kinship with the Boeotians', but they do not quite do that, although, to be sure, the issue is relevant and we are meant to bear it in mind, as 3.2.3 makes clear.

I missed one or two works in the bibliography and notes, most of which would have reinforced rather than undermined D.'s conclusions. C. Pelling in M. Flower and M. Toher (edd.), *Georgica: Greek Studies in Honour of George Cawkwell* (London, 1991), pp. 120–42, should have been cited at p. 63 n. 14. Cawkwell's own *Thucydides and the Peloponnesian War* (London, 1997) would have been relevant at many points. And E. Badian, 'The Road to Acanthus', in R. Mellor and L. Tritle (edd.), *Texts and Tradition: Studies . . . Mortimer Chambers* (Claremont, 1999), pp. 3–35, would have helped D. with Chapter 8 on Brasidas in the north. Finally, p. 106 with n. 17 (on the Spartan war-fund inscription) needs a citation of M. Piérart in *BCH* 119 (1995), 253–82, who argues for an Ionian war date. It is a pity that J. J. Price, *Thucydides and Internal War* (Cambridge, 2001), appeared too late for D. to use, because its argument would have affected hers at a number of points.

There is an index of Greek terms but (frustratingly) no *index locorum* of Thucydidean (or other) passages. The word 'liberation' vel sim. ought to have appeared in the general index because of its obvious importance to the thesis of the book (see above on 8. 46).

University College London SIMON HORNBLOWER

RHODIAN HISTORIOGRAPHY?

H.-U. WIEMER: *Rhodische Traditionen in der hellenistischen Historiographie*. Pp. 291. Frankfurt am Main: Buchverlag Marthe Clauss, 2001. Cased. ISBN: 3-934040-04-7.

That a particular area of the ancient Greek world could produce a distinct historiographic tradition is an attractive notion. It certainly has the advantage of seeming inherently plausible: scores of historians dotted throughout the Eastern Mediterranean at any one time, working away at accounts of the past, producing texts that betray strong local bias and that are shaped by the methods and attitudes of earlier histories of their regions. The main problem for this reconstruction is that in the one case of 'local history' that we can control to any significant degree, namely Atthidography, it seems that the range of historiographic perspectives is so broad that the usefulness of grouping them is brought into question. For a long time the historians discussed under this heading were thought of as a distinct set, united by common plans and approaches, though perhaps differing to varying degrees in political orientation (some more 'democratic', others more 'conservative'). But this view has come under increasing attack lately: while the Atthidographers were perhaps all animated by the same patriotic nationalism, 'they were not by any means clones of each other' (P. Harding; but see also the recent work of P. Rhodes and J. Marincola).

Wiemer has in a certain sense tried to build just such a case for a regional grouping of historians in this book. It is therefore a very important discussion, the implications of which go far beyond the world of Rhodian historical writing. Let me say here that I am not sure W. makes his case; but this should not detract from the ambition and merit of the book.

After the introduction, the book divides into nine chapters, beginning with Polybius and the Rhodian historian Zenon (*FGrHist* 523); this chapter also discusses the

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press

Lindian *Anagraphe* (pp. 19–32). Then follows five chapters that all concern the historiographic treatment of Rhodes, and its relations with Rome and other powers of the Eastern Mediterranean: 'Rhodes, the Kings and the Greek States' (pp. 33–58); 'Rhodes, Philip V and Rome' (pp. 59–106); 'Rhodes, Antiochus III and Rome' (pp. 107–49); 'Rhodes, the Lycians and Rome' (pp. 151–8); and 'Rhodes, Perseus and Rome' (pp. 159–206). Two more narrowly historiographic chapters close the book: the relationship between Diodorus' narrative and Zenon, which includes among other matters an important though problematic discussion of *P.Köln* 6.247 (pp. 207–50), and a conclusion that returns us to Zenon (pp. 251–62).

It should in all fairness be pointed out that W. is sensitive to the problems inherent to his project. So, for instance, in his introduction he seems quite aware of many of the pitfalls involved in *Quellenforschung* as it relates to Diodorus. But although alert to methodological issues, he still seems in the end to fall into some of the difficulties he outlines. To give one example: towards the end of his book, W. lays out what he takes to be indices in the text of Polybius that reveal reliance on Zenon as a source: 'rhodocentrism', a 'glorifying' of things Rhodian, and correspondingly a tendency towards Rhodian 'apologetic'. While this sounds like quite an impressive array of indicators, do not the second two categories form but different aspects of the first? To be sure, any sort of regional bias implies in the first place putting one's homeland at the center of the *oikoumene*, and thereby providing a view of world events that is distorted, with local matters disproportionately privileged and perhaps matters of broader importance from elsewhere marginalized or omitted. But to my thinking at least Rhodian biases—both in favor of the island and in defence of it—are but elements of the same 'rhodocentric' view. But if regional bias is essentially our only tool to find Rhodian texts, we run into two difficulties. First, are Rhodian authors the only ones who can be 'rhodocentric'? To take an extreme case, but one suggestive of the shortcomings of this view, how about Polybius himself? He is without reservation 'romanocentric' because he sees the spread of Roman power as the unifying theme of the later history of the Mediterranean basin (Plb. 1.1.5, 2.7–8), and yet of course he was not a Roman.

Secondly, arguments that make use of Rhodian bias to indicate Rhodian source seem circular. I will take up one example. One of the great strengths of this book is W.'s willingness to look at a range of materials. For him, the Rhodian tradition of historical writing is to be found not only in the fragments and testimonia relating to Rhodian historians as they are found in Jacoby, but also in the evidence supplied by inscriptions and papyri. But his handling of *P.Köln* 247 mentioned above is highly problematic. Relying on older concepts of a *Hauptquelle* which Diodorus follows almost exclusively, W. is forced to draw very fine distinctions between Hieronymus, Zenon, and the unknown author of *P.Köln* 247, whom he does not believe to be Zenon. The argument here is not at all convincing, for it is based on highly speculative notions regarding Diodorus' working methods. As such, the claims W. makes for the authorship of the papyrus end up looking somewhat arbitrary and not sufficiently independent from his larger treatment concerning Zenon.

I do not want to end on a negative note. W.'s book is obviously the product of a great deal of research. It is a richly documented work that demonstrates a great deal of learning in a wide number of areas. If, in the end, it fails to prove its point—that there is a readily identifiable Rhodian tradition we can perceive in surviving texts—it is nonetheless an admirable treatment of an important issue in ancient historiography.

University of Virginia JOHN DILLERY

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.37 Published online by Cambridge University Press