

## FIRST THOUGHTS ON THE NEW EDITION OF THE FRAGMENTS OF THE ROMAN HISTORIANS

*The Fragments of the Roman Historians. Volume 1: Introduction; Volume 2: Texts and Translations; Volume 3: Commentary.* T. J. Cornell, General Editor. Editorial Committee: E. H. Bispham, T. J. Cornell, J. W. Rich, C. J. Smith. Contributors: E. H. Bispham, J. Briscoe, T. J. Cornell, A. Drummond†, B. M. Levick, S. J. Northwood, S. P. Oakley, M. P. Pobjoy, J. W. Rich, C. J. Smith. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013. Pp. 1 + 662, viii + 1159, viii + 829. ISBN for the set: 978-0-19-927705-6.

One's immediate reactions to the appearance of a collection of this magnitude and monumentality are bound to be complex. There is, first of all, the sheer delight that this enterprise has been completed, and amazement that, given its scale, it has been completed within a very reasonable amount of time. It was only in 1996 that the authors began to discuss the project. I well remember their notice in the nascent on-line journal, *Histos*, that a 'small équipe' (their phrase) was engaged in producing a new collection that would supersede Peter's *HRR*, and I remember wondering if it would appear in my lifetime. The way these things go today, we might reasonably have expected at least another decade or two before the work's actual appearance. But here the books are.

I confess that another thought, as soon as I saw the volumes, was 'Dear God, how much is this going to cost and will I have to sell my house?', followed closely by 'I wonder if there will be an electronic edition so I don't need a suitcase to carry it around with me.'

It should go without saying that a proper evaluation of such a work will only occur over the coming years and perhaps even decades rather than just a few months after its publication. But the business of grappling with this new edition has to begin at once, so here are some first thoughts from an interested user about this monumental new edition.

\*

The first thing that one might note about the edition is its arrangement. The three volumes, totalling some 2,500 pages, are divided in a way that is unique—to my knowledge, at least. The first volume contains the prefatory matter that one would expect, i.e., the editor's preface, the abbreviations and the general introduction to the entire collection. One might not have expected what follows, however, namely the individual introductions to each of the 110 historians in the collection. Now since the editors made a decision

not to offer formal comment on the testimonia on the historians (more on this presently), these introductions loom large for setting the historian and his—or her (for indeed Agrippina and her memoirs are included)—work in context. In the second and largest volume, we find the testimonia and fragments of the historians, along with a facing English translation. Finally, the third volume contains the commentary on the fragments. So then: introductions Volume 1; texts and translations Volume 2; and commentary Volume 3. The editors express their ‘hope that this arrangement will prove more convenient’.

The editors here seem to me to have engaged in what I shall call the *Atthis*-icisation of these fragments. By this I mean something that anyone who has worked with Felix Jacoby’s collection of the *Atthidographers* will understand, for if you wish to study those authors in Jacoby’s edition, you need to have open before you four volumes: the text of the historians; Jacoby’s commentary volume; the Notes volume to the commentary; and, last but not least, Jacoby’s monograph *Atthis*, to which frequent reference is made in the commentary. Similarly with *FRHist* one needs all three volumes simultaneously, and as these are not particularly small volumes, the physical space required is not slight.

But there’s another more pragmatic concern. Given that these volumes are expensive and are likely to be owned mostly by libraries, not by individuals, anyone working on any single historian in this collection will need to use all three volumes simultaneously. That, to me, does not bode well and means that anyone using the collection will monopolise lots of information that one does not need at that particular moment. If, for example, I am working on Cato’s fragments, nobody else can be working on Fabius Pictor’s. Well, you might think, how common a problem is *that* going to be? But if I want to give a graduate seminar (as I almost certainly shall, now that these volumes are available) on the fragmentary Roman historians, the students will have to carefully arrange who can use the collection when. The alternative, of course, would have been to have the general introduction in the first volume followed by the introduction, text/translation, and commentary of a third of the historians, with the second and third volumes following suit. Thus someone working on, say, Fabius Pictor, could yield to someone else the volume on Sisenna or the volume on Fenestella. The editors perhaps felt that flipping back and forth between a commentary and introduction in the same volume would have been cumbersome; perhaps so, but their own arrangement introduces greater problems in my opinion. But there can be differences about this, of course, and no one approach will be perfect. So let us turn to matters of more substance.

One thing that strikes the reader almost immediately in these volumes is the caution which is highlighted in the introductory remarks. Already on page 3 of the first volume we read:

Our aim throughout has been to show readers what is known about the lost works and their authors by editing and translating the fragments and testimonia, and adding explanatory introductions and commentaries. We have sought at every point to make readers aware of the limits of what can be known.

These thoughts are again quickly repeated just four pages later (I.7):

We have sought throughout to present the material in ways that will clearly bring out what can be known about the lost authors and their works as well as emphasizing the limits of our knowledge.

This caution will also be seen in the assignation of fragments to Books (I.7):

Scholars have not infrequently gone astray by taking as established some features of Peter's ordering which are in fact merely conjectural (the organization of books 2 and 3 of Cato's *Origines* is a notable instance). We have accordingly adopted a more conservative policy than our recent predecessors when assigning fragments to books and placing them in chronological sequence ....

Indeed, the caution is almost universal in that the first section of the introduction seems to suggest that little can be certain about these historians in general (I.7):

The arrangement and methodology of this edition ... are designed to make clear the distance that separates the lost originals from the surviving remnants, and to emphasize the uncomfortable fact that, all too often, the latter are inadequate to reconstruct the former, even in the most basic outline. We aim to draw attention to these uncertainties, and to make them clear to the reader. We do not shun conjecture or discussion of theoretical possibilities; but we have confined them to the commentary, and have not used them to identify the context of the fragments or to arrange them in order in the text. It is our hope that the conservative approach we have adopted to these tasks will make readers aware of the difficulties, and provide them with the means to conduct their own research and make their own choices.

One's reaction to such conservatism, if I may call it that, is likely to depend on one's expectation of what a collection of fragments ought to achieve. Most, I think, will be pleased (as I am) with such an approach, particularly since fragmentary authors too often, especially for some scholars, are thought to offer carte-blanche for their own fantasies. It is appropriate, I think, in an edition that aspires to be a fundamental resource that one's own hobby-horses be kept safely in their stables.

The editors have chosen a chronological approach, thereby ignoring or rejecting Jacoby's criticism of such arrangements as he outlined them in his 1909 article on the development of Greek historiography.<sup>1</sup> But Jacoby's adoption of his developmental principle meant that his collection was already tilted towards his own, sometimes questionable, views about Greek historiography and classical historiography in general. By contrast the editors here have followed a sensible approach to the authors, though again, in keeping with their general approach, they caution that in some cases, particularly with the cluster of lesser-known late Republican authors readers ought 'not to draw any inference about relative dating from the order we have adopted.'

What to put in and what to leave out are always difficult choices, but the editors seem to me in general to have chosen wisely. They explain their omission of 'antiquarian' authors which is certainly justifiable, though in my opinion they rely too much on Momigliano's distinctions, which have increasingly come under fire, and they accept too easily the notion that these works did not have a narrative component to them. To complicate matters they do, however, include a few antiquarian works and they state, somewhat charmingly, 'that more-or-less arbitrary choices remain'. Where they have rejected the inclusion of an author who had appeared in Peter or another collection, they refer the reader to an appendix of also-rans, where the editors give the relevant testimonia and bibliography along with the reasons in each case that the author has been excluded. This is an excellent appendix.

Although the editors do not seem to engage explicitly with recent discussions on the nature of fragments and of collections of fragments, they are careful to explain their criteria for inclusion and their definition of both *testimonium* and fragment (I.14, my emphases):

<sup>1</sup> F. Jacoby, 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio* 9 (1909) 80–123; repr. in id., *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung*, ed. H. Bloch (Leiden, 1956) 16–64.

... a text that purports to quote or paraphrase *a particular passage* of a lost original is a fragment, whereas a text that gives information about the author or about all or part of his work, *but without reference to a particular passage*, is a testimonium. In a few cases we have counted as testimonia passages which previous editors printed as fragments: we have reclassified them in this way because the passages in question summarize or characterize a part of the lost work without quoting or paraphrasing *a particular passage* of the text.

The editors in a footnote make reference to the Tauromenium inscription which both Martine Chassignet in her Budé edition of the fragments and Beck–Walter in their collection printed as a fragment but they as a testimonium, and this particular case raises interesting issues. The passage is by now a familiar one and first characterises Pictor himself and then gives a brief (lacunose, alas) summary of his work:<sup>2</sup>

[Κοίν]τος Φάβι[ο]ς ὁ Πι-  
 [κτω]ρῖνος ἐπικαλού-  
 [μεν]ος, Ῥωμαῖος, Γαίου  
 [υῖό]ς·  
 [οὔτο]ς ἱστόρηκεν τὴν  
 [τοῦ Ἡ]ρακλέους ἄφιξιν  
 [- ca. 3 -] . . Ἰταλίαν καὶ α . . εἰ  
 [- ca. 4 -] .ον Λανοῖου συμ-  
 [- ca. 4 -] ν ὑπὸ Αἰνεία καὶ  
 [- ca. 4 -] . . . . πολὶ ὕστε-  
 [ρον ἐγ]ένοντο Ῥωμύλος  
 [καὶ Ῥ]έμος καὶ Ῥώμης  
 [κτίσις ὑ]πὸ Ῥωμύλου,  
 [- ca. 6 -] . . βασιλε[-]

The first four lines are clearly a testimonium, but what of the remaining ones? Given that what is summarised here are the *contents* of Pictor's work, it seems to me an over-fine distinction to say that because it doesn't refer to a *specific* passage it's not a fragment. But it does refer to specific passages, does it not, those places where Fabius treated Heracles and Aeneas and Romulus and Remus? And when one considers that in none of the fragments of Fabius that follow as printed in *FRHist* is there any mention of Heracles, the reader who relied on the fragments alone would not know that Fabius had

<sup>2</sup> *FRHist* 1 T 7 = Chassignet, F 1; I have eliminated the sublinear dots.

treated the hero. And parenthetically, I might add, since the authors do not comment directly on the *testimonia*, there is no discussion of why Pictor might have treated Heracles; he is mentioned only in passing in the Introduction, where he is included as forming the ‘legendary prehistory’ of the city along with Aeneas and Evander. In addition, if, as the editors say, Pictor proceeded chronologically, Heracles must have been treated *before* Aeneas, such that the appearance given by the fragments that the work began with Aeneas is misleading. We can be pretty sure, thanks to the Tauromenium inscription, that it did not. So here it seems that it might have been preferable to split this up into a testimonium and a fragment. The good news is that the editors do not seem to have made many of these types of decisions.

Nor should such minor quibbling be taken in any way as a sign of disrespect towards what is, after all, an amazingly comprehensive and useful edition. In my (admittedly sparse, so far) use of it, I have found quite a number of illuminating treatments. I’ll take just two from recent projects of my own which called for the use of the fragmentary historians.

For the one, I had recourse to the *Annales Maximi*, and found that the treatment of the *AM* in *FRHist* (it’s by John Rich) is excellent: he gives an extremely helpful summary of the *testimonia*, separates out carefully what we know (or don’t know) about the *tabula apud pontificem*, explains what, if any, is the relation between the *tabula* and the eighty-book edition of the *Annales*, and what the contents and nature of each entity might have been. There is a clear summation of scholarship on the matter, some rejection of unnecessarily hypothetical relationships (e.g., between the *tabula* and the calendar, going back to Mommsen), but at the same time a recognition that no one hypothesis has yet been able to account for all of the *testimonia*. Unless I misread him, he seems to favour Frier’s Augustan date for the eighty-book edition, although he expresses some reservations about that and gives fair treatment to Frier’s critics.

The *testimonia* themselves and the fragments are arranged in good order, and the latter are limited to those that are explicit citations of the *AM*, rather than just to unnamed *annales*. Chassignet, on the other hand, included a section ‘Libri Annales sine nomine’, which collected all the references in later authors to ‘annales’, a decision for which she was criticised in reviews. Yet here Chassignet seems to me to have understood better what was helpful to scholars than her critics or the editors of *FRHist*. I would not have printed them in the same way as the other fragments (I would have used petite type or perhaps labelled them ‘doubtful’ or ‘possible’ fragments) but I would have included them for two reasons: first, where the *testimonia* and fragments are so sparse as with the *Annales Maximi*, and where scholarly uncertainty is so great, it is best, I think, to err on the side of

comprehensiveness, provided only that the reader is warned that such ‘fragments’ are not necessarily to be considered certain. Second, although it seems pretty clear that a number of Chassignet’s fragments are not from the *Annales Maximi*, there are several that I think likely to be. But in any case it is a matter of putting before the reader everything that will assist in understanding the work or the tradition.

The other matter about which I was eager to read was *FRHist*’s treatment of Cato on the Aeneas legend. This, as you all know, is a hornet’s nest of problems, given that what is reported on this topic by our sources seems to be haphazard and contradictory. But I must confess that Tim Cornell’s masterful treatment of this issue seemed to me pretty much perfect for a work of this sort. In just two-and-a-half pages he manages to sum up scholarly discussion in a succinct and clear way, point out where the contradictions appear, and expose the shortcomings of the traditional way of reconciling the fragments. Even though no solution to the dilemma is proposed, the reader well understands what the issues at stake are and from where, if anywhere, a solution might be reached.

\*

Finally, I thought that I might look at one particular author in the collection and see what it reveals about *FRHist* and where future research might go in its wake.

I chose Coelius Antipater not for any particular reason other than that he’s an interesting figure, there are a manageable number of testimonia and fragments, and he offers insight into early Latin historiography both in the content of his work and its style. John Briscoe’s entry has a number of strengths: strengths, by the way, that I think are likely to be characteristic of the collection the further we look. Like Rich on the *Annales Maximi*, he offers a clear and careful exposition of what we know about the work, and his arrangement of the fragments follows those guidelines in which only fragments with attested book numbers get placed in a particular order. Yet within this framework Briscoe offers a ‘fresh assessment’ of the distribution of the material within the work, and how the years of the Second Punic War fit into the seven books of Coelius. This was not done by either Chassignet or Beck–Walter, but Briscoe makes a compelling case for a more evenly distributed number of years per book and although it has, of course, a certain speculative quality to it, the arrangement proposed by Briscoe does not affect the way the fragments are arranged in the collection and therefore the fragments themselves do not prejudice the reader into accepting Briscoe’s hypotheses. In the commentary on individual fragments the observations are sensible, and in many cases the explanation of the context,

particularly of speeches, is compelling. And due attention is paid to Coelius' language and prose rhythm.

In thinking about where we might go with this new collection, I thought I would conclude by giving a concrete example, again using Coelius. In Peter's edition, the two fragments that are printed first are: (1) a passage from Cicero's *Orator*, which specifically states that the remark appeared in the *prooemium* of the work and that reads as follows (Peter, *HRR*<sup>2</sup> F 1 = Chassignet, F 2 = *FRHist* 15 F 1 = Cic. *Orat.* 229–30):

sed magnam exercitationem res flagitat, ne quid eorum qui genus hoc secuti non tenuerunt simile faciamus, ne aut uerba traiciamus aperte, quo melius aut cadat aut uoluatur oratio; (230) quod se L. Coelius Antipater in prooemio belli Punici **nisi necessario facturum negat**.<sup>3</sup> o uirum simplicem, qui nos nihil celet, sapientem qui seruiendum necessitati putet! sed hic omnino rudis ... et hic quidem, qui hanc a L. Aelio, ad quem scripsit, cui se purgat, ueniam petit, et utitur ea traiectione uerborum et nihilo tamen aptius explet concluditque sententias.

(2) The second is a fragment from Priscian, which he cited to show the use of *arbitror*, normally a deponent verb, used with a passive meaning, and which reads (Peter, *HRR*<sup>2</sup> F 2 = Chassignet F 1 = *FRHist* 15 F 62 = Prisc. *GL* II.383):

Coelius: **ex scriptis eorum qui ueri arbitrantur**, passive, ὑπολαμβάνονται.

Coelius: from the writings of those who are judged to be truthful. Passive; 'are judged'.

Peter believed that this latter general statement could only have come from the preface and so printed it as F 2. Chassignet, believing also that it came from the preface, prints it at the beginning but she follows Borioni in assuming that since this remark is about substance and the Cicero remark about style, their order should be reversed such that Priscian's citation comes first and Cicero's second. Beck–Walter, as is their wont, follow Chassignet. In *FRHist*, by contrast, the Priscian passage, since it does not contain a book number, does not appear at the beginning but is cited with

<sup>3</sup> For an explanation of the use of bold type in *FRHist* see S. J. V. Malloch, *Histos Working Paper* 2014.07, p. 3.

the other fragments without book number towards the end of the collection as F 62.

The reasons for Peter's and Chassignet's beliefs that such a remark must come from the preface are not hard to fathom, for professions of truth, reliability, or the use of reliable sources are very commonly found in the prefaces of historians. Nonetheless, *FRHist* seems to me here to have got it right in not assigning the fragment to the preface, for such professions are by no means *only* found in prefaces. They are often found later in the work where the historian wishes to explain the source for a particular matter or matters. So, for example, Sallust in a famous (or infamous) disclaimer states that responsibility for the reliability of his treatment of Africa must rest with his sources, though he here seems specifically *not* to vouch for their truth (Sall. *Jug.* 17.7: *ceterum fides eius rei penes auctores erit*). Perhaps a better example may be found in Tacitus. Suppose, for example, that we had only as a fragment his remark at *Annales* 13.20.2:

nos consensum auctorum secuturi, quae diuersa prodiderint, sub nominibus ipsorum trademus.

We could easily imagine that this was a general proclamation made at the beginning of the history which detailed the procedure that the historian was going to follow throughout. In fact, as you know, this is a very specific remark made by Tacitus during his account of Nero's decision to have his mother killed. There is no reason to think that what Tacitus says here is necessarily valid for the entire *Annales*.<sup>4</sup>

An examination of the commentaries to be found on F 62 is illuminating as well. Here first is Briscoe (II.269):<sup>5</sup>

**F62** Although certainty is impossible, it is very likely that this fragment comes from Coelius' preface (cf. F1), in the context of the sources he has used; for Coelius' attitude to his sources see I. 262.

The fragment is cited by Priscian as an example of *arbitror*, normally deponent ('think'), being used passively. The usage is found in Plautus (*Epid.* 267) and Gellius (1.13.2), and could have been in use in Coelius' time. *uerus* in the sense of 'truthful' occurs in Plautus, but also in Cicero (*OLD* s.v. 6c).

<sup>4</sup> See further Malloch, *Histos Working Paper* 2014.07, pp. 6–7.

<sup>5</sup> In quoting from this and the commentaries that follow on the next pages, I have maintained the orthography of each edition.

There is no need to think that Coelius was consciously imitating the statement of Hecataeus (*FGrHist* 1 F1a) that he was writing what seemed to him to be the truth. Cf. M. Borioni, *BSL* 13 (1983), 37, stressing that Coelius is appealing to the *auctoritas* of his sources, rather than making a personal evaluation. (It has not been possible to consult Borioni, ‘Per una ricostruzione [*sic*] del proemio di Celio Antipatro’, in P. S. Zanetti (ed.), *In uerbis uerbum amare* (Florence, 1980), 81–99.)

Briscoe notes the likelihood (but not certainty) that the fragment derives from the preface. He gives a reference to his earlier discussion of Coelius’ sources, he glosses the passive use of *arbitror*, and then treats the actual content of the remark. His dismissal of conscious imitation of Hecataeus seems sensible (although it’s unclear from his comment who actually proposed this, and the possible absence of *conscious* imitation is not the whole story), and he cites Borioni on the suggestion that Coelius is vouching for his sources, not necessarily for his personal activity. Leaving aside the fact that the one does not contradict the other—Caelius could have averred he was trying to find the truth à la Hecataeus but doing so by relying on written sources—the commentary on this fragment seems to me also to point the way forward for new research in the following way.

My own—again, admittedly still partial at this point—reading of *FRHist* does not suggest any thoroughgoing or consistent interest by the editors in historiographical matters. This is not meant as a criticism—*non omnia possumus omnes* as well as the fact that the work needed to be kept within bounds—but it is noteworthy that the commentaries I have looked at so far do not seek to place their authors or fragments within the larger context of Greco-Roman historiography, such that one might be able to discover to what extent a particular author or fragment might be doing something characteristic or new. For example, it is well known that dreams figure prominently in Roman historiography from its very beginnings, and the commentators in *FRHist* do indeed comment on the dreams. But they rarely refer to other historians, even those within the collection; far less do they give a sense why such dreams may have appeared and what function they may have served. To come to Coelius again, we are told who the dedicatee, L. Aelius Stilo, is, but not whether it was common for historians to dedicate their histories, nor is there a cross-reference, as there might have been, to Claudius Quadrigarius’ F 81 which is also a dedication.

In like manner, then, the concern of ancient historians with truth, and where Coelius might fit into that debate, is nowhere treated. Compare, for example, Briscoe’s commentary with that of Chassignet (p. 134):

1 1. Pour le sens passif d'*arbitror*, cf. P. FLOBERT, *Les verbes déponent latins*, p. 350.

Même affirmation dans le *prooemium* d'une œuvre historique de la nécessité pour son auteur de recourir à des sources garantes de la vérité chez THVC. I, 22, 2. Sur ces sources, cf. *supra*, p. XLVI.

De par son sujet, le passage appartenait sans doute à la première partie de la Préface de l'œuvre de Coelius Antipater. L'auteur devait y justifier l'originalité de la première monographie historique romaine par rapport aux ouvrages historiographiques antérieurs sur le plan du contenu et de la méthode employée. Les considérations sur le style figuraient plus probablement dans la seconde partie : cf. M. BORIONI, *Per una ricostruzione del proemio di Celio Antipatro*, in *In uerbis uerbum amare*, éd. P. SERRA ZANETTI, Florence, 1980, p. 81-99. Nous avons suivi le savant italien en intervertissant les fragments 1 et 2 P<sup>2</sup> (= 1 et 2 H).

She notes the claim to truth in Thucydides, and observes that Coelius' would have had to justify the originality of his work by a consideration of earlier treatment of the topic. This is certainly much more to go on than in *FRHist*.

But perhaps best of all is the commentary of Beck–Walter (II.40):

**Komm.:** Wahrheitsstreben und -anspruch zu begründen, gehörte seit Hekataios (FGrH 1 F 1), Herodot und dann insbesondere Thukydides (1,22) zum gängigen Diskursrepetoire der griechischen Historiographie. Dass solche Bekenntnisse auch für die römische Geschichtsschreibung charakteristisch wurden, ergab sich aus der Sache selbst, doch bestand hier von Anfang an ein eigentümliches Spannungsfeld zwischen der Wahrheitssuche einerseits und der Grundüberzeugung, mit der römischen Version des Ereigniszusammenhangs prinzipiell im Recht zu sein, andererseits (s. zu Fabius Pictor FRH 1 F 27; vgl. unten zu F 8). Für keine Auseinandersetzung galt dies mehr als für die Anlässe und Ursachen des 2. Punischen Krieges. Vor Coelius hatten mehrere frühe römische Historiker dieses Thema in ihren Schriften behandelt, ebenso Polybios sowie andere nicht- (und anti-) römische Autoren. Der monographische Zugriff versetzte Coelius Antipater in eine neue Position – und verlangte gleichzeitig, dass er sich von seiner Vorgängern qualitativ absetzte (vgl. oben S. 36). Dieser Anspruch wurde dem Leser im Proömium (so die einhellige Einordnung des Fragments: Hermann, Coelius 55 mit Anm. 6) prononciert vorgetragen. Unklar bleibt, ob Coelius auch die methodischen

Prinzipien explizierte, nach denen manche Quellen **als wahrhaftig gelten** konnten und manche nicht (vgl. Schmitt [1991] 253-4, für den das Bekenntnis zur Wahrheitsfindung aber bloße „Konvention“ ist). Für die praktische Umsetzung des Anspruches s. zu F 18 u. 36.

These commentators mention that claims to truth go back to the very beginnings of historiography, note that such things are also important in Roman historiography but are complicated by the Roman viewpoint (something that was especially relevant for the causes and outbreak of the Second Punic War), and they suggest why the new monographic form pioneered by Coelius demanded that he show how he stood out vis-à-vis his sources. Some of this is an expansion of Chassignet but by no means all of it, and only Beck–Walter help to establish the larger context for Coelius' remark. Moreover they alone direct the reader to Coelius' F 36 (*FRHist*'s F 28) where Livy tells us that Coelius mentioned his own investigations into the death of Marcellus, something surely which is relevant to his claim to truth.

But the good news here, at least as it seems to me, is that research on historiographical matters can now be done far more conveniently, far more accurately, and with far surer guidance than ever before, thanks to the scholars who have put together *FRHist*. The clear layout, the English translations, and the expert commentaries will now allow both students and scholars to study the fragmentary Roman historians in a way that they never could before. We shall all certainly stand on the shoulders of Cornell and company, and from my vantage point at least, the initial views are spectacular.

*Florida State University*

JOHN MARINCOLA  
john.marincola@fsu.edu