

Shored Against Our Ruins*

JOHN MARINCOLA

THE FRAGMENTS OF THE ROMAN HISTORIANS. VOLUME 1: INTRODUCTION; VOLUME 2: TEXTS AND TRANSLATIONS; VOLUME 3: COMMENTARY. General Editor: T. J. Cornell. 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, illus. ISBN 9780199277056 (set). £300.00/US\$375.00 (set).

I

These are exciting times for the study of Roman literature. New editions of the fragmentary poets and prose writers either have appeared or are in preparation,¹ while renewed interest in the nature and character of the early Roman audience, and in the development of Roman literature itself, has sought to explain the larger context in which these writings arose and were read.² Monographs and commentaries on early writers and genres have appeared in profusion, with four volumes on Ennius' *Annals* alone published within two years, at least one of which has raised serious questions of what we can and cannot know of the structure, orientation and contents of a poem that was (uniquely) influential on both later poetry and history.³

Roman historiography has been a beneficiary here as well. In the fifty years since Ernst Badian's mini-masterpiece on the early Roman historians,⁴ new approaches and new questions scarcely envisioned by Badian have proliferated. The widening scope brought about by the flourishing of historiographical (as opposed to historical)⁵ studies of the Roman historians has led scholars to examine the ways in which the Romans created and utilized their past, just as much as whether this or that historian was a reliable guide to early Roman history. Stephen Oakley's magisterial four-volume commentary on the second pentad of Livy's history is notable not only for its rigorous examination of the historical *Realien* behind Livy's text (to the extent that these can be determined) but also

* I am grateful to Jessica Clark, Christina Kraus, Catherine Steel and A. J. Woodman for reading earlier versions of this review and offering helpful corrections and criticisms. They must not be assumed to agree with the opinions expressed here.

¹ Two of the four planned volumes of *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta* have appeared to date: Schauer 2012 on Livius Andronicus, Naevius and the minor and anonymous writers, and Manuwald 2012 on Ennius; volumes on Pacuvius and Accius are in preparation. Catherine Steel and her team are producing a new edition of the Roman orators of the Republic (<http://www.frro.gla.ac.uk/>) and Andrea Balbo is preparing a new Teubner edition of the fragments of the Roman orators from Augustus to Symmachus. Gesine Manuwald is supervising a new edition of the Loeb Classical Library's *Remains of Old Latin*.

² To mention only a few: Goldberg 2005; Wiseman 2009 (reviewed by H. Flower, *JRS* 100 (2010), 251–3); Richlin 2014; Wiseman 2015; Feeney 2016.

³ Fabrizi 2012; Goldschmidt 2013, admittedly, as much about Virgil as Ennius (both Fabrizi and Goldschmidt are reviewed by J. Farrell, *JRS* 105 (2015), 421–4); Elliott 2013, which raises the questions mentioned above (reviewed by N. Goldschmidt, *JRS* 105 (2015), 424–5); Fisher 2014. One should also mention Enrico Flores' collaborative edition and commentary on the *Annals* (5 vols, Naples, 2000–2009).

⁴ Badian 1966.

⁵ Whether one agrees with them or not, the works of T. P. Wiseman, especially 1979, and A. J. Woodman, especially 1988, mark a watershed.

for its on-going appreciation of Livy as an artist actually shaping and constructing that history for his contemporaries and later generations.⁶ Stimulating and illuminating treatments of important aspects of the Roman historical and historiographical tradition as well as nuanced readings of individual historians are now to be found in abundance.⁷

Nor is our sense of how the Romans looked at their past bounded any longer by the conventions only of 'historical' texts. Though these, of course, loom large, and always will, in any treatment of how the Romans understood and appreciated their past, recent studies have emphasized the many other components of Roman memory. Uwe Walter's superb *Memoria und Res Publica* gives a comprehensive overview and analysis of how much of the Romans' sense of history was dependent on artistic representations, stage performances, commemorative inscriptions, tombs and monuments, and *lieux de mémoire* in general, not to mention performative moments such as the Roman funeral and procession, and the pervasive influence of exemplarity.⁸ All of these things worked to keep before the eyes of Romans of all orders the great men and, to a lesser (but persistent) extent, women of the past and their achievements, and set a yardstick by which later generations could and did measure themselves.

II

It is into this exciting milieu that a new edition of the fragments of the Roman historians now comes. For the better part of a century, scholars of Roman historiography had to make do with Hermann Peter's problematic and outdated collection of the fragmentary Roman historians.⁹ As Felix Jacoby was at work on his *Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* during the early and middle parts of the twentieth century, it became clear that something similar was needed for the Romans. Jacoby himself called for such a collection already in 1949,¹⁰ but while some excellent editions of individual historians appeared in the following decades, no complete collection, done in a modern manner, was forthcoming.¹¹ Then suddenly, the dam burst: Martine Chassignet's Budé edition in 1986 of Cato's *Origines* heralded her comprehensive three-volume collection of the pre-Sallustian Roman historians a decade later,¹² and these volumes were quickly followed by a two-volume study edition of the major *testimonia* and fragments from Hans Beck and Uwe Walter.¹³ Shortly thereafter Peter Scholz and Uwe Walter produced a slim volume, similar in orientation to Beck–Walter, which covered the writers of memoirs.¹⁴ And now, biggest of all, come these three volumes under the general editorship of Tim Cornell, the fullest treatment yet of the lamentably sparse remains of Roman historiography.¹⁵ The collection, proceeding in chronological order,¹⁶ begins

⁶ Oakley 1997–2005.

⁷ See, for example, Kraus and Woodman 1997; Eigler *et al.* 2003; Lachenaud and Longrée 2003; Marincola 2007; Feldherr 2009.

⁸ Walter 2004; an English translation is a strong desideratum.

⁹ Peter 1870–1906.

¹⁰ Jacoby 1949: 284 n. 73: '... a renovation of H. Peter's conscientious collections ... with the addition of a commentary would be desirable.'

¹¹ These editions of individual historians or works are noted in *FRHist* I, 6 n. 13.

¹² Chassignet 1986, 1996, 1999, 2004.

¹³ Beck and Walter 2001–2004.

¹⁴ Scholz and Walter 2013.

¹⁵ Not surprisingly, the work has already garnered much attention in the pages of *Histos*: see the series of Working Papers by C. Pelling, J. Marincola, L. Pitcher and S. Malloch from the 2014 Classical Association session organized by Catherine Steel (*Histos* Working Papers, 2014.04–2014.07); Woodman 2015, much of which corrects and supplements *FRHist*; and Chassignet 2015.

¹⁶ The editors caution that the difficulty of dating certain authors means that their arrangement in some cases is only approximate.

with the *Annales Maximi* and Fabius Pictor, and ends in the third century C.E. with Marius Maximus and Asinius Quadratus. It is massive, magisterial and sometimes maddening. It is superbly done, and will be the basis for the study of these historians, and of Roman historiography in general, hereafter.

The physical arrangement of the volumes is unlike any I have encountered before: the first volume contains an extremely valuable general introduction (see below, §III), followed by the introductions to the individual historians and several appendices; the second volume contains the texts of the testimonia and fragments with facing English translation, while the third has the commentary on the fragments. As is now standard practice, testimonia are laid out separately from fragments, and while both are translated, there is no separate commentary on the testimonia: the reader is directed to the individual introductions for discussion of these. In practical terms this requires that a scholar using the collection must have open simultaneously three large volumes; woe betide those with small desks! It also means that it is impossible for several scholars to use the collection simultaneously, since the study of any single historian will demand all three volumes at once. The editors say that they wished to avoid the inevitable flipping back and forth that is so often a feature of commentaries, and while they have done that, their arrangement comes with its own cost.

III

The first volume opens with a massive general introduction (I, 3–137), which contains: (i) a brief review of earlier editions; (ii) the scope, structure and contents of the present edition; (iii) a study of the prose styles of the authors;¹⁷ and (iv) a summary of each of the citing authors (Appian to Velleius Paterculus), with observations on how each used historical works and the consequences that this has for our understanding of the fragments themselves.

The first section, after pointing out that this new edition is the most comprehensive produced,¹⁸ turns to the criteria for inclusion in the volume. The last two decades have seen a number of important studies on the rationale and presuppositions of collections of fragments and commentaries, and it seems clear that the editors are familiar with them, given the caution with which they proceed in their collection.¹⁹ Scholars have pointed out, for example, that the ‘cover text’, the text in which the ‘fragment’ is embedded, is crucial in evaluating the fragment itself, since the quoting author often employs such citation or quotation in disagreement or polemic: we cannot, therefore, take at face value the remarks made by those who cite or quote. It is often very difficult, moreover, to know for certain the extent of a ‘quotation’, since the citing authors often add remarks of their own, especially by way of explanation, not to mention that the ‘quotation’ itself may be largely paraphrase, often unbeknown to modern readers.²⁰

The lessons imparted by this recent scholarship have been learnt by the editors, and caution may be said to be almost a defining motif of this collection. At the very beginning they alert the reader to the limits of the collection (I, 3, 7 with my emphases):

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

¹⁷ This is a revised and expanded edition of Briscoe 2005.

¹⁸ Chassignet limited herself to pre-Sallustian authors, and the latest author in Beck–Walter is Atticus.

¹⁹ See, for example, Most 1997; Gibson and Kraus 2002; see now (too late for the editors of these volumes to have seen) Davies 2016. The era of caution in the handling of fragments may be said to have opened with Brunt 1980.

²⁰ For the concept of ‘cover text’ see Schepens 1997.

introductions and commentaries. We have sought at every point *to make readers aware of the limits of what can be known*. ... 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*.

Pointing out that their arrangement of the fragments is ‘more conservative’ than that of their predecessors, they emphasize that their ‘arrangement and methodology [are] ... designed to make clear the distance that separates the lost originals from the surviving remnants’, such that conjectures and theoretical possibilities are ‘confined ... to the commentary’ (I, 7). Even within the individual entries, reminders are given of just how fragile our knowledge of the contents and arrangements of fragmentary histories is.²¹ Indeed, one can hardly read a few pages without encountering peremptory dismissals of this or that scholar’s reconstruction and/or interpretation, often without much discussion. It may seem that we are moving backwards, but in fact we are not, since we are reminded again and again of how little we know about these historians and their works. Given the fantasies that have too often been spun from the slender filaments of fragmentary authors (not least the Roman historians), I think this edition’s approach is appropriate and admirable.

Sometimes, however, the editors’ caution might go too far. In the section on the *Annales Maximi*, for example, only explicit citations of the *Annales* are deemed sufficient to be considered a fragment. Chassignet, by contrast, in her Budé edition included a section ‘Libri Annales sine nomine’, which collected all the references in later authors to ‘annales’; here Chassignet seems to me to have understood better what was helpful to scholars. The editors of *FRHist* could have made clear that some of these were doubtful fragments (as the editors in fact do with many of the historians elsewhere in the collection), but they ought nevertheless to have been included 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 are likely to be.²²

The criteria for inclusion in *FRHist* are clearly spelt out, although not entirely consistent (as the editors themselves admit). Roman historians are defined as all Romans who wrote chronologically-ordered prose narratives of primarily political and military events (I, 7). Hellenophone historians are included, of course, as are freedmen, but not non-Romans (so no Theophanes or Juba II), not poets (regrettable but understandable), and not authors whose works survive in substantial part and can be consulted elsewhere (for example, Sallust’s *Histories*, Granius Licinianus or Julius Exuperantius). Biographies of famous men, however, as well as memoirs and autobiographies are included, but antiquarian writers are not. One can, of course, justify the inclusion of biographies

²¹ See, for example, Cornell’s remarks on the structure of Books 2 and 3 of Cato’s *Origines* (I, 198–205).

²² Similarly, the collection does not include ‘anonymous’ citations, those places where, for example, Livy will cite *fama* or *scriptores* or *auctores*. Jacoby, by contrast, firmly believed that anonymous citations were essential: ‘... the collection of fragments ... must include all the material that the ancient sources give us about a specific place. In practice, this happens thus: for each place, we shall first list the fragments of the named chronicles in chronological order, then the collective citations, finally the facts that are cited without identification of source but can be traced back to local histories. This last-named information will be given either by the chronological order of the events or alphabetically according to the source’ (Jacoby 1909: 120). Although the purview of Roman historiography is not nearly so wide as that of Greek, it would have been worthwhile to have these citations, either arranged chronologically or by subject matter. That would obviously have added to the already considerable workload of the editors; but it would have put before the reader a great deal of information potentially very valuable for learning about the Roman historical tradition.

because of the important content which they contain. Yet having transgressed their generic boundaries so as to accommodate biography, the editors raise questions as to why this historical literature is included but not other types.

On the issue of ‘antiquarian’ writers, the editors, it seems to me, tie themselves in knots by trying to separate out historians and antiquarians, even though (as they well recognize) the latter term is not ancient and would not have been employed by Roman writers.²³ Yet even so, they include some works, such as Varro’s on Trojan families and Hyginus’ on Italian cities, noting that ‘they would probably not have been regarded by the Romans as “history”’ and concluding, ‘we have had to make some more-or-less arbitrary choices in marginal areas’ (I, 9). But why, then, is Verrius Flaccus not included? If the dividing line is narrative, that will not do, since it is clear from Gellius 4.5.1–7 that Flaccus’ *Book of Memorable Events* did contain narratives, including the famous one about Horatius Cocles and the treacherous Etruscan haruspices — which the editors duly print as F6 under the *Annales Maximi* since Gellius says that the story was in both. Here again, the issue is more than academic, for it goes to the heart of the reason for such a collection’s existence and its putative audience. As it happens, Verrius Flaccus, along with a number of other writers, is assigned to an (excellent) appendix of thirty-nine ‘also-rans’, authors who were not included in the collection. Here the reader may find the relevant testimonia and bibliography, together with the reasons in each case why the author was excluded.

Good sense and care are evident in the layout of the testimonia and fragments. I was troubled only by the typographical conventions which are designed to identify more clearly what exactly is part of the fragment and what is not. Bold type is used for any material attributed to the lost source by the citing author, while bold italic indicates what purports to be a verbatim quotation. In the case of uncertainty, bold type is used only for what can ‘with reasonable confidence be taken as attributed to the source’ (I, 15). So, for example, an entry will look like this (Cato, *FRHist* 5 F141):

dum se intempesta nox, ut ait M. Porcius, praecipitat.

Quite apart from the value of such a convention, I confess that I find it to be somewhat at odds with the caution displayed in the volumes as a whole, and I worry that material so marked by the editors will come to be taken by scholars as being an accurate or a verbatim quotation by the citing author, even though we know so well how careless (to use a more benign term) such citing authors can be.

IV

The editors are very clear as to what constitutes a fragment as distinct from a testimonium (I, 14 with my emphases):

... 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.

²³ Here Momigliano’s important 1950 article, ‘Ancient history and the antiquarian’, has continued to make its influence felt. Although the editors cite (I, 9 n. 6) some of the recent work questioning his distinction between ancient historians and antiquarians, including Miller 2007, they seem not to recognize the shaky foundations on which such a separation rests; see the important review of Luraghi 2007.

The editors in a footnote make reference to Fabius Pictor and the Tauromenium inscription which both Chassignet and Beck–Walter printed as F1 but which *FRHist* prints as a testimonium (T7), and this particular case raises interesting issues. The passage is by now a familiar one and first characterizes Pictor himself ('Quintus Fabius, surnamed Pictorinus, a Roman, son of Gaius'), and then gives a brief (lacunose, alas) summary of his work, which includes the arrival of Heracles, Lavinia, Aeneas and the 'later foundation' of Romulus and Remus.²⁴ The first four lines are clearly a testimonium, but what of the remaining ones? Given that what is summarized here are the *contents* of Pictor's work, it seems to me an over-fine distinction to say that because it does not refer to a *specific* passage it is 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 in fact treated the hero. 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 — namely, 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 would have been preferable to split this up into a testimonium and a fragment (or to repeat the latter part of the inscription in the fragments).

Sometimes the failure to place a remark into the fragments results in possible distortion. It is fine to print in the testimonia for Pollio's history the remark (*FRHist* 56 T5, from Tacitus' speech ascribed to Cremutius Cordus) that 'the writings of Asinius Pollio preserve a highly complimentary record of these same men [sc. Cassius and Brutus]'. But it ought to have been in the fragments as well since these two men appear nowhere else in the fragments, which are dominated by 'particular passages' on Caesar; and it would have been helpful to be reminded amongst such references that Pollio's work also contained (favourable) accounts of the deeds of Cassius and Brutus. I realize that in both these cases one can argue either way; but if it is the aim of a collection such as this to put before the reader all the relevant information, then anything that has to do with the contents of the work (be it specific or general) should be in the fragments.

The absence of a commentary on the individual testimonia is said to be made up for by taking full account of them in the introductions to the individual authors, but this is not, alas, always the case. Indeed, of all the editorial decisions made, this was the most regrettable. There is, as might be expected, much in the testimonia that cries out for comment but is not addressed in the introductions. I leave aside here the General Testimonia on Roman historiography (GT1–7, found at II, 2–9) where commentary would have been extremely helpful in making links with the other material found in these volumes (and in preserved authors, of course). To mention only Fabius Pictor again: since the authors do not comment directly on the testimonia, there is no discussion of why Pictor might have treated Heracles; the hero 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. Likewise, the remark concerning Cremutius Cordus' 'spirit in which he deplored the civil wars' (*FRHist* 71 T3) elicits no comment, yet if it is an accurate characterization of Cremutius' history (and there is no reason to think that it is not), it should have been linked with Velleius' remark that 'no one has lamented the fortune of this entire era [sc. that of the civil wars] in a sufficiently worthy

²⁴ [οὗτος] ἰστόρηκεν τὴν | [τοῦ Ἡ]ρακλέους ἄφιξιν | [- ca. 3 -] . . [I]ταλίαν καὶ α . . εἰ | [- ca. 4 -] .ον Λανοῖου
 συμ- | [- ca. 4 -] ν ὑπὸ Αἰνεΐα καὶ | [- ca. 4 -] πολὶ ὅστε- | [ρον ἐγ]έροντο Ῥωμύλος | [καὶ Ῥ]έμος καὶ Ῥώμης |
 [κτίσις ὑ]πὸ Ῥωμύλου, κτλ.

manner'.²⁵ Perhaps even more importantly, amidst all the questions of Cremutius' affiliations, this valuable indication of his disposition towards the events he narrated has been passed over. These are but a couple of examples; lost opportunities in the testimonia abound.

V

In this review article I have tended to focus on those areas that I have found wanting or problematic, so let me assert again that these volumes have a wealth of important and useful information, and all who work in the fields of Roman history and historiography are greatly in the editors' debt. Excellent treatments of important issues abound, and here I limit myself to but a few examples.

John Rich's overview of the issues surrounding the *Annales Maximi* could not be better (I, 141–59): he gives an extremely helpful summary of the testimonia, separates out carefully what we do (or do not) 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 (for example, 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. Likewise, Tim Cornell's masterful discussion of Cato's treatment of the Aeneas story seems to me pretty much perfect for a work of this sort. In just two-and-a-half pages he manages to sum up decades of 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 (III, 65–7). 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.²⁶ (Indeed, his commentary on all of Cato's fragments will now be the standard discussion.) John Briscoe offers a 'fresh assessment' of the distribution of the material in Coelius Antipater's history of the Second Punic War, and of how the individual years fit into Coelius' seven books, making a compelling case for a more evenly distributed number of years per book (I, 257–60). The reconstruction has, of course, a certain speculative quality to it, but in keeping with the policies of the collection, 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. Mark Pobjoy's long discussion of the textual problems with Sempronius Asellio's remark on the distinction between history and annals (20 F2) is invaluable for offering a comprehensive overview of the ways in which scholars have tried to emend the text (III, 278–81).²⁷ Andrew Drummond's introduction to Pollio's career and history is exemplary: it avoids making him a zealot of either side, and is careful to note that his legendary independence did not necessarily indicate hostility towards or criticism of the new Augustan régime (indeed, there is evidence that he fitted quite comfortably into that régime). He warns that Pollio's letters to Cicero should not be read as statements of his political convictions, but rather as

²⁵ *FRHist* 71 T3; 'illo ingenio, quo ciuilia bella defleuit' ~ Vell. 2.67.1: 'huius totius temporis fortunam ne deflere quidem quisquam satis digne potuit, e.q.s.'

²⁶ Similarly valuable on the Aeneas story is John Briscoe's discussion of Hemina, *FRHist* 6 FF6–8 (III, 162–5), which tries to reconcile quite disparate evidence.

²⁷ There are some important remarks about the text and Pobjoy's translation in Woodman 2015: 108–9.

mechanisms to safeguard his own interests,²⁸ and that we should not reconstruct Pollio's history based on inferences from his career (I, 430–45).

These and many other discussions of a similar high quality can be found throughout the collection. It is to be regretted, therefore, that the collection as a whole is not more unified. I do not mean simply in the matter of formatting or the like, where there is a general, though not uniform, consistency.²⁹ I mean in the more substantial matter of the material itself. The entries, except where there are clear indications of cross-referencing in the testimonia or fragments themselves (such as when several historians are cited for a particular matter), are mostly self-contained, and there is very little cross-referencing to issues or discussions elsewhere in the collection. This is partly ameliorated by the fine index of topics (III, 759–72), but it would have been good to have such references (and discussion) in the commentaries themselves.

If I had to give a general characterization of the collection, I would say that it is exceptionally strong on historical matters, and somewhat less strong on literary and historiographical questions. This is not to say that there are no important discussions of the latter, only that in general the work will, I think, satisfy historians more than students of literature and historiography.³⁰ For those interested in linguistic and historiographical issues, both Chassignet's and Beck–Walter's collections will continue to be of great use and should be employed alongside *FRHist*. Of course, the danger in a review of this sort is that with such an enormous text to choose from, any examples run the risk of appearing arbitrary; but I have worked through the whole collection, and I think that I have represented the contents fairly if not fully.

VI

Finally, a word about the work's form. Even the most devoted lover of books cannot fail to note that this collection in its physical form is something of a throwback to an earlier era. In an age when collections of fragments are increasingly found online — with all the conveniences of access and use that such a format brings — the appearance of these volumes solely as three print volumes must raise questions. What can possibly be the justification for the fact that there is no electronic version, no e-book, no online access and, so far as I can tell, not even the promise or preparation of such? An electronic version can more easily accommodate corrections (inevitably, I noticed quite a number of typographical and other errors) and additions. The admirably full bibliographies that precede each author will, in this paper version, quickly become outdated; online they could have been consistently updated.³¹ Since the collection is currently searchable on Google Books, an electronic edition exists somewhere. It is to be hoped that the editors and the publisher will address the issue of an electronic form of *FRHist* immediately. The magnificence of this collection and the scholarship on display in it demand that these volumes reach the widest possible audience.

The Florida State University
jmarinco@fsu.edu

²⁸ He is here implicitly rejecting the views of Syme 1939: 6 n. 1.

²⁹ So, for example, some authors use parenthetical references in their introductions, some use footnotes. Some translations maintain the historic present, some do not.

³⁰ I have given a fuller analysis of this absence in my working paper, cited above, n. 15, pp. 7–12.

³¹ For thoughts about how a truly electronic edition can change the way scholars think about fragmentary works, see the contribution of L. Pitcher in the *Histos* Working Papers, cited above, n. 15.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Badian, E. 1966: 'The early historians', in T. A. Dorey (ed.), *Latin Historians*, London, 1–38
- Beck, H., and Walther, U. 2001–2004: *Die frühen römischen Historiker*, 2 vols (vol. 1, 2nd edn, 2005), Darmstadt
- Briscoe, J. 2005: 'The language and style of the fragmentary republican historians', in T. Reinhardt, M. Lapidge and J. N. Adams (eds), *Aspects of the Language of Latin Prose*, Oxford, 53–72
- Brunt, P. A. 1980: 'On historical fragments and epitomes', *Classical Quarterly* 30, 477–94
- Chassignet, M. 1986: *Caton: les Origines (fragments)*, Paris
- Chassignet, M. 1996: *L'Annalistique romaine I: les annales des pontifes et l'annalistique ancienne*, Paris
- Chassignet, M. 1999: *L'Annalistique romaine II: l'annalistique moyenne*, Paris
- Chassignet, M. 2004: *L'Annalistique romaine III: l'annalistique récente, l'autobiographie politique*, Paris
- Chassignet, M. 2015: 'Une nouvelle édition des fragments des historiens romains', *Histos* 9, XXVII–XLIII
- Davies, J. 2016: 'The historical commentary', in C. S. Kraus and C. Stray (eds), *Classical Commentaries: Explorations in a Scholarly Genre*, Oxford, 233–49
- Eigler, U., Gotter, U., Luraghi, N., and Walther, U. (eds) 2003: *Formen römischer Geschichtsschreibung von den Anfängen bis Livius*, Darmstadt
- Elliott, J. 2013: *Ennius and the Architecture of the Annals*, Cambridge
- Fabrizi, V. 2012: *Mores veteresque novosque: rappresentazioni del passato e del presente di Roma negli Annales di Ennio*, Pisa
- Feeney, D. 2016: *Beyond Greek: the Beginnings of Latin Literature*, Cambridge, MA
- Feldherr, A. (ed.) 2009: *Cambridge Companion to the Roman Historians*, Cambridge
- Fisher, J. 2014: *The 'Annals' of Quintus Ennius and the Italic Tradition*, Baltimore
- Gibson, R. K., and Kraus, C. S. (eds) 2002: *The Classical Commentary: History, Practices, Theory*, Mnemosyne Supp. 232, Leiden
- Goldberg, S. 2005: *Constructing Literature in the Roman Republic: Poetry and its Reception*, Cambridge
- Goldschmidt, N. 2013: *Shaggy Crowns: Ennius' Annales and Virgil's Aeneid*, Oxford
- Jacoby, F. 1909: 'Über die Entwicklung der griechischen Historiographie und den Plan einer neuen Sammlung der griechischen Historikerfragmente', *Klio* 9, 80–123; reprinted in F. Jacoby, *Abhandlungen zur griechischen Geschichtsschreibung* (ed. H. Bloch), Leiden, 1956, 16–64; English trans. by M. Chambers and S. Schorn, *Histos* Supp. 3, Newcastle upon Tyne, 2015
- Jacoby, F. 1949: *Atthis: the Local Chronicles of Ancient Athens*, Oxford
- Kraus, C. S., and Woodman, A. J. 1997: *Latin Historians*, G&R New Surveys in the Classics 27, Oxford
- Lachenaud, G., and Longrée, D. (eds) 2003: *Grecs et Romains aux prises avec l'histoire: représentations, récits et idéologie*, 2 vols, Rennes
- Luraghi, N. 2007: 'Two (more) books about Momigliano', *Storia della Storiografia* 52, 113–23
- Manuwald, G. 2012: *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta, vol. 2: Ennius*, Göttingen
- Marincola, J. (ed.) 2007: *A Companion to Greek and Roman Historiography*, 2 vols, Malden, MA and Oxford
- Miller, P. N. (ed.) 2007: *Momigliano and Antiquarianism: Foundations of the Modern Cultural Sciences*, Toronto
- Momigliano, A. 1950: 'Ancient history and the antiquarian', *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13, 285–315, reprinted in A. Momigliano, *Contributo alla storia degli studi classici*, Rome, 1955, 67–106
- Most, G. W. (ed.) 1997: *Collecting Fragments/Fragmente sammeln*, Göttingen
- Oakley, S. P. 1997–2005: *A Commentary on Livy, Books VI–X*, 4 vols, Oxford
- Peter, H. W. G. 1870–1906: *Historicorum Romanorum Reliquiae*, 2 vols, Leipzig (2nd edn, 1914–1916)
- Richlin, A. 2014: 'Talking to slaves in the Plautine audience', *Classical Antiquity* 33, 174–226
- Schauer, M. 2012: *Tragicorum Romanorum Fragmenta, vol. 1: Livius Andronicus, Naevius, tragici minores, fragmenta adespota*, Göttingen
- Schepens, G. 1997: 'Jacoby's FGrHist: problems, methods, prospects', in Most 1997, 144–72
- Scholz, P., and Walther, U. 2013: *Fragmente römischen Memoiren*, Heidelberg

- Syme, R. 1939: *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford
- Walter, U. 2004: *Memoria und Res Publica: zur Geschichtskultur im republikanischen Rom*, Frankfurt
- Wiseman, T. P. 1979: *Clio's Cosmetics: Three Studies in Greco-Roman Literature*, Leicester and Totowa, NJ
- Wiseman, T. P. 2009: *Remembering the Roman People: Essays on Late Republican Politics and Literature*, Oxford
- Wiseman, T. P. 2015: *The Roman Audience: Classical Literature as Social History*, Oxford
- Woodman, A. J. 1988: *Rhetoric in Classical Historiography: Four Studies*, London
- Woodman, A. J. 2015: *Lost Histories: Selected Fragments of Roman Historical Writers*, *Histos* Supp. 2, Newcastle upon Tyne