

Edith Foster & Donald Lateiner (eds.), *Thucydides and Herodotus*. Oxford 2012 (OUP). xiv + 399p. ISBN 9780199593262.

Thucydides' enticing rhetoric of exclusivity is partly responsible for the fact that comparisons of his work with Herodotus' *History* usually focus on divergences rather than affinities. In many earlier studies, commonalities were mainly touched upon when it came to the contribution of either historian to the perfection of the genre. The thought-provoking volume, edited by Edith Foster and Donald Lateiner, challenges this dated approach. Instead of forcing choices or teleological schemes, its twelve contributions map afresh the common ground of the two historians on the basis of hitherto undervalued criteria, compare the answers they give to similar questions and use their texts as a background against which later literary works can be read. The volume is preceded by an introduction written by the editors and aiming to locate the work within the tradition of comparative examinations of the two historians and is then divided in three parts: "Methods of reasoning", "Common themes", and "Reception".

In a chapter titled "Structure and Meaning in Epic and Historiography", Richard Rutherford reminds us that the length of the Homeric epics is unique and that the large scale narrative promotes the application of techniques (such as foreshadowing or further devices whereby the various parts of the narrative are linked to each other) which will be found later in historiography. The division of the narrative work in two parts which display structural and thematic correspondences is a further common, Homeric element, inherited by both classical historians. Philip Stadter treats "Thucydides as a 'reader' of Herodotus", – a contemporary one – and shows that he appropriates Herodotus' vision of the war and, more specifically, his version of the Persian Wars. Affinities are found in method (e.g. chronology), arrangement of the work (topics addressed in the proem), historical outlook and narrative techniques (authorial comments and devices prompting the reader to "look to the end") etc. It is largely thanks to the affinities that deviations become meaningful. Carlo Scardino ("Indirect discourse in Herodotus and Thucydides") demonstrates that indirect speeches in Herodotus and (mainly) Thucydides share important features with direct speeches; these features are grouped under the following headings: Authorial introductory and closing formulae, types of indirect speech and their dramatic function, argumentative and rhetorical topoi, the rhetorical sophistication of the indirect speeches. Catherine Rubincam relates the different numeric practices of the two historians (Herodotus provides more frequently the result of arithmetic calculations) to the different authorial persona adopted by each historian.

The five papers of the central section investigate Thucydides' direct response to Herodotus or reveal structural elements of the narrative which are exploited by both historians in a comparable manner, so as to increase its dramatic potential. Stahl and Lateiner focus on erroneous decisions and oaths respectively. Decisions which are taken against reason and ignore the available information provide both historians with explanations for disasters. Oaths are interesting for the narrator when they are used as a means of deception, when they are abused or manipulated, finally when they prove futile and misleading. Edith Foster's chapter titled "Thermopylae and

Pylos, with Reference to the Homeric Background” explores the similarities between events which are explicitly linked by Thucydides, and highlights affinities between the two historians (combat of intelligence, the use of irony and reversal) but also distinct Homeric features which are absent from Herodotus’ narrative (the focus on the experience of battle and weapons, a predilection for explanations which take into account the psychology of the two armies etc.). The next two chapters compare the ways in which common themes are presented by the two historians. Wolfgang Blösel (“Thucydides on Themistocles: A Herodotean Narrator?”) revives the hypothesis that Charon of Lampsacus is Thucydides’ source on the exile and the end of Themistocles, a passage which he sees as belonging to an early stage of the work, Rosaria Vignolo Munson’s “Persians in Thucydides” infers that, even though Herodotus sets the standards for Thucydides’ presentation of the Persians of the past (in speech or in narrative episodes), in his main narrative line the later historian “avoids emphasizing the alterity of the East”. However, in the unfinished Book 8, she discerns elements of a Herodotean reporting style.

The contributions of the third part exemplify in various ways the impact of the classical historians on later authors. The parallel examination of Thucydidean speeches and the surviving rhetorical treatises of the 4th century (especially the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*) by Christopher Pelling shows that there is no direct dependence of these treatises on Thucydides but also refutes the assumption that Thucydides applied earlier forms of the same theories. Moreover, the evidence of Herodotus suggests the existence of “a longstanding tradition” which explains both the practice of the historians and the paths followed by rhetorical theory. Emily Baragwanath (“A Noble Alliance: Herodotus, Thucydides, and Xenophon’s Procles”) convincingly argues that Xenophon’s indebtedness to Herodotean historiography can be compared to his indebtedness to Thucydides; together they suggest a self-definition of his work, a view which has hitherto been underrepresented in studies on Xenophon. The main part of the chapter focuses on Procles of Phlius: themes (e.g. expediency, self-sufficiency), motives (the wise advisor), moral issues (the emphasis on ethical achievement), and the way speeches are interwoven in the narrative inevitably recall Xenophon’s predecessors and are used in a way that makes his contribution distinct before this amalgam of influences. Iris Samotta (“Herodotus and Thucydides in Roman Republican Historiography”) shows that the two Greek historians provided the models for the development of early Roman historiography, either directly (Fabius Pictor) or indirectly (through the study of Western Greek historians and, later, Polybius). The influence is visible in the choice of topics and ideas, as well as in the narrative arrangement. Samotta traces a more direct influence of the two historians on individual historians in Roman Republican historiography. After the massive arrival of Greek books to Rome following the Roman conquest, the Greek tradition becomes a more explicit point of reference, and the historians’ use of Greek models (e.g. during and after the Punic Wars) has ideological implications. Samotta also discusses the Atticist reception of the two historians in the first century B.C., placing emphasis on Cicero’s attitude towards them.

Students of ancient historiography will profit greatly from this book; apart from the thorough and mostly well-researched investigations of individual topics, the value

of the collection lies in the improvement of the re-contextualisation of classical historiography. Thus, the book fully justifies Rutherford's estimation that "even at the opening of the twenty-first century, we still have much to discover about these inexhaustible authors" (34). A new appraisal of the importance of rhetorical models for the shaping of historical writing in the 5th century (a topic not directly addressed in the book) might be a future desideratum. Finally, a corrigendum: on p. 290 replace "Alcmene" with "Aithra".

ANTONIS TSAKMAKIS
UNIVERSITY OF CYPRUS
a.tsakmakis@ucy.ac.cy