

(p. 317), *SEG* 48.1330 (only the last appears in the *Index of Passages*); it would have been easy enough to gather together this bibliography into a note where the passage is first cited. No names no packdrill – but despite a *Timeline* setting *c.* 513 Darius' unsuccessful expedition against the Scythians as related in Herodotus Book 4, two contributors (pp. 213, 277) confuse this campaign with that of 522 further east, against the Saka Tigrakhauda, the Sakas of the pointed caps, the successful conclusion of which is represented by the appearance of Skunkha in his distinctive headgear at the end of the queue of rebel leaders in the Behistun relief. Sophocles' line and a half in honour of Herodotus (*IEG* ii p.166 F 5; T 163 Radt) is described (p. 127) as 'iambic': elegiac (or conceivably hexameter). The contributor who directs us (p. 191 n. 1) to Fowler's *Early Greek Mythography* for the fragments of Hecataeus' *Periêgêsis/Periodos Gês* sends us on a wild goose chase. There are three deplorable mistranslations on pp. 229–30 (one from Herodotus, two from Thucydides). I pass over misprints and false references.

Since Jacoby, who could hold the balance between historical and philological considerations, the study of Herodotus has suffered from a scholarly schizophrenia. If the two sides do not talk to one another, real advance is impossible. Such a volume as this has much to offer both, and should stimulate dialogue and co-operation.

Hertford College, Oxford

STEPHANIE WEST

stephanie.west@hertford.oxford.ac.uk

## HERODOTUS BOOK 6

SCOTT (L.) *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6. (Mnemosyne Supplementum 268.)* Pp. xiv + 716, maps. Leiden and Boston: Brill, 2005. Cased, €139, US\$199. ISBN: 978-90-04-14506-1. doi:10.1017/S0009840X07001710

The Introduction presents a general appraisal of Herodotus and his methodology (pp. 1–36), a discussion of the Ionian Revolt (pp. 37–73), a cursory 'Note on the Text' endorsing Cagnazzi's theory that Herodotus' history divides into 28 papyrus rolls (pp. 73–4), and a brief treatment (pp. 75–7) of ancillary sources. The commentary (pp. 79–354) is divided into sub-sections (e.g. [6.] 1–5, 6–17, 18–21), each preceded by a succinct summary of its contents and a general analysis, sometimes brief, sometimes extensive. Twenty-three appendices follow (pp. 457–652), most providing exegesis of major difficulties; others give stemmata, some deriving from Davies' *APF*, one ('Spartan Royal Houses') without documentation, another ('The Inachos Stemma') vaguely tied to discussions in the commentary; and there are ten maps (pp. 655–64). Pp. 665–84 give the Bibliography, and the book concludes with three indexes, 'Herodotean Words and Phrases' (p. 658), 'Citations' (pp. 687–702) and a 'General Index' of ancient names and *Realien* (pp. 703–16). The first of these is exiguous (46 words or phrases) and indiscriminately combines 'peculiarly Herodotean' words with those that are 'unusual or rare in fifth and fourth century *Attic* usage' (my emphasis). The 'General Index' might usefully have included the names of modern scholars cited in the work.

The commentary, 'quarried' from S.'s doctoral thesis, and undertaken by him after his retirement as a barrister (pp. vii–viii), is clearly a labour of love. Though one is inclined to be sympathetic, the subject unfortunately overpowers its author. A commentary on Herodotus requires depth of experience and close familiarity both

with the entire text of Herodotus and with the rich history of the multinational scholarship long devoted to him. Neither is evident here. S. relies essentially on contributions of very recent date written, almost exclusively, in English. Thus, though the Bibliography lists approximately 700 items, only some 77 are in languages other than English, and of these only a portion are actually cited in the commentary, sometimes only once. Most crucially, centrally important discussions are completely ignored. Ed. Meyer, Busolt, Beloch and Pohlenz were not consulted. Jacoby, apart from *FGrHist*, is credited only for his *Atthis*, Momigliano only for his *Alien Wisdom*. Stein's commentary, still useful, is virtually disregarded. Even Reginald Macan, mysteriously, is almost a missing person in spite of the numerous occasions when S. would have benefited from his always intelligent comments. It is inexcusable to ignore these writers (and many others almost equally distinguished): their knowledge of the subject is unmatched, and more recent work, however excellent, by no means supersedes them. S. took a short-cut to his own great cost.

Leaving this aside, the book would have benefited from drastic revision. Want of self-discipline is everywhere apparent. The appendices (save for 19–22, which are too perfunctory) are prolix, much too unconfined and, like the commentary itself, full of pointless inferences which even S. does not pursue. Some over-written appendices (3, 5–9, 13, 15–16) should have been drastically reduced and brought into the text; others (e.g. App. 17, on Marathon) are awash with irrelevancy. The same excess is manifest throughout the commentary: see, for example, S.'s introductory remarks (pp. 213–20) to the sequence 49.2–55.

Methodologically more disturbing is S.'s unrestrained approach to *Quellenkritik*. The idea (sometimes expressed by others as well) that some of the material we find in Book 6 derives from Herodotus' recollection of events or, rather, of traditions about the events, when he was a 'youngster' (88, 113, et al.), is simply depressing. Unless Herodotus had an adult head planted atop a juvenile body his direct memory of contemporaneous chatter will have been inconsequential, and it is naive to suppose that he would have failed to verify and elaborate such vague recollections by prosecuting his enquiries in his customary manner when writing his work. In general, S. is an avid source-hunter with an irrepressible desire to explain Herodotus (or explain him away) by invoking supposititious sources which unnecessarily duplicate him. In S.'s defence it must be admitted that the same kind of mechanistic explanation proceeding from indemonstrable premises has ever been the curse of Herodotean scholarship. If a Philiad is mentioned, the source, if 'favourable', is Philaid, if not, it is Alcmeonid, and so forth. This ceaseless questing creates a *Tummelplatz*. There are Demaratus-sources, Cleomenes-sources; Herodotus becomes a puppet on leading-strings, a weather-cock shifting with every wind. To cite one recent quite remarkable instance, S. (p. 63 et al.) follows Murray, *CAH*<sup>2</sup> IV.2 pp. 486–7, in his divination of a biographical source for Herodotus' account of Histiaeus. The inference is based chiefly on the observation that there is notable consistency in Herodotus' account of this figure. S. promotes this idea to its grotesque conclusion at 29.1, where we are informed that it remains a question 'whether Herodotus the *editor* has improved the story' (my emphasis) in the alleged biography by spicing up details about Histiaeus' execution. Cf. S. at 108.3. Though inconcinnities in Herodotus' treatment of one figure or another may well prompt us to posit the influence of antagonistic authorities, the formation by Herodotus of a consistent account requires no special explanation. In this instance, the oral tradition about a late archaic figure will plausibly have become simplified and rendered coherent by the mid fifth century when there is every reason to

presume that living memory of Histiaeus had solidified in the manner reflected by Herodotus.

Now some points of detail. (6.)<sup>3</sup> *κακὸν τοσοῦτον* expresses an important, even malevolent, judgement inadequately appraised and improperly associated by S. with 5.97.3. 11.1 cries for an explanation of the elevation of Dionysius of Phocaea, whose contingent consisted of only three ships. Macan ad loc. made a beginning, and might have been consulted. 12.2: S. veils Herodotus' implicit condemnation of Ionian *mores* while his assignment to Samian tradition of the ludicrous complaints here made by the Ionians (it is Herodotean satire) is groundless. 18 *ἔκτωι ἔτει* is not 'the fifth year in our terms'. 21.2 on Phrynichus: a diffuse note. Pace Roisman (S., as often, is noncommittal), *οἰκία κακά* implies kinship-affiliation; it is a useless support for down-dating the play if we arbitrarily question Herodotus' understanding that the play was written soon after 494. At 22.1 the reader should compare S. with Stein ad loc. 27.1 *φιλέει δέ κως*: *κως* = *wohl* (Stein). S. misunderstands the text; Herodotus is wrongly alleged to have been dubious about the *σημίαι*; *ταῦτα μὲν σφι σημίαι ὁ θεὸς προέδεξε* is unequivocal. Putative Chian sources, invented by S. and then analysed, are a figment. 29.2: it is not true that 'Greeks had the reputation of being poor at learning the other languages'. Momigliano (*Alien Wisdom*, p. 8), cited here, wrote nothing of the kind. 32 *ad fin.*: S. implicitly dismisses Herodotus' ominous remark that 'Ionia fell for the third time' (the fourth soon to follow), while the significance of *καταδουλώθησαν* quite escapes him. This is of a piece with his vacillating approach to the question of Herodotus' evaluation of the Athenian *ἀρχή*. See below on 44.2. 36.1: uninformed guesses about the size of the contingent taken by Miltiades to Chersonesus serve no purpose. But we do expect discussion of the fact that Pisistratus gave Miltiades a free hand in recruitment, as implied by *πάντα τὸν βουλόμενον*. S.'s explanation of *οἱ ἐπαγαγόμενοι (Μιλτιάδην) τύραννον (αὐτὸν) κατεστήσαντο*, namely, that '[t]he words may reflect part of the defense of Miltiades ... in 493 when accused of tyranny' (p. 170; cf. Macan, who is more guarded) postulates a chain of verbal transmission that is stunning. The use of the middle is best explained not by apologetic purpose but by simple thematic consequence: Herodotus is characterising the Dolonci. 42.2 (with App. 11): Artaphernes' assessment of tribute in 493 and its continuation from then to Herodotus' present: S. endorses the opinion now fashionable that Herodotus here wants to tell us that the Persian kings retained the claim to tribute-collection after they lost control of it, though he also inconsistently alleges '[t]hat [Herodotus] was influenced by Athenian sources justifying both their hegemony ... and the Peace of Callias'. It has long since been contended that Herodotus should have written more explicitly, but the very fact that he expressed himself as he did is illuminating. Unless we accuse Herodotus of deliberate mystification, his contemporaries must have understood his phraseology to refer to current practice, not to imbecile posturing. 'Artaphernes' assessment remains in place today' is an allusion to Athenian tribute-collection, and it is pettifoggery to object that different assessments were made after 478/7, just as it is special pleading to interpolate the ineffably arid point that Persia never resigned its claims. The natural explanation is that the arrangement continues honoured in the observance, not the breach. Note the introductory word *χρήσιμα* (42. 1), which alone suffices to prove that Herodotus was talking about the realities: the Athenians picked up where the Persians left off, the effeminate Ionians deserving no less. 44.1: a comment is needed on Herodotus' use of the word *δούλους*, for it is clear from this and his immediately preceding language (e.g. *πρόσχημα*) that this passage was written when he had reached his final conception of the Great War. S., *more suo*, credits Herodotus' strong

language to ‘a Persian or Greek source hostile to Mardonius’. **56** commences an unexpected and intrusive disquisition worthy of comment, even if it brings S. into the forbidden territory of *Kompositionsgeschichte*. Macan ad loc. would have been helpful. **61.1** τότε τὸν Κλεομένηα ἐόντα ἐν τῇ Αἰγίνῃ καὶ κοινὰ τῇ Ἑλλάδι ἀγαθὰ προεργαζόμενον is surely Herodotus’ own sound and independent judgement, not the echo of a pro-Cleomenes source. **94.1** temporally conjoins Athens’ Aeginetan war and Darius’ vigorous preparation in 491 for war against Athens. The combination is admittedly improbable. S. smoothes the difficulty by accusing Herodotus of intentional ambiguity, as if our historian ever engaged in such obfuscation. At **108.3** οὐ κατὰ εὐνοίην is a perfectly reasonable if erroneous conclusion drawn by Herodotus, who often interprets history with reference to the Peloponnesian War. S. imputes the phrase to a ‘source’, thus stultifying Herodotus by inventing utterly unnecessary intermediaries. At **113.3** insufficient attention (a rare passing reference occurs in App. 17 p. 625) is devoted to a difficulty inherent in Herodotus’ picture of the Athenian/Plataean line of battle. If the Athenians need to thin their line in order to confront the opposed front of the Persians, the flanks would be thinned in due proportion. S. might have consulted Macan. (We should assume that the Persians massed their centre while adopting a merely defensive posture for their flanks, evening the odds.) **121–4**: S. is typically indecisive. Whether or not any Alcmeonid gave the shield-signal, it is indubitable that the family was held responsible for it by the demos, and that is the material point. At **123.2**, εἰ δὴ οὗτοι and what follows is alleged by S. to have been written by Herodotus in order ‘to tone down the popular tradition that the Alcmaeonids had bribed the Pythia’. The sentence does not extenuate; it is merely a rhetorical trope; the emphasis falls on εἰ δὴ οὗτοι, not on ἀναπέισαντες. **125** gives nothing more than a false though delightful aetiological explanation, like that of Callias λακκόπλουτος. It is a fiction undeserving of the laborious attention it receives. At **128.2** S. skirts the prosopographical question of Hippocleides’ descent. **131.2**, interpretation of the lion-dream of Agariste, is left in the air. The old view of Jacoby dies hard. Sentimental Periclean apologists spring up like mushrooms. **132**: S. invariably takes against round numbers (Miltiades’ 70 ships). They are not inherently suspicious unless their context makes approximation a reasonable deduction.

Brown University

CHARLES FORNARA  
charles\_fornara@brown.edu

## WOMEN IN HERODOTUS

HAZEWINDUS (M. W.) *When Women Interfere. Studies in the Role of Women in Herodotus’ Histories*. (Amsterdam Studies in Classical Philology 12.) Pp. viii + 256. Amsterdam: J. C. Gieben, 2004. Cased, €68. ISBN: 978-90-5063-449-6.

doi:10.1017/S0009840X07001722

At the centre of this book is an important set of claims: that Herodotus relates significant matters in *microstorie* – *logoi* that are on the margins of the ‘main narrative’ – and that several of these accounts prominently feature women whose actions and motives Herodotus does not limit by preconceived ‘gender roles’. There are several excellent close readings, relying especially on two distinctively Dutch areas

The Classical Review vol. 58 no. 1 © The Classical Association 2008; all rights reserved