



Project  
**MUSE**®

*Scholarly journals online*

# ENNIUS'S *FASTI* IN FULVIUS'S TEMPLE: GREEK RATIONALITY AND ROMAN TRADITION

JÖRG RÜPKE

## 1. ENNIUS AND FULVIUS: AN INTRODUCTION

Despite its title, this paper does not claim to have discovered a new Ennian text. The text that is the focus of my study, the *fasti* in the temple of Hercules Musarum, is unanimously attributed to M. Fulvius Nobilior, not to Q. Ennius. We do, however, know of a personal relationship between the poet and the Roman politician. In the opening of his *Tusculan Disputations*, Cicero quotes from a speech of Cato the Elder, who reproached M. Nobilior, consul in 189 B.C.E., for taking poets into the provinces, presumably because he objected to a poet celebrating the deeds of a general.

The poet in question, as Cicero does not fail to notice, was none other than Ennius, who accompanied Fulvius on his Aetolian campaign (*Tusc.* 1.3). The late republican grammarian L. Aelius Stilo interprets the famous “Good Companion” passage of the *Annales*<sup>1</sup> as a veiled portrait of Ennius and thus, implicitly, views the relationship between the patron and the poet in a more positive light.<sup>2</sup> These two testimonies demonstrate the spectrum of opinions among ancient writers on the practice of patronage and on the nature of the relationship between the patron and the poet. This issue is still a subject of debate today, and other contributors to the present

---

1 Ennius *Ann.* 268–86. For a discussion of this passage, see also the introduction to the present volume, pp. 402–04 above.

2 Gellius 12.4; Skutsch 1985.448 interprets the fragment as relating to Cn. Servilius in the Second Punic War.

volume engage more directly with it.<sup>3</sup> For the purpose of my study, it is sufficient to remember that Ennius certainly composed the *Ambracia*, a *fabula praetexta* that dealt with contemporary Roman history, and more specifically, with Fulvius's Aetolian campaign (*Scen.* 366–69 Vahlen). Further, he wrote the *Scipio*, which contained the following programmatic statement: “nam tibi moenimenta mei peperere labores,” “for my poetic labors created a monument for you,” which is nothing less than the textual equivalent of the statuary offered by the Roman people that “spoke of” Scipio’s deeds.<sup>4</sup>

But what was Ennius’s role in the making of the *fasti* in the temple Hercules Musarum? Although it is very significant that these *fasti* were explicitly offered by and publicly associated with Fulvius, I do not deny that I am going to suggest that Ennius was the “ghostwriter” of the *fasti*. Yet to prove individual authorship is beyond the scope of this paper, and perhaps altogether irrelevant. Rather, my aim is to contextualize historically and intellectually the undeniably authentic works of Ennius and reread them as testimony of a complex historical development. I hope to show that this contextualization can further our understanding of Ennius’s *Annales* in particular.

Fulvius’s *fasti* are associated with a dedication or rededication of a temple of Hercules. Controversial ancient testimonies and modern interpretations about the occasion that led to the (re)dedication of the temple can be summarized in the following hypothetical reconstruction of events.<sup>5</sup> When Fulvius returned to Rome with immense booty after the capture of the Aetolian town of Ambracia, he was severely criticized for his sacrilegious (even by Roman standards) plundering of the city’s temples (Livy 38.44). Like most Roman generals (see Orlin 1997), he organized splendid and highly innovative games (Livy 39.22.1–2). Further, he displayed a substantial part of his artistic booty, statuary in particular, in his own villas. To many of his fellow senators, this seemed excessive, and in a speech that goes under the significant title *Uti Praeda in Publicum Referatur*, “Booty Should be Made Public Property,” Cato showed his disapproval of Fulvius’s behavior.<sup>6</sup>

---

3 See, especially, Goldberg and Sciarrino in the present volume.

4 Quotation: Ennius *Operis inc. frag.* 7; cf. *Operis inc. frag.* 3–4 (= *varia* 1–2 Vahlen): “Quantam statuam statuet (faciet Vahlen) populus Romanus, / quantam columnam quae res tuas gestas loquatur.”

5 For a detailed discussion of the sources, see Rüpke 1995a.332–36, who follows Aberson 1994.211–16.

6 See Cato 72 Sblendorio Cugusi; cf. *ibid.* 103–06.

A decade passed, and only when Fulvius held the censorship together with his former enemy M. Aemilius Lepidus and was able to cooperate with him did he add a portico to an already existing temple of Hercules, probably the temple of Hercules Magnus Custos in the Campus Martius. In the portico, he dedicated the statues of the Muses that he had taken from Ambracia, and so Hercules became Hercules Musarum, Hercules, The Tutor of the Muses. The appellative was not new; Hercules Musagetes was known in Greece, but in the Roman setting, it gained a new meaning given the dominance now accorded to the Muses.<sup>7</sup> The temple itself was probably used as the meeting place of the *collegium scribarum histrionumque* that was said to have been meeting in the temple of Minerva in 200 B.C.E.,<sup>8</sup> a group that was obviously identical with what was later called the *collegium poetarum*, housed in the temple of Hercules.<sup>9</sup>

## 2. INSCRIPTION OR BOOK?

Thus far, I have neglected the most important detail of the decoration of the interior of the enlarged temple complex. A late, and yet very reliable, source, Macrobius, who writes at the beginning of the fifth century C.E., is the only author who mentions it. In his account of the names of the months, Macrobius notes that the interpretation of Maius is highly disputed. He introduces his discussion of the possible etymologies of the

---

7 The most explicit account of the events is given in the *panegyricus* of Eumenius in C.E. 297 (9.7.3): "Aedem Herculis Musarum in circo Flaminio Fulvius ille Nobilior ex pecunia censoria fecit, non id modo secutus quod ipse litteris et summi poetae amicitia duceretur, sed quod in Graecia cum esset imperator acceperat Heraclen Musagetem esse, id est comitem ducemque Musarum, idemque primus novem signa, hoc est omnium, Camenarum ex Ambraciensi oppido translata sub tutela fortissimi numinis consecravit, ut res est, quia mutuis opibus et praemiis iuvari ornarique deberent: Musarum quies defensione Herculis et virtus Herculis voce Musarum" ("The famous Fulvius Nobilior built a temple of Hercules of the Muses in the Circus Flaminius from the censors' funds, not only because he himself was induced by literature and his friendship with the foremost poet, but also because while a general in Greece he had learned that Heracles had been 'Musagetes,' that is, a companion to and leader of the Muses. And he was the first to consecrate nine statues of the Camenae, that is, of all of them, that he had transferred from the city of Ambracia under the tutelage of the strongest god because, as fits the matter, they ought to be supported and adorned by each other's resources and prizes: the leisure of the Muses by the defense of Hercules and the virtue of Hercules by the voice of the Muses").

8 Livy 31.12.10, Festus 446.26–48.4 Lindsay.

9 See, e.g., Val. Max. 3.7.11, Pliny *Nat.* 34.19. The existence of the college is disputed, see Horsfall 1976, Romano 1990. A good summary is given by Schmidt 1997.69.

name of the month with the following statement: “For Fulvius Nobilior says in his *fasti*, which he placed in the temple of Hercules Musarum . . .”<sup>10</sup> What type of *fasti* does he mean, “calendar” or “list of consuls”? Unfortunately, the verb used by Macrobius, *ponere*, does not help to clarify this question. That verb can be used to describe any type of material or object. So, what exactly does Macrobius describe as *fasti*?

Two possible interpretations have been proposed: Fulvius dedicated either a wall painting or a book. If the term *fasti* refers to a large calendar, it must indicate a wall painting; other objects and materials should be excluded. As far as we know, there is not one example of a bronze calendar at Rome, and, moreover, a large inscription would be expected to appear on the outside of a temple, not inside. Furthermore, a calendar has value primarily as a text, not as an object, unlike, for example, an armillary sphere; hence any precious material should probably be ruled out. In addition, painted calendars are the only type of calendar known from republican times down to later imperial times, from the republican *Fasti Antiates Maiores* to the Severan *Fasti Porticus*. The production of marble calendars is, by and large, unique to the Augustan and Tiberian age (see Rüpke 1995a).

The alternative idea that Fulvius’s *fasti* was published in the form of a book has found a number of supporters, including Ettore Pais and Walter Burkert.<sup>11</sup> Without any doubt, it is not only factual information that is quoted from Fulvius’s *fasti*; we also have citations in the form of commentary on the calendar. This fact, however, does not force us to imagine publication as a book. The inscribed steles of the Augustan *Fasti Praenestini*, composed by the grammarian Verrius Flaccus (admittedly an inscription without parallels), show clearly that a commentary could be integrated even within the text of the calendar. Further, the few book calendars that we have or are able to reconstruct in any meaningful way do not seem to support the hypothesis that Fulvius’s *fasti* was a book. Known book calendars do not contain commentaries; rather they collect different sorts of lists, usually chronologically arranged. A clear example is the codex calendar of 354;<sup>12</sup> the same arrangement is likely for the fifth-century collection of Polemius Silvius. Nor should we use Ovid’s work as a *comparandum*.

---

10 Macrobius *Sat.* 1.12.16: “Nam Fulvius Nobilior in fastis, quos in aede Herculis Musarum posuit . . .”

11 See Pais 1909.208, Frazer 1929.4.346, Boyancé 1955a.174 and, following him, Burkert 1961.241.

12 See Salzman 1990 for the reconstruction of the original form.

Ovid's poem does not belong to the genre of *fasti*. His *Libri Fastorum* is a commentary on the calendar. The title is but the equivalent of *de Fastis* (Rüpke 1994). Since it is highly unlikely that Fulvius dedicated a "pocket calendar," we must infer that, if his *fasti* was indeed a book, it must have been a lengthy text. Macrobius would, therefore, not have referred to it with the simple term *fasti*; he would have used a phrase like "*librum, quem de fastis scripserat*."

These reflections are supported by biographical evidence and aesthetic issues. First, as far as we know, Fulvius's only work was the *fasti*. He wrote nothing else. Second, a wall painting, perhaps displayed together with paintings that were part of the booty of the Aetolian campaign, would have had a much stronger visual impact than a book.<sup>13</sup> Further, it should be stressed that there is no evidence that this meeting place of poets reflected the Alexandrian idea of combining a *musaion* with a library.<sup>14</sup>

In his passage that supplies us with the only evidence about the decoration of the Roman *musaion*, Macrobius does not mention Fulvius's *fasti* in relation to the typical information one would find in a calendar. Above all else, Macrobius is interested in the etymology of the names of the months, and it is in connection with this that he cites Fulvius. Etymology, however, is not discussed in any other *fasti*, again with the exception of the *Fasti Praenestini*, where we find such explanations at the heads of the monthly columns. Hence many scholars believe that Fulvius's calendar was parallel in form with Verrius's.<sup>15</sup> Alternatively, we could think of a separate book *de Fastis* that would have accompanied the dedication of the painting and supplied the quotations used by later antiquarians.<sup>16</sup> To solve the problem of the form of Fulvius's *fasti* and of its significance, we must turn to the few remaining quotations from the text, delving also into the problems of the transmission of antiquarian information connected with these quotations.

13 Degrassi 1963.xx also suggests a painting.

14 Stressed by Rawson 1989.442.

15 E.g., Münzer 1910.267, Boyancé 1955a.174 n. 1, Degrassi 1963.xxiv. See Michels 1967.125 n. 18: "I like to think that he inspired Verrius Flaccus with the idea for *Fasti Praen[estini]*."

16 Michels 1967.125 n. 18 thinks of a secondary wall edition of an original book.

**3. VARRO DE LINQUA LATINA 6.33–34**  
**(M. FULVIUS NOBILIOR FRAG. 1–2 FUNAIOLI =**  
**M. IUNIUS GRACCHANUS FRAG. 5–6 FUNAIOLI)**

Mensium nomina fere sunt aperta, si a Martio, ut antiqui constituerunt, numeres: nam primus a Marte. secundus, ut Fulvius scribit et Iunius, a Venere, quod ea sit Aphrodite; cuius nomen ego antiquis litteris quod nusquam inveni, magis puto dictum, quod ver omnia aperit, Aprilem. tertius a maioribus Maius, quartus a iunioribus dictus Iunius. (34) dehinc quintus Quintilis et sic deinceps usque ad Decembrem a numero. ad hos qui additi, prior a principe deo Ianuarius appellatus; posterior, ut idem dicunt scriptores, ab diis inferis Februarius appellatus, quod tum his paren<te>tur; ego magis arbitror Februarium a die februato, quod tum februatur populus, id est lupercis nudis lustratur antiquum oppidum Palatinum gregibus humanis cinctum.

The names of the months are in general obvious, if you count from March, as the ancients arranged them; for the first month is from Mars. The second as Fulvius writes and Iunius also, is from Venus, because she is Aphrodite; but I have nowhere found her name in the old writings about the month, and so think that it was called April rather because spring “opens” everything. The third was called “May” from the “elders,” the fourth “June” from the “younger men.” (34) Then the fifth is called “Quintilis” and so in succession to “December,” named from the numeral. Of those which were added to these, the prior was called “January” from the god who is first in order [Ianus]; the latter, as the same writers say, was called “February” from the “gods of the lower world,” because at that time expiatory sacrifices are made to them; but I think that it was called February rather from the “Purification Day,” because then the people “are purified,” that is, the old Palatine town girt with flocks of people is passed around by the naked Luperci. (trans. following Kent 1958)

Two observations regarding this passage need stating. First, in his very brief description, Varro<sup>17</sup> does not name any authority when he regards an etymology as uncontested. Other interpretations are given only when they either diverge from his own or when Varro refrains from taking a position. This is clearly visible for February and April, and Varro's treatment of May and June confirms the pattern. We know from Censorinus (see the following section for a discussion of the text) that the etymology of the names of these last two months was highly contested and that Varro argued for an etymology different from the one given above by Fulvius and Iunius. In this instance as well, the naming of these authors implies Varro's disagreement. It is likely that these same authors, M. Fulvius Nobilior and M. Iunius Gracchanus, proposed etymologies for the other months, too, but when Varro agrees with them, he does not cite them.<sup>18</sup>

The second point concerns the relationship between Fulvius and Iunius. Fulvius is quoted only together with Iunius, and he is named first. Both (*idem scriptores*) are again named at the end of the passage. This need not imply that Varro consulted Fulvius at first hand. Iunius is quoted in other passages too (5.42, 48, 55; 6.95). It is simpler to assume that Varro consulted only Iunius Gracchanus's treatise (*de Potestatibus*?), and Iunius, in turn, quoted Fulvius for his etymologies. Certainly, Iunius quoted Fulvius for the etymology *Aprilis a Venere* and *Februarius a diis inferis*, and likely for the other months as well.<sup>19</sup>

#### 4. CENSORINUS *DE DIE NATALI* 22.9–13 (M. FULVIUS NOBILIOR FRAG. 1 FUNAIOLI = M. IUNIUS GRACCHANUS FRAG. 5 FUNAIOLI)

Nomina decem mensibus antiquis Romulum fecisse  
Fulvius et Iunius auctores sunt. et quidem duos primos  
a parentibus suis nominasse, Martium a Marte patre,  
Aprilem ab Aphrodite id est Venere, unde Maiores eius  
oriundi dicebantur; proximos duos a populo: Maium a  
maioribus natu, Iunium a iunioribus; ceteros ab ordine  
quo singuli erant: Quintilem usque Decembrem per inde

---

17 Followed by Suetonius: Isidore *Nat.* 4 (= Suet. *fragmenta* pp. 163.4–65.6 Reifferscheid).

18 Cf. the discussion by Mercklin 1841.32–41.

19 For the identification of the work, see Mercklin 1840.43f.



a numero. (10) Varro autem Romanos a Latinis nomina mensum accepisse arbitratus auctores eorum antiquiores quam urbem fuisse satis argute docet. (11) itaque Martium mensem a Marte quidem nominatum credit, non quia Romuli fuerit pater, sed quod gens Latina bellicosa; Aprilem autem non ab Aphrodite, sed ab aperiendo, quod tunc ferme cuncta gignantur et nascendi claustra aperiatur natura; (12) Maium vero non a maioribus, sed a Maia nomen accepisse, quod eo mense tam Romae quam antea in Latio res divina Maiae fit; Iunium quoque a Iunone potius quam iunioribus, quod illo mense maxime Iunoni honores habentur. (13) . . . ceterum Ianuarius et Februarius postea quidem additos, sed nominibus iam ex Latio sumptis: et Ianuarius ab Iano, cui adtributus est, nomen traxisse, Februarium a februo.

Fulvius and Iunius state that Romulus gave the names to the ten old(er) months. And, in fact, he had named the first two from his parents, March from his father Mars, April from Aphrodite, that is Venus, from whom his forefathers were said to stem. The following two from the people: May from the “older ones,” June from the “younger ones”; the others from their sequence: hence Quintilis through December derive their names from their number. (10) Varro, however, believed that the Romans derived the names of the months from the Latins and cleverly argued that their inventors had been older than the city. (11) Therefore, he believed that March had, indeed, been named from Mars, not because Mars was the father of Romulus, but because the Latin people were warlike; April, however, not from Aphrodite, but from “opening,” because, in that period, everything grows and nature opens the doors of birth. (12) May did not derive its name from the “older ones,” but from Maia, because during this month in Rome, as earlier in Latium, a sacrifice was performed for Maia. June, too, from Juno rather than from the “younger ones,” because important honors were given to Juno in that month. (13) . . . for the rest, January and February certainly were added later, but also

their names were taken from Latium, and January derived from Ianus, to whom the month is consecrated, February from a purification rite.<sup>20</sup>

This long quotation is necessary to clarify some of my previous remarks. It is obvious that Censorinus cannot have used Varro's *de Lingua Latina* as his source. Here Fulvius and Iunius are named as sources for the etymology of all ten months from March to December, and Varro's own interpretations for the month of May and June are given in greater detail than in his own *On the Latin Language*. Censorinus's mention of Fulvius and Iunius is also noteworthy in two respects. First, as in Varro's *de Lingua Latina*, both authors are named together and no distinction can be seen in their positions. Second, their etymologies are reported only briefly. For example, for the month of February, only Varro's interpretation is given in detail (Censorinus *de Die Natali* 22.14–15). Fulvius and Iunius serve only as the background (*auctores sunt*) for the detailed account of the Varronian solutions (*Varro autem . . .*) with which Censorinus seems to be in agreement.

Combining these observations with the preceding discussion, we may arrive at the following conclusions: Censorinus's source for his detailed explanation of the names of the months was Varro's *Antiquitates*. It is unlikely that Censorinus used Fulvius or Iunius at first hand. As for Censorinus's source, Varro in his *Antiquitates Rerum Humanarum et Divinarum* probably quoted Fulvius only indirectly, via Iunius. We may further note that, in contrast to *de Lingua Latina*, Varro's discussion of the etymology of the names of the months in the *Antiquitates* did not serve a purely linguistic purpose; rather it was part of a reconstruction of the origins and history of the Roman calendar. A similar approach can be found in Ovid (*Fasti* 3.1–166, esp. 151–56).

**5. CENSORINUS DE DIE NATALI 20.2–4**  
**(M. FULVIUS NOBILIOR FRAG. 2 FUNAIOLI =**  
**M. IUNIUS GRACCHANUS FRAG. 6 FUNAIOLI)**

Annum vertentem Romae Licinius quidem Macer et  
postea Fenestella statim ab initio duodecim mensum fuisse

---

20 All the translations that follow are my own.

scripserunt. sed magis Iunio Gracchano et Fulvio et Varro et Suetonio aliisque credendum, qui decem mensum putarunt fuisse, ut tunc Albanis erat, unde orti Romani. (3) . . . (4) postea sive a Numa, ut ait Fulvius, sive, ut Iunius, a Tarquinio duodecim facti sunt menses et dies CCCLV, quamvis luna duodecim suis mensibus CCCLIII dies videbatur explere.

Licinius Macer and later Fenestella wrote that, at Rome, the passing year had twelve months from the very beginning. But we should believe Iunius Gracchanus, Fulvius, Varro, Suetonius, and others, who thought that it was a calendar of ten months, as was that of the people of Alba at that time, from whom the Romans descended . . . (4) Later, it was made twelve months and 355 days either by Numa, as Fulvius maintains, or by Tarquinius, as Iunius believed, although the twelve months of the moon seemed to comprise only 354 days.

Here, for the first time, a discrepancy between Fulvius and Iunius emerges. Both authors are again quoted together, but Censorinus reports that while they agree that originally the Roman year was divided into ten months, Fulvius and Iunius part company when it comes to the question of who first turned to a twelve-month calendar. According to Fulvius, it was Numa; for Iunius, it was Tarquinius. Apart from this difference, however, both Fulvius and Iunius associate the etymological explanation of the names of the months with the genesis of the Roman calendar. A similar connection was seen in the previous passage. Varro is named immediately after these older authors, and this fact suggests that Varro's *Antiquitates* was Censorinus's direct source. Since it is likely that Varro used only Iunius as his source, we should conclude that the information about Fulvius's attribution of the change to the twelve-month calendar to Numa derives from Iunius. Thus we can infer that Iunius quoted Fulvius even when he did not agree with him. All the more, we may believe that he reported Fulvius's ideas, and he reported them correctly, when he was in agreement with him. Hence Iunius's text, which was used by Varro, proves to be a rather reliable source.

**6. MACROBIUS SATURNALIA 1.12.16–18**  
**(M. FULVIUS NOBILIOR FRAG. 1 FUNAIOLI =**  
**M. IUNIUS GRACCHANUS FRAG. 5 FUNAIOLI)**

Maium Romulus tertium posuit, de cuius nomine inter auctores lata dissensio est. nam Fulvius Nobilior in fastis, quos in aede Herculis Musarum posuit, Romulum dicit postquam populum in Maiores iunioresque divisit, ut altera pars consilio altera armis rem publicam tueretur, in honorem utriusque partis hunc Maium, sequentem Iunium mensem vocasse. (17) sunt qui hunc mensem ad nostros fastos a Tusculanis transisse commemorent . . . (18) Cingius mensem nominatum putat a Maia.

Romulus put May in third place. Authorities disagree widely about its name. Fulvius Nobilior, in the calendar that he placed in the temple of Hercules of the Muses, states that Romulus, after he divided his people into older and younger, so that the former would defend the state by their counsel, the latter by force of arms, named the one month May and the following one June in their honor. (17) Some relate that this month was introduced into our calendar from the Tuscans . . . (18) Cingius believes that the month is named from Maia.

The passage quoted above is only a small part of the extended discussion of the names of the months found in the *Saturnalia*. Regarding Romulus's ten-month calendar, Macrobius fills nearly seven printed pages in the Teubner edition, thus providing a rough idea of how much more detailed Varro's treatment of the Roman calendar in the now lost *Antiquitates* was as compared to Varro's own abridged version in *de Lingua Latina* or to Censorinus's summary in *de Die Natali*. Macrobius's passage, however, once again brings to the forefront the issue of sources.

In contrast with the previously discussed texts, Macrobius provides more information about his sources. This conforms to his usual practice. Very often (if not always), Macrobius cites the titles of the books he refers to. A quotation from the late republican antiquarian Cincius, which precedes the passage above, is introduced by the following statement: "Cingius in eo libro quem de fastis reliquit" ("Cingius in that book that he wrote on

the calendar,” Macrobius *Sat.* 1.12.12). We need not assume, however, that Macrobius read all the books he cites. The contrary is probably true: he used many of them only indirectly and cites them, for instance, from quotations by earlier *Buntschriftsteller*, like Gellius. These intermediate sources, however, are never named. Likely Macrobius wanted to give the impression that he had directly consulted the texts he cites. Nevertheless, the breadth of Macrobius’s reading remains impressive.<sup>21</sup> With this in mind, let us return to the passage at hand. Macrobius’s remark about Fulvius’s *fasti* makes it clear that this work could have been consulted only in the temple of Hercules Musarum (“nam Fulvius Nobilior in fastis, quos in aede Herculis Musarum posuit”). Hence we can reasonably rule out the possibility that the *fasti* was a book that could be consulted elsewhere. This is, at least, what the sources used by Macrobius seem to imply, since we can safely rule out any Macrobian autopsy, 700 years after the original publication.

But what was the original source for this information and how was it transmitted? There is no explicit evidence. This more detailed description of the *fasti* finds no parallel in our other sources, but the attempt to connect the etymology of the names of the months to historical events—a feature that seems to distinguish Fulvius’s *fasti*—appears here as well. Actually, the relationship between etymology and the history of the calendar is here made even more explicit.

Ancient authorities agreed on the etymology of the numeral months and of the month of March. On the names of April, May, June, and February, however, there was disagreement, and for all of these months, as we have seen above, Varro offered an original interpretation. Since Varro’s *Antiquitates Rerum Humanarum et Divinarum* was key to the transmission of Fulvius’s text, it would be valuable to isolate Varronian material in the Macrobian presentation, material put into the mouth of the speaker Praetextatus.

Unfortunately, the overall agreement regarding the etymology of the month of February, said to be created by Numa, does not help us sepa-

---

21 For the discussion of the sources, see Türk 1962, 1968, who later rethought some of his earlier conclusions: Türk 1970.576 n. 4. For Macrobius’s presentation of the material, cf. Türk 1963.339. The sources of Macrobius’s account of the Roman calendar have been analyzed by Mastandrea 1979.15–19 (with bibliography at 16 n. 12). He underscores Cornelius Labeo’s key role as an intermediary source for Macrobius and Johannes Lydus (58–65). For a different view, see Reifferscheid 1860 and Wissowa 1880, who believe Suetonius to be the main source. Mastandrea’s convincing reconstruction, however, does not address the issue of the additional sources used directly by Macrobius.

rate and identify different traditions (Macrobius *Sat.* 1.13.1–5). An analysis of the spring months proves to be more rewarding. Praetextatus does not question the tradition that ascribes the ten-month year to Romulus and the twelve-month calendar, with the addition of January and February, to Numa. Accordingly, he credits Romulus with the name of the month of April.<sup>22</sup> Yet he does offer multiple theories regarding its etymology. First, he reports a tradition, with its different variants, that connects April to Venus (no specific author is connected with such an interpretation: Macrobius *Sat.* 1.12.8–11). Next, Praetextatus gives an account of Cincius's etymology, who criticizes the Venus connection by pointing out the lack of important sacrifices to Venus during the month of April, and, alternatively, views April as a derivative from *aperire*, “to open,” just like Varro: “Cingio etiam Varro consentit, adfirmans . . .” “Varro agrees with Cincius, asserting that . . .”<sup>23</sup> At the end of this passage, just before the passage quoted above, Verrius Flaccus is quoted for a point of detail. The structure of the passage and the manner of its quotation of sources suggest that Macrobius first presents the *communis opinio* and only uses Verrius Flaccus and Varro for their contrary interpretative positions. Perhaps Varro is used via Verrius, even though Macrobius did use him directly elsewhere, in particular for the history of the calendar. It is possible, therefore, that it was Verrius himself who actually reported that Varro and his younger contemporary Cincius were in agreement on the etymology of the name of the month of April.<sup>24</sup>

---

22 Macrobius *Sat.* 1.12.8: *Secundum mensem nominavit Aprilem.*

23 Macrobius *Sat.* 1.12.13. Cincius in §12. According to the *Fasti Praenestini*, Verrius Flaccus preferred the derivation from Venus (Aphrodite); *aperiri* is only a second possibility (*Inscr. It.* 13.2.127): “[Alīi ab ape]ri[ri] q[uod]am i[n] m[en]se, quia fruges, flores animaliaque ac maria et terrae aperiuntur” (“others from opening in a certain month, because crops, flowers, and animals and sea and lands open”).

24 Given the frequent exchange of *C* and *G* in the majuscular tradition, the Cingius of the Macrobius manuscript should be identified with the late republican antiquarian Cincius. The content of Macrobius's quotations agrees with the other fragments attributed to Cincius (*GRF* pp. 371–82 Funaioli). Varro never quotes Cincius, and we have no evidence that Cincius quoted Varro. Verrius Flaccus most likely used Cincius for his quotations of Aelius Stilo, Varro's teacher. See especially Festus 439.18–22 Lindsay and 166.11–17 Lindsay. Verrius's interest in comparing Varro's and Cincius's positions is suggested by *consentit* in the passage quoted above and *idem fere sentiunt* in Festus 454.1–7 Lindsay, in which we find a reference to Cincius (and Sennius Capito) after a quotation of Varro. For a different view, see Mastandrea 1979.202, who attributes this comparison to Cornelius Labeo in the 3rd cent. [ibid. 193].

Verrius Flaccus followed Varro for the month of June. See Paulus Festus 92.6–7 Lindsay: “Iunium mensem dictum putant a Iunone. idem ipsum dicebant Iunonium et Iuno-

Next the discussion turns to May and the various etymologies that connect the name of the month to deities who are venerated in that month. The length of the passage shows the importance given to this kind of discussion in antiquarian literature. Again, the passage reveals Macrobius's typical organization of the material. Priority is given to Fulvius, who gives the most coherent historical interpretation. Next we are introduced to the remaining variants. Some (*sunt qui*) believe the name May to be imported from Tusculum, where Maius was the equivalent of Latin Jupiter. Cincius believes that the name was from Maia. Both interpretations seem to derive from Varro, for they agree with what Censorinus states about Varro's interpretation of the etymology of May. There follows the annalist Calpurnius Piso (and his explanation), who, we might add, was frequently used by Varro as a source. With the name of Cornelius Labeo we come to sources who belong to a different time frame and who dominate the rest of the discussion on May.<sup>25</sup> The coherence of the presentation, which interweaves different sources, can, and probably should, be explained most easily by assuming that Macrobius used Verrius Flaccus as his direct source.<sup>26</sup>

The presentation of the month of June shows a similar pattern. Macrobius begins his discussion by presenting the Fulvian account. Unlike the month of May, where contrasting etymologies are accounted for in lengthy detail, here the etymology that connects June to Juno is only briefly summarized. The name Cingius appears again and is directly related to an etymology that derives the name of the month from the Latins, while the reference to Prae-

---

nalem" ("They believe that the month June is named from Juno. These people call the same month Junonius or Junonialis"). The extensive account of Oscan-Latin parallels for the name of May (Festus 120.6–12 Lindsay, the following entry about Oscan *Maesius* in Paulus Festus 121.4–5 Lindsay) points in the same direction. A secure dating for Cincius, however, is possible only on the basis of his quotation of the formula to declare war on Cleopatra in quasi-fetial forms in 32 B.C.E. (Rüpke 1990.105), recorded by Cincius in modified form in his *de Re Militari* (Gellius 16.4.1). Probably both authors did not mention each other on purpose. The disagreement in their positions might be indicated by the presence of *ego* used twice by Varro to introduce his position in *LL* 6.33–34. In the surviving portion of Varro's work, the use of the first-person pronoun to introduce a personal opinion is found in the context of two other etymologies only (5.43: *Aventinus*, 5.83: *pontifex*).

25 Macrobius *Sat.* 1.12.20. The change of sources described above is in respect to the sources named in §§17–19. The extent of the usage of Labeo could be reconstructed by comparison with Lydus's *de Mensibus*, which frequently cites Labeo as a source (Mastandrea 1979.43–65).

26 Ovid, who is aware of the "constitutional" interpretation of May and June (*Fasti* 5.57–78), could have used Varro's *Antiquitates* directly or via Verrius Flaccus, but other contemporary sources cannot be excluded for such a popular tradition.

neste could go back to Verrius Flaccus. Next follows a statement claiming that the *mensis Iunius* was earlier and more correctly called *Iunonius* (Macrobius here claims to be quoting from a commentary on the calendar by Nisus, written in the second half of the first century C.E.), and this statement, too, points to Verrius, because this is the interpretation that is dominant in the epitome of Festus.<sup>27</sup> After this brief summary of the different etymological variants, Macrobius offers what is most relevant for him, that is, the more historically oriented interpretation. He argues for the derivation of the name from Iunius Brutus because, in that month, Brutus expelled Tarquinius from Rome and made a *votum* to the goddess Carna (Macrobius *Sat.* 1.12.31–33).

To sum up: references to Fulvius in Macrobius must, in all likelihood, be traced back to Verrius Flaccus or to Varro. Since Varro was Verrius Flaccus's main source, we might assume that Varro is also the source for Verrius's information on Fulvius's *fasti*. As far as the content of the Fulvian *fasti* is concerned, we see that there is an attempt to integrate Romulus's invention of the calendar and his naming of the months with his political and military activities in his role as founder. The Macrobian passage might come close to being an actual quotation of the *fasti* of Fulvius.

## 7. MACROBIUS SATURNALIA 1.13.20–21

Quando autem primum intercalatum sit varie refertur. et  
Macer quidem Licinius eius rei originem Romulo adsignat.  
Antias libro secundo Numam Pompilium sacrorum causa id  
invenisse contendit. Iunius Servium Tullium regem primum

---

27 Paulus Festus 92.6–7 Lindsay, Macrobius *Sat.* 1.12.30: “Iunius Maium sequitur, aut ex parte populi, ut supra diximus, nominatus, aut ut Cingius arbitrat quod Iunonius apud Latinos ante vocitatus, diuque apud Aricinos Praenestinosque hac appellatione in fastos relatus sit adeo ut, sicut Nisus in commentariis fastorum dicit, apud Maiores quoque nostros haec appellatio mensis diu manserit, sed post detritis quibusdam litteris ex Iunonio Iunius dictus sit. nam et aedes Iunoni Monetae kalend. Iuniis dedicata est” (“June follows May, and it is either called after a part of the people [the younger], as we said above, or, as Cingius believed, because it used to be called ‘month of June’ [Iunonius] by the Latins in earlier times and, for a long time, it was recorded in the calendar by that name by the peoples of Aricia and Praeneste, so that, as Nisus in his commentary on the calendar says, even among our ancestors, this name of the month persisted for a long time and only later, after the loss of some letters, was Junonius pronounced as Junius. For even the temple of Juno Moneta is dedicated on the Kalends of June”).

Verrius also points to Latin names of the months in the fragments of the *Fasti Praenestini*, e.g., in the explanations for January and March (*Inscr. It.* 13.2.111–21). For January, cf. Paulus Festus 93.4 Lindsay (*ianual*).



intercalasse commemorat, a quo et nundinas institutas Varroni placet. (21) Tuditanus refert libro tertio Magistratuum decem viros, qui decem tabulis duas addiderunt, de intercalando populum rogasse. Cassius eosdem scribit auctores. Fulvius autem id egisse M'. Acilium consulem dicit ab urbe condita anno quingentesimo sexagesimo secundo, inito mox bello Aetolico. sed hoc arguit Varro scribendo antiquissimam legem fuisse incisam in columna aerea a L. Pinario et Furio consulibus, cui mensis intercalaris adscribitur.

There are different opinions about the date of the first intercalation. Licinius Macer, in fact, assigns the origin of this practice to Romulus. In his second book, Antias asserts that Numa Pompilius devised it for the sake of the religious rites. Iunius states that intercalation was first introduced by King Servius Tullius, who also established the market days, according to Varro. (21) In the third book of "The Magistrates," Tuditanus reports that the *decemviri*, who had added two tables to the Ten Tables, had proposed a law about intercalation to the people. Cassius also names the *decemviri* as the authors in his writings. Fulvius, however, states that it had been done by the consul Manius Acilius in the year 562 after the foundation of the city, shortly before the outbreak of the Aetolian War. But Varro argues against this and writes that there was a very old law inscribed on a bronze column by the consuls L. Pinarius and Furius, whose date was an intercalary month.

It is relatively easy to identify the source for this passage. All the authors named here wrote before the time of Varro, and Varro himself is quoted twice. In the first instance, he is mentioned for his support of the attribution of the introduction of *nundinae* to Servius. In the second, he is presented as the proponent of a counter argument, specifically, an alternative date for the introduction of the intercalary month. It is, therefore, apparent that Macrobius repeats a line of argument that he found in Varro.<sup>28</sup> Macro-

---

28 Varro's usage of the older annalists can be verified through the transmission of Cassius Hemina, who is nearly always quoted through Varro (Albrecht 1992.304).

bis is satisfied to quote from his source and does not attempt to solve the incongruities he found in it. For example, how could Romulus invent intercalation, if the year of twelve months was introduced by Numa? Nor does Macrobius attempt to clarify his source. From what we can tell from the text and from what we know of Varro's manner of reporting data, Fulvius spoke not of the first intercalary law, but merely of a certain intercalary law. This is a new piece of information about Fulvius's text. We will discuss its significance shortly. Here we may just point out that Iunius Gracchanus is named in the same context, and he was probably Varro's source for the Fulvian text, as our earlier findings seem to support. We may go even further. It is probable that Macrobius's first mention of Fulvius, which we ascribed to Varro, was ultimately derived from Gracchanus.

We see how the Gracchanian-Varronian transmission offers an important contribution to the reconstruction of Fulvius's text. It underlines the historicizing approach towards the calendar that we have already noticed in regard to Fulvius's account of Romulus's contribution to the Roman calendar, when Fulvius attempted to explain the etymology of May and June within a political frame, a type of analysis usually rejected by antiquarians. In this passage, we see how this historicizing approach continues to Fulvius's own times, as the calendar is presented as an object of *leges* and of political decisions. The mention of the law on the intercalary month marks the personal connection between Fulvius and Acilius and, once again, associates changes to the calendar with political and historical events. In this instance, the event with which Acilius's intercalary law is associated is the Aetolian war, which also happens to be the event the Fulvian *fasti* itself points towards from its position in the middle of a temple filled with booty taken during the same war.

## 8. LYDUS *DE OSTENTIS* 16A, P. 47 WACHSMUTH

ταῦτα μὲν οὖν <Φούλβιος> φ[ησιν, ἐκ τῶν τοῦ <Νουμά> ἱστορήσας, "Fulvius says these things reporting them from the writings of Numa." It is not necessary to quote the words of Numa, attributed to Fulvius, in full. There is no doubt that this Fulvius is our M. Fulvius Nobilior. Likewise, we can be sure that the inserted quotation of Numa is apocryphal,<sup>29</sup> and the attribution to Fulvius must be regarded as pseudoepigraphical. The

---

29 For the image of Numa in the time of Cicero and Augustus, see Gabba 1984.85, Buchheit 1993; for late antiquity, see Cancik 1977.8–10, Brandt 1988, Fugmann 1990.153–75.

explanations for divination based on astronomy and natural philosophy offered by Johannes Lydus are not part of calendar treatises.<sup>30</sup> On its own, the Pythagorizing exposition in the manner of Plato's *Timaeus* is not necessarily anachronistic for the beginning of the second century B.C.E.,<sup>31</sup> but such reflections are entirely improbable for a Roman author who wrote 100 years before Cicero and who witnessed the first attempts at Latin philosophical prose by Ennius.

It was easy, however, to associate Fulvius with apocryphal writings of Numa; after all, Fulvius was known as a philhellene and alive when Numa's literary works were discovered in 181 B.C.E.<sup>32</sup> Thus he could safely be seen as a person who could transmit at least some words from Numa's books, which had been denounced as "philosophy" and quickly burned.<sup>33</sup> While historically implausible,<sup>34</sup> the connection would have its attractiveness from a later perspective.

This sixth "fragment" thus does not contribute to the reconstruction of Fulvius's *fasti*, but it is very informative about the image of Fulvius in imperial times. Fulvius, whose relationship with Ennius is mentioned in a letter of Symmachus at the end of the fourth century (*Epist.* 1.20.2), was seen as a transmitter of philosophical and historical knowledge on a large scale.<sup>35</sup>

30 As maintained by Burkert 1961.241f., who cites Ovid *Fasti* 1.1–2: "Tempora cum causis Latium digesta per annum / lapsaque sub terras ortaque signa canam" ("I will sing the times spread throughout the Latin year with their *aitia* / and the signs that fall below the horizon and rise"). Burkert does not realize that this twofold formula aims at preparing the reader of his *libri fastorum* for what could not be expected, the risings and settings of the stars. These are also introduced by a sort of inner proem (1.295–96). Rosen 1985.86 wishes to ascribe the quotation of Numa to Fulvius's calendar. This hypothesis should be rejected together with the idea of a Fulvian calendar book.

31 Thus Boyancé 1955a.185–92 and 175–77, vaguely followed by Burkert 1961.242.

32 Livy 40.29.3–14; Val. Max. 1.1.12; Pliny *Nat.* 13.84–87, naming earlier authors; Plut. *Numa* 22.2–8; Lactantius *Inst.* 1.22.5 and 6–8.

33 Rosen 1985.79–81. Given the politico-religious discussions of the time, the books would have revamped the legend of Numa and Egeria and refueled discussion about the divine status of individual politicians (82–84). For the history of the tradition, see now Rosenberger 2003.

34 See Burkert 1961.243 against Boyancé and others.

35 See also Pliny *dub. serm.* (Charisius *GL* 1.138 Keil).

## 9. A COMMENTARY?

We are now ready to draw some final conclusions. Fulvius's *fasti* entered the antiquarian tradition only through the work of M. Iunius Gracchanus, who most likely wrote at the end of the second century B.C.E. In turn, Gracchanus was the source for Varro's *Antiquitates Rerum Humanarum et Divinarum* (general information on the calendar would have been part of the *res humanae*), and it was from here that all knowledge of Fulvius's *fasti* flowed into other antiquarian texts. Varro's treatment of the Roman calendar in *de Lingua Latina* is but a brief excerpt of his extensive treatment in the *Antiquitates*. My interpretation of Macrobius has already led to the conclusion that the Fulvian *fasti* must have been a wall painting rather than a commentary in the form of a book. Further, analysis of the fragments forces us to modify the *communis opinio*.<sup>36</sup> There is no trace of a proper commentary. The focus of the Fulvian *fasti* was not to comment on the etymology of the months, an important topic of later commentaries (Mastandrea 1979.20f.), but to give a short history of the Roman calendar that takes the names of the months as indicators of its developmental stages.

All the information attributed to Fulvius's *fasti* could be contained in a heading of a few lines similar to ones we find elsewhere.<sup>37</sup> The following text does not pretend to be a faithful reconstruction of the original, but a plausible one:

Bello Aetolico confecto fastos posuit M. Fulvius Nobilior  
cos. cens.

Romulus X menses appellavit: primos in honorem patris  
proaviaeque; postquam populum in Maiores iunioresque  
diviserat, ut altera pars consilio altera armis rem publicam  
tueretur, tertium et quartum in honorem utriusque partis;  
ceteros a numeris. Numa II additos a Iano et dis inferis.  
mensis XIII lege Acilii cos. anni DLXII interkalatur.

36 The severely limited content of the authentic fragments prevents us from following the suggestion made by Scholz 1990.261, who attributes to Fulvius the report of the existence of calendar years of four and six months (of the Arcadians and the Acarnanians respectively: Plut. *Numa* 18.6, Censorinus *de Die Natali* 19.7, Macrobius *Sat.* 1.12.2). Collections of ethnographical oddities like this are common in Greek writings and usually do not rely on autopsy.

37 Headings of more than one line are preserved for the *Fasti Foronovani* (3 lines) and *Fasti Maffeiiani* (5 lines); such a heading is highly probable for the *fasti* of the *vicomagistri*.

The consul and censor M. Fulvius Nobilior set up this calendar after the conclusion of the Aeolian War:

Romulus gave names to the ten months, the first and the second he named in honor of his father and his ancestress; after he divided his people into older and younger so that one group would defend the state with their counsel, the other by force of arms, he named the third and fourth months in their honor; the rest of the months were named from their number. Numa gave names to the two months he added from Ianus and the gods of the netherworld respectively. A thirteenth month was intercalated according to a law of the consul Acilius in the year 562.

Such a text cannot be called a commentary; it is a dedication.<sup>38</sup> It is, however, not a dedication that is associated with a specifically religious monument, but with a monument that commemorates history.

## 10. AN ENNIAN HISTORY

Finally, we turn to Ennius. Ingo Gildenhard argues for parallels between the temple project as a whole and Ennius's epic.<sup>39</sup> This connection is strengthened by my findings. The history contained in Fulvius's "headlines" bears a vague resemblance to Ennius's *Annales*. In Ennius's Trojan-Latin prehistory of the Romans, Venus is acknowledged as the "mother" of Romulus via Aeneas.<sup>40</sup> Fulvius's Romulus names the month of April after her, his ancestress. In general, Fulvius's Romulus links the names of the months to genealogy and to politics; similarly, Ennius's Romulus gives names that echo the genealogy of the city of Rome itself and the city's political and social units (i.e., the tribes).<sup>41</sup> Numa's contributions to the calendar, disputed in the historical or antiquarian discussions of the second century B.C.E.,<sup>42</sup> are not reflected in the preserved fragments of Ennius, whereas Fulvius credited

---

38 For the dedication of calendar-like objects in Greece, see Jacoby 1904.550.

39 Gildenhard 2003; see also the introduction in the present volume (especially pp. 408–10).

40 Ennius *Ann.* 58: "precior, Venus, te genetrix patris nostri."

41 Ennius *Ann.* 77, *Ann. test.* lix Skutsch = Varro *LL* 5.55; see Skutsch 1985.252.

42 See Macrobius *Sat.* 1.13.20, Censorinus *de Die Natali* 20.4.

Numa with the introduction of January and February. Ennius does, however, give a detailed account of Numa as the organizer of Roman cults and religion.<sup>43</sup> Fulvius's commemoration of the contemporary *lex Acilia* attests to an attempt at covering contemporary history, which should be compared to the way in which Ennius attempted to extend his epic's temporal frame to reach the always new threshold of the present by adding new books to its end. Furthermore, for Ennius, interest in the calendar itself is explicitly attested. His dating of a solar eclipse to the Nones of June in 400 B.C.E. is the earliest testimony for the elimination of lunar months at Rome (if the date is correct; *Ann.* 153). Further, an unplaced fragment assigned 366 days to the year.<sup>44</sup>

Fulvius's *fasti* offers further points of comparison. What is entirely new for the tradition of the *fasti*, a type of calendar so named by virtue of the information it gave concerning the days suitable for lawsuits, *dies fasti*, is the record of *dies natales templorum* (see Rüpke 1995a.45–425). Certainly, these dates are also associated with specific sacrifices and festivals. But, undeniably, the dedication and construction of temples and the staging of games are usually connected with historical events. Victory in war and the taking of booty are the necessary prelude for the erection of a new temple or for the creation of games that might subsequently be repeated (see Abernethy 1994 and Orlin 1997). The *Annales* celebrated the dedication of Fulvius's temple of Hercules Musarum within a similar historical frame. That is to say, both authors describe the erection and/or dedication of temples not simply for their religious significance, but also in their relation to historical events.

The third point of contact between the Fulvian and the Ennian texts is even more important. Fulvius added a list of consuls and censors to the calendar. This can be deduced from the fragments of the later *Fasti Antiquiores Maiores*, which derived from the Fulvian *fasti* (Rüpke 1995a.43–44, 346–52). It is highly probable that the Fulvian painting offered the possibility of making a record of the highest Roman magistrates starting about 173 and going forward. Another section of the display (a third one) probably gave information on earlier magistrates.<sup>45</sup> Most likely this was not a

---

43 Ennius *Ann.* 114–18, in particular the list of the *flamines* (116–18).

44 Ennius *inc.* 32 Vahlen = Censorinus *de Die Natali* 19.2, on the basis of which Skutsch 1985.314 attributes “speculations on the calendar” to Ennius.

45 I am grateful to Denis Feeney, Princeton, who made me rethink the hypothesis expressed at Rüpke 1995a.365, namely, that the earlier period was represented in the form of dedication dates only.

complete list of consuls from 509 or 507 or some other date posited as the beginning of the republic. To assemble such a record was a task for the rest of the second century and most of the first century B.C.E.—a task that resulted in diverging lists and, ultimately, in the attempt at canonization by the Augustan *Fasti Capitolini* (Rüpke 1995b). Roman historiography prior to the time of Fulvius and Ennius was not annalistic. Neither Fabius Pictor, despite his attempt to create a symmetry between historical periods, nor the other annalists who wrote in Greek seem to have used consular dates as a chronological frame. The first annalist, in this sense of the word, is Ennius himself. It is in the *Annales* that pairs of consuls and iterations of offices appear for the first time in a non-documentary text: “Quintus pater quartum fit consul,” “Quintus the father was made consul for the fourth time” (*Ann.* 290). And later: “Additur orator Cornelius suaviloquenti / ore Cethegus Marcus Tuditano collega / Marci filius,” “Then the rhetor Marcus Cornelius Cethegus, son of Marcus, with his persuasive speech, is added as a colleague to Tuditanus” (*Ann.* 304–06).

## 11. RATIONALITY AND TRADITION

The censor and the adoptive Roman citizen, Fulvius and Ennius, were good Romans. The *fasti* is imbued with Romanness, Roman gods, Roman consuls, Roman victories, and Roman history. It is a part of a decorative program that commemorates Roman victories over the Aetolians, that is, over Greeks. At the same time, however, the project is utterly “Greek.” This holds true not only for the presence of the Greek Muses brought from Ambracia and the Greek conception of Hercules as tutelary deity of the arts, but also for the exploitation of writing, which I take to be a key indicator of rationalization. It is, of course, true that the technique of writing had not been unknown at Rome, but in the second century, its use was rapidly spreading to different social contexts and being directed towards different types of communication. It was a new idea for history not to be narrated orally but to be written down. Similarly novel was the phenomenon of not just participating in but of recording the celebration of festivals and the building of temples and then to have these records not simply displayed on the building but also available elsewhere. One could claim that this is not exactly the case for the wall painting of the *fasti*. It was tied to a particular place. But we need to keep in mind that the site where this wall painting was displayed was the meeting place of the professional writers in Rome. It was available for copying, and indeed it was, as the *Fasti Antiates Maiores* demonstrates.

Systematization is the next indicator of rationalization. To write lists that do not contain fixed and codified wisdom but which are fluid and can be extended, to aim at completeness, and to arrange material according to a specific principle, these are all clear indicators of a change in mentality on the part of the members of the local elite at Rome. Such systematization is a sign that, by the early second century, they were exploring new intellectual possibilities and new venues for organizing knowledge.

The third specific form of rationalization that we can see at work here is the impulse toward historicization. The incipient use of historicization is apparent in aetiological myths. These aetiologies, however, tend to remain anecdotal. Ennius's *Annales* replaced anecdotal forms of gentilician memory (whether in the form of *Heldenlieder* sung at banquets or of *laudationes funebres*) with a coherent and sequential history. This is what the Fulvian *fasti* did as well, although, in this case, the means used was not a narrative but the chronographical form of the calendar.

These are some of the important parallels that can be drawn between Fulvius's *fasti* and Ennius's *Annales*. The differences between the politician and the poet, between the patron and the professional—whose status was that of a client—are, however, also noteworthy. Fulvius did not write poetry, and, in particular, he did not write in the highly artificial and rhythmic language of epic. Fulvius wrote prose, hardly more than lists—if it was indeed he who composed these lists. What is important to notice is that he wished his name to be associated with this type of prose composition. In so doing, he simultaneously distanced himself from poetry, which was to remain closely associated with professional practitioners.

I would like to conclude my survey concerning the Fulvian *fasti* by mentioning another work of Ennius. In terms of its content, that other Ennian work the *Euhemerus* is an important model for the creation of Fulvius's *fasti*, for it is this work that clearly shows just how far historicization could go. In the *Euhemerus*, Jupiter, Rome's highest state god, is given a mortal genealogy and becomes a historical king whose many local cultic titles are merely the result of his hosts being grateful and commemoration by his subjects as he wanders from place to place.<sup>46</sup>

Differences in social status, however, were not only differences in intellectual or technical capability, they were also related to a work's

---

46 For Ennius's *Euhemerus*, see Winiarczyk 1994, 2002; for the Greek original, Müller 1993.



chances for success and to the history of its reception. For more than a century, Ennius's *Euhemerus* did not find a successor, but had to wait for Lucretius. Fulvius's idea became popular long before.<sup>47</sup> His historic combination of calendar and consular lists decorated a villa at Antium and was available to many Romans in the form of papyrus rolls. Rationality and tradition were not two antithetical poles in late republican times, but two options that could be interwoven in different forms. Ennius is part of the beginning of the "hot phase" of this weaving.

*University of Erfurt*

---

47 For the limited popularity of Ennius's *Annales*, cf. Goldberg pp. 441–43 in the present volume.