

REVIEW–DISCUSSION
ESSAYS ON THE SOURCES AND MODELS
OF ANCIENT HISTORIANS*

Olivier Devillers and Breno Battistin Sebastiani, edd., *Sources et modèles des historiens anciens*, 2. Scripta Antiqua 145. Bordeaux: Ausonius Éditions, 2021. Pp. 460. Paperback, €25.00. ISBN 978-2-35613-370-0.

Sources et modèles des historiens anciens—the title of this second volume of an international collection of articles on ancient historiography edited by Olivier Devillers and Breno Battistin Sebastiani—offers space for a whole range of topics. In the broadest sense, any idea can be justified in some form under the label ‘sources and models of ancient historians’. In this regard, the volume deals with authors from Thucydides to late antique hagiography and even devotes itself to the reception of Florus, Herodotus, and Thucydides in modern and contemporary times in France, India, and Chile. As is usual with such a format, at times the individual articles refer more, and sometimes less explicitly to the overarching theme of the volume. Nevertheless, due to the large number of authors covered, anyone interested in ancient historiography will find information in one way or another, with the result that the book is a particularly useful addition to our knowledge in the field. This is especially the case when the previous volume is also considered.¹

It is precisely the multifaceted sum of languages in the collected contributions that gives this volume its unique value. Articles in French, Spanish, Italian, and English are presented by authors from Chile to New Zealand. Like no other book in this field of research except its antecedent, the collection of Devillers and Sebastiani thus offers a panorama of the worldwide study of ancient historiography and gives an international voice to researchers who are less often the focus of general attention. *Sources et modèles des historiens anciens 2* is an impressive statement in favour of keeping more than one academic language in the study of antiquity.² The diversity so often called for in many places, but repeatedly distorted into a placeholder by the frequently observable

* I would like to thank Mary Curwen (Yale University) for improving the English of this text.

¹ Devillers–Sebastiani (2018).

² Unfortunately, a contribution in German is missing to complete the panorama of scholarly languages. But see Pausch (2018), at least, in the first volume.

fixation on purely English-speaking research and the disregard of contributions in other languages, is achieved by Devillers and Sebastiani in an admirable manner.

The thirty-five articles of the collection cover topics from the analysis of Thucydides to the reception of Herodotus by Mahatma Gandhi. In addition to such classics as Polybius, Livy, and Tacitus, less frequently studied authors such as Festus and Euagrius Scholasticus also find their way into the volume.

Martinho Soares, Cesar Sierra Martín, and Andrea Giannotti open the book with three contributions on Thucydides.³ In a philosophical essay, Soares devotes himself to the question of nomological knowledge and the historical narrative within Thucydides' history of the Peloponnesian War. For this purpose, Soares invokes the reflections of Paul Ricœur, who mentions the search for the internal dynamics that underlie the structure of a work, i.e., its meaning, as the first rule of hermeneutics. Secondly, Ricœur says, one must grasp the potency of the work to project itself out of itself, i.e., the world it unfolds in front of one's eyes.⁴ For this approach, Soares builds a bridge to Thucydides' chapter on methodology. If one cannot yet speak of a scientific approach by the historiographer, one can certainly speak of a nomological or even more gnomic knowledge within an interpretive framework of idealisation and generalisation. This is precisely what makes the work useful for other times. By following a system of probabilities, Thucydides establishes a parallel to Ricœur's understanding of science and thus reveals a concise nomological knowledge. Thucydides does not establish any laws, but he does establish generalisations according to common sense. With such an interpretation, Soares can show the nuances of the Thucydidean concept of truth and underline the differences between the ancient historian and the modern view of history.⁵

Soares' approach is as unusual as it is refreshing. Similarly, Cesar Sierra Martín also takes an unusual perspective. He observes 'the uneasiness in culture' in Thucydides and takes as his starting point Sigmund Freud's *Civilization and its Discontents*.⁶ In this text, a pessimistic view of mankind is developed, which Sierra Martín then applies to Thucydides. He hopes for new impulses for research from the historian, especially in the field of ethics, and then deals in detail with the relationship between the individual and the *polis*. He looks at Thucydides' description of the plague; the internal struggles in

³ 'Giannotti' is misspelled both in the list of authors and in the table of contents, 'Sierra Martín' in the table of contents.

⁴ Ricœur (1986) 36–7.

⁵ Cf. already Erbse (1989) 177 and Sommer (2006) 59–62 on such an understanding of the Thucydidean concept of truth; on the differences between the ancient historiographer and modern historians, see as well Loraux (1980) and Pébarthe (2018).

⁶ Freud (1930).

Kerkyra; and the Melian dialogue. He thereby correctly highlights *stasis* as a habitual state of Greek societies and not as an anomaly.⁷ In this sense, Sierra Martín not only describes war as a violent teacher *à la* Thucydides, but also shows that it demonstrates what the nature of man would be without society. Thucydides thus anticipates some points from Plato and Aristotle in the relationship between *physis*, *nomos*, and *politeia*. It is ultimately the polis that guarantees that one remains a moral human being. In this way, Sierra Martín certainly can highlight Thucydides as an important author for ethical and political investigations in the field of ancient political philosophy.⁸ By illuminating the relationship between the polis and the individual in the historiographer's work, and by repeatedly demonstrating how the two entities merge, his original starting point in Freud's text on the uneasiness of culture is also thought-provoking.

Finally, Andrea Giannotti dedicates himself to an intertextual analysis of Thucydides and Euripides' tragedy *The Suppliants* on the Battle of Delion. While attention is often drawn to the relationship between Euripides and statements in Diodorus (i.e., above all his source Ephorus) Giannotti, on the other hand, aims to demonstrate the close similarities the Euripidean text has with Thucydides. He succeeds in this endeavour through employing excellent textual analysis, which can trace diverse connections between the two texts, such as the link between Theseus in Euripides and the general Pagondas in Thucydides. Euripides owes much more to Thucydides for his tragedy than has been assumed by scholars so far. In addition to textual aspects, the moral approaches of both authors also show similarities. Military, political, and social consequences of war are shown, as well as its unpredictability. In this respect, the Euripidean text addresses all those who support war and shows them the consequences of their actions.

After three studies on Thucydides, the subsequent contributions by Cinzia Bearzot, Livia de Martinis, and Paolo A. Tuci are devoted to the historian Xenophon. Bearzot is particularly interested in Xenophon's understanding of *pseudos* and *alētheia*. With her article in this volume, she is enlarging upon points she has previously made elsewhere on the concept of *pseudos*.⁹ First, she collects all the passages in which *alētheia* is mentioned by Xenophon and elaborates the understanding of a juridical concept of truth for the historiographer's *Hellenica*. This concept, however, according to Bearzot, is already close to a historical truth. Although Xenophon has no chapter on methodology, he by no means eschews systematic research. In this sense, truth can be reconstructed, demonstrated by means of arguments, and proven by means of testimonies.

⁷ See now also Börm (2019).

⁸ See, however, also already Strasburger (1954).

⁹ Bearzot (2018).

Bearzot then tackles the term *pseudos*, which has a lower frequency in the *Hellenica*. In the rest of Xenophon's writings, however, the term is frequently contrasted with *alētheia*. Bearzot thus arrives at the dichotomy between uncertain realities (*adēlon*) and things that can be presented with certainty (*saphes*). In this regard, Xenophon ultimately adopts the same concept of truth that Thucydides pursues in his work and is thus also orientated towards the method propagated by his predecessor. For Bearzot, Xenophon and Thucydides appear more similar than is often perceived. Yet it is precisely this point that would have made an even closer examination of the concept of clarity (*saphes*) interesting. This very term appears at a central position in Thucydides' chapter on method and offers a telling approach to his understanding of truth, which is difficult and laborious to ascertain, and requires a high degree of intellectual reflection (Thuc. 1.22.4). In the end, for Thucydides the historiographer cannot rely solely on probabilities, but must minimise the degree of uncertainty as much as possible through his own thinking, personal experience, and eyewitness enquiry.¹⁰ This conclusion, however, leads to supposed inconsistencies with the juridical concept of truth that Bearzot points out for Xenophon. Should not an argument based on general plausibility suffice for the latter? After Bearzot has compiled the relevant passages in this study, it would certainly be worthwhile to examine the relationship between *saphes* and *alētheia* in Xenophon in greater detail with more arguments in order to highlight the similarities and differences with Thucydides.

Livia de Martinis then discusses the religious perspective in Xenophon's *Anabasis* and *Hellenica* as well as their Socratic foundation. She examines the use of divine vocabulary in its various forms: e.g., *theos*, *theion*, *daimonion*. De Martinis is thereby able to point out differences between Xenophon on the one hand and Herodotus and Thucydides on the other. A list of traditional religious practices in both works rounds off the article.

In a concluding contribution on Xenophon, Paolo A. Tuci focuses on the Spartan general Derkylidas. Tuci's aim here is not to trace a comprehensive biography of the Spartan. Rather, he wants to give an overview of the Xenophonic portrait of the commander. He succeeds in an exemplary way in breaking down the information given by Xenophon from different perspectives. Tuci illuminates both Xenophon's depiction of the Spartan's rational behaviour and his emotional actions. He also looks at Derkylidas' demeanour in private as well as in public. By concentrating on the occurrence of emotions, Tuci moves into a promising field of research that holds further potential.¹¹

¹⁰ See Moles (1993) 107 and Gehrke (1993) 11–12 on the Thucydidean method.

¹¹ Cf. Chaniotis (2012), Chaniotis–Ducrey (2014), and Chaniotis (2021).

Tuci's article should encourage more engagement with emotion-studies in the field of ancient historiography.

James H. Richardson then offers some reflections on the understanding of past and present in historical thought and historiography with a clear reference to early Rome. Especially for this phase of ancient history, the historiographers, who are invariably to be dated later, repeatedly offer perspectives that reveal more about the authors' own respective presents than about the past they are dealing with. Consequently, Richardson can show a series of anachronisms in Livy and Dionysius of Halicarnassus. He highlights how much the image of the past in Roman times was shaped by the writer's own present, and thus points to an important element in the approach to historical thinking.¹² Anachronisms form an integral part of the human condition.¹³ It is precisely this emphasis on the multiple anachronisms in the tradition of early Rome, however, that seems to allow for promising further analysis. In particular, the intentional use of anachronisms would lead to profitable results for the analysis of Livy or Dionysius of Halicarnassus.¹⁴ Richardson, on the other hand, opts for a somewhat different approach. He emphasises the importance of the past for the present in such a way that it presents the actions of present actors as orientated towards their predecessors. He thus basically reverses the argument according to which the view of the past is shaped by the present. On the contrary, the present is rather controlled by the orientation towards the past. The behaviour of people in the Augustan period for example, in which some of our historiographical sources are located, would thus allow conclusions to be drawn about the behaviour of past generations. With this argument, Richardson makes a strong case for the fundamental orientation towards a *mos maiorum* and the example of the ancestors. However, to give more positivist weight to the content of the sources on early Rome seems methodologically difficult. The reviewer lacks the decisive evidence for this view that would make it more than a circular argument or one of silence. Moreover, Richardson's remarks do not satisfactorily establish the source situation on early Rome as trustworthy material for this period.

Richardson's article is followed by a block of four contributions on the historian Polybius. Daniel Barbo, John Thornton, Álvaro M. Moreno Leoni, and Eugene Teytelbaum focus on methodological aspects of his historical work. Barbo examines the temporal perspective in Polybius' historical method. He sees the second century BC as a time of change in fundamental notions of temporality, as Reinhardt Koselleck was also able to show for the eighteenth

¹² Of course, this does not only apply to the Roman period. The historian is always bound to his own time.

¹³ See Most (2004).

¹⁴ Exemplified in the volume by Junghanß–Kaiser–Pausch (2019) on other authors.

and nineteenth centuries.¹⁵ Through Rome's expansion into the eastern Mediterranean world, political history had become an organic whole (*sōmatoeidēs*) and thus it had also become the task of the historian to present this whole in a new kind of work. In this respect, Polybius' historical observations reflect the fundamental change in the assessment of temporality as it had developed through the changed political constellation. Timaeus of Tauromenium could not yet have written a work like Polybius'. In his study, Barbo thus points out important aspects for the classification of the Polybian historical work in its contemporary context. It is therefore even more regrettable that the relevant scholarly debate on Polybius, which is dedicated to similar questions, remains completely unused.¹⁶

John Thornton then makes an important contribution to Polybius' use of models. He devotes himself to the Herodotean elements in Polybius' historical work. Starting from Hermann Strasburger's essential observation of how much the definition of the nature of historiography was shaped by Herodotus, Thornton works out methodological and intertextual similarities between the father of historiography and Polybius.¹⁷ Thornton thus detaches Polybius from the references to Thucydides that are usually invoked and can cast a very promising glance at the breadth of Polybian models beyond the historian of the Peloponnesian War.

Following this, Moreno Leoni succeeds in analysing the relationship between local knowledge and universal historiography in more detail. He shows how Polybius abandons a too narrow view of the polis and chooses a universal approach that places individual local history in a trans-local context. Moreno Leoni's contribution thus offers a geographical complement to the topic that Barbo had already illuminated from a temporal perspective.

Finally, Eugene Teytelbaum tackles an individual case study. He is interested in the depiction of sieges in Polybius and asks whether they rely on traditional literary *topoi* or a pragmatological approach by the author. In a solid overview of the sieges described by Polybius, Teytelbaum concludes that the depictions are fundamentally influenced by the literary canon, but also reflect the author's own experiences to a certain extent. On the one hand, he provides a sound analysis of the underlying material. Yet, on the other, Teytelbaum's conclusions can hardly be a surprise. The article will nevertheless be useful to anyone dealing with sieges.

In the following contributions, several historians are treated in individual papers. Virginia Fabrizi provides a case study of the *topos* of the duel in Livy's *Ab urbe condita*. She emphasises the close model of the epic for historiography

¹⁵ Koselleck (1988).

¹⁶ See esp. Maier (2012), but also Petzold (1969) and the overview by Dreyer (2011).

¹⁷ Strasburger (1966).

and cites poetic elements in Livy's work that refer to Homer or Ennius. On the basis of three duels, she traces the comparable structures of these episodes and clearly demonstrates how questions of individual heroism, and the collective interests of Roman society are negotiated in them.

Jorge Tomás García then looks at a fragment of Nicolaus of Damascus on the tyrant Cleisthenes of Sicyon. This contribution seems to take a somewhat different perspective from the other articles in the volume. Tomás García traces the tradition of the tyranny in Sicyon and discusses the fragment preserved by Nicolaus. However, he seems to be more concerned with Cleisthenes of Sicyon, the protagonist of the fragment, than with the historian Nicolaus. In this respect, it seems as if it is less a study of ancient historiography than a historical source-analysis that aims for a better classification of the tyranny in Sicyon.

A different approach to the ancient material is shown by Nelson Horn. He highlights how the work of Pompeius Trogus, who is only preserved in the epitome of Justin, is usually used purely as a source for the history of Philip II and Alexander the Great, and not dealt with as a form of literature in its own right. His look at the depiction of Alexander is intended to help us to better understand the literary conceptions of Trogus. In doing so, Horn succeeds in identifying the Macedonian general as an exemplum in both a positive and a negative sense. Alexander is the ideal ruler of a Macedonian empire, but also the incarnation of its faults. He thus becomes a contrast to and foil for Augustus, who is opposed to the Macedonian as an anti-Alexander. Augustus overcomes Alexander just as Rome overcomes Macedonia. Horn's remarks are an important addition to the way Augustan historiographers dealt with the past.

P. A. F. Almeida then considers Caesar's *Gallic War* in the context of other ethnographic accounts. Poseidonius' remarks on the Celts are presented as well as those of Diodorus. Almeida also examines Caesar's distinction of the Gallic tribes and society more closely. He offers an interesting study. However, the work of Dieter Timpe in particular should definitely have been taken into account in this context.¹⁸

Juan Carlos Iglesias-Zoido then looks at Flavius Josephus' description of the siege of Masada. In a detailed analysis of the passage, he shows the rhetorical embellishments of Josephus, which make the entire scene appear tragic. At the same time, Iglesias-Zoido makes the point that Josephus is trying to criticise poorly executed rhetorical depictions by his own stylistic ornamentations.

Jakkojuhani Peltonen and Emanuele Berti then turn their attention to the Alexander historiographer Curtius Rufus. Peltonen takes a closer look at the representation of prostitution in Babylon. He tries to point out that Curtius

¹⁸ Timpe (2006).

basically follows a Herodotean model of historiography, but at the same time propagates a Roman system of gender. No author describes Alexander's stay in Babylon in greater detail than Curtius. So far, however, this passage has only been used for *Quellenforschung*, while the metatext has not received any attention. Peltonen assumes that Herodotus' account of Babylonian prostitution could have inspired Curtius Rufus. He also tries to demonstrate how the account presents the opposite of a Roman understanding of gender. Overall, however, Peltonen's conclusions always appear vague, so that his interpretations need not be compelling.

Next, Emanuele Berti offers a comparison between Curtius Rufus and Arrian's *Anabasis*. Based on two speeches given by Alexander, Berti is primarily interested in the rhetorical models of the two historiographers. He can convincingly demonstrate the similarities with the technique in the declamations of Seneca the Elder. Curtius Rufus and Arrian are thus familiar with *suasoriae*, and they construct their speeches in this manner.

The following contribution by Natan Henrique Baptista and Leni Ribeiro Leite on the construction of Domitian in the contemporary tradition is remarkable. They compare the emperor's portrayal in historiography with that of the poems of Statius and Martial. Baptista and Ribeiro Leite are mainly concerned with the rhetorical construction and less with the historical personality of Domitian, and they conclude that a multitude of personas of the emperor are encountered in the literary tradition. Poetry repeatedly represents a counterpoint to historiography. Baptista and Ribeiro Leite offer a thorough analysis of the texts they use as a basis. It is therefore even more regrettable that relevant literature on the subject has not been considered in this case. There are several important studies on the topic dealt with in this paper. As accurate as Baptista and Ribeiro Leite's observations are, they coincide in many cases with already published studies on the same topic.¹⁹ It would therefore have been intriguing to see how the two authors comment on these studies.

Tacitus is the subject of the following two articles. Victoria E. Pagán's is dedicated to the account of the massacre in Tarracina, Spain, during the year of the Four Emperors in the *Histories* (*Hist.* 3.76–7). In keeping with the title of the volume, she is concerned with sources and models for Tacitus' portrayal of the battle. In this way, she can show how Tacitus draws on the Flavian literary tradition and supports this image with examples from the republican period.

Sergio Audano then turns to Tacitus' treatment of consolatory literature using the example of Tiberius and the Stoic consolation on the death of Drusus in the *Annals* (4.8.2–13.1). Audano shows how Tacitus lets Tiberius mourn Drusus in the spirit of Stoic ideas. The ruler remains committed to the *mos*

¹⁹ See Bönisch-Meyer–Cordes–Schulz (2014), Cordes (2017), and Schulz (2019).

maiorum and mixes it with Stoic *apatheia*. Audano thus succeeds in providing an interesting insight into Tacitus' ethical model and, after Paolo A. Tuci, in placing another contribution in the field of emotion-studies.

Related studies on the same author do not follow in the further course of the volume. First, François Porte deals with the portrayal of Cn. Pompeius Magnus in Plutarch and Appian. He looks at Pompey's paradoxical hesitation in the fight against C. Iulius Caesar. For both authors, Porte notes the influence of Caesar's *Bellum Civile*, but probably also of Asinius Pollio and Livy. In the *Bellum Civile*, Pompey never takes the initiative and thus appears above all as a strategist of flight. It is precisely this evoked image, however, which makes a coherent analysis of Pompey's actual tactics extremely difficult. However, Porte can show how the Livian example of Fabius Maximus Cunctator in the fight against Hannibal is used by Plutarch and Appian for Pompey. The fact that Caesar's opponent is incapable of adequately executing the tactics of the delayer, however, demonstrates how far the degeneration of the republican setting had already progressed. Portes' contribution is an exciting insight into the working methods of two authors of the High Empire and the handling of their models.

The article by Fara Nasti attracts particular attention. She gives an overview of an author hardly known, Sextus Pomponius, who probably lived at the time of Hadrian or Marcus Aurelius and whose work *Encheiridion* was used as a source for the *Digest*. From a total of fifty-three paragraphs of legal codification, some clues can be gained about this lost work. Nasti gives an overview of the apparently three-part structure of the text, which traced the origin of law from the time before Romulus to the Principate, then went into more detail about the Roman magistracies and finally presented a list of jurists. Nasti gives the impression of a work that was comparable in its approach to Aristotle's *Athenaiōn Politeia* and corresponded in its mindset to his *Politika*.

Next, Jeremy J. Swist makes a valuable contribution to research on Florus. He gives the historical work of Florus the value that it is often denied. Swist uses the account of the Roman regal period to show the extent to which this is a careful and systematic reworking of the Livian material. Florus does not simply epitomise some basic information of the monumental work *Ab urbe condita*. Rather, he transforms Livy's account in such a way that it corresponds to the mentality of the second century AD in terms of its ideology, military virtue, and Stoic sense. It is basically an encomium in which the *populus Romanus* is the honouree. Florus thus possibly forms a counterpoint to the work of Tacitus. In any case, he offers those readers who were familiar with Livy an alternative perspective on history. In this way, Swist can show a tendency towards re-writing in Florus, which can also be seen in other authors of the second and early third centuries. Arrian and Cassius Dio, for example, also

endeavoured to throw new perspectives on topics that had long been dealt with.²⁰

Following this, Nuno Simões Rodrigues takes a closer look at the constitutional debate between Augustus, Maecenas, and Agrippa found in Cassius Dio's Book 52. His contribution provides a useful outline of constitutional debates mainly in Greek literature. Dio, however, could have been much more in focus, judging by the title of the article. One learns all sorts of things from Protagoras to Pindar, Sophocles, Euripides, and Plato. However, the extent to which all these authors, and especially Herodotus, served as inspiration for Dio would have to be demonstrated more with the help of relevant textual examples.

Karine Laporte, on the other hand, can present a useful narratological analysis of Marcus Aurelius and Iulia Maesa in her study of types and figures in Herodian. She explains how, apart from a few examples, research on Herodian has long concentrated on purely source-specific aspects. In this respect, her literary analysis offers a welcome extension to current research on Herodian that was published at the same time as the present volume.²¹

With Beatrice Girotti, the volume then moves into late antiquity. She examines the characteristics of *avaritia*, *ambitio*, and *cupiditas* in the historiographers of the fourth century AD. She focuses on Eutropius as well as on the *Epitome de Caesaribus* and Aurelius Victor, and uses them to demonstrate how the three categories apply to the early Roman emperors.

Moving on, Moisés Antikeira examines Aurelius Victor's portrayal of the emperor Julian. Antikeira follows Jonas Grethlein's approach of the 'future past', showing that the portrayal of former times is fundamentally shaped by the later, already-known outcome, and this can be understood very well in Aurelius Victor.²² Antikeira often keeps his arguments vague, but is ultimately able to show that Julian did not correspond to Aurelius Victor's moral expectations.

Like Fara Nasti, Murray Dahm then turns his attention to a rather seldom treated text. He focuses on the *Breviarium* of Festus, which, despite its 185 medieval manuscripts and its use as a source for Jerome and Isidore of Seville, has not yet received a published English translation.²³ Dahm traces its importance as a didactic military manual intended to show the ruler how to approach a campaign against the Persians. Murray elaborates on the genesis of the work, which is addressed to Emperor Valens and thus has a

²⁰ See, e.g., Free (2019) and (2022).

²¹ Cf. especially Galimberti (2021) and Chrysanthou (2022).

²² Grethlein (2013), (2014), and (2016).

²³ Though a translation and notes from 2002 by Thomas Banchich and Jennifer Meka can be found on line at <http://www.roman-emperors.org/festus.htm> or, differently formatted, at <http://www.attalus.org/translate/festus.html>.

chronological connection to Eutropius and the anonymous *De rebus bellicis*. After questions about the genre, he finally states the undoubted literary talent of Festus. In this sense, his contribution is primarily an appeal for a more intensive examination of this rarely treated text.

Like Moisés Antigueira, Jakub Pigón then also deals with the concept of the future past. He looks at the narrative prolepsis in Ammianus Marcellinus in Book 21 and asks to what extent Tacitus could have served as a model in this case. Pigón offers a thorough narratological study, but his result must be negative. He cannot identify a Tacitean model in this case.

After that, Fabrizio Petorella turns to late antique hagiography. He chooses the lives of Porphyry of Gaza, Ambrose of Milan, and Martin of Tours as case studies to demonstrate the ambiguity between historical reality and political power in these texts. In these cases, the driving force behind decisive deeds within history never emanates from rulers, but from the saints. In this context, history develops towards a predetermined end on the one hand and is the manifestation of God's intervention on the other. The ruler must fulfil God's will and it is the task of the saints to advise him well in this. This is the first time in this volume that somebody focuses on the reinterpretation of history in a Christian context.

Ivan Matijašić then concludes the round of studies on antiquity. He takes a look at the list of ancient historiographers in Euagrius Scholasticus. Matijašić emphasises the remarkable fact that this author, in addition to church historians such as Theodoret and Sozomen, also includes names such as Charax of Pergamum and Polybius of Megalopolis. Euagrius shows the adherence to a historical cycle even in late antiquity. However, he probably had no more than shallow knowledge of the more specific authors he cites.

Matijašić's chapter is followed by three contributions on the reception of antiquity in modern times and contemporary history. Guillaume Flamerie de Lachapelle takes a closer look at the reception of Florus in eighteenth- and nineteenth-century France, expanding on a paper he wrote in the first volume of *Sources et modèles des historiens anciens* on the reception of Florus in the seventeenth century.²⁴ He now offers an overview of the author's use in schools and universities, as well as the editions in libraries, before turning to the treatment of Florus by professors and intellectuals. With this and the essay from *Sources et modèles 1*, the reception of Florus in France between the seventeenth and nineteenth centuries is excellently treated.

The co-editor of the volume, Breno Battistin Sebastiani, then looks at a possible use of Herodotus by Mahatma Gandhi. In a commentary on the Bhagavad Gita, one of the central texts of Hinduism, Gandhi discusses the episode of Croesus and Solon, which is treated at length by Herodotus (1.30–

²⁴ Flamerie de Lachapelle (2018).

2). Sebastiani asks to what extent Gandhi could have used Herodotus directly in this case. He ultimately concludes, however, that Gandhi used an intermediate source here. More than Herodotus, he probably drew on Tolstoy.

Finally, Paulo Donoso Johnson examines the reception of Thucydides in Chile between 1949 and 2017, illustrating how long Chilean scholarship depended on a translation in Castilian Spanish before there was also a Latin American version. Johnson addresses the linguistic subtleties of five translations and discusses the political context at the time of their creation.

If one draws a conclusion from the series of articles presented, both their thematic and international range should be positively emphasised. It is especially good that less frequently treated authors such as Festus and Sextus Pomponius are given a platform here. The contributions also offer new insights into better-known authors such as Pompeius Trogus, Appian, and Herodian. However, some contributions also repeat knowledge that has long since found its way into research. Unfortunately, the insufficient consideration in some articles of debates that already exist in the scholarly literature must be criticised here. Overall, however, the volume will be useful to anyone who deals with one of the authors it covers.

*Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität,
München / Yale University*

ALEXANDER FREE
Alexander.Free@lrz.uni-muenchen.de

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bearzot, C. (2018) 'À propos du terme $\psi\epsilon\tilde{\nu}\delta\omicron\varsigma$ dans l'historiographie grecque', in T. Blank and F. K. Maier, edd., *Die symphonischen Schwestern: narrative Konstruktionen von 'Wahrheiten' in der nachklassischen Geschichtsschreibung* (Stuttgart) 31–48.
- Bönisch-Meyer, S., L. Cordes, and V. Schulz, edd. (2014) *Nero und Domitian: Mediale Diskurse der Herrscherrepräsentation im Vergleich* (Tübingen).
- Börm, H. (2019) *Mordende Mitbürger: Stasis und Bürgerkrieg in griechischen Poleis des Hellenismus* (Stuttgart).
- Chaniotis, A., ed. (2012) *Unveiling Emotions: Sources and Methods for the Study of Emotions in the Greek World* (Stuttgart).
- (2021) *Unveiling Emotions III: Arousal, Display, and Performance of Emotions in the Greek World* (Stuttgart).
- and P. Ducrey, edd. (2014) *Unveiling Emotions II: Emotions in Greece and Rome: Texts, Images, Material Culture* (Stuttgart).
- Chrysanthou, C. (2022) *Reconfiguring the Imperial Past: Narrative Patterns and Historical Interpretation in Herodian's History of the Empire* (Leiden).
- Cordes, L. (2017) *Kaiser und Tyrann: die Kodierung und Umkodierung der Herrscherrepräsentation Neros und Domitians* (Berlin and Boston).
- Devillers, O. and B. B. Sebastiani, edd. (2018) *Sources et modèles des historiens anciens* (Bordeaux).
- Dreyer, B. (2011) *Polybios: Leben und Werk im Banne Roms* (Hildesheim, Zürich, and New York).
- Erbse, H. (1989) *Thukydides-Interpretationen* (Berlin and New York).
- Flamerie de Lachapelle, G. (2018) 'Florus comme modèle et source de trois abrégés du XVII^e s. *Florus Francicus*, *Florus Gallicus* et *Florus sanctus*', in Devillers–Sebastiani (2018) 373–90.
- Free, A. (2019) 'Review of V. Fromentin et al., edd., *Cassius Dion: nouvelles lectures* (Bordeaux, 2016)', *Klio* 101: 392–5.
- (2022) 'Between Mimesis and Innovation: Some Thoughts on Arrian's Place in the Literary Currents of his Time', in R. Rollinger and J. Degen, edd., *The World of Alexander in Perspective: Contextualizing Arrian* (Wiesbaden) 111–29.
- Freud, S. (1930) *Das Unbehagen in der Kultur* (Vienna).
- Galimberti, A., ed. (2021) *Herodian's World: Empire and Emperors in the III [sic] Century* (Leiden).
- Gehrke, H.-J. (1993) 'Thukydides und die Rekonstruktion des Historischen', *A&A* 39: 1–19.
- Grethlein, J. (2013) *Experience and Teleology in Ancient Historiography: Futures Past from Herodotus to Augustine* (Cambridge).

- (2014) ‘Future Past: Time and Teleology in (Ancient) Historiography’, *H&T* 49: 315–35.
- (2016) ‘Ancient Historiography and Future Past’, in A. Lianeri, ed., *Knowing Future Time in and through Greek Historiography* (Berlin and Boston) 59–77.
- Junghanß, A., B. Kaiser, and D. Pausch, edd. (2019) *Zeitmontagen: Formen und Funktionen gezielter Anachronismen* (Stuttgart).
- Koselleck, R. (1988) *Vergangene Zukunft: zur Semantik geschichtlicher Zeiten* (Munich); Eng. trans. by K. Treib, *Futures Past: On the Semantics of Historical Times* (Cambridge, Mass. and London, 2004).
- Loroux, N. (1980) ‘Thucydide n’est pas notre collègue’, *QS* 12: 55–61; Eng. trans. by C. Dudoit in J. Marincola, ed., *Greek and Roman Historiography* (Oxford, 2011) 19–39.
- Maier, F. K. (2012) ‘Überall mit dem Unerwarteten rechnen’: die Kontingenz historischer Prozesse bei Polybios (Munich).
- Moles, J. L. (1993) ‘Truth and Untruth in Herodotus and Thucydides’, in C. Gill and T. P. Wiseman, edd., *Lies and Fiction in the Ancient World* (Exeter) 88–121.
- Most, G. W. (2004) ‘Anachronismus’, *Scientia Poetica* 8: 294–7.
- Pausch, D. (2018) ‘Umkämpfte Erinnerungsorte: auf der Suche nach Vorbildern für Livus “Schlacht auf dem Forum”’, in Devillers–Sebastiani (2018) 181–96.
- Pébarthe, C. (2018) ‘Comment lire un collègue? De la lecture de Thucydide’, in Devillers–Sebastiani (2018) 37–52.
- Petzold, K. E. (1969) *Studien zur Methode des Polybios und zu ihrer historischen Auswertung* (Munich).
- Ricœur, P. (1986) *Du texte à l’action—Essais d’herméneutique, II* (Paris).
- Schulz, V. (2019) *Deconstructing Imperial Representation: Tacitus, Cassius Dio and Suetonius on Nero and Domitian* (Leiden).
- Sommer, K. L. (2006) *Techne und Geschichte: eine diskursgeschichtliche Studie zu Thukydides* (Bonn).
- Strasburger, H. (1954) ‘Die Entdeckung der politischen Geschichte durch Thukydides’, *Saeculum* 5: 395–428; repr. in H. Herter, ed., *Thukydides* (Darmstadt, 1968) 412–76.
- (1966) *Die Wesensbestimmung der Geschichte durch die antike Geschichtsschreibung* (Frankfurt am Main); repr. in id., *Studien zur alten Geschichte II*, edd. W. Schmitthenner and R. Zoepffel (Hildesheim and New York) 965–85.
- Timpe, D. (2006) *Römisch-germanische Begegnung in der späten Republik und frühen Kaiserzeit: Voraussetzungen—Konfrontationen—Wirkungen: Gesammelte Studien* (Munich).