

Extract from *The Fragments of the Roman Historians*, ed. T. J. Cornell (Oxford, 2013), vol. I, pp. 249–288 (by E. Bispham and T. J. Cornell)

## 001 Q. FABIVS PICTOR

### *Life*

The life of Quintus Fabius Pictor, the first Roman historian, was roughly contemporary with that of his kinsman, Q. Fabius Maximus Verrucosus, the famous *Cunctator*.<sup>1</sup> We know that Fabius Pictor fought in the Gallic war of 225 BC (T1), and that he was sent by the senate to Delphi in 216 BC to consult the oracle after the disaster at Cannae (T3-4). We are not told of any magistracy, but he was a member of the senate (Pol. 3.9.4 = T6, and, implicitly, T4), and he must have been a relatively senior figure when chosen to head the embassy to Delphi. Other qualifications will have included his knowledge of Greek language and culture, and perhaps a family tradition of diplomacy in the Greek East.<sup>2</sup> Piety may also be assumed, but there is no evidence that he had any special religious expertise or priestly authority, and it can be demonstrated that he was not an *augur* or a *pontifex*; if he held one of the major priesthoods, it would have been as a *decemvir sacris faciundis*, but this remains a matter of conjecture.<sup>3</sup> Even so, an interest in ritual is suggested by the fragments, and the episode of the Delphic embassy speaks for itself.

Also conjectural, but likely enough in the circumstances, is the possibility that he was an ex-praetor at the time of the embassy to Delphi; if so, he would have held the office before 218 BC.<sup>4</sup> The only other item of evidence bearing on his career is F20, which tells us that he held a position of command in a war against the Ligurians. Roman military activity in Liguria is attested throughout the 230s and 220s, the earliest campaign

dating from 238, the latest from 223;<sup>5</sup> Pictor's involvement (when he commanded a garrison under siege) could be placed at any time during that period. Frier has made a good case for 233, when Fabius Maximus Verrucosus triumphed over the Ligurians as consul, and may have employed his cousin as a senior field officer;<sup>6</sup> this is attractive, but obviously not certain.

The evidence combines to suggest that Fabius Pictor was born around 270 BC;<sup>7</sup> certainly there are difficulties in a date earlier than around 280 or much later than 260 (if his command in Liguria is dated in the 230s). This dating strongly supports the further possibility that he was the son of the consul of 269, C. Fabius C.f. M.n. Pictor; the historian's filiation, as 'son of Gaius', is confirmed by the Tauromenium inscription (T7).<sup>8</sup> If so, we can place Fabius Pictor securely in the family tree of the patrician Fabii, one of the most distinguished houses of the Roman nobility. According to Frier's convincing reconstruction (*Libri annales*, 225, 227-31), the historian was a second-cousin of Fabius Cunctator, a great-nephew of Fabius Maximus Rullianus, the hero of the Samnite Wars, and a great-grandson of M. Fabius Ambustus, the dominant political figure of the mid-fourth century (see comm. on F17).<sup>9</sup>

His distinctive surname Pictor (= 'Painter') was first carried by the C. Fabius who painted the walls of the temple of Salus in 304 B.C., during the Second Samnite War (Cic. *Tusc.* 1.4; Val. Max. 8.14.6); according to Pliny (*nat.* 35.19) the frescoes survived until the temple burned down in the reign of Claudius. Both Cicero and Valerius Maximus describe him as *nobilissimus*, in contrast to his lowly artistic interests: he was presumably the grandfather of the historian.<sup>10</sup> The Tauromenium inscription calls the historian 'Pictorinus', which is unparalleled and at first sight surprising, but is actually a

relatively common variation for a Roman *cognomen* (cf. Rufus-Rufinus, Corvus-Corvinus, Augur-Augurinus, etc.).<sup>11</sup>

The historian's descendants include a praetor of 189, probably his eldest son, who was also *flamen Quirinalis*.<sup>12</sup> More speculatively the Fabius Pictor (probably N. Fabius Pictor) mentioned in Cic. *Brut.* 81 has been identified as the son of the foregoing, and therefore the historian's grandson, and as the father of N. Fabius Pictor, a moneyer in 126 BC.<sup>13</sup> The political dominance of the family in Fabius Pictor's time, and the immense weight of their legendary tradition and historical distinction, cannot have failed to leave a mark on his history (see further below).

Nothing more is heard of Fabius after his return from Delphi in 216. We do not know when he died, or when he composed his history. The latest event referred to in the fragments is the battle of Trasimene (F23). Whether he survived the war, and lived to see the subsequent Roman intervention in the eastern Mediterranean, and if so whether these experiences influenced his writing, are questions to which no firm answers can be given, but which profoundly affect our assessment of his work; and to this we now turn.

### *Work*

Fabius Pictor was the first Roman to write the history of his city (T11-12), and he did so in Greek. This is unequivocally stated by Cicero (T10) and Dionysius of Halicarnassus (T12), and must be taken as a fact, but it is sobering to reflect that without these two references it would never have been suspected.<sup>14</sup> On the contrary: all the other evidence seems to point in a quite different direction. It has long been accepted that several of the preserved fragments can only have come from a Latin text (F4d-e, F29,

F31), and that both Cicero (T8-9) and Fronto (T18) list Fabius as a Latin writer in discussions of historical style.<sup>15</sup> The conclusion seems inescapable: historical works in both Greek and Latin circulated under the name of Fabius Pictor.

There is a further complication. Surprisingly few of the fragments are ascribed specifically to Fabius Pictor. Most of them, and around half the *testimonia*, refer simply to 'Fabius', or sometimes to 'Q. Fabius'. While we can be confident that most of these should be assigned to Fabius Pictor,<sup>16</sup> in a few cases the matter is less clear. There were other writers named Fabius, some of them historians or antiquarians.<sup>17</sup> They include Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus (8), listed by DH as one of the historians approved by the Romans themselves (8 T1), Fabius Rusticus (87), a contemporary of Pliny and Tacitus, and three writers who have sometimes been taken for historians but whom we have relegated to the appendix: M. Fabius (A20), Fabius Gallus (A21), and Fabius Vestalis (A22). At least some of the fragments traditionally ascribed to Pictor could instead be given to one or more of these (e.g. F27, F28, F29, F32), and even some of the fragments where 'Fabius' is described as a historian or a writer of annals could theoretically belong to Fabius Maximus Servilianus (e.g. F3, F14, F31, F24).

Unfortunately these two problems do not cancel each other out. While some of the Latin fragments could be assigned to a different Fabius (most obviously F29 and F31), others are categorically attributed to Fabius Pictor (F4d, F4e). The existence of a Latin Fabius Pictor cannot therefore be so easily evaded. The simplest explanation of the evidence we have is that Fabius Pictor wrote his history in Greek, but that a later stage it was made available in a Latin version, produced either by the author himself or by someone else.<sup>18</sup> We might then assume that Greek writers generally used the Greek

version, and that at least some Latin authors used the Latin version. In many cases, e.g. those of Livy or Pliny the Elder, we would have no way of knowing which version they used. There is also the possibility that some of our citing authorities knew of Pictor only at second hand – in which case the question becomes meaningless.

At the opposite pole is the idea that the Latin history was a totally different work either by Fabius Pictor himself or by someone else with the same name. While the first of these alternatives, though theoretically possible, can be dismissed as far-fetched, the second must be taken seriously, because we happen to know of another Fabius Pictor who was a literary figure in his own right: this was the orator mentioned by Cicero in *Brut.* 81. This man, Numerius Fabius Pictor,<sup>19</sup> was probably the grandson of our historian, and is described by Cicero as an expert in law, literature, and the study of the past (*et iuris et litterarum et antiquitatis bene peritus*). It may have been he who wrote the work on pontifical law (*commentarii iuris pontificii*) that is cited in antiquarian sources under the name Fabius Pictor.<sup>20</sup> Such a work would fit Cicero's description of N. Pictor's interests, and it is reasonable to identify him as its author. But Cicero's words would not in themselves exclude a historical work, and this has led some to suspect that N. Pictor was also the author of the Latin annals.<sup>21</sup>

On the other hand it would be very surprising to find Cicero using such a vague phrase if he had known that N. Fabius Pictor had written an independent history;<sup>22</sup> and in general the strongest single argument against the theory of two different histories by two different Fabii Pictores is precisely the fact that none of our sources seems to have been aware of any such thing.<sup>23</sup> On the contrary, the evidence we have is most easily explained on the assumption that the Greek history and the Latin history were essentially the same

work – that is, that the latter was a version of the former<sup>24</sup> – and that Q. Fabius Pictor was its author. That said, it may be acknowledged that all kinds of intermediate positions are possible. The Latin work may not have been an exact translation of the Greek original; it may have been abridged, expanded, or otherwise modified. Peter for example thought that the translator/editor continued Pictor's history and brought it up to date.<sup>25</sup> But it is clear that, once the basic point is conceded, the identity of the translator/editor, and the nature of his revisions, if any, are questions entirely beyond our control, the pursuit of which would be both unprofitable and impracticable.

The conclusion that only one Fabius Pictor wrote history, and that it circulated in two versions, is provisionally accepted here as a working hypothesis. While we acknowledge that other interpretations are possible, and have been careful to point these out in the commentary on individual fragments, we have taken all the fragments to belong to the same work – a procedure that affords us the great practical advantage of being able to order them in a single sequence.<sup>26</sup>

We have ordered the fragments in chronological order of events referred to, where these can be identified,<sup>27</sup> since all the indications are that Fabius' history was a chronological narrative of events from the beginning to his own time. The overall shape of the work, and the way in which the material was arranged, are difficult questions that will be tackled presently; for now it may be observed that it began with the legendary prehistory of the city, dealing with the adventures of Aeneas (F1-3), Heracles (T7),<sup>28</sup> and possibly Evander (F27). It went on to cover the foundation of the city, the kings, and the Republic down to the Second Punic War. The latest event recorded in the fragments is the Battle of Trasimene (217), but it is a reasonable supposition that Livy's detailed account

(T4) of Fabius' visit to Delphi, and his report to the Senate on his return, goes back to Fabius' own account.<sup>29</sup>

We do not know when Fabius made the pioneering decision to write the history of Rome. It is theoretically possible that he did so as a relatively young man, inspired by Rome's victory over Carthage in the First Punic War and his own experiences in the Ligurian and Gallic Wars, particularly in the great emergency of 225 BC. On this view Hannibal's invasion would have occurred after he had started and perhaps when a considerable portion of the work was already written. But he would in that case have gone on to include at least some if not all of the Second Punic War. This hypothetical speculation is offered merely as an illustration of what is possible.<sup>30</sup> The fact that it is perfectly compatible with all the evidence serves to show that the standard views on this matter, which maintain that Fabius was inspired by the events of the Hannibalic War itself, and began writing when Rome's victory was assured, or after it had been achieved, have no basis in the evidence, and that arguments about his aims and intentions based on the alleged time of writing are circular.<sup>31</sup>

The question of when the narrative ended, however, is a different matter, and some further argument is possible. It is rather surprising that Livy, who recognised his authority as a contemporary witness for the Second Punic War (T2 = F23), does not cite him for any event later than 217 BC, even on occasions where a reference to Fabius might have been expected. Thus, on two occasions Livy speaks of writers who were nearer to the living memory of events, but without mentioning Fabius, perhaps implying that he was no longer available.<sup>32</sup> This argument, while not absolutely conclusive, suggests that Fabius' history ended between 216 and 213 BC, probably because death or

infirmity prevented him from continuing.<sup>33</sup> This does not necessarily mean, however, that he died soon after 212 BC, as Frier maintains; it is perfectly possible that he was writing years afterwards, in the 190s or even later, but that death overtook him when he had brought the narrative down to some time after 216. Frier argues that he would have been too old to have started after the defeat of Carthage;<sup>34</sup> but old age is not an impediment to historical composition, and it is perfectly conceivable that Fabius was over seventy when he began. His most important successor, Cato, was in his eighties when he wrote the *Origines* (see introduction to no.5).

In short, apart from the fact that he was able to record events of 217 BC, and probably of 216, we have no idea when Fabius was writing. We do not know how long he worked on the history, or when he stopped; equally we do not know when he started, or what inspired him to write. This applies to literary inspiration as well as the effect of historical events. Whether Fabius wrote before or after the appearance of Cn. Naevius' *Bellum Punicum*, an epic poem in Latin on the First Punic War, or of the pro-Carthaginian history of the war by Philinus of Acragas (T6), are questions that cannot be answered on the evidence currently available; the same can be said of the Greek historians who accompanied Hannibal, and wrote about the Second Punic War from a Carthaginian point of view.<sup>35</sup> If we knew for certain that Fabius was writing in the 190s, we could reasonably conjecture that he was reacting to some or all of these; but as we do not, we cannot.

The idea that Fabius was reacting to hostile Greek accounts of Roman actions, and aimed to set the record straight, is one of the explanations that have been offered for Fabius' decision to write in Greek. That he was at least partly targeting a Greek audience



is a reasonable assumption, but it seems unlikely that his sole, or even his main, purpose was to justify Rome's policy and to respond to hostile criticism of her actions, as the more extreme versions of this theory maintain.<sup>36</sup> There is little or no evidence in the fragments that Fabius was engaged in crude propaganda.<sup>37</sup> Naturally his account of the Punic Wars presented Roman actions in a good light (T5), but that is not the same thing. It is likely enough that Fabius was able to take advantage of the Greek language to explain Roman traditions and institutions to a wider world that was unfamiliar with them, especially if he felt that existing Greek accounts were inadequate or poorly informed (in particular, F15, F25 and F26 look as if they were aimed at a non-Roman readership). He also took care to write in terms that would be comprehensible to non-Roman readers; he used Olympic dating (F5), expressed sums of money in talents (F12), perhaps gave a Greek translation of Pometia (F30), and possibly measured distances in stades (F4a, section 79.4).<sup>38</sup>

But Fabius was also, beyond doubt, writing for his fellow Romans – at least for that section of the elite that could read Greek; according to E. S. Gruen, his history 'must have been intended primarily for Romans'.<sup>39</sup> More probably he was writing for both home and overseas readers, and aimed at a world-wide audience. Recent studies have highlighted the interesting possibility that he was mindful of Greek-speaking readers in Italy and Sicily.<sup>40</sup> The fact that a library in Tauromenium possessed a copy suggests that it caught the attention of Sicilians, and the catalogue entry (T7) shows that Fabius stressed the mythical connections between Rome and Sicily.<sup>41</sup> Further Sicilian references and connections occur in F28 and F32, but in both cases the context is uncertain, as is the attribution to Fabius Pictor (see comm. *ad locc.*).

However that may be, Fabius' use of Greek may not have been the result of a conscious choice. It may indeed have been quite natural, since history was a Greek literary genre, and the possibility of writing in Latin may not have occurred to him. At the time Fabius was writing, Greek was the language of history, and not only for Greeks: Egyptians, Babylonians, Jews, and possibly Phoenicians, Carthaginians, Etruscans, and others, had taken the opportunity to write their national histories in Greek.<sup>42</sup> Fabius was not alone. The question, indeed, is not why Fabius wrote history in Greek, but why he wrote history at all.

What passed for a historical tradition in Rome before Fabius was a body of received legends and memories, transmitted by oral reports, stories attached to public and private monuments, priestly records (in particular the *Annales Maximi* – see above), and the traditions of the great aristocratic families.<sup>43</sup> Fabius Pictor evidently believed that he could improve on this by applying to it the principles and methods of Greek historiography, thereby ordering the disparate material into a coherent narrative, and using his independent judgement in assessing and interpreting it. This was a truly revolutionary step, as Momigliano recognised.<sup>44</sup>

It has been argued that Latin prose was insufficiently developed at this time to carry a work of such scope as Pictor's,<sup>45</sup> but to argue the weakness of Latin in the age of Plautus seems hazardous, especially as Plautus himself reveals the existence of established prose styles and at least the possibility of developed prose literature.<sup>46</sup> We do not know when the Latin version of Fabius appeared, but it could have been within a few years of the original; there is no reason to rule out a date before the appearance of Cato's *Origines*. Indeed, if anything, the fact that Cato's *Origines* is nowhere hailed as the first

history in Latin prose could be a sign that Fabius' Latin history was regarded as a precursor (see introduction to Cato, below p.000).

The existence of a Latin version, which may have differed somewhat from the Greek original, raises difficulties when we come to consider the structure and economy of the work. Only three fragments are preserved with book numbers. Two of these (F4e, F31) are from the Latin version, while the third (F4c), from the *OGR*, could be from either. Although these fragments suggest that, at least in the Latin version, the birth and upbringing of Romulus and Remus occurred in book 1 (F4), and the first plebeian consul (366 BC) in book 4 (F31), we cannot be sure that the same book structure was reproduced in the Greek version. Any attempt to reconstruct the economy of the work from this evidence is hazardous at best and in any case can only apply to the Latin annals.<sup>47</sup>

Apart from this our knowledge of the work's structure depends almost entirely on a much discussed statement of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (T12), who says that Fabius and Cincius (Alimentus) wrote in detail (ἀκριβῶς) about the period in which they themselves lived, but dealt summarily (κεφαλαιωδῶς) with the early events after the foundation of the city. This may mean that the earlier history was skipped over in just a few pages; but that is not a necessary assumption. Dionysius could equally well imply that the first five centuries of Roman history occupied less space (even if they filled several books) than the few decades that Fabius himself had lived through. Dionysius' words would be perfectly compatible with a work in which four or five books (say) were devoted to the period down to the first Punic War, and twice that number to the age of the Punic Wars themselves. We may compare the procedure of Polybius, who contrasted his

main narrative, beginning in book 3 with the events of 220 BC, with his introductory books, which were written κεφαλαιωδῶς.<sup>48</sup>

The important point, as Frier has argued, is that Dionysius makes this remark in the context of a wider justification for his own treatment of the 'archaeologia' of Rome – that is, his highly elaborate and rhetorical account of Roman history before the Punic Wars, an account that filled twenty books.<sup>49</sup> Even in his day, Dionysius says, the Greeks were ignorant of Rome's earliest history, because no full-length treatment of the subject existed in their language. Greek historians had only touched on the period, and even the early Roman historians who wrote in Greek (i.e. Fabius, Cincius *et al.*) did not cover it adequately. That is the argument of which T12 forms a part. In other words, Fabius and Cincius were deficient by Dionysius' own standard; but his notorious prolixity, and the tendentious thrust of the whole passage, should warn us not to infer that Fabius' account of Rome's early history was only a brief sketch. The fragments on the contrary suggest a fair amount of detail.

Most recent commentators, however, have used T12 to support a rather different interpretation of the overall shape of Fabius Pictor's history. Dionysius says that Fabius and Cincius dealt summarily with the early events 'after the foundation of the city'. This formulation could be taken to mean that the foundation itself, and the events leading up to it, were treated more fully, and that the summarising started only after the foundation had been dealt with. This has given rise to the widely held theory that Fabius' history was shaped like an egg-timer or 'hour-glass' – that is, expanded at either end, and constricted in the middle.

There may well be something in this, in the sense that the origins of cities and peoples was a topic of abiding interest for Greek historians, and that a special literary category of 'foundations' (κτίσεις) emerged in the Hellenistic period.<sup>50</sup> The study of foundations and origins extended beyond the borders of the Greek world, and included barbarian peoples and cities; if there was one aspect of the Roman past in which the Greeks had taken an interest, it was the city's foundation legend. The origins of Rome had been discussed by Greek historians since the fifth century, and were of particular interest to historians of the west, especially Timaeus. Plutarch tells us (F4b) that Fabius Pictor drew upon a full account of the foundation of Rome (Ῥώμης κτίσις) by Diocles of Peparethos. It could well be that Fabius was able to write at greater length about the legendary origins of the city, on which he could find abundant material in Greek sources, and about his own age, than about the intervening archaic period, which was poorly documented in comparison; an hour-glass shape resulted because that was the shape of the existing picture of the Roman past in Greek historical accounts.<sup>51</sup> It has also been argued that it is characteristic of oral tradition in general.<sup>52</sup>

On these general grounds, then, it is possible that Fabius's account was fuller on the origins and on contemporary events than on the period in between. This has been widely accepted, and the 'hour-glass' analogy is now a scholarly commonplace.<sup>53</sup> Nevertheless, some reservations are in order. In the first place, the key passage of Dionysius of Halicarnassus in T12 offers no positive support for the theory. Dionysius does not say that the foundation story (the κτίσις) was treated more fully than what followed. What he says does not rule it out, however, and his wording, if pressed, could even be said to be compatible with such an interpretation. But it hardly amounts to

positive evidence, and it remains possible that he meant simply that Fabius gave a summary account of the early history from the start, and wrote more expansively as the story reached his own lifetime.<sup>54</sup>

Secondly, the frequency and relative length of surviving quotations might seem to support the hour-glass theory. A considerable portion of the fragmentary text we possess is concerned with the foundation legend, which might suggest therefore that Fabius treated it at some length; on the other hand the early republican period down to the Punic Wars, particularly the fifth and fourth centuries, is barely represented in the surviving fragments.<sup>55</sup> But this argument is weak, because the fragments that survive are not a random or representative sample of the original text. It cannot be stressed too often or too strongly that the preserved fragments of any lost ancient author are a biased sample reflecting, wholly and exclusively, the interests and concerns of the secondary authors who quote them. For this reason the content, frequency, and distribution of preserved quotations should never be regarded as any sort of guide to the form, content, or structure of a lost historical work.<sup>56</sup>

In fact the distribution of the fragments of Fabius Pictor resembles that of all the other lost republican historians, and in almost all cases the result is the inverse of the true balance of the original work. It seems that all histories of Rome from the origins, including surviving examples such as Livy, expanded in scope as they reached the author's own time, and in all of them recent and contemporary events occupied a disproportionately large amount of space.<sup>57</sup> The surviving fragments of their works, however, are overwhelmingly concerned with the period of the legendary origins of the city, and Fabius Pictor is no exception. On a rough calculation, over 50% of the surviving

'text' of Pictor deals with events before the foundation, around 70% with the pre-republican age.<sup>58</sup> The evidence does not suggest an hour-glass, but an inverted pyramid, and a top-heavy one at that. The explanation for this has to do with the interests and concerns of the citing authorities; as pointed out above, the relative frequency of citations cannot be used to reconstruct the economy of the original work.

This argument also serves to undermine an influential version of the 'hour-glass' theory, according to which Fabius wrote at length about not only the foundation legend, but also the monarchic period and the beginning of the republic, down to the Twelve Tables in the mid-fifth century. The case was made in detail by D. Timpe, who observed that a number of other writers, including Polybius, Cato, Cicero, and Diodorus, also paid particular attention to this period, and highlighted the Decemvirate and the Valerio-Horatian Laws of 449 BC as marking the end of a formative stage in the development of the Roman state.<sup>59</sup> According to Timpe, this tradition went back to Fabius, who included the whole of this period in his account of the foundation (κτίσι") of the city.

In this way Timpe is able to reconcile his reconstruction of the shape of Fabius' work with Dionysius' statement in T12 that he wrote summarily about the period after the κτίσις – that is, on Timpe's view, the period from around 450 to the early third century. It has to be said, however, that this is an impossible interpretation of the text. There is no evidence that Dionysius, or any other author, ever thought of the κτίσις in that way; on the contrary, it is perfectly clear that Dionysius understood the κτίσις to be the foundation of the city by Romulus, and he never used the term to mean anything else.<sup>60</sup> The point can be adequately made by two passages in which he cites Fabius Pictor, and which are printed here as F5a and F6: in F5a he says that Fabius dated the foundation (the κτίσις) to

the first year of the eighth Olympiad (i.e. 748/7 BC), and in F6 he quotes Fabius' opinion that the rape of the Sabine women occurred in the fourth month after the foundation (μετὰ τὴν κτίσιν).<sup>61</sup>

This discussion prompts the following conclusions. The shape and economy of Fabius' history cannot be reconstructed from the surviving fragments, which give a wholly misleading picture of the original. From Dionysius, whom we have no reason to disbelieve, we learn that Fabius and Cincius devoted more space to recent and contemporary events than to the preceding history – the inverse, therefore, of the impression created by the surviving fragments. Dionysius says that Fabius and Cincius treated the early period summarily (κεφαλαιωδῶς), but this is a relative term: we are entitled to infer only that the early period was treated summarily compared with their narrative of the Punic Wars on the one hand, and with Dionysius' long-winded treatment of the early centuries on the other. This still leaves scope for a reasonable breadth of treatment: the fragments make it clear that Fabius did not stint on details, and F31, if attributed to Pictor, would indicate that the Latin version, at least, needed four books to reach the year 366 BC. On the other hand there is nothing to suggest that the early legends were treated more fully than the period after the founding of the city; and while Fabius may have regarded the period down to the Decemvirate as an important formative stage in the city's development, there is no proof that he did, and no evidence that he treated it more fully than the succeeding republican period.

There has been much discussion of the layout of the work, and particularly the question of whether the material was arranged annalistically, as in later historians. The fact that the work is called *Annales* by some sources is of no significance in this regard;



by Cicero's day the term was a synonym for history. In any case the original title would have been in Greek, and is unlikely to have given any clue to the arrangement of the contents.<sup>62</sup> The direct evidence of the fragments does not allow the question to be answered conclusively. F18 might suggest a year-by-year arrangement, at least for that part of the narrative (294 BC); on the other hand F31 would be compatible with an episodic structure, with events dated by intervals, rather than every year being recorded under the names of the consuls. Both methods are possible, if we assume that more recent events (let us say from the Samnite Wars onwards) were treated annalistically, and the earlier period selectively, in the way that Polybius did for events before the First Punic War (1.6-7; 2. 18-21), or Thucydides in the 'pentecontaetia' (1.89-118). But there is no positive evidence for this theory, and the arguments used by Gelzer in its support are misconceived.<sup>63</sup> Although the debate cannot be conclusively settled on the evidence we have, it seems safer to regard Fabius as an 'annalist', if only because Cicero seems to imply it in T8-9, and because Cato 5 F81 suggests criticism of predecessors who had reproduced the content of the pontifical chronicle in their works.<sup>64</sup>

Although Fabius has been compared to historians such as Berossus and Manetho, who reacted against what Greek historians had written about their native countries (respectively, Babylonia and Egypt), and aimed to correct their 'false' opinions, Fabius seems to have been much more thoroughly Hellenised.<sup>65</sup> He and his Roman successors wholeheartedly embraced a Greek perspective and accepted what Greek authors had said about the past of Rome. The most remarkable example of this is the statement of Plutarch (T16 = F4b) implying that Fabius' account of the story of Romulus and Remus followed that of Diocles of Peparethos.

This is a highly problematic text, both because we know so little about Diocles of Peparethos<sup>66</sup> and because it is not clear how Plutarch's words are to be interpreted. While he could mean no more than that Diocles was the first to publish among the Greeks the standard version of the legend, the one that Fabius followed in most essentials (taking λόγου as the antecedent of ᾧ),<sup>67</sup> the alternative interpretation is a far more natural reading of the passage, and surely closer to what Plutarch intended – namely that the most probable version of the story was first published among the Greeks by Diocles, who was followed in most essentials by Fabius (taking Διοκλῆς as the antecedent of ᾧ – as in our translation). Although it is unthinkable that Fabius had to rely exclusively on Diocles for information about the foundation story, Plutarch's statement must mean that Diocles' version was similar to that of Fabius, who had known of it and had probably referred to it with approval in his text.<sup>68</sup> We cannot know how much, if any, of Plutarch's account of the twins went back to Diocles, any more than we can attribute any of its details specifically to Fabius (see comm. on F4). The same must be true of the literary character of the fragment: those scholars who argue that 'tragic' features of the account were introduced by Diocles go well beyond what the evidence actually permits us to infer.

This is not to say, however, that Fabius did not use Greek sources more widely. Indeed it is probable that he did so, and made extensive use especially of Timaeus, who wrote about the earlier history of Rome in his account of the Pyrrhic War as well as in his general history of the West (DH 1.6.1 = *FGrHist* 566 T9b). Although direct dependence cannot be conclusively proved in any given instance, many of the fragments of Fabius are reminiscent of the interests, methods, and outlook of Timaeus,<sup>69</sup> and in general Timaeus

is frequently, and rightly, seen as an indispensable source of both information and inspiration for the first Roman historians.

But Fabius' sources will also have included documents and archives, as well as native oral traditions, that would not have been available, or indeed of much interest, to Greek historians and their readers. The *Annales Maximi* and other priestly records, lists of magistrates and triumphs, family archives and traditions, and other materials of the same kind would have been freely available to Fabius as a member of the ruling aristocracy, and material from such sources was undoubtedly incorporated into his account, even if we cannot be certain what the end result was exactly like. For example whether it contained a complete list of consuls going back to the beginning of the Republic is unknown and much disputed; but there is little doubt that it could have done so, and we are inclined to believe that it did.<sup>70</sup>

One outstanding example of Fabius' use of documentary sources is the muster of Italian forces at the time of the Gallic invasion of 225 BC. Polybius tells us that the Romans instructed their allies to provide lists of men of military age (2.23.9), and proceeds (2.24) to break down the resulting totals to provide a global figure of 700,000 infantry and 70,000 cavalry. Similar figures appear in Diodorus (25 fr.13) and Pliny (*nat.* 3.138, but giving 80,000 cavalry instead of 70,000), while sources dependent on Livy (*per.* 20; Eutrop. 3.5; Oros. 4.13.6-7) give a round figure of 800,000 for the total. These figures are close enough to one another to make it certain that they go back to a common source – a common source that is identified by Eutropius and Orosius as Fabius Pictor (F21a-b). But it is also extremely probable, as Mommsen recognised,<sup>71</sup> that Polybius' detailed breakdown of the figures also comes from Fabius; this would be likely enough in

any case, but the evidence of Eutropius and Orosius makes it virtually certain, especially in view of Orosius' additional comment, in which the numbers are divided between Romans and allies.<sup>72</sup>

Fabius' account of Roman and Italian manpower in 225 BC represents a conflation of the figures for military forces actually serving in 225 (perhaps from the archives of the Senate), the recorded census totals (for Romans capable of bearing arms), and an official record of the figures that were returned by the various allied states (Pol. 2.23.9: ἀπογραφαί; cf. 2.24.10: καταγραφαί).<sup>73</sup> In other words we have the clearest possible evidence that Fabius did first-hand research using material available from archival sources. A wider interest in questions of military manpower is also attested by F10, and a liking for facts and figures perhaps by F9 and F12.

Another body of material to which Fabius would have had privileged access was the records of his own family, in the form of oral tradition as well as documents and physical memorials. The surviving accounts contain an exceptionally rich seam of stories about the Fabii, both as individuals and as a clan, and there must be a good chance that some of these were brought into the historiographical tradition by Fabius Pictor. The Fabii traced their origins back to Hercules, who featured in Pictor's account of the foundation legend, as we now know from the Tauromenium inscription (T7). The fact that one of the two groups of *luperci* were known as *luperci Fabi(an)i* also suggests that they were important at the time of Romulus, but it is striking that in the surviving accounts of the foundation and the regal period more generally the ancestors of the Fabii play no part (the same is true of the other major patrician clans). This is taken by Momigliano as evidence of Fabius Pictor's honesty;<sup>74</sup> it is in any case a sign that Fabius

and his successors did not try to rewrite the earliest history of the city in the interests of family pride.

The history of the Republic, on the other hand, is replete with episodes from the family tradition of the Fabii. The famous story of their private war against the Etruscans, and its fatal conclusion at the Cremera in 477 BC, is a case in point.<sup>75</sup> They were also intimately linked to the tradition of the Gallic catastrophe, which was caused by the rashness of the three Fabii who were sent to Clusium to negotiate with the Gauls, but then joined the Clusines in a battle against them;<sup>76</sup> another famous story was the exploit of C. Fabius Dorsuo, who sneaked out of the beleaguered Capitol and through enemy lines in order to carry out an annual festival of the Fabian *gens* on the Quirinal.<sup>77</sup> In the twenty-second year after this, according to Fabius, if he is the author of F30, the first plebeian consul took office; this was the result of the 'Licinio-Sextian Rogations', a reform movement that lasted ten years and started, according to Livy, because of an incident in the house of M. Fabius Ambustus. The story, a kind of soap-opera, involved the rivalry between Fabius' two daughters, one of whom was married to a patrician, the other to a plebeian. The complaints of the second daughter induced Fabius to support the plebeians' struggle to achieve equality between the orders.<sup>78</sup>

The next set of examples concerns the career of Q. Fabius Maximus Rullianus, the historian's great-uncle. Two episodes in particular stand out: the first is the dispute between Rullianus and Papirius Cursor, which we know was narrated by Fabius Pictor (F17); the second is the reconnaissance mission of Caeso Fabius, the brother of the consul Rullianus (and therefore another of Pictor's great-uncles), who in 311 BC made his way through the trackless Ciminian Forest to Camerinum in Umbria, which he

persuaded to become an ally of Rome. The story is notable for its family-based circumstantial detail. The interesting feature is not so much the fact that the consul appointed his brother for the task, as his reasons for doing so. Livy explains that the brother had been brought up in Caere and spoke fluent Etruscan; he was therefore able to undertake the hazardous expedition disguised as a peasant and accompanied only by a slave.<sup>79</sup>

Two features of these stories deserve attention. First, each one of them has a familial aspect. This is obvious in the case of the Cremera, the exploit of Fabius Dorsuo, the daughters of Fabius Ambustus, and the expedition of Caeso Fabius through the Ciminian Forest. But we may also note Diodorus' account (14.113.6-7) of the role played by the father of the Fabii at the time of the embassy to Clusium, and the similar intervention by M. Ambustus, the father of Rullianus, who appealed to the tribunes of the plebs on behalf of his son during the dispute with Papirius Cursor in 325 (Livy 8.30-36).<sup>80</sup> This episode too, at least in Livy's account, is turned into a family affair. It seems inherently probable that all these stories formed part of a family tradition of the *gens Fabia*, in which members of the clan played key roles at major turning points in the history of the city; and the most reasonable explanation of the prominence of these stories in the surviving sources must be that they were brought into the historiographical tradition by Fabius Pictor.

If so we must also assume that Pictor's account showed the second characteristic feature of what we may call the Fabian tradition, namely the fact that it is not invariably favourable to the Fabii. This is especially evident in the story that we know was in Fabius Pictor, namely the dispute between Fabius Rullianus and his commander, the dictator

Papirius Cursor. Pictor made it brutally clear (F17) that Rullianus burned the booty in order to prevent the dictator from using it to adorn his own triumph; and as for the dispute itself, Oakley has demonstrated that Rullianus was definitely in the wrong, although the reader is evidently meant to sympathise with him.<sup>81</sup> Here and elsewhere we find the young Fabii presented as reckless and headstrong, but at the same time heroic: at the Cremera they allow success to go to their heads, and are lured into an ambush (Livy 2.50.3-6; DH 9.20.1-3; Ov. *fast.* 2.213-34), while at Clusium one of the brothers engages with the enemy chief and slays him in single combat (Diod. 14.113.5; Livy 5.36.7; DH 13.12.1; App. *Celt.* 2), thus achieving glory for himself and disaster for Rome; on the other hand the older generation pleads for moderation and seeks resolution (thus M. Fabius Ambustus on behalf of his daughter in the 370s, and his namesake on behalf of his son in 325). One can easily see why Fabius Pictor might have taken this line in his history, and how it might have fitted in with his presentation of his great contemporary, Fabius Cunctator.

However probable this reconstruction may be, little of it is capable of proof, and in accordance with our general principles (see General Introduction, above, 000) we have printed as fragments only explicitly attributed passages. But it calls to mind the general point that the surviving sources are likely to preserve far more of the lost historians than they openly acknowledge; and that the passages we have been discussing must be considered together with other texts that are undoubtedly based, at least in part, on Fabius Pictor. These include Polybius' account of the Gallic invasions of Italy in book 2, and much of his narrative of the First Punic War in book 1. Mommsen's famous theory that the Roman sections of Diodorus 11-20 are taken directly from Fabius Pictor is now

discredited,<sup>82</sup> but there are other possible examples. These include the anonymous historical fragment known as the *Ineditum Vaticanum*, containing a speech by a Roman named Caeso at the time of the First Punic War. At this date the *praenomen* Caeso was used exclusively by the Fabii; the speaker was therefore a Fabius, which led the first editor of the fragment to attribute it to Fabius Pictor.<sup>83</sup> Many other passages could be, and have been, traced back to Fabius with greater or lesser degrees of probability; but in general we have to reckon with the fact that many of the basic elements of the history of Rome down to the Second Punic War are likely to have featured, even if briefly and in rudimentary form, in the pioneering account of the historian who first established the tradition of historical writing at Rome.<sup>84</sup>

## NOTES

1. That the two men were related is confirmed by Plutarch (T3). Fabius Maximus was born probably before 280, since he must have been at least an adolescent when appointed an augur in 265 BC (Liv. 30.26.7; Val. Max. 8.13.3; Plin. *nat.* 7.156): see D. E. Hahm, *TAPhA* 94 (1963), 77 n.4. Valerius Maximus (*l.c.*) cannot be right in saying that Fabius Maximus obtained the augurate at a 'robust' age, and therefore lived for 'easily a century'.
2. Thus, Beck-Walter 1, 57. The evidence is a famous embassy to the court of Ptolemy II Philadelphus in 275 (DH 20.14; Val. Max. 4.3.9), which included N. Fabius Pictor, probably the historian's uncle, and Q. Fabius Maximus Gurges, probably his father's cousin (see Frier, *Libri annales*, 229-30).



3. All the patrician members of the pontifical college, and most of the patrician augurs, are known for this period, and they do not include Fabius Pictor (*MRR* 1, 281-4). Moreover Fabius Cunctator was (most unusually) a member of both colleges, and it may have been illegal for two members of the same *gens* to belong to the same priestly college (Dio 39.17.1, with the comments of Mommsen, *RF* 1, 80-90; Badian, *Arctusa* 1 (1968), 31-6; C. J. Smith, *The Roman Clan* (Cambridge, 2006), 309-10; on the other hand it has been argued that the law was introduced only in the late republic: J. A. North in *Parenté et stratégies familiales dans l'antiquité romaine* (Rome, 1990), 527-31; A. Drummond, *Historia* 57 (2008), 367-407). That Fabius was a *decemvir s.f.* was suggested by H. Diels, *Die Sibyllinische Blätter* (Berlin, 1890), 10-13, 106 (with a far-fetched theory that he composed some of the Sibylline oracles); Münzer, *RE* 9, 1837; cf. Verbrugge, *Studi ...Manni* 6 (1980), 2163-4.

4. Frier, *Libri annales*, 235.

5. Details in *MRR*, *sub annis*. Note that the record for this period is pitifully inadequate, and there may have been more campaigns in Liguria than are reported in our meagre sources.

6. Frier, *Libri annales*, 234.

7. Thus, Frier, *Libri annales*, 231, now widely followed: Chassignet 1, lv; Beck-Walter 1, 56; Flach, *RGS*<sup>3</sup>, 61-7; Kierdorf, *RGS*, 9; *Klio* 84 (2002), 401; Suerbaum in Herzog-Schmidt 1, 361. This reconstruction cannot be absolutely certain. A later date remains possible: thus, e.g., Oakley, *Comm.* 1, 22, preferring a date between 255 and 250.

8. The Tauromenium inscription (T7) is one of a series of texts painted on the wall of the gymnasium at Tauromenium in Sicily, each dealing with an ancient writer and

giving information about his life and works. Apart from Fabius, the writers who have been identified so far include two other historians, Callisthenes and Philistus, and one philosopher (Anaximander of Miletus). The standard interpretation is that the building was actually the library of the gymnasium, and that the texts painted on the wall, which resemble catalogue entries, were designed to advertise some of the library's holdings and to provide information about their authors (see Manganaro, *PdP* 52 (1974), 389-409; H. Blanck, *PdP* 52 (1997), 241-55; F. Battistoni, *ZPE* 157 (2006), 169-80).

9. Frier's reconstruction of the family tree is extremely probable, but in the nature of these things cannot be conclusive. It remains theoretically possible that the Fabii Pictores were descended from M. Fabius Dorsuo (cos. 345), rather than from M. Fabius Ambustus (cos. 360 etc.): thus, e.g., Oakley, *Comm.* 3, 393. But Plutarch (*Fab.* 18.3 (T3b)) describes Pictor as a kinsman (suggenhv") of Fabius Cunctator, which would not easily apply to a great-grandson of Dorsuo, who was from a separate branch from Ambustus.

10. Frier (*Libri annales*, 229) plausibly identifies him with the C. Fabius M.f. N.n. Ambustus who was *magister equitum* in 315 BC (*Fast. Cap.*; Liv. 9.23.6), although Oakley disagrees (*Comm.* 3, 293, *ad loc.*). Cicero's *nobilissimus* (*Tusc.* 1.4) refers to the painter, not to his grandson, the historian, as Peter (1<sup>2</sup> lxix) thought; it therefore rules out Zimmerman's eccentric notion (*Klio* 26 (1933), 261-6) that the first Pictor was a freed slave. A similar notion can also be found in E. Pfuhl, *Malerei und Zeichnung der Griechen* (Munich, 1923), 751. On the significance of Fabius' artistic endeavours cf. F. Coarelli, *Revixit ars* (Rome, 1996), 21-31.

11. See the important discussion of Oakley, *Comm.* 2, 30-2, noting that the inscription provides the earliest evidence we have for variation between the simple form and the

form in *-inus* of a person's name (which had become common by the early empire).

Suerbaum (in Herzog-Schmidt 1, 360) regards *Pictorinus* as 'die in Sizilien gebräuchliche Form des Ethnikons', but the text specifies *Ῥωμαίος*, so the author of the inscription could hardly have taken 'Pictorinus' to be an ethnic (cf. F. Battistoni, *ZPE* 157 (2006), 178).

12. He died in 167: Liv.45.44.3; Münzer, *RE* 6, 1841-2.

13. Crawford, *RRC*, 291-2 (no. 268). For the *praenomen* of the Fabius Pictor mentioned by Cicero, *Brut.* 81, see n.19 below.

14. Though it is now supported by the Tauromenium inscription, which refers to a copy of Fabius' history in the local library; on any reasonable view this work must have been in Greek.

15. These passages are best read in full under General Testimonia: GT1, 2, 6. It is just conceivable that in the *de oratore* passage (GT1) Cicero is concerned only with the form and content of the works in question (as Woodman contends: *Rhetoric*, 76-95), and not with their language and style, but this goes against most scholarly opinion and seems to us to amount to special pleading (cf. General Introduction, above p.00). As for the *de legibus* and Fronto passages (GT2, 6), they make no sense if the works discussed were not written in Latin.

16. This must be true of all citations of 'Fabius' or 'Quintus Fabius' by Polybius (for chronological reasons), and those by DH, Livy, and Plutarch. Sometimes these authors make the matter clear by association (F5, F7 (DH: Fabius bracketed with Cincius)), or by some other means (e.g. F16 (where Livy calls Fabius *longe antiquissimus auctor*); cf.

F10, F12, F23). In F21a-b Eutropius and Orosius also clearly identify Pictor: *Fabius historicus, qui ei(dem) bello interfuit* (225 BC).

17. But Cicero's reference to Fabii in the plural in F14 should not be taken as a reference to more than one historian named Fabius. It is an example of a common Latin idiom meaning 'people like ...' Cicero means Fabius Pictor, and by 'Gellii' he means Cn. Gellius. Cf. Kühner-Gerth, 15. Kühner-Stegmann, 72, Hofmann-Szantyr, 19.

18. A Latin translation of Pictor's original text: Beloch, *RG*, 98; Walbank, *CQ* 39 (1945), 16 n.2; Momigliano, *Terzo Contributo*, 57; Alföldi, *Early Rome*, 170 n.1. For the view that Fabius himself translated his own text, Zimmermann, *Klio* 26 (1933), 253; Bung, *Q. Fabius Pictor* (1950), 204; Boldrini, *Athenaeum* 39 (1961), 358; E. Ruschenbusch, *Die frühen römischen Annalisten* (Wiesbaden, 2004), 9: 'gleichzeitiger lateinische Übersetzung'. A later translation: Schanz-Hosius 1<sup>4</sup>, 172, 173-4; Badian, 'Latin Historians', 30 n.27; Schulz, *WJA* 24 (2000), 139. Further bibliography and discussion in Chassignet 1, lviii-lxii.

19. The *praenomen* is a problem. Once read as Ser(vius), based on the reading of B, it is now agreed to have been Numerius, after Martha's emendation was upheld by Badian: *JRS* 57 (1967), 228; accepted by Sumner, *Orators*, 43; Frier, *Libri annales*, 232.

20. Nine fragments are assembled by Peter 1, 114-6. In F9 Nonius (223M = 330L) quotes Varro: <in> *commentario ueteris Fabi Pictoris legi* ... Varro's description of Fabius Pictor as *uetus* confirms the early date for this author.

21. Thus Peter 1, lxxvii-lxxxix; clxxiv; Soltau, *JKPh* 132 (1886), 479-80; Münzer, *RE* 6, 1843; Rosenberg, *Einleitung*, 133; Gelzer, *Hermes* 69 (1934), 48; 82 (1954), 344 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 133, 147); Frier, *Libri annales*, 250-1 ('without much conviction').

22. Especially as he explicitly mentions A. Postumius Albinus' history in the preceding sentence (4 T4).
23. Thus, rightly, Hanell in *Entretiens Hardt* 4 (1956), 171-2 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 303-4).
24. But note that Leo (*GRL* 1, 86 n.1) inverted this relationship, and supposed that the Latin version was Fabius Pictor's original draft, from which he composed his Greek version – and that it was preserved by the Fabii and subsequently put into circulation. This perverse idea was revived by F. D'Ippolito, *A&R* 43 (1998), 142-55. An even more extreme theory was proposed by H. B. Mattingly, *LCM* 1 (1976), 3-7, who attributed the Latin annals to Q. Fabius Pictor, the praetor of 189 BC (*RE* 127), and the Greek version to the later Fabius Pictor (*RE* 128) mentioned by Cic. *Brut.* 81. This is refuted by T1, 2, and 3c, and by the filiation in T7; cf. N. Horsfall, *LCM* 1 (1976), 18.
25. Peter 1, lxxx-lxxxi.
26. Chassignet has done the same, and for the same reason. Peter separated them and printed them under different authors, in line with his view that they were independent works. For his part, Jacoby printed the Greek fragments and the Latin fragments separately (respectively F1-27, F28-33), but within the same entry and in the same sequence, thereby signifying that he regarded them as different versions of a work by a single author, Fabius Pictor. The resulting arrangements (in both Peter and Jacoby) are misleading, however, because they conceal the fact that most of the fragments assigned to the 'Greek' history cannot actually be ascribed with certainty to either version.
27. The fragments that cannot certainly be placed in context (F24-26) are printed in chronological order of citing authorities.

28. The Tauromenium inscription (T7: see above, n.8), which purports to summarise the contents of Fabius' work, deals only with the origins of the city. The standard explanation is that the summary covered only the first book (Frier, *Libri annales*, 230; Chassignet 1, 16 n.1; Beck-Walter 1, 61; Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 404), but this is a rash assumption, since the text breaks off after 15 lines and we have no idea how much is missing. It could have gone on to summarise the rest of the work (cf. F. Battistoni, *ZPE* 157 (2006), 178).

29. That Livy depends, directly or indirectly, on Fabius' own narrative is likely enough on general grounds (Hanell, *Entretiens Hardt* 4 (1956), 177 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 304-5); Momigliano, *Terzo Contributo*, 56; Dillery in J. Miller *et al.* (eds.), *Vertis in usum* (2002), 2-5), and appears to be confirmed by Appian (*Hann.* 27.116 = T3c) who, when reporting the senate's appointment of Fabius Pictor, describes him as 'the historian of these events' (τὸν συγγραφέα τῶνδε τῶν ἔργων). Cf. Peter 1, lxxii; Frier, *Libri annales*, 235-6.

30. The heterodox view that Fabius began writing before the Hannibalic War (already suggested by Zimmermann, *Klio* 26 (1933), 261), has now been advanced as a tenable hypothesis (and quite rightly so) by Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 401-2.

31. Cf. previous note. For the theory that Fabius was writing during the war: Leo, *GRL* 1, 87; Knoche, *NJAB* 2 (1939), 199 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 230); Hanell, *Entretiens Hardt* 4 (1956), 177-8 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 304-5); Alföldi, *Early Rome*, 169-70; Timpe, *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 956; Frier, *Libri annales*, 236-46; Chassignet 1, lvi-lviii; Beck-Walter 1, 60. That he wrote after the war: Münzer, *RE* 6, 1837; Schanz-Hosius 1<sup>4</sup>, 171-2; Rosenberg, *Einleitung*, 125; Gelzer, *Hermes* 68 (1933), 132 n.2 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 82 n.22) and *passim*;

Bömer, *SO* 29 (1952), 37; Badian, 'Early Historians', 4. Non-committal (but either during or after the war): Momigliano, *Terzo Contributo*, 56-8; 65; *Classical Foundations* (1990), 89. In our view, the only proper approach is to leave the question completely open; thus, Scholz, *WJA* 24 (2000), 142-4.

32. Livy 25.11.20 (212 BC): *plures propioresque aetate memoriae tradunt* ('as recorded by the majority, and by those who were closer in time to the memory of the events'); 29.14.9 (204 BC): *traditum a proximis memoriae temporum illorum scriptoribus* ('reported by writers closest to the memory of those times').

33. Zimmermann, *Klio* 26 (1933) 262-3; Frier, *Libri annales*, 236-7; Chassignet lvii. The argument is not conclusive, however, as D. Hoyos points out (*ZPE* 134 (2001), 78): Hoyos argues that Pictor was the author of PRyl. 491, a historical fragment dealing with the events of 203 BC normally attributed (we think rightly) to one of the pro-Carthaginian Greek historians of the war (see n.35, below).

34. Frier, *Libri annales*, 237; also Chassignet 1, lvii and n.217; Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 401.

35. Sosylus of Sparta, *FGrHist* 176; Silenus of Caleacte, *FGrHist* 175; others include Chaereas, *FGrHist* 177, Eumachus of Naples, *FGrHist* 178, Xenophon, *FGrHist* 179, and unspecified others, *FGrHist* 180.

36. Gelzer, *Hermes* 68 (1933), 129-66; 69 (1934), 46-55; 82 (1954), 342-8 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 77-129; 130-43; 144-53); Hanell, *Entretiens Hardt* 4 (1956), 163-5 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 305-6); C. P. T. Naudé, *AClass* 4 (1961), 53-5; Alföldi, *Early Rome*, 169-70; Badian, 'Early Historians', 4-6; W. V. Harris, *War and Imperialism in Republican Rome* (Oxford, 1979), 109-10.

37. Thus, Momigliano, *Terzo contributo*, 64: 'se Fabio era un propagandista, non lo era in maniera volgare'. Cf. C. W. Fornara, *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley, 1983), 40-1.
38. There is obviously no guarantee that the wording of F4a reflects Fabius, rather than DH: see the remarks of Poucet, *Historia* 26 (1976), 201-16. It is sometimes suggested that the mention of talents in F12 shows that Livy must have used the Greek version of Fabius. Since Livy was writing in Latin, this argument refutes itself.
39. Gruen, *Culture and National Identity*, 231; in general on this issue see Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 104-6.
40. Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 411; Manganaro, *PdP* 29 (1974), 395-6 and in Alföldi, *Römische Frühgeschichte* (1976), 87-8; C. P. Jones, *HSCP* 97 (1995), 235-6; F.-H. Mutschler in *Moribus antiquis* (2000), 100; A. Erskine, *Troy between Greece and Rome* (Oxford, 2001), 40-1.
41. The inscription mentions Lanoios, the eponymous founder of Lanuvium, who hailed from Centuripae according to an inscription published by Manganaro, *RAAN* 38 (1963), 23-44; cf. J. and L. Robert, *REG* 78 (1965), 197-9 (no. 499); R. K. Sherk, *Municipal Decrees of the Roman West* (Buffalo, 1970), no. 59 (with English translation). The original edition of the Taormina inscription (reproduced in Chassignet, F1) spoke of the 'return' (novston) of Lanoios, but this reading is no longer accepted: F. Battistoni, *ZPE* 157 (2006), 176-7.
42. This comparison has frequently been made, but is given particular prominence by Momigliano, *Terzo Contributo*, 61; *Classical Foundations* (1990), 98; and recently by Dillery in J. Miller *et al.* (eds.), *Vertis in usum* (2002), 1-23.



43. On the nature of the historical tradition before Fabius, especially its oral component, see now J. von Ungern-Sternberg in J. von Ungern-Sternberg, H. Reinau (eds.), *Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung* (Stuttgart, 1988), 237-65; D. Timpe, *ibid.*, 266-86; T. P. Wiseman, *Historiography and Imagination*, 32-6 (and *passim*); Beck-Walter 1, 27-37; Scholz, *WJA* 24 (2000), 145-6.
44. Momigliano, *Terzo Contributo*, 61.
45. W. Soltau, *Die Anfänge der römischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Leipzig, 1909), 78-9; Peter 1, lxxv-lxxvi; Bardon, *Litt. inconnue* 1, 31-2; Badian, 'Early Historians', 3.
46. J. N. Adams in *ALLP*, 73-4; cf. Briscoe, *ibid.*, 58.
47. Those who have made the attempt include von Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* 5, 515; Beloch, *RG* 100; Verbrugge, *Studi ... Manni* 6 (1980), 2168. Their conclusions are summarised by Chassignet 1, lxvi-ii, n.256.
48. Pol. 1.13.7; 2.1.4; cf. 2.14.1, 40.4; Walbank, *CQ* 39 (1945), 16.
49. Frier, *Libri annales*, 257; also Dillery in J. Miller *et al.* (eds.), *Vertis in usum* (2002), 14-15; Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 101-2.
50. B. Schmid, *Studien zu griechischen Ktisissagen* (Diss. Freiburg i. Ü., 1947); Bickerman, *CPh* 47 (1952), 65-81; Cornell, *RAC* 12, 1108-11. For historians notice esp. Pol. 9.1.4, with Walbank *ad loc.*
51. See Gabba's fundamental study, 'Tradizione letteraria', 135-74, esp. 135-8.
52. J. von Ungern-Sternberg in J. von Ungern-Sternberg, H. Reinau (eds.), *Vergangenheit in mündlicher Überlieferung* (Stuttgart, 1988), 247-9; D. Timpe, *ibid.*, 276-7.

53. The tripartite 'hour-glass' structure is accepted by the following (among others): Schanz, *GRL* 1<sup>2</sup>, 120; Münzer, *RE* 6, 1839; Peter 1, lxxii-lxxiv; Zimmermann, *Klio* 26 (1933), 258; Gelzer, *Hermes* 68 (1933), 129; 82 (1954), 343 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 77, 146); Knoche, *NJAB* 2 (1939), 200 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 232); Walbank, *CQ* 39 (1945), 17-18; Bung, *Q. Fabius Pictor* (1950), 201; Bömer, *Historia* 2 (1953-4), 199-200; Hanell, *Entretiens Hardt* 4 (1956), 165 (= Pöschl, *RGS*, 307); Momigliano, *Terzo Contributo*, 63; C. P. T. Naudé, *AClass* 4 (1961), 53; Badian, 'Early Historians', 3; Gabba, 'Tradizione letteraria', 135-8; Timpe, *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 932-40; Wiseman, *Clio's Cosmetics*, 9-10; Verbrugge in *Studi ... Manni* 6 (1980), 2167; Petzold in W. Schuller (ed.), *Livius* (1993), 161-9; D'Ippolito, *A&R* 43 (1998), 146; Scholz, *WJA* 24 (2000), 141; Beck-Walter 1, 61; Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 402-3; Suerbaum in Herzog-Schmidt 1, 362. The 'hour-glass' idea has also made its way into standard works of reference, e.g. Brennan, *Praetorship*, 6-7.

54. Schanz-Hosius (1<sup>4</sup>, 172) infer that Fabius' work was divided into two parts: a brief summary of early history and a detailed account of recent events. Similar reservations are expressed by Vitucci, *Helikon* 6 (1966), 409; Poucet, *Historia* 25 (1976), 212-4; Chassignet 1, lxxviii-lxxix. Frier, *Libri annales*, 255-8 (followed by Dillery, in J. Miller *et al.* (eds.), *Vertis in usum* (2002), 15) invokes Jacoby, *Atthis*, 285 n.75 in an attempt to minimise the effect of DH's statement, and to deny that Fabius' work was divided into identifiable narrative sections. He is taken to task by Petzold (in Schuller (ed.), *Livius* (1993), 161, 184 n.63), who upholds the orthodox view.

55. Gabba, 'Tradizione letteraria', 135-6; Timpe, *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 937-8; Verbrugge, *Studi ... Manni* (1980), 2169-73.

56. Thus, rightly, Vitucci, *Helikon* 6 (1966), 409-10; Suerbaum in Herzog-Schmidt 1, 362; Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 102.

57. Cato (5) devoted four out of seven books to the period from the First Punic War to his own time, and Piso (9) probably did something similar; Claudius Quadrigarius (24) dealt with Cannae in the fifth of his 23 or more books. Valerius Antias (25), who wrote at least 75, apparently dealt with an event of 136 BC in book 22, while Livy devoted 71 of his 142 books (i.e. the second half) to the period after 91 BC.

58. The calculation is based on the amount of text in Greek or Latin that we have printed as 'fragments'. This is a crude measure, but the results are overwhelming. If the long description of the *ludi magni* (F14-15) is included, then over 90% of what survives deals with the period down to 490 BC.

59. Timpe, *ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 938-40, accepted by Beck-Walter 1, 61. See also Gelzer, *Gnomon* 28 (1956), 85 (= *Kl. Schr.* 3, 196); Kierdorf, *Chiron* 10 (1980), 212-13; Cornell in J. G. F. Powell, J. North (eds.), *Cicero's Republic* (London 2001), 46-7.

60. Thus, rightly, Poucet, *Historia* 25 (1976), 214; Kierdorf, *Klio* 84 (2002), 403-4; Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 102. Timpe's notion (*ANRW* 1.2 (1972), 935-6; already in *AAP* 83 (1970-71), 17; cf. Badian, 'Early Historians', 8) that a Greek literary *Ktisis* typically included some of the early history of a city, as well as the actual foundation, has no support in the evidence.

61. Cf. Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 102, with further examples. As Northwood rightly observes, the point at issue is not what κτίσις might have meant to Fabius, but what it meant to DH.

62. Cicero calls the work *Graeci annales* in T10 (= F1) – a unique reference. Pliny calls it simply *annales* (F20, 25), as does Gellius (T17), while Nonius calls it *res gestae* (F4e). The Greek title was probably Ῥωμαϊκὰ (thus, DH 7.71.1 = F15). Diodorus' Ῥωμαίων πράξεις (F3) is probably a description of the work, rather than a title. For the implications of these titles/descriptions see Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 110-11; and cf. 98-9 on the meaning of the term 'annalist'; on which see also Verbrugge, *Studi ... Manni* (1980), 2165 n.10.

63. Gelzer's case (*Kl. Schr.* 3, 93-110) rests on a series of question-begging assumptions: (a) that Sempronius Asellio 20 F1 was distinguishing between 'senatorial historians', from Fabius to Cato, and 'annalists', who came later and wrote in Latin (on this see Jacoby, *Atthis*, 285 n.75); (b) that Cicero's references to Fabius in T8-9 are in fact to the Latin annals, which Gelzer takes to have been a different work; (c) that Fabius set out to justify Roman policy to the Greeks, and that an annalistic chronicle of the early Republic would have been wholly unsuitable for this purpose; and (d) that Polybius' summaries (1.6-7; 2.18-21) of Roman history before the First Punic War are not only based on Fabius, but also adopt the format of his text.

64. Thus, Walbank, *CQ* 39 (1945), 15-18; Bömer, *Historia* 2 (1953-4), 198-204; Frier, *Libri annales*, 269-84; Oakley, *Comm.* 4, 475-7; J. W. Rich in J. D. Chaplin, C. S. Kraus (eds.), *Livy* (Oxford, 2009), 134-6. For discussion of the whole issue see Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 97-114.

65. Thus, Dillery in J. Miller *et al.* (eds.), *Vertis in usum* (2002), 19-23.

66. Apart from the Plutarch passage, the only thing we know about Diocles is that his death was alluded to by Demetrius of Scepsis (*ap. Athen.* 2.22 = *FGrHist* 820 T1), who

was writing in the first half of the second century BC. Jacoby assumes that Ῥώμης κτίσις was the title of a work by Diocles (*FGrHist* 820 F1), but this is not a legitimate inference from Plutarch's text.

67. Peter 1, lxxxii-lxxxiii.

68. Thus Mommsen, cited by Momigliano, *Secondo Contributo*, 403; Frier, *Libri annales*, 260.

69 See above all Momigliano, *Classical Foundations* (1990), 101: 'He (sc. Timaeus) gave Fabius the taste for the happy turn of phrase, for the significant anecdote, for the antiquarian detail, and perhaps even for the autobiographical elements.'

70. The extreme revisionism of scholars such as J. Rüpke (*Klio* 77 (1995), 184-202; *Kalender und Öffentlichkeit* (Berlin, 1995), 331-68) and F. Mora (*Fasti e schemi cronologici. La riorganizzazione annalistica del passato remoto romano* (Stuttgart, 1999)), who believe that the consular list did not exist in Fabius' time, but was fabricated by historians and antiquarians in the second century, seems to us both improbable and insufficiently based in the evidence. For a critical assessment see J.-C. Richard, *REL* 79 (2001), 19-25; Northwood in *Corolla Rodewald* (2007), 108-9.

71. *RF* 2, 383-4.

72. We have therefore highlighted this sentence in bold in F21b.

73. As argued by K. J. Beloch, *Die Bevölkerung der griechisch-römischen Welt* (Leipzig, 1886), 355-70. See also Mommsen, *RF* 2, 382-406; M. Gelzer, *Hermes* 70 (1935), 273-5 (= *Kl. Schr.* 3, 224-6 = Pöschl, *RGS*, 159-61); A. Afzelius, *Die römische Eroberung Italiens* (Copenhagen, 1942), 98-101; Walbank, *Comm.* 1, 196-203; A. J. Toynbee, *Hannibal's Legacy* (London, 1966), 1, 479-505; Brunt, *IM*, 44-60.

74. Momigliano, *Classical Foundations* (1990), 105; cf. *Quarto Contributo*, 489.
75. Principal sources: Livy 2.48.8-50.11; DH 9.15.2-7, 18.5-22.6; Diod. 11.53.6; Ov. *fast.* 2.193-242; Gell. 17.21.13; Fest. 358; Paul.-Fest. 451; *Lib. de praen.* 6. Discussion in Mommsen, *RF* 2, 246-61 (esp. 256-7: Fabian family tradition transmitted via Pictor); E. Pais, *Storia di Roma* 1.1 (Turin, 1898), 434-6, 515-21; id., *Ancient legends*, 168-84 (esp. 172-8: the whole story fabricated as a reprojection of an event in 358 BC: Livy 7.15.10); Ogilvie, *Comm.* 359-66; and the important studies of J.-C. Richard, *Latomus* 47 (1988), 526-53; 48 (1989), 312-25 (taking it for granted that the story was in Fabius Pictor).
76. Livy 5.35.5-36.11; App. *Celt.* 2-3; DH 13.12 (with two Fabii rather than three). Diodorus (14.113.3-7) does not name the ambassadors (cf. Dio fr.25.2), which prompted Mommsen to suggest that the Fabii were introduced at a later stage in the development of the tradition (*RF* 2, 303-7). Ogilvie argued that this secondary version was the work of Fabius Pictor (*Comm.* 716), which is rather paradoxical, especially as Livy's version is hostile to the Fabii (NB especially 5.35.1 *mitis legatio, ni praeferoces legatos Gallisque magis quam Romanis similes habuisset*: 'a peaceful embassy, if it had not consisted of headstrong ambassadors more like Gauls than Romans'). But see further below.
77. Livy 5.46.1-3, 52.3; Val. Max. 1.1.11; App. *Gall.* 6 (= ?Cassius Hemina (6) F22); Dio fr.25.5-6. Cf. C. J. Smith, *The Roman Clan* (Cambridge, 2006), 45-6, comparing DH 9.19.1, stressing the fact that the Fabii are represented at key moments in history as especially tightly bound to their own festivals, and invoking Fabius Pictor.
78. Livy 6.34.5-11; Dio fr.29; Zonar. 7.24. On the story see Cornell in *Tria Corda. Scritti in onore di Arnaldo Momigliano* (Como, 1983), 114-5; Oakley, *Comm.* 1, 646-7.

79. Livy 9.36.2-9; also Frontin. *strat.* 1.2.2 (probably from Livy). The anecdote does not occur in the parallel narrative of Diod. 20.35.1-5 or in the fragments of Dio. On the difficulty in Livy's text see Oakley, *Comm. ad loc.* Possible derivation from Fabius Pictor: Cornell, *Beginnings*, 355-6.

80. There may be some duplication here, as the stories have a very similar structure, and in Livy the father of the three Fabii who fought at Clusium is named M. Fabius Ambustus (5.35.5), who is otherwise unknown, unless he is to be identified with M. Fabius Vibulanus, cos. 442 (cf. Ogilvie, *Comm.*, 716, *ad loc.*). The doublet (if such it is) may already have been inherent in the family's own tradition – that is to say, the family may have claimed a proud record of fathers intervening to save their headstrong sons.

81. Oakley, *Comm.* 2, 704-7. On the burning of the booty, cf. Momigliano, *Classical Foundations* (1990), 103.

82. *RF* 2, 221-96.

83. H. von Arnim, *Hermes* 27 (1892), 118-30, at 130. The text is reproduced also as *FGrHist* 839 F1. Similar passages, evidently drawn from the same source, occur at Diod. 23.2.1 and Athenaeus 6.273. Derivation from Fabius is suggested also by Mazzarino, *Pensiero storico* 2.2, 445-6, and Momigliano, *Classical Foundations* (1990), 105.

*Contra*: Badian, 'Early Historians', 30 n.26.

84. The immense influence of Fabius Pictor is accepted by virtually all modern historians, regardless of whether they believe that he collected and shaped a pre-existing tradition (the majority view, to which we subscribe), or that he freely invented much of it, and passed on his fabrications to succeeding generations of Roman historians (which is the position adopted by A. Alföldi, *Early Rome*, 123-75, and *passim*).

