REVIEW DISCUSSION
Mirrors of Herodotus

KIRKLAND, N. Bryant. 2022. *Herodotus and Imperial Greek Literature: Criticism, Imitation, Reception.* Oxford: Oxford University Press. £93.00. 9780197583517.

Roberto Nicolai

This study by N. Bryant Kirkland applies theoretical models he calls 'kinetic reception' and 'hypotextual activation' that strive to overcome the concept of reception or the outdated concept of an author's fortune. The former is defined as 'the relation between inherited reputation, explicit criticism, and a receiving author's own imitative acts … the interactive "movement" or tension between critical expectation or overt expression and actual appropriation' (18). Hypotextual activation is defined, quoting Gérard Genette: 'the hypertext, the imitating work, can evoke its imitated hypotext "more or less perceptibly without necessarily speaking of it or citing it"' (19). Another critical category adopted by Kirkland, drawn from Foucault, is that of Herodotus as 'transdiscursive' author. Foucault's formulation is quoted on page 26:

> [O]ne can be the author of a theory, tradition, or discipline in which other books and authors will in turn find their place. These authors are in a position that I will call 'transdiscursive.' … They are unique in that they are not just the authors of their own works. They have produced something else: the possibilities and the rules for the formation of other texts.

This calls into question the very concept of the author: 'Foucault famously asked, "What is an author?" and we might in many cases in this book ask, "Who is an author?" or even "Who is *the* author?"' (27).

To these theoretical assumptions must be added the idea of a global or ecumenical Herodotus (28 f.), with which the authors of the Imperial age are confronted in their search for ways to interpret the reality of their time. Herodotus is considered a mirror through which a situation is reflected (with reference to François Hartog),[1] but connections with the environment of the Herodotean age must also be included in the discourse. Kirkland also applies relevant formulations by Gadamer, for example on history as predominantly a matter of disintegration and occasionally of the restoration of order (183). The use of modern critical tools is inevitable, although it requires at least one clarification which can be formulated as a question: how aware were Greek authors of the literary operations they were undertaking in the Imperial age? The answer is not the same for all authors but the twin cases of Ovid and Apuleius allow us to answer that there was a widespread awareness of, and also a remarkable ability to exploit, meta-literary references within a text and to integrate them into the communicative strategies of that text.[2]

---

[1] Hartog 1980.
[2] See Rosati 1983; Nicolai 1999.

Two of the focal points on which the Introduction dwells are originality and imitation: on the latter especially Kirkland proposes noteworthy considerations. On the theme of originality and innovation (and, conversely, the force of tradition), there have been several recent contributions with different theoretical assumptions and outcomes.[3] A crucial question posed by Kirkland's book concerns the use we can make of ancient rhetorical theory: for instance, the Aristotelian distinction between poetry and history is not applicable to Herodotus – and neither is it applicable to Thucydides, as Kirkland persuasively argues (2 f.). Using Aristotle to understand fifth-century literature – as has always been done for tragedy – can lead to serious misunderstandings. The problem is that Aristotle is both descriptive and normative and the two are not always easy to distinguish. For this reason, I am inclined to favour Gorgias' formulations on tragedy.[4] Another problematic point concerns the definition of literary genre, which emerges in Genette's formulation, as cited on page 29. Important clarifications on the relationship between praxis and the theory of literary genres in ancient cultures have been pursued by Luigi Enrico Rossi, while Gian Biagio Conte developed Kroll's *Kreuzung der Gattungen* by emphasizing the intertwined strategies of different genres and the critical role of the reader.[5] (The reader here is understood both as ideal reader, the one the author has in mind when composing, and the author's actual readership over time.) From this perspective, the questions posed by Kirkland seem to be the right ones: 'not just *how* Herodotus is received, the poetics of his reception, but also *why* he is so received, the hermeneutics of his intellectual afterlife' (30, emphasis original). The question as to why Herodotus proposes certain pieces of information, the function of this information, is in my opinion *the* question, rather than questioning the veracity of his account or his role as μυθολόγος ('teller of *mythoi*').

The profound reception of Herodotus' '"sweet," "charming," "graceful"' style entails for the authors of the Imperial age the creation of internal references that open their works to different levels of significance (31–32). I refer the reader to the indispensable contribution on this point by Umberto Eco.[6] The theme of openness is ambivalently connected to otherness (and also to identity, in its shifting edges), a recurring concern for the authors of the Imperial age, variously adapted to the current geopolitical situation. Kirkland escapes the danger of over-schematizing polarities (e.g. Greek/Barbarian, as one finds in Edith Hall),[7] showing that he has fully grasped Herodotus' lesson. The ethical reception of Herodotus by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (35 ff.) is an interesting case not only from the point of view of reception: Dionysius grasped an essential aspect of Herodotus' paradigmatic nature, the ethical, where ethics (προαιρέσεις τοῦ βίου, 'life choices') are intertwined with politics and the writer's actions are entangled with power. These entanglements are well analysed by Kirkland, identifying in Dionysius a parallelism between the ἔργα ('works') narrated by the historian and the ἔργον

---

[3]   I refer, among many possible examples, to Fantuzzi and Hunter 2004; Cantilena 2012; Konstantinou 2015.
[4]   See Nicolai 2010, 2014.
[5]   Rossi 1971; Conte 1991.
[6]   Eco 1962.
[7]   Hall 1989.

('work') of the historian himself, selecting details for his narration (40 f.). This parallelism has deep roots, to recall only the close relations between Thucydides' programmatic passages and his remark on the ἔργα of Athens in Pericles' epitaph (2.40). Dionysius' relationship to Thucydides cannot be reduced to the mere mimesis of a model (42 n. 22): this is shown both by the (often critical) judgements in his *De Thucydide* and the essential programmatic statement made in *Roman Antiquities* (1.8.3 f.), where he explicitly distances himself from the genre of books on war.

An important aspect of Dionysius' reception is his use of Herodotus to construct his own identity as a narrator (57 ff.). Particularly effective here is Kirkland's observation that 'Dionysius's rhetorical works thus exhibit various watermarks – unmarked imitative acts – that support his own interest in a polyphonic reading, an experience by which readers sense the voices of the past speaking in and through the work before their eyes' (58). This formulation prompts us to reconsider not just the concept of tradition but also the action performed by the author at a stage of conscious classicism. Dionysius is aware that he stands on the shoulders of the giants who preceded him. Kirkland attempts to penetrate Dionysius' working method, particularly with regard to the relationship with the Herodotean model, and elaborates the concept of 'submerged imitation' (61). This strategy for imitation differs from more conventional ones, such as the use of the Ionian dialect or the adoption of the theme of the Persian Wars: 'Instead, it allows Dionysius to act both as a critic, set at a presumed distance from the authors under critique, and as a mimetic artist, who fashions his own literary persona by subsuming qualities and stylistic facets of the very writers he appraises' (62).

In general, it is striking that Kirkland identifies Herodotus' traits where we might not look for them, namely in the rhetorical texts of Dionysius. I am sceptical about Dionysius somehow anticipating Hayden White's conception of narrative and historiography (67). In the *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius* 3.11 there is actually a reader-orientated perspective, which we find elsewhere in ancient rhetorical and literary theory. The *True History* of Lucian might be considered one possible kind of meta-history (see below). Kirkland analyses Dionysius' revival of Herodotus' historiography as imperial and ecumenical mainly on the basis of the first book of the *Roman Antiquities* but still takes into account the entire corpus of Dionysius' work. But when modern categories of globalism and cosmopolitanism are applied to ancient historians (77), some doubts arise. In particular, Dionysius' insistence on the Greekness of the Romans, discussed by Kirkland, seems to render these categories meaningless. It is true that Herodotus deals with almost the whole of the world known to the Greeks, but it should not be forgotten that the Persian Empire failed to unify that world, unlike the Romans (on the Roman Empire realizing Xerxes' ecumenical dream, see 97 ff.). In this way, Kirkland is right to argue that 'Herodotus's text is an empire in its own right, one that widens the scope of what historical writing can do, bringing together in "more illustrious" fashion (λαμπρότερον) both Europe and Asia within the confines of "a single work" (εἰς μιᾶς περιγραφὴν πραγματείας)' (91). This could be supplemented by comparison with Thuc. 2.40 and with Thucydides' proem, where the monumental nature of the historian's chosen subject and of his work – and the profound unity of the events narrated – emerge. A delicate point, barely touched upon (102), is the possible reference to Herodotus which is

interpreted as a warning of the dangers threatening the Roman Empire: the fact that Dionysius compares the treatment of peoples conquered by the Romans with the unjust treatment practised by the Spartans and Athenians (*Ant. Rom.* 14.6.4–5) shows how profound was his search for analogies and paradigms.

The chapter on Plutarch aims to analyse that writer's criticism of Herodotus as a means of constructing his own ethos as an author, also through implicit *synkrisis* techniques (143–46). Plutarch's critique of Herodotus' 'simple and effortless style' (λέξις … ἀφελὴς καὶ δίχα πόνου, *De Herodoti malignitate* 854E) is put to the purpose of demolishing Herodotus' intimately deceptive character (108 f.).[8] Plutarch's is an interesting case of psychological criticism practised through style. The in-depth examination of the concept of κακοήθεια, hard to translate (Kirkland notes the inadequacy of the English 'malice'), involves a passage in which the concept of ἀμφιβολία ('ambiguity') is concerned (863E; Kirkland 117) – for which term Isocrates' *Panathenaicus* (240) is a fundamental reference. I only remark here that ἀμφιβολία is generally considered a flaw in ancient rhetorical theory. An interesting consideration is the analogy between the construction of ethos practised in the *Lives* and the picture of Herodotus' ethos that emerges from *De Herodoti malignitate* (122–25). A delicate question, on which there has been much discussion, is the relationship between the *Lives* and the genre of historiography, but I believe this is often a misplaced question: if, following Eugen Cizek's definition,[9] we consider ancient historiography as a galaxy of genres, the *Lives* can be a form of historiography, one in a dialectical relationship with other genres and subgenres.

The chapter on Dio opens with his judgement of Herodotus (18.10), interpreted by Kirkland as ambiguous (152 f.). I think we need to be careful in talking about ambiguity and especially in this particular place, where Dio suggests that Herodotus' work μυθῶδες μᾶλλον ἢ ἱστορικόν ('concerns myths rather than history'). Thucydides uses the term μυθῶδες to contrast his work with those intended for public entertainment (1.22.4). Moreover, Dio's exploitation of certain traits of Herodotus to construct his own ethos as a writer through a series of intertextual references affects the status of his own work. Kirkland considers the Borysthenitic to be the Herodotean discourse *par excellence* (157–85). This is a very complex speech addressed to a double audience: the citizens of Prusa, present at the actual declamation, and the Borysthenites/Olbians, to whom Dio speaks. Dio himself plays the dual role of narrator and protagonist in the narration of his experience in Borysthenes. The strong influence of the Herodotean model in the first part of the discourse is captured especially in the attitude of the traveller reporting what he has seen with his own eyes. Of course, Herodotus' Book 4 was also the richest and best-known literary source on Scythia. Dio's attitude towards a little-known area like Scythia echoes what Kirkland calls the 'Herodotean uncertainty principle' (162). Dio, in fact, adopts a Herodotean

---

8 For ἀφελής, the comparison with Isocr. *Paneg.* 11 (ἀφελῶς, in Valckenaer's correction) and *Panath.* 1 (ἁπλῶς, 'in a simple manner', also present in the *Panegyricus*) is crucial; we can also compare *De Herodoti malignitate* 854E, where the same terminology recurs.
9 Cizek 1985.

approach to peoples living at the borders of the known world, the so-called 'sensitive areas'[10] where the usual categories and distinctions of the Greeks dissolve.

Another key theme of Kirkland's book is cities, developed by Dio both according to the Herodotean principle of changing fortunes (1.5.3 f.) and in terms of environmental determinism (cf. 9.122.3). In Dio the issues of incoherence and identity are already present, concerns that will emerge more fully in Lucian (185). Starting with the uncertainty and instability of the world represented by Herodotus, Kirkland questions Lucian's reception of Herodotus and his ability to 'uncover latent energies, activating margins that were already there' (189). In *Herodotus and Aëtion*, Lucian does not focus on the beauty of Herodotus' style but on his ability as ἀγωνιστής ('athlete', 'competitor') at Olympia, as a kind of fellow sophist or – one might say – the paradigm of sophist (191 f.). The interesting discussions of the comparison with the painter Aëtion and the theme of θαύματα ('wonders') might be enriched by consideration of the ecphrastic aspect of Herodotus' work and, in parallel, the spectacular aspect of the sophist's performance; θαύματα are both the subject of the works (of Herodotus and Lucian) and the effects they have on the audience. Lucian's interaction with *his* Herodotus leads Kirkland to a very interesting conclusion: 'Instead, we find Lucian's "Herodotus" present in the essay not only as the topic of discussion but as a quasi-authorial force, shading into the ostensible presence of the authorial Lucian. Pointing the finger at Herodotus means also pointing at Lucian – that is, at the Herodotean Lucian' (194).

The *True History* prompts the reader to question historiography as a genre and in particular the reader's experience of a historiographical work, specifically Herodotus' work (196). Herodotus' ethnographic content is associated with the theme of uncertain perceptions of identity (197). The two intertextual references to Herodotus Book 2 (197–200) identified by Kirkland bear meta-literary significance that could be further developed by calling into question the *mise en abyme*: by placing the narrator-protagonist into a Herodotean dimension, Lucian also defines himself and his work as well as the role of the reader in receiving it.

Kirkland's reading of Hdt. 2.148.5 f. contains an important intratextual reference to 2.99.1 (204, 207 f.): the transition between the narrative based on autopsy and that based on the λόγοι ('stories') of the Egyptians. If for Herodotus' Egypt the boundary between subjectivity and objectivity is particularly important, and in some cases uncertain (for example, the account of Helen in Egypt),[11] Lucian's manipulation creates a refraction and amplification which naturally involves the idea of ἀλήθεια ('truth'). The narrator-protagonist – about whom Lucian says nothing – introduces a section in which instances of 'Herodotean' ambiguities in the *True History* are examined (210–35). I cannot dwell here on all the relevant passages but I will comment on a select few, beginning with Endymion's speech promising that 'travellers will live near me the happiest possible life' (ἁπάντων εὐδαιμονέστατα παρ' ἐμοὶ καταβιώσεσθε, *Ver. hist.* 1.12; Kirkland 213). This passage recalls Homer, not just through the hodological dimension of the narrative but also one of the themes typical of the fable, the confrontation with peoples whose way of life diverges

[10] Jacob 1983: 26.
[11] See Nicolai 2012.

from expectations. In the *Odyssey*, one of these peoples are the Phaeacians but for Lucian it requires more than just exceptional navigation to reach them: one has to reach the moon. The nexus of 'new and unexpected things' (καινὰ καὶ παράδοξα, *Ver. hist.* 1.22; Kirkland 215) brings us back to evaluation on the basis of our knowledge, which is regularly surpassed. But the term παράδοξα ('unexpected things') should be noted, as it indicates phenomena that confound our expectations and opinions, but are substantiated by testimonies, so much so that the παράδοξα were objects of interest for respectable people. In the people with removable eyes of *True History* 1.25 one finds, as Kirkland points out (217 f.), a reference to the principle of autopsy, but one cannot fail to detect a Herodotean hypotext: the *logos tripolitiko*s (3.80.1) introduced by Lucian through the words περὶ μέντοι τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν, οἵους ἔχουσιν, ὀκνῶ μὲν εἰπεῖν, μή τίς με νομίσῃ ψεύδεσθαι διὰ τὸ ἄπιστον τοῦ λόγου ('If I should write what manner of eyes they have, I doubt I should be taken for a liar in publishing a matter so incredible', trans. Hickes). The difference lies in Herodotus' firmness in asserting that these 'speeches were actually given' (ἐλέχθησαν δ᾽ ὦν). Moreover, the term ἄπιστα ('incredible things') is suggestive of the distinct Hellenistic genre concerning improbable writings, a genre clearly different from the παράδοξα. Connected to these themes is Kirkland's reflection (219 f.) on the term θαῦμα ('wonder') in the passage on the lunar mirror allowing one to see things happening on earth (Luc. *Ver. hist.* 1.26). That Lucian's reworking echoes a Herodotean hypotext – as in the case of the City of Lamps (*Ver. hist.* 1.29; cf. Hdt. 2.62) – is the conclusion Kirkland reaches through an argument that, again, involves questioning objectivity and subjectivity (220–25). In this way, the long-established rules of and borders between literary genres, recognized in the fourth century, are loosened.[12]

The episode of the whale in the *True History* calls into question aspects already highlighted above, but it should be noted that Kirkland (226) also emphasizes the relevance of the reference to an epigraph (1.32), a reference that must be considered significant for the entire historiographical genre. The protagonist's encounter with two characters, an old and a young man, is an opportunity to introduce one more theme: the multiplicity of models. Kirkland notes the reversal of roles in ethnographic enquiry, with the host asking questions of the visitor (227). In this case, however, the main model seems to me to be the epic: *Od.* 9.252–55, with the Cyclops questioning Odysseus and his companions. The allusion to ancient opinions on Herodotus' style in the phrase ἡδεῖα καὶ εὐώδης ('sweet and fragrant', *Ver. hist.* 2.5) may be too subtle, even when we have a direct quotation from the historian (229). The episode of the Isle of the Blessed is constructed in a meta-literary dimension, with the ancient authors and their characters, including those from the Homeric poems. Nevertheless, Lucian is not satisfied with this, so he calls in grammarians and relative discussions on topics such as Homer's homeland (*Ver. hist.* 2.20). The incorporeality of the figures that populate the island (230 f.) recalls Odysseus' experience in the *Nekya*, when he tries in vain to embrace his mother (*Od.* 11.203–24). In this case, the 'Herodotean' experience of the ethnographer exploring unknown places, highlighted by Kirkland, is intertwined with a 'living'

---

[12] See Nicolai 2004, 2014.

literary memory put into play by Lucian, with Homer's shadow dedicating an epigram to him (2.28; Kirkland 231–33). The fact that Herodotus is placed among the damned for his lies (2.31; Kirkland 234) is a further element in a work to be considered both intertextual and meta-literary.

Herodotus also comes into play in the two works of Lucian featuring Anacharsis. In Herodotus, Anacharsis is presented as a kind of Scythian Solon and this allows the historian to reinforce the dialectic between (Greek) identity and otherness that plays such a central role in his work. In his analysis of Lucian, Kirkland applies the tool of hypotextual mobilization (242 f.) and dwells on the relationship between Anacharsis and Solon/Athens in the *Scythian* (243–47) and on Lucian's representation of the autochthony of the Athenians, a canonical theme of the propaganda on Athenian identity in the *epitaphioi logoi* ('funeral orations'). Autochthony is connected to the debate on the Pelasgians, on which Herodotus seems to offer different and partly contradictory answers.[13] Lucian compromises the category of Hellenism, crucial to the identity of the Greeks. Gymnastic activity, criticized in the *Anacharsis*, is another important theme for Greek identity, but the parallels are not limited to those indicated by Kirkland (247 n. 38) as the important precedent of the beginning of Isocrates' *Panegyricus* should be considered.

An interesting point, scarcely dealt with by Kirkland (149), is the current evaluation of the *Anacharsis* (and of so many other works, not only Lucian's) as a purely rhetorical work: this is an evaluation that does not take into account the pervasive character of rhetoric in the education system and literature and that, in the final analysis, originates from the Romantic rejection of rhetoric. Kirkland challenges this tendency by demonstrating the profound rigour of works like the *Anacharsis*, and also through his analysis of the relationship that Lucian establishes with the Herodotean model. The theme of the relationship between gymnastic exercises and military preparation that runs through Lucian's work is, in my opinion, also a retort to the solemn statements of the epitaphs. I am referring to Thuc. 2.36.3:

> τὰ δὲ πλείω αὐτῆς αὐτοὶ ἡμεῖς οἵδε οἱ νῦν ἔτι ὄντες μάλιστα ἐν τῇ καθεστηκυίᾳ ἡλικίᾳ ἐπηυξήσαμεν καὶ τὴν πόλιν τοῖς πᾶσι παρεσκευάσαμεν καὶ ἐς πόλεμον καὶ ἐς εἰρήνην αὐταρκεστάτην.

> Lastly, there are few parts of our dominions that have not been augmented by those of us here, who are still more or less in the vigor of life; while the mother country has been furnished by us with everything that can enable her to depend on her own resources whether for war or for peace. (trans. Crawley)

to be compared with Luc. *Anach*. 30:

> καὶ ὅπερ ἔφην τὸ κοινὸν ἀγαθὸν καὶ τὴν ἄκραν πόλεως εὐδαιμονίαν, τοῦτ' ἔστιν, ὁπότε εἰς τε εἰρήνην καὶ εἰς πόλεμον τὰ

ἄριστα παρεσκευασμένη φαίνοιτο ἡ νεότης περὶ τὰ κάλλιστα ἡμῖν σπουδάζοντες.

I told you of a prize that all may win and of a supreme political happiness; these are attained when we find our youth in the highest condition alike for peace and war, intent upon all that is noblest. (trans. Fowler and Fowler)

Note that the theme of preparing young men for war also appears in Thucydides' epitaph (2.39). The echo of the epitaphic tradition in Lucian can be demonstrated in the reference to the expedition of Eumolpus, Hippolyta's Amazons (presented as women of Scythia) and other peoples attacking Athens:

οὐ ταῦτα ἔφασαν, ὦ Ἀνάχαρσι, Θρᾳκῶν τε ὅσοι μετ᾽ Εὐμόλπου ἐφ᾽ ἡμᾶς ἐστράτευσαν καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες ὑμῶν αἱ μετὰ Ἱππολύτης ἐλάσασαι ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν οὐδὲ οἱ ἄλλοι ὅσοι ἡμῶν ἐν ὅπλοις ἐπειράθησαν.

Ah, Anacharsis, the Thracians who invaded us with Eumolpus told another tale; so did your women who assailed Athens with Hippolyta; so every one who has met us in the field. (trans. Fowler and Fowler)

Incidentally, the rapidity of the allusions to the expeditions rejected by the Athenians closely resembles the epitaph of Plato's *Menexenus* 239β. The reference to Spartan customs in *Anacharsis* 40 goes in the same direction (cf. Thuc. 2.39 again). In brief, the references to Herodotus, which, as Kirkland well demonstrates, are indisputable, overlap with those to other authors: each reference is mirrored by and given deeper significance by the others.

Introducing the last author examined, Pausanias, Kirkland recalls an observation of Greta Hawes: 'Pausanias' evocation of Herodotus secures his place within a particular literary genealogy, but this strategy should not be understood as merely rhetorical' (262),[14] highlighting again the current, and erroneous, devaluation of rhetoric. In the case of Pausanias also, the relationship to the Greek literary tradition is crucial: 'His textual landscape makes pointed allusion not just to the past but to the literary past, summoning events recorded as well as the earlier textures of their recording' (262). Like Herodotus, Pausanias also shapes his narrative by means of intratextual repetitions that must be intertextually interpreted in relation to their Herodotean model (264). The presence of intratextual references or cross-references in Thucydides was already underlined by Antonios Rengakos in an important study published thirty years ago.[15] The tricky topic of 'divine detections' (i.e. interventions) in Herodotus and Pausanias leads Kirkland to explore the conventional features of some references.[16] I will point out only one problem in a passage analysed by Kirkland, the alleged source for the destruction of Helike identified in Strabo 8.7.1. Establishing the dependence on

---

[14] Hawes 2016: 340.
[15] Rengakos 1996.
[16] This matter has been treated, for instance, by Christian Habicht (1985: 154), cited by Kirkland on page 269.

Strabo, assumed by Kirkland on page 272, is in fact crucial to better understand the fortunes of this author in the first centuries of the empire.[17] The two examples of Helike (Paus. 7.24.11–25.1) and Aglaus of Psophis (8.24.13 f.) show well how the Herodotean hypotext offers a deep insight into Pausanias' text (269–81). Sulla (281–86) is also treated as a paradigmatic character for his impiety and violence and his entanglement in the ups and downs of Athens, the city that inspires Herodotus' observations on the transience of human fortunes, and the same can be said of the events at Megalopolis (286–95) which lead to a landscape of ruins. A theme that might be interesting to develop concerns these ruins and their significance in historiography, starting with Herodotus and continuing with Thucydides' archaeology of the future (1.10) through to later developments such as those of Pausanias. In this respect, Kirkland makes a highly suggestive remark: 'Perhaps somewhat unexpectedly, the Herodotean breadth of the Pausanias passage is adduced as evidence for the inappropriateness of wonder. Decline is the way of the world' (291). The role of divinity in the reversal of human destinies (Paus. 4.29.8 f., quoted by Kirkland on page 293) is certainly a Herodotean theme which activates intertextual relations, but it is useful to stress Pausanias' τὰ ἀνθρώπινα ('the vicissitudes of human affairs', trans. Jones) recalling Thucydides' κατὰ τὸ ἀνθρώπινον ('according to human nature', 1.22.4). This might be said to refer to the continuity factor that is determined by man as an actor in history. In searching for the causes of events, the explanations offered by Herodotus (and Pausanias) diverge from Thucydides. Here it should be pointed out that the application of the methods of psychogeography to Herodotus and Pausanias should be supplemented with ancient rhetorical theory. For example, the passage of the Anonymous *De sublimitate* 26.2 on Herodotus, quoted on page 297 (ὁρᾷς, ὦ ἑταῖρε, ὡς παραλαβών σου τὴν ψυχὴν διὰ τῶν τόπων ἄγει τὴν ἀκοὴν ὄψιν ποιῶν, 'You see, friend, how he takes you along with him through the country and turns hearing into sight', trans. Fyfe) can be usefully compared with Theon's definition of ecphrasis (*Progymnasmata* 2.118): ἔκφρασις ἐστὶ λόγος περιηγηματικὸς ἐναργῶς ὑπ' ὄψιν ἄγων τὸ δηλούμενον ('Ecphrasis is descriptive language, bringing what is portrayed clearly before the sight', trans. Kennedy). In general, I believe that modern methodologies can and should be compared with ancient theory that comes close to Greek and Latin authors in terms of categories of thought.

Another issue mentioned by Kirkland and that would be useful to investigate concerns the forms of interaction between the hodological perspective and the 'cartographic mode of bird's-eye geography' (299). Cartography and the bird's-eye view differ profoundly, a point that needs careful clarification. One could discuss at length all the intertextual references identified by Kirkland, but there is no space for that here. To offer just one example, the reference to Herodotus' Themistocles through the mention of the Laurion mines in Pausanias' opening lines (301) may appear to be tenuous but it can be sustained through what we might call Pausanias' 'Herodotean mode'. Whether this is a direct reference to Herodotus or to a tradition of geo-ethnographic description of which Herodotus is the progenitor is

---

[17]   On Strabo's poor literary fortunes until the fifth century AD, see Diller 1975.

a question we should certainly try to answer, even if there is a risk of losing sight of the wood for the trees.

Another interesting case is the maritime perspective that Herodotus and Pausanias share (303), even if the periplus is a genre that pre-dates Herodotus, was practised throughout antiquity and thus affected the descriptive techniques of geographers. Kirkland's reference to the 'cartographic space of Athenian piety' (305) causes some perplexity: there are no clear signs of this in Pausanias' text, while the hodological indications are very clear. The argument about the connection between the tripod on which the killing of the Niobids is depicted and the autopsy of Mount Sipylus (306–08) appears too flimsy. Kirkland's claim that Pausanias 'produces a textual cartography that at once recalls Herodotus's hodological footsteps' (308) implies an integration of a cartographic and a hodological mentality that does not respect the hodological way of thinking as defined by Pietro Janni.[18] Similar doubts may arise with regard to Pausanias' considerations of language and syntax, in which Herodotean elements, Atticisms and Asian traits merge (310): on this point, too, there seems to be a desire to see more in the text than the text can support. On the other hand, the idea of Pausanias avoiding repeating Herodotus' authoritative account in detail (311–15) is solidly argued: Pausanias tends to integrate historiography by tackling the same themes from a different perspective. The distance detected by Kirkland from the paradoxography of the Imperial age, combined with the observation of the Greek localization of many θαύματα (320–29), invite us to reflect on the one hand on the Herodotean origins of Hellenistic paradoxography and, on the other, on the conception of the παράδοξον as an extraordinary and unexpected phenomenon, as are many of the historical events that actually happened and are narrated in Polybius (see above). Kirkland's formulation on page 329 is particularly effective and pleasing: 'In Pausanias's literary crafting, the Herodotean energy of distant, exoticizing wonder is felt anew – for Greece itself': Greece, with its wonders, including those connected to religious traditions (an element missing from Hellenistic paradoxography) is narrated from the outside.

Regarding the bibliography, it must be noted that the extensive list is dominated by works in English; only rarely does it contain fundamental studies in other languages. One important absence, for example, is Sotera Fornaro's commentary on the epistle to Pompeius Geminus.[19]

In conclusion, this book is carefully and intelligently constructed; it stimulates many reflections and allows us a better understanding of the way that Herodotus (but also Thucydides) was understood in the Roman Imperial age. Analysing attitudes towards great models allows us to enter the study of ancient authors and to grasp in concrete terms the practice of mimesis that we often acknowledge only in theory. Referencing Colin Burrow's work,[20] Kirkland states: 'the dynamics of imitation need not be confined to straightforward verbal repetitions and borrowings. They may refer, rather, to formal concerns, rhetorical and argumentative structures, patterns of thought, and the effort to generate the perceived *effect* of a text without

[18] Janni 1984.
[19] Fornaro 1997.
[20] Burrow 2019.

necessarily copying its details' (24, emphasis original). This flexible definition of imitation coincides with an equally flexible conception of reception: with this in mind, the concept of intertextuality brings to the fore cases in which allusion to a hypotext is necessary for understanding the message.[21]

Sapienza Università di Roma
roberto.nicolai@uniroma1.it

Bibliography

Bonanno, Maria Grazia (2018), *L'allusione necessaria. Ricerche intertestuali sulla poesia greca e latina* (2nd ed., Pisa and Rome).

Burrow, Colin (2019), *Imitating Authors: Plato to Futurity* (Oxford).

Cantilena, Mario (2012), 'Intorno alla tradizione', *Seminari romani di cultura greca* n.s. 1: 147–63.

Cizek, Eugen (1985), 'Les genres de l'historiographie latine', *Faventia* 7: 15–33.

Conte, Gian Biagio (1991), *Generi e lettori* (Milan).

Diller, Aubrey (1975), *The Textual Tradition of Strabo's* Geography (Amsterdam).

Eco, Umberto (1962), *Opera aperta* (Milan).

Fantuzzi, Marco, and Richard L. Hunter (2004), *Tradition and Innovation in Hellenistic Poetry* (Cambridge).

Fornaro, Sotera (1997), *Dionisio di Alicarnasso,* Epistola a Pompeo Gemino (Stuttgart and Leipzig).

Habicht, Christian (1985), *Pausanias'* Guide to Ancient Greece (Berkeley).

Hall, Edith (1989), *Inventing the Barbarian: Greek Self-Definition through Tragedy* (Oxford).

Hartog, François (1980), *Le miroir d'Herodote. Essai sur la représentation de l'autre* (Paris).

Hawes, Greta (2016), 'Pausanias and the footsteps of Herodotus', in Jessica Priestley and Vasiliki Zali (eds.), *Brill's Companion to the Reception of Herodotus in Antiquity and Beyond* (Leiden), 322–45.

Jacob, Christian (1983), 'Carte greche', in Omar Calabrese, Renato Giovannoli and Isabella Pezzini (eds.), Hic sunt leones. *Geografia fantastica e viaggi straordinari* (Milan), 24–29.

Janni, Pietro (1984), *La mappa e il periplo. Cartografia antica e spazio odologico* (Rome).

Konstantinou, Ariadne (2015), 'Tradition and innovation in Greek tragedy's mythological *exemplā*', *Classical Quarterly* 65: 476–88.

Nicolai, Roberto (1999), '*Quis ille*? Il proemio delle *Metamorfosi* di Apuleio e il problema del lettore ideale', *Materiali e discussioni* 42: 143–64.

— (2004), *Studi su Isocrate. La comunicazione letteraria nel IV secolo a.C. e i nuovi generi della prosa* (Rome).

— (2010), 'Le emozioni a teatro: da Gorgia alle neuroscienze', *Critica del testo* 13: 153–70.

---

[21] Bonanno 2018.

— (2012), 'Erodoto e la tragedia di Troia (2.112–120)', in Guido Bastianini, Walter Lapini and Mauro Tulli (eds.), *Harmonia. Scritti di filologia classica in onore di Angelo Casanova* (Florence), 633–49.

— (2014), 'Gorgia e Isocrate: i poteri della parola e la scoperta della letteratura', in Mauro Tulli (ed.), *ΦΙΛΙΑ. Dieci contributi per Gabriele Burzacchini* (Bologna), 11–32.

Rengakos, Antonios (1996), 'Fernbeziehungen zwischen den thukydideischen Reden', *Hermes* 124: 396–417.

Rosati, Gianpiero (1983), *Narciso e Pigmalione. Illusione e spettacolo nelle Metamorfosi di Ovidio* (Florence).

Rossi, Luigi Enrico (1971), 'I generi letterari e le loro leggi scritte e non scritte nelle letterature classiche', *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 18: 69–94