

STRUCTURING ROMAN HISTORY: THE CONSULAR YEAR AND THE ROMAN HISTORICAL TRADITION*

Note: This paper was first published in *Histos* 1 (1997), and republished in a revised and abridged form in J. D. Chaplin and C. S. Kraus (eds), *Oxford Readings in Classical Studies: Livy* (Oxford, 2009), 118–47. The present version reproduces the original paper in full, but incorporates the 2009 revisions and a few further changes.

Abstract: This article is concerned with the shaping of the annual narrative in historical writers working in the Roman annalistic tradition and contests the view that Livy and his predecessors conformed to a standard pattern from which Tacitus departed. It is true that Livy in Books 21–45 employs a regular internal–external–internal pattern based on the consuls’ movements between Rome and their provinces, with copious details on routine matters in the opening and closing domestic sections. However, Livy manipulates this framework freely for his own purposes, especially when incorporating Polybian material. Moreover, the pattern is characteristic only of his account of the Middle Republic: the annual narratives of Books 1–10 do not conform to it, and Livy probably abandoned it when dealing with events from the Social War on. It seems likely that the annual narratives of most of Livy’s predecessors were varied and informal, like those of Livy Books 1–10, and this is corroborated by fragments of Claudius Quadrigarius and Sallust’s *Histories*. Livy probably derived his mid-republican pattern from Valerius Antias: it will have been an innovatory feature of his work, based on documentary research, especially in the archives of the senate. Assessment of Tacitus’ handling of his annual narratives should take account of the wide range of models available to him within the annalistic tradition.

1. Introduction

By comparison with historians today, Roman historical writers had little freedom to decide what to write about and how to organize their material. For those who aspired to write full-dress Roman history the choice was largely made by the tradition in which they worked. They could, if they wished, write a monograph, normally on a war. Alternatively, they would follow the majority of their predecessors in writing annalistically, and in that case their subject matter was clearly defined as the deeds of the Roman

* An earlier version of this paper was delivered in a panel on Roman Historical Writing at the Classical Association Conference at Nottingham in April 1996. I have benefited much from the comments made then and by Christina Kraus and David Levene on a subsequent draft

people, at home and at war (*domi militiae*), arranged by consular years. The aspiring annalistic historian had merely to decide which of the two main branches of that tradition he should join—whether, like Livy, to take as his subject the whole history of the Roman people from the origins to their own time, or, like Tacitus, to confine himself to a limited period of relatively recent history.

Their handling of the formal requirements of the genre is therefore a topic of central importance for the understanding of writers working within the Roman annalistic tradition. It is accordingly surprising that there has been comparatively little detailed study of how such historians shaped their material within the framework of the consular year. The most important contribution is Judith Ginsburg's excellent monograph on Tacitus, which mainly confines itself to the first six books of the *Annals* (Ginsburg 1981). Regrettably, there has been nothing comparable on Livy. Studies of Livy's compositional techniques, like those of Burck (1934, 1950) and Luce (1977), have focused primarily on the shaping of individual books and groups of books and deal only incidentally with his treatment of the consular year. The main reason for this neglect is, I suspect, the general assumption that there is no problem to be examined, that we understand perfectly well how Livy handled the consular year. In what follows I seek to challenge this consensus.

The generally accepted view may be summarized as follows.¹ Livy, it is held, organizes his annual narratives on a standard pattern structured round the consuls' movements, with a central section of external events sandwiched between opening and closing domestic sections, and these domestic sections include detailed accounts of various recurrent topics, some of a ceremonial character. This standard pattern is perceived as playing an important part in setting the tone of Livy's work: although it was monotonous and much of the recurrent material was jejune, it made an appeal to Roman tradition, emphasized the regularity of Rome's constitutional processes and served to lower the tension between the great episodes. Livy, it is supposed, took the pattern over from his annalistic predecessors, and it has usually been thought that it derived ultimately from the *Annales Maximi*, the record of events kept by the *pontifex maximus*. Until recently it was held that the full impact of the *Annales Maximi* on the historical tradition followed their publication by P. Mucius Scaevola in the 120's. However, the ancient evidence

¹ See e.g. McDonald (1957), 155–6; Walsh (1961), 30–1, 174–6, (1974), 23; Frier (1979), 270–4. For more nuanced views, noting variations in Livy's practice, see Burck (1992), 50–2; Kraus (1994), 9–13, and (1997), 61–2; Oakley (1997–2005), 1.122–5; Feeney (2007), 190–3. On official notices in Livy see Packard (1969); Phillips (1974). The best overview of the annalistic tradition and its use of archival material is now Oakley (1997–2005), 1.21–108, 4.475–92.

shows only that the keeping of the record ceased with Scaevola, and, if a published version ever appeared, this is more likely to have taken place under Augustus, as Frier (1979) has argued.²

This view of traditional annalistic practice, as exemplified by Livy, is adopted by Ginsburg and plays an important part in her argument.³ Tacitus' methods, as she well shows, are quite different from those she attributes to Livy. Livy, she holds, adhered to chronological order and faithfully recorded recurrent domestic events, whereas Tacitus sometimes departs sharply from chronological order and reports routine items only when it suits him. Moreover, while he sometimes uses Livy's internal–external–internal pattern, Tacitus also deploys a variety of other patterns for the ordering of internal and external sections within the annual narratives. Tacitus, Ginsburg concludes, was adhering to the annalistic form only to subvert it. Annalistic form was traditionally associated with the Republican past, but in his hands it served to demonstrate the hollowness of the façade of republican government in the early principate.

I have no quarrel with Ginsburg's analysis of Tacitus' selection and ordering of his material or with her demonstration of the way in which he used these techniques to reinforce his historical interpretation. However, I hope to show that her conception of Livy's practice and of the annalistic tradition needs reconsideration.

2. Annalistic Form in Livy, Books 21–45

Let us begin by looking at Livy's methods in the later extant books, namely Books 21–45, covering the years 218–167. As examples, analyses of Livy's narratives of three years from the fourth decade, 193, 189 and 184, are given in Appendix 1 below. Each of these sample narratives exhibits some of the principal features which have customarily been identified as characteristic of the 'annalistic form', and the same is true of all the annual narratives in Books 21–45. For each year covered in these books the activities of the consuls provides a chronological and structural framework, from their entry into office, which at this period took place on 15 March, and their early activity in Rome, to their departure to their provinces and activity there, and finally to the return of one or both consuls to Rome and the election of their successors. A number of routine topics regularly figure in the domestic sections of these annual narratives. For virtually every year Livy supplies in-

² For attempts (in my view unconvincing) to defend Scaevolan publication see Forsythe (1994), 53–73, and (2000), and Petzold (1999), 4–94, 252–9.

³ For her view of Livy see especially Ginsburg (1981), 7, 29, 33–4, 53, 78–9, 84–6.

formation on the initial disposition of provinces and armies and on the election of consuls and praetors. Other topics which frequently appear include the reporting and expiation of prodigies, the games and other activities of the aediles, and the death and replacement of priests. Prodigies are usually reported in the opening domestic section, as having been dealt with before the consuls' departure, while the notices about the aediles and the priests usually occur at the end, out of chronological sequence, as further events occurring 'in that year' (*eo anno*).

Livy's practice is, nevertheless, a good deal more flexible than some modern accounts suggest. There is plenty of variety even within those parts of the annual narratives which derive from his annalistic sources, and Livy uses this material freely to serve his own compositional purposes.⁴

Levene (1993) has shown how much variation there is in the selection, location and treatment of the prodigy notices. He tends, I think, to underestimate the extent to which these variations may derive from Livy's sources, but he must be right in explaining at least some of them as narrative devices of Livy himself. Study of other categories of routine material would yield similar results.⁵ The notices of the deaths and replacement of priests may serve as an example. These are not always confined to the end-of-year location and are sometimes linked to a broader theme, as when the deaths of three *pontifices* at Cannae are grouped with other consequences of the disaster (23.21.7) or priestly deaths form part of a pestilence narrative (41.21.8–9). The bald death notice is occasionally elaborated, as for Fabius Maximus, who is accorded a laudatory obituary (30.26.7–10), or for Q. Fulvius Flaccus, of whose death we are given grim details (42.28.10–12). Livy gives a nearly complete record of changes to the pontifical college, but a number of deaths and appointments of augurs and rather more of *decemviri sacris faciundis* must have been omitted.⁶ Between 196/5 (33.42.1–6, 44.3) and 184/3 (39.45.8–46.1) there are no priestly notices, except for the appointment of Q. Fabius Pictor (the historian's son) as Flamen Quirinalis, only mentioned à propos of his

⁴ In her notes Ginsburg concedes that Livy does vary his practice (Ginsburg 1981, 109 n. 35, 111 n. 12, 117 n. 3), but she does not explore the extent and significance of this flexibility.

⁵ Cf. Luce (1977), 191–2; Davies (2004), 21 ff.; Levene (2010), 36 ff.

⁶ For the membership of the priestly colleges in this period see Broughton (1951), especially 282–3, 393–4; Hahm (1963); Szemler (1972), 70 ff., 101 ff.; Palmer (1997), 107–14 (*decemviri*); Rüpke (2008), 80–98. The pontifical and augural colleges had nine members each, one fewer than the *decemviri*, but in Books 21–45 Livy reports the death of 21 *pontifices*, but only 13 augurs and 10 *decemviri*. The one pontifical change which Livy certainly omits is the death of Q. Fulvius Flaccus and appointment of C. Sempronius Tuditanus to his place between 207 and 196 (Rüpke 2008, nos. 1762, 3016).

election to the praetorship (37.47.8). This lengthy gap must owe something to authorial choice as well as the accidents of mortality.

Although some years do fall into a simple internal–external–internal pattern, the alternation between internal and external events is often more complex even within the sections deriving wholly from annalistic sources. Accounts of developments in war zones sometimes break into the opening domestic section before the consuls’ departure.⁷ Sometimes the scene shifts back to Rome during their absence.⁸ Reports of one or both consuls’ activities in their province sometimes dwindle almost to vanishing point.⁹ Livy’s account of the year 193 (see Appendix 1) is an extreme example of what Luce (1977, 52) has termed ‘interlocking’ structure.

Some events are reported as occurring simply *eo anno*, but most purport to be narrated in chronological sequence. Sometimes Livy gives precise dates or (more rarely) intervals, but usually he just gives vague indicators of time such as ‘at the beginning of the year’, ‘in that summer’, ‘near the end of the year’ (*principio anni, ea aestate, exitu prope anni*) or links events by loose temporal connectives such as ‘during those days’, ‘about the same time’, ‘next’ (*per eos dies, sub idem tempus, inde*). All this serves to convey the impression that the narrative is moving through the busy and varied events of the Roman year, but this is to some extent an illusionistic effect. In the sections deriving from annalistic sources, we seldom have the evidence to control Livy’s chronology, but, when we do, we are sometimes able to puncture the illusion, revealing Livy as ready to invent chronological links or displace events within the narrative when it suited him. Two of our sample years supply an example. Calendars show that the shrine of Victoria Virgo was dedicated on 1 August 193, less than half way through the consular year, but Livy mentions the dedication near the end of his account of the year (35.9.6). This in itself is not misleading, for the only explicit indication of time Livy gives for the dedication is that it occurred ‘in the same days’ as the procurement of some prodigies, which are themselves reported merely as occurring ‘in that year’ (35.9.2–5). However, one may doubt whether there was any basis for the chronological link between the prodigies and the dedication, and in any case, it tells the reader nothing, since the prodigies are undated.¹⁰ For 189

⁷ E.g. 31.10.1–11.3; 34. 46.1; 35.1.1–12, 21.7–11; 37.57.5–6; 40.47–50.

⁸ E.g. 35.6.1–7.5, 23–24; 36.21.6–11, 39.1–2 (doublet); 38.28.1–4.

⁹ E.g. 32.7.7–8, 9.5, 26.1–3 (doublet); 37.46.10–47.2; 39.44.11, 56.3; 40.35.1; 42.26.1; 45.44.1.

¹⁰ For the calendar evidence see Degrassi (1963), 489; Briscoe (1981), 157. The dedication of the temple of Magna Mater in 191 is a comparable case: see Livy 36.36.3–4; Degrassi (1963), 438; Briscoe (1981), 274–5. The chronological link which Livy makes between that dedication and Scipio Nasica’s games is probably false (*contra* Briscoe, who prefers to emend 36.37.1).

Livy reports the foundation of Bononia and the triumphs of L. Cornelius Scipio and L. Aemilius Regillus in the opening domestic section, yet he himself supplies the dates of these events, all of which occurred near the end of the consular year (37.57.7–8, 58.3–59.6).¹¹ His reason for extending the opening section so far was evidently to get the triumphs of Scipio and Regillus out of the way before narrating the activity of their successors in the command against Antiochus.¹² A false link to another domestic event slips in: Regillus' triumph is said to occur 'during the same days' (*per eos dies*) as the censorial elections, but these must in fact have happened earlier, since Livy later reports the censors' activity during the year (37.57.9–58.2; 38.28.1–4).¹³

It was from one or more of his Roman annalistic predecessors that Livy drew the chronological sequence which gave him the structure of his annual narratives in Books 21–45. However, much of his material in these books came from sources of a different kind, and it was above all this blending of material from such diverse sources that gave his history of the period its novel character. Books 21–30 are dominated by the great campaign narratives of the Second Punic War, much of them taken from Coelius Antipater's monograph on the war and from Polybius, whom Livy used directly from Book 21 on, as has now been convincingly demonstrated by Levene (2010, 126–63). In Books 31–45 their place is taken by the copious material which Livy drew from Polybius on the Greek East. Polybius' history was itself organized annalistically, but his years began in the autumn and were subdivided by regions. Incorporating material from this work into his own structure based on the consular year posed considerable problems for Livy. To cope with these problems, he devised a range of strategies, which have been well analysed by Luce (1977).

The chronological indications with which Livy links Polybian to annalistic sections are frequently misleading. Thus when, as he often does, Livy starts a Polybian section with a reference to winter, he sometimes correctly brings out which winter is intended (e.g. 33.27.6), but elsewhere conveys the impression that the events took place a year later than their true date (32.32.1 ff; 35.13.4 ff). Notoriously, Livy implies that Galba and Villius campaigned in Macedonia during their consulships in 200 and 199 respectively,

¹¹ The dates of the triumphs are also given by the *Fasti Triumphales* (omitting to state that Scipio's took place in an intercalary month): Degrassi (1947), 554.

¹² Cf. Luce (1977), 86–7.

¹³ A consul had to preside over the election of censors (Gell. 13.15.4), so these elections must in fact have been held before the consuls of 189 departed for their provinces, *contra* Lintott (1999), 12–13, who overlooks Livy's distortion.

whereas their campaigns actually took place a year later.¹⁴ Livy links his account of the triumphs of L. Scipio and L. Regillus, which, as we saw above, occurred towards the end of the consular year 189, with his Polybian narrative of their successors' arrival in Asia by the words *eodem fere tempore* ('at about the same time', 37.60.1), but in reality he has reverted at this point to the early part of the year. These and other similar chronological misstatements have earned Livy a good deal of criticism, and he clearly did not find chronology easy. However, the main reason why such false chronologies occur so frequently is surely not incompetence, but the fact that chronological accuracy was not of great importance to him. Livy was more concerned in Books 31–45 with conveying the *impression* of the interweaving of Eastern and other events.¹⁵

Only five year narratives in these books contain no Eastern material (and one of these is lacunose), and several have two Eastern sections.¹⁶ The majority of the Eastern passages are located in the central external section of the annual narratives, but Eastern material occurs in other locations as well. In several of the year narratives of the 190's Livy interrupts the opening or closing domestic sections with an Eastern passage.¹⁷ For 193 and 192 he brings the final domestic section to what Levene (1993, 85) has called a 'false close', and then adds Eastern material pointing ahead to the coming war with Antiochus (35.12–19, 42–51).¹⁸ For the years 185–181 Livy develops a new technique by which a report of Eastern embassies at Rome at the start of the year leads into an extended Eastern section, and this serves to unfold the story of the last years of Philip.¹⁹

¹⁴ Livy 31.22.4–47.3, 32.3–6. Cf. Luce (1977), 59 ff., who seems unduly confident that Livy himself was not taken in.

¹⁵ On Livy's manipulations of annalistic chronology in his third decade see now Levene (2010), 34–63. Levene concludes (p. 63) that 'for Livy, chronology is important, but it is also artificial'.

¹⁶ No Eastern material: 187, 186, 180, 177, 176 (lacuna). Two Eastern sections: 200, 196, 192, 191, 189, 171.

¹⁷ Eastern events interrupting the opening domestic section: 31.14–18 (200); 33.27.6–35.12 (196); cf. the year 191, where an extended narrative of events in Greece and the consul Glabrio's campaign there (36.5–35) is followed by events at Rome before the departure of his colleague Scipio Nasica (36.36 ff.). Eastern events interrupting the closing domestic section: 33.38–41 (196); 36.41–45.8 (191).

¹⁸ Two of Livy's accounts of the First Macedonian War also stood at the end of year narratives: 26.24–26.4 (211); 29.12 (205). In each case the reason is that the commander returned to assume the consulship for the following year.

¹⁹ 39.23.5–29.3 (185: uniquely, the normal year opening material is omitted); 39.33–37 (184); 39.46.6–53 (183); 40.2.6–16.3 (182); 40.20–24 (181). Cf. Briscoe (2008), 4.

As Luce (1977, 3–9) has shown, Livy planned Books 31–45 as a single span, whose principal theme was the defeat of Macedon and the extension of Roman supremacy over the Greek East. The wide range of techniques which he deployed for interweaving Eastern and Western events all served to emphasize the primacy of the Eastern theme. The framework of the consular year which Livy took over from his Roman source or sources divided events according to the traditional polarities of *domi* and *militiae*—civil and military affairs. Livy in effect superimposed a new set of polarities: East and West. This becomes explicit in the remarkable narrative for 184, which opens with an extended Greek and Macedonian section and then returns to make a new beginning for the other events of the year (see Appendix 1).

Thus, to my mind, even for Books 21–45 the contrast which Ginsburg draws between Livy and Tacitus is too sharp. It is true that throughout those books Livy’s annual narratives are structured round the chronological sequence of the consular year and include a good deal of routine domestic detail. But Livy manipulates this framework with a much freer hand than Ginsburg suggests and makes it serve his narrative purposes.

3. Annalistic Form in the Rest of Livy’s Work

In Books 21–45, then, Livy took over a standard pattern from one or more of his annalistic sources but deployed it flexibly, notably in the way in which he combined it with Polybian material. This gives his account considerable diversity, but the underlying framework is nonetheless unmistakably present. The consuls’ movements between Rome and their provinces provide a chronological structure, ensuring that the main accounts of domestic events generally come at the beginning and end of the year, and these domestic sections contain extensive routine material. It is commonly implied that Livy used the same structure for the annual narratives in the rest of his work. ‘We find this pattern in *any* book of Livy’, wrote McDonald in what is perhaps the classic statement of the orthodox view of the ‘annalistic form’. We must now consider the validity of this claim.²⁰

McDonald’s statement is patently not true for Book 1, on the kings, for which Livy does not use an annalistic framework at all. But is it true for Books 2–10? If we read these books without preconceptions, the answer must be negative.²¹

²⁰ McDonald (1957), 156.

²¹ On annalistic form in the first decade see especially Kraus (1994), 9–13; Oakley (1997–2005), 1.122–5.

From Book 2 on Livy's narrative does provide an annalistic record of the civil and military affairs of the Roman people arranged by the years of office of the chief magistrates. This is announced in programmatic fashion at the beginning of Book 2, associating the transition to the annalistic mode with the establishment of political liberty (2.1.1): *liberi iam hinc populi Romani res pace belloque gestas, annuos magistratus ... peragam* ('Henceforth I shall recount the achievements of the now free Roman people, their annual magistrates ...'). Only at two points in Books 2–10 does Livy not record the year transitions, namely the Coriolanus saga, where he omits the consuls of 490 and 489 (2.34–9), and the anarchy preceding the Licinio–Sextian reforms, in which for a *quinquennium* only plebeian magistrates are said to have been elected (6.35.10). The significance of the latter case is well brought out by Kraus (1994, 281): 'Without (annual magistrates) there can be no historiographical narrative By eliminating the authorities by whom time is measured the tribunes effectively take control of narrative authority as well.'²²

There are, however, striking differences between the annual narratives of Books 2–10 and those of Books 21–45. In important respects the first decade year narratives do not conform to the pattern familiar from the later books. Indeed, they do not exhibit a standard pattern at all.

Elections are frequently noticed, but the other recurrent domestic topics which get such detailed treatment in the later books play much less part in the first decade. It is true that the machinery and responsibilities of the Roman state in the period covered by the first decade were much simpler than later, and so there was no occasion for such detailed information on provinces and armies. However, this explanation cannot account for the fact that only twenty year narratives in Books 2–10 yield prodigy reports, with many of those being much more integrated into the surrounding narrative than in the later books.²³ Deaths of priests are reported only twice, each time in pestilence narratives, while it is only in Book 10 that we start to get reports of aediles' activities comparable to those in the later books.²⁴

It is true that many of the year narratives in these books do purport to narrate events in chronological sequence, and it is not uncommon for us to find narratives which offer in embryonic form a pattern not unlike that found in the later books. Many year narratives end with reports of elections. An account of a campaign may open with information on the sharing of commands between the consuls or consular tribunes and on the conduct of

²² Livy shows no knowledge of the 'dictator years', on which see Drummond (1978).

²³ MacBain (1982), 82–6.

²⁴ Priests: 3.7.6 (463); 3.32.3 (453). Aediles: 10.23.11–13 (296); 10.31.9 (295); 10.47.3–4 (293). Livy's selectivity with these and comparable items in the first decade is noted by Oakley (1997–2005), 1.48 ff.

the levy and close with the commander's return in triumph. A number of the year narratives consist of accounts of campaigns followed by notices of internal events which took place in the same year. Year narratives of this type are sometimes heavily compressed, as for 332 (8.17.5–12), sometimes relatively lavish, as for several years of the Third Samnite War in Book 10.²⁵

However, many of the year narratives of these books conform to quite different patterns. There is, for example, what one might call the minimalist model: heavily compressed notices which merely list a few items in a sentence or two, with little or no attempt to establish a chronological or thematic sequence.²⁶ Twice Livy merely reports that nothing worth mentioning happened.²⁷

The extreme variety of the year narratives is in fact one of the hallmarks of the first decade. The amount of space accorded to individual years varies hugely: Livy passes rapidly over some years and sometimes over a whole series of years in order to make space available for extended treatment of key episodes. Livy feels under no obligation to report both internal and external events under each year, and for many years only a single topic is mentioned. When he does include both internal and external sections, there is no set order of presentation. In the first pentad, where the relationship between internal discord and external threats is a key theme, the narratives of individual years sometimes switch repeatedly between domestic and external settings. By contrast, the second pentad is heavily dominated by external events.²⁸

To illustrate some of these points I give an analysis of Book 4 below as Appendix 2. This book covers 42 years, the longest span of any of Books 2–10. No year gets very extended treatment, but the narrative alternates between episodes of moderate length and highly compressed passages. A number of the year narratives deal with just one topic, and twice a single topic extends over two years (440–39, 417–6). By Roman standards there was comparatively little warfare in these years, and so many of the year narratives deal only with internal affairs, although the book closes with two years for which only external events are recorded (405–4). Several of the year narratives which include both internal and external events fall into an internal–external–internal pattern (443, 432, 409, 406), but a variety of other patterns also occur.²⁹ Since, on Livy's view, elections were highly controversial in this

²⁵ See especially 10.16–23 (296) and 10.38–47 (293).

²⁶ E.g. 2.40.14 (487); 3.31.1 (456); 6.5.7–8 (387).

²⁷ 2.19.1 (500: contrast D.H. 5.52–7); 4.30.4 (429).

²⁸ Briscoe (1971), 18, gives statistics for military and domestic material in Books 2–10.

²⁹ I have refrained from classifying a number of campaign narratives since, although they are an external rather than a domestic matter, the scene of action shifts between

period, a good deal of space is devoted to them. There is, however, only a modest number of notices of other domestic administrative matters.³⁰

Thus the year narratives of Books 2–10 do not conform even in rudimentary fashion or as a norm to the standard pattern for the year narratives which we know from Livy's later extant books, with its regular internal–external–internal structure based on the consuls' movements and copious routine domestic detail. There was in fact no standard pattern to the year narratives in this part of his work. Traces of the pattern familiar from the later decades begin to appear in the Third Samnite War narratives in Book 10, and no doubt it emerged as standard in the course of the lost second decade.

The difference in the structure of Livy's year narratives for the Early and for the Middle Republic is obviously related to the discrepancy in their scale. The Middle Republic narratives are generally extended accounts covering a wide variety of topics, whereas those for the Early Republic are usually much more modest in their size and range. There are a number of reasons for these differences in the scale and structure of the year narratives for the two periods.

One factor is the scope of Livy's work. He must have decided from the outset to allot less space to the early history of Rome, and this obliged him to select and compress his material much more than for later periods. Comparison with the parallel account of Dionysius reveals numerous occasions where Livy must have shortened what he found in his sources. It has often been held that his brief notices of events derive, albeit indirectly, with little alteration from the *Annales Maximi*, but this is a questionable assumption, and their compression may often owe much to Livy himself. However, there is no reason to think that a standard pattern like that of Livy's later books could be found in any of his predecessors, and so the explanation for its absence must be sought mainly in the nature of the available material.

The Republic's business was itself less complex in the early period than in the Middle Republic when the Romans had imperial responsibilities and were commonly fighting on several fronts at once. In addition, the quantity of archival material available must have been much smaller. Livy himself evidently consulted only earlier historical writers, but the chronological structure and the wealth of domestic detail which he provides for the Middle

Rome and the theatre of war. Some of the book's campaign narratives move from war preparations at Rome to the campaign and then to the commander's return to Rome, but they do not all fall into this internal–external–internal pattern.

³⁰ The main topics dealt with are the censorship (8, 22.7, 24.22–9), games (12.2, 35.3–4), the temple of Apollo (25.3, 29.7), a law about fines (30.3), and the trial of a Vestal (44.11–12).

Republic must derive ultimately from archival sources, exploited by one or more annalistic intermediaries and with a good deal of distortion and invention creeping in in the process.³¹ It is likely enough that such material was preserved in increasing quantity from about 300 BC on.³² It may be, as has often been suggested, that the *Annales Maximi* became more detailed from about that time. However, the *Annales Maximi* were at most only one of the archival sources from which Livy's Middle Republican material derived. Much of it is cast in the form of reports of the decisions of the senate, and the record of senatorial decrees was probably the most important archival source.³³ It may well be that few or no senatorial decrees survived from the period covered by the first decade.

We must now go on to enquire how long Livy continued to conform to the standard pattern established for the Middle Republic year narratives in the lost books from 46 on. The answer to this question is largely a matter of speculation, although some help is afforded by the brief summaries of the individual books in the *Periochae*. Study of the *Periochae* for the extant books shows that they are generally accurate on the assignment of events to books but sometimes re-arrange events within books.³⁴

³¹ The extent to which annalists distorted archival evidence for the Middle Republic or supplemented it by invention is a matter of dispute, as, for example, on the much discussed question of the legionary lists, for which see especially Gelzer (1964), 220–55; Brunt (1971), 644–60; Gschnitzer (1981); Seibert (1993), 368–95. However, there can be no question that a good deal of Livy's domestic material on the period derives ultimately from archives.

³² Lack of records does not, however, appear to be the reason for the shortage of notices of priestly appointments, for what purported to be an inscribed list of appointments to a priestly college (probably the augurs) extending back to the early Republic was erected near the Regia (*ILS* 9338; Vaahtera 2002).

³³ So rightly Klotz (1940–1) and Bredehorn (1968), although these writers fail to recognize the extent of invention and distortion in apparently archival material. The conventional doctrine that the *Annales Maximi* were the primary source derives from Nissen (1863), 86 ff. Much of Livy's information on prodigies may come ultimately from *senatus consulta* (Rawson 1991, 1–15, points out difficulties in ascribing this material to the *Annales Maximi*, though see also MacBain 1982). His information on aedilician activity and on priests cannot derive from the senate record, which may explain why these notices are introduced simply as events occurring *eo anno* rather than in chronological sequence. His ultimate source may have taken this material either from the *Annales Maximi* or from the *commentarii* of the aediles and the priestly colleges. Some of the material on censors' actions may derive from the *commentarii* of the censors.

³⁴ Jal (1984), lxi–ii. On the controversial question of the extent to which Livy's lost books were grouped by pentads and decades see (e.g.) Syme (1959), 29–37; Stadter (1972); Wille (1973); Luce (1977), 9–24. Stadter (1972), 304–6, gives a table showing the years covered in each book according to the *Periochae*.

For the period 167–91 BC, covered in Books 46–70, Livy’s year narratives probably continued to conform to his mid-republican pattern. In the later second century internal discord will once again have played a larger part in his account, and the activity of the Gracchi and Saturninus was accorded extensive treatment. However, there was as yet no fundamental change in the workings of the Roman state.

The outbreak of the Social War in 91 B.C. came nearly half way through Livy’s work. From now on the scale of the narrative became much ampler, particularly for the periods of civil war: the remaining books (71–142) covered just 84 years. In view of this change of scale and still more the nature of the subject matter, the structure of Livy’s annual narratives must now have undergone radical modification. Livy doubtless continued to record routine administrative items, although with some changes: for example, traditional prodigy reports will have become less frequent, since expiation appears to have declined in the Late Republic, and Livy himself represented them as redolent of antiquity.³⁵ However, the standard internal–external–internal pattern based on the consuls’ movements would henceforth have been quite unsuited to the character of Livy’s material.

Livy devoted no less than twenty books (Books 71–90) to the period from the outbreak of the Social War to the death of Sulla in 78 and the ensuing revolt of Lepidus. Most of this ample narrative was taken up with the internecine warfare in Rome and Italy and the conflict with Mithridates in the East. Republican institutions were in disarray in those years, and it would have been wholly inappropriate, and indeed impossible, to retain the old regular pattern for the annual narratives. Moreover, there are indications that in this part of his work Livy may have permitted himself, probably for the first time, to depart occasionally from the strict annalistic principle to narrate in a single section events taking place in one region over two or more years.³⁶ Book 90, which was otherwise concerned with events of 78–77, seems to have included a flashback of the Sertorian war in Spain from c. 80.³⁷ The *Periochae* of Books 79–83 suggest that Livy may have used the same technique on a more extended scale in narrating the Italian and Eastern events of 87–84.³⁸

³⁵ Livy 43.13.1–2; Liebeschuetz (1979), 57–8; Davies (2004), 46–8.

³⁶ Tacitus resorted to this expedient much more freely, using it first in *Ann.* 6.31–7 and frequently in the later books of the *Annals*.

³⁷ This arrangement of material appears not only in the *Periocha* of Book 90 but in other sources deriving from Livy (Eutropius 6.1; Orosius 5.22.16–23.4).

³⁸ Books 79–80 dealt with events in Rome and Italy from Cinna’s consulship in 87 down to Marius’ death in early 86. Livy then turned back to the East, and events there from the start of Sulla’s siege of Athens in 87 down to 84 were dealt with in Books 81–3. Events in Rome during 85–84, when Cinna and Carbo held a two-year consulship, ap-

A superficial stability returned between Sulla's death and the renewal of civil war in 49, and the *Periochae* indicate that for this period Livy adhered once again to the strict annalistic principle, dividing the campaigns of Pompey, Caesar and others into annual sections. However, changes in administrative practice will have prevented Livy from reverting to the old internal–external–internal pattern based on the consuls' movements between Rome and their provinces, for the consuls now spent most or all of their year of office in Rome, and the elections were normally held in July, in the middle rather than near the end of the consular year (which since 153 had begun on 1 January).³⁹ For many of these years Livy may have contented himself with a single urban section.

All semblance of republican order collapsed once again in 49, and for much of the ensuing period of civil war and despotism (again narrated by Livy on a very ample scale) Rome and the republican political institutions played only a peripheral role. Livy could, if he chose, have reverted to a more traditional narrative mode to recount Augustus' new order, but how far he did so we cannot say. The meagre *Periochae* of the Augustan books are concerned mainly with external events.⁴⁰

From Book 2 on Livy's work was a record of the domestic and external affairs of the Roman people arranged by the years of office of the chief magistrates. Although his later books charted both the collapse of political liberty and a corresponding reduction in the magistrates' importance, he doubtless continued to organize his material in this way to the end of his work, noting the transition to the new consuls and narrating events under their consular year, with only occasional departures from this strict annalistic principle. However, the foregoing discussion has, I hope, shown that the character and structure of Livy's annual narratives varied considerably between the different parts of his work. One factor making for change was Livy's use of different sources and the nature of the material available to his sources. However, the most important factor was the nature of the events themselves: the vast changes in the fortunes of the Roman people had their necessary counterpart in the structure of Livy's annual record.

pear to have been dealt with together in Book 83 (*Per.* 83: *L. Cinna et Cn. Papirius Carbo a se ipsis consules per biennium creati*). As with the anarchy before the Licinio–Sextian reforms, this interruption of the annalistic structure based on the chief magistracy may have seemed appropriate, for Livy doubtless agreed with Cicero (*Brut.* 227) that the domination of Cinna was a period in which *sine iure fuit et sine ulla dignitate res publica*.

³⁹ Elections: Mommsen (1887), 584–5. Giovannini (1983), 83–90, shows that consuls in the Late Republic sometimes left for their provinces while still in office, but always towards the end of their term.

⁴⁰ For speculation about the character of Livy's Augustan books see Syme (1959), 57–76; Badian (1993).

The standard pattern for the annual narrative which is familiar to us from Books 21–45, with its underlying internal–external–structure based on the consular year and wealth of routine detail in the opening and closing domestic sections, was not, as is commonly supposed, a norm which Livy attempted to observe throughout his work. It was rather a distinctive feature of Livy’s account of the period from the early third century to the Social War, and so of about two-fifths of his 142 books. Its adoption for his account of the Middle Republic helped him to convey the special character of that period, in which Rome’s affairs were more complex than they had been in the early centuries and the republican system was more stable than in both the earlier and later periods. The collapse of republican order from 91 BC on was reflected in the narrative structure.

4. Annalistic Form in Livy’s Predecessors

Livy took over his annual pattern for the Middle Republic, with its regular chronological structure centred on the consuls’ movements and mass of routine domestic detail, from one or more of his predecessors. In origin it was a literary creation. Although it must have been based on documentary research, the archival material did not supply the pattern. As we have already noticed, the usual view that the pattern derived from the *Annales Maximi* probably exaggerates its importance as a source, and in any case it disregards the likely character of the pontifical record. As Cicero (*de Orat.* 2.52) and Servius Danielis (*Aen.* 1.373) tell us, the *pontifex maximus* displayed the record on a whitened board, but it must have been preserved in a more compact and durable format, either bound wax tablets or papyrus rolls.⁴¹ According to Servius Danielis, the *pontifex maximus* ‘had been accustomed to note down events worthy of record which happened at home and at war, on land and on sea, day by day’ (*digna memoratu notare consueuerat domi militiaeque, terra marique gesta per singulos dies*). Thus the pontifical record probably consisted of a series of notices of events, recorded simply in the order in which they occurred (or the *pontifex maximus* learned of them) with no grouping by topic or distinction between domestic and external matters.

The annalist who first established the pattern not only undertook a good deal of archival research, but also imposed thematic and chronological order on the results. Two further, related questions now arise: to which writer should this considerable achievement be credited, and from which source or sources did Livy himself derive the pattern?

⁴¹ Surely not on bronze tablets, as suggested by Bucher (1987 [1995]).

The first history of Rome was written in Greek by Q. Fabius Pictor at the close of the third century BC, and in the early and mid second century three further Roman histories in Greek appeared, by L. Cincius Alimentus, A. Postumius Albinus and C. Acilius. Cato was the first to write a Latin prose history, but his *Origines* were highly distinctive, incorporating not just Roman history, but extensive treatment of other Italian communities. Histories of Rome from the foundation in Latin were produced in the later second century by such writers as Cassius Hemina, L. Calpurnius Piso and Cn. Gellius, and this tradition was to be continued in the early first century by the writers of whom Livy made most use, Valerius Antias, Claudius Quadrigarius and C. Licinius Macer.⁴²

It is disputed how early in this tradition historians began to arrange their material by the consular year. Some have argued that Piso was the first to organize his work annalistically from the foundation of the Republic.⁴³ That Piso's work was organized in this way is shown by the fact that it is almost invariably cited as *annales* and by fragments giving consular dates for events in 305, 158 and 146 (fr. 26, 36, 39).⁴⁴ However, Piso cannot have been the pioneer of annalistic arrangement. His predecessor Hemina gave consular dates.⁴⁵ So already, in the early second century, did Ennius in his great Roman historical epic, whose title, *Annales*, surely alludes to its annalistic organization.⁴⁶ Ennius was most likely following the example of the first Ro-

⁴² Peter (1914) has long been the standard edition of the fragments of the Roman historians, but new editions of the early writers are now provided by Chassignet (1996–2004) and Beck and Walter (2001–4), and Cornell et al. (forthcoming) will provide a comprehensive replacement for Peter. Valuable discussions of the early historians include Badian (1966); Timpe (1972), (1979); Rawson (1991), 245–71, 363–88; Forsythe (2000); Suerbaum (2002), 345–458; Walter (2004), 212–356. On the language and style of the verbatim fragments see Briscoe (2005). For the fluidity of ancient usage of the terms *annales* and *historiae* see Gell. 5.18; Verbrugge (1989). The flexibility of Roman, as of Greek, historical genres is well stressed by Marincola (1999).

⁴³ So especially Wiseman (1979), 9 ff., and Forsythe (1994), 38 ff., followed in the original version of this paper.

⁴⁴ I cite the Roman historical fragments throughout by the numeration of Peter (1914). Piso's *annales*: cited thus ten times in Latin writers, and by circumlocutory Greek equivalents at Dion. Hal. 4.7.5, 4.15.5, 12.9.3.

⁴⁵ Fr. 26, 37, 39 (events of 219, 181 and 146); cf fr. 20 (= Gellius F25), consular tribunes of 389. Forsythe (1990) fails to refute Hemina's priority over Piso. Fornara (1983), 25 regards Hemina as the earliest annalist.

⁴⁶ Entry into office of consuls of 214 and 204: *Ann.* 290, 304–6 Skutsch. Allocation of provinces to consuls of 200, at the start of the Second Macedonian War: *Ann.* 324. The title is given as *Annales* by Lucilius 342 M, and always thereafter.

man historian, Fabius Pictor.⁴⁷ Ennius may have used annalistic arrangement only for relatively recent history: a complete magistrate list could hardly be accommodated in the two books (Books 4 and 5) which he devoted to events from the establishment of the Republic to the Samnite Wars.⁴⁸ Fabius, however, may well have organized his material by the consular year from the inception of the Republic: citations show that he treated both the early years of the Republic and the Samnite Wars in some detail, and Livy's citation of his account of the warfare of 294 surely indicates annalistic organization at that point.⁴⁹ Fabius will certainly have sought Greek readers and been influenced by Greek models, but this is not, as has sometimes been thought, a reason for doubting his use of year-by-year arrangement: many Greek histories were, of course, organized in that way.

In constructing the first historical account of the Roman past, Fabius must have made considerable use of archival sources, including the annual record compiled by the *pontifex maximus*. That record included fairly routine domestic items such as prodigies and famines. The inclusion of some material of this kind is known to have been a feature of annalistic accounts of the Roman past from Ennius on, and most likely went back to Fabius himself. Thus in Fabius' account, like those of his successors, rather dry notices in-

⁴⁷ It is most improbable that Ennius himself pioneered annalistic arrangement, as is maintained by Beck and Walter (2001–4), 1.35 ff.; Walter (2004), 258 ff. The case for Fabius as the originator of annalistic organization in Roman historiography is well made by Frier (1979), 255 ff. Northwood (2007) refutes attempts to demonstrate the contrary.

⁴⁸ Little survives of Books 4 and 5. Book 6 may have been devoted wholly to the Pyrrhic War: so Skutsch (1985), 84 ff., 305 ff., (1987); Suerbaum (1995). Cornell (1986), (1987) argues that the book may have started earlier.

⁴⁹ Livy 10.37.14 (= Fabius fr. 19): 'Fabius writes that both consuls campaigned in Samnium and near Luceria and an army was led across into Etruria (but by which consul he does not add) ...' (*Fabius ambo consules in Samnio et ad Luceriam res gessisse scribit traductumque in Etruriam exercitum—sed ab utroque consule non adiecit*). Although Fabius did not indicate which commanded in Etruria, the passage surely implies that he did name the consuls. Other citations relating to the Samnite Wars: fr. 18, 20. Events in the early years of the Republic: fr. 17–19, to which should be added Livy's citation of 'the most ancient authors' at 2.18.5. Dionysius' statement (1.6.2) that Fabius and Cincius 'narrated the events of their own time in detail ..., but ran over the early events after the foundation of the city in summary fashion' is not evidence against Fabius' use of annalistic organization for the early Republic. The passage means merely that he and Cincius, like many of their successors (including Livy), treated recent events in greater detail than earlier times, and does not, as often supposed, imply a contrast between their coverage of the regal and early Republican periods (the context shows that 'foundation' here must refer to Romulus' foundation of the city). A fragment of the Latin history of Fabius Pictor (probably just a translation of the Greek original), cited by Gell. 5.4.3, shows that the year 367 occurred in its fourth book, so confirming the density of treatment for the early period (the use of an interval date in this fragment is not evidence of non-annalistic organization).

cluding some routine domestic events probably alternated with more fully narrated episodes.

Cato in his *Origines* reacted against the tradition which Fabius and Ennius had established. His declaration (fr. 77) that ‘I do not wish to write what is on the tablet at the home of the Pontifex Maximus, how often grain was dear, how often darkness, or something else, has obscured the light of the moon or sun’ is surely a polemic against his predecessors. He seems to have accorded the early Republic only brief treatment. He adopted the remarkable policy of not naming Roman commanders, and, if he did not name the commanders, he cannot have named the consuls. Probably his work was not organized annalistically at all.⁵⁰

Cato’s successors followed him in writing in Latin prose, but in their annalistic arrangement, as in their subject matter, they reverted to the tradition established by Fabius. It does not, however, follow that the distinctive pattern of Livy’s Middle Republic narratives, with their regular chronological structure based on the consuls’ movements and mass of routine domestic detail, was already established in the tradition at that point. On the contrary, what we know of their book structure shows that, with one exception, the histories of Rome from the foundation composed in the later second century narrated the Middle Republic on too small a scale to accommodate a treatment like that with which we are familiar from Livy: Cassius Hemina’s history filled only four (or perhaps five) books, and Piso’s only seven.⁵¹ We know hardly anything of the book structure of the histories of Fabius and those who followed him in writing Greek histories of Rome, but it is most unlikely that any of their accounts of the recent past conformed to the ample pattern of Livy’s Middle Republic year narratives.⁵²

One late second century historian of Rome did write at greater length, namely Cn. Gellius, whose work appears to have been on a more ample scale than that of Livy himself: he had already reached Book 33 by 216 BC (fr. 26) and his cited book numbers go up to 97 (fr. 29). This obscure writer is thus a possible candidate to be the originator of the annual pattern for the Middle Republic used by Livy. However, Livy can hardly have derived it from Gellius directly: since Livy never cites him, it is unlikely that he made much use of his work and may well not have consulted it at all. Moreover,

⁵⁰ Structure of the *Origines*: Nepos, *Cato* 3.3; Astin (1978), 212 ff. For an eclipse recorded in the *Annales Maximi* and by Ennius see Cic. *Rep.* 1.25 (= *Ann.* 153 Skutsch).

⁵¹ Hemina reached at least 281 in Book 2 (fr. 21); his fourth book began with the Second Punic War (fr. 31) and continued at least to 181 (fr. 37). Piso treated an event of 304 in Book 3 (fr. 27) and of 158 in Book 7 (fr. 36).

⁵² One book number is cited for the Latin version of Fabius: above, n. 49.

other possible explanations are available for the huge scale of Gellius' work: it may simply be the result of rhetorical invention and elaboration.⁵³

Livy must, therefore, have taken his annual pattern for the Middle Republic from one or more of the first century annalists, and this narrows the choice to Valerius Antias and Claudius Quadrigarius, the only such writers cited by Livy in Books 21–45. It is usually supposed that Valerius' and Claudius' works were broadly similar in character and that both organized their year narratives on the pattern with which we are familiar from the later extant books of Livy. In the heyday of *Quellenforschung* it was generally held that Livy switched between these sources with no radical alteration to the character of his narrative.⁵⁴ Scholars such as Kahrstedt (1913) made elaborate attempts to attribute individual sections to their source on the basis of minor discrepancies. Klotz argued instead that Livy used a single main annalistic source over several books: in his view Livy followed Valerius for Books 31–38 and then switched to Claudius out of disgust at Valerius' treatment of the Trials of the Scipios.⁵⁵ Such theories have now been discredited, and it is widely recognized that Livy is unlikely to have operated so mechanically and may not always have confined himself to a single main source.⁵⁶ Yet it is still generally accepted that Valerius' and Claudius' works were broadly alike.

It is, however, unlikely in principle that the two works were as similar as is supposed, and what little we know about them suggests that they were not. Valerius' work began with the origins of Rome, but Claudius seems to have taken the original step of starting with the Gallic Sack.⁵⁷ Claudius found a distinctive source in his second-century predecessor C. Acilius.⁵⁸ Transmitted book numbers suggest that Valerius wrote on a more ample scale than Claudius: the episode of Mancinus' dishonourable treaty with Numantia in

⁵³ So Wiseman (1979), 20 ff.

⁵⁴ An exception is Soltau (1897), 27 ff., who held that Claudius had no interest in domestic archival material and that for his domestic sections Livy used Valerius Antias and Piso. Zimmerer (1937), 19 ff., and Klotz (1940–1), 77–8, held that Claudius was rather less formal than Valerius in his handling of domestic archival material.

⁵⁵ Klotz (1915, 1940–1). Zimmerer (1937), 26 ff., attempted to reconcile the approaches of Kahrstedt and Klotz and to differentiate more sharply between Valerius' and Claudius' work. For criticism of her views see Klotz (1942).

⁵⁶ See especially Briscoe (1973), 3 ff; Luce (1977), 139 ff.

⁵⁷ The earliest fragments deal with the Gallic invasion, and Claudius may be identical with the Clodius mentioned by Plut., *Num.* 1.2, who in a work on chronology argued that no authentic records survived from before the Gallic Sack. See Frier (1979), 121–6; Crawford (1998); Chassignet (1996–2004), 3.xxiv–v; *contra* Zimmerer (1937), 8–10, 14–16.

⁵⁸ Fr. 57a, 64a = Livy 25.39.12, 35.14.5. Livy's reference to 'Claudius' in these passages must be to Claudius Quadrigarius, *contra* Zimmerer (1937), 10–14.

137 and the political storm to which it gave rise figured in Book 9 of Claudius (fr. 73) and in Book 22 of Valerius (fr. 57), and only a few of Valerius' additional books can have been devoted to the early period omitted by Claudius.⁵⁹ Fronto singled out Claudius' style for praise, saying that he wrote *lepide*, but criticized Valerius for writing *invenuste*.⁶⁰ Fronto's friend Aulus Gellius shared his taste for Claudius and gives a number of verbatim extracts, which reveal him to have been an attractively simple and vivid writer.⁶¹

One of Gellius' extracts from Claudius happens to include a transition to a new consular year. The passage recounts the famous meeting of the great Fabius with his son when the latter was consul in 213 (fr. 57 = Gell. 2.2.13). It opens as follows:

Deinde facti consules Sempronius Gracchus iterum Q. Fabius Maximus, filius eius, qui priore anno erat consul. Ei consuli pater proconsul obuiam in equo uehens uenit neque descendere uoluit, quod pater erat ...

Then were made consuls Sempronius Gracchus for the second time and Quintus Fabius Maximus, the son of the man who was consul the previous year. His father, as proconsul, came to meet that consul riding on a horse and did not want to dismount, because he was his father ...

Claudius passes straight from the younger Fabius' election to the story of their meeting. However, the meeting took place after the consul Fabius' arrival in his province, and thus in Livy's narrative, in his usual manner, it is separated from the notice of his election by a chapter of information on administrative arrangements at the end of the old and start of the new year, as follows:

- | | |
|--------------|---|
| 24.43.5–6 | Election of Fabius and Gracchus and of the praetors for 213 |
| 24.43.7–8 | Games in 214 |
| 24.43.9–44.6 | Entry into office of consuls of 213; provinces and armies |

⁵⁹ Valerius treated events after 137/6 on a still more ample scale, since his work extended to at least 75 books (fr. 62). Forsythe (2002) holds that Valerius' allusion to the Mancinus affair in fr. 57 comes, not from his treatment of that episode, but from a reference forward in his account of the parallel episode of the Caudine Forks treaty of 321. This would produce a more even book distribution, but the fragment gives too much detail about the Mancinus episode to be interpreted in this way.

⁶⁰ Fronto 134 van den Hout². For Fronto's admiration for Claudius see also Gell. 13.29.

⁶¹ On Claudius' style see Briscoe (2005), 66–9.

- 24.44.7–8 Prodigies expiated
 24.44.9–10 Departure of consuls for their provinces. ‘The father came to the camp at Suessula as legate to his son. When the son came to meet him ...’ (*Pater filio legatus ad Suessulam in castra uenit. Cum obuiam filius progredereetur ...*)⁶²

Thus Claudius handled this year transition in a fashion quite different from the standard pattern used by Livy for the Middle Republic. A single passage cannot in itself be conclusive, since it might be untypical. However, it seems unlikely that an annalist whose year transitions were normally a record of administrative formalities would have treated such matters with the cavalier disregard which Claudius shows here. Thus, in the light of this passage and the other considerations about the two authors noted above, we should in my view conclude that it was only Valerius, and not Claudius, who organized his annual narratives for the Middle Republic on the uniform pattern which Livy took over. I suspect that Claudius, and probably also earlier annalists such as Piso, treated the period in a manner much more like Livy’s first decade, with its lack of fixed pattern for the annual narratives and less comprehensive coverage of routine domestic affairs.

Valerius Antias was thus Livy’s source both for the bulk of his domestic material on the Middle Republic and for the chronological framework of the consular year. Livy will, of course, have used other Roman authorities as well on domestic events, just as he drew on Polybius for events at Rome relating to the Greek East. Occasionally we may detect Livy blending domestic material from other annalists with his Valerian framework, as in his notices on dramatic festivals in the 190’s.⁶³

The question remains whether it was Valerius himself who did the archival research and subsequent shaping of material needed to produce annual narratives with the standard pattern and copious domestic detail which Livy took over from him or whether he himself was following Cn. Gellius, who, as we have seen, is the only possible candidate among earlier annalists. The fragments of Gellius’ work contain nothing to suggest that he deserves the credit, but are too meagre to decide the question. I suspect, though, that, if Valerius was so heavily dependent on Gellius, Gellius’ work would have

⁶² Livy is right that the elder Fabius was *legatus* to his son. If he had been proconsul, as Claudius states, and so an independent holder of *imperium*, he would have been under no obligation to dismount.

⁶³ At 34.44.5 and 36.36.4 (= fr. 40), Livy follows Valerius on this topic, but at 34.54.3–8 he draws on another source (perhaps Claudius): see Asconius 69–70 Clark; Briscoe (1981), 118, 134, 276.

had wider influence and Livy would have used him directly. Thus on balance it seems more likely that Valerius did the work himself.

If this conclusion is correct, Valerius Antias emerges as a much more remarkable figure than is commonly allowed: he was all too ready to distort and invent, but combined this with diligent research in the archives, which he then turned to creative use. It now becomes easier to comprehend Livy's heavy dependence on Valerius, despite the mistrust which he more than once expresses. Valerius, like Polybius, offered Livy a much more detailed account of the Middle Republic than was provided by the other annalists Livy consulted, and much of this account had at least the appearance of reliability.⁶⁴

5. The Alternative Tradition: Fannius, Asellio, Sisenna and Sallust

In my view, then, the treatment of the consular year in the Roman annalistic tradition was not nearly as monotonously uniform as is customarily supposed. In the light of this analysis, Tacitus' handling of his annual narratives may appear not quite so novel as Ginsburg claimed. As always in assessing Tacitus' originality we are hampered by our almost complete ignorance of his direct predecessors, the first annalistic historians of the early principate. However, there is one further avenue which can be explored, namely the practice of Republican writers who belonged to the same branch of annalistic historiography as Tacitus, taking a limited period of recent history as their theme.

The earliest such writer may have been C. Fannius, perhaps to be identified with the consul of 122, but more probably a contemporary relative.⁶⁵ All the dateable citations from his work concern contemporary events. His work is usually cited as *Annales*, and so was presumably organized by consular years.

Fannius' younger contemporary Sempronius Asellio almost certainly limited himself to recent history: he dealt with events of 133 (fr. 6: death of Tiberius Gracchus) in Book 5 and of 91 (fr. 11: death of Livius Drusus, the last dateable citation) in Book 14. Asellio served as a military tribune under Scipio Aemilianus at Numantia (Gell. 2.13.3), where he probably met Polybius. It is sometimes suggested that he began his history in 146, where Polybius stopped. Asellio echoed Polybius' conception of pragmatic history in

⁶⁴ On Valerius Antias see further Rich (2005).

⁶⁵ The problem of Fannius' identity will be fully discussed in Cornell *et al.* (forthcoming).

the famous criticism of *annales* in his first book (frs. 1–2 = Gell. 5.18). Writers of *annales*, he tells us (fr. 1), merely reported ‘what happened and in which year it occurred’ (*quod factum quoque anno gestum sit*), whereas those who, like him, sought to recount the *res gestae* of the Romans, aimed not only to tell what happened but also to explain the planning and reasoning behind it (*quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent*). More follows in the same vein (fr. 2):

Scribere autem bellum initum quo consule et quo confectum sit, et quis triumphans introierit ex eo, quae< que> in bello gesta sint non praedicare aut interea quid senatus decreuerit aut quae lex rogatione lata sit, neque quibus consiliis ea gesta sint iterare, id fabulas pueris est narrare, non historias scribere.

To write in whose consulship a war was undertaken and in whose it was ended, and who entered the city in triumph thereafter, and not to declare what was accomplished in the war, and meanwhile what the Senate decreed or what law or bill was put forward, nor to recount with what purposes those things were accomplished, is to tell stories to children, not to write histories.⁶⁶

Asellio’s critique was presumably aimed at the tradition founded by Fabius and in particular against recent exponents such as Piso. Since Piso covered republican history down to 158 in just six books and said something about every year of the Republic, many of his annual narratives must have been very brief. Asellio’s objections would not have applied to the much fuller version of *annales* later developed by Antias, with its copious details of senatorial decisions.

We have no information about how Asellio organized his history. However, we should not infer from this polemic that he did not arrange it by years. That, after all, was how his mentor Polybius had organized his work.

The next Roman writer of recent history was L. Cornelius Sisenna, whose subject was the Social War and the ensuing civil wars.⁶⁷ His *Historiae* (the title is well attested) may, as has often been suggested, have been a continuation of Asellio’s work. A fair number of fragments survive from this important work. A few of these deal with earlier events, particularly the Aeneas story (frs. 1–4): these probably come from the preamble or an excursus. One fragment (127) is concerned with Sisenna’s arrangement of his material:

⁶⁶ The passage presents considerable textual problems, but the overall sense is clear. I print the text and translation of J. Briscoe, from Cornell *et al.* (forthcoming).

⁶⁷ For Sisenna see Rawson (1991), 363–88; Chassignet (1996–2004), 3.xxxviii–xlix, 50–88, 193–221; Beck and Walter (2001–4), 2.241–313; J. Briscoe, in Cornell *et al.* (forthcoming).

Nos una aestate in Asia et Graecia gesta litteris idcirco continentia mandauimus, ne uellicatim aut saltuatim scribendo lectorum animos impediremus.

I have treated together the events which occurred in Asia and Greece in a single summer, to avoid confusing readers by picking out items or hopping about.

It follows from this that Sisenna arranged his material by years, and within the year by regions. For other years he may have treated Asia and Greece as separate regions, but at least for this summer (probably 88 BC, when revolt from Rome spread from Asia to Greece) he found it preferable to treat them together. This arrangement by year and regions was consistent with established annalistic practice, though Sisenna may also have been influenced in this respect by Polybius.⁶⁸

Next in this tradition come the *Histories* of Sallust, composed a generation after Sisenna's and very likely conceived as a continuation of his work. Here we are on much firmer ground, for about five hundred fragments survive from the five books of Sallust's *Histories*, many with book numbers.⁶⁹ The work's opening words (1.1) declared its scope precisely and in traditional annalistic terms as the civil and military deeds of the Roman people from 78 BC:

res populi Romani M. Lepido Q. Catulo consulibus ac deinde militiae et domi gestas composui.

I have compiled the military and civil history of the Roman people for the consular year of M. Lepidus and Q. Catulus, and for the years thereafter.

The fragments show that much of Book 1 was taken up with prefatory material, including a survey of the Social War and the ensuing civil wars, but thereafter the work consisted of an account of the period from 78 to 67 BC organized by consular years. Although the possibility cannot be excluded

⁶⁸ Rawson (1991), 374, wrongly takes the passage as showing that 'Sisenna ought certainly not to be called an annalist.' On the contrary, it shows that he arranged his material by years.

⁶⁹ Maurenbrecher (1893) remains the standard edition of the text, though see also now Reynolds (1991), 151–201, and Funari (1996). McGushin (1992, 1994) provides a translation and useful commentary, but his treatment of the structure of the *Histories* is not wholly satisfactory: see my reviews in *CR* 43 (1993), 280–2; 46 (1996), 250–1.

that for some minor wars Sallust chose to narrate together events of a single region over more than one year, it is clear that in general, and certainly for the major wars, he adhered to strict annalistic arrangement, assigning events to the appropriate year narrative.⁷⁰

For the rest of the work we know little about how Sallust organized his year narratives, but portions of three *bifolia*, or double leaves, surviving from a palimpsest give us remarkable evidence for the structure of the closing section of Book 2 and the beginning of Book 3, covering the period from the end of 76 to early 74 BC. The relationship of the *bifolia* (of which the later two come from the same gathering) has been painstakingly reconstructed by scholars from Hauler to Perl, and the results may be tabulated as follows (using Maurenbrecher's numeration of the fragments, followed by McGushin's in brackets):⁷¹

- 2.42 (40) End of **76 BC**; entry into office of consuls of **75**
About 200 characters missing
- 2.43 (41) Despatch of quaestor P. Lentulus Marcellinus to Cyrene
About 200 characters missing
- 2.45 (42) Consuls chased by *plebs* rioting over corn
About 200 characters missing
- 2.47 (44) Speech of Cotta
- *****
- 2.87 (69) Servilius Isauricus' campaign in Cilicia
Missing: equivalent of about 80 Teubner lines
- 2.92-3 (75-6) Operations of Pompey in Spain
Missing: equivalent of about 70 Teubner lines
- 2.98 (82) Letter of Pompey to the senate; reception of the letter at
Rome at the start of **74 BC**
Missing: equivalent of about 80 Teubner lines
- 3.5-6 (6-7) Operations of M. Antonius against pirates in the West

⁷⁰ The material in Book 1 on Sertorius' early career and the first years of his war in Spain, which is usually held to have formed an excursus in Sallust's account of the year 77 (1.87-126 Maur. = 1.76-114 McG.), probably belonged with the prefatory matter earlier in the book.

⁷¹ See Perl (1967-8); Konrad (1995), 162 ff. Perl used the relationship of the hair and flesh sides of the parchment to show that the later two *bifolia* must have been the outermost and fourth in a *quinio* (gathering of five). Earlier reconstructions (most clearly expounded in Bloch 1961) assumed that the *bifolia* were bound in gatherings of four. Cotta's speech and Pompey's letter, of which only portions are preserved in the palimpsest, survive complete in *Cod. Vat. Lat.* 3864.

Sallust's account of the year 76 ends with obscure external events, and he then passes by an abrupt transition to the opening of the new year at Rome. The mention of the consuls of 75 leads not to administrative details, but to some characteristically mordant comments on their personalities (2.42 [40]):

* * * < *apud* > *quem exercitus fuerat legionem misit dispecta uanitate, idque illi in sapientiam cesserat. Dein L. Octavius et C. Cotta consulatum ingressi, quorum Octavius languide et incuriose fuit, Cotta promptius sed ambitione tum ingenio largit. ... cupiens gratia singulorum* * * *

... who had commanded the army, sent one legion in spite of the contempt he felt for his lack of judgement, a gesture which had earned for him a reputation for wisdom. Then L. Octavius and C. Cotta entered upon their consulship. Of these, Octavius conducted himself in a careless and apathetic manner; Cotta was more quick to act, but was through ambition and by nature a briber, desirous of the favour of individuals.

Further domestic events follow, and in a very short space Sallust has reached the corn riot and the speech of the consul Cotta. Since the riot occurred when both consuls were escorting a candidate for the praetorship, this episode probably took place about June, shortly before the elections and half way through the consular year.⁷² Thus in this opening section Sallust may have been grouping together notable domestic events of the year rather than attempting to follow a chronological sequence. Very likely this was the only domestic section in his narrative of the year.

A gap of indefinite length follows in which Sallust passed from domestic to external events. This missing portion included an account of the activity of the new governor C. Scribonius Curio in Macedonia, of which the opening has survived in a fragment (2.80 [60]) cited by Nonius Marcellus:⁷³

Eodem anno in Macedonia C. Curio principio ueris cum omni exercitu profectus in Dardaniam, quibus potuit modis, pecunias Appio dictas coegit.

⁷² *Contra* Frassinetti (1975), 384, and McGushin (1992), 209, who assume from its location in Sallust that the episode must have taken place early in the year. It was an unusual step for the consuls to accompany a candidate, and the incident surely took place at the climax of the electoral campaign.

⁷³ Nonius cites the fragment as from Book 2. This excludes the dating to 74, proposed by Pecere (1969), 67–77, since Sallust's editors are surely correct to infer from the evidence of the palimpsest taken together with 3.3 that the book ended shortly after the transition to 74. See McGushin (1992), 226.

In the same year in Macedonia at the beginning of spring C. Curio set out for Dardania with his whole army, and collected by whatever means he could the payments agreed upon with Appius.

We may note that Sallust linked this section with what preceded it simply by *eodem anno*, without attempting to establish a more precise chronological relationship.

The fragments from the other two *bifolia* open with warfare in Cilicia and this is followed by operations by Pompey in Spain. It is usually supposed that this Spanish section dealt simply with winter events and that events in Spain earlier in the year had been treated separately in the missing portion before the section on Cilicia. The traditional basis for this view is the assumption that the three battles of Valentia, Sucro and Segontia took place in 75, evidently more than could be accommodated in the short gap between 2.87 (69) and 2.92 (75). However, Konrad (1995) has demonstrated that these battles should be dated to 76. Konrad still supposes that Sallust had two Spanish sections for 75, since he dates the first defections from Sertorius and the ensuing sieges of Pallantia and Calagurris to that year. This may be correct, but it seems to me impossible to decide with confidence between Konrad's chronology and the alternative of Frassinetti (1975), on which those events are dated to 74. On Frassinetti's view, there is no need to postulate two Spanish sections in Sallust's account of the year 75.

The supposed two Spanish sections for the year 75 were used by Perl as the basis for a wide-ranging theory about the structure of the *Histories*, namely that Sallust throughout divided his military narratives into summer and winter sections on the example of Thucydides.⁷⁴ This is a most implausible notion. There is no other evidence for such seasonal sections in the *Histories*, and an attempt to match a Thucydidean campaigning year based on the seasons with a consular year starting on 1 January would surely have proved impossibly cumbersome. If Sallust did include two Spanish sections in his account of the year 75, there is no need to adduce Thucydides in explanation. It would have been natural enough to divide the events of a particular region into two sections occasionally, when circumstances made it appropriate, and earlier Roman annalistic writers probably resorted to this device. Livy certainly did so, not only with Polybian but also with annalistic material, as in his account of the year 193, which contains two sections on warfare in both Spain and Liguria (see Appendix 1). A number of scholars

⁷⁴ Perl (1975), followed by McGushin (1992) 13–14, (1994), 13–14. Thucydidean influence on the disposition of Spanish material for the year 75 had already been suggested by Bloch 1961, 71–2.

have been attracted by the suggestion that the structure of Sallust's *Histories* was influenced by Thucydides, but no cogent arguments have been adduced in its support.⁷⁵ Structurally, the *Histories* belong firmly in the Roman annalistic tradition. In this work as in the monographs, Sallust owed much to Thucydides, but the debt was not in matters of structure but in style and thought.⁷⁶

Although a short section is missing after 2.92–3 (75–6), this account of Pompey's Spanish operations evidently led into his celebrated letter to the senate demanding supplies. From this Sallust passes to the letter's reception at Rome at the start of the year 74 (2.98 [82] D):

Hae litterae principio sequentis anni recitatae in senatu. Sed consules decretas a patribus provincias inter se parauere: Cotta Galliam citeriorem habuit, Ciliciam Octavius. Dein proxumi consules L. Lucullus et M. Cotta litteris nuntiisque Pompei grauiter percussi, cum summae rei gratia tum ne exercitu in Italiam deducto neque laus sua neque dignitas esset, omni modo stipendium et supplementum parauere ...

This letter was read in the senate at the beginning of the following year. The consuls agreed among themselves on the provinces which had been allotted to them by the senate: Cotta took Cisalpine Gaul, Octavius Cilicia. Then their successors, L. Lucullus and M. Cotta, greatly disturbed by Pompeius' letter and messages, both because of the interest of the state and because they were afraid that, if he led an army into Italy, they themselves would have neither glory nor status, used every means to provide him with pay and reinforcements ...

The letter affords a neat transition back to Rome and the new consular year. However, Sallust rather confusingly prefaces his account of the response to the letter with a report of the share-out of provinces between C. Cotta and Octavius, the consuls of 75, which must surely have been arranged earlier. Sallust probably reserved his mention of the agreement until this point because of its relevance to the intriguing over commands which broke out early in 74, in the aftermath of Pompey's letter and with the renewed war against Mithridates in prospect.⁷⁷ The connection is pointed up by the parallelism which Sallust's language draws between the two pairs of

⁷⁵ La Penna (1963), 11–12, suggests that the structure of the prefatory material in the first book may have been influenced by Thucydides, but the analogy is far-fetched.

⁷⁶ See especially Perrochat (1949), 13 ff; Avenarius (1957); Scanlon (1980), 166 ff.

⁷⁷ On the intrigue see Plut., *Luc.* 5–6, probably from Sallust.

consuls, with repetition of *parauere* and chiasmic arrangement of the names of the brothers Cotta.⁷⁸

Firm conclusions about how Sallust organized his material can hardly be drawn from the fragmentary remains of one year narrative. Nonetheless, this evidence does give us some indications about his procedures. The basic principle was the grouping of events within the year into regional sections. It is not clear to what extent, if at all, these were arranged to form a narrative which purported to show the progression of events through the consular year. If there were two Spanish sections for the year 75, this would imply some overall chronological progression. However, there may, as we have seen, have been only one Spanish section. There was probably only one domestic section for 75, and both 76 and 75 ended with external events. When dealing with domestic material, Sallust's concern was with politics and personalities, and he shows no interest in matters of routine administration. Such material is omitted altogether in what survives of the domestic section for 75, and the distribution of provinces between the consuls of that year is postponed to the following year narrative for political effect. The overall impression is of a writer handling his year narratives with a freedom and informality which contrasts markedly with the manner which Livy adopted from Valerius Antias for the Middle Republic.

Later accounts of the recent Roman past included Asinius Pollio's history of the civil wars, and the histories by imperial writers such as Aufidius Bassus and Cremutius Cordus, and their successors Servilius Nonianus, Pliny the Elder and Fabius Rusticus. We have no information on the arrangement of any of these works, but most, and perhaps all, were probably organized by the consular year.⁷⁹

5. Conclusion

If the arguments advanced above are correct, the handling of the consular year in the Roman historical tradition developed on broadly the following lines.

The use of the consular year as an organizing principle probably went back to the first Roman historian, Fabius Pictor. Cato reacted against the tradition which Fabius had established in various ways, probably including the rejection of annalistic arrangement. In the next generation, Hemina,

⁷⁸ The parallelism was pointed out to me by Christina Kraus.

⁷⁹ The nature of his material may perhaps have induced Pollio to dispense with or at least modify annalistic organization. For Pliny the Elder annalistic organization seems likely for his 31-book continuation of Aufidius Bassus' history, but less so for the 20-book work on the German wars.

Piso and Gellius reverted to the Fabian model, although Gellius contrived to write on a much more ample scale. New modes of Roman historiography were now pioneered: L. Coelius Antipater wrote a seven-book monograph on the Second Punic War, and Fannius and Asellio wrote the first Roman histories which, instead of starting with the foundation of the city, dealt only with a period of the recent past. However, Fannius and Asellio probably and their successors Sisenna and Sallust certainly organized their material by the consular year.

We may surmise that the year narratives of the early historians, from Fabius to Piso, followed no fixed pattern and varied between extended episodes and brief notices, whose style perhaps echoed that of the *Annales Maximi* themselves. Much the same was true of some of their first-century successors, such as Claudius Quadrigarius. However, the work of Valerius Antias constituted a major new departure. By diligent research in the archives, particularly of the senate, he amassed a good deal of new material, much of it concerned with matters of routine domestic administration and ceremonial, for the years from about 300 BC on. Valerius incorporated this into his work along with much distortion and invention and shaped it into a narrative with a regular, formal structure which purported to follow the progression of events through the consular year and in particular the consuls' movements between Rome and their provinces.

Livy used Valerius Antias' work as the framework for his own account of the Middle Republic, although he also drew on other annalists and introduced much material from Coelius and Polybius. His year narratives for the period exhibit the regular pattern and wealth of routine domestic detail which he took over from Valerius, but he also manipulated the pattern for his own purposes and in Books 31–45 transformed its character by combining it with extensive Polybian material on the Greek East. In the rest of Livy's work, his year narratives had a different character. Those for the Early Republic have no fixed pattern, and are probably closer in manner to those of Piso and Claudius. (Valerius' narratives for this period were probably much the same). We cannot tell how Livy organized his annual narratives for the period from the Social War on, but a number of factors will have ensured that they differed from those for the Middle Republic: the use of different sources, the still ampler scale of Livy's account, and above all the collapse of republican order and stability, of which the uniform pattern of Livy's third and second century year narratives had served as an emblem.

Livy's work was the culmination of the long tradition of histories of Rome from the foundation. However, before Livy wrote, the alternative models of the monograph and the history of a limited recent period pioneered respectively by Coelius and by Fannius and Asellio had each found a great practitioner in Sallust. What survives of Sallust's *Histories* suggests that

the year narratives in that work had a free and informal structure quite unlike the regular Valerian pattern.

When Tacitus came to write annalistic history, he undoubtedly devised his own ways of handling the annalistic form and made it serve his own purposes. However, he should not be thought of as reacting against a uniform traditional pattern. A wide range of models was available to him of how the annual narrative might be structured, most notably in Sallust's *Histories*, in the different phases of Livy's work and (the most obscure to us) in the earlier historians of the principate.

University of Nottingham

JOHN RICH

APPENDIX I
Sample year narratives from Livy, Books 31–45

(a) 193 (34.55–35.19)

ROME

- 34.55.1–4 *Principio anni*, earthquakes and their expiation
 34.55.6–56 Provinces and armies; bad news from Liguria leads to emergency measures; departure of consuls
 34.57–59 Reception of eastern embassies, especially those from Antiochus [from Polybius' *Res Italiae*]
 34.60–62 Embassy from Carthage reports Hannibal's despatch of Aristo and complains about Masinissa; Roman embassy sent out [largely Polybian]

SPAIN

- 35.1 Warfare in Spain *principio anni*

ROME

- 35.2 C. Flaminius, the praetor appointed to Hispania Citerior, fails to get additional troops in response to this news

NORTHERN ITALY

- 35.3–5 The consuls' warfare against the Ligurians and Boii

ROME

- 35.6–7.1 Despatches from the consuls and resulting senatorial discussions
 35.7.2–5 Measures to alleviate debt
 (35.7.6 *haec in Italia domi militiae acta. in Hispania ...*)

SPAIN

- 35.7.6–8 Warfare by the praetors

ROME

- 35.8 Consul L. Cornelius Merula returns to hold elections; unsuccessfully seeks triumph
 35.9.1 Censors close *lustrum*
 35.9.2–5 Prodigies *eo anno*
 35.9.6 Cato dedicates shrine of Victoria Virgo *iisdem diebus* [calendars give its *dies natalis* as *kal. Aug.*]
 35.9.7–8 Foundation of Latin colony *eodem anno*
 35.10.1–11 *In exitu iam annus erat*: election of consuls and praetors

- 35.10.11–12 *Aedilitas insignis eo anno* of Lepidus and Paullus: many *pecuarii* fined and public works constructed with the proceeds

LIGURIA

- 35.11 *Extremo eius anni*, the consul Q. Minucius Thermus twice escapes from serious danger

GREECE AND ASIA

- 35.12–13.3 Aetolian approaches to Antiochus, Philip and Nabis [from Polybius' *Res Graeciae* for 194/3]
 35.13.4–19 Roman embassy to Antiochus; his war council. [13.4–5 *ea hieme ... principio ueris ...* implies that we have now moved into 192, and so there is no explicit reference to the consuls' entry into office at 35.20, but in fact this section is from Polybius' *Res Asiae* of 194/3]

(b) 189 (37.48–38.35.6)

ROME

- 37.48–49 Rumours of setbacks in the East; Aetolian embassy rebuffed
 37.50–51.7 Provinces and armies; dispute over *flamen Quirinalis*; departure of consuls and praetors
 37.51.8–56 News of battle of Magnesia; embassies from L. Scipio, Antiochus and others; senatorial decisions on the peace settlement
 37.57.1–6 *Per eos dies* report of defeat and death in Liguria of L. Baebius on way to Spain; successor sent

SPAIN

- 37.57.5–6 Victory of L. Aemilius Paullus

ROME AND ITALY

- 37.57.7–8 *Eodem anno* Bononia founded, *a.d. iii. kal. Ian.*
 37.57.9–58.2 *Eodem anno* censorial elections
 37.58.3–59 *Per eos dies* return and triumph of L. Aemilius Regillus (*kal. Feb.*) and L. Scipio (*mens. intercal. pr. kal. Mart.*), with *supplicatio* for Paullus between them

THE EAST

(from Polybius' *Res Graeciae* and *Res Asiae* for 190/89)

- 37.60.1 *Eodem tempore et Cn. Manlius consul in Asiam et Q. Fabius Labeo praetor ad classem uenit* [in fact doubling back to summer 189]
 37.60.2–7 Naval activity of Q. Fabius Labeo

- 38.1–11 Events in Aetolia: the war there ended by consul M. Fulvius Nobilior
 38.12–27 Cn. Manlius Vulso's Galatian campaign

ROME

- 38.28.1 *Dum haec in Asia geruntur, in ceteris prouinciis tranquillae res fuerunt*
 38.28.1–4 Activities of censors
 38.28.4 Floods

GREECE

- 38.28.5–34 Activity of Fulvius Nobilior, the Achaeans etc [from Polybius' *Res Graeciae* for first half of 189/8]⁸⁰

ROME

- 38.35.1–4 Return of Fulvius; elections; prorogation of Fulvius and Manlius
 38.35.4–6 Dedications *eo anno* by the consul Fulvius, by a Cornelius and by the aediles from fines on corn-hoarders. Games repeated

(c) 184 (39.33–45.1)**GREEK AND MACEDONIAN AFFAIRS**

- 39.33 Returning Roman embassy and embassies from Philip and Greeks heard in senate *principio ... anni*; new Roman embassy despatched
 39.34–35.4 Activity of Philip; the Roman embassy's dealings with him
 39.35.5–37.21 Developments in Achaea; the ambassador Ap. Claudius there [This section is from Polybius' *Res Italiae*, *Res Macedoniae* and *Res Graeciae* for 185/4]

ROME

- 39.38 *Romae principio eius anni*, provinces and armies; envoys from Spanish commanders
 39.39 *Subinde*, election of a suffect praetor abandoned after dispute over eligibility of flamen Dialis
 39.40–41.4 Censorial elections
 39.41.5 Departure of magistrates

⁸⁰ On the chronological problems of Fulvius' movements see Warrior (1988); Briscoe (2008), 104–6, 110.

ITALY

39.41.5-7 Two praetors hold *quaestiones* into poisoning, conspiracies of shepherds, and Bacchanalia

SPAIN

39.42.1 Activity of the incoming commanders

ROME

39.42.2-4 Triumphs of returning commanders from Spain, following their victory in 185

39.42.5-44.9 Activity of the censors Cato and Valerius Flaccus

39.44.10 Colonies founded at Potentia and Pisaurum *eodem anno*

39.44.11 *Consules eius anni nec domi nec militiae memorabile quicquam egerunt*

39.45.1 Consular elections. (Names of praetors postponed after year break (at 45.2), as also replacement of augur (45.8))

APPENDIX 2
Analysis of Livy, Book 4

<i>Year</i>	<i>Chapters</i>	
445	1–6	INTERNAL: disputes frustrate levy, resolved by granting of patrician–plebeian intermarriage and introduction of consular tribunes
444	7	INTERNAL: consular tribunes declared <i>uitio creati</i> and replaced by consuls; renewal of treaty with Ardea; <i>et foris ... et domi otium</i>
443	8	INTERNAL: institution of censorship
	9–10.6	EXTERNAL: Roman intervention in Ardea
	10.7–9	INTERNAL: triumph of consul Geganius; his colleague's success in maintaining <i>concordia</i>
442	11	Colony to Ardea; <i>pax domi forisque fuit et hoc et insequente anno</i>
441	12.1–5	INTERNAL: <i>ludi</i> ; tribunician agitation
440	12.6–13.5	INTERNAL: corn crisis; Sp. Maelius aims at regnum
439	13.6–16.8	INTERNAL: Sp. Maelius put to death
438	17.1–6	EXTERNAL: Fidenae defects to Veii; Roman ambassadors killed
	17.7	INTERNAL: elections
437	18–20	War against Veii and Fidenae: consul wins costly victory; Mam. Aemilius appointed dictator; Roman victory in which Cossus, <i>tribunus militum</i> , kills king of Veii; triumph and dedication of <i>spolia opima</i> ; source conflict over Cossus
	21.1–2	EXTERNAL: raid on Veientine and Faliscan territory
436	21.3–5	INTERNAL: tribunician agitation; pestilence and prodigies
	21.6–22.6	EXTERNAL: Veii war continues: enemy raid up to walls of Rome, but driven back; Fidenae captured
435	22.7	INTERNAL: Censors construct <i>uilla publica</i> and hold census
	23.1–3	Source conflict over magistrates
	23.4–24.1	EXTERNAL: Etruscan assembly summoned, prompting Roman appointment of Mam. Aemilius as dictator; other Etruscans refuse to help Veii
434	24.2–25.1	INTERNAL: dictator passes law limiting censors' tenure; elections
	25.2–5	INTERNAL: pestilence and famine; temple vowed to Apollo
432	25.6	INTERNAL: end of pestilence and corn shortage

	25.7–8	EXTERNAL: enemy meetings
	25.9–14	INTERNAL: tribunician agitation over elections
431	26–29.6	War against Aequi and Volsci at the Algidus: disturbing news from front leads to appointment of A. Postumius Tubertus as dictator; his victory and triumph; some report that he executed his son for leaving his post to fight
	29.7	INTERNAL: dedication of temple of Apollo
	29.8	FOREIGN: first Carthaginian expedition to Sicily
	30.1	INTERNAL: tribunician agitation over elections
430	30.1–2	EXTERNAL: Aequi granted <i>indutiae</i> ; Volsci dispute amongst themselves
	30.3	INTERNAL: law about fines
429	30.4	<i>Nihil dignum dictu actum</i>
428	30.5–6	EXTERNAL: Veientine raids on Roman territory; consequent Roman measures about Fidenae
	30.7–11	INTERNAL: drought, leading to pestilence; novel religious remedies spread, leading to ban
427	30.12–16	War declared against Veii; elections
426	31–34	War against Veii, joined by Fidenae: consular tribunes' defeat leads to appointment of Mam. Aemilius as dictator; his victory, capture of Fidenae and triumph
425	35.1–2	<i>Indutiae</i> granted to Veii and Aequi
424	35–36	INTERNAL: votive <i>ludi</i> celebrated; tribunician agitation
	37.1–2	FOREIGN: Samnites capture Capua
423	37.3–42.2	War against Volscians. Negligence of consul C. Sempronius Atratinus retrieved by cavalry officer Sex. Tempanius. Their return home; tribunes attack Sempronius and secure conviction for military negligence of M. Postumius, consular tribune in 426. Elections
422	42.3–9	INTERNAL: tribunician prosecution of C. Sempronius (for his conduct as consul 423) dropped
421	42.10–43.2	EXTERNAL: Consul Cn. Fabius easily defeats Aequi and holds ovation on return
	43.3–7	INTERNAL: tribunician agitation over plebeian representation on increased quaestorship etc. prevents elections
420	43.8–44.12	INTERNAL: <i>interrex</i> secures compromise permitting election of consular tribunes and quaestors; C. Sempronius (consul 423) fined; acquittal of Vestal <i>eodem anno</i>
	44.12	FOREIGN: Campanians capture Cumae
419	44.13–45.2	INTERNAL: slave conspiracy foiled

- 45.3-4 EXTERNAL: Aequi prepare war, joined by Labicani; Roman embassy sent to Labici and Tusculum instructed to keep watch
- 418 45.5-47.7 War against Aequi and Labicani. Consular tribunes' disputes lead to appointment of Q. Servilius Priscus as dictator. He defeats Aequi and captures Labici. Colony to Labici
- 417- 47.7-48.16 INTERNAL: tribunes propose agrarian law, but
416 thwarted by tribunician veto. (N.B. two years narrated together)
- 415 49.1-6 Veii prevented from renewing war by Tiber flood. Raids on Roman colony at Labici from Bola; Romans capture Bola; tribunician proposal for colony there vetoed
- 414 49.7-50.8 Bola recaptured from Aequi by M. Postumius Regillensis. He angers assembly and is murdered by troops on return to camp. *Interregnum*
- 413 51.1-6 INTERNAL: inquiry into death of Postumius; popular discontent
- 51.7-8 EXTERNAL: Romans take Ferentinum from raiding Volsci and give it to Hernici
- 412 52.1-3 INTERNAL: tribunician agitation interrupted by pestilence
- 411 52.4-8 INTERNAL: famine
- 410 53 Tribune's opposition to levy overridden. Arx Carventana recovered from Volsci. Troops, denied booty, hostile at consul's ovation
- 409 54-55.7 INTERNAL: plebeians elected to quaestorships; agitation for election of consular tribunes and levy impeded until concession made
- 55.8 EXTERNAL: campaign against Aequi and Volsci
- 56.1-3 INTERNAL: elections
- 408 56.4-57.12 Volscian war plans. Dictator appointed for the war at Rome after dispute. Successful but unmemorable war. Elections
- 407 58.1-5 EXTERNAL: exchange of embassies with Veii; Verugo lost to Volsci

406	58.6–14	INTERNAL: declaration of war against Veii proposed but delayed by tribunes
	59.1–10	EXTERNAL: campaign against Volsci; Anxur taken
	59.10–60.9	INTERNAL: pay for soldiers introduced; war declared against Veii
405	60.9–61.2	EXTERNAL: siege of Veii begun
404	61.3–11	EXTERNAL: siege of Veii continued; successful warfare against Volsci

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Astin, A. E. (1978), *Cato the Censor* (Oxford).
- Avenarius, W. (1957), 'Die griechischer Vorbilder des Sallust', *SO* 33, 48–86.
- Badian, E. (1966), 'The early historians', in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Latin Historians* (London), 1–38.
- (1993), 'Livy and Augustus', in W. Schuller (ed.), *Livius: Aspekte seines Werkes* (Konstanz), 9–38.
- Beck, H. and Walter, M. (2001–4), *Die Frühen Römischen Historiker*, 2 vols (Darmstadt).
- Bloch, H. (1961), 'The structure of Sallust's *Historiae*: the evidence of the Fleury manuscript', in S. Prete (ed.), *Didascaliae: Studies in Honor of A. M. Albareda* (New York), 59–76.
- Bredhorn, U. (1968), *Senatsakten in der republikanischen Annalistik* (Marburg).
- Briscoe, J. (1971), 'The first decade', in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Livy* (London and Toronto).
- (1973), *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXI–XXXIII* (Oxford).
- (1981), *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXIV–XXXVII* (Oxford).
- (2005), 'The language and style of the fragmentary Republican historians', *Proc. Brit. Acad.* 129, 53–72.
- (2008), *A Commentary on Livy Books XXXVIII–XL* (Oxford).
- Broughton, T. R. S. (1951), *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* i (Cleveland, Ohio).
- Brunt, P. A. (1971), *Italian Manpower 225 BC–AD 14* (Oxford; repr. 1987).
- Bucher, G. S. (1987 [publ. 1995]), 'The *Annales Maximi* in the light of Roman methods of keeping records', *AJAH* 12, 2–61.
- Burck, E. (1934), *Die Erzählungskunst des T. Livius* (Berlin; repr. Berlin/Zurich, 1964).
- (1950), *Einführung in die dritte Dekade des Livius* (Heidelberg).
- (1992), *Das Geschichtswerk des Titus Livius* (Heidelberg).
- Chassignet, M. (1996–2004), *L'Annalistique Romaine*, 3 vols (Paris).
- Cornell, T. J. (1986), 'The *Annals* of Quintus Ennius', *JRS* 76, 244–50.
- (1987), 'Ennius' *Annals* VI: a reply', *CQ* 37, 514–6.
- Cornell, T. J. et al. (forthcoming), *The Fragments of the Roman Historians* (Oxford).
- Crawford, M. H. (1998), 'Numa and the antiquarians', *Fa ventia* 20, 37–8.
- Davies, J. P. (2004), *Rome's Religious History: Livy, Tacitus and Ammianus on their Gods* (Cambridge).
- Degrassi, A. (1947), *Inscriptiones Italiae*, 13.1: *Fasti Consulares et Triumphales* (Rome).
- (1963), *Inscriptiones Italiae*, 13.2: *Fasti Anni Numani et Iuliani* (Rome).

- Drummond, A. (1978), 'The dictator years', *Historia* 27, 550–72.
- Feeney, D. C. (2007), *Caesar's Calendar: Ancient Time and the Beginnings of History* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London).
- Fornara, C. W. (1983), *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London).
- Forsythe, G. (1990), 'Some notes on the history of Cassius Hemina', *Phoenix* 44, 326–44.
- (1994), *The Historian L. Calpurnius Piso Frugi and the Roman Annalistic Tradition* (Lanham etc.).
- (2000), 'The Roman historians of the second century BC', in C. Bruun (ed.), *The Roman Middle Republic. Politics, Religion and Historiography c. 400–133 BC* (Rome), 1–11.
- (2002), 'Dating and arranging the Roman History of Valerius Antias', in V. B. Gorman and E. W. Robinson (eds), *Oikistes: Studies in Constitutions, Colonies and Military Power in the Ancient World offered in honour of A. J. Graham* (Leiden, Boston & Cologne), 99–112.
- Frassinetti, P. (1975), 'I fatti di Spagna nel libro II delle 'Historiae' di Sallustio', *StudUrb* 49/1, 381–98.
- Frier, B. W. (1979), *Libri Annales Pontificum Maximorum: The Origins of the Annalistic Tradition* (Rome). Revised edn. 1999 (Ann Arbor).
- Funari, R. (1996), *C. Sallusti Crispi Historiarum Fragmenta* (Amsterdam).
- Gelzer, M. (1964), *Kleine Schriften* iii (Wiesbaden, 1964).
- Ginsburg, J. (1981), *Tradition and Theme in the Annals of Tacitus* (New York).
- Giovannini, A. (1983), *Consulare Imperium* (Basle).
- Gschnitzner, F. (1981), 'Das System der römischen Heeresbildung im zweiten Punischen Krieg: Polybios, die Annalisten und die geschichtliche Wirklichkeit', *Hermes* 109, 59–85.
- Hahm, D. E. (1963), 'Roman nobility and the three major priesthoods, 218–167 BC', *TAPA* 94, 73–85.
- Jal, P. (1984), *Abrégés des livres de l'Histoire Romaine de Tite-Live* (Paris).
- Kahrstedt, U. (1913), *Die Annalistik von Livius B. XXXI–XLV* (Berlin; repr. Rome, 1971).
- Klotz, A. (1915), 'Zu den Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius', *Hermes* 50, 481–536.
- (1940–1), *Livius und seine Vorgänger* (Stuttgart; repr. Amsterdam, 1964).
- (1942), 'Der Annalist Q. Claudius Quadrigarius', *RhM* 91, 268–85.
- Konrad, C. F. (1995), 'A new chronology of the Sertorian War', *Athenaeum* 83, 157–87.
- Kraus, C. S. (1994), *Livy: Ab Urbe Condita Book VI* (Cambridge).
- (1997), 'Livy' in C. S. Kraus and A. J. Woodman, *Latin Historians* (Oxford), 51–81.

- La Penna, A. (1963), 'Per la ricostruzione delle "Historiae" di Sallustio', *SIFC* 35, 5–68.
- Levene, D. (1993), *Religion in Livy* (Leiden).
- (2010), *Livy on the Hannibalic War* (Oxford).
- Liebeschuetz, J. H. W. G. (1979), *Continuity and Change in Roman Religion* (Oxford).
- Luce, T. J. (1977), *Livy: The Composition of his History* (Princeton).
- MacBain, B. (1982), *Prodigy and Expiation: A Study in Religion and Politics in Republican Rome* (Brussels).
- Marincola, J. (1999), 'Genre, convention and innovation in Greco-Roman historiography', in C. S. Kraus (ed.), *The Limits of Historiography: Genre and Narrative in Ancient Historical Texts* (Leiden, Boston and Cologne), 281–324.
- Maurenbrecher, B. (1893), *C. Sallustii Crispi Historiarum Reliquiae* (Stuttgart; repr. 1967).
- McDonald, A. H. (1957), 'The style of Livy', *JRS* 47, 155–172.
- McGushin, P. (1992), *Sallust: The Histories. Vol. I: Books i–ii* (Oxford).
- (1994), *Sallust: The Histories. Vol. II: Books iii–v* (Oxford).
- Mommsen, T. (1887), *Römisches Staatsrecht* i (Leipzig).
- Nissen, H. (1863), *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius* (Berlin; repr. New York, 1975).
- Northwood, S. J. (2007), 'Quintus Fabius Pictor: was he an annalist?', in N. V. Sekunda (ed.), *Corolla Cosmo Rodewald* (Manchester), 97–114.
- Oakley, S. P. (1997–2005), *A Commentary on Livy Books VI–X*, 4 vols (Oxford).
- Packard, J. (1960), *Official Notices in Livy's Fourth Decade: Style and Treatment* (Diss. North Carolina) (non vidi).
- Palmer, R. E. A. (1997), *Rome and Carthage at Peace* (Stuttgart).
- Pecere, O. (1969), 'Su alcuni frammenti delle "Historiae" di Sallustio', *SIFC* 41, 61–77.
- Perl, G. (1967–8), 'Der alte Codex der "Historiae" Sallusts', *BIRT* 15, 29–38.
- (1975), 'Das Kompositionsprinzip der Historiae des Sallust (zu Hist. fr. 2,42)', *Actes de la XIIe conférence internationale d'études classiques 'Eirene'* (Bucharest and Amsterdam), 317–37.
- Perrochat, P. (1949), *Les modèles grecs de Salluste* (Paris).
- Peter, H. (1914), *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae* i (2nd edn, Leipzig; repr., Stuttgart, 1967).
- Petzold, K.-E. (1999), *Geschichtsdenken und Geschichtschreibung: Kleine Schriften zur griechischen und römischen Geschichte* (Stuttgart).
- Phillips, J. E. (1974), 'Form and language in Livy's triumphal notices', *CPh* 69, 265–73.
- Rawson, E. (1991), *Roman Culture and Society* (Oxford).

- Reynolds, L. D. (1991), *C. Sallusti Crispi Catilina, Iugurtha, Historiarum Fragmenta Selecta, Appendix Sallustiana* (Oxford).
- Rich, J. W. (2005), 'Valerius Antias and the construction of the Roman past', *BICS* 48, 137–61.
- Rüpke, J. (2008), *Fasti Sacerdotum. A Prosopography of Pagan, Jewish and Christian Religious Officials in the City of Rome, 300 BC to AD 499* (Oxford).
- Scanlon, T. F. (1980), *The Influence of Thucydides on Sallust* (Heidelberg).
- Seibert, J. (1993), *Forschungen zu Hannibal* (Darmstadt).
- Skutsch, O. (1985), *The Annals of Quintus Ennius* (Oxford).
- (1987), 'Book VI of Ennius' *Annals*', *CQ* 37, 512–4.
- Soltau, W. (1897), *Livius' Geschichtswerk: seine Komposition und seine Quellen* (Leipzig).
- Stadter, P. A. (1972), 'The structure of Livy's History', *Historia* 21, 286–307.
- Suerbaum, W. (1995), 'Der Pyrrhos–Krieg in Ennius' *Annales* VI im Lichte der ersten Ennius–Papyri aus Herculaneum', *ZPE* 106: 30–52.
- (2002), *Der archaische Literatur von den Anfängen bis Sullas Tod*, vol. 1 of R. Herzog and P. L. Schmidt (eds), *Handbuch der lateinischen Literatur der Antike* (Munich).
- Syme, R. (1959), 'Livy and Augustus', *HSCP* 64, 27–87, repr. in his *Roman Papers I* (Oxford, 1979), 400–54.
- Szemler, G. J. (1972), *The Priests of the Roman Republic* (Brussels).
- Timpe, D. (1972), 'Fabius Pictor und die Anfänge der römischen Historiographie', *ANRW* i.2.928–69, repr. in id., *Antike Geschichtschreibung: Studien zur Historiographie* (Darmstadt, 2007), 132–81.
- (1979), 'Erwägungen zur jüngeren Annalistik', *A&A* 25, 97–119, repr. in his *Antike Geschichtschreibung: Studien zur Historiographie* (Darmstadt, 2007), 209–36.
- Vaahtera, J. (2002), 'Livy and the priestly records: à propos *ILS* 9338', *Hermes* 130, 100–8.
- Verbrugghe, G. (1989), 'On the meaning of *Annales*, on the meaning of Annalist', *Philologus* 133, 192–230.
- Walsh, P. G. (1961), *Livy: His Historical Aims and Methods* (Cambridge).
- (1974), *Livy* (Greece and Rome New Surveys No. 8).
- Walter, U. (2004), *Memoria und res publica. Zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom* (Frankfurt am Main).
- Warrior, V. M. (1988), 'The chronology of the movements of M. Fulvius Nobilior (cos. 189) in 189/188 BC', *Chiron* 18, 325–56.
- Wille, G. (1973), *Der Aufbau des Livianischen Geschichtswerks* (Amsterdam).
- Wiseman, T. P. (1979), *Clio's Cosmetics* (Leicester).
- Zimmerer, M. (1937), *Der Annalist Qu. Claudius Quadrigarius* (Munich).