Early Roman Histories  
written by James Faulkner  
has been approved for the Department of Classics

---

Associate Professor Jacqueline Elliott

---

Associate Professor Noel Lenski

Date 4/25/14

The final copy of this thesis has been examined by the signatories, and we  
Find that both the content and the form meet acceptable presentation standards  
Of scholarly work in the above mentioned discipline.

Faulkner, James (M.A., Classics)

Aetiological *Annales*: the Early Roman Histories

Thesis directed by Associate Professor Jacqueline Elliott

This thesis attempts a re-evaluation of the early Roman histories. The first chapter challenges the traditional conception of the methodology of the “annalists,” i.e. that they drew directly and substantially from the extant public chronicles of Rome, known as the *Annales Maximi*. Testimonia on the *Annales Maximi* are examined case-by-case, and it is concluded that, whatever these records were, our access to their content and nature has been irrecoverably damaged as a result of the agenda of later authorities. Thus, a new naming principle is proposed for the “annalists” as “early Roman historiographers” (ERHs). The second chapter explores the extant fragments of the ERHs without the assumed strictures of the “annalistic” genre, and investigates the numerous aetiologies found therein. These rationalizing strategies are adduced as further evidence that the ERHs deserve a reappraisal in form, content, and methodology.

## CONTENTS

### Chapter

1.	The Sources and Methodology of the ERHs	1
	<i>Annales Maximi</i>	5
	In early sources	5
	In <i>De Oratore</i>	10
	In Servius	21
	In Isidore	24
	Evolving Modern Views	31
	Methodology of this Study	38
2.	Aetiological thinking in the ERHs	41
	Toponyms/Ethnonyms	44
	Rome	44
	Sicily	47
	Trojan Foundations	51
	Etymology	52
	Romulus and Remus Episode	52
	Misc. Etymologies	60
	Extended Aetiologies	67
	Mytho-Religious	67

Religious Curiosities	68
Lupercalia	70
Ara Maxima	80
Historical Aetiologies	87
Marcius	88
Tarpeia	91
Concluding Thoughts	95
 Bibliography	 99
Appendices	
Abbreviations	102
The Cast of ERHs	103

## CHAPTER 1

### *The Sources and Methodology of the ERHs*

A certain amount of caution is prudent when wrangling with fragmentary authors. The transmission process undoubtedly and profoundly warps even our most basic conceptions of the material – so much so that it is worth asking whether any general account of such authors is profitable. The case of the fragmentary Roman historians is no different.<sup>1</sup> Several recent attempts, however, have been made to better sketch the trajectory of early Roman historiography. For about a century, Hermann Peter's *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* remained the standard edition of the fragments.<sup>2</sup> Efforts, from both French and German institutions, have produced Chassignet's *Annalistique Romaine* (1996) and Beck and Walter's *Die Frühen Römischen Historiker* (2001) volumes, respectively. Another major modern edition is in the distribution process, *Fragments of the Roman Historians*, edited by T.J. Cornell, and could not be fully taken into account in this study. This new wave of critical attention has made the early Roman historians much more accessible, the new additions greatly

---

<sup>1</sup> "Fragments are a fact of life for the ancient historian. As a practical, technical point, it is necessary for historians who use them to be aware of the sources from which they are drawn" (Potter 1999: 65).

<sup>2</sup> It is lamentable that Jacoby was never able to write an accompanying commentary to the later volumes of his *Fragmente Griechischen Historiker*, which include the fragments of the early Roman historiography written in Greek (*Graeci annales*). Nonetheless some of the editorial choices in his organization of the fragments are revealing.

improving upon Peter in commentary – both in depth and content – as well as providing helpful translations, testimonia, and bibliographies. Another development has been a series of editions dedicated to single historians, particularly those by Forsythe on Calpurnius Piso (1994) and Santini on Cassius Hemina (1995).<sup>3</sup>

Without this academic impulse of the last three decades, this study would not be engaging with the early Roman historians– or if it did, it would do so on very different terms. Nonetheless, a re-evaluation needs to take place of even the most basic claims and terms concerning these enigmatic figures. Much, for instance, is made of the titles of these histories as *annales*, and this is taken to mean that the histories of Fabius Pictor et al. proceeded in a chronological, year-by-year fashion (< *annus*), and hence Roman historians of this type have been dubbed “annalistic” historians.<sup>4</sup> Fundamental to this approach is the understanding that these histories drew directly from epigraphic, documentary evidence, attested by ancient sources as the *Annales Maximi*. Thus, the early Roman histories drew on the public records for both content and title, *annales*. The *Annales Maximi* then were supposed to be records kept by the *Pontifex Maximus*, which alongside sacerdotal notices and prodigies (i.e. famines, celestial events, abnormal births) retained the skeletal details of public life at Rome, including elections, wars, and

---

<sup>3</sup> Chassignet’s edition of Cato’s *Origines* slightly predates this period (1986).

<sup>4</sup> On the difficulties of the “annalist” moniker, ancient and modern, see Verbrugghe 1989.

civil unrest.<sup>5</sup> Once *per annum*, this information would be transcribed onto a more permanent medium. It has been argued that these bare entries of the *Annales Maximi* were compiled into book format at a later date, either under the leadership of the Pontifex Maximus Scaevola in 120 or at some time later – under Augustan antiquarians according to Frier.<sup>6</sup>

The assumption of such a transmission process, i.e. from epigraphic notices to historiography, has greatly altered the perception, both modern and ancient, of the early Roman historians. On this basis, they have been found deficient, both in style and content, though nevertheless trustworthy. But the assumptions about these authors simply do not square with the sum of their attested fragments, and this is the primary motivation for this study. For instance, Fabius Pictor contains very little of what could

---

<sup>5</sup> For this conception, see Cornell 1995: 12-15; Jacoby 1941: 60-61; Walbank 1957: 32. Rawson 1991: 4-14 calls into question whether such prodigy lists were used by early Roman historians, and how useful they in fact could be (cf. Drews 1988: esp. 289-290). One piece of evidence that has particularly excited some scholars is the supposed solar eclipse of 350 AUC, reported by Ennius' *Annales* (quoted by Cicero): *id* [the eclipse] *non quidem Ennium fugit; qui ut scribit, anno quinquagesimo et CCC fere post Romam conditam 'Nonis Iunis soli luna obstitit et nox'* (*de Rep.* 1. 25 = Skutsch 153). Cornell is excited to map this onto a specific astronomical event: "it so happens that there was an 80 per cent solar eclipse visible from Rome on 21 June 400 BC" (Cornell 1995: 14, cf. Skutsch 1985: 311-314). There are several problems here. 1) Solar eclipses are not as uncommon as Cornell suggests, happening 2-5 times *per annum* 2) There was no solar eclipse on Jun 21 400 BCE, but presumably Skutsch and Cornell meant the eclipse exactly a year later. It was visible from Rome, but it would not have made for a particularly impressive one. On the other hand, the Jun 21 400 BCE eclipse was preceded by a much more substantial (total) eclipse on Jan 18 401 BCE. 3) This all assumes a foundation date given in Ennius around Varro's and/or Cicero has not interpolated Ennius' AUC date onto a Varronian timeline. 4) Finally, I calculated that given a +/- margin of 3 years – presumed to be sufficiently accurate to please Cornell et al. – there is an 8% chance that during any such period Rome would experience a visible eclipse in May or June; there is not a negligible probability that the Ennian/"annalistic" eclipse could coincide with a real eclipse by random chance. NASA's eclipse data can be found online at <http://eclipse.gsfc.nasa.gov/SEcirc/SEcircEU/RomeITA2.html> ; <http://eclipse.gsfc.nasa.gov/SEcat5/SE-0499--0400.html>. On the general pitfalls of the eclipse notices, see Feeney 2007: 192-3.

<sup>6</sup> Frier 1999: 32.



be dubbed “annalistic” material. The dry notices of Livy – e.g. year openings with what consuls were elected, what were the fields of war – are just not paralleled in the extant fragments of earlier authors.<sup>7</sup> One proposed defense is that later authors would feel it unnecessary to quote their predecessors on “points of fact,” or universally agreed upon events, (i.e. that Q. Fabius Maximus was consul in 209 BC), and so these notices in the early Roman histories have not reached us. This is a less than satisfactory proposition, and an unprovable one. Again, this notion does not correspond with the bulk of the fragments of early Roman historiography. What instead can be observed in these authors is a remarkably creative approach to the past, one that uses a variety of methodologies to explain Roman history. (These will be investigated further in the following chapter). I have thus resorted to renaming the first “annalists” as the “early Roman historiographers.”<sup>8</sup> This nomenclature frees them from the perceived strictures of drawing primarily on the *Annales Maximi*, including organization based upon a year-by-year schema.<sup>9</sup> Also, it is important to draw a distinction, however pedantic, between history and historiography. The possibility can then be entertained that the ERHs were not akin to modern historians, relying primarily upon documentary evidence, but rather employed less rigorous – but more inventive – methodologies that allowed them

---

<sup>7</sup> On the later annalistic style see Beck 2007: 261-262; Cornell 2013 (1): 158; Ginsburg 1981: *passim*; Kraus 1994: 10-12; McDonald 1957: 155-159; Rich 2011: esp. 3-15; Vaahtera 2002: 102-103.

<sup>8</sup> Abbreviated ERHs hereafter.

<sup>9</sup> cf. Rüpke 2006: 510; Vaahtera 2002: 102. *contra* Rich 2011: 1-2 on the structural constraints of the *Annales* genre.

to actively shape the narrative of a national “history.”<sup>10</sup> It is only under these terms that the achievements of the ERHs, in literature and history, can be understood.

## **Annales Maximi**

### **Early Testimonies on the *Annales Maximi***

First, it would seem appropriate to investigate the state of the sources available to the ERHs, including the problematic *Annales Maximi*. The operating assumption will be that the ERHs took care to directly consult documentary evidence – though this itself is merely conjectural.<sup>11</sup> Nonetheless, if this were the case, what sort of material would have been available to the ERHs?<sup>12</sup> Bucher has catalogued a number of public records, and the media on which they were kept, starting from the late Regal period and early Republic.<sup>13</sup> One source type in particular is important, *Fasti*, calendar inscriptions that

---

<sup>10</sup> This wording is especially inspired by Wiseman’s (1979) chapter heading “Unhistorical Thinking.”

<sup>11</sup> See Potter 1999: esp. 74ff. on this question. Wiseman (1979: 42ff.) documents several major anachronisms in the Roman historiographic tradition. Either this information did not come from documentary material or, more likely, there were major deficiencies in the “official” records. One potent example is the misattribution of 2nd century BCE sewer system improvements to Tarquinius Superbus, an error of at least three centuries (ibid. 43).

<sup>12</sup> See Oakley 1997: 22-38 for the fullest discussion of these sources, who rightfully stresses the effect of the oral tradition on the ERHs.

<sup>13</sup> Bucher 1987: 6-27.

were kept by the pontiffs.<sup>14</sup> It seems these would have been sometimes accompanied by lists of magistrates.<sup>15</sup> Unfortunately, the earliest extant calendars date from the late Republic (1st century BC) and the early empire. Rüpke has nonetheless made compelling reconstructions of *Fasti* from previous periods, most notably a hypothetical version of Fulvius Nobilior's calendar in his *aedes Herculis Musarum*.<sup>16</sup> In general, however, the epigraphic evidence of the early Republic – at least in the state that it survives to us – is not substantial enough to paint an optimistic picture of Roman memorial culture. One cannot prove a negative, i.e. that records were not kept, but the paucity of inscriptions should be troubling to those that seem to posit extensive record keeping from an early

---

<sup>14</sup> Cornell et al. are right to separate the calendars from the *Annales Maximi* (Cornell 2013 (1): 145). The *Annales Maximi* and *Fasti* are seen as natural co-developments by Jacoby (1949: 63).

<sup>15</sup> Rüpke 1993: 9-10. On the divergent *libri lintei* – linen rolls of magistrate lists supposedly kept at the temple of Juno Moneta – see Frier 1999: 155-158; Oakley 1997: 27-28; Wiseman 1979: 14-15.

<sup>16</sup> Rüpke 2006 esp. 507-510. Notably, this calendar would have included a prefacing (perhaps poetic?) inscription that contains the aetiology both for the month names and their chronological progression. A consular list may or may not have been included however (Northwood 2007: 109 n. 47).

date.<sup>17</sup> In the case of the calendars, few indeed have survived with any appended public, “pontifical” information.<sup>18</sup> There is also a thought that early historiography was supplemented by family histories and the *imagines*, ancestral death masks, which would sit on display in noble houses with accompanying *titula* and be paraded during the *pompa funebris*.<sup>19</sup> No examples of this kind of history survive unfortunately – other than perhaps the epitaphs of the Cornelii Scipiones – but several sources lament the degree

---

<sup>17</sup> Acknowledged in Cornell 1995: 19. cf. Vine on “the intransigent facts that there is relatively little [archaic material], and that the little we have (partly for its very paucity) is extraordinarily difficult to evaluate” (Vine 1993: 29). Puzzingly, Frier seems very optimistic about the slim list he adduces: the treaty with Carthage mentioned by Polybius (Polyb. 3.22, date of document disputed), an antiquarian “law” concerning the fixing of a nail as a year-marker on the Capitoline (Livy 7.3), the *foedus Cassianum*, *lex de Aventino* (Dion. Hal. 10.32.4), a treaty with Ardea, and some censorial account work (Frier 1999: 128ff. cf. Potter 1999: 133f.). The *lex de clavo figendo*, so to speak, is clearly the product of antiquarian scholarship. Livy here is *not* quoting the law directly: *lex vetusta est, priscis litteris verbisque scripta, ut qui praetor maximus sit idibus Septembribus clavum pangat*. To be clear, the syntax and orthography of *qui praetor maximus sit idibus Septembribus clavum pangat* is not representative of early Latin, but rather merely part of the indirect command *lex vetusta est ...ut....* (Sacral laws were often prohibitions of the form *nequis* + imperative [e.g. *violato*]... – see Degraffi *ILL* 504-509; Vine 1993: 255-257). The possibility is then open that this Cincius did not discover a genuine law – could he have read it properly had he done so? – but rather manufactured the whole gist of a “law” to explain the nail holes in the side of the temple and whatever matching gibberish inscriptions accompanied them. A positive view of this Cincius’ claims, however, is explored on p. 69-70.

<sup>18</sup> *Fasti* were probably not “published” anyway until Cn. Flavius first did so in 304 BCE (Rüpke 1993: 44-50). There may have been book compilations, *commentarii*, of magistrate lists available in the late Republic however (Wiseman 1979: 14-15).

<sup>19</sup> Oakley 1997: 30-33.

to which individual families have warped the historical record with erroneous claims to magistracies and victories.<sup>20</sup>

In the case of the *Annales Maximi*, in particular, these evidentiary concerns have been overlooked. This is because ancient witnesses claim to have seen the *Annales Maximi* first-hand and/or to possess knowledge about the ways in which they were kept and transmitted. Yet there are profound problems with these testimonia. Let us begin with the first, Cato's comment preserved by Gellius:<sup>21</sup>

*non lubet scribere quod in tabula apud pontificem maximum est, quotiens annona cara, quotiens lunae aut solis lumine caligo aut quid obstiterit.* (Gell. 4.5 = 4.1 C)

“it is not pleasing to write that which exists on the *tabula* [tablet?] at the house of the pontifex maximus, that is, how many times there was a crop shortage, how many times there was a lunar or solar eclipse.”

---

<sup>20</sup> This would explain the (exaggerated?) prominence of the individual families in Livy's early narrative, particularly the Fabii – the implication being that this material was worked early into the tradition by Fabius Pictor (Flower 1996: 149; Oakley 1997: 29-30; Wiseman 1979: 39-40). The two most damning opinions of family records and their manipulation of the historiographic tradition belong to Livy and Cicero: **1)** *vitiatam 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. nec quisquam aequalis temporibus illis scriptor exstat quo satis certo auctore stetur* (Livy 8.40-5) **2)** *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; ut si a M. Tullio esse dicerem, qui patricius cum Servio Sulpicio consul anno x post exactos reges fuit* (Cic. Brut. 62). Livy's charge of *falsisque imaginum titulis* is bolstered by the well-known discrepancy between the Barbatus epitaph and the historiographic tradition – consul assigned Etruria as field of operation (Livy 10.12) vs. southern Italian victories on epitaph (CIL VI 7). These accolades were perhaps “stolen” from his consular colleague, Fulvius, who campaigned against Samnium. Plutarch's *Numa* may also preserve the sentiment of Claudius Quadrigarius, who could have been the first to attack the family histories as part of an argument to discredit early Republican history (Plut. *Numa* 1.1).

<sup>21</sup> Rightly included as the first testimonium in Cornell 2013 (FRH *Annales Maximi* T 1).

What exactly this *tabula* is, is confusing at best, and its description in a parallel passage of Dionysius of Halicarnassus does not elucidate things much further:

οὐ γὰρ ἡξίουں ὡς Πολύβιος ὁ Μεγαλοπολίτης τοσοῦτο μόνον εἰπεῖν, ὅτι κατὰ τὸ δεύτερον ἔτος τῆς ἑβδόμης ὀλυμπιάδος τὴν Ῥώμην ἐκτίσθαι πείθομαι, οὐδ' ἐπὶ τοῦ παρὰ τοῖς ἀρχιερεῦσι κειμένου πίνακος ἑνὸς καὶ μόνου τὴν πίστιν ἀβασάνιστον καταλιπεῖν, ἀλλὰ τοὺς ἐπιλογισμούς, οἷς αὐτὸς προσεθέμην, εἰς μέσον ὑπευθύνους τοῖς βουλευθεῖσιν ἐσομένους ἐξενεγκεῖν. (Dion. Hal. 1.74.3)

“For I do not deem it sufficient – as Polybius from Megalopolis does – to say this alone, that is that I am convinced that Rome was founded in the second year of the seventh olympiad nor to place unreasonable trust in the tablet that lies at the house of the Pontifices, a single and unique item, but rather instead to set forth those proofs in which I place my faith so that they may be answerable to those who are interested.”

πίναξ at least seems to translate *tabula*. Its form and content are not expanded upon other than that it seems to have contained a date for the foundation of Rome, and the syntax of the opening sentence makes it unclear whether Polybius is also to be implicated in those that relied upon the πίναξ.<sup>22</sup> Furthermore, whatever the “tablet” contained remains murky. What is clear is that it is seen as a special case, “a single and unique item” (ἑνὸς καὶ μόνου). If Dionysius and Cato are speaking about the same document – which itself is not certain – then it is telling that both view it in a negative light.<sup>23</sup> Neither believes it to be very compelling evidence; to rely on this document

---

<sup>22</sup> In fact, the parallel construction οὐ γὰρ ἡξίουں ὡς Πολύβιος ὁ Μεγαλοπολίτης... οὐδ'... makes it seem as though Polybius is not to be grouped together with those citing the πίναξ. See Frier 1999: 112.

<sup>23</sup> These two testimonies were connected at least as early as Crake (1940: 378).

would be “to leave the case uninvestigated” according to Dionysius.<sup>24</sup> Thus both Dionysius and Cato, the first to comment on the chronicle, have a primitive conception of the chronicle / *Annales Maximi*, and cast doubt on its value for the historiographer.<sup>25</sup> Moreover, even if these records were used by the ERHs, as Dionysius may suggest, the sense is their relevance was limited, e.g. to a foundation estimate for Rome.<sup>26</sup>

### **Cicero's *De Oratore* 2.50-4**

So where did a broader conception of the chronicle, one that persists in modern scholarship, come from? Cicero's views are much more expansive:<sup>27</sup>

*erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio, 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*

---

<sup>24</sup> For this sense, compare the usage of ἀβασανίστως in Thucydides (Thuc. 1.20.1; Wiseman 1979: 41).

<sup>25</sup> Fornara is on shaky grounds to dismiss this pessimism: “But Cato's complaint should not be taken at face value: he would not have criticized the *Annales Maximi* unless they were worth criticizing and possessed some measure of historical utility” (Fornara 1983: 24). At face value, Cato's comments suggest otherwise.

<sup>26</sup> The limitations of the record keeping tradition are corroborated by another quote from Dionysius, who claims that “each [of the ERHs] has copied something from the old accounts [words?] preserved on the tablets of the pontiffs:” ἐκ παλαιῶν μέντοι λόγων ἐν ἱεραῖς δέλτοις σωζομένων ἕκαστός τι παραλαβὼν ἀνέγραψεν (Dion. Hal. 1.73.1 = *FRH Annales Maximi* F 7). What follows in Dionysius' account are debates over the basic (kin) relationship between Aeneas, Romulus and Remus, and various Italic peoples; the sense is that the tablets are only helpful in quite selective circumstances. cf. Dion. Hal. 4.1.1 = 13 C = *FRH Annales Maximi* F 8.

<sup>27</sup> For productive discussions of the *De Oratore* passage see esp. Cornell 2013 (1): 156; Elliott 2013: 32-33; Feldherr 2003: 202-203; Frier 1999: 73-75

*album et proponebat tabulam domi, potestas ut esset populo cognoscendi, eique etiam nunc Annales Maximi nominantur* (Cic. *De orat.* 2.52)

“For historiography then was nothing beyond the compilation of annales, for the sake of which thing [i.e. historiography] and memory-keeping the Pontifex Maximus, from the beginning of the Roman state up to the pontificate of P. Mucius, used to mark down all events, year-by-year, in inscriptions [*litteris*] and used to copy them onto a white board [*album*] and showcase the tablet at his house, so that the people might have the ability to consult them, and these are even now called the *Annales Maximi*.”

Most academic attention on this passage has been (mis)spent on reconstructing the transmission process outlined by Cicero – was the *album* a temporary medium, from a collection of which a larger literary version was assembled, the infamous *liber annalis*?<sup>28</sup>

Ultimately, such an attempt does not lead to any satisfactory conclusion, and relies upon Cicero’s reliability in such matters – an assumption to be challenged later.<sup>29</sup>

Rather, following Frier, it is more profitable to consider this passage in its context.<sup>30</sup>

From the start, the hostility of Cicero’s interlocutor, Antonius, to the Roman historiographic tradition is apparent: *erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio*.

This famous rebuke of the ERHs, however, is part of a much larger discourse. Cicero’s panel has decided, unsurprisingly, that there are many other disciplines that require the

---

<sup>28</sup> These conclusions can only come from uncritically mashing together the testimonia of Cicero and others, such as Servius/DS. Cornell 2013 (1): 144-149 is a lamentable waste of intellectual resources on the matter.

<sup>29</sup> *contra* Cornell 2013 (1): 144 who claims that the basic facts of Cicero’s account of the *Annales Maximi* are “undisputed.”

<sup>30</sup> See p. 10 n. 27.



skill of the orator (2.50). Antonius then opens the question on the relationship between historiography and oratory, and a question-answer session follows with Catulus (2.51):

A: *qualis oratoris et quanti hominis in dicendo putas esse historiam scribere?*

C: *si, ut Graeci scripserunt, summi, si, ut nostri, nihil opus est oratore; satis est non esse mendacem.*

A: *Atqui, ne nostros contemnas, Graeci quoque ipsi sic initio scriptitarunt, ut noster Cato, ut Pictor, ut Piso.*

A: "What sort of orator and how skilled a man in speaking does the writing of history require, you think?"

C: "If, as the Greeks have written, the best, if, as we [Romans] have written, there is no need to be an orator; it is enough merely to not be an outright liar."

A: "On the other hand, lest we should look down upon our own historians, at the start the Greek historians themselves also wrote in such a way as did our Cato, Pictor, and Piso."

Antonius comments then bleed into 2.52, the above-quoted passage on the *Annales Maximi*. In sum, the panel's view is that the ERHs – here represented by Cato, Pictor, and Piso – only concerned themselves with providing a "true" account of affairs, and slavishly devoted themselves to preserving the records of the *Annales Maximi* without any rhetorical flourish (*satis est non esse mendacem*).

There is an extended comparison made to the Greek tradition which is made more explicit in the following section (2.53):

*hanc similitudinem scribendi multi secuti sint, 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.*

“Many followed this similarity of writing [to the *Annales Maximi*], who left behind only notices of times, men, places, and deed; and so as amongst the Greeks there was Pherecydes, Hellanicus, Acusilas, and many others, so amongst us was Cato and Pictor and Piso. They did not understand the means by which narration can be decorated – for these precepts have just recently been imported to us here – and, provided that what they say can be understood, they believe conciseness to be the highest praise in speaking”

In this line of argumentation, the early Greek mythographers – Pherecydes, Hellanicus, and Acusilaus – are analogues for the ERHs, again exemplified in Cato, Pictor, and Piso. The pairings of three, Pherecydes/Cato, Hellanicus/Pictor, and Acusilaus/Piso, may be significant. Pherecydes’ Athenian *Genealogiai* might be construed to resemble Cato’s *Origines*, which covered local Italian cities, their histories and foundations, in Books 2-3; Hellanicus was the first Greek universal historian, Pictor the first Roman; Acusilaus and Piso were known for their rationalism and simplicity.<sup>31</sup> Unfortunately, Roman historiography had not yet benefitted from rhetorical precepts – at least as of 91 BC, the hypothetical setting of the *De Oratore* – and so as of yet there was no Roman Thucydides, the culmination of a long tradition of historiography and oratory.<sup>32</sup> Instead Roman historiographers were stuck in a primitive phase, like Pherekydes, Hellanicus,

---

<sup>31</sup> Gellius lauds the *simplicissima suavis* of Piso (Gell. 11.14.1).

<sup>32</sup> The *Rhetorica ad Herennium* has often been dated to the 90/80s BC (his consulship was in 93 BC), but this dating has been called into question. Even if the tract belonged Cicero’s era, the reference to the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* could remain intact; perhaps Cicero’s faithfulness to the hypothetical setting of the *De Oratore* had limits. On Cicero’s dabbling as an antiquarian, successes and failures, see Rawson 1991: 58-79.

and Acusilaus, and could not progress past the mere *narratio* of events already recorded in the public chronicles.

On closer inspection, however, this whole rhetorical scaffolding collapses.<sup>33</sup> After all, Cato could hardly be construed as a true “annalist” that drew upon the *Annales Maximi* for inspiration (Gellius, above, recorded his disdain for such an approach, = 4.1 C).<sup>34</sup> Besides, Cicero may not even share the opinions of his panel; the discussion could be meant to relate the various debates on history writing in 91 BC, not Cicero’s own day. Tellingly, the setting of the *De Oratore* loosely corresponds with the period in which Sempronius Asellio attempted to draw a distinction between the “annalistic” tradition and the more robust tradition of Greek *historia*.<sup>35</sup>

*‘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 ἐφημερίδα vocant. Nobis non modo satis esse video, quod factum esset, id pronuntiare, sed etiam quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent demonstrare.’ Paulo post idem Asellio in eodem libro: ‘Nam neque alacriores,’ inquit, ‘ad rem publicam defendendam, neque segniores ad rem perperam faciendam annales libri commovere quicquam possunt. Scribere autem bellum initum quo consule et quo confectum sit et quis triumphans introierit ex eo, et eo libro quae in bello gesta sint non*

---

<sup>33</sup> cf. Feldherr 2003: 203.

<sup>34</sup> cf. Elliott 2013: 31-32.

<sup>35</sup> The fact that Cicero didn’t care much for Asellio’s attempt at contemporary history (*De Leg.* 1.6) does not preclude him from the influence of Asellio’s historiographic principles. Moreover, as with the rest of the *De Oratore* material, it is difficult to pin down precisely whose opinions are being shared, ones belonging to Cicero himself, or those attributed by Cicero to his earlier interlocutors. In other words, it is unclear whether the conception of the Roman historiographic tradition presented in the *De Oratore* passages (above quoted) is meant to reflect Cicero’s own or those belonging to intellectual circles of the 90s BC. Both possibilities will be explored in the pages to follow.

*praedicare aut 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.*’ (Gell. 5.18.7-9 = 1 + 2 C)

“Truly between those who wanted to leave behind *annales* and those who tried to write the history [*res gestae*] of the Roman people is the following fundamental difference: books of *annales* only recounted what was done on a year-to-year basis, a similar process to those who write a daily log, which the Greeks call ‘dailies.’ I see that it is not sufficient for us to merely pronounce what happened, but also to demonstrate by what decision-making and rationale it was done.’ A little later in the same book Asellio on a related note says: ‘For books of *annales* are not at all able to stir others to be more eager to defend the republic or more reluctant to do it harm. Moreover, to write under which consul a war was begun and under which one it was finished, and who on that account entered the city in a triumph, and to not explain in that book what things occurred in the war or what in the meantime the senate decreed or what law or question was debated and not to revisit under what deliberations these things happened – that is to tell fairy tale stories to children, not to write histories’”

At Rome, there would be a continuing debate on the development of the genre of historiography.<sup>36</sup> In this same section, Gellius includes the related comments of the antiquarian Verrius Flaccus.<sup>37</sup> Verrius mentions a Greek etymology of ἱστορία < \*εἶδω / οἶδα (“to see,” and therefore “to know”) used to separate *annales* writing from history, here narrowly defined as the writing of contemporaneous events:

*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; eamque esse opinionem quorundam, Verrius Flaccus refert in libro De Significatu verborum quarto. Ac se quidem dubitare super ea re dicit, posse*

---

<sup>36</sup> cf. esp. Elliott’s discussion at Elliott 2013: 30-38; also Cornell 2013 (1): 255-257; Rich 2011: 22-23.

<sup>37</sup> For a discussion of the relationship between Verrius’ and Asellio’s conception of historiography see Frier 1999: 33-35. His distinction between the dyads of *annales* / *historia* (Verrius) and *annales* / *res gestae* (Asellio) seems unnecessarily pedantic. It is generally thought that Asellio’s opinion on the matter was a deciding factor in his organization principles and his decision to write contemporaneous history, i.e. things that he had witnessed (read “seen”).

*autem videri putat nonnihil esse rationis in ea opinione, quod ἱστορία Graece significet rerum cognitionem praesentium.*

“Some say that *historia* differs from *annales* in the following way, that is, although both are the *narratio* of *res gestae*, nevertheless *historia*’s proper subject is the *res gestae* in which the narrator himself was a participant or witness. Verrius Flaccus records that this opinion existed amongst some authorities in his fourth book ‘On the Meaning of Words.’ Although [Verrius] says that he is in doubt on this matter, he thinks that there is some sense in this opinion because ἱστορία in Greek refers to the knowledge of current affairs.”

What implications does this have for the interpretation of *De Oratore* 2.50-3? Clearly, Cicero is inserting himself and his interlocutors into a broader dialogue over historiographical precepts. Asellio, and presumably a like-minded group described by Verrius, showed a preference for contemporaneous histories.<sup>38</sup> The unstated, but obvious logic, is that actors/ witnesses would have the best insight into not only the veracity of historical events, but could also speak to the motivation and rationale behind various deliberations and decisions. Conversely, prior *annales* are presented as overly detailed, like daily logs, covering such a massive amount of raw data (*ab urbe condita*) that it rendered any analytic efforts moot.<sup>39</sup> These are exactly the sorts of charges that were leveled by Antonius: *hanc similitudinem scribendi multi secuti sint, qui sine ullis ornamentis monumenta solum temporum, hominum, locorum gestarumque rerum reliquerunt*, “Many followed this similarity of writing [to the *Annales Maximi*], who left behind only notices of times, men, places, and deeds.”

---

<sup>38</sup> cf. Elliott 2013: 36-37; Rich 2011: 23.

<sup>39</sup> *Diarium* is probably better rendered “daily log” than “diary.” The modern sense of “diary” does imply personal thoughts, which would undercut Asellio’s critique.

The circularity of Antonius (/ Cicero's?) logic should now be apparent. His entire conception of the chronicle given in *De Oratore* 2.52 is a rhetorical setup to explain the faults of early Roman historiography, that is its over-reliance upon the chronicle for style and content (*hanc similitudinem scribendi*).<sup>40</sup> This is an opinion Cicero voices elsewhere:

*Nam post Annalis Pontificum Maximorum quibus nihil potest esse ieiunius, si aut ad Fabium aut ad eum, qui tibi semper in ore est, Catonem, aut ad Pisonem aut ad Fannium aut ad Vennoniani venias, quamquam ex his alius alio plus habet virium, tamen quid tam exile quam isti omnes? (De Leg. 1.2.5-6)*

“For after the annales of the Pontifices Maximi – than which nothing could be more dry – if either you should come upon Fabius, or Cato, who is always on your tongue, or to Piso, or Fannius, or to Vennonianus, even if one or another of all these possesses more oomph, nevertheless what is as lowly as this whole lot?”

The tone is hostile (*isti omnes*) and directed towards the usual suspects, Fabius, Cato, and Piso. They are all followers (the sense of *post* here) of the *Annales Maximi*, and hence are *ieiuni* and *exiles* by association.<sup>41</sup>

---

<sup>40</sup> Cornell et al. come very close to this conclusion: “Cicero [*De Oratore* 2.50-54] claims that the Pontifex Maximus’ record served as a stylistic model for the first Roman historians. Cicero’s concern is solely with style, and he accordingly does not indicate whether these writers also used the record as a source of information, but it is natural to suppose that he took them to have drawn on it for content as well as style. However, Cicero may not have had any good information about the early historians’ relation to the Pontifex Maximus’ record, and he appears to have been drawing on the theory of a Greek author, perhaps Theophrastus, about the relationship of early historical writers to archives, which later influenced Dionsyus” (Cornell 2013 (1): 156).

<sup>41</sup> Note how Cicero has essentially appropriated the opinion of Cato: *non lubet scribere...* (Gell. 2.28.4 = 4.1 C).

Cicero is probably not alone in advancing this negative relationship between the *Annales Maximi* and the ERHs.<sup>42</sup> Returning to the *De Orat.* 2.52 passage, the antagonism becomes more obvious:<sup>43</sup> early historiography is just the slavish copying of the *Annales Maximi* (*erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio*). Furthermore, the motivation posited for archiving is simply anachronistic: *cuius rei* [*confectio annales = historia*] *memoriaeque publicae retinendae causa* – how could a barely literate Pontifex Maximus, from the very beginning of the Roman state/republic (*ab initio*), plan for an as of yet non-existent historiographic tradition? Other details are suspicious. The pontificate of P. Mucius is a rather indeterminate *terminus* for the lapse of the *Annales Maximi*, likely meant to signify some period around the turn of the 1st century BC.<sup>44</sup> This was a key *locus* in the trajectory of Roman historiography. On one side of the century lies the massive universal history of Gn. Gellius in a hundred or more books, on the other, the more circumscribed histories of Quadrigarius and Asellio, the scope of which were limited to better-attested periods of Roman history.<sup>45</sup> Thus, this point in time may have been chosen not because P. Mucius purposefully discontinued the chronicle, but rather

---

<sup>42</sup> Rawson 1991: 61-62 opens the possibility that Cicero was regurgitating this sentiment from a 1st Century BCE antiquarian source.

<sup>43</sup> Quoted p. 10.

<sup>44</sup> Notably, this is the only source on the *Annales Maximi* that mentions Mucius.

<sup>45</sup> Wiseman places the career of Cn. Gellius between 110 and 90 BC (Wiseman 1979: 9). Asellio is placed directly after Cn. Gellius in Chassignet's edition; Beck-Walter inserts Coelius Antipater between the two. Claudius Quadrigarius limited his history to the period after the Gallic Sack (390 BC). Valerius Antias, however, a near contemporary of Quadrigarius, probably wrote a history on the scale of Cn. Gellius (Wiseman 1979: 12); historiographic scaling was not a closed debate.

because it reflects a period when, in the minds of some, Roman histories began to depart from their use of the *Annales Maximi* – a claim perhaps entirely founded upon stylistic grounds and organizational principles. It was hinted earlier that this group of dissenters may have been composed of a group of historians and antiquarians that took an interest in rendering older histories as obsolete and inadequate. Antiquarian manipulation itself is evident at the end of *De Oratore* 2.52 passage from the etymology *Pontifex Maximus* <*Annales Maximi*: *pontifex maximus referebatque in album et proponebat tabulam domi... eique etiam nunc Annales Maximi nominantur; etiam* forms the causal relationship: the records took their name, *Maximi*, from their caretakers.



Indeed, very little of the passage demonstrates a firsthand knowledge of the *Annales Maximi*.<sup>46</sup> Just because, for instance, the *album* is consistent with attested, archaeologically-supported forms of record keeping in the early Republic – wouldn't it be more surprising if Romans of the first century BC had *no* idea of early monumental media? – this does not prove that the *album* is anything more than a later interpolation between the epigraphic and written stages of the chronicle. In other words, it is not certain that Antonius/Cicero is doing anything other than positing a hypothetical intermediate step between the inscription and book-form of the chronicle, itself an integral part of his case on the *similitudo scribendi* between the *Annales Maximi* and written *annales*. Conveniently, the *album*, a charred-white board, could be

---

<sup>46</sup> Other passages might be adduced to demonstrate that Cicero did have access to the epigraphic evidence of the chronicle, but rather seem to be a product, like *De Orat.* 2.52, of rhetorical manipulation: 1) *at vero, ut Annales Populi Romani et monumenta vetustatis loquuntur, Kaeso ille Quinctius et M. Furius Camillus et C. Servilius Ahala, cum essent optime de re publica meriti, tamn populi incitati vim iracundiamque subierunt, damnatique comitiis centuriatis cum in exilium profugissent, rursus ab eodem populo placato sunt in suam pristinam dignitatem restituti* (*De Domo Sua ad Pontifices* 32.86). Cicero clearly is making an appeal to the archival authority of the *Annales Maximi*, here redubbed the *Annales Publicum* (cf. *De Rep.* 2.15.28), and analogizing them to other forms of material memory culture, *monumenta vetustatis*. The problem is that what supposedly derives from the *Annales Maximi*, the description of the exiles of prominent Romans that follows, cannot, *a priori*, come from the chronicle or other “hard” evidence; this is not a bare, “annalistic” notice, but rather must have come from an ERH or other authority and his rationalizing account of these exiles as the product of the whims of the populace. 2) *id [eclipse dating] autem postea ne nostrum quidem Ennium fugit, qui ut scribit, anno quinquagesimo CCC fere post Romam conditam: ‘Nonius Iunis soli luna obstitit et nox.’ Atque hac in re tanta inest ratio atque sollertia, ut ex hoc die quem apud Ennium et in Maximis Annalibus consignatum videmus...* [quotes date from regal period for Romulus’ apotheosis]. Cicero here is intent on fact-checking the eclipse of Ennius – and may have altered Ennius’ dating schema to AUC (see p. 3 n. 5) – against contemporary astronomical methods of estimating eclipses past and Present (Cicero mentions Thales, for one). Nonetheless, most scholars agree that information, such as eclipse dates, from the regal period could *not* have been preserved in the *Annales Maximi* or elsewhere, and therefore we must conclude this is merely an intellectual exercise, not a factfinding one. Rather it seems to be used again to buttress his conception of the relationship between the “annalistic” tradition and the chronicle, here the linkage being with Ennius and the *Annales Maximi* (*apud Ennium et in Maximis Annalibus*). 3) *Nam post Annalis Pontificum Maximorum quibus nihil potest esse ieiunius, si aut ad Fabium aut ad eum, qui tibi semper in ore est, Catonem, aut ad Pisonem aut ad Fannium aut ad Vennoniani venias, quam quam ex his alius alio plus habet virium, tamen quid tam exile quam isti omnes?* (*De Leg.* 1.2.5-6). Discussed p. 17.

archaeologically invisible, its disappearance explained as a product of age or the “fiery” Gallic sack.<sup>47</sup> This skeptical line of inquiry could also explain why Cicero’s view so differs from that of Dionysius and Cato, whose accounts cast doubt on the utility of the *Annales Maximi* for historiography. There is a sense that Dionysius, and certainly Cato, visited whatever epigraphic evidence existed at the house of the Pontifex Maximus; Cato claims to have tried to transcribe it himself. Contrarily, there are good reasons not to trust the account on the *Annales Maximi* given by Antonius/Cicero in the *De Oratore*, primarily the levels of rhetorical distortion that are occurring. To speculate, it may have been felt that the *Annales Maximi* no longer needed to be directly consulted or “fact-checked” since the imputed connection had already been so thoroughly forged between history and epigraph; *annales* at this point had been fully equated with the *Annales Maximi* (*historia* = *confectio annalium*). For Antonius, the relationship seems self-evident based upon the lack of rhetorical ornamentation in *annales*.

If this line of speculation is correct it would also help explain the concinnity of several other later sources on the *Annales Maximi*. Frier’s solution is that Verrius Flaccus is ultimately responsible for these testimonia. From Gellius, it was at least apparent that Verrius inserted himself in the debate over *annales* vs. *historia*.<sup>48</sup> Unlike Frier, however, we ought to attribute these later testimonia to a group of historians and antiquarians of

---

<sup>47</sup> See note on Livy 6, p. 36 n. 78.

<sup>48</sup> Quoted p. 15.

the first century BC competing over the modes of historiographic expression at Rome – not the sole genius of Verrius, who was assuredly a member of this movement. This is an approach suggested by Elliott: “we learn of the *Annales Maximi* only through late sources, themselves apparently confused or abbreviated, clearly only partially informed and probably interdependent.”<sup>49</sup>

### Servius/DS

Note, for instance, how closely Servius follows the arguments of Asellio/Verrius, and how DS mirrors *De Oratore*’s description of the *Annales Maximi* in lock-step:

*annales: inter historiam et annales hoc interest: historia est eorum temporum quae vel vidimus vel videre potuimus, dicta ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱστορεῖν, id est videre; annales vero sunt eorum temporum, quae aetas nostra non novit: unde Livius ex annalibus et historia constat. haec tamen confunduntur licenter, ut hoc loco pro historia inquit ‘annales’. ita autem annales conficiebantur: tabulam dealbatam quotannis pontifex maximus habuit, in qua praescriptis consulum nominibus et aliorum magistratuum digna memoratu notare consueverat domi militiaeque terra marique gesta per singulos dies. cuius diligentiae annuos commentarios in octoginta libros veteres retulerunt, eosque a pontificibus maximis a quibus fiebant annales maximos appellarunt: unde quidam ideo dictum ab Aenea ‘annales’ aiunt, quod et ipse religiosus sit et a poeta tum pontifex inducatur.*

(Serv. *Aen.* 1.373, DS unitalicized)

S: “*Historia* and *annales* differ in the following way: *historia* concerns those events which one either has seen or could have seen, from the Greek ἱστορεῖν, which means ‘to see.’ But *annales* concern those events which our generation did not witness: on this account Livy’s work consists of *annales* and *historia*. Nevertheless, these terms are freely confused, since he calls it *annales* instead of *historia*.”

---

<sup>49</sup> Elliott 2013: 25.

DS: “Moreover, *annales* were compiled in the following way: the Pontifex Maximus had a whitened tablet [*tabulam dealbatam*], on which, under the headings of the consuls and other magistrates, he was accustomed to mark down events worthy of recording on a day-to-day basis, events both at home and afield. Because of the diligence of the Pontifex Maximus, the ancients edited these year-by-year commentaries into an 80 book work, and they called these books the *Annales Maximi* from the name of the Pontifices by whom they were made. Some also say that it was called *annales* by Aeneas, because he himself was very religious and so was presented as a Pontifex by the poet.”

First, Servius revisits the argument in the Verrius (and perhaps Asellio and others) with the etymology of *historia* < “seeing” again foregrounded: *historia est eorum temporum quae vel vidimus vel videre potuimus, dicta ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱστορεῖν, id est videre*. Moreover, what was only hinted at in Gellius’ quotation of Asellio and Verrius is now explicit: “*historia* concerns those events which one either has seen or could have seen... but *annales* concern those events which our generation did not witness.”

DS then expands on the archival process of the *Annales Maximi*. Frier has noted the points of contact between this passage and *De Oratore* 2.52:<sup>50</sup>

1) *erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio (Cic.) / ita autem annales conficibantur (DS)*

“For historiography then was nothing beyond the compilation of *annales*.” / “Moreover, *annales* were compiled in the following way...”

2) *cuius rei memoriaeque publicae retinendae causa... res omnes singulorum annorum mandabat litteris pontifex maximus efferebatque in album et proponebat tabulam domi ... potestas ut esset populo cognoscendi (Cic.) / tabulam dealbatam quotannis Pontifex*

---

<sup>50</sup> Frier 1999: 72 (with my modifications).

*Maximus habuit, in qua praescriptis consulum nominibus et aliorum magistratuum digna memoratu notare consueverat domi militiaeque, terra marique gesta per singulos dies* (DS)

“for the sake of which thing [i.e. historiography] and public memory-keeping... the Pontifex Maximus used to mark down all events, year-by-year, in inscriptions [in litteris] and used to copy them onto a white board [album] and showcase the tablet at his house, so that the people might have the ability to consult them.” / “the Pontifex Maximus had a whitened tablet [*tabulam dealbatam*], on which, under the headings of the consuls and other magistrates, he was accustomed to mark down events worthy of recording on a day-to-day basis, events both at home and afield.”

3) *ii qui etiam nunc Annales Maximi nominantur* (Cic.) / *libros...eosque a pontificibus maximis, a quibus fiebant, Annales Maximos appellarunt* (DS)

“these are even now called the *Annales Maximi*.” / “they called these books the *Annales Maximi* from the name of the Pontifices by whom they were made.”

Cicero and DS (Flaccus?) agree that 1) history writing developed from compiling epigraphic evidence from a chronicle 2) this material had been itself assembled by the Pontifices for public display, with the records updated on a year-to-year basis 3) the name of this collection was the *Annales Maximi*, *Annales* < *annus*, *Maximi* < Pontifex Maximus.

Because of these similarities, there is the real potential for dialogue and *contaminatio* between the accounts of Cicero and Verrius, a possibility, perhaps on generic grounds, not fully explored by Frier.<sup>51</sup> In fact, it seems appropriate to include the S/DS testimony in the larger conversation over the direction of Roman

---

<sup>51</sup> “There are a few insignificant verbal similarities between the two accounts, not enough to suggest that Verrius was conscious of Cicero’s discussion” (Frier 1999: 85). Frier may have felt that Cicero would not be an obvious model for Verrius to turn to in a historiographic debate, especially in a work, at least nominally, concerned with oratory (the *De Oratore*).

historiography, in which Cicero, Asellio, and Verrius were already included. The relationship between these passages, however, is probably not as simple as Frier proposes, i.e. that S/DS – and a number of later sources – all draw upon Verrius and only Verrius. The S passage does have strong affinities with Verrius, such as the etymology of history <“seeing/knowing.”<sup>52</sup> Nonetheless, DS seems to be very closely aligned with the conception of the *Annales Maximi* in *De Oratore* 2.52, which cannot be directly paralleled in Verrius. Furthermore, it is neither impossible nor unlikely that writers in late antiquity could have had access to Cicero’s *De Oratore* and Asellio’s history, and so, in practice, these too could be sources for S/DS.<sup>53</sup>

### Isidore as missing-link?

Of the late sources on the chronicle, Isidore makes the most compelling case study for the interdependence of our sources. Here is his entry on *historia*:

*De Historia: historia est narratio rei gestae, per quam ea, quae in praeterito facta sunt, dinoscuntur. Dicta autem Graece historia ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱστορεῖν, id est videre vel cognoscere. Apud veteres enim nemo constribebat historiam, nisi is qui interfuisset, et ea quae consribenda essent vidisset.* (Isid. 1.41.1)

“*Historia* is the narration of *res gestae*, through which what was done in the past is made known. *Historia* comes, moreover, from the Greek ἱστορεῖν, that is “to see”

---

<sup>52</sup> *inter historiam et annales hoc interest: historia est eorum temporum quae vel vidimus vel videre potuimus, dicta ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱστορεῖν, id est videre; annales vero sunt eorum temporum, quae aetas nostra non novit* (S quoted p. 21) | *quod ἱστορία Graece significet rerum cognitionem praesentium* (Verrius, quoted p. 15).

<sup>53</sup> Mankin et al. have demonstrated that, despite its troubled transmission to the modern era, the *De Oratore* circulated widely throughout antiquity (Mankin 2011: 49). Likewise, Asellio is quoted by Nonius (2 times), Charisius(2), Priscian (1), and, most importantly, DS (once, *Aen.* 12.121). Whether this implies a steady readership into late antiquity, or knowledge through later summaries, is up for debate.

or “to know.” For no one amongst the ancients used to write history except someone who was present and witnessed the events to be written about.”

Again we find the etymology of *historia* that can be traced back to Servius and Verrius through the Gellius quotation.<sup>54</sup> Yet, the comment on “eye-witness” historiography – presumably opposed to traditional *annales* – is reminiscent of those of Asellio, which are reported in the same section of Gellius.<sup>55</sup> A few sections later Isidore writes “on the types of *historia*,” and its first section may be drawing upon Asellio:

*De generibus historiae: genus historiae triplex est. Ephemeris namque appellatur unius diei gestio. Hoc apud nos diarium vocatur. Nam quod Latini diurnum, Graeci ephemerida dicunt. (Isid. 1.44.1)*

“there are three types of *historia*. The activities of one day are called an *ephemeris* (‘daily’). This is called a ‘diary’ in our parlance. For that which the Latins call a ‘daily,’ the Greeks call *ephemeris*.”

Asellio seems to have had a similar discussion (again quoted from Gellius), perhaps originating the translation of *ephemeris* for *diarium*, and so would be a logical authority for Isidore to cite “on the types of *historia*”:

*cum vero non per annos, sed per dies singulos res gestae scribuntur, ea historia Graeco vocabulo ἐφημερίς dicitur, cuius Latinum interpretamentum scriptum est in libro Semproni Asellionis primo...’id est quasi qui diarium scribunt, quam Graeci ἐφημερίδα vocant’” (Gellius 5.18.7 = 1 C)*

“But when histories are written not organized by years, but on a -day-to-day basis, this type of history is called an *ephemeris*, from Greek diction, the Latin interpretation of this is recorded in the first book of Sempronius

---

<sup>54</sup> See p. 24 n. 52.

<sup>55</sup> ‘Verum inter eos,’ inquit, ‘qui annales relinquere voluissent, et eos qui res gestas a Romanis perscribere conati essent, omnium rerum hoc interfuit. See note supra.

Asellio....'[writing *annales*] is a similar process to those who write a daily log, which the Greeks call 'dailies.'"

Yet in the middle of Isidore's entry "on the types of *historia*" elements of DS and Cicero's accounts surface:

*quaeque enim digna memoria domi militiaeque mari ac terrae per annos in commentariis acta sunt, ab anniversariis gestis annales nominaverunt. Historia autem multorum annorum vel temporum est, <...> cuius diligentia annui commentarii in libris delati sunt.* (Isid. 1.44.3-4)

"for those things which were worthy of memorialization, both at home and abroad, were noted in *commentarii* [commentaries?] on a year-to-year basis, and [the ancients] named them *annales* from the yearly record of events [*anniversariis gestis*]. Moreover, *historia* consists of many years and time periods <...> by whose diligence the annual *commentarii* were edited into books."

Frier is right to note the garbled syntax of the passage here; *historia* does not make sense as the antecedent of *cuius*. Rather, there was probably a note on the role of the Pontifex Maximus preceding the relative; the transition from pre-literary to literary forms of the chronicle would be overseen by the Pontifices.<sup>56</sup> *Cuius diligentia annui commentarii in libris delati sunt* would then make a parallel to DS' *cuius* [supply *Pontificis Maximi*] *diligentia annuos commentarios in octaginta libros veteres retulerunt*. Moreover, the archival material that is *digna memoria* corresponds to Cicero's *memoriaeque publicae retinendae causa* and, more closely, DS' *digna memoratu*.<sup>57</sup> The comment *historia autem multorum*

---

<sup>56</sup> The logic of this part of the passage would proceed 1) *annales* were year-by-year chronicles (*ab anniversariis gestis annales nominaverunt*, the representation here of the *annales* < *annus* etymology) 2) history writing began with the compilation of multiple years together into commentaries (*historia autem multorum annorum* = *annalium confectio*?) 3) historiographers were further aided by book forms of the *Annales Maximi*. The Pontifices would be key in all three phases of this process.

<sup>57</sup> See chart on p. 22-23.



*annorum vel temporum est* could then be interpreted, as the provided translation suggests, as related to Cicero's impression of the compilation of yearly records into a continuous collection, which then was primitively touted as *historia* (*erat enim historia nihil aliud nisi annalium confectio*).<sup>58</sup>

Finally, the concluding remarks of the passage match almost word-for-word those of S, which, it was argued earlier, may have come from Verrius:<sup>59</sup>

*inter historiam autem et annales hoc interest, quod historia est eorum temporum quae vidimus, annales vero sunt eorum annorum quos aetas nostra non novit. Unde Sallustius ex historia, Livius, Eusebius et Hieronymus ex annalibus et historia constant.* (Isid. 1.44.4)

"Between *historia* and *annales* moreover is the following difference, that is that *historia* concerns those times which we have witnessed, but *annales* concern those years which our generation does not recall."

*annales: inter historiam et annales hoc interest: historia est eorum temporum quae vel vidimus vel videre potuimus, dicta ἀπὸ τοῦ ἱστορεῖν, id est videre; annales vero sunt eorum temporum, quae aetas nostra non novit: unde Livius ex annalibus et historia constat.* (Serv. Aen. 1.373)

"Between *historia* and *annales* is the following difference: *historia* concerns those times which we have witnessed or could have witnessed, from ἱστορεῖν, which means 'to see'; but *annales* concern those times which our generation does not recall: hence Livy consists of a mixture of *annales* and *historia*."

Isidore's encyclopediac approach to historiography thus seems to derive from some synthesis of earlier views (more likely from an earlier intermediary than novel

---

<sup>58</sup> See p. 26 n. 56.

<sup>59</sup> The Verrian comparandum: *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; eamque esse opinionem quorundam, Verrius Flaccus refert in libro De Significatu verborum quarto. Ac se quidem dubitare super ea re dicit, posse autem videri putat nonnihil esse rationis in ea opinione, quod ἱστορία Graece significet rerum cognitionem praesentium* (Gell. 5.18.1-2).

research of his own). But this was not done indiscriminately. Asellio was a natural choice for explaining the “genres” of history writing available to Roman historiographers, and Asellio and Verrius’ dyad between *annales* and *historia* continues into Isidore and S. Part of the development of this tension was the purported difference in source material: *annales* came from the public chronicle, “analytic” *historia* from eye-witness knowledge. Isidore, Cicero and DS provide access to the next stage in the “argument,” positing both the archival motivation and process. There are two convenient aspects to their description of the *confectio annalium*, i.e. the transition from material to bookform *annales*: 1) the archives were kept on a haphazard intermediary, the *album*, which conveniently would have disappeared long ago because of age or warfare (e.g. Gallic sack) 2) the archives were compiled into book form, and hence were available at some point – using the pontificate of Mucius as a rough estimate – in the period that coincided with the “annalistic moyenne” of Chassignet, a stage in the course of Roman historiography that so many found overwrought and cumbersome to a fault. What should be clear is that the modern conception of the chronicle / *Annales Maximi* is entirely bound up in the opinion of these later sources on the quality and trajectory of Roman historiography. They are *not* independent witnesses to the archival tradition at Rome, but rather demonstrate the ways in which later rhetoric has warped the conception of the *Annales Maximi*, ancient and modern, from the minimalist,

contemporary account of Cato.<sup>60</sup> Thus, the apparent agreement of Isidore and later sources on the chronicle – who, of course, were even further removed from its original usage – cannot be adduced as evidence for a linear dissemination of local knowledge on the *Annales Maximi*, but must instead be recast as part of a tangled nexus of later, targeted speculation.<sup>61</sup>

The negative conception of the ERHs, and their relationship with public chronicles, can be attributed to the antagonism of first century BCE and later sources. During this period, there would have been an effort by the contemporary historiographic/ antiquarian community to distance itself from the burdensome historiographic trends of the previous century. Histories were now trending towards

---

<sup>60</sup> As Elliott writes: “The other surviving testimonies [besides Cato] all come from writers who, to the extent that they were not downright hostile to the annalistic tradition, considered it outmoded and undesirable. In consequence, these authors – Sempronius Asellio, Cicero, and Quintilian are the ones in question – view all the texts of the annalistic tradition as an undifferentiated set, making no attempt to differentiate among them. Indeed, the disdain these authors express for early Roman historiography as a whole is so profound that Cato himself tends to get mixed up with *annales*. In these authors’ accounts, *annales* represent all that is inadequate in Roman historical writing” (Elliott 2013: 30). Frier also comments that Cicero and the later sources “reflect no contemporary understanding of the tabula, but rather, at best, such currents of accepted beliefs as survived in their own time” (Frier 1999: 83).

<sup>61</sup> I have neglected several late sources in this treatment. The etymology given by Paulus – i.e. *Annales Maximi* < Pontifex Maximus – dates at least to Cicero, though its appearance here is attributed by Frier to Verrius Flaccus and his like-titled *De Verborum Significatu* (Frier 1999: 47): *Maximi Annales appellabantur, non magnitudine, sed quod eos pontifex maximus confecisset* (Paulus p. 113 L). Quintilian is worth remarking on in so far as he too posits the *Annales Maximi* as the origin of Roman historiography, and tacitly compares the transmission process from the *Annales Maximi* to the ERHs to Livius Andronicus’ translation of the *Odyssey*: *turpe etiam illud est, contentum esse id consequi quod imiteris. nam rursus quid erat futurum, si nemo plus effecisset eo quem sequebatur? nihil in poetis supra Livium Andronicum, nihil in historiis supra Pontificum Annales haberemus* (Quint. Inst. Or. 10.2.7). Finally, Macrobius shows clear affinities with the accounts of Cicero and DS (later reproduced in Isidore): *Pontificem Aenean vel ex nomine referendorum laborum eius ostendit. Pontificibus enim permissa est potestas memoriam rerum gestarum in tabulas conferendi, et hos Annales appellant et quidem Maximos quasi a Pontificibus Maximis factos* (Macr.3.2.17).

more manageable limits – in temporal scope at least, more so than the lengths of histories – with a newfound focus on analysis versus historical *minutiae*.<sup>62</sup> Early historiographers were archaized, consigned to roles like Hellanicus' and Acusilaus' in the Greek historiographic tradition, early copyists/horographers that did not yet understand the *exemplary* role of history writing.

Modern opinions of the methodology of the ERHs can be likewise self-interested. In the face of the admittedly “thin and desultory” evidence, Cornell is still compelled to defend the baseline narrative of “annalistic” history, and its origin in direct, documentary evidence: “But on the positive side the important thing is to have established that the elementary framework, skeletal though it is, does indeed rest on a solid documentary base.... The information survives because it was perserved in documents like the *Annales Maximi*.”<sup>63</sup> One can guess the motivation here; for the *modern* historian, writing a *modern* history of early Rome, the state of the evidence is an inconvenient truth. The task likely wouldn't have be any easier for the ERHs, but they

---

<sup>62</sup> Though not in all historians; see Oakley's comments on Valerius Antias' fixation with adjusting death toll figures (Oakley 1997: 89-90).

<sup>63</sup> Cornell 1995: 15. cf. Cornell 2013 (1): 157 (restated). “The notion of the ‘hard core’ is equally difficult. For the kind of information which is normally authentic might have been invented on occasions by an annalist as part of his ‘plausible’ elaboration; and material which one would normally regard with suspicion might in fact be authentic (this is especially likely to be true of parts of book ix and x). As we have said, there is in fact no yardstick by which such a hard core in L.’s narrative can be ascertained. Thus one has to follow the age-old procedure of judging each case on its merits; but it is important to add that this is not the same as accepting annalistic information unless it is proved to be wrong – an absurd procedure given the inadequacies of our sources” (Oakley 1997: 101-2). cf. Frier 1999: 284.

were not constrained by *modern* historical methodology, and their achievements cannot be understood under such parameters.

## Evolving Modern Views

Once the ERHs are freed from a close dependence upon the chronicle in structure and content, a host of new avenues are opened for further exploration, and the following chapter will be dedicated to examining the ERHs on their own terms and merit. The first implication is obvious and fundamental: the ERHs may not have always organized their histories on a year-to-year, strictly chronological, basis. This is a possibility that has already been explored for the early epic “histories,” Ennius’ *Annales* and Naevius’ *Bellum Punicum*. Elliott has demonstrated the ways in which assumptions about the chronological ordering of Ennius’ *Annales*, founded primarily on notional descent from the *Annales Maximi*, have profoundly, and arbitrarily, corrupted editorial presentation of his fragments.<sup>64</sup> Likewise, a “gigantomachic” fragment of Naevius’ *Bellum Punicum* has spawned a series of discussions about an inset ecphrasis at the

---

<sup>64</sup> Elliott esp. 2013: 18ff., *contra* Skutsch: “Ennius called his poem *Annales*, taking the title from the priestly records, and he followed these records also in writing *praescriptis consulum nominibus* (Serv. *Aen.* 1.373)...The *Annales Maximi* may even have put into the poet’s mind the original idea of recording all Roman history in verse” (Skutsch 1985: 6-7). Elliott has also shown on what slim grounds Skutsch and others have adduced “annalistic” markers in Ennius’ *Annales*: “it is a small group of isolated fragments that account for a fraction of our current collection, smaller still of the work at large” (Elliott 2013: 52-54).

temple of Agrigentum.<sup>65</sup> This would have mirrored Aeneas' retelling of the Trojan War in *Aeneid* 2, all spawned by the temple-carvings at temple of Juno in Carthage (Verg. *Aen.* 1.453ff.).<sup>66</sup> The corollary notion that the ERHs may have used other – i.e. not “annalistic” – chronological principles is gaining steam. Nonetheless, there is much progress to be made.

Let us take the case of Fabius Pictor. Dionysius reports that Fabius Pictor gave a foundation date in the 8th Olympiad:<sup>67</sup>

τὸν δὲ τελευταῖον γενόμενον τῆς Ῥώμης οἰκισμὸν ἢ κτίσιν ἢ ὅτι δῆποτε χρῆ  
καλεῖν Τίμαιος μὲν ὁ Σικελιώτης οὐκ οἶδ' ὅτῳ κανόνι χρησάμενος ἅμα  
Καρχηδόνη κτιζομένη γενέσθαι φησὶν ὀγδόῳ καὶ τριακοστῷ πρότερον ἔτει  
τῆς πρώτης Ὀλυμπιάδος. Λεύκιος δὲ Κίγκιος ἀνὴρ τῶν ἐκ τοῦ βουλευτικοῦ  
συνεδρίου περὶ τὸ τέταρτον ἔτος τῆς δωδεκάτης Ὀλυμπιάδος. Κόϊντος δὲ  
Φάβιος κατὰ τὸ πρῶτον ἔτος τῆς ὀγδόης Ὀλυμπιάδος. Κάτων δὲ Πόρκιος  
Ἑλληνικὸν μὲν οὐχ ὀρίζει χρόνον, ἐπιμελὴς δὲ γενόμενος, εἰ καὶ τις ἄλλος,  
περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν τῆς ἀρχαιολογουμένης ἱστορίας ἔτεσιν ἀποφαίνει δυοὶ  
καὶ τριάκοντα καὶ τετρακοσίοις ὑστεροῦσαν τῶν Ἰλιακῶν (Dion. Hal. 1.74.1-2  
= 8 C)

“But Timaeus the Sicilian says that the foundation of Rome – or *ktisis* or whatchamacallit – occurred in the thirty-eighth year before the first Olympiad [814/813 BCE], at the same time as Carthage. What chronology he used I do not know. On the other hand, L. Cincius, a man of the senate, says it was around the

---

<sup>65</sup> A thesis originating in Stryzelecki's *De Naeviano Belli Punici Carmine Quaestiones Selectae* (1935), and mostly recently revisited in Dufallo 2013: 16-21. Barchiesi stresses caution on this interpretation (Barchiesi 1962: 271-3).

<sup>66</sup> Prisc. *Inst. gramm.* 6 p. 198 Hertz = 19 Barchiesi. On Aeneas' speech after the shipwreck Servius comments *et totus hic locus de Naevio belli Punici libro translatus est* (Serv. *Aen.* 198). This suggests another Vergilian–Naevian pairing (of speeches) that would have proceeded the two paired ecphrases.

<sup>67</sup> It may be safe to suppose that Dionysius has not interpolated the Olympiadic system into Fabius' text from a corresponding quote of Solinus: *Cincio Romam duodecima olympiade placet conditam: Pictori octava* (Solin. 1.27). cf. Cornell 2013 (3): 22.

fourth year of the twelfth Olympiad [729/728 BCE], and Q. Fabius at the first year of the eighth Olympiad [748/747 BCE]. Yet Porcius Cato still does not date by Hellenic chronology, taking as much care as possible for the compilation of history, and demonstrates that the foundation was four hundred and thirty two years after the Trojan War. This date, mapped onto that in the *Chronologies* of Eratosthenes, falls in the first year of the seventh Olympiad [752/751 BCE].”

Most scholars have accepted the notion that Fabius (and others) made an attempt to synchronize Rome’s foundation within a Hellenic dating schema, but dismiss out of hand the idea that these strategies could have persisted later into the work.<sup>68</sup> In other words, once the ERHs reached the Republican period in their histories, consular dating was the only option available to them. Moreover, this argument is buttressed by the claim that later, annalistic historians could not or would not cite an ERH not employing annalistic ordering. Since Livy and others appeal to the ERHs on the early Republic, no other thematic or periodic dating could have been used – or so the logic goes.<sup>69</sup> Not only does such assertion gloss over evidence to the contrary – to which I will soon turn – but it downplays the moment of the *Graeci annales* of Fabius and Cincius beginning with

---

<sup>68</sup> “Few, for example, conceive of the later part of Fabius’ narrative not being annalistic; but plenty have thought differently about his account of the early republic” (Northwood 2007: 99). This, however, depends on ideas about the partitions of Fabius’ history, i.e. what was treated summarily and what at length. Northwood is right to challenge the *communis opinio* on the structure of Fabius’ history, but his translations of Dionysius’ famous κεφαλαϊκῶς remark are unsound, and damage his interpretation (Northwood 2007: 102-103).

<sup>69</sup> “Had Pictor used [a thematic] system, he would not have written within an annalistic framework and hence would not have been cited by annalists for events of that period - just as Cato, who eschewed consular names (Nepos, *Cato* 3.4), is not to our knowledge cited by annalists save once, and then by Livy (34.15.9)” (Frier 1999: 259-260). Compare the almost verbatim language of Dillery 2002: 7. There is probably not cause to single out Cato on this account; Hemina is not cited by later “annalists,” and his “annalistic” affiliation is not generally doubted.

Hellenic chronology.<sup>70</sup> Even Cato, whose history was the first to appear in Latin, resorted to using a pan-Mediterranean – if not downright Hellenic – foundation *comparandum*, the Trojan War. Hemina, likewise, synchronized the lives of Homer and Hesiod within the reigns of the Alban Kings using the Trojan War and foundation of Rome as anchor points.<sup>71</sup> In light of these facts, it seems hasty to assume that the ERHs would not consult non-annalistic historiographers. On the contrary, Fabius is supposed to have closely followed Diocles of Peparethus, a 4th/3rd century BC Hellenic historiographer, who is unlikely to have organized annalistically: Διοκλῆς Πεπαρήθιος, ὃν καὶ Φάβιος ὁ Πίκτωρ ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ἐπηκολούθηκε, “Diocles of Peparethus, whom Fabius Pictor followed on most occasions” (Plut. Rom. 3.1).<sup>72</sup> Fabius also engaged directly with Timaeus on the foundation date: if Timaeus had indeed synchronized the foundations of the two Western Mediterranean foes, as Dionysius suggests, Fabius’ correction represents some form of jingoistic reaction.<sup>73</sup>

At least for the early period, there is more evidence that Fabius played with chronology. Fabius seems to have dated the Rape of Sabine Women upon his newly

---

<sup>70</sup> Clarke’s comments on this implication are of interest. She examines the dialogue between Roman historians and the Greek historiographic community and *vice versa* – e.g. Polybius’ view on the meteoric rise of Rome (Clarke 2008: 155-156).

<sup>71</sup> *de Homero et Hesiodo inter omnes fere scriptores constitit <...> utrumque tamen ante Romam conditam vixisse Silviis Albae regnantibus annis post bellum Troianum – ut Cassius in primo Annalium de Homero atque Hesiodo scriptum reliquit – plus centum atque sexaginta* (Gell. 17.21.3 = 12 C). cf. Rawson 1991: 249.

<sup>72</sup> cf. Jacoby 1949: 64.

<sup>73</sup> Feeney 2007: 96.



established AUC framework: τετάρτῳ δὲ μηνὶ μετὰ τὴν κτίσιν, ὡς Φάβιος ἱστορεῖ, τὸ περὶ τὴν ἀρπαγὴν ἐτολμήθη τῶν γυναικῶν, “in the fourth month after the founding – as Fabius tells in his history – the Rape of the Sabine Women was perpetrated” (Plut. *Rom.* 14.1). Dillery has suggested this may be an example of “proto-antiquarianism,” an interpolation based upon the four month gap in the Roman religious calendar between the Parilia, the celebration of Rome’s birthday, and the Consualia, which was the supposed stage for the original wife-stealing.<sup>74</sup> A similar sort of calculation may have been applied to the reign of Ascanius and the Alban king list, with a base of 30 year generations used to fill the gap between the Trojan war and the foundation of Rome.<sup>75</sup>

The most important evidence concerns the consulship of Lucius Sextus:

*Quapropter tum primum ex plebe alter consul factus est duo et vicesimo anno postquam Romam Galli ceperunt* (Gell. 5.4 = 23 C)

---

<sup>74</sup> Dillery 2002: 7-8. cf. Alföldi 1965: 127; Cornell 2013 (3): 23-24.

<sup>75</sup> The 30 piglet prodigy could have been the achetype for this, which prophesied that Ascanius would found Alba Longa in 30 years (Diod. Sic. 7.5.4-5 = 5 C). cf. Hdt. 1.142.2 for 33 1/3 year generations. The following is a rough – and purely speculative – reconstruction of how this calculation could have worked: The Alban lists, assuming they represent Pictor’s invention, usually have 14 generations of kings (Livy 1.3 ; Dion. Hal. 1.70-71), and so 14 kings \* 30 year reigns = 420 years + 747 BC (Fabian foundation date) = 1167 BC Trojan War date. This 420 year span closely corresponds to the sum of each of the individual reigns listed in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (426 years). If this figure (426) were added to the Fabian foundation date instead, this would give a date of Aeneas’ arrival in Italy of 1173 BC, ten years after the traditional date of Eratosthenes of 1183 BC (*BNJ* 241 F 1b). If an additional ten years were granted Aeneas for his *nostos* wanderings – as with Odysseus – then the Fabian chronology would exactly correspond with that of Eratosthenes. What this might suggest is that 1) Fabius roughly estimated the number of kings needed to fill the 436 year gap between his foundation date and the Trojan War using 30 year generations/reigns 2) this came out unevenly (~14.5 kings necessary) 3) Fabius added an extra 6 years spread amongst various Alban reigns, and then another 10 years, for the traditional post-Troy Mediterranean migrant (total of 420 + 16 = 436). For the sake of variety, individual reigns were lengthened and shortened – though some may have been established in oral tradition anyway – to reach this target number of 426 years.

“Therefore, then for the first time one of the consuls was elected from the plebs in the 22nd year after the Gauls sacked Rome”<sup>76</sup>

This fragment does not prove that Fabius organized his work in a radical way, i.e. thematically. What it does show, however, is within his chronological framework there was latitude to highlight landmark moments of Roman history.<sup>77</sup> The Gallic Sack was to form an ideological watershed in later histories – particularly in Quadrigarius and Livy – and its importance may ultimately derive from Fabius’ treatment of it, if the fragment under consideration is anything to go by.<sup>78</sup> It is probably not a coincidence then that a political achievement that marked the true end of the Struggle of the Orders is juxtaposed to the recent catastrophe at the hands of the Gauls; “look at how well Rome rebounded in 22 years!”

Koptev has shown the ways in which Fabius, Cincius, and Piso insert famous Roman historical events – e.g. the foundation, interregnum, and Gallic Sack – into Greek

---

<sup>76</sup> This may be as close as we come in the extant record to a direct quotation of Fabius – Gellius is quoting from a book of his *annales* at a bookseller’s shop. The fact remains that the quote is given in Latin rather than the original Greek.

<sup>77</sup> cf. Northwood 2007: 102. This is a flexibility shared in two fragments of Cato’s *Origines* as well (Vell. Pat. 1.7.2 = 3.1 C; Non. p.142 Lindsay = Gell. 10.1.10 = 4.9 C). The first fragment uses AUC dating, the second comments on the interval between the First and Second Punic Wars.

<sup>78</sup> Quadrigarius began his history after the Gallic Sack, while Livy’s opening to Book 6 makes it clear that a refoundation of Rome – both of the city and the historical record – is occurring: *Quae ab condita urbe Roma ad captam eandem Romani sub regibus primum, consulibus deinde ac dictatoribus decemvirisque ac tribunis consularibus gessere, foris bella, domi seditiones, quinque libris exposui, res cum vetustate nimia obscuras velut quae magno ex intervallo loci vix cernuntur, tum quid rarae per eadem tempora litterae fuere, una custodia fidelis memoriae rerum gestarum, et quod, etiam si quae in commentariis pontificum aliisque publicis privatisque erant monumentis, incensa urbe pleraeque interiere. Clariora deinceps certioraque ab secunda origine velut ab stirpibus laetius feraciusque renatae urbis gesta domi militiaeque exponentur* (Livy 6.1.1). See Kraus 1994: *ad loc.*; Feeney 2007: 102.

frameworks, all following the lead of Timaeus. This creates a dialectic of complex, overlapping chronological systems both within the Roman tradition and between the Roman and Greek traditions.<sup>79</sup> Koptev's account brilliantly demonstrates the fragility of the notion of an "annalistic" framework for Roman historiography, and deserves more attention.<sup>80</sup>

"[Timaeus'] chronological scheme is known to have been re-elaborated by the first Roman historians, Q. Fabius Pictor and L. Cincius Alimentus, although they may have used other principles of chronological reckoning. Second-century annalists filled the gaps between chronological milestones with annual proceedings embellished with 'secondary narrative,' while the key episodes of Roman history took on the significance of 'structural facts.' How reliable were these 'structural facts' that went back to Timaeus?"

Koptev's eventual conclusion is that these foundational dates were manipulated for rhetorical purposes, e.g. synchronism, and offer little historical "truth" value.<sup>81</sup>

In general, scholars are moving away from the *Annales Maximi* as the principle source of the ERHs, and understanding the (later) artificiality of the annalistic form.<sup>82</sup> The versatility of *Annales*, as a genre, is beginning to be examined. Elliott has probably recovered the original meaning of *Annales* to Ennius, not "a year-by-year history *ab urbe*

---

<sup>79</sup> Koptev's charts (2010: 47, 49) are especially helpful. cf. Cornell 2013 (3) 22-23; Feeney 2007: 84-86.

<sup>80</sup> Koptev 2010: 6.

<sup>81</sup> Koptev 2010: 44ff.

<sup>82</sup> See p. 4 n. 7.

*condita*,” but rather “a history of the Roman people.”<sup>83</sup> I would argue that this is the case in the ERHs as well; the *Annales Maximi* were inspirational in so far as they were the (purported) public records of Rome, but were not the ultimate determinants in the style and content of the early histories.<sup>84</sup>

### **Methodology of this study**

What remains is to survey the fragments themselves in order to test our picture of the ERHs against the evidence as it survives. Due caution must be exercised at all points to underscore the ways in which our quoting authorities may have cherry-picked or otherwise misrepresented their source material in the ERHs. A safeguard against these localized distortions is to look at broad, thematic trends in the fragments. In this case, “aetiological” fragments of the ERHs will form the focus. There is a logic for this choice: 1) It is generally supposed that this kind of analytic thinking is a product of the antiquarian movement in the first century BC<sup>85</sup> 2) these sections of the narrative would be inherently un-“annalistic,” in so far as they shift between contemporary culture, ancient historical precedents, and all the steps in between 3) these episodes would provide insight into the personal contribution of the historiographers, as they attempt

---

<sup>83</sup> Elliott 2013: 22.

<sup>84</sup> cf. Frier 1999: 276-284.

<sup>85</sup> The attribution of all aetiological material in quotes to an unspecified “Cincius” to L. Cincius the antiquarian, despite the broad data set of aetiologies in the ERHs compiled in the second chapter (on L. Cincius see p. 108-110), is a case in point. Rawson downdates the generic split between *annales* and antiquarian works to the 1st Century BCE, and emphasizes the role of L. Aelius Stilo in this fissuring (Rawson 1991: 245).

patriotic explanations of the evolution of fundamental cultural institutions and identities at Rome. Especially on this last point, the ERHs begin to look more like literary contributions – e.g. the poetic “histories” of the second century BC, to which they are closer in date – and less like the later annalistic style preserved in parts of Livy / Tacitus.

To merely catalogue all uses of aetiology in Roman Republican historiography would be beyond the scope of this study – a telling fact perhaps in itself – and it is now essential to enumerate precisely what is meant by “ERHs.” This experiment is circumscribed to only a subset of Roman historians from Fabius Pictor to Cassius Hemina. There are grounds for this selection (beyond paring down our sources to a manageable amount of material). One objective is to situate Cato within the development of Roman historiography. Cato’s *Origines* is usually considered of a different genre than annalistic history proper, and so its particular quirks – e.g. aetiology, lack of consular dating – are discarded as a sort of “dead end” in the scope of Roman historiography. The present study suggests, on the contrary, that aetiology was present from the very start of the tradition, though Catonian influence is very likely in the later authors of our subgrouping (particularly Hemina, who writes in Latin). Unfortunately, a re-evaluation of the *Origines* will not be possible in these chapters, but the groundwork may be set.

Another reason for this selection of the ERH authors is that they *do* seem to be of a different character than later Roman historiographers. In including Hemina, I slightly modify Chassignet's designation between the early and middle annalists, but these categories are, to some degree, arbitrary and must undergo slippage at points.<sup>86</sup> There is a heavier emphasis on rationalization and guesswork in the ERHs, rather than the factfinding and factchecking of pedantic details in the later tradition, and this may be reflected in their citations (or lack thereof) in Livy; later "annalists" had different interests.<sup>87</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup> Chassignet's designation of early vs. middle annalists does not rest on good grounds. In fact, she produces Cicero (*De Orat.* 53-54; *De Leg.* 1.6-7) as an authority for this editorial decision – hardly a trustworthy literary critic (Chassignet 1996 (2): VII-VIII). Furthermore, she claims that the middle annalists composed their histories in *otium*: "*à l'instar de leurs prédécesseurs de l'annalistique ancienne, se sont adonnés à l'écriture pendant leurs loisirs, ou plus vraisemblablement après en avoir terminé avec leur carrière politique*" (ibid. VIII). This is puzzling considering so little is known about the publication dates of the early *Annales*, and Chassignet herself suggests that Cincius wrote *after* his career had finished in the 2nd Punic War, and Cato, according to Nepos, only began writing history as a *senex*, (*senex historias scribere instituit*, Nepos *Cato* 3). Forsythe invites the tempting possibility that none of the ERHs were properly "annalists," but that the form began with Piso (Forsythe 1994: 42; cf. Fornara 1983: 26; Wiseman 1979: 12-13).

<sup>87</sup> Fabius Pictor (cited 6 times), Cincius Alimentus (2), Postimius Albinus (0), Acilius (2), Hemina (0) vs. Calpurnius Piso Frugi (6), Coelius Antipater (10), Claudius Quadrigarius (12), Licinius Macer (7), and Valerius Antias (33). It is telling that 5 of the 6 fragments of Pictor preserved by Livy come from the first decade; Livy is interested in appealing to Pictor's authority only on early Roman history. Moreover, he is interested mostly in Fabius' figures, such as those for a census (1.44.2 = 14 C), the cost of the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus (1.55.7-9 = 15 C), the lifespan of Coriolanus (12.40.10-11 = 21 C), the question of a dedication of spoils (8.30.8-10 = 24 C), and on a province allotment and temple dedication (10.37.14 = 25 C). In these fragments Fabius' antiquity is often paraded: *eo magis Fabio, praeterquam quod antiquior est, crediderim* (15 C); *Apud Fabium, longe antiquissimum auctorum* (21 C). Using Valerius Antias as a case study for the middle and late "annalists" – he is by far the best preserved with 33 fragments – it appears that these sources had a much more even distribution in Livy's work. Antias is first cited in Book 3 (3.5.12-13 = 20 C) and regularly thereafter up until Book 45 (45.43.8 = 55 C).

## CHAPTER 2

### *Aetiological Thinking in the ERHs*

The aim of this chapter is to investigate the degree to which “aetiologies,” and what is dubbed here as “aetiological thinking,” featured in the ERHs.<sup>88</sup> By this terminology what is meant is the preoccupation with the origins of various cultural institutions and physical artifacts within the Italian landscape (e.g. a set of inscriptions, a temple foundation). This kind of rationalization, however false, speaks to a more nuanced engagement with historical data than a supposed slavish devotion to accurately relaying the dry “facts” of the *Annales Maximi*. It is in these aetiological passages, despite their corrupted and fragmentary state, that the development of a nationalistic historiographic voice is most apparent. Moreover, they demonstrate that the ERHs cannot have been so narrowly confined to chronology as the “annalistic” ordering implies. These aetiologies, by their nature, are digressive, a-linear, and often downright anachronistic. The general investigative process will be familiar to those acquainted with later antiquarianism: (c) modern cultural institution/artifact originates from its original instantiation or foundation (a), often with an intermediate step (b)

---

<sup>88</sup> General discussions of aetiology in the ERHs: Beck 2007: 264; Chassignet 2008: 40-41; Rawson 1991: esp. 246-264. Chassignet is much more cautious in assigning aetiological fragments within my grouping of ERHs (save in Hemina). See p. 95 n. 168 for my designations.

posited to explain the evolution of the subject over time. The endgame of these aetiologies is not to preserve a chronologic progression (a)-(b)-(c), but rather to show the ways in which Roman topography, religious practices, and monuments engage present-day Rome with its mythopoeic past.

Aetiologies will be broken into subgroupings under the headings “toponyms/ethnonyms,” “etymology,” and “extended aetiologies” (further subdivided into mythical/historical). These distinctions entail a degree of arbitrariness as, especially in this last category, the ERHs often made use of multiple aetiological strategies to tackle any one subject. There is also a deal of slippage between categories; for instance, any naming scheme will intrinsically involve a degree of etymology. By etymologies then I mean those instances in which the etymology *is* the *action* itself. Thus, even though the logic behind the proposed derivation *Crustumium* < *Clytemnestra* (discussed p. 48) is obviously based on etymological grounds, the way in which it is articulated is as a *ktisis/toponym/ethnonym* —i.e. the founder of the city named his city after his wife, as for *Lavinium* < *Lavinia* — and so it is grouped rather with these strategies. In this schematization, a “simple” etymology would look like *Novensiles* < *novus* and < *novem* (discussed p. 66). Here there is little to no rationale given beyond the orthography of the word itself. In fact, the fundamental nature of these obscure gods, the *Novensiles*, seems to be at stake; are they “new” or are they “nine” in number or both? In other words, our



source, in this case Cincius, had very little clue or access to the origins of these divinities, and so has resorted to designing one of his own using etymology.<sup>89</sup>

Again, one should not attach negative value judgements to these various strategies of the ERHs. In the previous chapter, issues regarding the transmission of a historical record at Rome were addressed. The conclusions, though necessarily not authoritative, were in the negative. The ERHs, like modern historians, tasked themselves with reconstructing a continuous narrative out of suboptimal conditions; there simply could not have been the evidence necessary to reproduce anything resembling a continuous, faithful account of Roman history from its foundation or even the Early Republic. Rather the aim of my approach will not be to ascertain the validity of the ERHs' conception of Roman history, but rather to examine its actual instantiation. This is why the appearance of aetiology is important; aetiology, at its core, implies several things: 1) the personal investment of our sources in their own past 2) an innovative tack in the face of poor evidence<sup>90</sup> 3) organization systems based on thematic constructions (e.g. geography, ethnography) rather than only temporal (and linear)

---

<sup>89</sup> Discussed p. 66.

<sup>90</sup> This may seem to imply that the Romans thought the material/historical evidence for their early history was "poor," but that is not intended here. Rather what is meant is that by modern standards the basis of Early Roman history, *as told by Romans*, is precarious. Without a modern *comparandum*, the Romans could not have known that they had particularly poor access to their past. Chronographers in Greece were one analogy drawn (hence Hellanicus' mention in the *de Oratore*, but Jacoby has shown that chronicles had a very different role in Athens and Rome (Jacoby 1949: 62-63). Romans were acutely aware of the lateness with which historiography, and literature itself, arrived at Rome. This perceived inferiority and embarrassment may have led later Romans to attach a validity to their august priestly chronicles that is *prima facie* highly improbable. This conception in turn has entirely tainted modern ones on the chronicle.

ones. These various aspects have been somewhat eroded by the general impression given by scholars that the “annalistic” tradition was one continuous tradition employing a single, basic methodology, that is consulting the *Annales Maximi* directly (or consulting someone who had, so goes the logic). In sum, the traditional conception of the “annalists” does not satisfyingly explain the content of the ERHs in the preserved fragments, nor the prominence of other types of thinking in the ERHs, including the role of “aetiological thinking” in narratology, and this will become clear as the chapter progresses.

## **Toponyms/Ethnonyms**

### **Rome**

Toponyms and ethnonyms played a role in Roman historiography from the very start. A prominent example comes from an inscription preserved in Tauromenium dating from circa 125 BC, and discovered in 1969. In sketch, it outlines the content and scope of Fabius' early, mythical history. Unknown to Peter and other early editors, this inscription has been placed as Fabius Pictor's first fragment in the editions of Chassignet and Beck-Walter.<sup>91</sup> Essentially, it gives a chronologically ordered catalogue

---

<sup>91</sup> = T 7 in Cornell 2013 (2).

of Roman heroes, all of whom - presumably by their inclusion in this summary - seem to have played a major role in the early sections of Fabius' work. The inscription proceeds first with Heracles' arrival in Italy, the *nostos* of Lanoios, his allies Aeneas and Ascanius, then "much later" with Romulus, Remus, and the foundation of Rome:

Κόιντος Φάβιος ὁ Πικτωρῖνος ἐπικαλούμενος, Ῥωμαῖος, Γαίου υἱός ...  
ὅς] ἱστόρηκεν τὴν Ἡρακλέους ἄφιξιν εἰς] Ἰταλίαν καὶ δ' ἔτι νόστον Λανοίου συμμάχου τε Αἰνεία καὶ Ἀσκανίου πολὺ ὥστε ῥον ἐγένοντο Ῥωμύλος καὶ Ῥέμος καὶ Ῥώμης κτίσις ὑπὸ Ῥωμύλου, [ὅς] πρῶτος βεβασίλευκεν

"Quintus Fabius, called Pictor, a Roman, son of Gaius... who narrated the arrival of Heracles into Italy and then the *nostos* of *Lanoios*, and that of his ally Aeneas and Ascanius, and [how] much later Romulus and Remus were born, and the foundation of Rome by Romulus, who was the first to rule."

The inscription is dense with topographic references. "Lanoios, ally of Aeneas and Ascanius" has generally been taken to be an eponym for Lanuvium.<sup>92</sup> Before the arrival

---

<sup>92</sup> Beck-Walter 2001 (1): 63-64; Chassignet 1996 (1): 16 n. 4; Frier 1999: 231. Fabius' *action* seems to have met competition; Appian lists Diomedes as the founder of Lanuvium (App. *Civ.* 2.20). There may be a motivation behind the inclusion of the otherwise recondite Trojan, *Lanoios*: Lanuvium was a member of the Latin League, and thus a signatory to the *Foedus Cassianum* of 493 BC, which acknowledged the superior position of Rome within the League. Lanoios may have been (re)mentioned during or after the Latin Wars, highlighting the shared Trojan heritage of the belligerents. Chassignet posits instead that the *communio sacrorum* shared by Lanuvium and Rome was inaugurated by a mythic episode of the striking of a *foedus* between Lanoios and Aeneas— an equally tantalizing retrojective ploy.

of the Trojans, however, Fabius narrated the Ηρακλεους ἀφιξιν , which may have served as an *aetion* for the *Ara Maxima* and the various rites of Heracles' conducted in the *Forum Boarium*. Heracles' Italian travels would receive an extensive treatment later in Cassius Hemina (discussed p. 80-87), and continued to fascinate Roman writers into the Augustan Era.<sup>93</sup> That in Pictor Heracles reprised his role as a "civilizer" seems likely, especially with his prominent placement in the inscription; Heracles must kill monsters "first" before cities can be founded.<sup>94</sup> Moreover, Heracles' adventures in Italy, through their connection with his Western exploits in Spain (the Cattle of Geryon labor), were a way of forging an East-West axis in early Roman history. The Hercules (-Cacus?) episode was a sophisticated narrative linkage, meant to set Rome on level footing within early Greek mythohistory, prominent even as early as Pictor, who seems to have navigated around various Western mediterranean *topoi*.<sup>95</sup>

Lastly, the final lines of the inscription make the Rome < Romulus toponym quite clear. The visual display of the inscription helps highlight "Fabian" pairings: Romulus and Rome, as endlines, would have been visually displayed atop one another (Ῥωμύλος... Ῥώμης... Ῥωμύλου) – perhaps Fabius too was as explicit as the epigraphist at Tauromenium. Within this inscriptional tension is the dyad Ῥωμύλος | καὶ Ῥέμος

---

<sup>93</sup> cf. Ovid *Fasti* 542 ff.; Prop. 4.9; Verg. *Aen.* 8.185ff..

<sup>94</sup> Frier 1999: 231.

<sup>95</sup> Perhaps Pictor drew motivation from Timaeus, a 4th/3rd century Sicilian historiographer, who wrote an *Italika and Sikelika* and a *Hellenika and Sikelika* (Suda s.v. = BNJ 566 T 1).

Remus notably appearing only on the lefthand side of the inscription, Ῥωμύλος... Ῥώμης... Ῥωμύλου all on the righthand side. Finally, the relative clause ὅς | πρῶτος βεβασίλευκεν seems to have an explanatory force, i.e. Rome is named after Romulus "because he was the first to rule it." This reading would insinuate that Fabius treated the foundation of Rome aetiologically, as Ennius would famously: *certabant urbem Romam Remoramne vocarent* (77 Skutsch), the winner receiving the honor of toponym status.

## Sicily

Fabius included another set of toponyms early in his history, the Sicilian brothers Helymus and Eryx: *Fabius Helymum regem in Sicilia genitum, Erycis fratrem fuisse dicit*, "Fabius said that king Helymus was born in Sicily, and that he was the brother of Eryx" (Serv. *Aen.* 5.73 = 4 C). Helymus was the ethnonym for the Elymi who, consequently, inhabited the prominent Sicilian city Eryx. These peoples had featured in earlier Greek historiography, both in Hellanicus and Thucydides. According to Thucydides, the *Elumoi* were refugees from Troy that settled in western Sicily (Thuc. 6.2). Hellanicus claims instead that the Sicels, then living in Italy, migrated in two waves into Sicily, the first of which contained the *Elumoi* (Dion. Hal. 1.22 = FGrH 4 F 79b). This happened three generations before the Trojan war, τρίτῃ γενεᾷ προτερον τῶν Τρωικῶν. It appears that Fabius inserted himself into this migration argument, stressing

that king Helymus was *in Sicilia genitum*, i.e. that he was born *after* the migration to Sicily. In another fragment, Fabius seems to connect the Volscians with these Sicilian migrations: *Fabius quoque a Siculis profectos corrupto nomine Vulscos ait dictos*, “Fabius also says that those who set off from Sicily were called the Volscians” (Isid. *Etym.* 4.7.1-5 = 22 C).

Sicily also caught the attention of Cassius Hemina early in his work. He posits a Sicilian named "Archilochus" as the founder of Aricia: *Notum est... consitutam... Ariciam ab Archilocho Siculo, unde et nomen, ut Heminae placet, tractum*, “it is known that Aricia was established by Archilochus the Sicilian, from whom the name was also taken, as it appealed to Hemina” (Solin. 2.10 = 2 C). The next fragment has been grouped together, presumably, by its geographic focus: *Cassius Hemina tradidit Siculum quendam nomine uxoris suae Clytemnestrae condidisse Clytemestrum, mox corrupto nomine Crustumerium dictum*, “Cassius Hemina hands down that some Sicilian founded the city Clytemnestrum under the name of his own wife, and that it was called Crustumerium after the name was soon corrupted” (Serv. Auct. *ad Aen.* 7.631 = 3 C). Dionysius' account is clearly in a different vein, where Crustumerium is twice reckoned as an Alban colony that well predated Rome itself (Dion. Hal. *AR* 2.36; 2.53).<sup>96</sup> In the latter of these references, Dionysius mentions a myth that Nomentum, Crustumerium, and Fidenae were each founded by three brothers from Alba Longa. On the other hand, Cassius, as

---

<sup>96</sup> ἀλλὰ καὶ ταύτην ἐποίησεν ἄποικον Ῥωμαίων τὴν πόλιν ὥσπερ τὰς προτέρας (Dion. Hal. *AR* 2.36).

Fabius, appears to be forging a connection between archaic Latium/ Apennine Italy and Sicily in the opening books of his work.<sup>97</sup>

Part of this connection would have been some sort of East-West migration, as the Greek name *Clytemnestra* bears witness. Solinus, shortly after listing the Italian cities and their founders – hence came Hemina 2 C (= Solin. 2.10) on Aricia – again quoted Hemina on Aeneas' recovery of the Palladium from Diomedes (Solin. 2.14 = 8 C). It is not inconceivable then, by the proximity and subject matter of the two quotes, that Solinus or, more probably, an earlier source is ultimately drawing from the same part of Hemina's history.<sup>98</sup> Solinus' second citation reinforces this notion: *ubi dum simulacrum, quod secum ex Sicilia advexerat, dedicat Veneri matri quae Frutis dicitur, a Diomede Palladium suscepit...*, "after [Aeneas] dedicated the icon which he had brought from Sicily to his mother Venus under the name *Frutis*, he fetched the Palladium from Diomedes (Solin 2.14 = 8 C). This order implies that Hemina's work contained the familiar, "Vergilian" chronology: Aeneas first landed in Sicily and then moved to Italy proper. Logically, Hemina would have him next visit Diomedes, traditionally placed in Southern Italy, to repossess the Palladium before coming to Latium.<sup>99</sup> Thus, part of Aeneas' own

---

<sup>97</sup> Rawson believes these fragments may "reveal the naïvete and ignorance that underlies his enthusiastic use of learned tools" (Rawson 1991: 249). Hemina's connections may be over-"enthusiastic," i.e. not supported by hard evidence, but that does not mean his efforts need to be cast in the negative. In general, it is too hasty to dismiss these kinds of aetiological thinking in the ERHs. They *are* surely wrong and ahistorical; but they may have never purported to be otherwise.

<sup>98</sup> Surely they both would have come from Book 1. On Hemina's book divisions see p. 116.

<sup>99</sup> Aeneas acquires important statuary from both excursions, the simulacrum from Sicily, the Palladium from Diomedes.

wanderings – in Hemina’s history at least – would be retracing the steps of earlier east-west migrants and their new foundations, e.g. Diomedes and Evander, Timaeus’ Sicily playing the part of the Western Mediterranean’s Staten Island.<sup>100</sup>

The constellation of Sicilian-Latin toponyms in the ERHs, primarily Hemina and Fabius Pictor, forged a strong and early connection between Sicily and Italy.<sup>101</sup> This was made manifest in an aetiology in Acilius’ work which posited that Italy and Sicily were once joined together, until the Flood severed the two (*rēgnumi*), and hence comes the name of the city *Rhegium* at the precise spot of the fissuring (Paradoxogr. Vatic. Rohidii 40 p. 111 Keller = 4 C).<sup>102</sup> The most obvious fracturing point in Sicilian-Roman relations would come in the Punic Wars, where the island played battlefield, tactical footing, and bargaining chip by turns.<sup>103</sup> Polarized along an West-East axis, Sicily was divided in

---

<sup>100</sup> Rawson has suggested that the Palladium episode in Hemina may have been a means of repairing postbellum relations between Greeks and Romans (Trojans) (Rawson 1991: 249); Diomedes and Aeneas became models of ethnic collaboration. Cato too seems to have dealt with Sicilian *topoi*, and may have been the most direct precursor to Hemina’s interests in the island (Hygin. *Fab.* 260 = 5 *FRH F* 6c). This fragment suggests Eryx as the toponym for Mount Eryx, killed there by Hercules on his western travels. Aeneas buried Anchises at the site after dedicating a temple to his mother as Venus Erycina, probably upon learning that Eryx was a fellow son of Venus. This temple site was the site of grid-locked, intense fighting in the First Punic War (Polyb. 1.55.6ff.), and perhaps this action spurred the interest of Cato in this particular locale.

<sup>101</sup> The unspecified *annales veteres nostri* referred to by Varro may implicate the ERHs generally in this: *A Roma quod orti siculi, ut annales veteres nostri dicunt* (Varro *LL* 5.101). Feeney has argued that Fabius had a particular motivation to synchronize his foundation date of Rome with the colonization of Sicily (Feeney 2007: 96-98). This would help explain his interest in the migrations from Sicily to Italy and *vice versa*.

<sup>102</sup> Ἀκύλιος ὁ Ῥωμαῖος ἱστορικός φησι τὴν Σικελίαν πρὸ τοῦ κατακλυσμοῦ μὴ νῆσον εἶναι ὡς σήμερον, ἀλλ’ ἤπειρον γενέσθαι συνημμένην τῇ ὕστερον Ἰταλίᾳ· ἐκ δὲ τῆς ἐπικλύσεως τῶν ῥευμάτων τῶν ῥιζῶν ἀποσπασθεῖσαν τοῦ Ἀπεννίνου, κατὰ τὸ Σκύλλαιον ῥαγείσης τῆς ἡπείρου, νῆσον ἀποκαταστήναι καὶ διὰ τοῦτο Ῥήγιον ἀποκληθῆναι τὸ πλεονὸν τῆς Ἰταλίας ἐκεῖνο.

<sup>103</sup> Fabius mentions the Sicilian campaigns in the Punic Wars twice: Polyb. 1.14.1-3 = 27 C Fabius Pictor; Polyb. 1.58.2-6 = 28 C Fabius Pictor.



sympathy between the Carthaginian and Roman cause respectively.<sup>104</sup> An imagined shared genealogy of Sicilian and Italic peoples may have served both as a territorial claim over the island as well as a tactic to reconcile Rome and a newly conquered people – one with openly ambiguous feelings towards its conquerors.

### **Trojan Foundations**

The interests of the ERHs are clearer in their approach to Trojan foundations. Several toponyms are attributed to the companions (especially nurses) of Aeneas. Prochyta, the nurse of Aeneas, seems to have been a popular example, first appearing in Acilius' history: *Et postquam ad classem rediit repperitque mortuam Prochyta, cognatione sibi coniunctam, quam incolumem reliquerat, in insula proxima sepelisse quae nunc quoque eodem est nomine, ut scribunt Lutatius et Acilius <et> Piso*, "and afterwards [Aeneas] returned to the fleet and discovered Prochyta dead, a kinswoman whom he had left unharmed, and he buried her on a nearby island which now too bears her name, this is as Lutatius and Acilius and Piso write" (OGR 10.1-2 = 2 C). This nurse-cousin becomes the *aetion* for an otherwise undistinguished island, and appeared in Lutatius and Piso Frugi's *annales* (above quoted) as well as Naevius' *Bellum Punicum* (Serv. Auct. *ad A.*

---

<sup>104</sup> Polyb. 1.10.

9.712) and an unnamed work mentioned by Dionysius (Dion. Hal. AR 1. 53).<sup>105</sup> To confuse things further, Postumius Albinus mentions another nurse in the *de adventu Aeneae*, Boia, who is both the nurse to the Trojan Euximus and the toponym/ethnonym for Baiae: *Postumius de adventu Aeneae et Lutatius communium historiarum Boiam Euximi comitis Aeneae nutricem, et ab eius nomine Boias vocatas dicunt*, “Postumius and Lutatius in their complementary histories say that Boia was the nurse of Euximus, a companion of Aeneas, and that from her name the ‘Boii’ are called” (Serv. *Aen.* 9.707 = 2 C). Note that Lutatius (Catulus) is implicated again in this quote; he apparently had interest in several Trojan nurses. To most, Prochyta's Vergilian counterpart, Caieta, is the more familiar variation, who dies in the Bay of Naples as Aeneas sails up the Italian coast from Cumae to the mouth of the Tiber.<sup>106</sup> Notably, these *topoi* – Gaeta, Baiae – all coalesce around the bay of Puteoli; Naples seems to have been home to several Trojan nurses.

## Etymology

### Romulus and Remus

---

<sup>105</sup> Chassignet is probably right to assert Naevius as the originator of “Prochyta” island (Chassignet 1996 (1): 95 n. 4).

<sup>106</sup> *tu quoque litoribus nostris, Aeneïa nutrix, | aeternam moriens famam, Caieta, dedisti; | et nunc servat honos sedem tuus, ossaque nomen | Hesperia in magna, si qua est ea gloria, signat* (Verg. *Aen.* 7.1-4). She also receives an epitaph in Ovid’s *Metamorphoses* (Ovid. *Met.* 14.433-444).

Historiographic retellings of the Romulean foundation myth include a number of interesting etymologies, and suggest that the ERHs signposted various natal moments and places with aetiologies. Relying upon Plutarch's account in the *Life of Romulus*, it appears that these can be traced as far back as Fabius. Our conclusions will have to be provisional, however, based upon the reliability of Plutarch's quotation, i.e. the degree to which he faithfully reflects Fabius' original.<sup>107</sup> *Romulus* 3ff. (= 7a C) gives the account of Diocles of Peparethus, whom "Fabius followed on most matters:" τοῦ δὲ πίστιν ἔχοντος λόγου μάλιστα καὶ πλείστους μάρτυρας τὰ μὲν κυριώτατα πρῶτος εἰς τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἐξέδωκε Διοκλῆς Πεπαρήθιος, ᾧ καὶ Φάβιος ὁ Πίκτωρ ἐν τοῖς πλείστοις ἐπηκολούθηκε (3.1). What follows is a meandering account, the sources of which are hard to trace, though it seems safe to say that it often represents the ERHs and Fabius' "original" account. The first etymology is of Kermalos (3.5). This was the bend in the Tiber in which Romulus' and Remus' cradle came to rest. *Germani* ["brothers"] > *Kermalos* is the derivation given:<sup>108</sup>

τοῦ δὲ ποταμοῦ κατακλύζοντος ἡ πλημμύρα τὴν σκάφην ὑπολαβοῦσα καὶ μετεωρίσασα πρῶτως κατήνεγκεν εἰς χωρίον ἐπιεικῶς μαλθακόν, ὃ νῦν Κερμαλὸν καλοῦσι, πάλαι δὲ Γερμανόν, ὡς ἔοικεν ὅτι καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς γερμανοὺς ὀνομάζουσιν (3.5)

---

<sup>107</sup> On the difficulties of identifying the sources of the accounts in Plutarch and Dionysius, see Cornell 2013 (3): 16-20; Poucet 1976: 215f.; Verbrugghe 1981. Chassignet also is hesitant to include the following fragments as Fabian/ Cincian aetiologies (Chassignet 2008: 40).

<sup>108</sup> cf. Varro LL 5.8: *Germalum a germanis Romulo et Remo, quod ad ficum ruminalem, et ii ibi inventi, quo aqua hiberna Tiberis eos detulerat in alveolo expositos*. The connection of the *Germalus/Kermalos* with the *Ficus Ruminalis* (discussed below) may demonstrate that both Varro and Plutarch are following the ordering of Fabius.

“but as the river flooded, the current took hold of the basket and bore it aloft, and set it down gently at a place that was sufficiently calm, which now they call the ‘Kermalos,’ but used to be called the ‘Germanus,’ just as they name brothers ‘Germani.’”

In the following section, several competing etymologies are given for the *ficus Ruminalis*, a tree traditionally connected with the Lupercal (4.1):

ἤν δὲ πλησίον ἐρινεός, ὃν Ῥωμινάλιον ἐκάλουν, ἣ διὰ τὸν Ῥωμύλον ὥς οἱ πολλοὶ νομίζουσιν, ἣ διὰ τὸ τὰ μηρυκώμενα τῶν θρεμμάτων ἐκεῖ διὰ τὴν σκιὰν ἐνδιάζειν, ἣ μάλιστα διὰ τὸν τῶν βρεφῶν θηλασμόν, ὅτι τὴν τε θηλὴν ῥοῦμαν ὠνόμαζον οἱ παλαιοί, καὶ θεόν τινα τῆς ἐκτροφῆς τῶν νηπίων ἐπιμελεῖσθαι δοκοῦσαν ὀνομάζουσι Ῥουμῖναν, καὶ θύουσιν αὐτῇ νηφάλια, καὶ γάλα τοῖς ἱεροῖς ἐπισπένδουσιν.

“There was a fig nearby, which they called the ‘Ruminal,’ either for Romulus, as many think, or for the chewing that animals would do there under the shade, or better yet for the nursing of young animals, since the ancients called the breast ‘*ruma*,’ and they call a certain goddess who they think takes care of the nursing of infants ‘*Rumina*,’ and they celebrate her with honey and sprinkle milk on her sacrificial victims.”

First, there is the etymology of *Ruminalis* < Romulus, “as many believe.”<sup>109</sup> The rationale of the second etymology, *Ruminalis* < *ruminari*, “chewing,” rests on livestock grazing in the shade under the tree. Lastly, there is *Ruminalis* < *ruma*, “teat,” “since the ancients called the breast ‘*ruma*.’” As evidence for *ruma* as “teat,” Plutarch adduces *Rumina*, a goddess of child-rearing. An enticing word play may even connect the woodpecker in the passage that follows (4.2), *picus* - *ficus* (δρυοκολάπτης in Plutarch’s Greek):<sup>110</sup>

---

<sup>109</sup> This is the etymology given by Livy as well: *in proxima eluvie, ubi nunc ficus Ruminalis est — Romularem vocatam ferunt* (Livy 1.4.5).

<sup>110</sup> Plutarch elsewhere recounts that *Picus*, transformed into a woodpecker, helped feed the twins (*Quest. Rom.* 21).

ἐνταῦθα δὴ τοῖς βρέφεσι κειμένοις τήν τε λύκαιναν ἱστοροῦσι θηλαζομένην καὶ δρυοκολάπτην τινὰ παρεῖναι συνεκτρέφοντα καὶ φυλάττοντα. νομίζεται δ' Ἄρεως ἱερὰ τὰ ζῶα, τὸν δὲ δρυοκολάπτην καὶ διαφερόντως Λατῖνοι σέβονται καὶ τιμῶσιν: ὅθεν οὐχ ἥκιστα πίστιν ἔσχεν ἡ τεκοῦσα τὰ βρέφη τεκεῖν ἐξ Ἄρεως φάσκουσα.

“There they recount that the she-wolf suckled the babes and that there was a woodpecker present too that nourished and guarded them. It is thought that this is the reason the animals are sacred to Mars and the Latins worship and honor them above all others; and this is the foremost reason that Ilia was believed when she said that Mars was the father of her children.”

Ilia's own ancestor, Picus, as a transformed woodpecker, may have helped legitimate her claim about the boys' father.<sup>111</sup>

The story then shifts focus to Faustulus' wife (4.3):

οἱ δὲ τοῦνομα τῆς τροφοῦ δι' ἀμφιβολίαν ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες ἐκτροπήν τῇ φήμῃ παρασχεῖν: λούπας γὰρ ἐκάλουν οἱ Λατῖνοι τῶν τε θηρίων τὰς λυκαῖνας καὶ τῶν γυναικῶν τὰς ἐταιρούσας: εἶναι δὲ τοιαύτην τὴν Φαιστύλου γυναῖκα τοῦ τὰ βρέφη θρέψαντος, Ἄκκαν Λαρεντίαν ὄνομα. ταύτῃ δὲ καὶ θύουσι Ῥωμαῖοι, καὶ χοὰς ἐπιφέρει τοῦ Ἀπριλίου μηνὸς αὐτῇ ὁ τοῦ Ἄρεως ἱερεὺς, καὶ Λαρενταλίαν καλοῦσι τὴν ἑορτήν.

“But some say that the name of the nurse, on account of its ambiguity, bent towards the mythic: for the Latins used to call the wild she-wolves *lupae* as well as prostitutes: and the wife of Faustulus who nurtured the youths, Acca Larentia, was this sort of woman. Yet the Romans sacrifice to her, and the priest of Ares pours libations to her in the month of April, and they call the festival the ‘Larentalia.’”

This is the infamous charge regarding Acca Larentia's past, i.e. that she was a *lupa*, prostitute. Such a claim, whether embedded in folklore or not, entails a degree of

---

<sup>111</sup> Possibility explored p. 60 n. 118.

rationalization – surely the twins were not suckled by a real wolf, but rather a prostitute under the same terminology.

It remains to be seen, however, how many of these aetiologies can be directly traced to Fabius and other ERHs. Unfortunately, the longest counterpart to Plutarch's account, that of Dionysius (Dion. Hal. 1.79.4-83.3 = 7b C), largely ignores the above etymologies. The exception is the *lupa* double entendre, which Dionysius implies was *not* in the Fabian narrative:<sup>112</sup>

ταῦτα μὲν οὖν τοῖς περὶ Φάβιον εἴρηται. ἕτεροι δὲ οὐδὲν τῶν μυθωδεστέρων ἀξιοῦντες ἱστορικῇ γραφῇ προσήκειν τήν τε ἀπόθεσιν τὴν τῶν βρεφῶν οὐχ ὥς ἐκελεύσθη τοῖς ὑπηρέταις γενομένην ἀπίθανον εἶναί φασι, καὶ τῆς λυκαίνης τὸ τιθασόν, ἢ τοὺς μαστοὺς ἐπεῖχε τοῖς παιδίοις, ὥς δραματικῆς μεστὸν ἀτοπίας διασύρουσιν. ἀντιδιαλλαττόμενοι δὲ πρὸς ταῦτα λέγουσιν ὥς...τὴν τε τιθηνησαμένην τὰ παιδιά καὶ μαστοὺς ἐπισχοῦσαν οὐ λύκαιναν εἶναί φασιν, ἀλλ' ὥσπερ εἰκὸς γυναιῖκα τῷ Φαιστύλῳ συνοικοῦσαν Λαυρεντίαν ὄνομα, ἣ δημοσιευούσῃ ποτὲ τὴν τοῦ σώματος ὥραν οἱ περὶ τὸ Παλλάντιον διατρίβοντες ἐπὶ κλησιν ἔθεντο τὴν Λούπαν (1.79.3-1.84.4)

“And so goes the story of Fabius on such matters. But on the other hand, some, who deem that nothing of the mythic variety has a place in historiography, say that it is unlikely that the exposure of the infants by the servants occurred contrary to orders, and the docility of the she-wolf, which gave its breasts to the children, they disdain as full of dramatic absurdity. Of a different opinion, they say instead of these things that... and they say that it was not the she-wolf that suckled the children or give them its teats, but that this was the woman living with Faustulus, Larentia. Because she had sold the prime of her body [i.e. prostituted herself] those living around the Palatine gave her the nickname ‘*lupa*.’”

---

<sup>112</sup> This is the same point at which Livy deviates from the Fabian account: *sunt, qui Larentiam vulgato corpore lupam inter pastores vocatam putent; inde locum fabulae ac miraculo datum* (Livy 1.4.7).

ἔτεροι δὲ implies that *lupa* < prostitute is a rationalizing account meant to correct Fabius' fabulous account: "the *lupa* was a woman not actually a wolf, but was mistaken for one (by Fabius et al.) because of the nickname *lupa*, given to prostitutes" – so it might go.<sup>113</sup> Moreover, it was precisely at this point that Plutarch's account made the *lupa* aside, οἱ δὲ τοῦνομα... (Plut. *Rom.* 4.3). Yet if Plutarch and Dionysius depart from the "mainstream," Fabian account, for the *lupa* < prostitute etymology, this picture is still complicated by Quintilian's possible quotation of Fabius (through Varro): '*lupus*' masculinum, quamquam Varro in eo libro, quo initia Romanae urbis enarrat, '*lupum feminam*' dicit, Ennium Pictoremque Fabium secutus, "*lupus* is masculine, although Varro in his first book, in which he narrates the beginnings of Roman history, speaks of the '*lupus femina*,' following in the footsteps of Ennius and Fabius Pictor" (Quint. *Inst. Or.* 1.6.12 = 7e C). This unusual wording – surely the motivation for its inclusion by Varro – could suggest not just a "she-wolf," but rather a "wolf-wife," a wife who was a prostitute, i.e. Acca Larentia. If this is indeed a faithful representation of Fabius' diction, then it is hard not to allow this possibility. Any conclusion then on the *lupa* < prostitute etymology in Fabius would have to be provisional, but it is clear, however, that this etymology appeared early in historiographic tradition.<sup>114</sup>

---

<sup>113</sup> Dionysius did make a habit of correcting Fabius himself, particularly quibbling with his "irrational" chronology in the regal period and early Republic (Dion. Hal. 4.6.1 = 12a C; Dion. Hal. 4.30.2 = 12b C; Dion. Hal. 4.15.1 = 13 C; Dion. Hal. 4.64 = 17 C)

<sup>114</sup> Acca Larentia was a *meretrix* at least as early as Cato's *Origines* (Macr. *Sat.* 1.10.16 = 23 C).

What about Plutarch's other etymologies, e.g. *figus Ruminalis*? The corresponding narrative of the OGR draws from Fabius and touches on several key moments:

*At vero Fabius Pictor libro primo et Vennonius...Tum illi quibus imperatum id erat impositos alveo pueros circa radices montis Palatii in Tiberim qui tum magnis imbribus stagnaverat abiecerunt eiusque regionis subulcus Faustulus speculatus exponentes, ut vidit, relabente flumine, alveum in quo pueri erant obhaesisse ad arborem fici puerorumque vagitu lupam excitam, quae repente exierat, primo lambitu eos deterxisse, dein levandorum uberum gratia mammas praebuisse, descendit ac sustulit nutriendosque Accae Larentiae, uxori suae, dedit, ut scribunt Ennius libro primo et Caesar libro secundo. Addunt quidam Faustulo inspectante picum quoque advolasse et ore pleno cibum pueris ingessisse; inde videlicet lupum picumque Martiae tutelae esse. Arborem quoque illam Ruminalem dictam, circa quam pueri abiecti erant, quod eius sub umbra pecus acquiescens meridie ruminare sit solitum (OGR 20.1. 3-4 = C, extended)*

"But indeed Fabius Pictor in his first book and Vennonius tell of...[Ilia's pregnancy, Amulius' reaction]... Then the servants threw them into the Tiber, which had overflowed with great rainfall, since it had been ordered that the boys be placed in a basket at the bottom of the Palatine. Faustulus, a swine-herd in this vicinity, watched the men expose the boys in the receding river, and saw that the basket in which the boys were carried was stuck against a fig tree. He watched as a wolf was stirred by the crying and suddenly appeared. First, it cleaned the boys by licking them, then it offered its teats to be suckled by the boys. Faustulus climbed down and took up the boys and gave them be nursed by his own wife, Acca Larentia. This is as Ennius, in his first book, and Caesar, in his second, tell the story. Some add that, with Faustulus looking on, a woodpecker flew over to the boys and offered them food from its full mouth; from that time forward the wolf and woodpecker were guardians of Mars. Also, the tree near where the boys were cast away was called the Ruminal because domestic animals were accustomed to graze there at midday under its shadow."

The OGR's narrative maps well onto Plutarch's (Plut. *Rom.* 3.1ff): 1) Amulius discovers Ilia's pregnancy and orders the twins to be exposed 2) the twins' basket gets stuck against a fig tree (though no *kermalos* mentioned) 3) a wolf and woodpecker come to the aid of Mars' grandchildren and so become attached with the god 4) the tree receives the



nickname “*Ruminalis*” because animals – like the wolf and woodpecker? – enjoy its shade and graze there. The etymology of *figus Ruminalis* < *ruminari*, “to chew” parallels the second given in Plutarch (Plut. *Rom.* 4.2), which may therefore narrow the originator to Fabius. A woodpecker, *Picus* in latin, so closely associated with a *figus*, fig tree, probably would have made for good word play, whether explicitly pointed out or otherwise. This too could have existed in Fabius’ account.<sup>115</sup> After all, the woodpecker in *OGR* supposedly “prechewed” the food for the babes right beside the “chewing” tree. In sum, the early account of the Romulus-Remus account was highly rationalized, with many aetiologies (particularly in the form of etymologies). Some cannot be directly attributed to Fabius Pictor from the extant fragments – *lupa* < prostitute, *picus* - *figus*, *kermalos* < *germani* – but they either came from his account or those of other ERHs. There are other interesting variants, such as the rumor that Ilia was actually impregnated by the Amulius and named Mars as the father to cover up the incest,<sup>116</sup> that demonstrate continuous engagement with the “core” of the foundation narrative.

One main thrust of all these “foundation” aetiologies would have been to establish the Lupercal < *lupa* etymology / toponym. The other connection would be with its concomitant festival, the Lupercalia: *Luperci quod Lupercalibus in Lupercali sacra faciunt*, “They are called Luperci because they perform sacrifices in the Lupercal” (Varro

---

<sup>115</sup> This is supported by a quotation of Pictor by Nonius: *et simul videbant picum Martium* (apud Non. p. 834 Lindsay = 7c C). The pairing would be of the *picus* and *figus Martium*.

<sup>116</sup> ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀμουλίου διαπαρθενευθεῖσαν (Plut. *Rom.* 4.2)

LL 5.15). This would later be used by Acilius as evidence that Rome “was a Hellenic foundation,” since it was an Arcadian import from Mt. Lykaion.<sup>117</sup> Picus, son of Saturn, later transformed into a woodpecker by his spurned lover Circe, could have been just one figure in a complex ERH set of aetiologies that spliced Greek material into the most “native” story at Rome, the Romulus and Remus foundation.<sup>118</sup> This mythological survey of the foundation was also a topographical one, however, and the aetiologies are pregnant with monumental references, e.g. Lupercal, *ficus Ruminalis*; the Romulus and Remus story that appears in the ERHs mapped mythic time onto contemporary Roman space.<sup>119</sup>

### Misc. Etymologies

A final Fabian etymology is preserved in Arnobius. Arnobius' testimony implicates Fabius as the font in a long line of Roman historians/ antiquarians that include a murder myth behind the naming of the Capitolium, i.e. Capitolium > *caput Oli/Auli* (Arn. *Adu. Nat.* 6.7 = 16 C).<sup>120</sup> Fabius is said to have told "whose son Aulus was,

---

<sup>117</sup> The Lupercalia is discussed on p. 70-80.

<sup>118</sup> Ovid *Met.* 14. 320ff. Vergil posits a line from Saturn - Picus - Faunus - Latinus (Verg. *Aen.* 7.45-49).

<sup>119</sup> Rawson hits the mark: “Cicero says that the early Roman historians recounted *sine ullis ornamentis monumenta solum temporum hominum locorum*; he is referring to Fabius Pictor, Cato and Piso. We note *loci*. It is clear that by Cassius’ time the earliest city on the site of Rome, Evander’s, had been placed on the Palatine, and a number of shrines and monuments, such as the Ara Maxima, the Lupercal, the *ficus Ruminalis* and so on were so inextricably confused with the legends that it is impossible to say where popular belief stops and scholarly or literary embellishment begins” (Rawson 1991: 252).

<sup>120</sup> See Alföldi 1965: 216 n. 2 for further bibliography.

what race and nation the belonged to, why he was stripped of his life and light by a slave's hand, and what he committed against his own citizens such that a tomb would be denied him in the soil of his fatherland."<sup>121</sup> Unlike the Romulus - Remus episode, etymology seems to be the sole motivation for the inclusion of Aulus; the biography of Aulus is all just a setup for this final etymology: *nec erubuit civitas maxima et numinum cunctorum cultrix, cum vocabulum templo daret, ex Oli capite quam ex nomine Iovio nuncupare*, "and the greatest society, one that worships all the gods, did not blush, when it came time to name the temple, to name it from 'caput + Oli' [the 'head of Aulus'] rather than from Iove's name." On the other hand, in Livy, the prodigy is taken to mean that Rome would one day become the *caput mundi*, and this would suggest a more substantial treatment (if indeed there are Fabian traces in Livy's version).<sup>122</sup>

---

<sup>121</sup> *Valerius Antias et Fabius indicabunt, cuius Aulus fuerit filius, gentis et nationis cuius, cur manu servuli vita fuerit spoliatus et lumine, quid de suis commeruerit civibus ut ei sit abnegata telluris patriae sepultura.* The story occurs in Livy and Dionysius as well (Dion. Hal. 4.59.2-4.61.2; Livy 1.55.1-6).

<sup>122</sup> *hoc perpetuitatis auspicio accepto secutum aliud magnitudinem imperii portendens prodigium est: caput humanum integra facie aperientibus fundamenta templi dicitur apparuisse. quae visa species haud per ambages arcem eam imperii caputque rerum fore portendebat, idque ita cecinere vates, quique in urbe erant quosque ad eam rem consultandam ex Etruria acciverant* (Livy 1.55.6; cf. Dion. Hal. 4.61.2). Notably, a quote of Fabius, concerning the expense of the temple immediately follows (Livy 1.55.7-8 = 15 C). Alföldi's has supposed, drawing on Livy and Dionysius' later accounts, that Fabius used the *caput Oli* etymology to show that Rome, despite the setbacks at Cannae and Trasimene, was destined to become the *caput mundi* – an interesting reading for these purposes (Alföldi 1965: 220).

<sup>123</sup> Fabius did deal with Tarpeia as well (Dion. Hal. 2.38ff. = 10 C). Discussed p. 92. In Dionysius' narrative the *caput Oli* discovery triggers the renaming of the "Tarpeian hill" to the Capitoline and could represent Fabius' agency (Dion. Hal. 4.60.3-4.61.2).

Fabius' *caput Oli* could have competed with another, less savory, toponym on the Capitoline, the Tarpeian rock.<sup>123</sup> Plutarch relates a story that the bones of Tarpeia were discovered instead in the foundation of the Capitolium:

τῆς μέντοι Ταρπηίας ἐκεῖ ταφείσης, ὁ λόφος ὠνομάζετο Ταρπήιος, ἄχρι οὗ Ταρκυνίου βασιλέως Διὶ τὸν τόπον καθιεροῦντος ἅμα τὰ τε λείψανα μετηνέχθη, καὶ τοῦνομα τῆς Ταρπηίας ἐξέλιπε: πλὴν πέτραν ἔτι νῦν ἐν τῷ Καπιτωλίῳ Ταρπηίαν καλοῦσιν, ἀφ' ἧς ἐρρίπτουν τοὺς κακούργους

"Since Tarpeia was buried there, the hillock is called 'Tarpeian,' that is until king Tarquin dedicated the land to Jupiter and her remains were transferred elsewhere, and he struck off the name of 'Tarpeia.' Even now, however, they call it the 'Tarpeian' rock on the Capitoline, off which they throw criminals."

The question remains whether both burial discoveries were presented by Fabius, or whether the bones of Tarpeia have been added as a doublet by another ERH to challenge Fabius' account.

This exhausts the evidence for etymology in Fabius. Did the other ERHs follow his lead? A prominent fragment of Cincius Alimentus suggests so: *Cincius et Cassius aiunt ab Evandro Faunum deum appellatum ideoque aedes sacras 'faunas' primo appellatas, postea fana dicta, et ex eo, qui futura praecinerent fanaticos dici*, "Cincius and Cassius say that Faunus was heralded as a god by Evander, and so sacred precincts were originally called '*faunae*' and afterwards '*fana*,' and on account of this those who predict the future are called 'fanatics'" (Serv. *Georg.* 1.10 = 2 C). This fragment even posits a chain of derivation. Evander recognized Faunus as a god, from whom "sacred precincts were

originally called ‘*faunae*.’” Afterwards *faunas* was corrupted and became *fana*, its later Latin form. *Faunus* - *faunas* - *fana* - *fanaticos*? This last derivation requires an unstated logical leap. Presumably, those “who prophesy the future” have some divine inspiration, and are thus “*fanatic*,” i.e. belonging to holy shrines (*fana*). A further, missing etymology may lurk behind *praecinere*: *carmen* < *Carmentis*, the mother of Evander. This is the derivation given by Ovid in the *Fasti*: *ipsa [Carmentis] mone quae nomen habes a carmine ductum*, “you yourself give the warning, you who take your name from *carmen*” (Ovid *Fasti* 1.467). It is Carmentis’ forewarning, in the *Fasti*, that ironically gets her exiled:

*quae [Carmentis] simul aetherios animo conceperat ignes,  
ore dabat pleno carmina vera dei.  
dixerat haec nato motus instare sibi que,  
multaque praeterea tempore nacta fidem.  
nam iuvenis nimium vera cum matre fugatus  
deserit Arcadium Parrhasiumque larem... (473-8)*

“Who [Carmentis] just then began to spawn heavenly fires in her mind, and was giving forth soothsaying prophecies from her mouth, which was possessed by the god. In her possession, she had foretold these things for her son and herself, and had proved right many times before. Thus, the young man fled Arcadia and his Parrhasian home with his too true mother...”

Fabius himself included the flight of Evander (and Carmentis?).<sup>124</sup> The first fragment of Fabius, before the discovery of the Tauromenian fragment, was traditionally the arrival of the alphabet in Italy (2 C = 1 Peter). Evander is listed as its *repertor* and is analogized

---

<sup>124</sup> That Carmentis was included in Fabius and Cincius is supported by Chassignet on Acilius 1 C (Chassignet 1996 (1): 62 n. 1). The quoter, Strabo, could be drawing on Fabius in the introductory material to the passage, suggesting a citation of several ERHs at once. Acilius may himself have been directly referencing other ERHs on Carmentis and her connection with the *Ara Maxima* (see further p. 95 n. 222).

to another famous alphabet-bearer / exile, Cadmus. Cincius is also cited in this fragment, and it leads off his collection (1 C).<sup>125</sup> Thus, Cincius and Fabius both seemed to have told the story of Evander's exile, though Cincius may have expanded upon Fabius with the *Faunus* - *faunas* - *fana* - *fanaticos* etymology, inset within or referencing a previously given etymology, *carmen* - *Carmentis*.

Cincius included several other etymologies as well. Cincius may have been responsible for the derivation of *Ahala*'s cognomen from *ala*, "armpit."<sup>126</sup> Another episode posited that the Tiber received its name from the death / drowning of the Alban king Tiberius Silvius (*Tiber* < *Tiberius*): *qui* [sc. *Tiberius Silvius*] *cum adversus finitimos bellum inferentes copias eduxisset, inter proeliantes depulsus in Albulam flumen deperiit mutandique nominis exstitit causa, ut scribunt Lucius Cincius libro primo*, "who [Tiberius Silvius] when he had led forth his troops against his warring neighbors was driven in the midst of battle into the river Albula and perished, and this was the *aetion* of switching the name [i.e. to Tiber]" (OGR 18). This archaic name for the Tiber, *Albula*, was

---

<sup>125</sup> Evander was an acculturating figure in Cato as well, teaching the natives Aeolian Greek (Lyds Mag. 1.5 = 1.19 C).

<sup>126</sup> ἐκ τούτου καὶ τὴν ἐπωνυμίαν τὸν Ἄλαν αὐτῷ τεθῆναι λέγουσιν, ὅτι τὸ ξίφος ἔχων ὑπὸ μάλης ἦλθεν ἐπὶ τὸν ἄνδρα: ἄλας γὰρ καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι τὰς μάλας (Dion. Hal. 12.4.5 = 5 C). The whole biographical narrative seems set up for this punchline etymology (cf. comments on *caput Oli* etymology in Fabius Pictor 16 C, p. 80-82). Both of these instances could rightfully be included in the "extended aetiologies" subsection as well.

borrowed by Cassius Hemina (*circa flumen Albulam*, 4 C).<sup>127</sup> Perhaps Cassius names it so intentionally because the Hercules-Cacus episode, in which the citation is made, predates the reign and death of Tiberius Silvius, and so the river would have still been the *albula*. Moreover, there is something coy about an *Alban* king perishing in the *Albula*.

Another Cincian etymology posits that *delubrum* comes from the verb *diluere*, i.e. that the essential feature of the *delubrum* is its "flowing water:" *alii, ut Cincius, dicunt delubrum esse locum ante templum, ubi aqua currit, a diluendo*, "Others, like Cincius, say that the *delubrum* is the place in front of the temple, [the term] coming from 'washing away'" (Serv. *ad A.* 2.225). The *delubrum* then is a technical term for a cleansing area directly before the temple. A fragment preserved in Arnobius suggests a similar approach to a grouping of gods, the *Novensiles*: *Novensiles...Cincius numina peregrina novitate ex ipsa appellata pronuntiat*, "Cincius claims that the *Novensiles* are so named on account of their foreign 'novelty' [*novitas*]" (Arn. 3.38-39 = 12 C). Cincius proposed a

---

<sup>127</sup> cf. Livy 1.3.5: *fluvius Albula, quem nunc Thybrim vocant*. Compare also the usage in the *Aeneid*: *tum manus Ausonia et gentes venere Sicanae, / saepius et nomen posuit Saturnia tellus / tum reges asperque immani corpore Thybris, / a quo post Itali fluvium cognomine Thybrim / diximus; amisit verum vetus Albula nomen* (Verg. *Aen.* 8.328-332). Hollis traces this local antiquarianism in the mouth of "garrulous and pedantic old Evander" back to Alexandrian influences (Hollis 1992: 278). This is surely part of the explanation, but it is telling that Evander's archaized speech signposts an etymology in the ERHs. Other elements of the speech, such as the etymology of *Latium* < *latere* "to hide" (8.322-323), may also have come from these sources. After all, Evander is giving a universal history of Rome, at least up until his contemporary day: *primus ab aethero venit Saturnus Olympo / arma Iovis fugiens et regnis exsul adeptis... me pulsum patria pelagique extrema sequentem / Fortuna omnipotens et ineluctabile fatum / his posuere locis, matrisque egere tremenda / Carmentis nymphae monita et deus auctor Apollo* (Verg. *Aen.* 8.322-323, 329-332). Hemina also dealt with the Numic(i)us river, where Aeneas is supposed to have drowned (Solin. 2.14 = 8 C). cf. Livy 1.2.6.; Serv. *Aen.* 7.150; Ovid *Met.* 14.599. Ovid's grouping of the nymphs of the Numicus and Albula may point to an earlier connection in the ERHs, perhaps even in Hemina: *numina, naiades, quas Albula, quasque Numici* (Ovid. *Met.* 14.328).

derivation of *Novensiles* < *novitas/novus*;<sup>128</sup> the gods are “new” because they are foreign.

The explanation that follows in Arnobius supports this line of thinking: *nam solere Romanos religiones urbium superatarum partim privatim per familias spargere, partim publice consecrare*, “for the Romans were accustomed to promulgate the religious practices of conquered cities in part privately through adoption by families, and in part by publicly consecrating them.”

Religion seems to have been a fixation of Cincius, who, in addition to these etymologies, *Faunus faunas - fana - fanaticos*, *delubrum* < *diluendo*, and *Novensiles* < *novitate*, also investigates a nail-fixing ritual amongst the Volsinii (Livy. 7.3 = 9 C, later discussed). In his etymologies, there is a clear, and at times, complex rationalization of fundamental aspects of Roman religion, down to the temples themselves, *fana* and *delubra*. Moreover, these etymologies are apparent in at least 4 of the 13 fragments of Cincius, and must be viewed as integral to his work.<sup>129</sup> The learnedness of these references may support the notion that Cincius did not merely insert prominent “folk-tale” etymologies as he came upon them in his narrative, but sought to incorporate and explain otherwise obscure material, e.g. *Novensiles*, ritualistic nail-fixing.

---

<sup>128</sup> Arnobius, in the same section, sets this *Novensiles* < *novitas* etymology against a rival *Novensiles* < *novem*, for which he cites Calpurnius Piso: *Novensiles Piso deos esse credit novem in Sabinis apud Trebiam constitutos* (47 C). It is not entirely clear whether Cincius was engaging in a debate over two already extant etymologies, and privileging one over the other, or whether Calpurnius is the later originator of *Novensiles* < *novem* in response to Cincius.

<sup>129</sup> This includes fragments where he is cited alongside other historians (see Piso above), and, in the case of the *Albula* etymology, a Cincian etymology may have been reprised by another ERH. This all supports the idea that these fragments belong to a 2nd century BC ERH, and should not be assigned to the little-known 1st century antiquarian.



## Extended Aetiologies

### Mytho-Religious

It has been often assumed that aetiology within the Roman literary tradition was a late addition, a product of the antiquarian movements of the late 2nd and early 1st century BC. Our study has shown that the ERHs were capable of at least some “simple” aetiologies, often wordplays on place names and historical figures. The claim will be advanced now that the ERHs featured sustained aetiological digressions, entailing a more sophisticated and thorough treatment. An example of this feature was the cluster of toponyms/etymologies in Fabius’ (and others’) foundation narratives. Investigative similar instances will necessarily involve some guesswork. Etymologies will have been disproportionately cited by lexicographers and grammarians, for instance, and within this decontextualized, isolated environment the fragments may appear rather unimportant and recondite.<sup>130</sup>

Nevertheless, sometimes a larger chain of logic can be uncovered. Such was the case with the *Faunus* - *faunas* - *fana* - *fanaticos* etymology in Cincius (2 C). The goal must have been to link Faunus (*c*, in the schema given at the beginning of the chapter), the

---

<sup>130</sup> These types of citations account for over half of the extant fragments of Hemina. See p. 95 n. 169.

uncivilized “Pan” figure of the Italian pantheon, to ecstatic religious expression, *fanaticos* (a). This precipitated the pseudolinguistic, intermediary stage *faunas-fana* (b), which need only loosely relate *Faunus* to something in the religious domain in order to complete the series. A further proposition was made that — assuming Servius retains the diction of Cincius— this grouping of etymologies could also have engaged with the better known derivation *carmen* < *Carmentis* through the verb *praecinere*. It is clear that Cincius dealt with the migration of Evander to Italy, and presumably his famous mother Carmentis (1 C). The idea that Cincius would relate these two primordial Italian deities to various musical/religious expression is a tempting one. Nonetheless, the original grouping of *Faunus* - *faunas* - *fana* - *fanaticos*, whether or not set alongside, or directly within, a hypothetical *carmen* < *Carmentis* derivation, is sufficient to demonstrate the depth of aetiological inquiry possible in the ERHs.

### **Religious curiosities**

Another example of “extended aetiology” was apparent in the naming of the Capitolium (< *caput Oli*) from Fabius’ history. The testimony of Arnobius insinuates that the figure Aulus was given a rather full biography, all for the eventual punchline *caput Oli* upon the dramatic unearthing of his head on the site of the Capitol. Cult, temple, and heroic *explananda* grant many opportunities for “extended aetiologies,” and were a

mine for “antiquarian” investigation. Cincius seemed to have particularly religious tastes, and his interest in the nail-fixing ritual amongst the Volsinii was mentioned cursorily before:

*Lex vetusta est, priscis litteris verbisque scripta, ut qui praetor maximus sit idibus Septembribus clavum pangat; fixa fuit dextro lateri aedis Iovis optimi maximi, ex qua parte Minervae templum est. Eum clavum, quia rarae per ea tempora litterae erant, notam numeri annorum fuisse ferunt eoque Minervae templo dicatam legem quia numerus Minervae inventum sit. Volsiniis quoque clavos indices numeri annorum fixos in templo Nortiae, Etruscae deae, comparere diligens talium monumentorum auctor Cincius adfirmat. (Livy 7.3 = 9 C)*

“there is a law, written with old lettering and words, that states that whoever happens to be the *Praetor Maximus* is to fix a nail during the Ides of September; [the law] was affixed to the the right side of the temple of Juppiter Optimus Maximus, at the part where there is Minerva’s shrine. They say this nail, because writing was scarce at that time, was a marker of the number of years, and that this law was decreed at this temple of Minerva because counting was her invention. The author Cincius, diligent to compare such monuments, also affirms that that at Volsinii [an Etruscan city] nails were fixed as year counters in the temple to Nortia, an Etruscan goddess.”

If the full quote represents Cincius’ reconstruction and research it would be impressive, and many of the details would have involved a deal of explanation to his contemporary audience. First, some linguistic commentary would have been needed to translate the archaic Latin of the law if it were quoted in-text. This would include some explanation of the defunct office of the *Praetor Maximus*. Thereafter, some connection would have been made between the Roman Minerva and Etruscan Nortia as goddesses, whether it be through the invention of counting, or perhaps even an etymology running something like *Minerva* - *Minortia* - *Nortia*. Sparing the details, there seems at the least to be a

strong motivation to connect Etruscan and Roman religious practice. Moreover, the methodology of Cincius, himself described as *comparere diligens talium monumentorum*, could be described as “proto-antiquarian.”

### The Lupercalia

The Lupercalia and its accompanying aetiologies will have been an early fixation in the ERHs as well. Yet Dionysius’ account can give the false impression that interest in the festival was a later addition in the historiographical tradition. One of the last “annalists,” Aelius Tubero, is the author cited by Dionysius to corroborate the details of the festival (Dion Hal. 1.80). The basic elements of the Lupercalia story — its institution by Evander, the association with Pan and Arcadia, *mons Palatinus* < *Pallantion*, the naked run — are all present here. It is important to note, however, how this excursion on the Lupercal is inset within Dionysius’ larger account of the Romulus-Remus biography (1.79.3ff), which he had sign-posted as ERH material: περὶ δὲ τῶν ἐκ τῆς Ἰλίας γενομένων Κόιντος μὲν Φάβιος ὁ Πίκτωρ λεγόμενος, ᾧ Λεύκιός τε Κίγκιος καὶ Κάτων Πόρκιος καὶ Πείσων Καλπούρνιος καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συγγραφέων οἱ πλείους ἠκολούθησαν, “Quintus Fabius Pictor told about what transpired concerning Ilia [and the events thereafter], and Cincius and Porcius Cato and Calpurnius Piso and all the rest of the historiographers followed his account on most matters” (1.79.3). Thus, it was

earlier argued that Dionysius’ account of the foundation myth contained a substantial core of Fabian material that mirrored that in Plutarch’s *Life of Romulus*.<sup>131</sup> When Dionysius mentions Aelius Tubero’s account of the Lupercalia at 1.80 then, it is not to refute the Fabian account of the festival — what this might have been will be examined shortly — or to make up for a deficiency in its details, but rather to clarify a specific plot point in the Romulus-Remus narrative.

Dionysius wants to include a variant story on the capture of Remus by the wicked Numitor. The section begins:

ὥς δὲ Τουβέρων Αἴλιος δεινὸς ἀνὴρ καὶ περὶ τὴν συναγωγὴν τῆς ἱστορίας ἐπιμελὴς γράφει, προειδότες οἱ τοῦ Νεμέτορος θύσοντας τὰ Λύκαια τοὺς νεανίσκους τῷ Πανὶ τὴν Ἀρκαδικὴν ὥς Εὐάνδρος κατεστήσατο θυσίαν ἐνήδρευσαν τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον τῆς ἱερουργίας,

“But as Aelius Tubero writes, who is careful about the construction of history writing, Numitor’s henchmen, with the foreknowledge that the young boys [i.e. Romulus and Remus] were about to perform the *Lykaia* to Pan – an Arcadian sacrifice that Evander instituted– set up an ambush for them at that sacred festival” (1.80.1).

It was at the Lupercalia, according to Tubero, that Numitor’s men kidnapped Remus.

The ERH account, which Dionysius has followed just up to this point (ibid.

1.79.3-1.79.14), had Remus lured out in battle and captured by Numitor’s men. After the

brief Aelian digression, Dionysius reverts again to the meat and bones, ERH narrative:

ὁ μὲν οὖν Ῥῶμος ἐπὶ τοῖς πολεμίοις γενόμενος οὕτως, εἶθ’ ὥς ὁ Φάβιος παραδέδωκε

---

<sup>131</sup> See p. 53-60.

δέσμιος εἰς τὴν Ἀλβαν ἀπήγετο, “Remus having fallen into the hands of the enemy in this way [i.e. Tubero’s story], or in the way Fabius tells it, was dragged off in chains to Alba...” (1.80.3). Thus the Lupercalian trickery is listed as an alternative to the mainstream account in the ERHs that Remus was captured in battle – i.e. the “Fabian” one (1.79.12-14).

Dionysius had already mentioned the Lupercalia in his early history of Rome, and this section grant further insight into the festival’s treatment in the ERHs (1.32). For Dionysius, the Palatine is *the* locus classicus for Greek-Roman cultural hybridization, and it is in this section of the history that he first deals with its related festival, the Lupercalia. Rome is characterized as an Arcadian colony, *Pallantion*, which was founded by Evander and his fellow Arcadian immigrants:<sup>132</sup>

πόλεων μάλιστα πασῶν μνημονευθησομένην. ὄνομα δὲ τῷ πολίσματι τούτῳ τίθενται Παλλάντιον ἐπὶ τῆς ἐν Ἀρκαδία σφῶν μητροπόλεως· νῦν μέντοι Παλάτιον ὑπὸ Ῥωμαίων λέγεται συγχέαντος τοῦ χρόνου τὴν ἀκρίβειαν καὶ παρέχει πολλοῖς ἀτόπων ἐτυμολογιῶν ἀφορμὰς. (1.31.4)

“They established the name of that city as *Pallantion*, from their home-city in Arcadia: now still it is called the *Palatium* by the Romans, though time has mixed up the correct spelling, and it has afforded a jumping off point for many to make specious etymologies”.

Later the name was corrupted to *Palatium*, i.e. *mons Palatinus* (*Pallantion* > *Palatium* > *mons Palatinus*).

---

<sup>132</sup> See p. 113-114 on Acilius.

All of this “standard” aetiologizing may have come from Fabius and the other ERHs. Next in the passage, Polybius is implicated as a deviant – perhaps like Aelius Tubero? – with the other “false” etymologies on “Palatine” that have been invented over the years (πολλοῖς ἀτόπων ἐτυμολογιῶν, quoted above):

ὥς δέ τινες ἱστοροῦσιν, ὧν ἔστι καὶ Πολύβιος ὁ Μεγαλοπολίτης, ἐπὶ τινος μαιρακίου Πάλλαντος αὐτόθι τελευτήσαντος: τοῦτον δὲ Ἡρακλέους εἶναι παῖδα καὶ †Λαύνας† τῆς Εὐάνδρου θυγατρὸς: χώσαντα δ' αὐτῷ τὸν μητροπάτορα τάφον ἐπὶ τῷ λόφῳ Παλλάντιον ἐπὶ τοῦ μαιρακίου τὸν τόπον ὀνομάσαι (1.32.1)

“But as some tell the story, amongst whom is also Polybius of Megalopolis, that it was named for Pallas, some boy who died on the hill. They say that he was the son of Hercules and [Lavinia?], daughter of Evander. They say that the maternal grandfather [Evander] heaped a tomb for him on the crest of the hill and named the place after the boy.”

Polybius is lumped in with an unnamed opposition group, ὥς δέ τινες ἱστοροῦσιν, who assert a *Pallantion* < *Pallas* etymology as a counter-balance to the more prevalent *Pallantion* < *Palatium*. Hercules is made the father of this Pallas, rather than Evander, but the general constellation of early Rome’s Greek/Indigenous figures is here — Hercules, Lavinia (?), and Evander. Other alternatives – ἐτυμολογιῶν implies there were multiple “false” etymologies of the Palatine hill in the mind of Dionysius – might have included the well-known later etymology *Palatium* < *balantum*, “bleating [sheep]” (Serv. *Aen.* 8.51).

This examination has demonstrated that Dionysius often uses other variant historians to riff off of a mainstream, “Fabian” account, and the Lupercalia is a

particularly good example of this. Our impression of Fabius' treatment of the Lupercalia so far has been somewhat in the negative, in so far as it did *not* contain Tubero's trickery or the etymology of Polybius. Yet it does seem that the Lupercal, its backstory, and concomitant worship must have played a featured role in Fabius Pictor, and so too in many of the ERHs who followed him.<sup>133</sup> The supporting evidence for this claim is mostly circumstantial in nature due to the citation style of Dionysius, full of loose attributions and scattered thought patterns, but the strong impression is that the Lupercalia had a place in the ERHs from Fabius onwards, and this would have required some extensive treatment within his longer narrative of the Romulus-Remus foundation.

Dionysius' transparent motivation, to connect the foundation of Rome and its earliest customs with Greek equivalents (he goes so far as to call Rome a Greek colony,

---

<sup>133</sup> τὸ δὲ ἄντρον, ἐξ οὗ ἡ λιβάς ἐκδίδεται, τῷ Παλλαντίῳ προσωκοδομημένον δείκνυται κατὰ τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν ἵπποδρομον φέρουσιν ὁδόν, καὶ τέμενός ἐστιν αὐτοῦ πλησίον, ἔνθα εἰκὼν κεῖται τοῦ πάθους λύκαινα παιδίοις δυσὶ τοὺς μαστοὺς ἐπίσχουσα, χαλκᾷ ποιήματα παλαιᾷς ἐργασίᾳ (Dion. Hal. 1.79.8). This is part of the long foundation fragment from Fabius (= Fabius Pictor 7 C). Though unnamed, this ἄντρον clearly refers to the Lupercal. This may be the only direct evidence that the Lupercal(ia) featured in Fabius' history. As always, caution is due with this particular section of Dionysius' history; it is unclear to what degree he is supplementing the general Fabian narrative with common knowledge / later versions. It is possible that these were generally known "facts" about the existence and purported significance of the Lupercal, but then again, Fabius' authority may have been what made these "facts" in the first place.



*Pallantion*), may well reflect the original intentions and thought process of the ERHs,<sup>134</sup> the city founded by wolf-suckled heroes must have something to do with wolf-mountain, Mt. Lykaia, in Arcadia. All of these convoluted stories, aetiologies, and other forms of fuzzy logic surrounding the Lupercalia, e.g. *mons Palatinum* < *Pallantion*, *Lupercal* < *lupa*, could not have been briefly dispatched in the histories of Fabius and his counterparts, and rather must have been thoroughly intertwined in the foundation story.

Moreover, there *is* some concrete evidence of the Lupercalia in the fragments of the ERHs. This is the fragment of Acilius (Plut. *Rom.* 21.7 = 3 C):

Γάιος δὲ Ἀκίλιος ἱστορεῖ πρὸ τῆς κτίσεως τὰ θρέμματα τῶν περὶ τὸν Ῥωμύλον ἀφανῆ γενέσθαι: τοὺς δὲ τῷ Φαύνῳ προσευξαμένους ἐκδραμεῖν γυμνοὺς ἐπὶ τὴν ζήτησιν, ὅπως ὑπὸ τοῦ ἰδρωτός μὴ ἐνοχλοῖντο: καὶ διὰ τοῦτο γυμνοὺς περιτρέχειν τοὺς Λουπέρκους.

“But Gaius Acilius recounts that before the foundation of the city the sheeplings of Romulus [and Remus] went missing: and that after praying to Faunus they ran naked in pursuit, so that they would not be bothered by sweat, and on account of this the *Luperci* run naked.”

---

<sup>134</sup> It is possible that the Dionysius’ Arcadian migrations (Dion. Hal. 1.31-34) are pulled from the ERHs. The 1.31.4 passage then would represent the mainstream account of the Lupercalia (against which Tubero is checked later in 1.80). If this were the case, this would almost exactly corroborate the early reconstruction of a Cincian etymology of Carmentis < *carmina* (cf. p. 84 n. 211): οἱ δὲ τὰς Ῥωμαϊκὰς συγγράψαντες ἀρχαιολογίας τῇ πατρίῳ γλώσσῃ Καρμέντην ὀνομάζουσιν: εἴη δ’ ἂν Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ Θεσπιῶδος τῇ νύμφῃ τοῦνομα: τὰς μὲν γὰρ ὥδας καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι κάρμινα, τὴν δὲ γυναικα ταύτην ὁμολογοῦσι δαιμονίῳ πνεύματι κατάσχετον γενομένην τὰ μέλλοντα συμβαίνειν τῷ πλήθει δι’ ὧδης προλέγειν (1.31.1). Within the following sections (1.31-34), Faunus (1.31.2), the Pallantion etymology (1.31.4, discussed above), the Lupercal (1.32.3), the arrival of the alphabet (1.33.4), and Hercules’ visit from Spain and the establishment of the *Ara Maxima* (1.34) make appearances, and all had precedents in the ERH tradition.

The aetiological logic is clear: “we run naked today [c] because Romulus and Remus once ended up running naked [a] and it started to become a local tradition [b].”

We are in a position now to make some rudimentary conclusions. Firstly, the Lupercalia, as a religious festival, received some attention in the ERHs. It was closely entangled within the foundation narrative and its aetiologies from the start, almost assuredly with Pictor. Grecizing was also likely present from the start; “nakedness” was something Greek, and it had to be explained how this element became part of an integral Roman festival. Acilius had his own hypothesis: Romulus and Remus needed to cool down one day and began running naked. Other ERHs gestured towards a coming of age rite from “Wolf Mountain” in Arcadia, the *Lykaia*.<sup>135</sup>

τὰ δὲ Λουπερκάλια τῷ μὲν χρόνῳ δόξειεν ἂν εἶναι καθάρσια: δρᾶται γὰρ ἐν ἡμέραις ἀποφράσι τοῦ Φεβρουαρίου μηνός, ὃν καθάρσιον ἂν τις ἐρμηνεύσειε, καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην τὸ παλαιὸν ἐκάλουν Φεβράτην. τοῦνομα δὲ τῆς ἐορτῆς ἑλληνιστὶ σημαίνει Λύκαια, καὶ δοκεῖ διὰ τοῦτο παμπάλαιος ἀπ’ Ἀρκάδων εἶναι τῶν περὶ Εὐάνδρον. ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν κοινόν ἐστι: δύναται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς λυκαίνης γεγονέναι τοῦνομα. (Plut. *Rom.* 21.3-4).

“The Lupercalia would seem to be a type of purification ritual according to its date. For it is held during the *nefasti* days of February, a month which some interpret to signify ‘purification,’ and that day they called the Febrata from ancient times. But the name of the festival refers to the Greek *Lykaia*, and as a consequence seems to be an ancient holdover from the Arcadians through Evander. Truly that is the common version: for its name could come from the wolf in the story.”

---

<sup>135</sup> Mt. Lykaion is most directly referenced in Dionysius’ alternative name for the Lupercal, the *lykaion*: ὁ καλοῦσι Ῥωμαῖοι Λουπερκάλιον, ἡμεῖς δ’ ἂν εἵπομεν Λύκαιον (Dion Hal. 1.32.3).

This is the ERH account that Acilius rationalized (Plut. *Rom.* 21.7, above). The original analogy, however, is Mt. Lykaion (mountain in Arcadia): *Lykaia* (associated rite) :: Lupercal : Lupercalia. The internal logic doesn't stand up well. Was the festival associated with wolves because of the primitive association in the *Lykaia* with wolves, and these rites were imported by Evander, or does the association date to the foundation and the *lupa* of Romulus and Remus (ἀλλὰ τοῦτο μὲν κοινόν ἐστι: δύναται γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς λυκαίνης γεγονέναι τοῦνομα)? Perhaps this temporal paradox wouldn't have bothered the ERHs very much; all the important elements are in place: wolves, Arcadians, Romulus and Remus, nakedness.

If the treatment of the Lupercalia can stand as paradigmatic for those of other festivals in the ERHs this would imply a deep fascination with religious origins, and a subsequent motivation to attach them to Greek *comparanda*. Which other festivals would have caught the interest of the ERHs? The Carmentalia, associated with Carmentis, would be a logical guess. We also possess an *action* for the *Vinalia*. This minor festival featured in the history of Postumius Albinus, the *de adventu Aeneae*, which had a focus on early Latin/Trojan history, as its title suggests (OGR 15 = 3 C). The context of this episode was the surprise siege and capture of the citadel of Lavinium by Lausus. The Latin locals are forced to send ambassadors to his father Mezentius to oversee their surrender and negotiate terms.<sup>136</sup> In return, they receive a set of demands, including the

---

<sup>136</sup> *Latini legatos ad Mezentium miserunt sciscitatum qua condicione in deditionem eos accipere vellet.*

seizure of all wine products in the *ager Latinus* for a period of some years, *aliquot annis*.<sup>137</sup> This particular stipulation is too much for Ascanius to bear: *consilio atque auctoritate Ascanii placuit ob libertatem mori potius quam illo modo servitutem subire*, “in his judgement and according to his authority it was more appealing to Ascanius to die for liberty rather than endure servitude in such fashion.” When the Latins successfully retake the city, they instead choose to dedicate the wine harvest to Jove, *vino ex omni vindemia Iovi publice voto consecratoque*, “the wine from the entire harvest was publically vowed and consecrated to Jove.”

There are several later versions of the story, in Ovid’s *Fasti*, Pliny the Elder’s *Natural History*, Plutarch’s *Romanae Quaestiones*, the closest match being Dionysius’ which agrees with Postumius on almost all details.<sup>138</sup> In each account, Mezentius makes some form of request/demand for the Latins’ wine which in turn enrages the Latins, and they rally under the leadership of Ascanius and his idea to consecrate the wine to Jove. Most significantly, there is a related fragment from Cato’s *Origines*:

[Cato] ait Mezentium Rutulis imperasse ut sibi offerrent quas dis primitias offerebant, et Latinos omnes similis imperii metu ita vovisse: ‘Iuppiter, si tibi magis cordi est nos ea tibi dare potius quam Mezentio, uti nos victores facias.’ (Macr. 3.5.10 = 1.12 C)

“Cato says that Mezentius ordered the Rutilians to grant him the first harvests which they were accustomed to give to the gods. Cato also says that all the Latins, in fear of a similar imposition, made the following vow: ‘Juppiter, if it is

---

<sup>137</sup> *cumque ille, inter alia onerosa, illud quoque adiceret ut omne vinum agri Latini aliquot annis sibi inferretur...*

<sup>138</sup> Dion. Hal. 1.65.2-5; Festus 322 Lindsay; Ovid *Fasti* 4.863ff.; Pliny 18.287; Plutarch QR 45. For full bibliography see Chassignet 1986: 6 n. 1.

your desire for us to grant you these [harvests] rather than Mezentius, let us be the victors.’”

It seems reasonable to assign the narrative skeleton of the Vinalia aetiology to Postumius and Cato, near contemporaries in the historiographic genre. Both fragments have garnered attention, Cato’s because it explicitly demonstrates that Mezentius was a *contemptor divum* long before Vergil (Verg. *Aen.* 7.648), and Postumius’ because his fragment is the first attestation of Lausus’ name.<sup>139</sup>

Let us return to the *OGR* quotation to isolate the Postumian contribution. The *OGR*’s quotation makes it appear as though Lausus’ capture of the was the crowning achievement of a life cut short: *filius eius Lausus collem Laviniae arcis occupavit... Latini urbe eruperunt fusoque praesidio interfectoque Lauso*, “his son Lausus took hold of the hill of the Lavinian citadel... the Latins burst forth from the city with the garrison routed and Lausus killed.” Thus, the passage is bookended by his moment of glory, the capture of the citadel, and his subsequent death. If this presentation mirrors Postumius’ own then Lausus’ rise and fall was part of a strategy to set up the aetiology of the Vinalia. This is supported by the later accounts of the Vinalia’s foundation which are quite consistent. Like Fabius, Postumius appears to have used a festival foundation to intermingle current religious practice within a mytho-historical timeline. His approach may or may not have been novel – it was paralleled by Cato at least, and it is impossible

---

<sup>139</sup> Chassignet 1996 (1): 93 n.2.

to prove that this was indeed Lausus' first entry into Roman historiography — but is at least characteristic of the aetiological treatment of cult by the ERHs.<sup>140</sup>

### **Ara Maxima**

The *Ara Maxima*, like the Lupercal, was another *locus* that invited a background narrative, one in which the rites to Hercules in the old Forum Boarium became a means to interweave Roman topography into Greek mythography and *ktisis* historiography; Rome became another stop in Hercules' Western travels, another locale to civilize.<sup>141</sup> The connection was made as early as Acilius, who uses the *Ara Maxima* to claim Rome as a Greek foundation, Ἑλληνικὸν εἶναι κτίσμα τὴν Ῥώμην:<sup>142</sup>

καὶ ὁ γε <Α>κύλιος, ὁ τῶν Ῥωμαίων συγγραφεύς, τοῦτο τίθεται σημεῖον τοῦ Ἑλληνικὸν εἶναι κτίσμα τὴν Ῥώμην, τὸ παρ' αὐτῇ τὴν πάτριον θυσίαν Ἑλληνικὴν εἶναι τῷ Ἡρακλεῖ. καὶ τὴν μητέρα δὲ τοῦ Εὐάνδρου τιμῶσι Ῥωμαῖοι, μίαν τῶν νυμφῶν νομίσαντες, Καρμέντην μετονομασθεῖσαν.  
(Strabo 5.3.3 = 1 C)

“And Acilius, a Roman writer, reckons it proof that Rome was a Hellenic foundation that a native Greek-style sacrifice exists there. Moreover, the Romans honor the mother of Evander, considering her one of the nymphs, her name changed to Carmentis.”

---

<sup>140</sup> Later sources suggest a further etymology surrounding the Vinalia: Vinalia < Venus. cf. Festus 322 Lindsay; Ovid *Fasti* 4.877.

<sup>141</sup> Burkert lists several Western Mediterranean locales where Hercules loses cattle during his visit to brigands and other lawless figures (Burkert 1979: 84). See Northwood 2007: 104 on the influence of *ktisis* literature on Fabius.

<sup>142</sup> On the emendation to Acilius, see Chassignet 1996 (1): 94 n. 2. Questioned by Cornell (3): 190.

Recall that Pictor (2 C) and Cincius (1 C) too had placed Evander prominently in the earliest parts of their histories, an acculturating figure modeled upon a Cadmean archetype who brings language and the alphabet to primitive Rome.<sup>143</sup> Moreover, by its placement at the top of the column of the Tauromenian inscription (Fabius Pictor 1 C), the Ἡρακλέους ἄφιξις must have featured in the very stages of Pictor's work and prominently so. It is safe to say then that Greek origins were highlighted from the start in the ERHs. In Pictor, Hercules and Evander already played important roles in the foundation narrative, and at least the latter was treated by Cincius as well. Perhaps Pictor was not so bold as to paint Rome as a Greek *ktisis*, but the constellation of Hercules and Evander suggests as much, and there was sustained focus in the ERHs on Evander's Arcadian origins as another Greek *aetion* for the Lupercalia (argued 70-77).

"Grecism" continued to be perceived at the heart of Roman institutions.

Romanticized accounts of Evander's Rome and the foundation of the *Ara Maxima* – *Aeneid* 8, Propertius 4.1, and Ovid's *Fasti* – were made famous in the Augustan poets, but their Cacus-Hercules accounts follow a vivid predecessor in Cassius Hemina. Here, Servius' distinction between *fabula* (i.e. Augustan poetic representations of the Hercules-Cacus episode) and *historia* (i.e. those presumably from the early historiographic tradition) must not be taken too much to heart.<sup>144</sup> Servius is right in so far as the Cacus

---

<sup>143</sup> See p. 63.

<sup>144</sup> Servius *Aen.* 8. 190: *Cacus secundum fabulam Vulcani filius fuit, ore ignem et fumum vomens, qui vicinia omnia populabatur. Veritas tamen secundum philologos et historicos habet hunc fuisse Evandri nequissimum servum ac furem.*

of the ERHs is not a poetic monster but rather a trickster slave of Evander – so at least is the case for Hemina. His foe, “Hercules,” in Hemina is accordingly just a local strongman shepherd. But this “realism” is merely a ploy for verisimilitude, not the *veritas* that Servius claims. These sorts of strategies were employed by Hemina throughout the early stages of his work, blending mythologic and historic data, and Rawson has plotted these Euhemeristic trends.<sup>145</sup> This subset of aetiology is apparent in the OGR’s citation of the Hercules-Cacus episode:

*Eo regnante [Evandro] forte Recaranus quidam, Graecae originis, ingentis corporis et magnarum virium pastor, qui erat forma et virtute ceteris antecellens, Hercules appellatus, eodem venit. Cumque armenta eius circa flumen Albulam pascere, Cacus Evandri servus, nequitiae versutus et praeter cetera furacissimus, Recarani hospitia bovea surripuit ac, ne quod esset indicium, aversas in speluncam attraxit. Cumque Recaranus vicinis regionibus peragratibus scrutatisque omnibus eiuscemodi latebris desperasset inventurum utcumque aequo animo dispendium ferens, excedere his finibus constituerat. At vero Evander, excellentissimae iustitiae vir, postquam rem uti acta erat, comperit, servum noxae dedit bovesque restitui fecit. Tum Recaranus sub Aventino Inventori Patri aram dedicavit appellavitque Maximam, et apud eam decimam sui pecoris profanavit. Haec Cassius libro primo. (OGR 6.1-4 = 5 C)*

“During the reign of Evander, by chance some man of Greek origin, named Recaranus, arrived there. He was a shepherd that possessed a giant frame and immense strength, who was outstanding above all others in physique and bravery, and so was called ‘Hercules.’ And while his flocks were grazing around the Albula river, Cacus, a servant of Evander, experienced in trickery and thieving above all else, stole the cattle of his

---

<sup>145</sup> Rawson 1991: 250-251. Hemina portrayed Saturn as an early (man) king of Rome: *Saturnum itaque, quantum litteras, neque Diodorus Graecus aut Thallus, neque Cassius Severus aut Cornelius Nepos, neque ullus commentator eiusmodi antiquitatum aliud quod hominem promulgaverunt* (Tert. Apol. 10.7 = 1 C). On the emendation of *Severus* to *Hemina* see Chassignet 1996 (2): 1 n. 3. Also, there is a hint of Euhemerism in the previously discussed fragment: *Cincius et Cassius aiunt ab Evandro Faunum deum appellatum ideoque aedes sacras ‘faunas’ primo appellatas* (Serv. Georg. 1.10 = 4 C). *Cincius et Cassius aiunt ab Evandro Faunum deum appellatum...primo* seems to be an *aetion* for Faunus’ quasi-god status; he was an early king at Rome, and, as with Saturn, when Evander arrived there he mistakenly hailed him as a god. Evander’s status too, somewhat ambiguous through his “divine” mother Carmentis, probably received some attention as well. Finally, Aeneas and his apotheosis would have been treated euhemeristically: *Patris Indigetis ei nomen datum* (Solin. 2.14 = 8 C).



guest Recaranus and, so that there would be no trail, dragged them backwards into a cave. And when Recaranus despaired that he would not find the cattle, bearing the loss with a wholly just mind, he decided to leave from the country. But in fact, Evander, a man of a man of outstanding good judgment, after he discovered how the affair had been carried out, he punished the slave and restored the cattle. Then Recaranus dedicated a temple beneath the Aventine to (his?) Father 'the Inventor' and called it 'Greatest', and at the altar sacrificed a tenth of his flock."

Some important details: 1) Recaranus is Greek, *Graecae originis*, but presumably not a fellow Arcadian that immigrated with Evander – hence he "arrives" at Rome during the reign of Evander, *eo regnante forte Recaranus... eodem venit* 2) His other main attribute is that he is a rustic strongman *quidam...ingentis corporis et magnarum virium pastor, qui erat forma et virtute ceteris antecellens* 3) these attributes, being Greek, strong, and virtuous, got him equated with Hercules (*Hercules appellatus* with a causal undertone). Servius again preserves a like Eumeristic sentiment, though confusingly: *Sane de Caco interempto ab Hercule tam Graeci quam Romani consentiunt, solus Verrius Flaccus dicit Garantum fuisse pastorem magnarum virium, qui Cacus adflixit, omnes autem magnarum virium apud veteres Hercules dictos* (Serv. ad A. 8.203), " Nearly all the the Greeks as well as Romans agree that Cacus was killed by Hercules; only Verrius Flaccus says that 'Garanus' was a shepherd of great strength, who killed Cacus, and moreover that amongst the ancients all those of great strength were called 'Hercules.'" If the OGR's account is to be trusted what is to be made of the fact that Verrius Flaccus is cited by Servius as the only originator of an alternate name for this Italian Hercules, here Garanus – Hemina

presumably lumped in with *tam Graeci quam Romani consentiunt?*<sup>146</sup> Though Servius is our second most prolific source on Hemina, the character of these citations, mostly short, etymological, and grammatical, suggests that Servius may not have had direct access to Hemina.<sup>147</sup> It would rather seem the case that an intermediary, Verrius Flaccus, drew upon Hemina's sentiment that *omnes autem magnarum virium apud veteres Hercules dictos (~Hercules appellatus)* but disagreed upon the original name, *Garanus* bearing a close resemblance to *Recaranus*.

Like many such citations, it is difficult to ascertain how much of the proceeding material in the *OGR* to attribute to Hemina. The author of the *OGR* cites an alternative afterwards in the "*Libri Pontificalium*" (*OGR* 7) where a subtle distinction seems to be drawn between Hemina's Italian "*Recaranus*" and the real Greek Heracles returning with Geryon's cattle. The only substantial disagreement between these accounts (*OGR* 6 vs. 7), however, is this name. *Libri Pontificalium* is probably meant here to refer to the other ERHs generally (i.e. *annales* in general), and Hemina only diverges with his euhemerization of an otherwise unknown "*Recaranus*." Moreover, the trigger to this episode is Evander's status as civilizer, a narrative present in the other ERHs:

*Primus itaque omnium Euander Italicos homines legere et scribere edocuit litteris, partim quas ipse antea didicerat; idemque fruges in Graecia primum inventas ostendit serendique usum edocuit terraeque excolendae gratia primus boves in Italia iunxit. (OGR 5.3)*

---

<sup>146</sup> See Momigliano 1960: 168-174 on the general reliability of the *OGR*.

<sup>147</sup> Hemina is cited 6 times by Servius, second only to Nonius.

“Thus Evander was the first of all to teach the Italians how to read and write the alphabet which he had just learned incompletely beforehand; and so he pointed out the edible plants that had been found first in Greece, and he taught them the process of sowing fields and he was the first to yoke cows together for the sake of cultivating the land.”

It follows that Hemina is just cited for his unique contribution, the assimilation of a local hero to Hercules.

There seems to have been a messy entanglement of Arcadian Evander and Hercules throughout several ERHs.<sup>148</sup> Certain elements in Hemina’s story hint at a rudimentary logic; of course Evander would welcome a fellow Greek, especially one so “strong and distinguished in virtue.” But our “learned” alphabet-fetcher again mistakes the identity of the hero in question and assumes he is some semi-divine figure, in this case Hercules (as he had done for Saturn earlier).<sup>149</sup> Evander’s tricky slave Cacus, the “bad” to his “good” (*evandros*), steals the shepherds’ flocks, and is punished by Evander for violating the *ius hospitium* by hiding Trecaranus’ cattle. This is followed by the restitution of the cattle and the altar foundation: *servum noxae dedit bovesque restitui fecit*.

*Tum Recaranus sub Aventino Inventori Patri aram dedicavit appellavitque Maximam, et apud*

---

<sup>148</sup> This is apparent in the fragment of Acilius: τοῦτο τίθεται σημεῖον τοῦ Ἑλληνικὸν εἶναι κτίσμα τὴν Ῥώμην, τὸ παρ’ αὐτῇ τὴν πάτριον θυσίαν Ἑλληνικὴν εἶναι πρὸ Ἡρακλεῖ· καὶ τὴν μητέρα δὲ τοῦ Εὐάνδρου τιμῶσι Ῥωμαῖοι (Strabo 5.3.3 = 1 C). Chassignet has argued that this material derives from Fabius (Chassignet 1996 (1): 62 n.1). For Fabius, we can only directly confirm that Hercules “arrived” at Rome from the Tauromenian Inscription (1 C, Ἡρακλέους ἄφιξις), but presumably someone was there to greet him. The Hercules-Cacus episode would be taken up later in the tradition by Gn. Gellius (Sol.1.7-9 = 6 C).

<sup>149</sup> See p. 82 n. 145. The equation of a rustic strongman to Hercules may be unique to Hemina, but Servius does not seem to have had any better access to other ERHs, in fact he cites them 6 times in total, an equal number to his fragments of Hemina alone (p. 84 n. 147).

*eam decimam sui pecoris profanavit*, “he [Evander] punished the servant and restored the cattle. Then Recaranus dedicated an altar to his Father, the inventor, at the base of the Aventine, and upon it sacrificed a tenth of his flock.” The original “father” in question seems to not be Jupiter, but rather Evander; he is properly the *inventor*, “finder,” of the lost cattle and the original dedicatee of the temple.<sup>150</sup> Over time, Hemina would argue, the identity of the vower, Recaranus, was synthesized with Hercules, and, by analogy, the father was understood to now be Jupiter. Thus, through a complex series of semiotics and rationalization Hemina has interwoven Greek and Roman institutions from their very inception. Whatever the Greek equivalent – suggested by Servius’ *tam Graeci quam Romani* – this is a distinctly Roman story about the violation of the *ius hospitium*, and describes a unique and ancient Roman rite, the sacrifice on the *Ara Maxima*.

*Prima facie*, the Greek saga – the arrivals of Evander and Hercules – could all be an *aetion* for the *Ara Maxima*. Hemina, after all, ends with its foundation. Nonetheless, these Grecizing connections may be somewhat more complex, as was the case of the Lupercalia.<sup>151</sup> Material cultural may have even existed to inspire the Herculean narrative of Hemina and the other ERHs. For instance, after the discovery of Daunian

---

<sup>150</sup> Perhaps a reference to his role as alphabet *repertor* as well (Mar. Victor. *Ars Gramm.* 1 p. 23 Keil = 2 C Fabius Pictor = 1 C Cincius)?

<sup>151</sup> It is actually possible that Cacus hid the cattle in the (future) Lupercal. The location of the *spelunca* is unspecified, and this was apparently the term used by Fabius for the Lupercal: *spelunca martis* (*apud* Serv. *Aen.* 8.630).

steles depicting a three-headed hero the emendation of *Trecaranus* for *Recaranus* has become popular, i.e. Greek τρικέφαλος, “three-headed.”<sup>152</sup> Richard, an editor of the *OGR*, authoritatively claims “que *Recaranus* soit a corriger en *Trecaranus* est une quasi-certitude au vu de certains fragments de stèles dauniennes découvertes dans les Pouilles.”<sup>153</sup> In addition to these steles Burkert adduces 1) three-headed Bronzes from Sardinia and Etruria, 2) another with three bulls’ heads rather than human, 3) and a widespread Celtic figure, “*Tarvos Trigaranus*.”<sup>154</sup> The three-headedness of this Italic/Gallic Hercules could have been easily transposed upon Heracles, conqueror of three-headed monsters, Cerberus, Orthos, Triton, and Geryon.<sup>155</sup> It also could have been used to explain another toponym, the *porta Trigemina*, situated near the *Ara Maxima*.<sup>156</sup>

### Historical (?) Aetiologies

---

<sup>152</sup> S. Ferri, 1969, 24 *RAL*: 133-153.

<sup>153</sup> J. Richard, 1983, *Pseudo-Aurélius Victor: Les Origines du Peuple Romain*: 126; contra N. Horsfall, 1985, 29 *EMC*: 397: “It does not solidly advance our comprehension to emend the name to *Trecaranus*, the three-headed.”

<sup>154</sup> Burkert 1979: 86. Add to this the evidence adduced by Adam, including another set of Parisian three-headed bronze statues (A. Adam, 1985, 97.2 *MEHR*: 577-586).

<sup>155</sup> Alföldi posits that Fabius’ (and perhaps Timaeus’) piglet prodigy was ultimately inspired by statuary in Lavinium, which competed with Alba Longa as an early Latin religious center. cf. Cornell 2013 (3): 15.

<sup>156</sup> The two *topoi* are connected in Gn. Gellius’ version: *quippe aram Hercules, quam voverat si amissas boves repperisset, punito Caco Patri Inventori dicavit. qui Cacus habitavit locum, cui Salinae nomen est, Trigemina nunc porta. hic, ut Gellius tradidit...* (Solin. 1.7-8 = 17 C). The *nunc* seems to have explanatory force, “the place is now called three-headed because Cacus once lived there,” and thus represent an aetiological approach.

## Marcius

Extended aetiologies in the ERHs will have clustered around a number of “historical” figures from Rome’s past. Like Lausus above, these characters and their stories provide the necessary background for Roman topologies and practices. Iunius Brutus himself, the tyrannicide, was an example: *Postumius Albinus Annali primo de Bruto: ‘Ea causa sese stultum brutumque faciebat, grossulos ex melle edebat*, “Postumius Albinus in his first book of Annals wrote on Brutus, ‘for this reason he made himself out to be stupid and brutish since he was accustomed to eat figs without honey’” (Macr. Sat. 3.20.5). It is safe to assume that Postumius’ history dealt with Brutus in some depth; surely more was mentioned than his “dumb” epithet.<sup>157</sup> A fragment of Hemina suggests a similar treatment for Scaevola (and perhaps the “lefty” etymology of his name): *censuit sese regem Porsennam occidere*, “he thought he had killed the king Porsenna” (Non. p. 408 Lindsay = 19 C).<sup>158</sup>

Even figures from more recent — and verifiable — periods received a deal of embellishment in the ERHs and their predecessors. Livy singles out a soldier, L. Marcius, to whom he attributes the salvation of the Roman forces in Spain and a rousing

---

<sup>157</sup> At least two other similar fragments – i.e. aetiologies from famous Romans – could be included in this section (Olus = Fabius Pictor 16 C; Ahala = Cincius 5 C; discussed at p. 60-62, 64). The aetiology of Marcius’ shield has been chosen because, unlike the other fragments, it was spawned by a near-contemporary material object. This would go to show that aetiologizing strategies were not *only* confined to regal and early Republican material.

<sup>158</sup> cf. Livy 2.12-13.

speech: *vir unus res perditas restituit. erat in exercitu L. Marcius Septimi filius, eques Romanus, impiger iuuenis*, “A single man restored the disastrous state of affairs. He was L. Marcius, son of Septimius, a Roman knight and an eager young man” (Livy 25.37.1).<sup>159</sup> This otherwise unknown soldier is granted a sort of “guerilla *aristeia*,” which ends in a massive Carthaginian defeat and a halt to their advances in Spain. Two sections later, Livy cites several later historians for casualty figures, Claudius Quadrigarius, Piso, and Valerius Antias. A key point here is the supposed translation of Acilius by Claudius, *Claudius qui annales Acilianos ex Graeco in Latinum sermonem vertit* (Livy 25.39.11-17). This aside suggests that Livy could trace the Claudian account back to Acilius. Nonetheless, it is difficult, under the circumstances, to untangle what material that follows is uniquely Acilian; is he responsible for the death toll, the longer narrative of L. Marcius, or both?

The end of the passage hints at the possibility that L. Marcius and his exploits had been “invented” earlier, or at least manipulated, to explain a dedicatory shield at the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus:

*ita nocte ac die bina castra hostium oppugnata ductu L. Marcii. ad triginta septem milia hostium caesa auctor est Claudius, qui annales Acilianos ex Graeco in Latinum sermonem uertit; captos ad mille octingentos triginta, praedam ingentem partam; in ea fuisse clipeum argenteum pondo centum triginta septem cum imagine Barcini Hasdrubalis... [corresponding casualty figures of Piso and Valerius Antias]... apud omnes magnum nomen Marcii ducis est; et uerae gloriae eius etiam miracula addunt flammam ei contionanti fusam e capite sine ipsius sensu cum magno pauore*

---

<sup>159</sup> The heroism of an individual soldier, not a *dux*, may have recalled Caedicius, the unnamed military tribune of Cato’s *Origines* (Gell. 3.7 = Cato Orig. 4.7 C).

*circumstantium militum; monumentumque uictoriae eius de Poenis usque ad incensum Capitolium fuisse in templo clipeum, Marcium appellatum, cum imagine Hasdrubalis*

“And so in one night and one day both camps of the enemy had been stormed under the leadership of L. Marcius. Claudius, who translated the *annales* of Acilius, is a source that 37,000 of the enemy were killed, 1830 were captured, and a great amount of spoils were acquired: amongst which was a silver shield weighing 137 pounds and with the image of Hasdrubal Barca. Amongst all [the authors] the great name of this leader is Marcius; and to his true glory they add a miracle: that a flame burst out on his head while he was speaking at an assembly, without any knowledge of his own, but it was matter of great fear for the soldiers standing around him. [They say] too that there was a monument concerning his victory over the Carthaginians in the temple of Jupiter Optimus Maximus, at least until the fire there. It was a shield called the ‘Marcian’ shield, and had the image of Hasdrubal on it.”

Thus, Livy’s historiographical survey gives the impression that the basic details are 1) the name of the soldier was Marcius (*apud omnes magnum nomen Marcii ducis est*) 2) his hair caught fire and was heralded as a prodigy (*miracula addunt flammam ei contionanti fusam e capite...*),<sup>160</sup> and 3) a shield was dedicated by him or in his honor at the temple of Jupiter (*monumentumque uictoriae eius de Poenis usque ad incensum Capitolium fuisse in templo clipeum, Marcium appellatum, cum imagine Hasdrubalis*). It seems likely that at least the first and last detail originated in Acilius, who is implicated with Claudius above on the detail that *in ea fuisse clipeum argenteum pondo centum triginta septem cum imagine*

---

<sup>160</sup> This would have been part of a series of “flaming hair” prodigies in Roman literature. Servius connects Iulus’ famous spontaneous combustion (Verg. *Aen.* 2.679-686) with that of Servius Tullius (*item hoc quoque de igni ad Servium Tullium pertinet*, Serv. *Aen.* 2.683; cf. Livy 1.41). There was an alternate “flame” associated with Tullius, in the form of the phallus that appeared to the slave Ocrisia as an omen before his birth. Dionysius maintains that this story is of great antiquity, coming to the ERHs directly from “local chronicles.” φέρεται δέ τις ἐν ταῖς ἐπιχωρίοις ἀναγραφαῖς καὶ ἕτερος ὑπὲρ τῆς γενέσεως αὐτοῦ λόγος ἐπὶ τὸ μυθῶδες ἐξαίρων τὰ περὶ αὐτόν, ὃν ἐν πολλαῖς Ῥωμαϊκαῖς ἱστορίαις εὕρομεν (Dion. Hal. 4.2.1). See Frier 1999: 111 n.10 for further documentation on the Tullius myth at Rome.



*Barcini Hasdrubali*. So, a reconstruction based upon Livy's information might run something like this: Acilius explained the dedication of a shield inscribed with the name Marcius (or a titulum) that also had an embossed image of Hasdrubal as a war spoil taken from Spain;<sup>161</sup> a Marcius then needed to be found or invented as its subject, and he was placed in an early Spanish campaign against Hasdrubal;<sup>162</sup> later authors filled in details on this enigmatic figure, such as the prodigy, death toll, and the speeches from Livy Book 25. Thus, the exposition of Marcius' *res gesta* would be a set up as an *aetion* for an artifact, the "Marcian shield," and this aetiological move appears to have been made as early as Acilius. Nonetheless, for the aetiologically oriented ERHs, it may not have mattered whether such a shield actually existed or was just the product of folklore; it may have been convenient that the shield was thought to have been destroyed by a fire (*usque ad incensum Capitolium fuisse*), and so could not be fact-checked.

### Tarpeia

Dionysius' account of Tarpeia (Dion. Hal. 2.38ff. = 10 C Fabius; 7 C Cincius; 7 C Piso) calves into two competing narratives: 1) Fabius' and Cincius' (perhaps as models for the whole ERH tradition) 2) Piso's (as a revisionist).<sup>163</sup>

---

<sup>161</sup> The weight of the shield does imply direct consultation with the artifact, but a shield of this weight (137 Roman pounds = 99 pounds) seems prohibitively clumsy for practical use. Of course, it could have been commissioned as a dedicatory piece.

<sup>162</sup> It is somewhat suspicious that, in Livy's chronology, this Marcius should feature in the same book as the famous seer that predicted Cannae, who has a similarly myterious background (Livy 25.12).

<sup>163</sup> cf. Cornell 2013 (3): 24-25.

παρεξιόντας γὰρ τὴν ῥίζαν τοῦ Καπιτωλίου τοὺς Σαβίνους εἰς ἐπίσκεψιν, εἴ τι μέρος εὐρεθείη τοῦ λόφου κλοπῇ ληφθῆναι δυνατόν ἢ βία, παρθένος τις ἀπὸ τοῦ μετεώρου κατεσκόπει θυγάτηρ ἀνδρὸς ἐπιφανοῦς, ᾧ προσέκειτο ἡ τοῦ χωρίου φυλακή, Τάρπεια ὄνομα: καὶ αὐτήν, ὥς μὲν Φάβιός τε καὶ Κίγκιος γράφουσιν, ἔρως εἰσέρχεται τῶν ψελλίων, ἃ περὶ τοῖς ἀριστεροῖς βραχίουσιν ἐφόρουν, καὶ τῶν δακτυλίων: χρυσοφόροι γὰρ ἦσαν οἱ Σαβίνοι τότε καὶ Τυρρηνῶν οὐχ ἦττον ἀβροδίαιτοι: ὥς δὲ Πείσων Λεύκιος ὁ τιμητικὸς ἱστορεῖ, καλοῦ πράγματος ἐπιθυμία γυμνοῦς τῶν σκεπαστηρίων ὅπλων παραδοῦναι τοῖς πολίταις τοὺς πολεμίους. (Dion. Hal. 2.38.2-3)

“From above, a young maiden looked down upon the Sabines as they were passing the base of the Capitoline searching for a vantage point to see if any spot could be taken by trickery or force. She was the daughter of a distinguished man, to whom the guarding of the spot had been assigned, and her name was Tarpeia. According to Fabius and Cincius, a desire for their arm bracelets took hold of her, bracelets which they wore on their arms and fingers [as rings]. For the Sabines then were gold-garbed and no less extravagant than the Etruscans. As Lucius Piso, a man who held the censorship, tells it, it was enthusiasm for a noble deed, that is so that the enemy soldiers would be bereft of defensive implements and she would hand them over to her fellow citizens.”

Thus, in the Pictor / Fabius account Tarpeia was an unequivocal traitor, allured only by the sight of enemy fineries to betray her country. Her short-sightedness and wickedness are really too mythic to take at face value;<sup>164</sup> and hence Piso tried to come up with a rationale for her odd behavior. In Piso’s reckoning, the meeting with Tatius and the request for their arms was a ruse to disarm the Sabines and allow Roman forces to capture them without a fight (Dion. Hal. 2.39.1-2):

μέχρι μὲν δὴ τούτων συμφέρονται πάντες οἱ Ῥωμαίων συγγραφεῖς, ἐν δὲ τοῖς ὕστερον λεγομένοις οὐχ ὁμολογοῦσι. Πείσων γὰρ ὁ τιμητικὸς, οὗ καὶ πρότερον ἐμνήσθην, ἄγγελόν φησιν ὑπὸ τῆς Ταρπείας ἀποσταλῆναι νύκτωρ

---

<sup>164</sup> One thinks of other “traiterous” mythic heroines, e.g. Scylla (Ovid *Met.* 8.6ff.), though these of course may be backformed – at least in the Roman tradition – from a Tarpeian archetype.

ἐκ τοῦ χωρίου δηλώσοντα τῷ Ῥωμύλῳ τὰς γενομένας τῇ κόρῃ πρὸς τοὺς Σαβίνους ὁμολογίας, ὅτι μέλλοι τὰ σκεπαστήρια παρ' αὐτῶν αἰτεῖν ὅπλα διὰ τῆς κοινότητος τῶν ὁμολογιῶν παρακρουσαμένη, δύναμιν τε ἀξιῶσοντα πέμπειν ἐπὶ τὸ φρούριον ἑτέραν νυκτός, ὥς αὐτῷ στρατηλάτῃ παραληψόμενον τοὺς πολεμίους γυμνοὺς τῶν ὅπλων: τὸν δὲ ἄγγελον αὐτομολήσαντα πρὸς τὸν ἡγεμόνα τῶν Σαβίνων κατήγορον γενέσθαι τῶν τῆς Ταρπείας βουλευμάτων. οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Φάβιον τε καὶ Κίγκιον οὐδὲν τοιοῦτο γεγονέναι λέγουσιν, ἀλλὰ φυλάξαι τὴν κόρην διαβεβαιοῦνται τὰς περὶ τῆς προδοσίας συνθήκας. τὰ δ' ἐξῆς ἅπαντες πάλιν ὁμοίως γράφουσι.

“Thus far all the Roman authors agree on these matter, but they do not agree on what happened next. For Piso, the ex-censor, whom I noted before, says that a messenger was sent from that place by Tarpeia during the night to make Romulus aware of what agreements with the Sabines the girl had made, that is that she was about to ask for their defensive implements to cheat them with the the ambiguity of the language of the agreement, and entreating him [Romulus] to send another force of troops to the garrison that night, so that enemy and their commander could be captured since they would be defenseless. But he [Piso] says it was the messenger that deserted to the leader of the Sabines and revealed the plans of Tarpeia. But, in the accounts of Fabius and Cincius, they say that nothing of that sort took place, but firmly maintain that the maiden kept the agreements on betraying the city. Nonetheless, on the following events all the authors are in agreement once again.”

Piso then has transposed blame from Tarpeia onto an unfaithful servant;<sup>165</sup> she may have let the enemy in the gates, but she did so with the best of intentions. Even Livy's Tarpeia retains some sense of ambiguity, since he includes, alongside the Fabian account that she approached Tatius, the possibility that she was the one approached by Tatius

---

<sup>165</sup> The rehabilitation of Tarpeia into a noble Roman matron may have recalled Fabius' glowing depiction of Lucretia. That Lucretia featured in Fabius is almost undeniable. Dionysius critiques Fabius at the beginning of his retelling of the Rape of Lucretia, asserting that Collatinus must be downdated a generation for the story to make sense (Dion. Hal. 4.64.2-3 = 17 C). Nonetheless, this is merely a prefacing remark, and presumably the broad strokes of the story that follows originated in Fabius (Dion. Hal. 4.64-66). This too was the method in which Dionysius treated the Fabian foundation narrative, that is that he tends to only demarcate disagreements with Fabius, but otherwise accepts his general account. Piso then would be recasting Tarpeia as a brave, noble woman along the line of the Fabian Lucretia, not the Fabian Tarpeia.

(Livy 1.11). Thus, Tarpeia might not have *actively* sought the destruction of her fatherland.

A tentative reconstruction of the Tarpeia myth in Roman historiography might look something like this: 1) Tarpeia began as a quintessential Roman noblewoman. In the 3rd century BC Greek historian Antigonus (Plut. *Rom.* 17.5 = FGrH 816 F 2) she was actually the daughter of Tatius.<sup>166</sup> 2) Fabius and the ERHs warped this positive conception of Tarpeia to fit an aetiology for the Tarpeian rock, i.e. why it was associated with criminality, and so made her the treacherous lover of a foreign invader<sup>167</sup> 3) Her status was changed to a Vestal – or at least highlighted – to further underscore the depth of her depravity (Varro *LL* 5.41; Prop. 4.4). Piso, perhaps alone, swam against this current, demonstrating the absurdity of this kind of behavior in a Roman noblewoman. Instead, he chose a convenient scapegoat, a slave, who foiled the heroic plans of his mistress. Indeed, the treatment in the historiographic tradition seems to mirror the ambivalence to a particular *topos*, the Tarpeian rock. On the one hand, like its toponymous heroine, it was thought to have been a most ancient part of Roman history, but its role in the execution of criminals, essentially a human sacrifice, complicated its later reception.

---

<sup>166</sup> Antigonus is placed between Timaeus and Polybius in Dionysius' chronology (Dion. Hal. 1.6.1 = FGrH T 1), and so *could* have influenced Fabius.

<sup>167</sup> This same motive may have led to his preference for the *caput Oli* toponym over the Tarpeian "hill" / rock. Discussed p. 62.

## Concluding Thoughts

If this survey has demonstrated anything it is that aetiology was pervasive in the fragments of the ERHs, existing in some fashion or another in a third or more of attested fragments in the ERHs.<sup>168</sup> Even if fragments of individual historiographers are disqualified – e.g. assigning the aetiological “Cincian” fragments to the antiquarian – the broad strokes remain the same. Moreover, in these calculations fragments that include multiple aetiologies (in multiple forms) would count a single time, and so their preponderance may be underrepresented. Again, it would be dangerous to extrapolate too widely from this data set, damaged as it is. Nonetheless, it is probably safe to assume that aetiology *was* an important trend in the ERHs from its wide instantiation in this set of historiographers. Thus, it was not so important for our purposes to ascertain whether an aetiological fragment belonged to one or another ERH, but rather to note its existence within the nebulous cast of ERHs or demonstrate some line of internal reception within these authors.

The quoting sources of the ERHs may have further skew the results, though probably only on a case to case basis. In the case of Cassius Hemina, for instance, many fragments are preserved in later grammarians, these fragments being too short and

---

<sup>168</sup> By rough tabulation: **Fabius** 1 C; 2 C; 4 C; 5 C; 7 C; 9 C; 10 C; 13 C; 16 C; 22 C = 10/37 fragments = 24.3% **Cincius** 1 C; 2 C; 5 C; 7 C; 8 C; 9 C; 11 C; 12 C; 13 C = 9/13 fragments = 69% **Postumius** 2 C; 3 C; 3 C = 3/4 fragments = 75%; **Acilius** 1 C; 2 C; 3 C; 4 C; 6 C = 5/8 fragments = 62.5%; **Hemina** 1 C; 2 C; 3 C; 4 C; 5 C; 7 C; 8 C; 14 C; 15 C; 16 C; 19 C; 30 C; 12/40 fragments = 30% **Total ERHs** = 39/102 = 38.2%

decontextualized to be of any analytic value;<sup>169</sup> the proportion of Hemina's aetiological fragments would be significantly higher discarding these scraps. Another concern may be that aetiological thinking featured almost exclusively in the early sections of the histories of the ERHs. This conception may be accurate in a broad sense, but there are fragments that suggest aetiologies in later periods, e.g. the shield of Marcius.<sup>170</sup> Moreover, by their very nature, aetiologies are intensely concerned with connecting present practice (*a*) to past inception (*c*), and so, in a sense, all aetiologies are both recent and past.

In addition, many fragments elude the basic aetiological categorizations given in this chapter. Cassius Hemina, for instance, retrojects various contemporary Roman religious observations back to the instructions and stipulations of Numa (Pliny *NH* 18.7 = 15 C; Pliny *NH* 32.20 = 16 C).<sup>171</sup> He also explained the origin and significance of the *Lares Grundilibus* (Diomed. 1 p. 384 Keil), and relates the Penates to a group of deities in Samothrace (Serv. *Aen.* 1.378 = 7 C).<sup>172</sup> Whether or not these episodes received any

---

<sup>169</sup> Some examples: 9 C; 10 C; 11 C; 13 C; 20 C; 31 C; 33 C; 35 C; 39 C.

<sup>170</sup> Elliott has similarly deconstructed the claim that fragments of Ennius' *Annales* detailing divine action were a feature solely of the early books, and that this material could not have persisted long into the *Annales* (Elliott 2013: 45-50, appendix 303-307).

<sup>171</sup> cf. Chassignet 2008: 41; Rawson 1991: 251. Hemina is the case study here, in part, because he employs such a wide range of aetiologizing strategies, and so defeats any simple scheme of categorization. Pictor too was interested in these sorts of "practical" aetiologies, crediting Servius Tullius with the creation of the 30 tribes (Dion. Hal. 4.5.1-2 = 13 C).

<sup>172</sup> cf. the "religious oddities" of Cincius, discussed p. 67-68. Hemina seems to have connected the *Lares Grundilibus* with the piglet prodigy that presages the founding of Alba Longa: *monstrum fit, sus parit porcos triginta, cuius rei fanum fecerunt Laribus Grundilibus* (Diomed. 1. p. 384 Keil = 14 C).

extended attention, or employed methods like etymology, is unclear. Fragments that do not contain aetiology, but rather exhibit degrees of rationalizing tactics, have been left aside as well, including instances of interplay between dating systems and synchronizations.<sup>173</sup>

The intention of this study has been to bring to light the intellectual gymnastics that the ERHs went through to craft their histories in order that their positive contribution to Roman literature can be better understood. Part of this endeavor has involved trying to trace the meandering logic of the ERHs, which lends itself to a digressive *cursus* of its own. Some themes recurred, most often Greek origins. East-West migrations were posited from, to, and through Sicily. The site of Rome itself was pre-settled with Greek *topoi* and rites that, supposedly, continued (esp. the Lupercalia, sacrifices to Hercules at the *Ara Maxima*). The Italians owed their language and agrarian-based society to this borrowed heritage, personified in the *inventor* figure of Evander. As Rome began to properly found itself, the landscape became dotted with early reference points, e.g. the Tarpeian rock, the Capit-Olium, the Lupercal. In the transition to the Republic, inspirational figures too began to populate the Roman spacetime continuum, e.g. Brutus, Scaevola, and Marcius. Or so the ERHs sketched it.

---

<sup>173</sup> In Hemina, this included synchronizing Homer and Hesiod to the Roman regal period (Gellius 17.21.3 = 12 C). Discussed p. 34. There is a relevant fragment from Pliny as well: *L. Aemilio M. Livio cos. anno urbis DXXXV...* (Pliny NH 29.12-13 = 29 C). These citations of Hemina may demonstrate that he oscillated and synchronized AUC and consular dating, which would suggest a more flexible dating system than is generally allowed for a “middle annalist.”

Future projects would do well to extend the study of aetiology in the ERHs backwards and forwards in time: Where did this rationalizing impulse come from? To what ends could it go? There is still room to improve the understanding of the influence of Greek historians on the ERHs, including backdating the appropriation of Alexandrian antiquarianism. From there, it is also important to situate Cato within these historiographic trends and trace the ultimate sundering of antiquarianism and history into the first century BC.



## BIBLIOGRAPHY<sup>174</sup>

- Alföldi, A. 1965. *Early Rome and the Latins*. Ann Arbor.
- Badian, E. 1966. "The Early Latin Historians." In *Latin Historians*, ed. T. A. Dorey, 1-38. New York.
- Beck, H. and U. Walter. 2005. *Die Frühen Römischen Historiker*. Darmstadt.
- Beck, H. 2007. "The Early Roman Tradition." In *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, ed. J. Marincola: 259-265. Malden.
- Bucher, G. 1987. "The Annales Maximi in the Light of Roman Methods of Keeping Records." *AJAH* 12.1: 2-61.
- Burkert, W. 1979. *Structure and History in Greek Mythology and Ritual*. Berkeley.
- Chassignet, M. 1996. *l'Annalistique Romaine*. Paris.
- Chassignet, M. 2008. "l'Étiologie dans l'Historiographie Romaine antérieure à César et Salluste." In *Étiologie dans la Pensée Antique*, ed. M. Chassignet: 35-52. Turnhout.
- Clarke, K. 2008. *Making Time for the Past*. Oxford.
- Cornell, T.J. 1995. *The Beginnings of Rome*. London.
- Cornell, T.J. et al. 2013. *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*. Oxford.
- Crake, J. 1940. "The annals of the Pontifex Maximus." *PCPH* 35.4: 375-386.
- Dillery, J. 2002. "Quintus Fabius Pictor and Greco-Roman historiography at Rome." In *Vertis in Usum*, 1-23. Leipzig.
- Drews, R. 1988. "Pontiffs prodigies, and the Disappearance of the *Annales Maximi*." *CPh* 83.4: 289-299.
- Dufallo, B 2013. *The Captor's Image; Greek Culture in Roman Ecphrasis*. Oxford.

---

<sup>174</sup> Journal titles are abbreviated according to the guidelines of *l'Année Philologique*.

- Elliott, J. 2013. *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annales*. Cambridge.
- Feeney, D. 2007. *Caesar's Calendar*. Berkeley.
- Feldherr, A. 2003 "Cicero and the Invention of 'Literary' History." In *Formen Römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius*, ed. U. Eigler et al., 196-212. Darmstadt.
- Fornara, C. 1983. *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*. Berkeley.
- Forsythe, G. 1994. *The Historian L. Capurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman Annalistic Tradition*. Lanham.
- Frier, B. 1979/1999. *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum*. Ann Arbor.
- Ginsburg, J. 1981. *Tradition and Theme in the Annales of Tacitus*. Salem, NH.
- Jacoby, F. 1949. *Atthis*. Oxford.
- Kraus, C. 1994. *Livy: Ab Urbe Condita 6*. Cambridge.
- Mankin, D. 2011. *Cicero: De Oratore Book III*. Cambridge.
- McDonald, A. H. 1957. "The Style of Livy." *JRS* 47: 155-172.
- Momigliano, A. 1960. *Secondo Contributo alla Storia degli Studi Classici*. Roma.
- Northwood, S. "Quintius Fabius Pictor: was he an Annalist?" In *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald* (vol. 2), ed. N. Sekunda, 97-114.
- Oakley, S. 1997. *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI-X*. Oxford.
- Peter, H. 1897. *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*. Leipzig.
- Potter, D. 1999. *Literary texts and the Roman Historian*. London.
- Poucet, J. 1976. "Fabius Pictor et Denys d'Halicarnasse: 'Les enfances de Romulus et de Rémus.'" *Historia* 25.2: 201-216.
- Rawson, E. 1991. *Roman Culture and Society*. Oxford.

- Rich, J. 2011. "Structuring Roman History: The Consular Year and the Roman Historical Tradition." *Histos* 5: 1-43.
- Rüpke, J. 1995/2011. *The Roman Calendar from Numa to Constantine*. trans. Richardson. West Sussex.
- Rüpke, J. 2006. "Ennius' *Fasti* in Fulvius' Temple: Greek Rationality and Roman Tradition." *Arethusa* 39.3: 489-512.
- Santini, C. 1995. *I Frammenti di L. Cassio Emina: Introduzione, Testo, Traduzione e Commento*. Pisa.
- Skutsch, O. 1985. *The Annals of Q. Ennius*. Oxford.
- Stryzelecki, W. 1964. *Belli Punici Carminis quae Supersunt*. Leipzig.
- Verbrugghe, G. 1981. "Fabius Pictor's 'Romulus and Remus.'" *Historia* 30.2: 236-238.
- Verbrugghe, G. 1989. "On the Meaning of *Annales*, on the Meaning of Annalist." *Philologus* 133.2: 192-230.
- Vine, B. 1993. *Studies in Archaic Latin Inscriptions*. Innsbruck.
- Walbank, F. W. 1957. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. Oxford.
- Wiseman, T. P. 1979. *Clio's Cosmetics*. Leicester.

## APPENDIX 1

### *Abbreviations*

**C** = fragment from Chassignet's edition of *l'Annalistique Romaine*

**Dion. Hal.** = all references to *Antiquitates Romanae*

**ERH** = Early Roman Historiographers

**FRH** = fragment from the edition of *Fragments of the Roman Historians* by Cornell et al.

**Gell.** = all references to *Attices Noctae*

**Isid.** = all references to the *Origines*

**OGR** = *Origo Gentis Romanae*, work of Ps. Aurelius Victor

**Pliny** = all references to the *Naturalis Historia* of Pliny the Elder

## APPENDIX 2

### *The Cast of ERHs*

#### **Q. Fabius Pictor:**<sup>175</sup>

Fabius Pictor was a Roman aristocrat of high pedigree.<sup>176</sup> His branch of the family, perhaps somewhat shamed by his father's connection to frescoes on his newly-built temple (hence the *Pictor* cognomen), nonetheless possessed close kinship ties with the more famous *Fabii Verrucosi* and *Fabii Maximi*.<sup>177</sup> Unfortunately, no birth date is attested for the historian. Instead there are only a few career notices. A fragment from Pliny (*NH* 10.71 = 8 C) suggests that Fabius was present at a battle with Ligurians, which Chassignet suggests either took place under P. Furius Philus in 223 or Pictor's cousin Verrucosus in 233.<sup>178</sup> Fabius also participated in the *tumultus Gallicus* of 225 (Eutr. 3.5/Oros. *His.* 4.13.6-7 = 30 C).<sup>179</sup> Later, he would be chosen to lead a mission to the

---

<sup>175</sup> For fuller discussion see Cornell 2013 (1): 160-178; Chassignet 1996 (1): LIV-LXXIII. Some have posited the existence of two *Fabii Pictores* (*Graeci annales* vs. *Latini annales*). I follow the logic of Chassignet (Chassignet 1996 (1) LIX) and the other modern editors that view the collection of fragments as wholly belonging to Fabius Pictor of the 3rd/2nd century BC. *contra* Frier 1999: 251-2.

<sup>176</sup> *nobilissimus homo* (Cic. *Tusc.* 1.14); *nobilissimus civis* (Val. Max. 8.14.6).

<sup>177</sup> Chassignet 1996 (1): LV. Badian interprets the cognomen as entirely derisive (Badian 1966: 2).

<sup>178</sup> His participation in the battle is signaled by the used of the pronouns *se* and *eius*. See Chassignet 1996 (1): LV.

<sup>179</sup> The testimonia echo each other (and thus may be interdependent): *traditum est a Fabio historico, qui ei bello interfuit* (Eutr. 3.5); *sicut Fabius historicus, qui eidem bello interfuit scripsit* (Oros. 4.13.6). These are listed as T 1a/b in the *FRH*.

oracle of Delphi on the heels of the disaster at Cannae.<sup>180</sup> This presupposes some advanced political and /or religious standing, but little else can be adduced concerning his *cursus*.<sup>181</sup>

The temporal context of his history writing is even more murky. A date for the publication of the *annales* is irrecoverable at this point.<sup>182</sup> Two theses have been advanced 1) a date during the Second Punic War<sup>183</sup> 2) a date after.<sup>184</sup> What is almost universally agreed upon, however, is one target audience of the work: Hellenic intellectuals. Greek historians, particularly Timaeus, Eratosthenes, Diocles, and Philinus,<sup>185</sup> had included Rome within the sphere of their own historical writings. Nonetheless, Fabius – so the argument runs – was compelled to write a native, patriotic perspective on Rome’s place in the Mediterranean, once a peripheral one, now central and hegemonic (during / after the 2nd Punic War at least).<sup>186</sup> Fabius was thus writing in

---

<sup>180</sup> App. *Hann.* 27.116.; Liv. 22.57.4; Liv. 23.11-6; Plut. *Fab.* 18.3.

<sup>181</sup> Frier and Scholz argue that this demonstrates a status of at least praetorian rank based on similar legations (Frier 1999: 235). He was at least a senator (Polyb. 3.9.4). Others have posited that he may have held a position in the pontifical college, but this inviting possibility is unverifiable. It would not be unheard of for a patrician family of such high social standing though.

<sup>182</sup> Chassignet 1996 (1): LVI.

<sup>183</sup> Chassignet 1996 (1) LVII; Frier 1999: 237.

<sup>184</sup> Badian 1966: 3-4.

<sup>185</sup> Philinus’ antipathy towards Rome is made famous at Polyb. 1.14, where Fabius and Philinus are singled out for their patriotic biases and a middle course is suggested.

<sup>186</sup> Chassignet gives a starting date for *Annales* between 216-209 BC, and explores the possibility that Fabius started his project on the *Annales* to show other Mediterranean powers that Rome would recover from the setbacks of Trasimene and Cannae and carry the day, as it had done before in the face of adversity (Chassignet 1996 (1): LVIII). Another suggestion is that Fabius actually began after the capture of Capua and Syracuse and the treaty with the Aetolian league in 209 (ibid.).

Greek for Greeks.<sup>187</sup> Yet he was writing for Romans too.<sup>188</sup> The boldness of his engagement with Hellenic historiography was recognized as early as Badian: “His chosen task of writing a Roman history in Greek was not only unprecedented: it was ambitious, not to say presumptuous, as a literary attempt.”<sup>189</sup> Fabius wrote the first native Roman history, crystallizing a narrative of early Rome that would remain, essentially unchanged, through the entire run of Roman historiography.<sup>190</sup>

The organization of Fabius’ work – as for many ERHs – is the object of much debate. The key ancient testimony comes from Dionysius: τούτων δὲ τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἑκάτερος, οἷς μὲν αὐτὸς ἔργοις παρεγένετο, διὰ τὴν ἐμπειρίαν ἀκριβῶς ἀνέγραψε, τὰ δὲ ἀρχαῖα τὰ μετὰ τὴν κτίσιν τῆς πόλεως γενόμενα κεφαλαιωδῶς ἐπέδραμεν (Dion. Hal. 1.6.2): “each of these men [Fabius and Cincius], relying upon his experience, wrote with precision on those events he was present at, but concerning the archaic period after the foundation of the city each rushed through in a summary fashion

---

<sup>187</sup> Fabius’ work is referred to as *Graeci Annales* by Cicero (Cic. *De Div.* 1.43). cf. Ῥωμαίων ὅσοι τὰ παλαιὰ ἔργα τῆς πόλεως Ἑλληνικῇ διαλέκτῳ συνέγραψαν, ὧν εἰσι πρεσβύτατοι Κόιντός τε Φάβιος καὶ Λεύκιος Κίγκιος, ἀμφοτέρω κατὰ τοὺς Φοινικικοὺς ἀκμάσαντες πολέμους (Dion Hal. 1.6.2).

<sup>188</sup> Northwood’s comments are of moment here: “A more promising alternative might be the argument that even if [Fabius] could have written in Latin, Fabius’ choice of Greek does not imply a specific posture other than the desire to be read widely (he could reach both Romans and Greeks) and to be treated seriously as an historian. Every work of history known to him was in Greek” (Northwood 2007: 106).

<sup>189</sup> Badian 1966: 2.

<sup>190</sup> For pre-Fabian variant foundation myths (i.e. not the Romulus-Remus version), see especially Dion. Hal. 1.72-3 and Servius *Aen.* 1.272.

(κεφαλαιωδῶς).”<sup>191</sup> Thus, the ancient, and modern conception, has been of an “hour-glass” shape to early Roman historiography, the foundation, regal period, and contemporary events treated extensively, the intermediary, early republican material glossed over.<sup>192</sup> Chassignet has argued that “this approach is nevertheless reduced to rubble given the evidence of the fragments and the plan of the passage of Dionysius which is dedicated to the works of his predecessors,” but it is a pernicious line to reconstruct a work based on the distribution of fragments – why should our sources quote proportionately to the material? – and in this case it may be more cautious to simply rely upon Dionysius’ testimony.<sup>193</sup>

Fabius’ history seems to have touched on many of the episodes that would become staples in the Roman historiographic tradition: Hercules (and Cacus?),<sup>194</sup> Evander’s arrival in Italy,<sup>195</sup> the tribulations of Aeneas,<sup>196</sup> pig prodigy and foundation of

---

<sup>191</sup> Wiseman 1979: 9. κεφαλαιωδῶς as “summary fashion” is probably corroborated by its latin translation *capitulatim* (Nepos *Cato* 3), aimed at Cato by Nepos. Polybius consistently uses κεφαλαιωδῶς as “summarily” (Polyb. 1.5.4; 1. 1.13 (3 times); 2.1.4). Interestingly, Nepos’ critique (?) is leveled at Cato’s treatment of the Punic Wars, not earlier material.

<sup>192</sup> See Elliott 2013: 246 n.57 for bibliography.

<sup>193</sup> Chassignet (1) LXVIff. Northwood cautions against this approach: “First, anyone who has done any detailed work on the fragments of the early Roman historians, poets, and antiquarians knows that the pattern of distribution of the fragments does not accurately represent the economies of the works concerned” (Northwood 2007: 102).

<sup>194</sup> *Inscrip.. Taur.* = 1 C.

<sup>195</sup> Mar. Victor. *Ars Gramm.* 1, p. 23 Keil = 2 C.

<sup>196</sup> I C; Cic. *De Div.* 1.43 = 3 C; Serv. *Aen.* 12.603 = 6 C.



Alba Longa,<sup>197</sup> Romulus, Remus (and Ilia!) and the foundation of Rome,<sup>198</sup> the Rape of the Sabine Women,<sup>199</sup> Tarpeia,<sup>200</sup> regal achievements,<sup>201</sup> the expulsion of the Tarquins,<sup>202</sup> the institution of the Latin games/victory at Lake Regillus,<sup>203</sup> Coriolanus,<sup>204</sup> Gallic Sack,<sup>205</sup> Samnite campaigns,<sup>206</sup> and the Punic Wars.<sup>207</sup> Many of these episodes would become set pieces in future histories, but it is rash to discount the novelty of Fabius and the ERHs; Alföldi and Frier, in particular, have touched upon the radical ways which Fabius shaped Roman national memory. Alföldi sees in Fabius a great manipulator, who has badly and purposefully manipulated Rome's position in early Latium.<sup>208</sup>

“This tale of conquest is not built on known facts but on a preconceived scheme, marking out the stages of a rapid growth and expansion. It is not the work of a clumsy scribbler but a shrewd doctrine forged by a far-sighted politician. This man was the first historian of Rome, writing in Greek for the Greeks, and trying to make them believe that his people were no barbarian horde, recently risen to power by rude force, but a

---

<sup>197</sup> Diod. Sic. 7.5.4-5 = 5 C.

<sup>198</sup> 1 C; Plut. *Rom.* 3.1-8/ Dion. Hal. 1.79.4-83.3 / OGR 20.1-3 = 7 C; Dion. Hal. 1.74.1 = 8C.

<sup>199</sup> Plut. *Rom.* 14.1 = 9 C.

<sup>200</sup> Dion Hal. 2.38.1-40.2 = 10 C

<sup>201</sup> Dion. Hal. 4.15.1 = 13 C; Livy 1.44.2 = 14 C; Livy 1.55.7-9 = 15 C; Arn. *Adu. Nat.* 6.7 = 16 C.

<sup>202</sup> Dion. Hal. 4.6.1 / 4.30.2 = 12 C; Dion. Hal. 4.64.2-3 = 17 C; Suda. s.v. Φάβιος Πίκτωρ = 18 C.

<sup>203</sup> Cic. *De Div.* 1.55 = 19 C; Dion. Hal. 71.1-73.5 = 20 C.

<sup>204</sup> Livy 2.40.10-11 = 21 C.

<sup>205</sup> Gell. 5.4.1-5 = 23 C

<sup>206</sup> Livy 8.30.8-10 = 24 C; Livy 10.37.14 = 25 C.

<sup>207</sup> 27-32 C.

<sup>208</sup> Alföldi 1965: 124. His full argument is probably the most skeptical approach to the ERHs – and is not without reason.

highly civilized community of a most glorious past, the mistress of Middle Italy for centuries.”

Frier, in turn, labels Fabius as a propagandist that relied upon the “ritualistic structure” of the *Annales Maximi* to imbue his history with authority.<sup>209</sup>

### **L. Cincius Alimentus:<sup>210</sup>**

As with Pictor, there is a debate over a plural identity for Cincius, though in this case there really are two distinct Cincii to choose from: Cincius Alimentus (1, ERH), L. Cincius (2, antiquarian).<sup>211</sup> The antiquarian’s works are listed as *De Verbis Priscis*, *De Fastis*, *De Comitibus*, *De Consulibus Potestate*, *De Officio Iurisconsulti*, *De Re Militari*, *Mystagogica*.<sup>212</sup> Consequently, his interests seem to have overlapped with those of the ERH Cincius as they ranged from political to legal to military history. To complicate things further, the cognomen Alimentus is only known from a single quotation; the rest are left ambiguously as “Cincius” or “L. Cincius.”<sup>213</sup> Beginning with Peter, many fragments of a “Cincius” have been disassociated from the annalist and attributed

---

<sup>209</sup> Frier 1999: 284.

<sup>210</sup> For fuller discussion see Cornell 2013 (1): 179-183; Chassignet 1996 (1): LXXIII-LXXIX.

<sup>211</sup> *omnes historici, Fabii, Cincii, et proxime Cloelius...* (Cic. *Div.* 1.55).

<sup>212</sup> Catalogued by Chassignet 1996 (vol.1): LXXV, with citations from Festus et al.

<sup>213</sup> Liv. 21.38.3 = 10 C.

instead to the antiquarian.<sup>214</sup> Several of these fragments have been excluded based on the understanding that aetiologies (etymologies in particular) are a feature of first century antiquarians, such as L. Cincius (2). This is a conception vigorously challenged in the second chapter, and there is support from Chassignet and Beck-Walter for doing so.<sup>215</sup>

From various *testimonia* in Livy, it is clear that Cincius played a prominent role in the Punic Wars.<sup>216</sup> Though the Cincii failed to hold a consulship – and were probably a plebeian family – L. Cincius Alimentus held a praetorship in Sicily in 209.<sup>217</sup> Cincius' most interesting and famous adventure in the wars, however, was his capture and POW experience under Hannibal.<sup>218</sup> During this time, Cincius claimed to have even held discussions with Hannibal over his losses and military strategy.<sup>219</sup> As participants in the 2nd Punic War, Cincius and Fabius would be able to lend personal touches like these to their histories. Moreover, they would have had access to veterans of the 1st Punic War

---

<sup>214</sup> Some of the fragments in doubt: OGR 17.3 = 3 C; OGR 18 = 4 C; Fulgent. *Serm. Ant.* 8 p. 114 Helm = 11 C; Arn. *Adu. Nat.* 3.38-39 = 12 C; Serv. *Aen.* 2.225 = 13 C.

<sup>215</sup> See Chassignet 1996 (1): LXXVff. for her logic. Notably, all of the fragments in doubt (see note x, above) are included in the editions of Chassignet and Beck-Walter. *contra* Cornell 2013 (vol. 1): 181ff.

<sup>216</sup> See Chassignet 1996 (1): LXXIII-IV (with n. 289-90); Cornell 2013 (1): 179-180; BNJ 810 (biography by Habinek).

<sup>217</sup> Livy 26.23.1; Chassignet 1996 (1): LXXIII.

<sup>218</sup> Livy 21.38.3-5 = 10 C.

<sup>219</sup> L. Cincius Alimentus, qui captum se ab Hannibale scribit... ex ipso autem audisse Hannibale, postquam Rhodanum transierit, triginta sex millia hominum ingentemque numerum equorum et aliorum iumentorum amisisse (ibid.).

and a (semi-)reliable oral tradition that stretched back a century earlier to the closing of the Samnite Wars.<sup>220</sup>

After the war, it is presumed that he took up history writing. The *annales* of Cincius Alimentus are thought to have been somewhat obscured by their proximity to those of Fabius: “*Il est plus que probable que son oeuvre a été éclipsée par les Annales de Fabius Pictor, considéré comme l’inventeur du genre historique.*”<sup>221</sup> Like Pictor, he wrote in Greek, and the two are often cited in conjunction.<sup>222</sup> Though the two overlap on the foundation story, Tarpeia, and elsewhere, Cincius seems to have at least generated a compelling story of the Spurius Maelius / Ahala episode that Dionysius privileged over the Fabian version – if such a corollary existed in Fabius’ history.<sup>223</sup>

### **Postumius Albinus<sup>224</sup>**

Postumius Albinus was a patrician who himself became consul in 151 BCE. His other achievements, however, are hard to pin down, since, as with Cincius Alimentus,

---

<sup>220</sup> Oakley 1997: 22-24. On Polybius’ similar use of witnesses see Walbank 1957: 33-35.

<sup>221</sup> Chassignet 1996 (1) LXXIX.

<sup>222</sup> *Graeci annales* (with Fabius) at Dion. Hal. 1.6.2. Cited with Fabius: Mar. Victor *Ars Gramm.* 1 p. 23 Keil = 1 C; Serv. *Georg.* 1.10 = 2 C; Dion. Hal. 1.79.4-83.3 = 5 C; Dion. Hal. 1.74.1 = 6 C; Dion. Hal. 2.38.1-40.2 = 7 C.

<sup>223</sup> Dion. Hal. 12.4.2-5 = 8 C. This is the only time Dionysius cites Cincius without Fabius. cf. Cornell 2013 (3): 52.

<sup>224</sup> For fuller discussion see Chassignet 1996 (1) LLXIX-LLXXXV; Cornell 2013 (1): 185ff..

his cognomen is only witnessed a single time.<sup>225</sup> Cornell and Chassignet have tried to sort out the various details of his career through a series of notices on Postumii (with some success).<sup>226</sup> A meager four fragments of Postumius' work survive, with Polybius providing most of the biographical details:

ὅτι Αὔλος Ποστόμιος ἄξιος γέγονεν ἐπισημασίας ἀπεντεῦθεν. οἰκίας μὲν γὰρ ἦν καὶ γένους πρώτου, κατὰ δὲ τὴν ἰδίαν φύσιν στωμύλος καὶ λάλος καὶ πέρπερος διαφερόντως. ἐπιθυμήσας δ' εὐθέως ἐκ παίδων τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀγωγῆς καὶ διαλέκτου πολὺς μὲν ἦν ἐν τούτοις καὶ κατακορῆς, ὥστε δι' ἐκεῖνον καὶ τὴν αἴρεσιν τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν προσκόψαι τοῖς πρεσβυτέροις καὶ τοῖς ἀξιολογωτάτοις τῶν Ῥωμαίων, τέλος δὲ καὶ ποίημα γράφειν καὶ πραγματικὴν ἱστορίαν ἐνεχείρησεν, ἐν ᾗ διὰ τοῦ προοιμίου παρεκάλει τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας συγγνώμην ἔχειν, ἐὰν Ῥωμαῖος ὢν μὴ δύνηται κατακρατεῖν τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς διαλέκτου καὶ τῆς κατὰ τὸν χειρισμὸν οἰκονομίας. (Polybius 39.1.1-4 = 1 C)

"That Aulus Postumius is remarkable is manifest from what follows. For he belonged to a distinguished house and clan, but was chatty, talkative, and proud according to his very nature. Straight from childhood he really took to heart the Greek way of life and language and he was so enthralled in these matters that on account of him the preference for Greek was looked down on by the old and accomplished Romans. He tried his hand at writing a work in verse and an instructional history. In the proem of this work he requests that readers give him pardon if he did not fare well in Greek and in the handling of the structure."

Polybius draws a μὲν... δὲ contrast between Postumius' proud and noble Roman heritage (οἰκίας... καὶ γένους πρώτου) and, on the other hand, his excessive idolization of all things Greek. This probably derives from a hostile source;<sup>227</sup> the enthusiastic young "greekling" (ἐπιθυμήσας...ἐκ παίδων) grows up into an embarrassment to the

---

<sup>225</sup> Livy 45.4.7.

<sup>226</sup> Chassignet 1996 (1): LLXXIX-LXXXI; Cornell 2013 (1): 185-7.

<sup>227</sup> See esp. Cornell 2013 (1): 186.

Roman nobility, to such an extent (ὥστε... result clause) “that on account of him the preference for Greek was looked down on by the old and accomplished Romans.”<sup>228</sup>

Whatever the quality, Postumius wrote a work in poetry (ποίημα) and in prose (πραγματικὴν ἱστορίαν). These two works appear to have been the *De Adventu Aeneae* – a title given by Servius and the author of the *OGR* – and a work of *annales* – attested by Macrobius.<sup>229</sup> In the preface to his *annales*, Postumius made a self-deprecating comment on the state of his Greek:<sup>230</sup>

*Iuste venusteque admodum reprehendisse dicitur Aulum Albinum M. Cato. Albinus qui cum L. Lucullo consul fuit, res Romanas oratione Graeca scriptavit. In eius historiae principio scriptum est ad hanc sententiam: neminem suscensere sibi convenire, si quid in his libris parum composite aut minus eleganter scriptum foret; ‘nam sum,’ inquit, ‘homo Romanus natus in Latium, Graeca oratio a nobis alienissima est,’ ideoque veniam gratiamque malae existimationis, si quid esset erratum, postulavit. (Gell. 11.8.1-3 = 1b C)*

“Justly and seemingly Marcus Cato is said to have reproached Aulus Albinus. Albinus was consul with L. Lucullus and wrote a Roman history in Greek. In the beginning of this history is written something to address this: that it was fitting that no one get angry with him if there should there be something poorly or clumsily written; for he said ‘I am a Roman born in Latium, and Greek speech is very foreign to us,’ and so he sought some leniency and a reprieve from bad esteem if some error was made.”

---

<sup>228</sup> Cicero’s testimony makes it appear as though Cato approved of Postumius: *sed vivo Catone minores natu multi uno tempore oratores floruerunt. Nam et A. Albinus, is qui Graece scripsit historiam, qui consul cum L. Lucullo fuit, et litteratus et disertus fuit* (Cic. *Brutus* 80-81). Gellius makes it clear this was not the case (see quote below).

<sup>229</sup> Serv. *Aen.* 9.707 = 2 C; *OGR* 15.1-4 = 3 C; Macr. *Sat.* 3.20.5 = 4 C.

<sup>230</sup> cf. Macr. *Sat.* Praef. 14 (almost verbatim).

Beyond this apology, little else is known about the history. Mezentius and Lausus make an appearance in one fragment,<sup>231</sup> while the Bruti are given their traditional, unflattering etymology.<sup>232</sup>

### **Acilius<sup>233</sup>**

Chassignet begins her biography on Acilius: “*Nous ne savons que très peu de choses sur C. Acilius.*”<sup>234</sup> Again, there are confusions regarding his full name, though most are limited to the nomen’s orthography (*Acilius*, *Acillius*, *Acilius*), probably in part due to transliteration into Greek.<sup>235</sup> He is attested as a senator by Gellius, and this status, along with his zeal for Greek philosophy, purportedly motivated Cato to purge the city of philosophers.<sup>236</sup> This is all that is known about the life of Acilius.

Acilius’ history was translated into Latin by an unspecified “Claudius,” who has been taken to be Claudius Quadrigarius.<sup>237</sup> It seems to have been interested in Greek

---

<sup>231</sup> OGR 15.1-4 = 3 C.

<sup>232</sup> Macr. *Sat.* 3.20.5 = 4 C; cf. Livy 1.56.8.

<sup>233</sup> For fuller discussion see Cornell 2013 (1): 224ff.; Chassignet 1996 (1): LXXXVI-LXXXVIII.

<sup>234</sup> Chassignet 1996 (1) LXXXVI.

<sup>235</sup> See Chassignet 1996 (1) LXXXVI n.350-1 for the variants.

<sup>236</sup> Gell. 6.14.9; Plut. *Cato* 22.5. His connection with “new” Greek philosophy is explicit in both fragments.

<sup>237</sup> Livy 25.39.11-17 = 6 C; Livy 35.14.5-12 = 7C; That Acilius wrote *graeci annales* is corroborated by Cicero (Cic. *De Off.* 3.115).

heritage at Rome, going so far as to call Rome a Greek foundation<sup>238</sup> and connecting the “nakedness” of the Lupercalia with Greek gymnastic practice.<sup>239</sup> Acilius is cited for later history as well, particularly the Punic Wars,<sup>240</sup> and Livy’s epitomator suggests that Acilius’ *annales* were cited as late as Book 53 (141 BC).<sup>241</sup>

### **Cassius Hemina<sup>242</sup>**

Chassignet’s entry on Hemina begins precisely the same way as her entry on Acilius; Cassius Hemina’s life is essentially unknown.<sup>243</sup> The sources are consistent in their reports of his nomen and cognomen except for a set of misquotations by Tertullian of our author as Cassius *Severus*.<sup>244</sup> The title of his history, however, is ambiguous, cited as *annales* and *historia* with similar frequencies.<sup>245</sup> Whatever the case, the work was of

---

<sup>238</sup> Strabo 5.3.3 = 1 C.

<sup>239</sup> Plut. *Rom.* 21.9 = 3 C.

<sup>240</sup> Livy 25.39.11-17 = 6 C; Livy 35.14.5-12 = 7C.

<sup>241</sup> *Acilius senator Graece res Romanas scribit* (Livy *Per.* LIII).

<sup>242</sup> For fuller discussion, see Chassignet 1996 (2): IX-XI; Cornell 2013 (1): 219-221; Santini 1995: 11-29.

<sup>243</sup> Chassignet 1996 (2): IX.

<sup>244</sup> Tert. *Apol.* 10.7 = 1 C. See n.3 *ad loc.* On the meaning of the cognomen Hemina see Cornell 2013 (1): 220; Santini 1996: 27-28.

<sup>245</sup> See Chassignet 1996(2): IX n.21-22; Cornell 2013 (1): 221.; Santini 1995: 33.



astounding economy (reconstructed): Book 1, pre-foundation material; Book 2, regal *and* republican material;<sup>246</sup> Book 3, 1st Punic War; Book 4, 2nd Punic War.

This framework is only comparable to Cato's, whose lead Hemina is supposed to have followed in form (Latin *annales*) and content (aetiology): "*écrivain en latin, et non plus en grec comme les auteurs de l'annalistique ancienne, il se distingue, comme Caton, par sa passion pour l'étymologie, l'éponymie, et l'étiologie.*"<sup>247</sup> This somewhat challenges the claim made by Pliny that Hemina was the *vetustissimus auctor annalium*, and instead situates him outside the mainstream, "annalistic" tradition.<sup>248</sup> Hemina's aetiological predilections *are* much better documented than for any of the other ERHs in this study.<sup>249</sup> His fragments are represented by a much higher proportion of lexicographical citations, perhaps further corroboration of this notion.<sup>250</sup> Furthermore, in several of the

---

<sup>246</sup> "[Book 2] thus covered a huge period of time" (Cornell 2013 (2): 221). cf. Rich 2011: 18.

<sup>247</sup> Chassignet 1996 (2): XV. That Hemina wrote in Latin is confirmed by the number of lexicographical citations (see x). Cato's arrangement of the *Origines*: Book 1, Roman Kings; Books 2-3, Italian origins; Books 4-5, 1st and 2nd Punic Wars; Books 6-7, Contemporary History.

<sup>248</sup> Pliny *NH* 13.84 = 40 C; Santini finds Hemina difficult to situate within the "annalistic" historiographic tradition; he was not particularly closely affiliated with Piso or Cn. Gellius, and was not engaged with until at least a century after – or at least as far as moderns can tell. Santini does note one common strain in Hemina, Piso, Gellius, and Cato: "*gli strumenti dell'eziologia e dell'etimologia e dalla corrispettiva fragilità di tale loro professione filologica al momento di trattare alcuni temi della archaiologia latina*" (Santini 1995: 21). Forsythe posits Piso as the first "true" annalist 1994: 42. cf. Wiseman 1979: 12-13; *contra* Fornara 1983: 25. Rich overstates the case for Fabius Pictor's as the originator of the annalistic framework (Rich 2011: 16-17).

<sup>249</sup> Chassignet 1996 (2): XV; Cornell 2013 (1): 223 ; Rawson 1991: 249-255. The fragments are discussed *passim* in Chapter 2.

<sup>250</sup> These account for 23 of the 43 fragments of Cassius Hemina. Not all are interesting from an "aetiological" standpoint. Nonetheless, this may be evidence that Hemina was seen as a mine for etymological/lexical data, and at the very least shows a connection with antiquarian ideology (if he was not actually preserved in antiquarians for the later grammarians). cf. Santini 1995: 38-39.

early fragments of the work, Hemina gives euhemeristic treatments to various Roman mythic figures (e.g. Saturn, Faunus, and Hercules).<sup>251</sup> Notably absent are typical notices of military *res gestae*, save a fragment from Nonius.<sup>252</sup> Some highlights from the history include: rule of Saturn,<sup>253</sup> Hercules and Cacus,<sup>254</sup> escape of Aeneas,<sup>255</sup> Aeneas' retrieval of the Palladium from Diomedes,<sup>256</sup> Scaevola's attempt on Porsenna,<sup>257</sup> Fabius Dorsuo's bravery during the Gallic Sack,<sup>258</sup> the 300 Fabii at Cremera,<sup>259</sup> the advent of the *Magna Mater* cult,<sup>260</sup> and the discovery of "Numa's" Pythagorean books.<sup>261</sup>

---

<sup>251</sup> Tert. *Apol.* 10.7 = 1 C; Serv. *Georg.* 1.10 = 4 C; OGR 6.1-7 = 5 C; Solin 2.14 = 8 C.

<sup>252</sup> Non. p. 239 Lindsay = 37 C. Could this move have been prefigured by Cato's decision to exclude commanders names (Nepos *Cato* 3)?

<sup>253</sup> Tert. *Apol.* 10.7 = 1 C.

<sup>254</sup> OGR 6.1-7 = 5 C.

<sup>255</sup> Schol. *Veron. ad Aen.* 2.717 = 6 C.

<sup>256</sup> Solin. 2.14 = 8 C.

<sup>257</sup> Non. p. 408 Lindsay = 19 C.

<sup>258</sup> App. *Celt.* fr. 6 Viereck-Roos = 22 C.

<sup>259</sup> Macr. *Sat.* 1.16.21-24 = 23 C.

<sup>260</sup> Non. p. 129 Lindsay = 30 C.

<sup>261</sup> Plin. *NH* 13.84-88 = 40 C.