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Neither Greek nor Roman historiography was in the first place the story of the distant past based on documentary research. It began by being basically contemporary or near contemporary, inspired by great events which left an impression upon the author and which he experienced directly or in its aftermath as history, in the sense of 'Geschichte' rather than 'Geschehenes'. Historiography should therefore be regarded as an event in the history of the human spirit before it is studied in its importance as literature or a science. The remote past provided the wider perspective, because history and the consciousness of history implies continuity: 'Ohne das Streben nach Kon­tinuität ... zu überschaubarer Ganzheit ist Geschichte nicht denkbar' 1. The incorporation, however, of earlier history on a large scale for its own sake and as a field for more extensive research was not characteristic of either Greek or Roman historiography when it first began. This belongs to a later phase, and only subsequently does written evidence come to be looked upon as the raw material for history. Research was at first adapted to the requirements of contemporary history and so it remained basically in antiquity — as is still reflected in as late an author as Ammianus Marcellinus: ea quae videre licuit per aetatem vel perplexe interrogando versatos in medio scire 2.

Roman historiography arose during or as a direct outcome of the Punic Wars, an extraordinary period in the history of Rome. Fabius Pictor participated in the Second Punic War. His work is fragmentary and must be retrieved from later authors such as Polybius and Livy. He dealt with the Regal period, the κυριακῆς of Rome, fully, and somewhat summarily, κεφαλαίωνδος, with the early Republican period, concluding with the Punic Wars as his special field, οἷς μὲν αὐτῶν ἔργοι παρεγένετο διὰ τὴν ἐπιτελείαν ἀναφέρει Ἀνέγραψε. 3 It was a period which stirred both Romans and Greeks to write about Rome 4. The First Punic War was treated by Philinus of Agrigentum, and it inspired the Bellum Punicum of Naevius. History and epic should be studied in conjunction with each other if the political or 'spiritual' climate in which the first Roman histories appeared is to be clearly understood. Both Fabius and Naevius reacted against the pro-Carthaginian standpoint of Philinus — whom they used as a source — so that Fabius' history was interwoven with existing Greek

---

1 This paper links up with my article, Die Ontstaan van die Romeinse Geskiedskrywing, Communications of the Univ. of S.A., C. 28, Pretoria 1961.
2 Wolfgang Schadewaldt, Die Anfänge der Geschichtsschreibung bei den Griechen, Die Antike X (1934) 145.
3 Schadewaldt p. 146.
historiography on account of its polemic nature. It was partly a reply to Philinus, and it was written in Greek for the Greek-speaking world, thereby establishing a tradition for Rome's first historians.

The Romans did not take to the writing of history readily: 'Geschichte hätten sie nicht geschrieben, wenn die Griechen nicht sie immer wieder neu gelehrt hätten, Geschichte zu erfassen und zu erzählen.' The Romans had no epic tradition, and it is the Greeks who with their epic past gave Rome a deeper sense of history and the continuity of history. The story of the founding of Rome, taken over by Fabius from Diodes of Peparethos, follows Homeric tradition and from it the first Roman history derives a certain Panhellenic character. But the paradigmatic outlook on the past more typically Roman, as Livy's preface reveals, is rooted in the 'archaic' period of Republican history. It finds expression in the annales, but doubtless did not inspire Fabian historiography to the same extent.

Greek historians became interested in Roman history from the Pyrrhic War onwards. Hieronymus of Cardia touched upon Roman history in his work on the Epigoni. After him Timaeus dealt with the early history of Rome in his greater work, and again with Roman history in a separate work on Pyrrhus. He synchronized the foundation of Rome and Carthage, but as a rule Greek historians dated Rome from the fall of Troy, in which they were followed by Romans such as Fabius and Cato. Timaeus admired and was well disposed towards Rome. His influence on Fabius is noticeable in the practice of correlating in earlier Republican history important events in the histories of Greece and Rome — a procedure appropriate to the purpose of Fabius' history, and evidence of its 'Panhellenic' character.

Börner more recently defended the thesis once put forward by Mommsen, and subsequently followed by others, on the evidence of Cicero, of a more or less native Roman historiography which evolved out of a pontifical chronicle. He disagreed

8 F. Klingner, Römische Geschichtsschreibung bis zum Werke des Livius, Die Antike XIII (1937) 5.
10 Cf. J. W. Mackail, Latin literature, p. 6, on Naevius.
11 Liv. praeef. 10; cf. Cicero de Leg. 1.5.18, and Dion. A.R. 1.6.4; Klingner, p. 4, on the 'senatorische Schriftsteller'; and Leeman p. 133: 'Auctoritas, pietas und Gloria zeichnen das Lebensverhältnis der vornen Römers zur Vergangenheit seiner Sippe'. Dionysios A.R. 1.6.3—4, implies, for what it is worth, that there was a lack of paradigmatic content in the earlier writers. But see Münzer, R.E. 6, 1846; Börner, Hist. 2 (1955—4) 199.
12 Dion. 1.6.3; cf. Hanell p. 150.
13 Dion. 1.74.1.
14 Polyb. 1.6.1; 3.22.1; Diod. 11.24.1; 14.133; and see Hanell p. 167.
15 Cicero de Orat. 2.52; de Leg. 1.6; Mommsen, Die röm. Chron. 2 1859, 137; Röm. Gesch. 8 1, 463; W. Saltau, Die Anfänge der röm. Geschichtsschreibung, Leipzig 1909; F. Leo, Geschichte der röm. Literatur I, Berlin 1913; 85 ff; G. de Sanctis, Storia dei Romani III 1, 227; 2, 172.
that Fabius was involved in a polemic with Philinus, and maintained that he should be approached 'literarhistorisch' via the study of Naevius. Fabius wrote *annales* and follows in the tradition of a 'vorfabianischen' or rather a 'vornaevianischen Chronik': 'Es wird hier eine Geschichte geschrieben, die von griechischen Theorien so gut wie unberührt ist'. Cato wished to break away from this tradition: his fragment (77), *non lubet scribere quod in tabula apud pontificem maximum est*, regarded by Börner as 'Kronzeugnis über die Annalistik', refers to Fabius.

This view can find no adequate explanation for the fact that the first Roman historians wrote in Greek. Nor is it convincing to argue that Latin prose was not yet sufficiently far advanced, since Albinus informs us in so many words that he would have preferred to write in his native tongue. Gelzer endeavoured to study Fabius 'quellenkritisch' from Polybius, and in his earlier article from the point of view that for the purpose of explaining Roman history and politics convincingly to the Greek world a mere chronicle as the vehicle would have been inadequate. The key to his thesis is the 'horizontal' division made by Asellio between the earlier Roman historians *qui res gestas describere conati essent*, and the subsequent writers of chronicle *qui annales relinquerer voluissent*. He draws our attention to the difference of approach in Cicero and Asellio: Cicero was concerned with style in the light of Greek literary theory, whereas Asellio regards the historians 'gemäss ihrem geistigen Verhältnis zum geschichtlichen Stoff: *annales* are only concerned with events and their sequence, while *res gestae* trace causal continuity — *quo consilio quaque ratione gesta essent*. Asellio in his derogatory reference to writers of annals had in mind the *Annales Maximi*, published by Scaevola c. 123 B.C., and subsequent historians who wrote in this tradition: *id fabulas pueros est narrare, non historias scribere*.

Asellio was no doubt influenced by Polybian doctrine of pragmatic historiography. He writes in the hypercritical spirit of reaction which so frequently characterises pronouncements, particularly the prefaces, of classical historians,

20 Hermes 1934, p. 49.
21 Hermes 1934, p. 47 and 53; Hermes 1954, p. 34,4; cf. F. Jacoby, *Athos*, Oxford 1949, p. 354 13: Dionysius (de Thuc. 5) ‘is actually describing a development of (historical) prose primarily in respect of style . . . he converts the stylistic development into a development in historiography, and this naturally makes difficulty for the modern reader’.
and the contrast he draws between pragmatic history and annals is exaggerated. Neither the study of causes nor a chronological arrangement of material is the prerogative of one of these genres to the exclusion of the other. Gelzer, who followed Asellio closely at first, subsequently modified his views: pragmatic history has a wider function than Asellio implies, and can more correctly be described as political history. On the other hand wider claims are also made for annales by Cicero (de Orat. 2,65).

The idea of a more or less native origin of Roman historiography and its unbroken development from its initial manifestation as 'annals' presupposes the existence of a pre-literary chronicle and the dependence, to a certain degree, of history on raw material of a documentary kind. This is implied in Mommsen's theory of a liber annalis, which exercised great influence on later studies and thought on the subject. Following the lead of Mommsen, and on the analogy of Roman historiography, Wilamowitz evolved his theory of the development of Greek historiography out of the supposed pre-literary chronicle at Athens kept by the eunuch exegetai. Greek historiography was therefore in the view of Wilamowitz dependent upon documents from the beginning, documents of a local nature, annalistic in form, which inspired it seemed an interest in early history. Jacoby examined this theory and discovered that it was wrong, and that Wilamowitz had been misled by Mommsen. Greek historiography, he points out, linked up with and derived its larger perspective from the epic, which was Panhellenic. It was not limited locally, but local history, 'Stadtgeschichte' or 'horography', with a characteristic interest in the early 'historical' past, followed in its wake as individual cities endeavoured to secure for themselves a place which 'Great Historiography' did not assign to them. A feature of this phase is the attention bestowed on the archaic historical period, and a certain advance, however qualified, in criticism and research; Jacoby speaks of the 'learned' factor and observes that

24 Jacoby, p. 282, 61; cf. p. 381, 6: 'It is typical for the whole of Greek Historiography that each successor puts himself into immediate contrast with his predecessor'; also Fr.Gr.H., commentary on 64—105, p. 117.
26 See note 15 above.
30 Jacoby p. 105: 'The idea is wrong that the Atthides treated the great common Greek enterprises of the Heroic Age. . . . All actual Atthides narrated the whole history of Athens, from the primeval times and the earliest king Kekrops down to the time of the authors. They shared this characteristic with all true local chronicles'. Cf. Gomme, p. 84, who doubts however that 'all Atthides' repeat the early history.
31 Jacoby p. 201; cf. p. 185; Klio 1909, p. 110.
this progress 'could more easily be made in local writing than in Great historiography' 32.

It is partly against this background that certain aspects of the Roman annales might be regarded. In the history of Greek historical writing we see in the effort to reconstruct the past and its institutions the normal progression from greater historiography to local history. Jacoby believed that the 'annals' were a species of Greek local history, especially because they were written in Greek: 'For as early an author as Fabius Rome aims at being a πόλις Ἐλληνική' 33. Fabius began ab urbe condita, which has its parallel in the Attichides 34; and emphasizing its form as a chronicle 35 Jacoby links Fabian historiography and the annales as a genre with the type of Greek 'horography' to which the Attichides belonged 36. He firmly believes, also on the evidence of Cicero, in the continuous development of Roman historiography beginning as annales with Fabius: 'The distinction Gelzer makes between the "senatorische Geschichtsschreibung von Fabius bis Cato" on the one hand and "Annalistik" on the other seems to me, as far as I understand it, quite wrong' 37. The relevance of Jacoby's view is the admission that the annales could be in the category of 'local history', although he takes virtually the opposite line from the views he had on Greek historiography 38. The question may therefore be asked whether, in the light of the development of Greek historical writing from greater to local history, the annales might not be considered as a parallel and independent native Roman phenomenon, i.e. as a phase in the history of Roman historiography which follows with a certain logic as 'local' history after the 'greater' histories written by Fabius and his successors — rather than in the first place as a genre continuous with Greek historiographical writing of a certain kind. The motive and the programme one would expect in an ἐδώς of Greek local history such as Jacoby conceives the early 'annals' to be are more clearly stated by Dionysius: έτι γάρ ἐγνωσται παρά τοῖς Ἐλληνικά τὸις Ἄρωματοι πόλεως ἱστορία; his object is Ἐλληνικά αὐτοῦ διὰ τὰ ἐπιστεῖαν, and at the same time to supply the gap precisely in 'archaic' Republican history with which Fabius and Cincius had dealt but κεφαλαίων δοξ. 39

The 'Latin' historians Hemina and Piso wrote in chronicle form and showed an interest in antiquities and documentary evidence along with a new appreciation for early Republican history as a field of study in itself 40. Gelzer

34 Jacoby p. 105, 110f.
35 Jacoby p. 87, 119.
36 Dion. 1, 8, 3; Jacoby p. 86; 289 110; and Klio 1909, 110f.
37 Jacoby p. 283 64; p. 285 73 and 75.
38 Jacoby p. 354 13: 'The whole idea is wrong that Greek historiography began with local history'.
39 Dion. 1, 4, 2; 1, 5, 1—2; 1, 6, 2—3. This does not however imply that Dionysius wrote 'local history', cf. 1, 8, 3.
40 W. Soltau, Die Anfänge der röm. Geschichtsschreibung, Leipzig 1909, 117ff.; Klinger, Die Antike 1937, p. 9; Bömer, Hist. p. 195; cf. Jacoby, p. 62, observing that 'die development of the Attichis does not take quite the same course as the writing of annalistic history in Rome: here the records of the later annalists become more and more detailed for
explained '... dass erst die Entstehung einer sich an das Ausland richtenden Geschichtsschreibung in Rom das Bedürfnis weckte, auch für den eigenen Gebrauch die Vergangenheit darzustellen und die Ursprüngliche der geltenden Ordnungen zu erforschen' 41. To this view Vogt objected, in which he was supported by Walbank, and also to the idea of the ‘dichten Schema der Chroniknotizen’ following after the free composition of earlier writers 42. These features make sense if we regard the annals in a somewhat similar relation to the previous Roman histories as one would the Atthis to greater Athenian historiography. It is also possible that too much emphasis may be placed on early Roman history as propagandist history for Greek consumption rather than seeing it in the larger context of a spiritual awakening during an important and crucial period of history.

The ‘pre-literary chronicle’ in some form or other is relevant for a study and understanding of the annales. Jacoby denies this relevance 43 because he dates the annals as a genre too early, in another context, and as ‘Greek’. But he is correct along with Gelzer in maintaining that whatever form the pontifical tabulae or ‘chronicle’ may have taken at the time of the first historians who wrote in Greek, they exercised very little influence on them 44. This so-called ‘chronicle’ is indeed a major problem and in the realm of hypotheses, but it becomes progressively more concrete as we approach the time of its publication as the Annales Maximi, which it is essential to regard as the end of a ‘process’.

Our knowledge of the Annales Maximi rests in the first place on Cicero and Verrius Flaccus 45. We are informed of a tabula dealbata on which the pontifex maximus yearly recorded events domi militiaeque terra marisque gesta. The tabulae initially performed a sacral function such as the record of prodigia and of priestly duties which such prodigia entail. But out of it a kind of chronicle arose because prodigia, and the appropriate rituals and expiatory sacrifices, were linked with major events. Historical data were at first incidental, limited and relevant from the priestly point of view. In due course a growing sense of history on the part of the priestly college who kept the tabulae made them add

the time of the kings and particularly the time of the early republic, whereas in the Atthis interest generally (p. 283 n. 76) shifts more and more towards contemporary history. The comparison will hold if Jacoby regarded the annals as the ‘second’ phase in Roman historiography, and the development here referred to as the initial characteristic which distinguishes them from the ‘first’ phase. Eventually the annales grew into ‘greater historiography’ with a due emphasis on the present; correlate Jacoby p. 103f. and 398.

41 Gelzer, Hermes 1934, p. 54.
43 Jacoby p. 62. But see note 40, above.
44 Jacoby p. 64; p. 283 64 (for ‘Kornemann’s thesis proper . . .’ read ‘Gelzer’s thesis . . .’); 283 73: ‘These notes certainly were not the only source for the first Annales, perhaps not even the (or a) main source’; Gelzer, Hermes 1934, p. 54: not ‘eine Hauptquelle’.
'irrelevant' details purely for their historical interest. On the dating of this process there is disagreement; but it is conceivable that it may have begun in the 3rd century B.C., considered in the same spiritual context which gave birth to the writing of histories. However, the 'pre-literary' or pontifical chronicle does not become relevant strictly till towards the middle of the 2nd century when national Roman historiography written in Latin began to take shape in the form of 'local history'. Cato should be studied in this context, midway between two phases: on the one hand he resisted the increasing Roman-centric approach, and the encroachment of the pontifical chronicle in style and outlook on current historiography; and on the other hand he endeavoured to establish a national historiography along broader 'Panitalic' lines partially in continuity with but at the same time as a reaction from the earlier 'Greek' histories, as his strictures on Albinus imply. But his reference to the tabula apud pontificem maximum at this late hour strongly suggests that, whatever may be understood by a priestly chronicle, it is unlikely that any such 'chronicle' existed other than what stood on the tabulae.

Stimulated by current historiography the sacral function of the tabulae dropped more and more into the background. The purpose of their publication by Scaevola (c. 123 B.C.) was to provide the raw material for the writing of history, for which the demand had been growing along with the growing interest in the constitutional, legal, and antiquarian aspects of Rome's past: 'Der Zweck der Veröffentlichung konnte nur sein, als die Zahl der schriftstellerischen Darstellungen sich mehrte, durch Freigabe der urkundlichen Aufzeichnungen der pontifices in der Geschichtsschreibung grössere Genauigkeit und Wahrhaftigkeit herbeizuführen'. The history of the Roman Republic now came to rest 'upon an authoritative collection of material, set in a chronological framework, that imposed its tradition upon Roman historiography'.

It reflected a consciously cultivated attitude to official source material as a cherished convention of the genre; and this may yet be a feature which for the Romans distinguishes annales from historiae.

46 Cf. Jacoby p. 64.
48 But see Gelzer: 'Wenn ich auch nicht als erwiesen erachte, dass Cato nicht die Einzeltafel im Auge gehabt habe, so möchte ich doch das Vorhandensein einer zusammenfassenden Chronik schon vor der Veröffentlichung der 80 Bücher annales maximi unter Mucius Scaevola nicht bestreiten', Hermes 1934, p. 51 (cf. n. 6 on the title of Ennius' Annales). Jacoby criticised this view, p. 283 64. It all turns on Jacoby's dating the 'annals' in an earlier context as a Greek genre, and like Bömer (Hix. 1953—4, p. 190 and 193) not admitting a 'horizontal' division in the history of Roman historiography. But his misgivings in regard to Gelzer's liber annalii (Hermes, p. 54) — i.e. the copying out separately of the contents of the tabulae 'schon im 3. Jahrh.' — may be justified.
49 R. C. W. Zimmermann, Zu Pobius Pictor, Klio 26 (1933) 259.
50 A. H. McDonald, The Style of Livy, J.R.S. 47 (1957) 155; Fifty Years of Classical Scholarship p. 390. Cf. T. F. Carney, Formal Elements in Livy, P.A.C.A. 2 (1959) 3, who adds: 'These were of such weight, dignity and standing as to preclude critical, analytical research'.
51 The distinction made by Verrius Flaccus (Gellius 5, 18 and Servius ad Verg. A. 1, 373) between annales and historiae is generally regarded as pedantic. Cicero often confuses the two genres; cf. R. Henze, Quomodo Cicero de historia eisque auctoris
The Romans began to write history at a time when Greek historical writing had already passed through various stages of development and had differentiated into several genres. Fabius, on a general view, linked up with current Hellenistic historiography. He attributed in his speeches a role to supernatural forces in the prevailing fashion of this time. He had certain affinities with Philinus who stood under the influence of the 'tragic' school; and since Fabius wrote for a Greek audience, especially where he would draw on Greek sources, he wrote 'tragic history'. Against characteristics such as these Polybius reacted in his reformulation of austere pragmatic history in the tradition of Thucydides, basically contemporary, with human excellence and institutions receiving due emphasis as historical forces. Polybius wrote history belonging to the class 'Ελληνικά, 'the main line of Greek historiography'. Fabius, who wrote ab urbe condita, may be classified with the Western Greek historians to whom also Timaeus belonged, 'Vater der römischen Historiographie,' and with whom Fabius had strong ties. Timaeus wrote histories of the type Συμπλήρωμα, a genre which resembles local history in so far as it takes up the story from the beginning, yet differing from chronicle or 'horography' in the treatment of the material; it is akin to ethnography and nearer than Atthishodography to contemporary 'great history'. Both Fabius and Cato may be regarded as linking up with this class.

The theory that Fabius wrote annales and the idea of development along a single line from the simple form of the annals to full-fledged historiography was in the first place inspired by two passages in Cicero (de Orat. 2,52 and de Leg. 1,6). History began by being but an annales confectio; the early historians, in a iudicaverit, Jena 1899, p. 15; and Balsdon, C. Q. 1953, p. 161: 'That the Latin description of a work, whether annales or Historiae, on the part of a later writer, cannot be pressed for evidence about method, should be clear enough'. Similarly Syme, Fondation Hardt, Entretiens IV (see n. 5), p. 188, of Tacitus: 'When he refers to 'annales nostri' (iv, 32), he simply means "the history I am writing", and cf. Furneaux Introd. I, 5. But where Syme in Tacitus, Oxford 1958, speaks of 'the documentary scruple of the Roman annalist' p. (278), and 'the idiosyncrasy of Cornelius Tacitus ... sacerdotal technicalities, the allocation of provinces', we feel tempted to ask whether this does not reflect the author's attitude to official sources as prescribed by his genre.

52 A. Klotz, Hermes 80 (1952) 327: 'Fabius ist durchaus in den Rahmen der hellenistischen Geschichtsschreibung eingespannt'; cf. Wilamowitz, Hell. Dicht., I 1924, p. 228: '... dass die Römer immer zunächst mit der Literatur der Hellenen in Berührung kamen, die jeweiligen modernen War'.


54 F. Wehrl, Eumutia, Zürich 1947, p. 53; T. S. Brown, Timaeus of Tauromenium, Univ. of Calif. Press 1958, 94 ff.

55 Polyb. 1,63,9 — an important passage. Cf. Cic. de Leg. 2,30: non fortius populum Romanum sed consilio et disciplina confirmatum esse; and my remarks, Amm. Marcel. in die Lig van die Antieke Geskiedskrywing, Leiden 1956, 89ff.

56 Jacoby p. 129; cf. Klio 1909, 96ff, where he classifies it under 'Griechische Zeitgeschichte'.

57 Hanell p. 152, adding: 'Die nationalrömische Geschichtsschreibung ist von ihm angelegt worden'.

58 Jacoby p. 118; Klio 1909, 92ff: 'Man beobachtet die Annäherung der Ethnographie an die griechische Zeitgeschichte wohl am besten bei den Συμπλήρωμα, der Geschichte von Westgriechenland, die man in einzelnen ihrer Vertreter geradezu als Zeitgeschichte ansprechen möchte'.
style similar to that of the Annales Maximi, were tantummodo narratores, and their only virtue was clarity and brevity — dum intelligatur quid dicant, nam dicendi laudem putant esse brevitate (c. 53). To this category belonged Cato, Pictor and Piso, whom Cicero compares to Thucydides, Helianicus and Acusilaus. As a history of historical writing these chapters and their context (de Orat. 2,52—64) are misleading. Cicero is mainly concerned with style 58, the theme namely quid oratoris historiam scribere; and he concludes the discussion: videtisne, quantum munus sit oratoris historia (c. 62). He reflects a literary theory of Greek origin, probably Theophrastus, from whom the style here prescribed for historiography derives, genus orationis fustum 60. In his par
cedia 61 presumably the source concerned, Theophrastus correlates the development of historiography as a genre with the development of its prose style; and it is along the advance in style that he sees the advance in form and scope from primitive to mature historiography. Guided by this source Cicero now gives a parallel account of the origin of Roman historiography 62. The locus classicus for the Greek source is Dionysius' introduction to his study on Thucydides (de Thuc. 5) Dionysius differentiates the greater historians from the archai synchronous who wrote kata' ethn kai xata' polies, i.e. local histories. With this crude type of historical writing on the part of early writers he correlates their crude style: λέξεως, ... σφρη και κοινή και καθορισμένο και σύντομον. After these writers Herodotus brought historiography a step further — ἕπτα τοί μείζον εὑρέγεικα καὶ λαμπρότεραν. He increased the scope from local to universal history, οὔτε πόλεως μιᾶς οὔτ' ένθεν ένός ιστορίαν; and also added to its style what it still lacked: τῇ λέξεως προσαπέδωκε τάς παραλειφθέοις, ὑπὸ τῶν πρὸ αὐτῶν συγγράφων ἀρετάς. The development continues with Thucydides who selects a special subject, the Peloponnesian War, which was strictly contemporary and based on methods of research appropriate to contemporary history (c. 6). Dionysius follows the same source where in the preface to his Archaeology he distinguishes between history and chronicle: the Athides fall in the latter category and are μονοεδείς καὶ ταχώ προσαπέταμεν τοῖς ἀκόλουθοι. In this survey (de Thuc. 5) Dionysius and his source, Theophrastus, invert the order of development and involve themselves in inaccuracies, such as grouping Hellanicus, the first Athidographer 65, with the archai synchronous but further on intimating that he was preceded by Herodotus. In the time of

60 M. Rambaud, Ciceron et L'Histoire Romaine, Paris 1953, 10 ff.
62 Cíc. Or. 39; Avenarius p. 50 and 172.
64 Cíc. Or. 39: Cicero writes of Herodotus and Thucydides: primisque ab his, ut ait Theophrastus, historia commoda est in anderer veribus quam superioris et ornatus dicer.
65 Dion A.R. 1, 8, 3; Jacoby p. 80.

61
Theophrastus the writing of history 'had long been understood to mean writing contemporary history, all other branches of historiography being considered secondary species or (in the manner of Aristotle) preliminary stages'; and Dionysius therefore describes a development from local to universal, and thence to contemporary history which to a certain extent 'turns the actual development upside down' 66.

Cicero was concerned with style 67. When he touches on other aspects comprehended under *aedificatio*, it was to emphasize the close relation of content and style — *res* and *verba*. This important subject, he felt, had not yet received treatment specially — *separatim*. Although it had been dealt with, as he knew from his reading of Theophrastus' *peri legezos*, he sees the matter in a wider context of special studies on styles appropriate to a variety of prose genres: *in eodem silentio multa alter oratorum officia iacuerunt, cohotationes, praeccepta, consolationes, admonita, quae tractanda sunt omnia dissertissime* (c. 64). Work had been done in the rhetorical schools on histriography. The schools considered the art of writing history in its elements — the style, composition, arrangement of material, and the relation of historiography in parts to other forms of literature or at any rate aspects of the orator's art. The rhetoricians doubtless also supplied the system, so that the division into *fundamenta*, the *prima lex historiae*, and *aedificatio* as Cicero implies was common knowledge 68. But what Cicero felt was lacking, with a sensitivity which we should not underrate, was a more systematic treatment and allocation of styles 69.

Two factors have been apt to influence our views on early Roman historiography. In the first place, the attitude of the literary historian who regards the history of a genre as an evolution out of more primitive beginnings. In the history of historical writing it implies a beginning which was little more than the publication of documents or of historical tradition: ὅσιοι διευκόλυσον περὶ τοῖς ἐπιγραφίαις μνήμης... ε' τ' ἐν τεροτεὶ ε' τ' ἐν βεβηλίω ἀποκείμενων γραµµατί, ταύτας εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἔπανων γνώσις ἔβενεν. Dionysius applies this doctrine pertaining to Greek historiography also to the beginnings of Roman historiography: ταλαίτις μὲν οὖν οὔτε συγγραφεῖς οὔτε λογογράφος ἑστὶ Ρωμαιόων οὐδὲ εἰς ἐν παλαίων μέντοι λέγον ἐν ἑλάξις δέλτοις σωζόµενον ἐκατοτός τι παραλαβόν ἀνέγραφον (AR 1,73, 1). It is Cicero who linked it up specifically with the *Annales Maximi*, finding his own parallel for ἐν τεροτεὶ γραµµατί 70. In the second place, the attitude of the scientist who

67 Correlate de Leg., 1, 2, 6; and this is the trend of his pronouncements on historians. Cf. Henze p. 39ff., and his summing up, p. 67: 'ut arte rhetorica optime institutus... imprimis de elocutione historicorum docte et subtiliter disputavit'. Nepos reflects the same approach when he described Cato as *sine doctrina*, a fragment, H.R.R. II, p. 40, reveals: *non ignorare deberis sumum hoc genus latinarum adhibe non medio non respondere Graeciae sed omnino rude auge inchoatum morte Ciceronis relicris*'.  
69 Cicero was not concerned with the genre of historiography as a whole, but only an aspect; Rambaud, p. 18, I feel reads too much in de Or. 2,63: 'N'en a-t-on pas le preuve dans le fait qu' Antoine, le porte-parole de Ciceron, avant d'exposer la théorie de l'histoire, en vient à déplorer que les professeurs n'enseignent pas les règles particulières de ce genre, en le distinguant des autres?'. See further Gelzer, Gnomon 24 (1954) 427; Avenarius p. 172.  
70 Cf. Gelzer, Hermes 1954, p. 53: 'Es leuchtet ein, dass dem Römer beim Vernehmen
in modern times looked upon the science of historiography as a discipline essentially based on documentary study of an earlier period, and who therefore believed that it must have been out of pre-existing documents and their collection that classical historiography developed; hence the disillusionment of Wilamowitz: 'Historische Kritik kann erst an der Geschichte der Vergangenheit geübt werden', and: 'Was wir historische Forschung und kritik nennen, kennt das Altertum nicht'.

dieser Lehre gleich die annales maximi einfielen, die sich ja als Sammlung ehrewürdiger Priesterkunden darstellen'.
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