

Our beloved *Polites*

Studies presented to P.J. Rhodes

Edited by

Delfim Leão, Daniela Ferreira,
Nuno Simões Rodrigues, Rui Morais

ARCHAEOPRESS ARCHAEOLOGY



ARCHAEOPRESS PUBLISHING LTD
Summertown Pavilion
18-24 Middle Way
Summertown
Oxford OX2 7LG
www.archaeopress.com

ISBN 978-1-80327-170-5
ISBN 978-1-80327-171-2 (e-Pdf)

© The authors and Archaeopress 2022

Cover: EM 13537: Epigraphic Museum, Athens, Photo by K. Takeuchi
© Hellenic Ministry of Culture and Sports / Hellenic Organization of Cultural Resources Development.

All rights reserved. No part of this book may be reproduced, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying or otherwise, without the prior written permission of the copyright owners.

This book is available direct from Archaeopress or from our website www.archaeopress.com

In Memoriam Professor P.J. Rhodes

(1940–2021)

Contents

A Tribute to P. J. Rhodes: An Overview	iv
Delfim Leão, Daniela Ferreira, Nuno Simões Rodrigues, Rui Morais	
PJR: An Appreciation	x
John Davies	
 Part I - History and Biography	
The Controversy Between Herodotus and Hecataeus: History and Competition in the <i>Histories</i> 2.143.	3
Denis Correa	
Thucydides on Athens' Goals in Sicily, 427-424 and 415-412 BC	15
Robert W. Wallace	
Reading Thucydides' Mythological Stories: Alcmaeon in <i>The Peloponnesian War</i>	23
Amanda Ledesma Pascal †	
Ionians in the <i>Hellenica Oxyrhynchia</i>: The Battle of Ephesus (<i>Hell. Oxy.</i> 1-3)	31
Antonis Tsakmakis	
Lycurgus' Biography and Constitution in Ephorus' Fragments	39
Martina Gatto	
The Sacred Band of Thebes and Alcibiades' <i>Exemplum</i> (Plutarch, <i>Pel.</i> 18-19 and <i>Alc.</i> 7.3-6)	51
Nuno Simões Rodrigues	
Sailing Directions. Echoes of Ancient Nautical Knowledge in the <i>Periplus</i> of Ps.-Skylax ..	65
Chiara Maria Mauro	
Heraclides' Epitome of the Aristotelian <i>Athenaion Politeia</i>	76
Gertjan Verhasselt	
A bastard Pharaoh: Why Ptolemy XII Auletes was not the Son of a Ptolemaic Princess	92
Antony Keen	

Part II - Law

Aristophanes on Solon and His Laws	111
Delfim Leão	
Legal Theory, Sophistic Antilogy: Antiphon's <i>Tetralogies</i>	121
Davide Napoli	
Demosthenes, <i>Against Aristogeiton</i>. Νόμος and Φύσις in 4th Century BC Athens	134
Lorenzo Sardone	
The Search for Consistency in Legal Narratives: The Case of the 'Good Lawgiver'	146
Ália Rodrigues	
Adoption and the <i>Oikos Eremos</i> in Ancient Athens: Public and Private Interests	160
Brenda Griffith-Williams	
The Semantic Overlap of 'Αδικία and 'Ασέβεια in the Amphiareion at Oropos	171
Aikaterini-Iliana Rassia	
Sacred Laws (<i>hieroi nomoi</i>) and Legal Categories in Hellenistic Crete	183
Michael Gagarin	
The Phrase <i>καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης</i> in Greek and Hellenistic Documents	191
Gerhard Thür	
Part III - Politics	
The Literary Sources for Athenian Prosopography	207
John Davies	
The Oligarchic Ideal in Ancient Greece	215
Roger Brock	
The Greek Polis and the Tyrant in the Archaic Age: Some Trends in the Relationship Between the Emergence of Tyranny and the Evolution of Political Community	227
Aitor Luz Villafranca	
A Tale of Two Cities: Studies in Greek Border Politics	237
Lynette Mitchell	

Empedocles <i>Democraticus</i>?	256
Carlo Santaniello	
From Chremonides to Chaeronea: Demosthenes' Influence in Later Athens	272
Ian Worthington	
Part IV - Epigraphy	
Epigraphy's Very Own History	285
Robin Osborne	
The Lost Dedicatory Inscription of the Serpent Column at Delphi	303
András Patay-Horváth	
Something to Do with Epigraphy? The 'Aegeus Episode' in Euripides' <i>Medea</i> and the Honorific Dimension of Athenian Tragedy	314
Andrea Giannotti	
Εὐθυνῶ τῆν ἀρχήν: <i>Euthynai</i> in the Sacrificial Calendar of Thorikos	322
Kazuhiro Takeuchi	
Philip's (Serious) Joke: [ΦΙΛΙΠΠΟΥ] ΕΠΙΣΤΟΛΗ 12.14	338
Adele C. Scafuro	
Index	360

A Tribute to P. J. Rhodes: An Overview

This volume was initially conceived as a natural outcome of the academic debate planned for the congress to be held on the occasion of the celebration of P.J. Rhodes' 80th birthday, in September 2020, at the University of Coimbra, an institution with whose researchers the honorand has been collaborating for almost two decades, particularly in the area of ancient Greek law. Unfortunately, the development of the pandemic situation made it impossible to hold this celebration according to the originally intended parameters. Notwithstanding, this did not detract from the main objective of all those scholars and friends (to whom we are so profoundly grateful) who were involved in the organisation and promotion of the event: to celebrate the person and the career of one of the most remarkable historians of ancient Greece, whose contribution to this area of knowledge is so splendidly demonstrated in John Davies' opening text. On 17 June 2021, there was a brief preliminary presentation of the contributions of the tribute in an online meeting, which was attended by the honoree. Sadly, his unexpected death a few months later (on 27 October) prevented P.J. Rhodes from appreciating the volume in its final form, but the tribute to one of the most brilliant scholars of ancient Greek history has been realised entirely in the terms in which it was presented to him.

The volume has been organised in four parts that map closely onto four prominent areas of P.J. Rhodes' research into ancient Greece: History and Biography, Law, Politics, and Epigraphy.

In the First Part, are included essays on political history, cultural memory and transmission and on some of the events that marked the historical process of the Greeks and several historical personalities. Denis Correa deals with agonistic intertextuality between Herodotus and Hecataeus in *Histories* 2.143. Following P. J. Rhodes method, the author asks questions Herodotus *qua* historian in relation to his goals and limitations and proposes an explanation for the perception of competition and emulation that may be recognised in his writings, focusing particularly on the controversy between Herodotus and Hecataeus. Then, following previous studies on the subject, Robert W. Wallace presents a new reading of Thucydides' suggestion that Athens' two expeditions to Sicily were intended as conquest manoeuvres. Wallace argues that the historian's suggestions frame Thucydides' accounts of Athenian expeditions to Sicily and that they seem inconsistent with various internal remarks, raising the question whether the historian later inserted what may be a misrepresentation of Athens' intentions in order to reinforce larger moral lessons from Athens' defeat. The author's main thesis is that the central sections in both Sicilian expeditions suggest that, at the time of his writing, Thucydides had not yet grasped his overarching theme, which he envisaged as Athens' overweening ambition, probably until Athens' defeat in 413/2. Once he hit upon his central thesis, Thucydides went back through his accounts of these expeditions inserting lines, especially at their beginning and end, just as he did with Athens and its allies. Thucydides is also the main topic of Amanda Ledesma Pascal's chapter, which analyses the inclusion of the mythological story of Alcmaeon in Thucydides' historiographical narrative. Although considered a secondary digression, this story has a Herodotean flavour and often causes admiration among Thucydides' critics, since one of the main features of the historian is the exclusion of myth from his narrative. But as Ledesma Pascal also reminds us, both narrator and audience shared mythical tradition, with the purpose of the excursus seeming to have been to invite readers to reflect on all

its implicit consequences. After Ledesma Pascal's contribution, Antonis Tsakmakis deals with the reference to the battle of Ephesus (409 BC) in the Cairo papyrus of the *Hellenica Oxyrhynchia*. Comparing this information to other sources such as Xenophon's *Hellenica* and Diodorus Siculus, the conclusion is that the three agree in most of the details concerning the battle. But there is a divergence on the allies of the Ephesians. Who were they? While Xenophon says that the Persians, Syracusans and Selinuntines were those allies, the papyrus refers to Spartans, reflecting a pro-Spartan attitude. The author explores this divergence, stressing that Xenophon's account, in alignment with a historiographic tradition which is dominated by prejudices against Ionians, tacitly denies any decisive role to the Ephesians in the defense of their own city, while the Oxyrhynchus historian draws a distinctly positive picture of these Ionian Greeks. Martina Gatto focuses on Lycurgus and how his life and political achievements, such as the constitution of Sparta, are present in Ephorus' fragments. The author considers that, in Ephorus' mind, the Lycurgan *politeia* was the key to the political and military ascent of Sparta and its hegemony in Greece until its defeat by Thebes. So, Ephorus' portrayal of Lycurgus was particularly important within his work. Therefore, Gatto outlines the main elements of the Spartan legislator's elaborated representation in Ephorus, which is significantly different from the representations that Herodotus and Xenophon made of the same personality. Nuno Simões Rodrigues makes an intertextual reading of two passages of Plutarch: one considering the Sacred Band of Thebes and the other dealing with a story about Alcibiades' and Socrates' comradeship on the battlefield. Taking account of the context of pederasty and same-sex relations in Ancient Greece, the author suggests that the passage on Alcibiades and Socrates should be read within the context of the topic of the Theban Sacred Band, considering it a possible way for Plutarch to pass on a message concerning Greek sexual customs and practices. Then, Chiara Maria Mauro proposes to identify traces of information once included in ancient *periploi*, or coastal pilot books, and determine its origin. Since the quantity and quality of this information increased during the Hellenistic Age, the focus is placed here on the previous period, running from the 6th to the end of the 4th century BC. Mauro considers this time frame to be crucial for understanding the development and transmission of nautical issues, as it was the time when geographical/literary documents called *periploi* appeared. Gertjan Verhasselt studies Heraclides' epitomes of Aristotle's constitutions, discussing their validity as a source for our knowledge of the lost ones, which are the majority. In fact, the *Athenaion Politeia* is the only surviving Aristotelian constitution. All that remains of the other constitutions are fragments. Verhasselt discusses Heraclides' method and reliability as an epitomist of Aristotle by comparing the section on Athens with the original Aristotelian text. This method sheds light onto the filter through which the other constitutions are now known to us. Since Heraclides' epitome of the Athenian case gives a heavily distorted picture of the original, the author argues that we should be cautious about the excerpts on other constitutions. The last chapter in this section belongs to Antony Keen, who discusses who the mother of Ptolemy XII Auletes was or, better said, could not have been. The topic was motivated to the author after rewatching the 1983 series *The Cleopatras*. Keen starts by underlining how brief and fragmented the sources are on this topic and period, being not concerned with demonstrating that Auletes' mother was, or was not, Egyptian, or Greek, or Syrian, but rather merely that she did not belong to the Ptolemaic royal house. The author concludes that Ptolemy XII Auletes was the illegitimate son of Ptolemy IX Lathyros, by an unknown mother.

The Second Part of the book brings together essays on Greek law. Delfim Leão focuses on Aristophanes' references to the laws of Solon. Leão stresses that they are comparatively scarce,

but, despite their relative paucity, those occurrences prove that Aristophanes was familiar with Solon's laws, which he uses mainly for parodic purposes. The article presents analysis of those passages in their proper context and compares them with passages from other authors in order to discuss their validity as sources for the study of Solon's laws. The second paper included in this part belongs to Davide Napoli and is centered on the method and purpose of Antiphon's *Tetralogies*, and their connection to the sophistic reflection on ancient Greek language and law. Napoli argues that the *Tetralogies* use a legal form to problematise legal principles, hence leading Athenian legal practice to demonstrate its own limitations. Thus, the *Tetralogies* might help us to redraw the boundaries of theory and practice in sophistic thought. Lorenzo Sardone proposes to re-examine Demosthenes' authorship of the *Against Aristogeiton*. The author takes account of new elements of assessment about the orator and the historical, political, and cultural background of the 4th century BC Athens. Sardone stresses the importance of the usage of such words as *physis* and *nomos*, considering they are not casual, but acquire a deep evocative meaning for the learned Athenian audience. In fact, the presence of the opposition between law and nature in the *Against Aristogeiton* suggests that its author had a good knowledge of this philosophical topic, and this is one of the reasons why the author argues that Demosthenes perfectly seems to fit as the author of the speech. Ália Rodrigues' essay analyses the ways in which the figure of the *nomothetes* is represented and characterised in 4th century BC legal narratives. Rodrigues argues that in all kinds of legal narratives (historical, philosophical, legal) there is a welldefined representation of the Lawgiver within the topic of the creation of Constitutions. Furthermore, the author shows that the uniformity of the Lawgiver's representation is maintained through the language used to describe the *nomothetes* and his activity. Therefore, the image of the Lawgiver as well as the idea of legal procedure were built not only in courts but also outside them. Next, Brenda Griffith-Williams focuses on the importance of adoption within the Athenian inheritance system for both family (*oikos*) and state (*polis*), stressing the significance and implications of an empty house (*oikos eremos*). Sources show that posthumous adoptions were a relevant issue in Classical Athens, since estates left vacant after the last owner had died leaving no direct heir became a problem to be solved in court. The author concludes that we cannot rule out the possibility that one of the Athenian archons at some time had an active role in the arrangement of posthumous adoptions. If the archon's legal duty was not concerned with the continuity of Athenian families, but with the supervision of estates left vacant after the last owner had died leaving no direct heir, that would be entirely consistent with the administrative functions over which the archon had charge. Aikaterini-Iliana Rassia reminds the reader of how often the notions of *adikia* ('injustice') and *asebeia* ('impiety') were used seemingly interchangeably, both being notions that qualify kinds of human transgression. Part of the confusion of the semantic overlap between *adikia* and *asebeia* is that both notions can be indistinguishably applied in both secular and religious matters. However, argues the author, the way we choose to interpret this semantic overlap often affects our broader understanding of the value terms of injustice and impiety in relation to social and religious matters. The focus of Rassia's chapter is placed on the analysis of the semantic overlap of *adikia* and *asebeia* attested in the sacred regulation of the Amphiareion at Oropos, one of the most important healing sanctuaries of ancient Greece. Michael Gagarin discusses what Greeks like the Cretans of the Hellenistic period meant when they referred to *hieroi nomoi* or 'Sacred Laws'. Although we have doubts about such category of laws in ancient times, the expression appears in the sources, and it meant something for those who used it. As the author argues, the conclusions reached in the chapter will not provide any further guidance on ways to organise a modern

collection, but may help reassure us that in forming such collections we are not radically departing from the Greek notion of sacred laws. Closing this part of the volume, Gerhard Thür demonstrates the variety of meanings that the expression *καθάπερ ἐκ δίκης* ('from a court procedure') could assume in papyrus contracts of the Ptolemaic and Imperial Era (the expression is a formula often found in these documents). Comparing these texts with other sources beyond Graeco-Egyptian papyri, Thür concludes that, depending on the context, the formula can pass the idea of full executive force but also mean legal irrelevance. It also acts as an instrument to dishonour, that would be particularly effective in a society marked by the ancient values of honour and shame.

The Third Part presents essays on Greek Politics and Political Thought. John Davies shows how written sources, such as literary texts, can be used to construct the history of individuals of ancient Athens, considering the methods, limitations, and achievements that these sources can offer to the historian of Ancient Greece. Davies stresses the caution that the historian must have when dealing with these sources. They often offer the historian the names of individuals, which Davies organises in three categories: names embedded in narrative or discursive text (e.g. lyric and dramatic poetry, historical narratives), names decontextualised as an item in a list or as an example selected for inclusion in a discourse, and names recontextualised in a later construct, typically a biography. The essay concerns mainly the second category. Still, the author makes several methodological and practical remarks on the three types of names/sources, showing how important the topic is to build a prosopography. Roger Brock's essay concerns the elements or social code that mark out the elite as a select minority, characterised by a control of membership through the use of unstated, subtle and elusive coded language and the monitoring of standards of correct behaviour. This is coherent and consistent with the aristocratic ideal, the ideal of an established elite, which could only be learned through socialisation: the oligarchic ideal was a well-constructed exclusionary code, argues Brock. Subsequently, Aitor Luz Villafranca proposes to study archaic tyranny within the consolidation of civic consciousness and citizenship in Greek *poleis*. The author analyses the role of tyranny in the changes of archaic aristocratic polis systems, as well as the emergence of the portrayal of the tyrant as a monster, which came to be used as a political tool by oligarchy. Lynette Mitchell, for her part, focuses on the concept of the border in Ancient Greece. She sets out to explore some of the themes of border politics in the Greek world by focussing on two sets of battles: the battles of Tanagra and of Oenophyta in 458/7, and the Athenian attack on Tanagra in 426 and the battle of Delium in 424 BCE. This series of events allows the author to explore their impact not only on themes in Greek international relations in the fifth century, but also on the importance of liminality – borders, borderlands, and border zones – in the Greek political and diplomatic landscape. Carlo Santaniello's essay focuses on an ancient tradition that suggests that Empedocles had "popular" or antioligarchic feelings. In fact, asks the author, why should Empedocles dissolve the Thousand, of which he was certainly a member, as he belonged to one of the noblest and richest families? Santaniello criticises this tradition, arguing that Empedocles might simply have challenged an attempt of the Thousand to support a new would-be tyrant, in the same way as he had formerly rejected the humiliations inflicted upon the participants in a symposium by a host with tyrannical aspirations. The author also considers doubtful some recent attempts at finding comparisons or confirmations of the philosopher's alleged democratic feelings in the *Peri physeos*. He then concludes that none of the surviving texts endorse any hypothesis regarding a democratic Empedocles. This part of the volume is closed by Ian Worthington's paper, which deals with

Athens' history after the Classical Period. Pertinently, the author focuses on a less "golden" age of the polis, stressing the resilience of its people who never stopped fighting against new foreign rulers, although circumstances persistently contradicted the goal of having freedom back. In this context, a man like Demosthenes, who fought for Athens' independence and freedom, gained special meaning for the Athenians of the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The existence of a statue then dedicated to him proves it and, as Worthington argues, must have been used as symbol against Macedonian rule, first, and Roman power, after.

The fourth and last part of the book is dedicated to Epigraphy. It starts with Robin Osborne's contribution, which presents a reflection on how the material form of inscriptions affects the historical use of inscribed texts. Osborne focuses on two specific aspects of epigraphic texts: their being written for display in a particular place and their freezing of a particular moment in time. The author argues that, by taking these aspects into account, epigraphic texts acquire additional dimensions that enable a rather richer history to be written. In his paper, András Patay-Horváth considers the remaining parts in the Serpent Column of Delphi (a list of 31 *poleis* that participated in the Battle of Plataea and a damaged preamble), but he deals mainly with the lost ones. Patay-Horváth argues that the traditional reading of the preamble is likely to be correct, since it gives all the necessary information about the dedicators. The author also argues that the dedicatory inscription was most probably incised on the lost base of the monument. It was likely to have been a very simple inscription, naming only the Hellenic symmarchy led by Sparta, and most probably the fact that it was erected as a military victory monument. As far as Andrea Giannotti is concerned, his main goal is to investigate to what extent the language of Athenian tragic plays is related to the language of epigraphy, in particular that of honorific decrees praising the deeds and virtues of foreign benefactors. Greek drama provides many examples of reciprocal relationships between people which mirror the logic of honorific practice. A comparative analysis of specific tragic episodes, such as Aegeus' in Euripides' *Medea*, and epigraphic testimonies can thus help us estimate to what extent the logic of honorific practice permeated Athenian society, as well as understand the significance of the logic of benefactions and exchanges in the world of Attic tragedy. Kazuhiro Takeuchi's essay deals with the sacrificial calendar of Thorikos, which was first published in 1983. Although the issues of its chronology and sacrificial ritual are still under debate, as the author remarks, it is pertinent to present a fresh look on this topic, based on autopsy. This method allows the author to offer epigraphical commentaries and propose new restorations concerning the oath of the *euthynos* ('auditor') and the *euthynai* ('audits') of officials appended to the end of the inscription. Takeuchi raises the issue about the date and the lettering of the document. Finally, the last contribution is Adele C. Scafuro's, whose chapter deals with a famous passage in 'Philip's Letter to the Athenians', in which the Macedonian king mentions repeated attempts to put an end, by arbitration, to his dispute with the Athenians over the island of Halonessos. Scafuro considers that Philip offered a formal *proklesis* to the Athenians for the arbitration of their dispute and explains why a *proklesis* may be appropriate in some contexts but inappropriate in others, such as diplomatic situations. The author also takes the authenticity issue of the letter into account, as well as a comprehensive overview of its reception and hermeneutics. In the end, Scafuro argues that 'Philip' properly resorts to a technical term of arbitration proceedings, used by cities that are bound together by agreements, considering this an indication of the genuineness of the document (e.g. as representing the author's intimate knowledge of international affairs).

The preparation of a coherent manuscript is a laborious and highly demanding task, to whose copy-editing Carlos Martins de Jesus devoted many hours of his time. The same can be said of David Wallace-Hare, who so generously and attentively reviewed the texts of non-native English-speaking authors. Special thanks must be given, as well, to the internal and external referees who read the papers, strongly contributing to improve them. The final quality of the volume owes much to their diligent commitment. Finally, a word of sincere appreciation to David Davison and to Archaeopress, for having accepted to publish the book and make it available to readers.

We have left to the end the greatest of thanks, which is due to P.J. Rhodes, for having enlightened and inspired generations of Classicists. May the work of the editors of this volume not detract from the exceptional quality of the scholar they endeavour to honour.

*Delfim Leão,
Daniela Ferreira,
Nuno Simões Rodrigues,
Rui Morais*

PJR: An Appreciation

John Davies

What was written and delivered via the electronic gathering at Coimbra as an Appreciation has had at the last moment to become an Elegy. The Editors' invitation to revise the text presents a dilemma. To leave the text unchanged risks incongruity and insensitivity; to change it significantly risks needless overlap with other tributes to Peter as scholar and human being, both those in this volume and those to come elsewhere. I have therefore changed virtually nothing of my text except the tense of some verbs.

It was both a privilege and a pleasure to have been able to offer this affectionate salutation to so long-standing a friend and colleague as Peter Rhodes, for our paths through life ran in parallel in ways that reflect aspects of the sociology of scholarship. Typically for our generation, we were both products of high-status and fiercely selective English grammar schools in a period when meritocracy was in vogue in Britain and when a few of the financially poorer and less distinguished colleges in Oxford and Cambridge saw competitive advantage in recruiting such applicants as ourselves, rather than applicants from independent fee-paying schools (the so-called 'public schools'). Wadham in Oxford was one such college, and in consequence first I, then Peter a few years later, had the good fortune to find ourselves there and to be taught ancient history by George Forrest (later Wykeham Professor of Greek History): I have described elsewhere how Forrest's personality and teaching style made the subject come alive and inspired a long succession of his students to follow him into the specialism.

A second shared experience followed, as first I, then Peter, came under the influence of David Lewis as the supervisor of the post-graduate projects that eventually gave us our doctorates and the entrée to university careers. Peter in his turn commented on that influence elsewhere, for I think he found it easier than I did to relate to Lewis's high expectations and hyper-laconic postcard-sized guidance. In retrospect, though, it is clear that we both responded constructively to his vision of studies that bypassed the traditional parade-ground of ancient Greek history, politico-military narratives, and instead explored how Greek societies and their institutions worked in practice. Both in the thesis that became his first big book, *The Athenian Boulé*, and in many other publications, Peter largely stayed true to the institutional side of that vision, while I have inclined more to its social and economic side. But our careers continued in parallel, his too with spells at Merton College Oxford and at the Washington Center for Hellenic Studies, a lectureship outside Oxford which became a personal Chair at Durham, and election as Fellow of the British Academy, not to mention many shorter-term honorific awards. Throughout the decades, his energy and industry were exceptional, enviable, and very efficiently employed: I can do no more here than touch very briefly on some of the most prominent themes of his activity.

I begin, not with his innumerable reviews or with his equally innumerable edited-volume chapters and journal papers, but with his books, because they displayed those 'prominent themes' in their most concentrated form. Above all, they showed him as 'editor', in no

fewer than three of the four possible roles that that term encompasses. (He wisely avoided the fourth role, the thankless task of actually editing a journal, but as a member of editorial committees of no fewer than eight journals over the decades he played a generous supportive role in that sector of scholarship too.) In the first of those three editorial roles, his activity as editor, translator, and commentator of literary texts was incessant for forty years. It began with his second *mega biblion*, the full-dress *Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*. It then moved to single books of Thucydides and Herodotos by way of the *Old Oligarch* and a translation of Thucydides, and more recently embraced *the Laws of Solon*.

The second role, that of editing, translating, and commenting on inscriptions, was an equally intense activity. He was never a hard hands-on epigraphist, but rather one who used, assembled, and explained them for general utility. A volume of mid-fourth century inscriptions in translation in 1972 began the sequence, but it abruptly changed course when David Lewis's final illness, combined with David's competing priorities, compelled Peter to take by far the major responsibility for compiling and editing what became *The decrees of the Greek states* in 1997. This is a characteristically painstaking compilation of evidence from across the Greek-inscribing world, so designed as to document how the range of distributions of power within Greek states was reflected in the formulae of the preambles of inscribed public decrees. It became his third *mega biblion*: one surmises that the intimate acquaintance with the whole Greek epigraphic corpus that it gave him helped to engender the step-change that was visible six years later in his fourth, the book of fourth-century inscriptions that is now known to us all as RO. Compiled jointly with Robin Osborne, it replaced Marcus Tod's 1948 volume of the same title, which in turn had replaced Hicks' pioneering effort of 1882, and it was a real step-change. All such compilations have been in essence a teaching tool for university courses, but the additions to each entry in RO of full-dress lemmata, full translations, some apparatus criticus, and detailed explanatory commentaries have raised its format and content much closer to the gold standard for full epigraphic publication. Nor did the editors stop there, for the editors then changed places on the title page and gave us OR for the fifth century: what we shall call the pre-478 volume when it appears remains to be seen. Together the volumes will form a magnificent trilogy.

There remains the third and last form of editorship, represented by eight examples of what has become our profession's signature art-form: edited book-form assemblages of papers, whether of conference proceedings, of a scholar's collected works, or of selected or solicited contributions to a theme. Three are singletons: a source-book in translation on *The Greek city-states*, the editorial responsibility for David Lewis's posthumous *Selected Papers*, and a collection of essays by 14 scholars on *Athenian democracy*. Others have been collaborations – with Lynette Mitchell for *The development of the polis in Archaic Greece*, with E.E. Bridges and Edith Hall for *Cultural responses to the Persian wars*, with Edward Harris and Delfim Leão for *Law and drama in ancient Greece*, with Polly Low and Graham Oliver for *Cultures of commemoration*, and with Valerij Goušchin for *Deformations and crises of ancient civil communities*. I cite them all in detail because collaborators' names tell one story (of wide and amicable collegiality) and the book titles tell another (of a wide range of thematic interest), but both sets reflect the central place which PJR occupied for decades in the communal mission to reconstruct the complex but patchily documented culture of Classical Greece and to present it lucidly and precisely.

I now turn from PJR as editor to PJR as reviewer. I do so not just because of the lucidity and sane judgment of his reviews but also, and primarily, because the intensity of his activity since 1970 that their numbers reflect was a polysemic marker: of his willingness to perform an essential but unglamorous and sometimes distracting task, of the choices that he made and of the profile that review editors have discerned, but especially of his acquisition of intellectual capital. To write a review is also to invest in one's own store of knowledge. To focus such activity over the decades, as he did, is to give oneself an unshakeable command not just of the 'bibliography' of a subject but also of its flows and tensions and inter-relationships. But the strategy is effective only if it is concentrated, achieving near-total coverage of an author, say, or of a region or a period or a specific culture-form. In this respect Peter's list is eloquent. Apart from a few outliers and from his surveys of publications in Greek history in *Greece & Rome* in 1988-91, the titles reviewed were almost wholly concerned with one or other of three interlaced subjects: Athens, Thucydides, and ancient Greek institutions and political theory. So have the four book-length monographs of his that I have yet to cite: first, *Ancient democracy and modern ideology*, with a meaningful title to which I return in a moment, secondly *A history of the Classical Greek world 478-323 BC*, thirdly *Alcibiades, Athenian playboy, general and traitor*, and fourthly *A short history of ancient Greece*.

If, keeping in mind that consistency of focus within reviews and monographs, one turns to his list of journal papers and chapters in edited volumes, one finds that -- hardly surprisingly -- they show exactly the same profile. There were a few ventures into foreign parts -- to a sentence in Suetonius, to Sparta twice, to Boiotia, Macedonia, Miletos, and Sicily once each -- and a near-dozen that reflected his affectionate loyalty to Durham and to his colleagues, but otherwise one is looking at the yield across those three interlaced subjects from that concentrated investment.

Does that concentration constitute a limitation? There is a case for the answer 'Yes', insofar as it gave him fewer opportunities to show how polities and institutions can be safely compared across time or space, and it has deprived the reader of what would have been equally carefully thought out and documented studies of other more neglected times and regions of Antiquity. But the far stronger case is for 'No'. How do I best put it? With some trepidation, I ask you to imagine in your mind's eye an old wooden box that is stored up in the dusty attic of an old house and is simply labelled 'Athens'. It is stuffed-full of preserved and rescued fabrics and clothing of every kind and pattern that have been dumped there by generations of families -- standard undamaged basic items (a waistcoat, an evening dress), unfinished garments, curtains, complete and fragmentary display pieces, roll-ends, torn and broken remnants, discards, heirlooms --- and of a quality that varies from the choice to the mundane, from shoddy to classic. The inexpert will open the box and despair. Yet a skilled tailor or seamstress who knows the range and potential of such materials can select, refurbish, combine, and reshape them so cleverly as to be able to present a new, elegant, robust and well-made product time and again. Peter was that tailor. Seemingly effortlessly (but the relentless hard work in study and library has to be imagined and factored in) and in response to endless requests for lectures and invitations to contribute to a volume, the list of creations grew so steadily, and latterly so fast (at least 4 or 5 a year since he retired), as to provide a complete conspectus of how Athenian and Greek public life and institutions worked in practice. When his forthcoming *Studies on fourth-century Athens* finally appears, it will surely be seen as a *Summa historica* and as yet another indispensable *mega biblion*.

Three words suffice to characterise this corpus: authority, lucidity, and caution. The first is obvious: for decades he knew the texts and documents and bibliography about Athens and Classical Greece as well as, and very probably better than, anyone else in the world, and he used that knowledge crisply, appositely, and constructively in the interests of fostering his readers' understanding of past realities. Secondly, whether describing or narrating or arguing, he always wrote simply: he wished to be understood. Thirdly, he stayed close to the evidence, showed his working, used his knowledge to demolish the extravagant or ill-founded ideas of others, and yet remained deeply cautious and critically aloof. One of his six *mikra biblia* provides a perfect illustration. This is his Presidential Address to the Classical Association at Bristol in 2015, entitled *Ktema es aei* (*A possession for all time*). Its 22 pages¹ bring text and author sympathetically alive, steer the reader through the interpretative debates, and yet keep their distance. This is very firmly not Thucydid-olatry, but in many ways Thucydides emerges vastly the better for being treated as a human being, with his foibles and obsessions, as well as a composer, making and using the historical record in order to reflect on the human condition.

But texts and institutional realities were not his only preoccupation, for an earlier *mikron biblion*, *Ancient democracy and modern ideology*, entered a much larger and even more contested arena. It and a later essay explored the relationship between two currently live questions: first, Where was power actually located during the two centuries of the Athenian democracy?, and secondly How far, when we ask that and other questions about Athens, should we be preoccupied with the possible utility of the answers for the political societies of the present day? The first question needs a descriptive answer, but one framed in terms both of evidence and of analytical concepts, whether modern (such as legitimacy, sovereignty, clientage, charisma, and networks) or those of the culture in question (*kharis*, *timé*, *eudaimonia*, etc.). The second needs a normative answer, and therefore one that locates the descriptive evidence not only within a lattice of human rights and values which may or may not be deemed to be universal and timeless, but also within a fiercely reductive debate about the sociology of knowledge. That debate is inclined to delegitimize much of the necessary working vocabulary as 'constructs' (and to some degree rightly so, for the shade of Foucault cannot be excised – or exorcised – from any debate on these matters). It is not melodramatic to assert that behind his responses to these two questions, and behind the detailed summaries of much modern scholarship, Peter was exercising a mission. It was one of measured resistance to the (nowadays largely American-led) tendency to look to ancient Greece, and especially to 'democratic Athens', for lessons for today's world, and instead to assert the absolute need to 'aspire to objectivity and disengagement' while still desiring 'to make the Greek and Roman world intelligible and interesting to inhabitants of our own world'.

Here, and everywhere else in his work, one detects a strong didactic streak. It goes back to his first source-book of 1972 in a series that was designed to serve the upper-school and undergraduate market, and it ran through his entire oeuvre. It cannot be chance, either, that the concentration identified above was reflected precisely in the two principal focuses of his teaching in Durham, Greek history and Greek political theory and practice. If I may (though I suspect Peter did not greatly approve) resort momentarily to economist-speak, his 'investment' generated 'production' of 'goods' with great 'efficiency' for an entire set of

¹ He published a longer and differently organised study (Rhodes 2015c) in the same year.

concurrent and complementary ‘markets’, from the school-room and the lecture-hall to the international journal and ‘the standard work on the subject’. We all try to do it, but few of us do it so effectively at all levels of scholarship and sophistication.

Even with all that said, one final group of readers has yet to be mentioned. Not all of Peter’s ‘ventures into foreign parts’ were desk- and library-based affairs. Annually and for many years, fortunate friends and colleagues found their email Inboxes suddenly filled with another instalment of ‘Peter’s travels’, a detailed and lively description in 3-7 pages of where he had been for work or pleasure. I lack early instalments, though I know of those for Russia in 1997 and Iran in 2000. My set starts with Poland and the Baltics in 2001, then jumps to Corfu, Barcelona, and Egypt in 2007, Mitteleuropa in 2009, Syria in 2010 (now a pitiful piece to re-read), and Poland again and southern France in 2011. Thereafter Perm in Russia appears year after year, and outside Europe Azerbaijan, Georgia, and Armenia come in 2015, Cuba and New England in 2016, India and Japan in 2018, Minsk, Morocco, and Utrecht in 2019 – and understandably nothing at all in 2020. Together they comprise a remarkable catalogue of adventure, observation, and reportage. In part, as he made very clear, they reflected his activity and popularity as a lecturer: in part they reflected the sort of informal international network of colleagues and former students which many of us academics tend to assemble: but above all they reflected his own sense of curiosity about places and peoples, his confidence in travelling alone or as a member of a tourist group across the accessible world, and his very firm view of a ‘holiday’ not as sunburnt sloth on a beach but as a carefully planned programme of active exploration in a deliberately chosen area. It all amounts to a revealing and honest self-portrait, all the more valuable for being unselfconscious.

My final sentence had been: ‘We congratulate him on his enterprise and vitality, we thank him most warmly for informing and entertaining us, we hope that the stream of scholarship will continue for many years to come, and we wish him well for the resumption of “Peter’s travels” when circumstances and governments allow.’ I retain it perforce as it was, painful though it now is to re-read.

References

- Davies, J.K. 1999. Professor William George Grieve Forrest. *Annual of the British School at Athens* 94 (1999), pp. 475-83.
- Rhodes, P.J. 2003. *Ancient democracy and modern ideology*. London: Duckworth.
- Rhodes, P.J. 2015a. *Ktēma es aei (A possession for all time)*. London: The Classical Association.
- Rhodes, P.J. 2015b. Directions in the study of Athenian democracy. *Scripta Classica Israelica* 34 (2015), 49-68.
- Rhodes, P.J. 2015c. *Thucydides*. London: Bloomsbury.
- P.J. 2019. John Davies, Greek historian, in Z.H. Archibald and J. Haywood (eds), *The power of individual and community in Ancient Athens and beyond. Essays in honour of J.K. Davies*: 311-315. Swansea: Classical Press of Wales.