

ON THE IDENTITY OF THE 'Q. FABIVS' OF VAL. MAX. 2.7.3*

Ralph Covino

Abstract

Münzer, Broughton, and others have provided a variety of identity options for the Q. Fabius who is mentioned at Val. Max. 2.7.3. Some attribute a quaestorship to this Fabius whereas others have been more skeptical. This paper seeks to explore the issue more fully so as to better illustrate the process by which magisterial attributions are made as well as to offer an alternative account to that which is commonly accepted in the post-Broughton era.

Introduction

One of the admittedly few unfortunate side effects of the publication of Broughton's magisterial *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* is a tendency to treat its contents with an almost holy reverence — and to ignore his many question marks. This is especially the case when it comes to students working on issues relating to the magistrates. It is an article of faith to them that Broughton's account is to be taken as unquestionable fact and that all the cited pieces of evidence relate to the same individual. While in many cases this approach is a fairly safe one as his volumes are, and will likely remain, the most essential standard reference works on the topic until such time as they are supplanted by a continuously updated cyber-equivalent, the deference shown to Broughton and the contents of *Magistrates* sometimes blinds even experienced scholars to other possibilities of interpretation. This paper seeks to examine the literary and numismatic evidence that is commonly associated with just one quaestor, a Q. Fabius who served in Roman Sicily, and question whether they should, indeed, be considered together at all. In doing so, it will cast doubt on Broughton's now standard account of this one magistrate, highlight the limitations of list-based accounts of Roman republican magistrates more generally, and, further, by discussing options rather than just presenting a conclusion, it will serve to demonstrate something of the process by which magisterial attributions are formed and the complexity of the issues involved.

The evidence and the standard account

Valerius Maximus relates that the consul P. Rupilius, known principally for his so-called 'reorganization' with the help of a senatorial commission of the province of Sicily under the terms of the similarly so-called *lex Rupilia*, "in the war he waged against the runaways in Sicily, ordered his son-in-law Q. Fabius to leave the province because he had

* I am indebted to Prof. C. J. Smith, Drs J. Serrati and D. Bloy, and Mr A. McAuley as well as to *SHT*'s two blind-reviewers for reading this piece at various stages of its development. Their observations and suggestions, particularly with regard to the most current archaeological discoveries, were of immeasurable help. Any errors remain my own.

lost the citadel of Tauromenium by his negligence.”¹ Münzer long ago highlighted the potential for confusion in reading this passage owing to the existence of two similarly named Fabian contemporaries, Q. Fabius Maximus, the later Allobrogicus, and Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus (*RE s.v.* Fabius 110, 1794–96 on Allobrogicus and 111, 1796–98 on Eburnus); he believed Eburnus to be the one referred to by Valerius Maximus and identified him as a quaestor.² Broughton, based on the Val. Max. passage as well as that of his epitomator, Januarius Nepotianus (16.2), and a bronze coin issue from Panhormus, listed there being a quaestor “? Q. Fabius Maximus (Eburnus?)” who served in Sicily at the year 132.³ The coins in question (*CIL* 1².2, p. 764 no. 383d) bear the inscription “Q.FAB.” and belong to the head of Zeus/standing soldier series of Sicilian bronzes which were produced at Panhormus, as is apparent due to the appearance of the Panhormitan mint-mark.⁴

In a footnote to his translation of Val. Max. 2.7.3, Shackleton Bailey argued his belief that the Q. Fabius is “Probably Eburnus, then Quaestor (132), not Allobrogicus”. The quaestorship is taken for granted. Shackleton Bailey cited Broughton but indicated that Broughton’s “arguments” are “not altogether conclusive” owing to a subsequent passage within Valerius Maximus, at 6.9.4.⁵ More recently, scholars have wisely been more cautious. Using similar evidence, Prag listed there being a “Q. Fabius (Maximus (Eburnus?))” as being “quaestor (?)” in 132 in his list of magistrates known to have served in Sicily.⁶ Themann-Steinke, in her commentary on the second book of Valerius Maximus, followed Münzer and Broughton and identified this Q. Fabius as Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus, serving as quaestor in Sicily; however, she notes her doubts about the utility of the Panhormitan coin issues in making any identification.⁷

They are all undoubtedly correct in exercising restraint in their attributions. The testimony of both Valerius Maximus and Januarius Nepotianus does solidly place an individual called Q. Fabius in Sicily in 132; however, as Prag observed, “Neither identification with Eburnus, nor the position of quaestor is certain”.⁸ The passage establishes

¹ Val. Max. 2.7.3: “*nam P. Rupilius consul eo bello, quod in Sicilia cum fugitivis gessit, Q. Fabium generum suum, quia negligentia Tauromenitanam arcem amiserat, provincia iussit decedere.*” The text and translation are from the Loeb edition of Shackleton Bailey 2000. On the war, see Brennan 1993 and 2000 vol. 1 pp. 151–3 with p. 139 and vol. 2 pp. 487–8, and 491 on the *lex Rupilia* in addition to Lopez 1972, Hoyos 1973 and Lintott 1981: 58–61 and 1993: 28–32.

² Regarding Allobrogicus, Münzer stated: “*Da Scipio erst 622 = 132 nach Rom zurückkehrte (o. Bd. IV S. 1456), so ist es wahrscheinlich, daß F. gleichfalls so lange in Spanien blieb; dann kann der in diesem Jahre auf Sizilien tätige Q. Fabius (Val. Max. II 7.3) nicht mit ihm identisch sein, sondern nur mit Nr. 111 (s.d.).*” On his being a quaestor, see *RE* 111 1797 where Münzer presumed a consular quaestorship cautiously. Such is not reflected in Münzer 1999: 233 where Eburnus’ quaestorship is presented as certain.

³ Broughton 1951: 498.

⁴ See also Gardner 1876: 124 no. 35; Bahrfeldt 1904: 393–6; and Crawford 1985. It bears noting that Burnett *et al.* 1992: 170 and Frey-Kupper 2006: 42 identified a second Sicilian bronze series, that featuring Janus/laurel wreath, and assign it different mint, perhaps Lilybaeum. Frey-Kupper indicated a slightly different circulation pattern based on the archaeological context of the finds for each series. See her figs. 13 and 14 which contain photographs of examples from both series.

⁵ Shackleton Bailey 2000: 180 n. 3. See below.

⁶ Prag 2007a: 300.

⁷ Themann-Steinke 2008: 359–60: “*Die Münzen von Panormos (heute: Palermo) geben keine anderen Informationen, als daß ein Q. Fabius auf Sizilien sie prägen ließ. Auf den Geldstücken selbst ist weder ein Cognomen noch ein Datum erkennbar (CIL 1².2, p. 764, no. 383d), insofern ist der Verweis Broughtons auf besagte Münzen wenig hilfreich für die Identifizierung der gesuchten Person.*”

⁸ Prag 2007a: 300.

only that there was a Q. Fabius in Sicily in 132 who was involved in a military operation; it does not speak to his having been a quaestor assigned to Sicily. It is solely the presence of the bronze coinage that hints at the existence of a Q. Fabius operating in the province at some point as a quaestor, but not necessarily in 132. In the Val. Max. excerpt, this Q. Fabius is only noted as having been a subordinate of the consul Rupilius as well as *generum suum* with the latter being crucial to the wider point being made about family ties and military discipline.⁹ As will be shown, a sharp division between the literary evidence and the numismatic must be established. The former speaks to activity at Tauromenium on one side of the province and the latter to Panormus on the other. Such is an important distinction in Sicily given its division into separate spheres of activity in terms of its administration, as demonstrated primarily by its unique dual quaestorship, but also by patterns of taxation.¹⁰

Interpretations

As Shackleton Bailey highlighted, with regard to the identity and rank of this Q. Fabius, there are generally just two potential options which have been put forward by scholars.¹¹ The first option is that the Fabius in question is Q. Fabius Maximus (*RE* 110), who later bore the *agnomen* Allobrogicus and who was one of the consuls for 121. The second is that the Q. Fabius may have been Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus (*RE* 111), the later consul of 116. Difficulties in determining which of these two men were responsible for what abound, not just for this early period in their careers, but for the rest of their respective trips to the top of the *cursus honorum* as well.¹² Each of these two has points which scholars have used to promote their case; indeed, they are really the only two known Fabii on the landscape at all at this point. In the mid- to late 2nd century, there is a dearth of known Fabii with which to contend. As such, once the members of the Labeo branch of the *gens* are ruled out, as they can be in this case due to Q. Fabius

⁹ Fabius' rank is left unmentioned in the passage which may suggest a lower rather than a higher one. Had he been named as a serving magistrate in the province, it would have certainly made for a more forceful anecdote.

¹⁰ On the dual quaestorship, see Harris 1976: 102 and 104. On their service locations, Ps.-Ascon. p. 187 St. *'cum a duobus quaestoribus Sicilia regi soleat, uno Lilybitano, altero Syracusano.'* The division of Sicily into distinct administrative areas with regard to taxation is attested at Cic. *Verr.* 2.3.167 which discusses the revenues of six *'publica'* which were farmed by the *publicani* at Sicily.

¹¹ Shackleton Bailey 2000: 180 n. 3. On the debate with prior bibliography, see Broughton 1951: 498 and 499 n. 1.

¹² There is a similar problem in determining which of the two men led the embassy to Crete in 113 and, more astonishingly, which of them held the censorship of 108. On the former, see Broughton 1951: 536–8. On the latter, Broughton 1951: 550 n. 3. Compare the similar issues with a Fabian identification raised regarding *Syll.*³ 684 in Kallet-Marx 1995: 141–3 and Brennan 2000.1: 226 with n. 33 at pp. 343–4. Also note the difficulty with the identity of the individual in Val. Max. 6.1.5 which records the information that a “Q. Fabius Maximus Servilianus” put a son to death on charges of lack of chastity “*censurae gravitate*”, for which he was prosecuted and exiled; Shackleton Bailey 2000.2: 4–5 n. 5 identified that Q. Fabius as Eburnus, who held the censorship in 108, and stated that “Valerius has them [Eburnus and his father] confused, unless he wrote *Serviliani f.*”, indicating the potential for confusion even within Valerius Maximus' text. On that incident, see Cic. *Balb.* 28; Ps.-Quint. 3.17; Oros. 5.16.8. See also Gruen 1964: 102–3; Richlin 1991: 289; Shaw 2001: 61; and Kelly 2006: 172–3.

Labeo's status as a moneyer later, Allobrogicus and Eburnus are the only known Fabii who remain who could have been in Sicily in 132 on official purpose.¹³

Klein identified the Q. Fabius of Val. Max. 2.7.3 with Allobrogicus and believed that he saw service in Sicily as a legate.¹⁴ In 134, this Fabius had served as a quaestor in Spain under his uncle, P. Cornelius Scipio, the consul of that year, as well as, perhaps, under his father, who was then one of Scipio's legates but who had previously been the consul of 145.¹⁵ There, he had 4,000 volunteers under him.¹⁶ This period of service in Spain as a quaestor would have barred Fabius from being a quaestor in Sicily in 132 to be sure, but would not necessarily have stopped him from serving as a legate in the province at that time.¹⁷ That Scipio's actions at Numantia are referenced at Val. Max. 6.7.1, almost immediately prior to the Q. Fabius *exemplum*, though, may also lend support to his interpretation.

An identification with Allobrogicus was dismissed by Münzer based on his belief that he likely would have remained with Scipio in Spain until Scipio returned to Rome in 132.¹⁸ Broughton supported this opinion regarding the chronology, but he did note the possibility that service in Sicily would have been possible if Allobrogicus had returned from Spain in time.¹⁹ As noted, Broughton argued against identification with Allobrogicus due to his belief that the Q. Fabius mentioned by Valerius Maximus was a quaestor in the province on the strength of the numismatic evidence. Having removed for himself Allobrogicus as an option, Broughton chose to identify the Q. Fabius of the Tauromenium episode with Allobrogicus' rough contemporary Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus. He postulated that Eburnus served in Sicily not as a legate but, instead, as a quaestor, due to the evidence of those coins issued at Panhormus which bear the inscription "Q.FAB."²⁰

There is good reason to argue against Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus as a quaestor for 132. He is known to have subsequently served as praetor by 119 and as consul for 116, likely having the minimum interval between those two curule offices which was allowed under the terms of the *lex Villia*.²¹ Details of his previous career, however, should be applied. Eburnus was taken by Crawford to be moneyer in Rome c. 127, producing

¹³ Labeo's moneyership was in 124 according to Crawford (1974.1: 294 #273); however, Mattingly 1998: 155–6 questioned Crawford's dating possibly by as much as two years.

¹⁴ Klein 1878: 132 no. 4.

¹⁵ He had been commended to the electors by Scipio, cf. Val. Max. 8.15.4.

¹⁶ See App. *Iber.* 84, despite the *cognomen* Buteo.

¹⁷ One could not normally repeat the quaestorship. The case of M. Aemilius Scaurus' having taken on an aspect of a quaestor's duties after having held the post is exceptional; the quaestor of Ostia's duties had been transferred to him to replace Saturninus. On this, see Cic. *Sest.* 39; *Har. Resp.* 43; Diod. Sic. 26.12 and Bates 1986: 262–66.

¹⁸ *RE* 110, 1794–95.

¹⁹ 1951: 499 n. 1. See also Cichorius 1908: 317–8.

²⁰ *CIL* 1² p. 764 n. 383d. *Contra* Grant 1946: 26 who identified this coin issue with another Q. Fabius, one who is quite far removed from the other two candidates in chronological terms, Q. Fabius Maximus, the suffect consul of 45, who may be the grandson, as he is *Q.f.Q.n.*, of either Allobrogicus or Eburnus; this view must be rejected, following Frey-Kupper 2006: 42. The forthcoming work of Frey-Kupper, referenced in Prag 2009, may shed still more light on this subject.

²¹ On his praetorship, see Cic. *Or.* 1.40; 2.170; 3.74; *Off.* 2.47; *Brut.* 159; *Lael.* 96; *ad Fam.* 9.21.3; *ad Q. Frat.* 2.3.3; and *Verr.* 2.3.3 with Broughton 1951: 526 and 527 n. 2. On his consulship, see Cic. *Mur.* 36.

coins which bore his mark.²² This would provide a *terminus post quem* for any putative quaestorship he might have enjoyed in Sicily, as it would have followed his year as one of the *Illviri monetales*.²³ This dating of events, then, does not support Broughton's association of the evidentiary pieces. For this reason, Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus as a quaestor in 132 may be ruled out of contention fairly safely.

An alternate reading of the evidence for 132

Having now introduced the options which have been presented by scholars as to Q. Fabius' identity and problematized the evidence set, the questions of how and where in Sicily this Q. Fabius had been assigned to serve will be addressed in an attempt to provide a different reading. Valerius Maximus tells us that a Q. Fabius served under his father-in-law Rupilius in Sicily, but was sent home in disgrace for having lost Tauromenium. Tauromenium is located on the eastern coast of Sicily and the responsibility for ensuring its safety could feasibly have been assigned to either a legate or to a quaestor.²⁴ The coins which bear the name of Fabius, however, originated in Panhormus, which lies within the administrative domain of the quaestor of Lilybaeum on the western coast of the island. As such, the locations of the two known events may lend themselves to a view which has never been seriously entertained. To arrive at such a conclusion, one must resist the temptation to associate each of the possible pieces of evidence that are extant; such is what led to the conclusions offered in the past which gave Prag pause. If the data are disaggregated and then associated differently, it may be posited (and was likely probable) that there may have been two distinct men bearing the name of Q. Fabius who served in Sicily, one on each side of the island, perhaps even at the same time — though such is admittedly rather unlikely.

In the passage which Shackleton Bailey flagged as being potentially related to the incident at 2.7.3, Valerius Maximus provides the following: "*Our community had no more disreputable member at that time than Q. Fabius Maximus in his young days, who by victory in Gaul won for himself and his descendants the surname of Allobrogicus; and none in that era was more distinguished or respectable than the same in old age.*"²⁵ While it is clear from the text that Allobrogicus had been a disappointing youth from the point of view of his lifestyle, Valerius Maximus makes it clear that it was only through his later Gallic military victory that his life was turned around and redeemed. This could fit quite nicely with the story of the Q. Fabius who was expelled from the province of Sicily. He was expelled from the province not merely for having lost Tauromenium, but for having done so as a result of *neglegentia*. It was not only the defeat which caused him to be expelled, but the defeat coupled with the means by which he was defeated. In this way, the later information supplied by Valerius Maximus as to his obdurate youth and

²² Crawford 1974.1: 289–90 #265 assigned the date of 127; however, note again Mattingly 1998: 155–6 who revised the date by as much as two years for this coin as well as that of Fabius Labeo discussed later.

²³ Broughton 1952: 439 cited Grueber 1910.1: 178 who had identified the moneyer of the Q.MAX issue with a later member of the Fabian *gens*, dating it to c. 94; given this, it is understandable why it could be ignored in the case of 132.

²⁴ Compare, for example, P. Caesetius and P. Tadius' operation at Cic. *Verr.* 2.5.63.

²⁵ Val. Max. 6.9.4: "*Nihil Q. Fabio Maximo, qui Gallica victoria cognomen Allobrogici sibimet ac posteris peperit, adulescente magis infame, nihil eodem sene ornatius aut speciosius illo saeculo nostra civitas habuit.*" The text and translation are from the Loeb edition of Shackleton Bailey 2000.

subsequent redemption through military victory becomes relevant.²⁶ As such Allobrogicus may have indeed served, as a legate, under Rupilius in Sicily in 132.

An alternate reading of the Panhormitan issues

The resurrection of the idea of Allobrogicus as a potential legate in Sicily, however, does not lend any assistance to the identification of the Q. Fabius who was responsible for the coin-issue from Panhormus. Because it was the quaestor who as a magistrate seems to have had the ability and authority to strike coins by virtue of his office, predominantly concerned with military finance as it was, this Q. Fabius must have been one.²⁷ At Rome, this right was only rarely exercised and the quaestors as a general rule struck only in the most unusual of circumstances, as Crawford noted.²⁸ The quaestors in the city were the immediate superiors of the moneyers who supervised the production of coinage.²⁹ In the provinces, however, it was the quaestor himself who was the responsible party for the supervision of the minting. In 216, for example, when the governors of Sicily and Sardinia asked the Senate for money and were told to find it for themselves, it was their quaestors who produced a coin issue so as to provide for the payment of their respective fleets and armies.³⁰ From this, then, it can be seen as unsurprising that the quaestors of Sicily held the responsibility for supervising the production of the province's bronze coinage in the period of the late Republic, anomalous as it is.

Dating any of the bronze issues of Sicily during the Republican period, including those in the series produced by the Panhormitan mint, is problematic. There is no significant stylistic means of putting these bronze issues into a coherent chronological sequence.³¹ Owing to this, Grant, based on his own beliefs as to their style, suggested that the "Q.FAB." coins were produced significantly later in the range of possible dates, though such has subsequently been rejected.³² More recent published opinion on the matter placed the series of bronzes bearing magistrates' names as being minted in the late 2nd century.³³ This was clarified recently by Frey-Kupper who assigned the coins to the period between c. 200 and c. 140, supported by archaeological evidence from the necropolis of Lilybaeum.³⁴ Bearing this in mind, then, who could have produced the coin during this period?

²⁶ Rosenstein, of course, indicated that early military failures were not necessarily an impediment to the subsequent holding of high office at Rome (see 1990: 188 n. 32).

²⁷ On the purpose of the coinage, see Prag 2007b: 99 where he suggested that the coins were used to pay troops, along with his nn. 179–181 with further references.

²⁸ Crawford 1974.2: 603. See also his list at pp. 606–7 of coins struck by *Senatus Consultum* in which quaestors feature prominently.

²⁹ Crawford 1974.2: 617. Note, for example, their role in testing the quality of the metal from the Carthaginian indemnity at Liv. 32.2.1–2.

³⁰ See Liv. 23.21.4; Val. Max. 7.6.1. See also Crawford 1974.2: 604.

³¹ It was Grueber who in 1910.2: 554 first noted that the chronological sequence of the coins cannot be precisely determined.

³² Grant 1946: 26–8; Grueber 1910.2: 554 noted as well that the earlier coins are much in the same style as the known issues from the triumviral era towards the end of the Republic.

³³ See Burnett *et al.* 1992: 170 *contra* Grant 1946: 26.

³⁴ Frey-Kupper 2006: 42. Her tomb evidence focused on only one of the two series of Sicilian bronze coinage from this part of the island; however, she noted that the two series overlap owing to presence of a common moneyer, NASO. See her figs. 13.2 and 13.3.

Q. Fabius Maximus Eburnus provides a logical starting point in the attempt to attribute the coins, as Allobrogicus could not have been a quaestor in Sicily with the requisite authority if the above reconstruction of events is correct. During a quaestorship in the mid-120s, though, Eburnus could feasibly have been responsible for the coins issued at Panhormus as Frey-Kupper's dating of the coinage is broadly construed. That said, however, it bears pointing out that the inscriptions on the coins which he issued in Rome bore not the "Q.FAB." of the Panhormitan issues but "Q.MAX" or a close approximation thereof. This may cast an element of doubt over his candidacy.

Another known Fabius who might have been responsible for the coins was Q. Fabius Labeo (*RE* 92), a moneyer taken by Crawford to be the grandson of the consul of 183.³⁵ According to him, Labeo's coins' style dates them to 124.³⁶ Nothing, however, of this Fabius' further career can be said with certainty; he may not, in fact, have had one at all. There is a possibility that he can be identified with the Q. Fabius Labeo known from inscriptional evidence from a period as (praetor) *pro consule* in Hither Spain.³⁷ Milestones bearing that name found near Lerida were taken by Broughton to date from c. 110; however, as Crawford noted, the possibility exists that the milestones may have been set there on Labeo's father's orders and not on Labeo's own.³⁸ If Fabius Labeo's career did not end after his year as one of the *IIIviri monetales*, then whether he was responsible for the milestones or not, he may have served as quaestor. Thus, he too may have been the Q. Fabius responsible for the coins which emerged from the Panhormitan mint. The coins which he minted at Rome do at least bear the same inscription, "Q.FAB." on one side; they also, however, bear the additional "LABEO" on the opposite, which the Sicilian bronzes lack.³⁹

No other Fabii are known to have served either as magistrates or moneyers during the late 2nd century, or during the early 1st century for that matter. The family's name has its next appearance in the *fasti* after a significant gap, coming in 84 when C. Fabius Hadrianus (*RE* 82) became praetor. Q. Fabius Sanga (*RE* 143), following Ryan, may have been praetor by 59.⁴⁰ The next Q. Fabius to appear is the suffect consul of 45 (*RE* 108), whom Grant believed to be responsible for the Sicilian coins. However, Frey-Kupper's findings make attributing the coins to any of them most improbable indeed.

Conclusion

The distinct pieces of evidence which have been used by Broughton and others to identify the Q. Fabius in Val. Max. 2.7.3 do not belong together. The literary testimony pins a Q. Fabius of uncertain rank in one part of the province in 132 while the numismatic places a quaestor Q. Fabius on the other at an uncertain time in the second century. Given this and the other considerations outlined above, no solid attribution is possible;

³⁵ Crawford 1974.1: 294.

³⁶ Crawford 1974.1: 65, though, again, see Mattingly 1998: 155–6. Broughton 1952: 562 assigned his moneyership to c. 109, following Grueber and others; on this see his p. 439.

³⁷ *CIL* 12.2.823 and 824; *ILLRP* 461. Broughton himself noted the uncertainty of the dating at 1951: 544.

³⁸ Broughton 1951: 544 and Crawford 1974.1: 294. On the milestones and their dating, see Lostal Pros 1992: 15–16, nos. 5 and 6, with figs. 5 and 9a.

³⁹ It should be noted that none of the Sicilian bronzes were struck with details beyond the *praenomen* and *nomen* and, as such, were it to have been Labeo minting, he may have merely been following local convention.

⁴⁰ Ryan 1996: 210–11.

however, Q. Fabius Maximus, the later Allobrogicus, must be identified as the leading candidate rather than Eburnus.

Until such a time as the Panhormitan coinage is better understood or additional archaeological information surfaces, only identity options for the responsible Q. Fabius exist, with neither Eburnus nor Labeo to be preferred. There is the very real possibility that the quaestor responsible for the bronze coins was, in fact, none of the above mentioned Fabii at all. They may have been issued by an as yet unknown Q. Fabius.⁴¹ As Prag noted, few quaestors who served in Sicily during the Republic are identifiable with any degree of certainty, with some like Q. Fabius more problematic than others.⁴² More are identifiable via numismatic evidence similar to the "Q.FAB." series of bronze coins, such as that of one M'. Acil(ius).⁴³ In these cases, as with that of Q. Fabius, caution must be exercised in assigning any positive attributions for location, rank, and period of service.

The desire to associate evidence such as coin issues with limited identifying information to individuals known from the literary sources is always tempting and Broughton and others' having done so is understandable. However, as the example of Q. Fabius demonstrates, standing attributions ought to be continually revisited and challenged, if necessary, in light of new discoveries and interpretations, particularly from archaeology and numismatics. Ultimately, of course, (re-)positing a legateship for Q. Fabius Maximus Allobrogicus in 132 does not alter scholarly understanding of the fall of Tauromenium in a major way as the Val. Max. passage is all that there is to describe it. Similarly, adding a new Q. Fabius, regardless of his identity, as a quaestor at Lilybaeum of an uncertain date does not fundamentally shift an understanding of the magistrates of Roman Sicily or their actions within the province. However, the case of Q. Fabius itself can be considered to be instructive as it highlights the need not only for a systematic and thorough reexamination of the evidence set, but also for far more question marks to be deployed than usually are, for more attention to be paid to them, and for there to be more discussion of the rationale behind an attribution than commonly appears.

Dr Ralph Covino
University of Tennessee at Chattanooga
History Department and the University Honors Program
E-mail: Ralph-Covino@utc.edu

⁴¹ Adequate details do not exist concerning the filiation of the ten other men bearing the gentilician name Fabius who served as magistrates from 100–45. A Q. Fabius who served as a Sicilian quaestor may be linked to any one of these or, of course, to none. A link from such a man to the Vestal Virgin Fabia who was accused of incest with Catiline in 73 may be posited; however, it is patently not provable.

⁴² Prag 2007a.

⁴³ *CIL* 1².2 p. 764 n. 382a.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bahrfeldt, M. (1904) 'Die römisch-sicilischen Münzen aus der Zeit der Republik.' — *Revue suisse de numismatique* 12, 351–445.
- Bates, R. L. (1986) 'Rex in Senatu: A Political Biography of M. Aemilius Scaurus.' — *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society* 130, 251–88.
- Brennan, T. C. (1993) 'The Commanders in the First Sicilian Slave War.' — *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica* 121, 153–84.
- Brennan, T. C. (2000) *The Praetorship in the Roman Republic*, 2 vols. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Broughton, T. R. S. (1951) *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, vol. 1. New York, American Philological Association.
- Broughton, T. R. S. (1952) *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic*, vol. 2. New York, American Philological Association.
- Burnett, A.; Amandry, M.; Ripollès, P. P. (1992) *Roman Provincial Coinage*, vol. 1. London: British Museum Press.
- Cichorius, C. (1908) *Untersuchungen zu Lucilius*. Berlin: Weidmann.
- Crawford, M. H. (1974) *Roman Republican Coinage*, 2 vols., Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Crawford, M. H. (1985) 'The Romans in Sicily.' — Crawford, M. H., *Coinage and Money under the Roman Republic*. London: Methuen, 103–15.
- Frey-Kupper, S. (2006) 'Aspects de la production et de la circulation monétaires en Sicile (300–180 av. J.-C.) : continuités et ruptures.' — *Pallas* 70, 27–56.
- Frey-Kupper, S. (forthcoming) *Die Fundmünzen vom Monte Iato (1971–1991). Ein Beitrag zur Geldgeschichte Westsiziliens*, 2 vols. (*Studia Ietina*; 10.) Lausanne.
- Gardner, P. (1876) 'Sicily.' — Poole, R. S. (ed.), *A Catalogue of the Greek Coins in the British Museum*. London: British Museum.
- Grant, M. (1946) *From Imperium to Auctoritas: A Historical Study of Aes Coinage in the Roman Empire, 49 B.C. – A.D. 14*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Grueber, H. A. (1910) *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum*, 2 vols. London: British Museum.
- Gruen, E. S. (1964) 'Politics and the Courts in 104 B.C.' — *Transactions and Proceedings of the American Philological Association* 95, 99–110.
- Harris, W. V. (1976) 'The Development of the Quaestorship, 267–81 B.C.' — *Classical Quarterly* 26, 92–106.
- Hoyos, B. D. (1973) 'Lex Provinciae and Governor's Edict.' — *Antichthon* 7, 47–53.
- Kallet-Marx, R. M. (1995) 'Quintus Fabius Maximus and the Dyme Affair (Syll. 684).' — *Classical Quarterly* N.S. 45.1, 129–53.
- Kelly, G. P. (2006) *A History of Exile in the Roman Republic*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Klein, J. (1878) *Die Verwaltungsbeamten der Provinzen des Römischen Reichs bis auf Diocletian*. T. 1: *Die Verwaltungsbeamten von Sicilien und Sardinien*. Bonn: Strauss.
- Lintott, A. (1981) 'What was the "Imperium Romanum"?' — *Greece & Rome* 28, 53–67.
- Lintott, A. (1993) *Imperium Romanum: Politics and Administration*. London: Routledge.
- Lopez, G. (1972) 'La «lex Rupilia» e l'eredità di Eraclio: Cic. Verr. II 2, 35–50.' — *Giornale Italiano di Filologia* 24, 178–91.

- Lostal Pros, J. (1992) *Los miliarios de la Provincia Tarraconense (Conventos Tarraconense, Cesaraugustano, Cluniense y Cartaginense)*. Zaragoza: Institución Fernando el Católico.
- Mattingly, H. B. (1998) 'Roman Republican Coinage c. 150–90 B.C.' — Burnett, A.; Wartenberg, U.; Witschonke, R. (eds.), *Coins of Macedonia and Rome: Essays in Honour of Charles Hersh*. London: Spink, 151–64.
- Münzer, F. (1999) *Roman Aristocratic Parties and Families*. Transl. T. Ridley. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.
- Prag, J. R. W. (2007a) 'Roman Magistrates in Sicily, 227–49 B.C.' — Dubouloz, J.; Pittia, S. (eds.), *La Sicile de Cicéron: lectures des Verrines*. Besançon: Presses Universitaires de Franche-Comté, 287–310.
- Prag, J. R. W. (2007b) 'Auxilia and Gymnasia: A Sicilian Model of Roman Imperialism.' — *Journal of Roman Studies* 97, 68–100.
- Prag, J. R. W. (2009) 'Republican Sicily at the start of the 21st Century: the rise of the optimists?' — *Pallas* 79, 131–44.
- Richlin, A. (1991) *The Garden of Priapus: Sexuality and Aggression in Roman Humor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Rosenstein, N. S. (1990) *Imperatores Victi: Military Defeat and Aristocratic Competition in the Middle and Late Republic*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Ryan, F. X. (1996) 'Four Republican Senators.' — *Classica et Mediaevalia* 47, 207–15.
- Shackleton Bailey, D. R. (ed. and trans.) (2000) *Valerius Maximus: Memorable Doings and Sayings*, 2 vols. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press.
- Shaw, B. D. (2001) 'Raising and Killing Children: Two Roman Myths.' — *Mnemosyne* 4th series, 54.1, 31–77.
- Themann-Steinke, A. (2008) *Valerius Maximus: Ein Kommentar zum Zweiten Buch der Facta et Dicta memorabilia. (Bochumer Altertumswissenschaftliches Colloquium; 77.)* Trier: Wissenschaftlicher Verlag Trier.