SPARTANS IN THUCYDIDES

P. DEBNAR: *Speaking the Same Language: Speech and Audience in Thucydides' Spartan Debates*. Pp. x + 254. Ann Arbor: The University of Michigan Press, 2002. Cased, £39. ISBN: 0-472-11236-8.

The thesis of this thoughtful, valuable, and well-written book is that the Spartans in Thucydides become in one important respect gradually more like the Athenians: they learn to 'speak the same language' as their enemies. At first sight the project of confining oneself to a particular subset of Thucydidean speeches does not seem promising, and I was pessimistic when asked to review the book. It makes sense (so I thought) to study individual speeches, sets of speeches, or the one great dialogue: many a German dissertation has done just this. And the military speeches have been successfully studied as a group by Luschnat and Leimbach. But it seemed a priori arbitrary to pick out speeches delivered by or to Spartans. In fact, the idea works quite well, and even those who are not convinced by the main thesis will learn much of value on the way.

The scope of the work is defined oddly so as to include a non-Spartan, Alcibiades (because of his speech at Sparta at 6.89–92), and to exclude a good Spartan speaker, Gylippos. The explanation for this exclusion is presumably that he delivered no 'deliberative speeches in *oratio recta*' (p. 221 n. 1), only speeches of military encouragement. But he is an important Spartan who for tact (see 7.5.3, where he apologizes and takes the blame for a military blunder) and eloquence invites comparison with Brasidas, to whom D. devotes a whole chapter. And the powerful speech at 7.66–8 by 'the generals and Gylippos', whatever that formula means, goes beyond purely military issues.

The main thesis of this book is an interesting one; my main worry is simply that I want to know how far D. really thinks that Th. was consciously trying to bring out about a 'collapse of the antithesis between Spartan and Athenian' (pp. 3 and 233, where she seems less than wholehearted about this idea), and if so, why exactly she thinks he should have wanted to do so. When David Lewis suggested twenty-five years ago (*Sparta and Persia* [Leiden, 1977], p. 148) that one theme of Herodotus' *Histories* is that the Persians gradually discover what the Spartans are like, and that he is making comparisons as well as contrasts between Sparta and Persia, that was an illuminating suggestion, first because these cultures were on the face of it so alien (if only for the elementary reason that one was Greek, the other barbarian), and secondly because the two cultures are shown in the end to have more than a little in common. But right to the end of Thucydides' text as we have it, he insists authorially that Athenians and Spartans were different sorts of people, the one quick, the other slow (8.96.5); in that same reflective chapter (and cf. 7.55) he notes that it is the Athenians and Syracusans who are ὁμοιότροποι. To be sure, D. does cite 8.96; see p. 234 n. 3, where she approves Pelling's 1997 discussion of the passage and his view that the categories of national character have become heavily qualified by the end of the History, with 'all those unspartan Spartans'. This may, however, be a little overdone: there are some pretty Spartan Spartans still throwing their weight around in Book 8, a single chapter of that book exhibiting not only the still arrogant Lichas (8.84.5, cf. 5.50) but also the physically violent Astyochus (8.84.2), whose threats with his βακτηρία I have discussed at H. van Wees (ed.), *War and Violence in Ancient Greece* (London, 2000), pp. 57–82. On the other and more positive hand, against D.'s p. 217 on the 'hollowness of their [the Spartans'] claim to be liberating the Greeks' by 415/4, we have to set the prediction

© The Classical Association, 2003

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.35 Published online by Cambridge University Press

ἐλευθερώσοντας ἥκειν made by Alcibiades to Tissaphernes about the Spartans at 8.46.3, a prediction borne out by events which took place in Asia Minor in and after about 400 B.C., and which Thucydides may have known about and even allowed his presentation to be affected by.

I now quibble about a few details. At p. 9 n. 37, D. follows J. M. Alty (*JHS* 102 [1982], 14), indeed goes slightly further than Alty, in holding that Pindar had 'an anti-Ionian bias'. This untenable view can be reached only by ignoring everything except the epinikian odes. See, for instance, the opening of *Paian* 2 for the Abderans 'I shall drive this paian for the Ionian people'. Nor, if we are going to confine ourselves to the epinikian odes, is it significant, as Debnar and Alty maintain, that the two odes for Athenians (*P*. 7, *N*. 2) do not make a fuss about the Ionianism of the victors celebrated, because both poems are very short.

At p. 87 and n. 29, D. makes a new and intriguing suggestion about the famous Delphic response at 1.118.3, cf. 2.54.4 (Apollo said he would help the Spartans whether invited or not, provided they fought with all their strength, πέμψαντες δὲ ἐς Δελφοὺς ἐπηρώτων τὸν θεὸν εἰ πολεμοῦσιν ἄμεινον ἔσται· ὁ δὲ ἀνεῖλεν αὐτοῖς, ὡς λέγεται, κατὰ κράτος πολεμοῦσι νίκην ἔσεσθαι, καὶ αὐτὸς ἔφη ξυλλήψεσθαι καὶ παρακαλούμενος καὶ ἄκλητος). She thinks it was ambiguous in that Apollo did not say he would take the Spartans' side rather than someone else's. But her long discussion proceeds as if we know the exact wording of the response, which we do not. (She speaks of Plutarch's paraphrase at *Mor*. 403b of 'the same oracle', but this too assumes too much). I have long wondered how the presumably verse original went, and surely we cannot exclude the possibilities that as usual it addressed the Spartans directly in the vocative, and that it said 'I will help *you*'. If so, D.'s idea will fail. There are actually several versions of the oracle (in addition to Plutarch, Philostratus *vit. soph.* 575 and Suid. under ἄκλητος, α899 Adler, see Suid. under κλητός, κ1798 Adler, a text overlooked by both Fontenrose and Parke-Wormell). I suggest that Th. substituted the prosy παρακαλούμενος for the rare and Homeric κλητός. We then might conjecture that κλητός featured early in a hexameter line which was ended by ἄκλητός τε (for the lengthening of the anceps first syllable of the last word cf. *Od*. 11.490, and for the whole expression cf. Horace *Odes* 2.18.49 'vocatus atque non vocatus audit'). I have also toyed with the nicely metrical inversion πολεμοῦσι κατὰ κράτος for Th.'s κατὰ κράτος πολεμοῦσι, but my colleague Alan Griffiths does not think this is good enough epic–ionic Greek, and suggests instead something like

ὑμῖν δ', ὦ Σπάρτης ναέται, νίκην ἐπιδώσω·
αὐτὸς γὰρ κλητός τε παρέσσομαι ἄκλητός τε.

He thinks that κατὰ κράτος, etc. formed [not part of the response but] part of the Spartans' question: 'if we engage in forcible warfare with the Athenians . . .?' I am not quite convinced about that; but I hope I have said enough to show that we need to be careful before assuming that the oracle did not specify that it was the Spartans whom the god planned to help. A basic ambiguity of course remains: if the Spartans lost, the god's credit could be saved by saying that they had not fought hard enough.

D.'s claim at p. 104, that apart from Androsthenes the Arkadian at 5.49.1 'there is only one other reference to an Olympic victor in the History' [sc. other than Dorieus at 3.8], is badly phrased as it stands because it takes no account of either Alkibiades at 6.16 or Lichas at 5.50. What D. presumably means is that 3.8.1 and 5.49.1 are the only places where an Olympic victory is referred to as a kind of date.

Finally, at p. 117, D. says that the Mytileneans at Olympia 'draw attention to their

https://doi.org/10.1093/cr/53.1.35 Published online by Cambridge University Press

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/53.1.35 Published online by Cambridge University Press