Simon Hornblower - C. B. R. Pelling (eds.). *Herodotus. Histories: Book VI*. Cambridge Greek and Latin classics. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2017, xv+354 p. £79.99, ISBN 978-1-107-02934-7 (hb); £24.99, ISBN 978-1-107-60941-9 (pb).

The series 'Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics' is in the process of producing an excellent series of texts *cum* commentaries of Herodotus' *Histories*. The currently latest of this series, edited by Simon Hornblower and Christopher Pelling, has Book VI (named after Erato, the muse of the hymn, the song, and the lyric) as its subject. Though Hornblower expressly states in his 'Introduction' to Book V[1] that Book V ('Terpsichore') and Book VI form in various respects a unity, Book VI is, nevertheless, "a structural unit" in itself as well (Hornblower 2013, 3). As a matter of fact, the recognisable relationship between Books V and VI appears to be an argument in Hornblower's view "to think away the conventional book divisions altogether" (Hornblower 2013, 1). As it is, however, such divisions (which Hornblower believes to have originated in the fourth century BC, during the Hellenistic period: Hornblower 2013, 1) are totally accepted by now and have become common practice.

Book VI -as we have it today- of the *Histories* is one of Herodotus' most varied books. It starts with the final collapse of the Ionian Revolt (*capita* 1-32, with some emphasis on the Battle of Lade (*capita* 7-18)) and goes on describing the Persian expedition to Greece of 490 BC (including the destruction of Eretria on Euboea (*capita* 100-101)),[2] which ended in the Athenian triumph at Marathon (*capita* 103-117). Besides, it provides, *inter alia*, (in my view) fascinating material on Sparta, full of court intrigue (*capita* 61-74) and culminating in Cleomenes' grisly death (*caput* 75), but also comedy, detailing Alcmeon's cramming clothes, boots, and even cheeks with Croesus' gold dust (*caput* 125) and Hippoclides happily "dancing away his marriage" (*capita* 126-129).

[1] Simon Hornblower (ed.), *Herodotus. Histories: Book V*. Cambridge Greek and Latin classics. Cambridge; New York: Cambridge University Press, 2013, 1, 3. See also Hornblower/Pelling 2017 [i.e. the book under scrutiny], ix.

[2] As a matter of fact, Herodotus does not refer to the year of the Persian expedition, but based upon Plutarch (Plu. *Arist*. 5.7), Aristotle (Arist. *Ath*. 22.3), and the *Marmor Parium* (ed. Jacoby) *ad* 48 (62-3), all of them referring to the fact that at the time 'Marathon' took place Phaenippus was the leading *archôn* in Athens, the period 490/89 BC appears to be certain. The situation as described by Herodotus establishes that the events should be placed at the beginning of his term of office, i.e. in 490.

However, within the composition of Book VI, Marathon remains the main point of focus, even though, as Hornblower and Pelling remark, Herodotus "… keeps a sense of proportion. The battle narrative is very brief, much briefer than those of Thermopylai, Artemision, Salamis, and Plataia (…). The text as a whole leaves no doubt that it is those battles, not this, that would decide the fate of Greece" (Hornblower/Pelling 2017, 7). Nevertheless, the fact remains that, in Herodotus' time, Marathon was already reaching almost legendary status, commemorated in epigrams and monuments,[3] and in the edition under scrutiny the very first part of the 'Introduction' discusses Herodotus' relation to these other memorials (Hornblower/Pelling 2017, 2-7). The introduction also, rightly, in my view, focuses on Herodotus' both implicitly and explicitly expressed sense of morality: this 'moral sense' clearly shows in Book VI, only to expand in the following books (cf. Hornblower/Pelling 2017, 8, 9).[4] Further parts of the 'Introduction' are devoted to 'Architecture' (Hornblower/Pelling 2017, 9-16; this part returns to the discussion of the place of Books 5 and 6 in the *Histories* as a whole), 'Kleomenes and Impiety' (Hornblower/Pelling 2017, 16-24; in fact to some extent an elaboration of Herodotus' moralistic views), the 'Qualities of Book 6' (a summation of what distinguishes Book 6 in terms of its variations in pace and tone, the distinctive speeches of Leutychides and Miltiades, the deftness of shorter passages of speech, and vivid descriptions: Hornblower/Pelling 2017, 24-30), 'Language and Dialect' (Hornblower/Pelling 2017, 30-36: in fact a contribution by A.M. Bowie and actually a reprint of his contribution, with the same title, as printed in Hornblower 2013, 41-47 (however, not indicated as such)), and Text (Hornblower/Pelling 2017, 36-7). In this last section, Hornblower and Pelling explain that, though they "have been able to make grateful use of Nigel Wilson's new Oxford Classical Text … our text is our own" (p. 36).[5] The text established by Hornblower and Pelling (pp. 41-83) is accompanied by a full commentary (pp. 85-302), covering literary and historical aspects and offering help with translation. This volume concludes with a review of 'Works Cited' (pp. 303-327) and 'Indexes' (328-342, one on Subjects and another on Greek words and phrases). The volume is, like all volumes of this series, easily accessible for undergraduates, graduate students, teachers, and scholars.

[3] For an extensive review of the literary (and archaeological) evidence regarding the Battle of Marathon, see, e.g.: Jan P. Stronk, 'From Sardis to Marathon. Greco-Persian Relations 499-490 BC: A Review. Part Two: The Battle of Marathon and its Implications', *Talanta* 51(2019), pp. 77-226.

[4] For a more extensive discussion on the role of morality in Greek historiography, see: Lisa Hau, *Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus*, Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2016.

[5] For a review of Wilson's edition, see, e.g., *ExClass* 21, 2017.

 http://dx.doi.org/10.33776/ec.v23i0.3727

As related above, Hornblower and Pelling constituted their own text, an in itself absolutely commendable effort. To do so, they relied upon a number of manuscripts (10 altogether in number) and -as indicated by themselves- upon the edition by Wilson. Through the use of the commentary, it becomes apparent, though, that Hornblower and Pelling also fully exploited previous editions of Herodotus' *Histories* (as might be expected, naturally). I found it, therefore, confusing that the previous Oxford Classical Text-edition, by C. Hude (2 volumes, last updated 1927, third edition and (rightly, from my perspective) highly praised by Hornblower in his 2013-edition of Book V) is referred to only under the 'Abbreviations' (Hornblower/Pelling 2017, xi-xv at xi) and not (also) under the 'Works Cited'. The same also applies to H.B. Rosén's Teubner-edition (2 vols., 1987-1997, Stuttgart and Leipzig) and P.-E. Legrand's (in eleven volumes, 1932-1954, Paris; Book VI from 1948) for Les belles lettres - Collection Budé. Legrand does feature, however, among the 'Works Cited' with the 1955 reprint of his *Hérodote: introduction. Notice préliminaire sur la vie et la présente edition* (Paris: Les belles lettres). At least as surprising -in my view, anyway- is the fact that an elementary commentary on Book VI, i.e. Lionel Scott's *Historical Commentary on Herodotus Book 6* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), is only referred to in the list of 'Abbreviations' as well, next to the (still interesting but by now, however, as yet largely obsolete) text *cum* commentary published by Macan.[6] Such works should -in my view- not (merely) be "hidden" under the 'Abbreviations' but fully come to their right as part of the 'Works Cited' as well (as they absolutely are, moreover!).

The above remarks might suggest that, in the process of constituting the text, Hornblower and Pelling also very much charted a quite independent course. Such an independent course obviously can be an asset. Sometimes, however, it also may cause some amazement. An example may, perhaps, serve as illustration. Though Hornblower and Pelling freely admit that in Wilson's edition the name of the Persian satrap of Lydia (and that of his nephew, one of the commanders of the expedition to Greece of 490 BC) is rendered as Ἀρταφέρνης (Artaphernes) and that this rendition is closer to the Iranian form (I might add: much closer), they themselves continue to use the name Ἀρταφρένης (Artaphrenes), as it was used by, e.g., Hude (as might, perhaps be as yet expected in view of at least Hornblower's earlier preferences). Admittedly, Hornblower and Pelling fully explain why they have opted for this rendition of the name (Hornblower/Pelling 2017, 85 *ad* 1.1), but I find it noteworthy that they ultimately prefer to follow a (what I at least have come to regard as a) more or less dated view. Believing that this work by Hornblower and Pelling will be -at least for Book VI- the standard

[6] R.W. Macan, *Herodotus: the Fourth, Fifth and Sixth Books, With Introduction, Notes, Appendices, Indices, Maps*, 2 vols., London/New York: Macmillan & Co, 1895.

work to be consulted for many years to come, I find their choice a missed opportunity to not merely *convey* the latest insights (what Hornblower and Pelling obviously do), but *apply* them as well [my emphases, JPS].

Throughout the commentary, the painstaking precision of the approach both to the text as well as the situation the text alludes to becomes evident. Again, some references, as *partes pro toto*, may serve as an example. I find the microscopic analysis of chapter 40, concerning the younger Miltiades, exemplary of the meticulous approach employed by Hornblower and Pelling. The judiciousness of the editors' negotiation of the chronological, linguistic, and historical puzzles displayed in *caput* 40 is, moreover, apparent throughout the commentary, even though one may come to different conclusions than theirs in the end. Their approach also shows in their handling of the chapters discussing the accusation that the Alkmeonidai were a fifth column in Athens, using a shield to flash a message to the Persian fleet as it sailed around Cape Sunium (*capita* 115, 121-123). Conflicting readings are cited, but the editors refrain from entering the interpretive fray other than to accept that Herodotus' argument cannot be simply taken at face value (also see my comments on this matter in Stronk, 2019, p. 167, 170).

It may have become apparent, by now, that in spite of some critical remarks on this volume (which certainly are possible, I believe), my final impression is extremely positive. In my view, *Herodotus. Histories: Book VI* is an example of combined scholarship, produced by two outstanding scholars in this field, and as such an invaluable addition to the C.U.P.'s ongoing series of nine commentaries on the *Histories* (we are still waiting for the volumes on Books I-IV and VII). As such, Hornblower and Pelling have made it difficult for a frequent user of Herodotus' work (and I am one of those) to imagine a more detailed and comprehensive commentary on Book VI. Moreover, the volume is well-executed and counts very few typos. All this ensures -as I already hinted at above- that, in my view, this will remain the most authoritative publication available for this book of Herodotus' *Histories*, at least for many years to come.

Jan P. Stronk
Independent researcher in Ancient History
jpstronk@planet.nl