
I

From 1970 to 1982 Peter Brunt held the Camden Professorship of Ancient History at Oxford, the leading chair in Roman history in this part of the anglophone world. Although the original job spec. did not so define or confine the Camden chair, a division of labour with the Wykeham Professorship became established *de facto*, and the last Camden Professor to be readily identifiable as a Greek rather than Roman historian was the translator (or traducer?) of Herodotus, George Rawlinson (1861-9). But the division of 'the ancient world' between Greece and Rome is of course only a convention, and for certain periods, areas and themes (e.g., the Second Sophistic) a manifestly awkward one. Besides, Professor Brunt has never been an entirely conventional ancient historian. So it is not at all a surprise to find him returning in his retirement years to the Greek history which primarily preoccupied him in the 1950s.

The surprise, rather, is the manner of his return. For the three substantial new essays that account for more than a third of the length of these collected *Studies* are concerned not with the warfare, politics, diplomacy, society or economy of Greece, but with the area that POLIS has made its own, Classical Greek political thought, especially that of Plato and Aristotle. It is with these essays therefore that the present review will be chiefly concerned. But first a brief look at some of the republished material, going back to 1951, and at the other substantial new piece.

II

One of the threads running through many of Brunt's major publications from the 1950s to the 1980s is an explicit concern, unusual for an ancient historian, with the protocols and norms of historiography—ours as well as the ancients'. It is not just that he is an exceptionally able and thorough *Quellenforscher* and *Quellenkritiker*,

---
as his two-volume Loeb edition of Arrian's history of Alexander (1976-83) or his (agnostic) discussion here of the authenticity of the Seventh Platonic Letter (pp. 320-5, 341-2) can amply demonstrate. He also has a conceptual and methodological interest in historiography as intellectual history. Hence the inclusion here of his relatively inaccessible 1980 essay on 'Cicero and Historiography', justifiable also on the grounds that the historians Cicero mainly engaged with wrote in Greek.3

Hence, too, Brunt's overriding preoccupation with Thucydides, for him 'the greatest historian in antiquity' (p.206). Only Aristotle gets a (barely) longer index entry. Thucydides and the Megarian Decree(s) (1951); Thucydides and Alkibiades (1952); Thucydides and Spartan policy and strategy in the first tranche of the Peloponnesian War (1965)—these are just the major studies with full scholarly apparatus that are reprinted here. In addition, this collection includes what is in some ways the most fascinating piece of 'early period' Bruntian intellectual historiography, his 'introduction to a selection from Thucydides' history made for the Great Histories series published by Washington Square Press in 1963, and intended for the general reader'. This, Brunt continues, 'was based on a study of Thucydides begun in 1950 and laid aside because of other preoccupations' (p. 137). To the slightly revised reprint he has added a more substantial Postscript on the Periklean Epitaphios (Funeral Speech), written in 1991.

Given the context, it is hardly unexpected that Brunt does not treat the vast bibliography of Thucydidean scholarship at all extensively. If that's what the reader wants, she should turn to the five volumes of 'Gomme', supplemented by the first volume of 'Hornblower'.4 But readers of POLIS may still legitimately feel a little cheated that neither in the main, largely reprinted text nor in the new Postscript does Brunt address the issue of how to classify Thucydides and his work. Was Thucydides, to borrow the title of a lively piece by David Whitehead, 'Fact-grubber or Philosopher'?5 That polarization is of course open to negotiation and mediation, but it would have been good to have had Brunt's considered reaction to, say,