Peleus im Mythos V. 61–65 s. zuletzt Carnes (s.o.) 5 und 8 f. Henry hätte seinen eigenen Beobachtungen S. 48 zu N. 4,93 ἔφεξαι στρέψεισ ἀx ‘twisting’ was an important technique in wrestling (vgl. V. 94) und 96 ἔφεξαι ἐχος ‘used in wrestling...’ für das ganze Gedicht nachgehen sollen.

Insgesamt enthält Henrys Kommentar zwar manchmal durchaus nützliche Beobachtungen und Hinweise im Detail, doch sind die gebotenen Informationen nicht immer aktuell und gelegentlich lückenhaft oder irreführend (s.o. zu N. 4, 6 und 8). Zum besseren Verständnis des Pindartextes und seiner Besonderheiten trägt Henry nur gelegentlich bei, am meisten in N. 10 (s. bes. seine textkritischen Erläuterungen, vgl. o., und z.B. seine instruktiven Bemerkungen S. 98 zu Syntax V. 17 f., S. 99 f zu ἐγένος κύλλεσις V. 22, S. 153 f zu ἀμφοτέρων ‘as a prelude’..., sc. to Olympic victory V. 33, oder S. 110 ff zu spezifischen Details der Tyndariden/Apharetiden-Erzählung V. 60 und 61–90; vgl. auch den Abschnitt zu N. 11 (S. 119–33), der in manchen Punkten den Kommentar von W. J. Verdenius (ICS 7, 1982 = Comm. on Pindar 1987/8) ergänzt und modifiziert.

W. B. Henry ist ein ausgewiesener Papyrologe und Philologe, doch die sprachliche und sachliche Kommentierung von Oden Pindars und die Analyse ihrer Struktur (‘Composition’) fordert mehr Zeit und Aufmerksamkeit, als er für sie übrig hatte.

Bonn/Münster

Adolf Köhnken


This massive and impressive book started life as a Leeds PhD, and is the work of a scholar who returned to classics in the 1990s after a forty-year career as a practising UK lawyer (‘barrister’) on the north-east circuit. It leaves no historical or chronological problem unaddressed, and reaches sensible, if sometimes excessively down-to-earth, conclusions on all matters which it touches on, and they are many: nihil quod tetigit non ornavit. (‘Down to earth’: Philippides was probably hypoglycaemic when he had his Pan-epiphany, if he did, 369). If this review suggests that other matters ought to have been touched on as well, that is perhaps no more than a complaint at the word ‘historical’ in the title. But, in the twenty-first century, we are entitled to ask, ‘can there be, and should there be, a (purely or mainly) historical commentary on Herodotus, or any section of him? My question deliberately echoes Dr Scott’s Balliol teacher of long ago, Sir Kenneth Dover, who has memorably asked the inverse question about Thucy-dides: ‘can there be, should there be, a ’Literary Commentary on Thucydidies’?': ‘The Greeks and their Legacy’ (Oxford, 2001) 55.

Dr Scott (henceforth ‘S’) supplies not only a formidably comprehensive historical commentary, but a 77-page Introduction, and nearly 200 pages of Appendices (there are 23 of these, one of them more than 30 pages long, and another nearly 20 pages). There are ten maps, all bunched together at the end of the book. There are three indexes, including an index locorum (‘index of citations’) which includes a suitably enormous entry on Herodotus himself. Inevitably, such topics as the battle of Marathon, and Herodotus’ very chronologically involved
treatment of Argive and Aiginetan history, are minutely treated, both in the Appendices and in the commentary. S. writes with clarity and decisiveness. You know exactly where you are: in a 'safe pair of hands', to use the modern political cliché. The Ionian Revolt began in book 5, and it is a particular potential difficulty of S.'s undertaking that the two books form a pair, to a greater extent than perhaps any other two adjacent books of Herodotus. S. is aware of the difficulty and the challenge, and meets it by a valuable lengthy section of Introduction, in which many book 5 difficulties are well addressed. But that book is now (2007) the subject of a collection of close readings by different hands (E. Irwin and E. Greenwood (eds.), 'Reading Herodotus: A Study of the Logoi in Book 5 of Herodotus' Histories'), many of whose contributors inevitably cut deeper, and see more subtleties in their book, than S. was able to do in his short and prefatory treatment of it.

S.'s commentary proper is arranged by short (often one-word) untranslated Greek lemmata. The narrative is divided into sections of a few Herodotean chapters each, all introduced by a helpful English summary in italics. There are no running heads in the commentary (as opposed to the Appendices), which is a great pity. This is not a trivial complaint; see below. There is, regrettably, virtually no help with translation, and untranslated Greek from other authors is printed, just like that (e.g. six lines of Greek epigram at 401, the fate of the unfortunate uprooted Eretrians).

Reviewers, it has often been remarked, concentrate on what they disagree with at the expense of agreement, and that will be true of my review as well. So I insist: what follows should not be allowed to obscure the very solid virtues of S.'s work (in both senses of 'work': the labour involved has been as vast as it has been fruitful), or diminish his huge achievement, conceived in its own terms.

Book 6 is a complex structure, with many sub-episodes and excursuses nestling inside the narrative(s), and even a professedly historical commentary surely needs to offer some guidance in this department. S. offers very little (no separate Appendix on Herodotus' organization of his material, for instance), and what information S. does provide is actually confusing. At 213 (introductory n. to chs. 49. 2–53) we are told that Herodotus here «breaks off his main narrative, the Persian invasion, until [ch.] 94». But then at 253 (introductory n. to chs. 61–70), we read that «the main narrative now resumes» after the institutional material about Sparta. Then, at 333, introductory n. to chs. 94–101, we read that Herodotus only now «resumes the basic narrative, the first Persian invasion of Greece»; this is the passage of Herodotus referred to in advance at 213. In between, 308 (on 84. 1) S. says «the narrative now resumes from the end of ch. 75». Even if we change «main» to «basic» at 213, as we must evidently do (so that «main» at 253 has a special and paradoxical sense 'subordinate'), the truth remains that the terminology adopted has nowhere been explained, and that a certain incuriosity has led S. himself into actual muddle. Some kind of chart to demonstrate the nesting of the various sections and sub-sections, static or institutional, and narrative/dynamic, would have helped, and above all some discussion of their inter-relationship. One way of mitigating the difficulties would see (above) have been a system of differentiated thematic running heads, instead of what we actually get, which is the bleak single word 'COMMENTARY' at the head of both left- and right-
hand pages. By inscribing a bigger theme at the head of the left-hand page and a smaller one on the right (the selection process and the precise wording need a lot of thought and care, but S. is an extremely thoughtful and careful author), S. would have assisted the reader greatly. At the very least, it would have been good to be told, by means of running heads, the chapter and paragraph we have reached; as it is, you can open some double pages of S. and not know where you are in the Herodotean book at all, though the full numbering of lemmata (e.g. '83. 2' not just «2») means this is not very common. (If I may be allowed a Herodotean insertion: the novelist Charles Dickens was aware of the importance of running heads or titles, and supplied them himself, sometimes using them to hint at meanings not spelt out in the text. See John Holloway’s interesting introduction to the Penguin edition of ‘Little Dorrit’, at 11–12, for Dickensian running titles which ‘do much to underline the course or meaning of the narrative’). For Thucydides, one can usually also give the date (BC and/or ‘campaigning year’) covered on that page, but this would admittedly be much harder to do for Herodotus, and partly inappropriate anyway. If Messrs Brill are planning to publish further commentaries of this size, I urge them to think about the inclusion of proper running heads.

The word ‘inter-relationship’, used above, raises further problems. As indicated already, S.’s chosen method of exposition is severely linear, and yet Herodotus to an unusual degree operates, as is well known, in circular and resumptive mode. No commentary in traditional book-form can be written in a circle, but we must make some attempt to escape the tyranny of linearity. S. pounds along a single track of presentation, with, as noted above, brisk summaries regularly punctuating the commentary, and functioning like stations on the railway route. Even anticipatory items like the disgrace of Leotychidas (ch. 72) are dealt with like everything else, although they may fall later than the close of Herodotus’ Persian War narrative. Thus: «in a future expedition to Thessaly, Leotychidas» (this is from the italicized summary of chs. 71–75 provided at 278. On the next page, S. does indeed say that Herodotus needed to look beyond the date at which he closed his Histories). There is, generally, little or no sense of (a) why an item is placed where it is, or (b) of the way in which speeches and narrative inter-act, sometimes subversively (an area where important work has been done by Christopher Pelling, a name absent from S.’s bibliography, apart from his 2006 article on Homer and Herodotus in the Festschrift for Jasper Griffin, M. Clarke and others (eds.) ‘Epic Interactions’. Pelling’s excellent handling of the entire topic in C. Dewald and J. Marincola (eds.) ‘The Cambridge Companion to Herodotus’ (2006) 103–121, was of course too late for S. to have used, but see below, ‘details’). It may be significant that, in a work which is bibliographically full and up-to-date to an admirable degree, the ‘green-and-yellow’ commentary on book 9 by M. A. Flower and J. Marincola (Cambridge, 2002) is absent. The section of their Introduction dealing with narrative technique (4–9), including anticipations and postponements (prolepses and analepses), provides the sort of treatment I miss in S. I now give examples of (a) and (b).

First, placement (a). Another modern name seriously under-noticed is that of Alan Griffiths. To be sure, his 1989 ‘Was Kleomenes Mad?’ is there (how could it not be?), and S. wrestles with its conclusions, in both commentary and appendix 14. But this article of
his stands alone in the bibliography. S. should, for instance, have taken account of Grif-
fiths' important 'Kissing Cousins: Some Curious Cases of Adjacent Material in Herodo-
tus', in N. Luraghi (ed.) 'The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus' (Oxford, 2001), 161–178. For book 6 in particular, note Griffiths 167f., on the stories, in close proximity,
of Alkmion in the treasury of Kroisos, and of the wedding of Agariste: both of these (Alkmaionid-related) stories involve 'aristocratic legs in motion', as Griffiths put it, showing generally how much illuminating fun you can have with this sort of thing. But some answering passages are positioned at much greater removes. Within the Agariste ex-
cursus, the mention of Sybaris as ‘particularly flourishing’ (6. 127. 1) gains an extra reso-
nance once we recall (a) the closely similar description of Miletos at 5. 28, and (b) the guest-friendship between the peoples of Miletus and Sybaris (6. 21. 1). See now 'Reading Herodotus' (above), 171f.

Then there is (b), speech/narrative. I miss, in the long treatment of the long ch. 86 (the story of Glaukos the Spartan, told by king Leotychides of Sparta in an attempt to get the Athenians to hand over some Aiginetan hostages), a proper sense of the oddness of the tale, and its subversive relation to its context; here it is the framing narrative which neatly subverts the speech (see my comments in A. Sommerstein and J. Fletcher (eds.) 'HORKOS' (Bristol, 2007), 139f.). In the first place, the frightening story – the man whose family is utterly wiped out not because he merely contemplates oath-breaking – is a piece of amusing verbal trickery by the Spartan speaker, because there is no suggestion or likeli-
hood that the Athenians who are being lectured to so menacingly had sworn to anything at
all. In the second and perhaps related place, the Athenians are not impressed by Leot-
ychides’ arguments. They refuse to hand the men over, and nothing bad happens to them whatsoever, unlike Glaukos in the story, whose family is wiped out for ever: so, rightly, J. K. Davies in A. B. Lloyd (ed.) 'What is a God?' (Swansea, 1997), 56. That there may, as Scott suggests, have been some sort of Athenian-Aiginetan hostage-swap later is perfectly possible, but Herodotus does not say so, and evidently does not want us to dwell on this possibility, which, as outcomes go, is in any case hardly a working-out of condign super-
natural vengeance. So what are we meant to conclude? There is (inter alia) some ?Athenian humour at work here.

Finally, a few details (other than typos and other small errors):

At 196, add a ref. to the important study by C. Pelling, 'Speech and Narrative: Herodo-
tus' Debate on the Constitutions', PCPhS 48 (2002) 123–58 (note the relevance of the first three words of the title of this article to what was said above about Pelling generally); 334f., add a ref. to C. Higbie, 'The Lindian Chronicle and the Greek Creation of their Past' (Oxford, 2003); 370 (cult of Pan at Athens), add a ref. to R. Parker, 'Athenian Reli-
gion: a History' (Oxford, 1996) 163–168, a book which is in fact listed in S.’s bibliography and is exploited elsewhere.

Simon Hornblower

---


Tra i cinque romanzieri greci del corpus pervenutoci per tradizione medievale Senofonte Efeso e Caritone, trasmessi entrambi dal codex unicus Laurenziano Conventi Soppressi 627 (= F), furono gli ultimi ad avere un‘edizione a stampa: rispettivamente nel 1726 (Londra, ed. A. Cocchi; ma nel 1723 era già uscita, a Londra e a Firenze, la traduzione italiana di A. M. Salvini) e nel 1750 (Amsterdam, ed. J. P. D’Orville). A quell’epoca il testo a stampa di Eliodoro