

the interplay between literary text and literal inscription demonstrated in recent articles by Peter Bing (e.g. 'Between Literature and the Monuments', *Hellenistica Groningana* 3 [1998], 21–43) will be disappointed. Still, R. is diligent and comprehensive, and she is a scrupulous observer not only of where meaningful connections are to be noted but also, equally importantly, of where the most significant distinctions lie. The case of bucolic epigram is again illustrative. After R. shows that no direct parallel between bucolic epigrams and inscriptions is demonstrable, she notes that poets nonetheless often inserted tell-tale epigraphic markers in their texts to make them appear more authentic (p. 61). R. also astutely observes that while epigrammatic epigrams developed from epigraphs attached to monuments, such epigraphs did not themselves regularly include detailed descriptions of their associated monuments or reliefs (p. 17).

Two sections demonstrate well R.'s concern to consider the *Realien* that might have influenced the production of epigrams: the commentary on Epigram 14, a poem modelled on ancient advertising signs, and a section (pp. 65–73) weighing the evidence on whether certain epigrams (1–3, 5–6) have been rightly considered as captions for works of art (R. thinks not).

It must be noted that an inadequate English translation (from the Italian) presents a serious obstacle to a full appreciation of this book. A glaring example is the consistent use of 'defunct' to refer to dead persons. Circumlocutions and stylistic oddities (e.g. frequent use of 'that' where English would have simply 'the'), while always obstructive, at times render the author's point irrecoverable. Translations of the epigrams themselves are also affected: γάρ is invariably translated 'in fact', and τραχὺς λύκος (Epig. 6.4) is simply 'bad wolf'. Few readers, I suspect, will make it beyond a few pages of continuous reading. Instead, the book will be consulted primarily for its commentaries on individual poems, updated bibliography, and summaries of scholarship since Gow.

*Brown University*

JERI BLAIR DEBROHUN

## EARLY GREEK HISTORIOGRAPHY

N. LURAGHI (ed.): *The Historian's Craft in the Age of Herodotus*. Pp. x + 340. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2001. Cased, £50. ISBN: 0-19-924050-7.

What did 'history' mean to Herodotus and other early Greek 'historiographers'? Any answer must obviously involve them, their sources and audiences, their collective attitudes toward knowledge of the past and its transmission, and the interactions of these. The nexus of this book's fourteen essays, most of which treat with Herodotus, is precisely the background of early Greek historiography. More particularly, it is the historian's 'embeddedness' in his social and literary context, the influence and impact of the 'fast changing mix' of oral and written, and himself and his knowledge as part of the 'wider framework of fifth century Greek culture', that provide scope for this collection.

As the volume is 'in a way a tribute to (Oswyn Murray's) scholarship', the reprinted 'Herodotus and Oral History' and Murray's reconsideration of it are positioned

amphiprostyle at the collection's beginning and end. In the latter, Murray revisits the 'time-bound essay', retrenching to some degree (e.g. muting positivism about the identity of Herodotus' sources), but also critically appraising points of contact with other essayists. Murray concludes by musing upon the relation of myth and early Greek historiography. (The alpha and omega of the book is in fact Felix Jacoby, whose work, L. observes in the introduction, is indispensable for students of Herodotus and early Greek historiography. At the book's end, Murray drives home the same peg, acknowledging that, whether as a point of reference or focus for disagreement, Jacoby's views are inevitably to be confronted. Thus, howsoever obliquely stated or realized, the book is also a tribute to Jacoby.)

While all of the essays are stimulating, I make only brief mention of some here. In another kind of update, E. L. Bowie carefully reviews and assesses what in early Greek elegiac and iambic and earliest prose historiography might be related. Though hazy, connections are perceptible especially to lengthy narrative elegies, such as Mimnermus' *Smyrneis* and the Simonides-fragment on Plataia. Bowie cautions, however, that the condition of relevant information remains such as to discourage fast conclusions.

For Lucio Bertelli, genealogists are the 'true initiators of historiography' (p. 71) and writing the '*necessary* tool to bring about the change of mentality from which (genealogical) historiography originated' (p. 72). Hecataeus' critical approach to tradition required the medium which enabled comparison of different versions of the same tale; his heterodox 'rationalisms' of myths resulted from these and his own sensibilities. Hecataeus fused the mythic past with the present by developing a 'chronological genealogy' which ended in himself. Analytical comparison, rational criticism, chronology: all present in Hecataeus' *Genealogies*, according to Bertelli, all requisite for the birth of Greek historiography.

In a similar vein, Robert Fowler considers where on the continuum between wholly literate and wholly oral early Greek historiography is to be placed. Fowler cites, among other things, Hecataeus' '*meta-cognitive*' sense of intellectual responsibility for his critical views, the prose genealogy itself, and his use of the crucial word *γράφω* to move him and (for additional reasons) Herodotus more away from orality. Fowler concludes that, although Greece was in transition from oral to literate in the fifth century B.C.E., Greek historiography was '(a pre-eminently literate activity) from start to finish' (p. 115).

How does the floating gap', i.e. the 'space' between remote and recent past, affect Herodotus' *Histories*? Rosalind Thomas finds that, although the 'gap' is to be found in the *Histories* and he often fails to confront it, Herodotus did begin to deal with the 'gap's' results in the Egyptian *logos*. Here he notices, for example, the difference between Hecataeus' claim to divine ancestry in sixteen generations and the Egyptian priests' calculation of 345 generations to the rule of the gods on earth.

Hans-Joachim Gehrke explores the creation of 'intentional' histories, that is, the union of myth, history, and current events, by the Magnesians and the Athenians. Such 'history' is really a social store of knowledge about the past and, as such, seems to be governed by socio-anthropological constants. Gehrke ends by noting the adoption of mythified Marathon as part of the 'intentional history' of western civilization.

Source is the focus of both Gianguilio and L., the former taking up Herodotus' reporting of the foundation-myth of Cyrene, the latter the 'discourse of ἀκοή'. Griffiths adduces Herodotean passages, whose constituents, although about different things, are 'intimately' linked; whereas Blösel zeroes in on Herodotus' treatment of Themistocles as an example of the historian's referencing of the present in the past. Vannicelli aims to highlight Herodotus' undertaking in Book 2 to define the beginning

and extent of human history as documented in Egypt. Möeller considers the roots of the annalistic pattern adopted by Hellanicus; Nicolai how Thucydides' *Archaeology* reflects the historian's view of the past and his methodological bias.

For the most part, the essays are of good quality, their authors tackling significant issues and generally laying out evidence, opinions, and conclusions well and ingeniously. Scholars must agree that contextualizing early Greek historiographers is essential to uncovering more about their works even as they realize that further evidence about the genesis and metagenesis of early Greek historiography must derive from confronting such specific questions as involve source, social memory, and the *spatium historicum*. (Certainly we must all mind the 'gap'.) These will also concur with Griffiths (p. 178) that the 'play of narrative at several levels' in the *Histories* of Herodotus 'cannot be used as raw material for the composition of history books until it is given the close attention it demands'.

On the other hand, readers may sometimes want for stronger arguments or better handling of evidence. L.'s statement, that Thucydides was first 'to objectify the perception that, for instance, the Athenians did indeed have no accurate knowledge of their past' (p. 151), seems to ignore Herodotus 7.152.3, wherein the distinction between τὰ λεγόμενα and Herodotus' reservations about them is established as a general principle for his work: of course Herodotus heard a good deal of 'history' from the Athenians. Griffiths's attempt to link Alcmaeon's visit to Croesus' treasury (6.125) and the marriage of Agariste (6.126–7) seems far-fetched (deconstructionistic in fact): 'both anecdotes climax with a memorable image of aristocratic legs in motion' (p. 167). On a different plane, Blösel's summary refusal to believe that Herodotus' informants could have given him diametrically opposed opinions and stories (or mixed ones) about Themistocles is perhaps less distressing than his total reconfiguring of Herodotus on the Artemision campaign. A certain *Tendenz* is perceptible in some essays, as apparently must be the case when thesis or theory is applied as a rigid template for reading ancient texts. This is by no means a generalized condition.

Above all, an early apology for (some of the) essays' methodology notwithstanding, one still keenly misses in many instances an integrative approach to early Greek historiography. As much as Herodotus was a Greek (or was he?), can he be conceived of as unaffected by the intellectual streams of his time or, for that matter, insulated in only one context or another? How may the attitudes that shaped Thucydides' views on 'history', his concern for, but self-imposed distance from, motivations and events, be omitted from any consideration of the forces shaping the genesis of early Greek historiography? (Nicolai confronts Thucydides' relationship to Herodotus but insufficiently [cf. p. 277 n. 37].) Like Thucydides, was Herodotus not part of but also apart from his socio-cultural context, a self-positioned 'outsider', even an 'alien' in some ways? Surely there is nothing to prevent at least considering questions of this sort even in such essays. Modern scholarship need not be narrowcast anymore, based upon 'party' or 'doctrinaire' lines, and some essays would have gained appreciable force by a broadened approach. (Gehrke's article provides a felicitous model.) Still, the essays in *The Historian's Craft* portray current trends in the subject's study and set the table nicely for further discourse. The book is thus compulsory reading for all whose intellectual (but not necessarily social) contexts include Herodotus and early Greek historiography.

Loyola University of Chicago

B. M. LAVELLE