Herodotus as storyteller interested in the past and one as a 'modern scientist' and seems to think that to see his work as influenced by contemporary 'science' (as suggested by R. Thomas, *Herodotus in Context*) is to think him uninterested in the past, which is patently mistaken.

In the Narrative section, de Jong produces a masterly chapter on the history of scholarly approaches to the unity of the *Histories*, various attempts to characterize the different narrative units, and ideas about how they link. Much of this is illuminating on his relation to Homer, and it strongly attacks the idea of 'digression'/*Exkurs* (one may add that the self-indulgent, irrelevant digression *can* be denoted by the vivid phrase, not used by Herodotus, 'wandering from the logos', ἀποπλανᾶν τοῦ λόγου, Hipp. *Joints* 34.4–6). de Jong deals the novella a mortal blow in pointing out that the Herodotean novella originated in 1870 out of an idea that sixth-century Greece should have had narrative units analogous to those of fourteenth-century Italy. This complements nicely the fine chapter by Dewald on Herodotus' authorial persona, a dense, narratalogically inclined development of her work on the authorial 'I' and the historian's creation of narrative.

Some chapters approach the same topic or the same *logos* from quite different angles or even under different categories. This can be enriching but also disconcerting, and raises fundamental questions about how to approach the *Histories*. 'Wise adviser' narratives, for instance, are categorized as 'short stories' by Gray, to avoid the terms *logos* or novella, but there seems a danger here of leaving them in a cultural no-man's land. The same tales are treated as 'tragic' by others (see Saïd's critique, pp. 119–22), or again as part of Herodotus' political wisdom, a way of learning from the past. Or are they oral traditions (van Wees)? If such tales have an important rôle within the larger scheme of the *Histories*, to what extent have they been shaped by Herodotus (a question Gray raises only at the end, p. 316)? If Herodotus was interested in the past, as he clearly was, then surely it is difficult to deal with these *logoi* on an exclusively literary level without some awareness of the nature of Greek cultural memory and Greek habits of moulding a story which may already have been at work even before Herodotus heard it. What some scholars see as an Homeric or tragic way of shaping a story in Herodotus may well have deeper and wider cultural origins and a less literary pedigree. Accounts of historical events may have been moulded by the same cultural perceptions, then picked up by Herodotus. I raise this because the volume offers an illuminating microcosm of approaches to Herodotus where historians and literary scholars meet, and a certain tension remains. This rich and suggestive collection points forward to new areas of investigation and fittingly reflects the complexity of the *Histories* themselves.

Royal Holloway, University of London/
Balliol College, Oxford
ROSALIND THOMAS
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni223

OVERLAPPING WORLDS

S. HORNBLOWER: *Thucydides and Pindar. Historical Narrative and the World of Epinikian Poetry.* Pp. xviii + 454, map, ills. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2004. Cased, £60. ISBN: 0-19-924919-9.

I should begin with a disclaimer. Although Thucydides was of considerable interest to me many years ago, I have not paid much attention to him since. Perhaps, without my realizing it, my move from Thucydides to Pindar was prompted in part at least by

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni224 Published online by Cambridge University Press

attraction to the 'austere style' which Dionysius of Halicarnassus states is best represented by Pindar and Thucydides. In any event, now for the first time we have a detailed comparison of the two authors in a wide variety of areas. Such an endeavour should not arouse surprise or scepticism, but whether it calls for a book of this length is another matter. Many pages, interesting though they are, do not seem to me to be particularly relevant.

As far as Pindar is concerned, much of what is said will be familiar to Pindarists (although perhaps not to most Thucydidean scholars), but there are some discussions which deserve special mention. One is the lengthy analysis (pp. 207–35) of the possible historical and political references in Pindar's Aeginetan odes. This is a welcome contrast to those who reject all such references and those who argue for them in numerous places. The analysis is thorough and convincing. If the evidence is problematic, H. is at pains to point this out. A second contribution of importance is his proposal (pp. 145–56) to identify frr. 71–4 as belonging to a dithyramb for Chians. Given the brevity of the fragments the arguments for this proposal are necessarily speculative, but they are certainly worthy of serious consideration. Significant too is his discussion of the origins of epinikian poetry. His conclusion is that 'the impetus to extravagant praise poetry came from the edges of the Greek world where outsize individuals demanded outsize celebration. If so, the origins of epinikian poetry are to be found not so much in *polis* formation as in *new-polis* formation, otherwise known as colonization' (p. 27).

Part II of the book concentrates more on Thucydides and on his awareness of Pindar's poetry, but the first page of this section contains the following startling pronouncement: 'I do believe that Pindar knew Thucydides' work' (p. 269). I can only assume that the words Pindar and Thucydides have been transposed, since although an aged Pindar and a teenage Thucydides could have met (see pp. 52–4), Thucydides could not have been writing before Pindar's death. That Thucydides knew epinikian poetry is obviously possible, even probable, but that he was influenced by it, consciously or unconsciously, often seems to me to involve special pleading. A typical example is H.'s analysis of the final sea-battle in Thuc. 7.70–1. Primarily on the basis of βοή and θέα in this description H. argues that 'Thucydides borrows the audience reaction from the world of athletics and equestrian competition' (p. 343). But βοαί in Pindar and Bacchylides are shouts of applause, not as here of wailing, and θέα does not appear in the remains of either poet. Again, because in 4.133 Thucydides states that in the battle of Delion the Thespians lost their ἄνθος, the only occurrence of the word in the historian, that hardly justifies calling this a 'Pindaric salute' (p. 45). In contrast, the chapter (pp. 354–72) comparing the style of Pindar and Thucydides is instructive and full of interest.

As I mentioned earlier, it is difficult at times to see the relevance for either author of certain sections of the book, such as pp. 31–42 on Dorieus or pp. 120–3 on the foundation myths of Keos. This is not, however, to deny the validity or significance of such sections, but simply to wonder why they were included. There is also much said about Herodotus and his methodology, again interesting but of little pertinence to the subject of the book. On some occasions a word or phrase in Pindar or Thucydides is examined in detail. For Pindarists I draw special attention to what he says about proxeny in *Nemean* 7.65 (pp. 178–80).

The book is a pleasure to read, whatever one may think about the relevance of certain sections, the style is lively, the Greek includes translations, and the indexes are excellent. Misprints are few and unimportant, except for the last line on p. 293, where the translation of *Pythian* 9.77 should read 'amid lengthy ones', not 'and lengthy

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni224 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ones'. H. states that the aim of his book is an attempt 'to place Thucydides, prose historian of war and politics, next to Pindar, and to show that the overlap between their two worlds was considerable' (p. 37). He has certainly succeeded in fulfilling that aim.

University of Western Ontario DOUGLAS E. GERBER
doi:10.1093/clrevj/bni224

PINDARIC OBSCURITY

J. T. HAMILTON: *Soliciting Darkness. Pindar, Obscurity, and the Classical Tradition*. (Harvard Studies in Comparative Literature 47.) Pp. xii + 348, ill. Cambridge, MA and London: Harvard University Department of Comparative Literature, 2003. Paper, £17.95 (Cased, £29.95). ISBN: 0-674-01257-7 (0-674-01222-4 hbk).

Compared with some other Greek writers, Pindar has been rather neglected by the current renaissance in reception studies in Classics. Various aspects of his reception history, especially in the early modern period, have been discussed, but especially in English-language scholarship he hasn't had the same kind of attention as Sappho, let alone drama or Homer. For this reason alone, H.'s *Soliciting Darkness* is welcome.

Over the years, Pindar has enormously fascinated a great number of poets and scholars. H.'s theme, the issue of Pindar's obscurity, goes to the core of this fascination. Throughout, H. is concerned with the different ways readers—poets, translators, scholars, film makers—have responded to the widely felt interpretative difficulties posed by Pindar's poetry, and develops a persuasive story of different ways of engaging with these difficulties. While some readers (especially classical scholars) have tried to eliminate any perceived obscurity through interpretation and work on historical context, others have found that such obscurity is inherent in Pindar's poetry and have either attacked or in fact admired him for it. H. highlights a large number of contexts in which Pindar's obscurity becomes important for his readers, whether as a source of challenge, annoyance or inspiration. On the way—and to me that is one of the most attractive features of the book—H. gives a sense of the sheer variety of Pindaric reception, ranging across various countries and genres. The heroes of the book, apart from Pindar himself, are probably Horace, Goethe, Hölderlin, and Wilamowitz, but many others get their time in the limelight. Inevitably, such variety creates as much curiosity as it satisfies. To what degree is the emphasis on Germany in the book a matter of H.'s selection, and to what degree does it reflect a special status for Pindar in German literature and scholarship? What about Pindar in painting and in music, neither of which feature prominently? Or Pindar in school and university teaching? H.'s book gives a sense of the scope for further work on Pindar's reception.

H.'s disciplines are German and comparative literature, and *Soliciting Darkness* is probably not intended as a book for classicists in the first place, but perhaps that is partly why it raises interesting methodological questions from a Classics perspective. The 'classical tradition' appears in the subtitle, and in some ways H.'s book is comparable to discussions tracing the afterlife of other ancient poets or works through the centuries. However, this is anything other than a chronological survey of Pindaric reception from the fifth century B.C. until today. Nor, though, is it an example of another well-established mode of writing reception history, detailed

The Classical Review vol. 55 no. 2 © The Classical Association 2005; all rights reserved

https://doi.org/10.1093/clrevj/bni224 Published online by Cambridge University Press