

*Lexicon historiographicum graecum et latinum (LHG&L)*, fasc. 2, αλ-αφ, diretto da Carmine Ampolo e Ugo Fantasia, coordinamento di Leone Porciani, redazione di Donatella Erdas, Maria Ida Gulletta, Anna Magnetto, Chiara Michelini. Pisa, Edizioni della Normale, Scuola Normale di Pisa 2007. ISBN 978-88-7642-187-7

Rev. by Philip A. Stadter (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill)

This second fascicule, coming three years after the appearance of the first fascicule (αβ-ακ) in 2004, now completes the entries for alpha, adding 23 articles, supplemented by 52 entries referring to articles in the Lexicon. The project, conceived by Giuseppe Nenci, is ambitious. “The lemmas of the Lexicon have been singled out by reading ancient historians from all angles: account has been taken of programmatic and methodological aspects (the lexicon of knowledge, research, verification, declaration of intent, memory and selection); the attitude and animus of the historian (with the lexicon of controversy and criticism); his relationship with his public (the lexicon of communication and the ‘edition’); finally the formal aspects such as the division and structure of the work, the method of internal cross-references, the categories and subcategories of historiography . . . The range of entries programmed for the Lexicon should be—as the editors hope—sufficiently wide to take account of all the terms and concepts applicable to the ‘historian’s task’, in the widest sense it is possible to give this expression”. This English translation from the ‘Introduzione’ of the first fascicule, p. 7-9, is available on the project’s website (<http://snsgreeksns.it/LHGL/index.html>), as is the full list of Greek entries from ἀβασάνιστος to ὠφέλιμος. The Latin entries are not yet available and the Greek entries so far do not refer to similar Latin lemmata. The editors plan to complete the Greek portion of the Lexicon first, then the Latin, and eventually distribute the whole on CD-ROM (or, one supposes, whatever technology is in use then).

The underlying assumption of the project is that a careful study of the terminology and semantics used by Greek and Roman historians will reveal their conscious and unconscious thinking on their objectives and methods and clarify similarities and differences among the authors. This hope is amply realized in the present volume.

The articles of this fascicule, divided among 16 authors writing in Italian, Spanish, English, and French, vary in length from twenty-two pages (Marincola on ἀλήθεια) to two. They follow a standard format: after the lemma, paragraphs treat etymology, related forms (in so far as relevant), personifications, attestations in ancient and medieval lexica, bibliography of works cited in the article, and an essay discussing the history of the lemma and related words and their usage in a historical context. The authors most frequently cited are Herodotus, Thucydides, Polybius (especially his discussion of historical method in Bk. 12), Diodorus, and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, but many others figure are introduced as necessary. Despite the formulaic structure of the set paragraphs, each article reflects the interests of the individual author.

What did ἀλήθεια, truth, mean to the Greek historian? John Marincola (M.) explores the issues from every angle. After a brief look at archaic poetry and its truth claims (notably Homer, Hesiod, Pindar, and Simonides), he presents a general view of historical truth, whether “the actual situation” or “reliability”, and its contrast to both falsehood and pretense. Historians, beginning from Hecataeus’ programmatic assertion that he writes what seems to him true, see truth as central to their work, and praise or blame others on this basis. M. notes Herodotus’ continual awareness of the tension between what he is told (and reports) and the truth, his pride in the methodology which on occasion can make him confident in his statements (as at VII 139, on Athens as savior of Greece). Thucydides contrasts his own method with the general disinterest in the search for truth (I 20, 3). M. gives five characteristics of truth for Thucydides (p. 18): it must be discovered, not assumed; it requires testing; it can be tested, unlike the accounts of the poets; it is not exaggerated; it offers usefulness, even at the cost of pleasure. M. rightly notes that Thucydides established “the parameters for historical ἀλήθεια in antiquity” (p. 19), so that later historians profess to follow his guidelines even when they don’t. Polybius added the experience, ἐμπειρία, of the historian as an additional criterion of truth (cf. also V. Costa s.v. ἀπειρία). Later authors simplified the challenge of discovering and presenting the truth: bias or flattery, already noted by Thucydides as a difficulty, emerged as the major perceived barrier to truth, but monarchical rule also obstructed the historian’s knowledge, as only a small inner circle were privy to decisions. Of course, there were different criteria of truth for contemporary and earlier history, with the latter emphasizing agreement of sources and restriction of the fabulous, but M. does not bring out as well as he might the methodological differences between the treatment of, e.g., stories of early Greece and reports of Alexander the Great. The article is a comprehensive introduction to the subject and to the fascicule.

O. Gengler notes Thucydides’ restriction of ἄλογος almost entirely to speeches, notably the Melian dialogue (cf. V 104-105) and the antilogy at Camarina (VI 76-87). He pursues the notion of the irrational in the psychology of Plato and Aristotle, illustrating how the same concept of the irrationality of the emotions, especially θυμός, reappears in Polybius and later historians. Historians from Polybius on also criticized their predecessors for ἀλογία (cf. already Hecataeus, *FGrHist* 1 F 1a, λόγοι . . . γελοῖοι). Incoherence and absurdity are enemies of the truth.

Exploring the uses of ἀμάρτημα as mistake, ethical error, or historiographical failing, C. Dognini concentrates on Herodotus, Thucydides, and Polybius. A. Magnetto illustrates the common use of ἀμφισβητέω and related words to express lack of agreement among sources or historians, but remarks that Diodorus also uses the term in the juridical sense of ‘dispute’ or ‘claim for oneself’. Gengler’s short article on ἀναγκαῖος (including ἀνάγκη) reviews the different types of constraint applied to historical actors, from physical force to laws of nature, and their role in historical causality, most of which are already found in Herodotus and Thucydides. Ostwald’s study of ἀνάγκη in Thucydides remains fundamental.

Ἀναγραφή, beginning from the sense of ‘list’ or ‘registration’, in Hellenistic times acquired the sense of ‘document’. A. Magnetto, in a wide-ranging discussion, notes especially Polybius’ usage in his criticism of Timaeus’ handling of such documents. The word acquired a broad spectrum of uses in historians, referring to lists, records, reports, archi-

ves, chronicles, etc., including royal Persian records in Ctesias, the records of the Egyptian priests cited by Diodorus, a divers sources in Josephus, lists of archons in Plutarch, and Roman annals in Dionysius and Plutarch. Ἀναγραφή may also refer to the historical narrative or treatment itself, or to a geographic and ethnographic account, just as the verb may express the act of composition. Magnetto follows this with a short article on ἀναλαμβάνω.

S. Ferrucci's article on ἄξιος addresses criteria for selection of subject and incident in Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Polybius: what is worth attention, worth remembering, worth seeing? Herodotus' interest in ἀξιοθέατα returns in Pausanias. In speaking of the high value Xenophon put on ἀποφθέγματα and his influence on the biographical tradition, Ferrucci might have mentioned *Smp.* 1, 1, where actions in playful moments may also be ἀξιομνημόνευτα, or *Ap.* 34, where Xenophon supposes that anyone who knew someone more useful in aiming for virtue than Socrates would be ἀξιωμακαριστότατον. Both cases, though not in historical works, refer to historical actors and the significance of their actions. Although neither text pretends to historical truth, Xenophon here as elsewhere tests the boundaries of genre. F. Battistoni, discussing ἀπλοῦς, notes its frequent use in discussions of rhetoric to mean a simple as opposed to an elaborate style. Strabo, however, in writing of the early historians thinks more of a certain superficiality or lack of analysis in their accounts.

In his article on ἀπόδειξις, A. Zambrini makes an impassioned defense of Herodotus' claim to be a historian 'in the modern sense,' that is making a rational demonstration, not just repeating or presenting stories. Taking as his key text the opening sentence of the Histories, he argues, following Luzzato and Bakker, that in the phrase ἱστορίας ἀπόδειξις, ἀπόδειξις must mean 'esposizione argumentata'. From this he argues against unnamed 'antichisti contemporanei' (p. 68) that the recent accent on performance downplays his activity as rational historian. Herodotus, he asserts, shares the objectives of the great historians through the ages: "la ricostruzione e interpretazione originale di un evento passato particolarmente significativo . . . credibile e degno di essere trasmessa alle generazioni future". I share Zambrini's evaluation of Herodotus' objective, but question whether all this can be derived from the word ἀπόδειξις, especially in its first appearance in the proem. Zambrini succinctly reviews the evidence for the early use of the term, but does not comment, as far as I can see, on the striking use of the verbal form of the root in the same sentence (ἔργα μεγάλα τε καὶ θωμαστά . . . ἀποδεχθέντα). There the sense of performance is central, and the implication of 'argumentata' is hard to discover. I believe that in Herodotus, performance and demonstration are more closely allied than Zambrini acknowledges. This fact partially explains Thucydides' insistence that his own work is not a contest piece. Tracing the later history of ἀπόδειξις, he rightly observes that Polybius' ἀποδεικτικὴ ἱστορία is closely related to Herodotus' claim, as well as to Thucydides' objectives.

There follow short articles on ἀποδέχομαι by D. Erdas, ἀπορία by A. Santoni, ἀρχαῖος by M. Bettalli, and ἄσημος and ἀσφαλής by Erdas.

Herodotus is the focus of U. Fantasia's study of ἀτρεκής, since he is the only historian to make frequent use of the term (in later historians, beginning with Thucydides, ἀκριβής is employed instead, with slightly different connotations). In Homer the word is always

coupled with verbs of speaking to mean ‘without distortion’, and to imply truth and sincerity. Herodotus in the majority of cases uses it with authorial statements or in connection with his inquiry (especially in Egypt). Most commonly, he states that his account cannot be ἀτρεκής, expressing the limits of his inquiry. Fantasia explores thoroughly the whole range of Herodotus’ practice. A final section discusses the return of the word in Arrian, not only in the *Indike*, an obvious homage to Herodotus and written in Ionic dialect, but also the *Anabasis* (alongside the more frequent ἀκριβής, which is commonly used also in his other works). Arrian, like Herodotus, often used the word with a negative to affirm the limits of his account.

Unusually, A. M. Biraschi’s brief essay on αὔξεις, ‘growth’ (whether physical or conceptual), is organized not by author but by issues connected with growth. Recognizing that Herodotus and Thucydides provide the paradigms for later historians, she treats first, the basis, causes, and modes of growth, then the characterization of growth, and finally its consequences, whether suspicion and new wars (as, for Thucydides, Athens’ growth led the Spartans to war) or further conquests (as with Herodotus’ Persia).

Three major articles on terms with the αὐτο- prefix dominate the final third of the fascicule, all by A. L. Chávez Reino (C. R.). In the first, αὐτοπάθεια (p. 113-123), after a review of the term’s common meaning of an internal response to a *pathos* of some sort, C. R. chiefly discusses Polybius’ requirement of personal experience in his criticism of Timaeus (XII 25a-28a). Here a cross reference would have been desirable to Costa’s treatment of ἀπειρία, pp. 59-63, which demonstrates that inexperience or ignorance is as disastrous for a historian as a general or statesman. Concerned that the studies of Pédech, Sacks, and Schepens have obscured the importance of the concept to the unity and movement of Polybius’ argument, C. R. undertakes an exposition of the structure of XII 25a-28a (p. 115-18) to establish the proper context in Polybius. For Polybius, he argues, αὐτοπάθεια not only refers to the assimilation by the historian of political experience, but a more profound sense of how both practical and physical circumstances effect historical reality, and thus is at the basis of his view of the historian’s task and of his criticism of Timaeus. Another substantial section criticizes Schepens’s hypothesis that Polybius drew the concept of αὐτοπάθεια, like those of ἔμφρασις and ἐνάργεια, from earlier historians. Curiously, the term does not reappear in later historians, with the exception of Plutarch, *Cat.Min.* 54, 8 (in the sense ‘sincerely, personally felt’, also found in Polybius).

The term αὐτόπτῆς (with αὐτοψία) deservedly receives a full treatment (p. 123-144), with an extensive bibliography (note that Marincola 1997a has now been superseded by “Odysseus and the Historians”, *Syllecta classica* 18 [2007] 1-79). At the beginning (p. 124), C. R. calls attention to a unique inscription, ΑΥΤΟΠΣΙΑ, on a vase from Nola, with a picture of three women, the one on the left holding a mirror, with no obvious reference to historiography (London BM E 223, cf. the article and photograph in *LIMC* III s.v.). After discussing several previous interpretations, he concludes that this example of αὐτοψία should be assigned to the religious sphere, (in later Greek is used for a divine manifestation), although its exact reference remains unclear. The presence of the mirror suggests to me a self-reflexive meaning, “looking at oneself (or herself)”, even though none of the women seems to be looking at the mirror. In any case, this action could also be interpreted more profoundly by the viewer. The image of history as a mirror in which one can under-



stand oneself and one's times is one example: cf. e.g. Plutarch, *Aem.* 1, 1. However, neither ἔσοπτρον nor κάτοπτρον are on the current list of lemmata.

In what follows, C. R. surveys the common meaning of αὐτόπτης and related words, which are not limited to historiography, but are found also in legal, magical, administrative, and medical contexts. In historiography, their principal use, established early by Herodotus, regarded geographic and ethnographic information, where the presence or lack of direct experience either confirms or limits the historian's knowledge. In this context ἀκοή is not opposed to ὄψις, but an additional source of information. Ctesias and Theopompus emphasized their particular opportunities for autopsy. Polybius stressed that personal witness often entailed considerable work for the historian. On the difficulties of using eyewitness evidence, one might add Plutarch, *Crass.* 18, 3, reporting that eyewitness fugitives warned Crassus' army of the size of the enemy forces, but adding, "as often happens, they exaggerated the danger". Eyewitness reports are subject to distortion, and in themselves do not guarantee truth. C. R. explores at length the theoretical implications of the historians' statements. He concludes (p. 143) that throughout the terms are linked to geographic-ethnographic realities. Rarely is the historian himself presented as a spectator of events. For this reason the ancient terms do not have quite the same methodological resonance that the idea of autopsy has in modern theory.

The third article, on αὐτουργία, reminds us that the term normally refers to someone working directly with his hands—a farmer or soldier—but is used by Polybius in his criticism of Timaeus, along with αὐτοπάθεια, to describe the historian's direct involvement in political events (p. 145). In this, Polybius is followed by Josephus.

R. Vattuone explores the infrequently discussed term ἀφανής, 'not apparent' or 'invisible', and shows the concept's importance for the work of the historian. Sometimes the historian is balked by what is ἀφανής in time or space, but on other occasions he is able by superior analysis or special information to bring to light what is hidden, especially historical causes, from Thucydides' ἀφανεστάτη πρόφασις to Theopompus' ἀφανεῖς αἰτίαι. Concluding the fascicule, C. Carusi's article on ἀφορμή focuses on Polybius' use of the term as part of his general treatment of causality. It also appears in the sense of military and financial 'resources' in Xenophon, and in Polybius as the 'resources' used to write history by Timaeus while sitting in Athens (XII 25d, 1).

Overall, one is reminded again of the role played by Herodotus and Thucydides in establishing the methodological principles of historiography. The loss of major fourth and third century historians makes it difficult, even employing the few relevant fragments, to understand their contribution. The next major figure is of course Polybius, where we are fortunate to possess fragments of his justification of his own method compared to that of Timaeus, Callisthenes, and others. Even there, however, we need to remember that fragments are often deceptive. Although much remains ἀφανές, this volume and the project of which it is a part represent an important contribution toward τὸ σαφές.

