

# PETER RHODES

Peter John Rhodes

10 August 1940 – 27 October 2021

elected Fellow of the British Academy 1987

by

J.K. DAVIES

*Fellow of the Academy*

LYNETTE MITCHELL

*Summary.* Peter John Rhodes (1940-2021), usually known as PJR, was at his death Professor Emeritus in Classics and Ancient History at Durham University, where he had served for his whole professional career. He devoted that career to the study of Greek History and his research output was prodigious: 39 books, 153 articles and book chapters, and 170 book reviews. Among these many works there were three main (and substantial) contributions to the field: *The Athenian Boule* (1972); *A Commentary on the Athenaion Politeia* (1981, rev. 1993); and with D.M. Lewis, *The Decrees of the Greek States* (1997). He also had truly international standing, collaborating with and mentoring colleagues from around the globe.

*Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the British Academy*, 22, 661–698

<https://doi.org/10.5871/mem/022.661>

Posted 14 November 2025. © British Academy 2025.



*Johnson*

## I

1. Peter John Rhodes (1940–2021), usually known as PJR – one could only call him ‘Peter’ on his invitation – was born on the 10 August 1940, in Southgate, north London. His father, George Thomas Rhodes, a talented mathematician, grew up in an orphanage and was self-educated through night-classes. He spent most of the Second World War in Northern Ireland, and after the war worked in a stockbroking office, first as clerk and then as office manager.

2. During the war, Rhodes and his mother, Elsie Leonora Rhodes (née Pugh), evacuated to Southport in Lancashire to live near her relatives. They were unable to live with his uncle, however, so he and his mother lived with his uncle’s work colleague who lived in the same street, although the arrangement created a difficult domestic environment for the two families. Rhodes saw little of his father until he was demobbed in 1946, and had little company of his own generation. He himself says that he was quiet, studious and timid, with less than his fair share of mischief. Nevertheless, his relationship with his mother remained extremely close until her death in 1998.

3. Rhodes’s brother, David George, was born after the war in Lancashire in 1945, but the family soon moved to Southgate in north London, where they remained until 1951. Another brother, John Andrew, was born in Southgate. Their father died in 1968. Although Rhodes’s only act of childhood ‘naughtiness’ remembered by the family is his attack on his father when he returned from the war, the family home was a very stable one. His maternal grandmother lived with the family from when he was about 10 until her death in the mid 1960s. She placed a high value on respectability, and was a strong formative influence.

4. In terms of religious thinking, the family was generally non-conformist, and had connections with various branches of the non-conformist traditions, such as the Presbyterians and Baptists, but retained a connection with methodism from the 1940s until the 1960s. Rhodes commented that ‘the non-conformity of those days regarded many things as sinful which I suspect that many non-conformists don’t regard as sinful any longer; I was aware that we didn’t do things that other families did do, but I didn’t feel unduly oppressed; at the end of my first year at Oxford I migrated into the Church of England, and I managed to shed some of those inhibitions without too much agonising or overreacting.’

5. Rhodes went to Osidge primary school in Southgate from 1945 to 1951, where he encountered teachers who he said ‘really taught’; Mrs Mills, one of his teachers, who taught him together with a Mrs Jenkins for his last three years in primary school, kept a large collection of books which she encouraged members of her class to read.

6. In 1951 the family moved again, this time to New Barnet in Hertfordshire, and from 1951 to 1959 Rhodes attended Queen Elizabeth’s (Boys) Grammar School, Barnet,

a Tudor foundation which had been taken over by the County authority in 1930. Rhodes notes that the Headmaster during his time at the school was extremely independent-minded, and that the school itself generally had high standards in the classroom and on the games field. Rhodes had less success at games (although he found a niche as scorer for the school's cricket team between 1955 and 1959). Very shy, and unwilling to initiate conversation, Rhodes notes that he also made himself join the debating society. This was all part of his determination, as both his family and he himself observe, to teach himself to 'join the human race'.

7. As well as academic success at school, Rhodes also had a deep-felt interest in music. He played the piano from an early age, and took Associated Board exams up to grade VII, and passed the grade V theory paper (required for higher practical grades) with full marks. In his final year at school he did some conducting but did not really enjoy it, although in the same year he started singing (tenor). He continued to sing, later with the Durham University College Chapel choir, until 2005. At that point, he says: 'my brain could still think the notes, and my voice could still produce the notes on a good day, but not every day was a good day, so I decided I had better stop before somebody ordered me to stop'. While at Oxford he also taught himself the organ and was acting college organist at Wadham during an interregnum, and was organist of the English Church in Athens in 1964. He also tried his hand at composition, including psalms and *Preces* and Responses for the University College Chapel Choir.

8. In terms of his classical education, Rhodes started learning Latin in 1951 under R.M. Wingfield, and in the sixth form was taught by P. Timson and J.W. Finnett. He took four O-levels in 1955, and in that year undertook a crash course in Greek. In summer 1957 he took A-levels in Greek, Latin, Ancient History, and Modern History. For scholarships he was aiming for Oxford (Cambridge then penalised students who did not offer verse composition): in 1957/8 he was unsuccessful at getting a place, but in 1958/9 he was offered a place at Queen's in the December exam, and then a scholarship at Wadham in January.

9. Rhodes was not required for National Service (it was coming to an end), and went up to Wadham in 1959. His tutor for Mods was T.C.W. Stinton. For Greats his tutor was W.G.G. Forrest for Ancient History, and I.M. Crombie for Philosophy. He received a safe first for Mods, but the best first in his year at Greats, with his highest marks in philosophy.

10. Nevertheless, Forrest's influence was significant. Rhodes's natural inclination was for Roman History, but discussions with Forrest led him to institutional history and D.M. Lewis, who suggested he work on the Athenian Boulé (see further below at §19). With three sons, his father was unwilling or unable to pay for further degrees, so he was left to find scholarships. Merton College had interviewed him for a Harmondsworth Scholarship, and turned him down, but once the results for Greats were announced Merton changed its mind, so in 1963 he migrated from Wadham to Merton.

11. Rhodes notes that as a supervisor, Lewis was ‘intimidatingly learned, giving the impression that if only he had the spare time he could write my thesis very quickly’. However, there was only one term during Rhodes’s time as a research student when both were in residence in Oxford, although Lewis read everything Peter wrote and commented in detail. However, Rhodes notes that Lewis offered little of general comment. For two terms in 1964/5 G.E.M. de Ste Croix deputised for Lewis, and offered a rather different kind of experience as supervisor: dinner in New College and then discussion until midnight.

12. In 1963 Rhodes won a Craven Fellowship, requiring him to spend half his time abroad. Having travelled very little previously (with a school group to Germany in 1959, and independent ventures to Italy in 1961, and Greece in 1963), he spent January to June 1964 at the British School at Athens, where he was part of the BSA’s first year of excavation at Lefkandi, although it was only at the end of the season, after Rhodes – and many others – had left, that serious finds were discovered. In 1965, he spent April to September at the University of Tübingen, a time which was formative, not least for the opportunity to advance his German language skills, which he notes remained his best modern foreign language. On his return from Tübingen he returned not to Oxford as he had expected, but in the autumn of 1965 to Durham, where he was appointed as the successor to E. Badian to a post in Classics (he notes: ‘the Greek History specialisation being by gentleman’s agreement and not by contract’, and that his teaching was never limited to Ancient History, let alone Greek History). He became a resident member of University College, which occupies the Castle, an association especially with the college Senior Common Room, where he lunched daily, and the chapel choir, that remained of fundamental significance until his death.

13. Rhodes married Jan Teresa Adamson in 1971. She had grown up in Liverpool, read English at Liverpool University and came to Durham on a graduate scholarship, but side-stepped from English into Theology. She obtained a Diploma in Theology, and then in 1974 completed a PhD on *Private Devotion in England on the Eve of the Reformation Illustrated from Works Printed or Reprinted in the Period 1530–40*. During the course of her doctoral work, she converted to Catholicism. From 1985 to 1988, disillusioned with pure academia, she retrained (at Leeds Polytechnic) as a speech therapist. Nevertheless, most of her working life was spent either in the rare books collection at Durham University or in the old library at Ushaw College, the Roman Catholic seminary outside Durham. Although Rhodes was committed to Jan, their marriage came to an end. He says in his notes, with characteristic directness and understatement: ‘Although there had been difficult periods earlier, I was surprised as well as saddened when she [Jan] decided in 1997 to separate from me (in 2001 she formally divorced me, and in 2003 she obtained an annulment from the Roman Catholic church). We had no children. I have not retreated into reclusiveness, but I have not had or sought any other consort, of any sex or legal status.’ Peter and Jan remained friends, meeting occasionally, until her death in July 2014.



## II

14. The guiding document for what follows here has been the ‘Curriculum Vitae and List of Publications’ which Rhodes compiled and circulated. He last revised it on 17 January 2021, but its inclusion of ‘forthcoming’ items has helped posthumous additions and emendations to be made. It contained three main sections: ‘Books’, with 39 titles dated from 1972 onwards; ‘Articles and article-length contributions to books’, with 153 titles from 1970 onwards; and ‘Reviews’, with 170 titles, also from 1970 onwards. Two ancillary sections listed ‘*Samizdat* publications’ and ‘Broadcasting and other spoken media’, and an Appendix listed entries written or revised by Rhodes for the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*<sup>3/4</sup>, for *Der Neue Pauly*, and for Wiley-Blackwell *Encyclopedias*. Readers will note the exceptional scale of the three main sections: for any academic historian of antiquity, these are enormous numbers. To summarise, or even to cite, each listed item here is impracticable and inappropriate. Instead, we have used the list of ‘books’ as a baseline, citing them all but grouping them by theme and by Rhodes’s intellectual development rather than strictly by date. Items from other sections have been cited as and when appropriate. Once all ‘forthcoming’ titles have been published, we may offer an updated version of Rhodes’s list to an appropriate periodical.

The notes attempt to report full bibliographical details of each publication that Rhodes himself catalogued as a ‘book’: ISBNs are reported in [square brackets]. All reviews known to us of such publications are listed, in alphabetical order of reviewers’ names. Single articles by Rhodes, and reviews by him or of a book of his, are cited when appropriate.

### The Oxford environment

15. In order to follow Peter Rhodes’s career trajectory, and to some degree to account for it, it is essential to sketch the atmosphere of Ancient Greek History in Oxford as it was when he gained his First-Class BA degree in 1961 (see §9).<sup>1</sup> To do so, three components must be welded together: syllabus content, staff specialisations, and collective

<sup>1</sup>This background information comes at first hand, one of us (JKD) having preceded Rhodes by four years on the same path through Wadham College and through assignment as an incoming PGR to David Lewis as supervisor. Details in J.K. Davies, ‘PJR: An Appreciation’, in D. Leão, D. Ferreira, N. Simões Rodrigues & R. Morais (eds), *Our Beloved Polites: Studies presented to P.J. Rhodes* (Oxford: Archaeopress, 2022), x-xiv. Other obituaries and appreciations include Paul Cartledge, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 141 (2021), viii (with photo); Lynette Mitchell, *CUCD Bulletin*, 51 (2022), (with photo), <https://cucd.blogs.sas.ac.uk/files/2022/06/PJ-Rhodes-obituary.pdf>; Robin Osborne, *Gnomon*, 96 (2024), 473–77; Robin Osborne, *Oxford Dictionary of National Biography* (2025), <https://doi.org/10.1093/odnb/9780198614128.013.90000382819>

involvements. The first is the easiest. The long-established syllabus for the subject<sup>2</sup> had been specified a century previously in terms of the study of narrative and other texts (Herodotos and Thucydides above all, but also Xenophon, Demosthenes, and Arrian), and had later been split between two options, Period I (776–403 BCE) and Period II (446–323 BCE): most students chose Period I. In his time the emphasis lay firmly on historical narrative texts and on politico-military history, supplemented by optional lecture courses on Classical Archaeology and the socio-economic history of Athens and by short-term lecture or seminar courses on a wide range of topics, while the formal study of Greek cults and cultures was largely left in the hands of the tutors of language and literature and of archaeology.

16. Though there were members of the academic staff in post who published little, there was no lack of engagement with the wide range covered by that syllabus. Yet there was also a strong and deep-rooted focus on Greek epigraphy. The most notable figure had been Marcus Tod, Fellow of Oriel College<sup>3</sup> and holder of the specialist post ‘University Lecturer [later ‘Reader’] in Greek epigraphy’ until his retirement in 1947, but Theodore Wade-Gery, Professor of Greek History until 1953, had also made an epigraphic name for himself by years of labour in Oxford and Princeton as one of the three authors of the definitive four-volume publication of *The Athenian Tribute Lists*: their impact (especially that of volume III in 1950) on staff and students had been substantial.<sup>4</sup> Moreover, also after years of labour, this time in Oxford and Greece, Lillian Jeffery’s *magnum opus*<sup>5</sup> had appeared in that very year 1961. By then, too, as one of us (JKD) can confirm from autopsy, George Forrest’s study table in Wadham College was covered with squeezes of the inscriptions of Chios,<sup>6</sup> while the more remote Peter Fraser at All Souls College had already displayed his mastery of Aegean and Eastern Mediterranean epigraphic documentation.<sup>7</sup> Lastly but crucially, David Lewis, Student of Christ Church since 1955, had already steeped himself in the craft of epigraphy via residences in

<sup>2</sup>For greater detail the reader is referred to Oswyn Murray’s contributions to *The History of the University of Oxford* (eds M.G. Brock & M.C. Curthoys). They are ‘The beginnings of Greats: ancient history’, in vol. VI: *Nineteenth-Century Oxford, I* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1997), pp. 520–42; and ‘Ancient History, 1872–1914’, in vol. VII: *Nineteenth-Century Oxford, II* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 2000), pp. 333–60. Coverage is continued, but in a much skimpier fashion, in B. Harrison (ed.), vol. VIII, *The Twentieth Century* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1994), pp. 116, 133, & 233–4.

<sup>3</sup>See Russell Meiggs, ‘Marcus Niebuhr Tod, 1878–1974’, *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 60 (1974), 484–95.

<sup>4</sup>Reflected especially in Russell Meiggs’s comprehensive survey *The Athenian Empire* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), but already permeating teaching and learning in the 1950s.

<sup>5</sup>L.H. Jeffery, *The Local Scripts of Archaic Greece. A study of the origin of the Greek alphabet and its development from the eighth to the fifth centuries B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1961).

<sup>6</sup>The project was eventually taken over by Angelos Matthaiou as *IG* xii 6.3 (forthcoming).

<sup>7</sup>Detailed documentation in Simon Hornblower FBA, ‘Peter Marshall Fraser, 1918–2007’, *Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the British Academy*, 12 (2013), 137–85.

Princeton and Athens that focused above all on the history and inscriptions of Classical Athens. By 1961 he was already the obvious supervisor for intending postgraduates who wished to focus on Athenian history.<sup>8</sup>

17. It was the third component, however, that indirectly shaped Rhodes's career most decisively, namely the existence of a long-standing collaboration between Oxford University's Clarendon Press and its academic staff on the task of identifying teaching- and research-focused needs and opportunities for academic publication. Ancient Greek history has played an active part through the centuries in this regard, but one contribution requires special notice. In 1882 E.L. Hicks, Fellow of Corpus Christi College, published with the Press his *Manual of Greek Historical Inscriptions*, with a chronological range extending from *ca.* 700 BCE to the Roman conquest. This book set out four didactic markers. First, its Introduction acknowledged the strength and vitality of contemporary scholarship (especially German) in collating and interpreting the ever-increasing bulk of newly discovered physical evidence for Greek antiquity – coins, sites, buildings, sculpture, pottery, inscriptions – that was being yielded by excavations and surveys. Secondly, in a gentlemanly but radical manifesto that can still be read with respect and pleasure, it set out not only the educational case for embracing and incorporating this new knowledge, but also the necessary practical guidance for students who were using epigraphical texts for the first time. Thirdly, by using English throughout for explanatory commentary, it distanced itself from the traditional pan-European medium of Latin that the Berlin Academy had inherited from August Böckh for its growing library of *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Finally, it emphasised that the selection of texts and the content of commentaries on them were focused on their 'historical' interest and importance, not on 'religious ceremonies, agonistic contests, and concerns of private life', 'legal and constitutional antiquities', or 'the archaeology of the subject'.<sup>9</sup>

18. The success of this explicitly didactic format was such that Hicks' book, revised and expanded in 1901 with the collaboration of G.F. Hill, begat a dynasty. In the next generation, invited by the Press, Marcus Tod had provided students and tutors with two updated and more narrowly focused volumes, effectively one for each 'period' as defined above. That for Period I appeared first, in 1933, itself requiring a second edition in 1946; Period II had to wait until 1948. Both volumes retained Hicks's format but built on his work in scale, erudition, and the capacity to integrate epigraphic documentation with the historical mainstream in the form that the literary sources were deemed to have shaped it. A generation later, again invited by the Press, a new edition for Period I was needed to accommodate 'the impressive accumulation of new inscriptions' (p. v) from the

<sup>8</sup> In what follows, repeated reference will be made to Simon Hornblower FBA, 'David Malcolm Lewis, 1928–1994', *Proceedings of the British Academy*, 94 (1997), 557–96.

<sup>9</sup> Hicks (1882), pp. xv–xvi.



Athenian Agora and elsewhere: edited by Russell Meiggs and David Lewis and published in 1969, it preserved Tod's format and title.<sup>10</sup> Notably, their list of acknowledgments already included the name 'P.J. Rhodes'.

## The Boulé

19. The phrase 'format and title' will feature yet again in later paragraphs, but attention must now turn to Rhodes's project as a postgraduate. We know of no evidence that Rhodes had a topic of his own in mind, and he states explicitly that the study of the Boulé, the Athenian Council of Five Hundred, was suggested by David Lewis as appointed supervisor, its aim being to 'give a detailed account of the organisation and working of the Athenian boule, the council founded by Solon and modelled by Cleisthenes which acted as a standing committee of the assembly'.<sup>11</sup> Rational enough in itself though Lewis's suggestion undoubtedly was, it is only in recent years that its wider context has been identified. As Simon Hornblower reported in his British Academy Memoir of David Lewis,<sup>12</sup> 'It can be shown, I think, that from very early in his career, perhaps already in 1959, he [Lewis] had in his head an interlocking set of thesis topics for future graduate students, amounting to no less than a programme of research into the history of classical Athens.' Hornblower's acute eye had fallen on an unpublished paper of Lewis's which revealed that he had identified four topics, each comprising the analysis of a prime active component of the Athenian system of government. The propertied class had been one, which happened to fit hand-in-glove with John Davies's own idea of applying to Athens the 'family politics' model that had already been applied to Republican Rome, 18th-century England, and the early 20th-century USA. The Boulé was the second, the Assembly the third, and the ten-man, annually elected, college of commanders of army and navy (the *strategoi*) the fourth.<sup>13</sup> Taken as a set, the quartet was, and remains, a

<sup>10</sup> Successor volumes are described in §46 below.

<sup>11</sup> P.J. Rhodes, *The Athenian Boule* (hereafter cited as *Boulé*) (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1972), xvi + 351 pp., quotation from p. vii. Known reviews: M. Chambers, *American Historical Review*, 78 (1973), 1026–1027; V. Ehrenberg, *Gnomon*, 46 (1974), 307–8; J.A.O. Larsen, *Classical Philology*, 69 (1974), 229–30; D.M. MacDowell, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 25 (1975), 254–7; C. Mossé, *Revue des Études Anciennes*, 75 (1973), 418–20; M. Piérart, *L'Antiquité Classique*, 45 (1976), 334–6; M. Piérart, *Revue Belge de Philologie et Histoire*, 54 (1976), 974–5; R.S. Stroud, *The Classical World*, 68 (1974), 181–2; R.E. Wycherley, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 93 (1973), 235–6.

<sup>12</sup> Hornblower (1997) (n. 8 above), 577.

<sup>13</sup> As Hornblower reports, the third topic was covered by the work of Mogens Hansen in Copenhagen (assembled in two volumes as *The Athenian Ecclesia: A collection of articles 1976–1983* and *The Athenian Ecclesia II: A collection of articles 1983–1989* (both Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press, 1983 and 1989). The fourth topic was treated in Robert Develin's book *Athenian Officials 684–321 BC* (Cambridge: University Press, 1987).

palmary example of looking behind the politics and the narrative towards the role of institutions, though it noticeably did not include the roles played by the lawcourts, the territorial subdivisions of the citizen body, or temples and sanctuaries.

20. Rhodes's topic was not, of course, an untilled field,<sup>14</sup> but two other influences had made Lewis's steer particularly timely. One, indirect, had been Antony Andrewes's inaugural lecture at Oxford as Wykeham Professor in May 1954, with its theme '*Probouleusis*: Sparta's contribution to the technique of government': the word denotes the preparation of business for the plenary assembly of all adult male citizens. A second, very direct and compelling, was the steady stream of new documents, whole or fragmentary, that the American School's excavations in the Athenian Agora, resumed from 1946 until 1960,<sup>15</sup> had been presenting. They provided such ample new light on the Athenian 'technique of government' as to offer Rhodes a golden opportunity, one which he took at once and made his own. It involved him in a twin-track task. One track was straightforward: to build an assemblage of antiquarian information that identified the various sectors of Athenian public administrative life in which the Boulé had standing and duties. The text which ensued was therefore not a narrative history so much as a catalogue raisonné, each sector in turn generating a detailed description of purposes and procedures. Such a format could be, and was by Rhodes, presented comparatively easily in separate chapters. Chapter I, 'Membership and organization' (sc. of the Boulé), was followed by II, 'Legislation', and then by III, 'Administration': this was a huge catch-all chapter that ranged from finance and army and navy to public works and religion. Finally, Chapter IV, 'Jurisdiction', dealt both with two specific procedures, *dokimasia* ('assessment of entitlement and/or suitability for a role or status') and *eisangelia* ('major accusation of public importance', p. 162), and with the thorny issue of the Boulé's judicial powers. Throughout the text, the relevant evidence – whether from inscription, play, speech, treatise, dialogue, lexicon, or physical location – is carefully cited or quoted. Virtually throughout, too, the voice of Rhodes's assured and calmly undemonstrative authority can be heard. It was (and remains) a remarkable voice, for it had emerged fully formed in his earliest publications and barely changed thereafter for the next forty years and more. Only on one important matter, the Boulé's acquisition of judicial powers, did the tone quaver slightly. For Rhodes, the theme required a 28-page Appendix, a detailed scrutiny of the evidence, and a resolute defence of the case that such powers were not acquired (even in a limited form) until the reforms of Ephialtes in the late 460s. One senses that exposition has here become not-quite-confident advocacy, a sense buttressed by his repeated use

<sup>14</sup> For earlier scholarship see recent editions of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary* s.v. Boule (n. 22 below).

<sup>15</sup> Dates taken from H.A. Thompson, *The Athenian Agora: A guide*<sup>2</sup> (Athens: The American School of Classical Studies at Athens, 1962), pp. 32–4.

of the phrase 'I believe' almost as a nervous tic, both in *Boulé* itself and in an early supporting paper.<sup>16</sup>

21. The other track, however, was anything but straightforward. It comprised a quest to elicit – in part from extant literary texts, but mainly from the texts of extant decrees, and especially from the various formulations of their prescripts – reliable indications of whether the decisions recorded therein reflected initiatives from within the Assembly, or from within the Boulé, or from more complex interactions such as a delegation of power from Assembly to Boulé.<sup>17</sup> This was a mammoth and complex task. Rhodes himself reported that he 'examined every Athenian decree published in *IG* i<sup>2</sup> and ii<sup>2</sup>, in *SEG* x-xxi, and in *Hesperia* (regular issues and supplements to the end of 1965), together with others known to me for any reason',<sup>18</sup> and though the results were complex enough to require 44 pages of tables, Chapter II was able to offer a lucid picture of gradual evolution and occasional innovation within a stable institutional framework (see §33 below)<sup>19</sup> In sum, the 1972 book stands out as the leading treatment of the subject, albeit lightly revised for a reprint in 1985. However, it does not stand entirely on its own, for by a most unfortunate coincidence a second, wholly independent study of the same theme of Athenian government and of the same documentation (but over a much narrower time-span),<sup>20</sup> was published the very next year in California. This, like Rhodes's the product of a doctoral thesis, was R.A. De Laix's *Probouleusis at Athens: A study of political decision-making*.<sup>21</sup> Reviewers of this rival book found comparison and evaluation difficult because, as Rhodes's own review of it noted, the two authors had each worked 'in ignorance of the other' and had devised different terminologies. However, there emerged a distinct sense that Rhodes's was the wider and fuller canvas, and its greater authority

<sup>16</sup> 'Ephialtes and the achievement of Athenian Democracy', in AA.VV., *Essays Presented to C.M. Bowra* (Oxford, The Alden Press for Wadham College Junior and Middle Common Rooms, 1970), pp. 39–49. Rhodes's consistently high rating of the importance of Ephialtes may stem directly from George Forrest's teaching – cf. Forrest's *The Emergence of Greek Democracy: The character of Greek politics, 800–400 BC* (London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson, 1966), ch. 9. 'I believe' reappears in 1997, again in connection with Ephialtes, in the final paragraph of his introduction to Mitchell & Rhodes (1997) (n. 69 below), and in *A Short History* (see §42), p. 74.

<sup>17</sup> For this contingency cf. *Boulé*, p. 82.

<sup>18</sup> *Boulé*, p. 244.

<sup>19</sup> That picture is now being incorporated in the newly edited fascicles of the third edition of *Inscriptiones Graecae* which are slowly appearing.

<sup>20</sup> De Laix's survey ends in 322/1 BCE, while Rhodes's extends into the 4th century CE.

<sup>21</sup> University of California Publications in History, 83 (Berkeley, Los Angeles and London, U. of California Press, 1973). Reviews include: H.C. Avery, *The Classical World*, 68 (1975), 388–90; S. Dow, *American Historical Review*, 80 (1975), 1304; V. Ehrenberg, *Gnomon*, 48 (1976), 719; C.D. Hamilton, *American Journal of Philology*, 96 (1975), 429–30; D.M. Lewis, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 26 (1976), 287; C. Mossé, *Revue des Études Anciennes*, 77 (1975), 363–4; H.W. Pleket, *Mnemosyne*<sup>4</sup>, 31 (1978), 328–33; and P.J. Rhodes, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 94 (1974), 232–3.

has been reflected alike in successive editions of the *Oxford Classical Dictionary*,<sup>22</sup> in the various updates of Pauly-Wissowa's *Realencyclopädie*,<sup>23</sup> in *I Greci*,<sup>24</sup> and indirectly in subsequent scholarly studies.<sup>25</sup> All the same, it is not an easy read: as one reviewer put it, 'It is a professional scholar's book for his professional colleagues'.<sup>26</sup>

22. However, the impact on Rhodes of such total immersion in the documentation of Athenian public life went far beyond acquiring the capacity to write and submit a doctoral thesis.<sup>27</sup> Rather, the experience gave him an unshakeable foundation of detailed documentary knowledge which he could use and display at will, and he built on that foundation relentlessly in various ways for the rest of his life. It was pressed into immediate use for his second 'book', a 45-page pamphlet published – also in 1972 – within LACTOR, an established series of translated texts edited and annotated for school and college use.<sup>28</sup> Its creation reflected the nature of the student body in his new environment, having been, as its preface states, 'originally made for the use of a General Degree class in the University of Durham': it presented 23 mid–4th century BCE texts, all but one featuring in Tod's Volume II. As will appear below, it was the precursor of much more that Rhodes went on to provide for the same 'market'.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>22</sup> Its first edition (1949) carried a one-column entry s.v. 'Boule' by A.W. G(omme); its second edition (1970) carried a two-column entry with extra material by T.J. C(adoux); subsequent editions added further bibliography and the initials PJR.

<sup>23</sup> *Der Neue Pauly* II (Stuttgart & Weimar: J.B. Metzler, 1997), cols. 836–839 s.v. Boule (signed by PJR).

<sup>24</sup> D. Lotze, 'Il cittadino e la partecipazione al governo della polis', in S. Settis (ed.), *I Greci: Storia Cultura Arte Società*, II,2 (Torino: G. Einaudi, 1997), p. 380.

<sup>25</sup> E.g. M.H. Hansen, *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, principles and ideology* (Oxford & Cambridge MA: Blackwell, 1991); 2nd revised and enlarged edition (London: Bristol Classical Press/Gerald Duckworth & Co, 1999); S. Lambert, *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees 352/1–322/1 BC: Epigraphical essays* (Leiden: Brill, 2012); S. Lambert, *Inscribed Athenian Laws and Decrees in the Age of Demosthenes: Historical essays* (Leiden: Brill, 2018); P. Liddel, *Decrees of Fourth-century Athens (403/2 – 322/1 BC)*, I-II (Cambridge: University Press, 2020). However, a vivid warning of source unreliability is conveyed by S. Hornblower, 'Thucydides and the Athenian Boulē', in L. Mitchell & L. Rubenstein (eds), *Greek History and Epigraphy. Essays in honour of P.J. Rhodes* (Swansea: The Classical Press of Wales, 2009), pp. 251–64.

<sup>26</sup> MacDowell (1975) (n. 11 above), 254.

<sup>27</sup> It was submitted in 1968, seven years after graduation.

<sup>28</sup> *Greek Historical Inscriptions, 359–323 B.C.* (London: London Association of Classical Teachers, Original Records No. 9, 1972), ix + 45 pp. A second edition with minor additions and modifications was issued in 1986, ISBN 0–903625–11–3.

<sup>29</sup> The nature of that 'market' may explain why Rhodes anomalously used Imperial units on p. iii, instead of the normal metric units, to report the dimensions of certain inscriptions, but he may also have been influenced by the practice of his senior Durham colleague R.P. Wright.

## Reviews

23. The early 1970s are therefore an appropriate vantage-point from which to trace his subsequent trajectories of publication. He used all four normal genres – monographs long and short, articles in journals or in *Festschriften* and other *ad hoc* assembled volumes, book reviews in journals, and edited volumes, whether as sole editor or with collaborators – and he did so on a grand scale (see §14 above). Most of this forest of publication will be mapped here in a sequence of thematically grouped titles, but one category, the book reviews, needs separate comment. His published reviews began in 1970 in *Classical Review* and *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, to be followed repeatedly thereafter by *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, *Gnomon*, *Hermathena*, *Historische Zeitschrift*, *Histos*, *Phoenix*, *Polis*, *Sehepunkte*, and the *TLS*, occasionally also by others, and latterly also by *Ancient East and West*, while for the four years 1988 to 1991 he also provided *Greece & Rome* with its biannual survey of new books in Greek history. Review editors clearly trusted his reliability, his range, and his succinct judgments, and occasionally gave him space for longer review articles.<sup>30</sup> Yet they cannot have been the only, or even the main, drivers of so intense a level of reviewing activity: one must look to the reviewer himself and to his internal drives. One such stimulus, most prominently represented by his efforts for *Greece & Rome*, was undoubtedly the pedagogic instinct – to provide information and materials for both learners and their teachers – that has already been described above. But there was also, and undoubtedly, a second drive: in order to be master of all the historical texts and periods that he had surveyed or wished to explore, the documentary knowledge which he had acquired needed to be complemented by as complete an awareness of relevant scholarship, past and current, as he could acquire. The two motivations overlapped, reinforced each other, and justified the time and effort required – and, as we both well recall, also gave him as a dividend no small part of the contents of the endless bookshelves that filled his house.

## The *Athenaion Politeia*

24. It was not until 1981 that his next book appeared, but when it did it was his career-defining masterpiece of 795 pages, *A Commentary on the Aristotelian Athenaion Politeia*

<sup>30</sup> Rhodes himself selected three: *Phoenix*, 30 (1976), 194–204 (review of B.D. Meritt & J.S. Traill, *The Athenian Agora* XV, and J.S. Traill, *The Political Organisation of Attica*); *Polis*, 15 (1998), 75–82 (review of J. Ober, *The Athenian Revolution*); and *International Journal of the Classical Tradition*, 12 (2005/6), 94–103 (review of K.A. Raaflaub, *The Discovery of Freedom in Ancient Greece*). In addition, several of his reviews in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review* are long enough to merit the title ‘review article’.



(‘Athenian Constitution’).<sup>31</sup> (Rhodes nearly always<sup>32</sup> cited it as ‘*A.P.*’: we follow him for convenience.) This text has a history, which we sketch summarily since it may not be known outside expert circles. It had been known for centuries that a library of 158 such ‘Constitutions’ of the Greek micro-states had been compiled in Athens in the 330s and 320s BCE by pupils of Aristotle, but none had survived via the mediaeval manuscript tradition. Yet, in the Graeco-Roman town sites, tombs, and settlements that were buried in the dry sands of Egypt, as travellers thither from the 16th century onwards discovered, there *had* survived a priceless treasure: a great, hidden, unplanned, and widely scattered deposit of inscribed papyri. It had accumulated over the millennia and had survived in various forms, whether in rolls or sheets or scraps or mummy-wrapping and whether inscribed in Egyptian (demotic or hieroglyphic), Greek, Hebrew, Coptic, Latin, or Arabic. Those travellers generated a treasure hunt and a market, fed largely by *clandestini* and at its most active in the late 19th century when scholars of all periods and regions of antiquity were being energised by the search for extra documentation.<sup>33</sup> Indeed, it was precisely in 1880 and 1891 that discoveries of partial texts of *A.P.* were announced, and the intensive international work on establishing a reliable text which then ensued was summarised in 1912 in what became the standard edition for decades:<sup>34</sup> though other editions and translations proliferated, Rhodes could assert that ‘it has not received a comprehensive commentary in any language since Sandys’ second edition of 1912’.<sup>35</sup> Coming from one whose work on *The Athenian Boule* had already required intensive reference to one major section of *A.P.*, §§ 43–49, that statement already hints that Rhodes saw the task of editing it as a logical next step – but his own word ‘obsession’ in his Preface (p. vi) exposes a more deep-rooted drive. Its effect on him can be judged by the steady stream of journal articles that began in 1970, for though there were occasional outliers (some are cited in §49 below) most of them until *ca.* 1992 continued to focus on Athenian affairs and institutions.

<sup>31</sup> Oxford, Clarendon Press (1981), xiii + 795 pp., ill., ISBN 0–19–814004–5. We cite Rhodes’s volume as *Commentary*, and follow his own practice by citing the Greek text as *A.P.* Known reviews: G.J.D. Aalders, *Mnemosyne*<sup>4</sup>, 37 (1984), 187–90; P. Cartledge, *Hermathena*, 134 (1983), 77–85; B.McM. Caven, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 103 (1983), 177–8; M.H. Hansen, *Classical Philology*, 80 (1985), 51–66; P. Harding, *Phoenix*, 39 (1985), 389–92; G.L. Huxley, *Times Literary Supplement*, 14 May 1982, 538; J.J. Keaney, *American Journal of Philology*, 103 (1982), 454–7; A. Lintott, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 33 (1983), 262–3; P. MacKendrick, *Classical Journal*, 79 (1983/4), 262–7.

<sup>32</sup> But not in his booklet *Atthis* of 2014 (§27 below), where it is consistently cited as ‘*Ath. Pol.*’

<sup>33</sup> General description in E.G. Turner, *Greek Papyri: an introduction* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1968), chs 2–4.

<sup>34</sup> J.E. Sandys, *Aristotle’s Constitution of Athens*, 2nd edition revised and enlarged (London: MacMillan and Co., 1912). It was reissued in New York in 1971 and 1973 (*Commentary*, p. 741, no. 27).

<sup>35</sup> *Commentary*, p. v: list of editions on pp. 739–47.

25. By any standard what he created was a Big Book<sup>36</sup> at or near the upper practical limit of a single octavo volume, even though it was set with a font size that was appreciably smaller than that used for *Boulé*. It is purely a commentary, without Greek text or English translation, and its *Introduction* alone occupies 63 pages. However, they are very instructive pages to dwell on, for their six sections directly reflect the various challenges that Rhodes needed to surmount when compiling the main text. Thus, while the first section (pp. 1–5) simply reports the various papyrus finds and editions, the two that follow delineate and distinguish the two components of the treatise, (a) the ‘historical’ narrative of the development of the constitution in eleven stages (*A.P.* §§ 1–41) and (b) the synchronic description of the constitution as it was at the time of writing (*A.P.* §§ 42–69). They exemplified two different scholarly genres, differed in quality,<sup>37</sup> and required different skills. For component (b), Rhodes’s previous work had equipped him near-ideally, but the historical narrative was a far more complex affair to deal with, both because it was itself an idiosyncratic amalgamation of source-material, and because it involved knowledge of, and comment on, virtually every known episode of almost three centuries of Athenian (and much Greek) history. Rhodes therefore had to master and cite a mass of primary sources (literary, epigraphic, numismatic and archaeological) and an ever-increasing flow of published scholarship: unsurprisingly, reviewers were much struck by the consequential length of the volume’s bibliography, even with work published in periodical form excluded. The remaining sections, moreover, reveal the depth of Rhodes’s involvement with the *A.P.* purely as a linguistic text. Section 4, ‘Language and style’ (pp. 37–51), does so in detail. It begins by attempting to determine how closely the text follows known sources or how far it shares ‘Aristotelian’ vocabulary or diverges from it. It then reports how far it avoids hiatus and uses prose rhythms, analytic structure, and ring composition, and ends by identifying infelicities of language and style and the ‘many oddities of grammar and sense’ (p. 49). As Rhodes drily remarked, ‘*A.P.* is thus a very uneven work’ (p. 50), but the gusto and detail with which he explored this aspect of the text is clear from the remarkable list of 116 ‘points at which I doubt or reject the text of Kenyon’<sup>38</sup> (pp. 737–8 & 769). A fifth section reviews the evidence for the date of its final publication, in part using identifiable ‘insertions and revisions’ (pp. 51–8), while a final section outlines the main features of the very complicated chronological and intellectual relationship between *A.P.* and Aristotle’s *Politics* (pp. 58–63).

26. The text of the *Commentary* itself occupies 671 pages. It is not for the novice: untranslated Greek or Latin presents itself on most pages, details of vocabulary are noted

<sup>36</sup> Even ‘monstrous’ (p. vi).

<sup>37</sup> In Rhodes’s own words, ‘As a historian *A.P.* is mediocre (though by no means useless to us), but as a describer of constitutional practice he is first in the field’ (*Commentary*, p. 60).

<sup>38</sup> This refers to the ‘standard’ text of *A.P.*, edited by F.G. Kenyon and published in 1920 as *Aristotelis Atheniensium Respublica* in the Oxford Classical Texts series.

and pursued, recondite scholarly debates are reported in enough detail to brief even the expert professional, detailed references to ancient texts abound, and minor scholarly observations in out-of-the-way places are carefully credited. Yet effort is continually expended on guiding the reader. The commentary itself is split into helpfully labelled blocks (A to K for the historical narrative, L to S for the survey of contemporary government), tables are occasionally used to set data out in a lucid form, and, when possible, this or that detailed point is deliberately contextualised within a wider narrative. It all amounts to a continuous concentrated barrage of information and judgment. Reviewers responded in kind. On the one hand they were unanimous in saluting the publication of a full-scale commentary on the text and in recognising its exceptional quality, not least in respect of ‘his knack of being able to summarise pointedly the “state of the question” on the multitude of historical, historiographical, and linguistic controversies provoked by *A.P.*’s text’ (Cartledge 1983, p. 79). On the other hand, most reviewers also felt the need to add a list of comments, suggestions, approvals, or corrections to specific pages or sections of text. Given the plethora of ‘loose ends’ that Rhodes was deemed to have left, some such lists were extensive, occupying five pages (Cartledge, MacKendrick) or even twelve (Hansen). It speedily became clear that for all its quality and its depth of cover, it was not a final *Summa Philologica*: ‘there is still room for dispute and further discussion of many problems’ (Hansen 1985, p. 65). But Rhodes’s edition became at once, and after over forty years remains, the foundation stone of study and debate.

27. Naturally enough, Rhodes built on what he had constructed. The first extension was a translation, published in the Penguin Classics series in 1984,<sup>39</sup> which was so well equipped with lavish notes and a detailed Introduction as to make the basic scholarship of the big edition available to a much wider readership, at a stiff but manageable price (£2.50 in 1984).<sup>40</sup> That was followed by a substantial set of ‘Select Addenda’, dated 1992 but incorporated as pp. 767–84 in a reissue of the big edition in 1993. By then, too, he had made a second extension. His work on the historical section of the *A.P.* had given him an intimate familiarity both with the remnants of the local historians of Athens and Attika (the ‘Atthidographers’) and with the three-volume edition of them which the German scholar Felix Jacoby had compiled during the 1940s and 1950s as a refugee in Oxford.<sup>41</sup> In 1990 Rhodes used that familiarity to publish a chapter on them,<sup>42</sup> and in

<sup>39</sup> Aristotle, *The Athenian Constitution* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1984), 198 pp. + ill. & maps, ISBN 0–14–044431–9. Review by J. Roy, *JACT Review*, 2 (1985), 20; reprinted in 1986 and reprinted with corrections in 2002, ISBN 13–978–0 140–4431–5 (review by T. Hooper, *Polis*, 36 (2009–10), 590–2).

<sup>40</sup> Several reviewers of the 1981 volume had expressed acute discomfort at its price (£45.00).

<sup>41</sup> *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*, Dritter Teil B Nr. 297–607 (texts), b I (Commentary) and b 2 (notes) (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1950 & 1954).

<sup>42</sup> ‘The Atthidographers’, in H. Verdin, G. Schepens, & E. de Keyser (eds), *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek historiography from the 4th to the 2nd centuries B.C.* (*Studia Hellenistica*, 30; Leuven: Lovanii, 1990), pp. 73–81 with 115–16.

2013 he returned to the topic with an invited lecture at Jacoby's pre-war institution, the Christian Albrechts-Universität in Kiel, on 'Atthis: The ancient histories of Athens'.<sup>43</sup> Two further interconnected extensions followed speedily thereafter. The first, in 2016, was an Italian edition of *A.P.* in the Valla-Mondadori series,<sup>44</sup> using a commentary prepared by Rhodes: this was followed a year later by an English-language edition that used the same material.<sup>45</sup> That material, which includes both Greek text and vernacular translation, well illustrates the challenge of creating an *editio minor* for a student readership. The Commentary is cut down to about one third of the 1981 original, with much on text and language omitted and with very little new material added: as a result, reviewers understandably criticised the many absences of reference to more recent scholarly publications. Yet it went far to meet the need, forcibly stated by Andrew Lintott in his review of the 1981 *magnum opus*, for volumes 'of a size that students can afford to purchase'.

### The wider mission, I: Thucydides and the Athenian Empire

28. Notwithstanding such extensions, the sequel clearly suggests that by the mid-1980s Rhodes felt that he had shot his bolt with the *A.P.* and could properly tackle other tasks. One such, fertilised if not sown by his teaching experience, was precisely that specified by Lintott: that of providing more appropriate and up-to-date textbooks for students of the Ancient World who had not had the 'advantage' of having been drilled in the ancient languages in 'Preparatory' and 'Public' schools since the age of eight or nine. He clearly took this mission seriously, for it stimulated him to transfer his historiographical focus to Thucydides and the Athenian Empire of the 5th century BCE. Its first product was minor but invaluable: a teacher's *Vade Mecum*. It was a slim booklet, entitled very simply *The Athenian Empire*, published in 1985 under the wing of the main periodical for Classical studies in schools and appropriately pitched to serve as a briefing document for teachers, whether at school or college.<sup>46</sup> However, he clearly saw guidance on the texts,

<sup>43</sup> Edited by Prof. Josef Wiesehöfer of Kiel, it was published in 2014 as Vol. 2 of the *Kieler Felix-Jacoby-Vorlesungen* (Heidelberg: Verlag Antike e.K.), 47 pp., ills, ISBN 978-3-938032-73-2.

<sup>44</sup> *Aristotele, Costituzione degli Ateniesi (Athenaion Politeia)*, tr. A. Zambrini, T. Gargiulo & P.J. Rhodes (Milano: Fondazione Lorenzo Valla, Mondadori, 2016): lii + 402 pp., ISBN 978-88-04-67169-5. For reviews see next note.

<sup>45</sup> P.J. Rhodes (ed. & comm.), *The Athenian Constitution Written in the School of Aristotle* (Aris & Philip Classical Texts; Liverpool: University Press), xii (incl. maps) + 441 pp., hb ISBN 978-78694-070-4, pb ISBN 978-1-78694-837-3. Reviews (of one or both versions): A. Esu, *Classical Review*, 68 (2018), 366-9; A. Fermari, *Gnomon*, 91 (2019), 364-6; R. Guggenberger, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2017.08.11; T. Hooper, *Polis*, 36 (2019), 590-2; G. Verhasselt, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2018.07.21; U. Walter, *Historische Zeitschrift*, 308 (2019), 156-7.

<sup>46</sup> *The Athenian Empire (Greece & Rome, New surveys in the Classics*, no. 17; Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1985), 47 pp., ISBN 0-903035-146]. Reissued with addenda in 1993.

whether literary or epigraphical, as the main need. As a young lecturer, Rhodes had already devised one home-made solution (§22 above), but alert publishers were already beginning to offer professionally polished products. In 1965 the Clarendon Press in Oxford had published Sir Kenneth Dover's editions of Thucydides' Books VI and VII, with Prefaces that began with the words 'The purpose of this book is to help senior pupils in schools and students in universities to read, understand, and enjoy Book VI [or 'Book VII'] of Thucydides.' That Rhodes had used those books in his own classes can be taken as certain: that he saw them as an excellent model is patent from the initial words of the Preface to his own edition of Book II of Thucydides:

The *Historical Commentary on Thucydides* of Gomme, Andrewes and Dover<sup>47</sup> is addressed to advanced readers, and its first volume was published more than forty years ago. Other English-speaking readers of Thucydides have to make do, except for books VI and VII, with editions which are nearly a century old and which, even when equipped with new introductions, do not cater for the needs and interests of the present day. Hence this new edition of book II, the book in which, having completed his introduction, Thucydides begins his main narrative of the Peloponnesian War.

29. Plainly, Rhodes was taking Dover's format and target readership as his model but applying it more widely. What emerged was an implicit programme, designed to render accessible to undergraduates all the texts about Athenian history that might be of interest and importance; doing so, as with *A.P.*, by providing an edited Greek text, a translation, and a middle-range commentary that guided readers to relevant discussion without overwhelming them. It was all the more ambitious a programme because by the 1980s other scholars and other publishers were feeding the same market,<sup>48</sup> but over the course of a decade Rhodes put together three books on that pattern: an edition of Thucydides' Book II in 1988,<sup>49</sup> an edition of Thucydides' Book III in 1994,<sup>50</sup> and an edition of Thucydides' Book IV with part (§§ 1–24) of Book V in 1998.<sup>51</sup> After a long hiatus there followed on

<sup>47</sup> Published by The Clarendon Press, Oxford, in five volumes: I (A.W. Gomme, 1945), II & III (Gomme, 1956; amended reprints 1962), IV (Gomme, A. Andrewes, & K.J. Dover, 1970), and V (Gomme, Andrewes & Dover, 1981).

<sup>48</sup> The Cambridge Greek and Latin Classics series and the Valla-Mondadori series were still later entrants.

<sup>49</sup> *Thucydides: History II* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1988), xi (incl. maps) + 282 pp., hb ISBN 0–85668–396–5, pb ISBN 0–85668–397–3. Corrected reprint (Oxford: Oxbow, 2008); reprint (Liverpool University Press, 2015), hb ISBN 9780856683961, pb ISBN 9780856683978, PDF eISBN 9781835539484, ePub eISBN 9781835530481. Detailed review by J. Percival, *Greece & Rome*, 36 (1989), 90–1.

<sup>50</sup> *Thucydides, History III, edited with translation and commentary by P.J. Rhodes* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1994), xiv (incl. maps) + 273 pp., hb ISBN 0–85668–539–9; pb ISBN 0–85668–540–2]. Reviews: A. Keen, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 95.08.05; R.J. Seager, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 115 (1995), 197–8.

<sup>51</sup> *Thucydides: History Book IV. 1 – V.1 24* (Warminster: Aris & Phillips, 1998), xiv (incl. maps) + 343 pp., hb ISBN 0–85668–701–4, pb ISBN 0–85668–702–2. Reviews: K. Carroll, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*,



the same pattern in 2014 an edition of Thucydides' Book I,<sup>52</sup> in 2019 an edition of Herodotos' Book V,<sup>53</sup> and there will be a posthumous edition of Herodotos' Book VI.<sup>54</sup> In the intervening period Rhodes had contributed over 200 pages' worth of Introduction and notes to another scholar's translation of the whole text of Thucydides,<sup>55</sup> and in 2015 had twice published summaries of his views and interpretations of the historian. One of them<sup>56</sup> merits particular note, for its 90 pages in four sections (The world of T.; T. the historian; T. the thinker; After T.) provide an excellent short briefing, with the final section offering an exemplary sketch of the 'reception' of Thucydides in subsequent centuries. The second summary,<sup>57</sup> a more informal address, complemented the first.

30. As the appearance of Herodotos in that list suggests, it would be inappropriate to make a direct comparison between these nine titles as a group and Simon Hornblower's three-volume commentary on Thucydides which the Oxford Press had published from 1991 to 2008 as a replacement for Gomme, Andrewes & Dover. Format, scale, content, and target readership differed sharply, and in later volumes Rhodes acknowledged his debt to Hornblower, not least in comments on Thucydides' narratological techniques. More fitting will be a grateful recognition that the two editors adopted complementary formats in their quest to maximise accessibility to a complex and often difficult text, written by a 'man who must have had his own prejudices, and cannot have been the dispassionate, scientific historian he was once taken to be'.<sup>58</sup>

---

2000.03.05; T. Rood, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 50 (2000), 276–7; R. Sitoski, *Classical Outlook*, 78 (2000), 41–3 (with two other books).

<sup>52</sup> *Thucydides, History Book I: Introduction, translation, commentary by P.J. Rhodes* (Oxford & Havertown PA: Aris & Phillips/Oxbow, 2014), viii (incl. map) + 282 pp., hb ISBN 978–0–90834–395–6, pb ISBN 978–0–90834–396–3.

<sup>53</sup> *Herodotus, Histories Book V* (Liverpool University Press, 2019), xii (incl. maps) + 263 pp., hb ISBN 978–1–78962–014–6, pb ISBN 978–1–78962–015–3.

<sup>54</sup> *Herodotus, Histories Book VI* (Liverpool University Press, forthcoming).

<sup>55</sup> *Thucydides, The Peloponnesian War*; tr. M. Hammond, introduction (pp. x–liii) & notes (pp. 473–632) by P.J. Rhodes (Oxford World's Classics; Oxford: University Press, 2009), 708 pp. & maps, ISBN 978–0–19–282191–1. Reviews: C. Constantakopoulou & P. Liddel, *Greece & Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 57 (2010), 396; J. Morwood, *Journal of Classics Teaching*, 19 (2010), 29; J. Taylor, *Anglo-Hellenic Review*, 42 (2010), 24; S.J. Willett, *Arion*, 19 (2011), 171–85.

<sup>56</sup> *Thucydides (Ancients in Action series)*; London & New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2015), xi (including map) + 92 pp., pb ISBN 978–1–47252–399–0; ePub 978–1–47252–658–8; ePub 978–1–47252–207–8. Reviews: R. Bruzzone, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 66 (2016), 590; J. Bulwer, *Classics for all*, 10.08.16; S.N. Jaffe, *Classics Ireland*, 23–24 (2016–17), 171–4; C. Scardino, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2016.07.10.

<sup>57</sup> Entitled *Ktema es aiei (A Possession for All Time)* (Oxford & London: The Classical Association, 2015), 22 pp., ISBN 978–1–4724–2399–0, ISSN 2041–3548. It was his Presidential Address to the Association in 2015.

<sup>58</sup> Rhodes, *Alcibiades* (2011), 2 (for detail, see §41 below).

## The wider mission, II: The ‘Old Oligarch’ and Solon the lawgiver

31. In volumes published in 2008 and 2015 Rhodes made further use of the pattern described above. Both volumes presented texts that cast light on Athenian history and society, and both were joint enterprises. The first<sup>59</sup> was an edition of a late 5th-century pamphlet, wrongly attributed to Xenophon, that throws a lurid light on contemporary Athenian politics. Initiated by John Marr of the University of Exeter, who invited Rhodes to assist him,<sup>60</sup> the edition found a home with the publishers of Rhodes’s earlier editions and has status as the principal current commentary on the text.

32. That status is true also for Rhodes’s second collaboration, this time with the Portuguese scholar Delfim Leão of the University of Coimbra, with whom he had already collaborated (together with E.M. Harris in 2010; PJR first went to Coimbra in 2004). Their aim was to assemble an edition of the known remnants of the law-codes that the legislators Drakon and Solon had devised and promulgated at Athens<sup>61</sup> in the late 7th and early 6th centuries BCE respectively. It was not a novel project, for an edition compiled by Eberhard Ruschenbusch had been published in 1966,<sup>62</sup> with a re-edition in 2010 revised and enlarged by Klaus Bringmann.<sup>63</sup> The initial idea had been Leão’s, who had sought Rhodes’s collaboration<sup>64</sup> and gained ‘a very positive’ response (Leão, pers. comm.), and though they became aware of Bringmann’s edition they had decided to

<sup>59</sup> *The ‘Old Oligarch’: The Constitution of the Athenians attributed to Xenophon*, ed. J.L. Marr & P.J. Rhodes (Oxford: Aris & Phillips/Oxbow Books, 2008), 178 pp., hb ISBN 978–0–85668–776–1, pb ISBN 978–0–85668–781–5. Reviews: C. Constantakopoulou & P. Liddel, *Greece & Rome*, 56 (2009), 258; S. Lewis, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 63 (2013), 352–3; D.F. Leão, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2009–04–05; C.J. Tuplin, *Polis*, 26 (2009), 407–10.

<sup>60</sup> Hence, no doubt, Rhodes’s follow-up paper, ‘How seriously should we take the Old Oligarch?’, in the Exeter periodical *Pegasus*, 52 (2009), 8–13.

<sup>61</sup> *The Laws of Solon: A new edition with introduction, translation and commentary* (Oxford, London & New York: I.B. Tauris, 2015), xiii + 210 pp., ISBN 978–1–78453–668–8; eISBN 978–0–85773–930–8. Reviews: C. Flament, *L’Antiquité Classique*, 87 (2018), 302–4; P. Liddel, *Classics for All*, Reviews 10 May 2016, <https://classicsforall.org.uk/reading-room/book-reviews/laws-solon-new-edition-introduction-translation-and-commentary>; N. Nowbahar & T.J. Figueira, *Humanitas*, 68 (2016), 258–64; K. Sagstetter, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 69 (2019), 360–1; W. Schmitz, *Sehepunkte*, 15.04.2017, <https://sehepunkte.de/2017/04/27635.html> (accessed 18.02.25); G. Thör, *Zeitschrift der Savigny-Stiftung*, 135 (2018), 842–4; R.W. Wallace, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2016.03.30. Rhodes’s own list also cites ‘T. Shahin, *HPB* 2017, 190–1’, but neither he nor we have been able to identify the periodical concerned.

<sup>62</sup> Σόλωνος νόμοι. *Die Fragmente der solonischen Gesetzeswerke mit einer Text- und Überlieferungsgeschichte* (*Historia*, Einzelschrift 9; Wiesbaden: F. Steiner Verlag, 1966); 2nd edn (Wiesbaden, 1983).

<sup>63</sup> *Solon: das Gesetzeswerk – Fragmente, Übersetzung und Kommentar* (*Historia*, Einzelschrift 215; Stuttgart: F. Steiner Verlag, 2010), ISBN 978–3–515–07909–3.

<sup>64</sup> For the start of the Leão-Rhodes link see Harris *et al.*, *Law and Drama*, Preface, p. vii (§45 n. 100). For the link with Goušchin see ‘Euthynai (Accounting)’, p. 11 n. 61 (on Rhodes’s valedictory lecture, see further §53 n. 127).

persevere ‘in order to provide an edition which would include translations and commentaries in English’,<sup>65</sup> i.e. to follow the same pattern of presentation that Rhodes had adopted for Thucydides and the Old Oligarch. Pragmatically, they had also adopted Ruschenbusch’s categories and numbering of attestations, but they added new attestations (which created complications with numbering), took fuller account of Solon’s poetry, expanded the commentary, and ‘contextualised the laws in a way that Ruschenbusch does not’ (Sagstetter’s review). However, another reviewer (Flamant) still had cause to complain that the brevity of commentaries on fragments would leave a reader who was unfamiliar with the controversies unable to form a balanced image of the debates. Some reviewers, moreover, were unable to share the authors’ ‘optimistic’ view<sup>66</sup> of their ability to categorise this or that attestation as authentically ‘Solonian’: the sceptic’s view is stated with some force by Nowbahar and Figueira, who also levelled some well-justified criticism at the small font size that the publishers had assigned to the commentaries. Nonetheless, the volume met general approval as a new standard edition.

### **The wider mission, III: The nature of the Greek city-state**

33. In retrospect, the publication of their joint book on Solon in 2015 can now be seen as the much-delayed culmination of Rhodes’s prolonged concentration on the history of the legal, administrative, and political management of a single well-documented ancient Greek city, Athens. Yet that concentration had simply been the earliest to take shape – and the most detailed, but also by far the narrowest in its scope – of the three main strands of the intellectual creativity of his maturity. All three had to do with the ancient Greek city-state, but the two others encompassed much wider horizons, whether of space or of time, than the first. The two other strands must now be described in some detail, together with the nature of his contribution to each.

34. One of them comprised nothing less than the scrutiny of the whole world of the Greek city-states, to be reviewed with the same degree of attention to the details of administration as had been applied to Athens in *Boulé* and *Commentary on A.P.* A first essay in this direction, undoubtedly a response to student needs in Durham’s Political Theory and Practice course, was the compilation of a source-book.<sup>67</sup> This consisted of an

<sup>65</sup> Leão and Rhodes (2015), p. ix.

<sup>66</sup> Cf. Rhodes’s own ‘The reforms and laws of Solon: an optimistic view’, in J.H. Blok & A.P.M.H. Lardinois, *Solon of Athens: New historical and philological approaches* (*Mnemosyne*, Supplement 272; Leiden: Brill, 2006), pp. 248–60.

<sup>67</sup> *The Greek City States: A source book* (London & Sydney: Croom Helm & Norman OK: U. of Oklahoma Press, 1986), hb ISBN 0–7099–2222–1, pb ISBN 0–7099–4223–0. Review by D. Whitehead, *Durham University Journal*, 48 (1986/87), 109–10. An enlarged second edition was published by Cambridge University Press in 2007, hb ISBN 978–0–521–85049–0, pb ISBN 978–0–521–61556–3. Review by C. Constantakopoulou & P. Liddel, *Greece & Rome*, 55 (2008), 293.

assemblage of excerpts (mostly of paragraph length or less) from illustrative literary and epigraphic texts, grouped by theme or period or place and lightly annotated. Its format therefore resembled that of other 'source books' which were being compiled and published in the same period.<sup>68</sup> However, it was a luxury version of the genre, for close examination reveals a compiler who was focused on social, economic and administrative life and procedures within the Greek political systems, and was possessed of a shrewd eye both for unusual detail and (in the enlarged second edition) for the Hellenistic world: the 528 texts of the second edition – especially those from out-of-the-way sources – are an education for all scholars. A second essay was also a compilation, edited jointly by Rhodes and one of the authors of this memoir (LGM) under the title 'The development of the *polis* in archaic Greece'.<sup>69</sup> It comprised a collection of 15 invited or submitted papers<sup>70</sup> which had been delivered at a conference in Durham in September 1995. Its purpose had been to offer the profession a systematic and wide-ranging review of the flood of recent work on both the historical and the historiographical aspects of the theme embraced by the volume's title. The result was therefore (together with some comparison with central Italy), 'a drawing together of new consensuses of recent years that have been tested in the fire of university teaching as well as in research seminars' (Shipley's review, p. 462).

35. That was a slim volume. In contrast, a second title of 1997, this time not co-edited but nominally co-authored, became (at 640 pages) Rhodes's second Big Book.<sup>71</sup> It had required a great effort on his part. Its Preface reports its genesis, namely a reaction by David Lewis to a claim made by Geoffrey de Ste Croix in 1981 to the effect that after the Classical period (say by *ca.* 300 BCE) Greek democracy in the form of the active

<sup>68</sup> The genre had been defined by N. Lewis & M. Reinhold, *Roman Civilization I-II* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1951, 1966), but the 1980s and 1990s saw an emphasis on Greece. Salient publications were M.M. Austin, *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A selection of ancient sources in translation* (Cambridge: University Press, 1981; 2006); M. Crawford & D. Whitehead, *Archaic and Classical Greece: A selection of ancient sources in translation* (Cambridge: University Press, 1983); M. Dillon & L. Garland, *Ancient Greece: Social and historical documents from Archaic times to the death of Socrates (c.800–399 BC)* (London & New York: Routledge, 1994); and T. Buckley, *Aspects of Greek History 750–323 BC: A source-based approach* (London & New York: Routledge, 1996).

<sup>69</sup> L.G. Mitchell & P.J. Rhodes (eds), *The Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece* (London & New York: Routledge, 1997), ISBN 0-415-14752-2. Reviews: A. Blanshard, *JACT Review*<sup>2</sup>, 26 (1999), 16; F. Lefèvre, *L'Antiquité Classique*, 68 (1999), 514–15; G. Shipley, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 49 (1999), 462–4; H. Van Wees, *Greece & Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 45 (1998), 95–6.

<sup>70</sup> It is proper to state that the joint editors of this Memoir each contributed one paper.

<sup>71</sup> P.J. Rhodes with David M. Lewis, *The Decrees of the Greek States* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1997). Reviews: A.L. Boegehold, *Classical World*, 93 (1999/2000), 295–6; D.T. Engen, *Ancient History Bulletin*, 13 (1999), 73–4; Y. Hashiba, *Journal of Classical Studies*, 48 (2000), 131–4 (in Japanese); E. Ruschenbusch, *Gnomon*, 73 (2003), 627–8; R. Thomas, *Times Literary Supplement*, 9 October 1998, 31; H. van Wees, *Greece & Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 45 (1998), 249.

participation of citizens in civic government had been destroyed.<sup>72</sup> For Lewis, as for any person who knew that the vast bulk of the documentation on the civic government of Greek-culture communities comprised an archive of epigraphic and papyrological sources that grew massively *after* 300 BCE and continued for centuries far into the Roman Imperial period, de Ste Croix's assertion was simply not true. The trouble was that to replace it by a more accurate assessment required an expert, intensive, and time-consuming trawl through that entire archive. With Rhodes' assistance, Lewis began such a trawl, but his illness, and eventual death in 1994, left Rhodes to pursue the task on his own,<sup>73</sup> requiring periods of study leave through the 1990s. So far as we know, he made no attempt to find a collaborator, enormous though the task was: rather, for him it was a source of great pride to have tracked down every known Greek decree.

36. The format which he adopted for the book was tripartite. Part I, *Athens*, summarised in some 50 pages the picture of Athenian procedures which *Boulé* and *Commentary* between them had painted. Part II, *Catalogues*, took 400 pages to take the reader across the entire Greek-language world, each of its 50 sections reporting the evidence for the procedures of civic government in this or that region or province, from Greece proper to the western Mediterranean, the Black Sea, Egypt and Persia. In each section, the evidence (nearly always in Greek, occasionally in Latin) is followed by a detailed summary of what can be inferred of the administrative system in that region: depending on the quantity of evidence, Rhodes either sketched the system in each single polity or reviewed under one heading an ensemble of numerous poorly documented polities. (The disparity of levels of information, as e.g. between the well-documented islands of the Aegean and the pitiful paucity of Sicily, is noticeable.) Finally, Part III, *The Greek World*, drew out of that evidence a picture of civic administrative practice across that entire world. In this Part, the text is organised not by region or polity but by administrative procedure, pinpointing the use of *probouleusis* as defined above (§20), the evidence for 'An active assembly', and the extent of 'Democracy and freedom' that could be detected across the huge tracts of space and time that his survey had encompassed. No fewer than 31 features or procedures – from 'proposer of decrees' to 'lawful procedure' and 'powerful officials' – are singled out as aspects of civic government, each being accorded a report of evidence and an evaluation. Yet, there is no grandiose conclusion. Instead, there is an eleven-line final paragraph,<sup>74</sup> which is best cited in full:

Changes did sometimes take place, then, in the way in which the texts of decrees were formulated for publication; and there was in the end a reduction, particularly under the

<sup>72</sup> G.E.M. de Ste Croix, *The Class Struggle of the Ancient Greek World* (Ithaca NY: Cornell University Press, 1981), pp. 300–26.

<sup>73</sup> His own list of titles states 'in fact 90% or more by P.J.R.'.

<sup>74</sup> *Decrees*, pp. 562–3.



Roman principate, in the extent to which Greek states were free to make their own decisions and the extent to which their citizen bodies were genuinely involved in the making of those decisions. Nevertheless, there was a significant continuity over many centuries, throughout<sup>75</sup> the Greek and the hellenised world, in the belief that a state was a community in which decisions were made through decrees of the citizens, and in the kinds of institution used to give effect to that belief. I hope that this book has helped to demonstrate the vitality of that belief and of those institutions.

37. It is difficult to do justice to this major, but challenging, contribution to scholarship within a brief biographical sketch. Its style is dry, its subject-matter is remote, and its details are intricate and arcane. The primary evidence for each of the 50 sections is presented in Greek only, much of it abbreviated to the verge of incomprehensibility. References are trimmed to the minimum, and though there are detailed indexes of Ancient Texts and of Places and Peoples, there is no *Index Graecitatis*. Even less than *Boulé* or *Commentary* (§§19 and 24 above) is it a book for the novice: understandably but regrettably, it attracted few reviews. Yet the meat of the book is a concentrated pabulum that could provide sustenance for many a conference. It is both a window onto the whole civic experience of Greek-speaking Antiquity, and an educative pathway into the professional milieu of the editing and publication of Greek inscriptions. *Decrees* has yet to wield its full potential influence.

#### **The wider mission, IV: Democracy ancient and modern**

38. If the ancient Greek civic world was the horizon of Rhodes's second strand, the whole historical and conceptual world of 'democracy' was that of his third: the word featured in the title of his very first published paper<sup>76</sup> and can be traced throughout his entire oeuvre. The obsession (for it was that) needs a diagnosis, best formulated as the amalgamation of two imperatives. One was straightforwardly descriptive – an ambition to display the realities of an ancient democratic regime by documenting in detail the institutions of the best-attested non-monarchic polity of Greek antiquity. For this task *Boulé* and *Commentary* between them had already provided much of what was needed, and Rhodes filled in the gaps by publishing a dozen or more papers of his own on aspects

<sup>75</sup> But 'throughout' in error in the published text.

<sup>76</sup> See n. 16 above.

of Athenian democracy'<sup>77</sup> and by gathering 14 papers, already published by others, together in an edited volume with the same title.<sup>78</sup>

39. However, the second imperative was a more complex matter, for it comprised a resolute opposition to certain fashionable approaches to historical texts. A first salvo, delivered in a lecture at Liège in 1992,<sup>79</sup> took aim at readings that either focused simplistically on the author (as rhetorician, journalist, or novelist) or adopted the deconstructionist approach of Derrida's 'Il n'y a pas de hors-texte'. Unfortunately, though Rhodes offers various counter-arguments and quotations, he does not identify the nature of the basic problem, which needs formalisation. To be brief, it is this: that, whereas for literary texts there are only two essential dimensions (the author with his/her imagination and linguistic command, and the reader with his/hers), for a historical text a third is primordial: the events that took place in the past. To omit that primary dimension, and not to acknowledge the consequential existence of a triangle of interpretation, is therefore a category error, which is irredeemable. Later to emerge, but ultimately dominant in Rhodes's mind, was a second component of the imperative: to document, but also to oppose, the deep-rooted but revived meta-historical trope of 'using the historical Greek experience of democracy as a resource for building normative political theory'.<sup>80</sup> This second component first found formal expression in the 1990s, in some of Rhodes's many reviews of books devoted to aspects of ancient democracy: his 1995 review<sup>81</sup> of

<sup>77</sup> 'Athenian democracy after 403 BC', *Classical Journal*, 75 (1979/80), 305–23; 'The Athenian revolution', in *Cambridge History*<sup>2</sup>, V (1992), pp. 62–95; 'Democracy and its opponents in Fourth-Century Athens', in U. Bultrighini (ed.), *Democrazia e antidemocrazia nel mondo greco* (Alessandria: Edizioni dell'Orso, 2006), pp. 275–89; 'Democracy and empire', in L.J. Samons (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Age of Pericles* (New York: Cambridge University Press, 2006), pp. 24–45; 'Ancient Athens: Democracy and empire', *European Review of History*, 16 (2009), 210–15; 'Stability in the Athenian democracy after 403 BC', in B. Linke, M. Meier & M. Strothmann (eds), *Zwischen Monarchie und Republik* (*Historia*, Einzelschrift 217; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2010), pp. 67–75; 'The Dionysia and democracy again', *Classical Quarterly*<sup>2</sup>, 61 (2011), 71–4; 'Athenian democracy and tragedy', in H. Roisman (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Greek Tragedy* (Chichester, Malden MA & Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), I, pp. 155–9; 'Theseus and democracy', *Miscellanea Anthropologica et Sociologica*, 15 (2014), 98–118; 'Directions in the study of Athenian democracy', *Scripta Classica Israelica*, 34 (2015), 49–68. See also n. 16.

<sup>78</sup> *Athenian Democracy* (*Edinburgh Readings in the Ancient World*; Edinburgh: University Press, 2004), hb ISBN 0-7486-1686-1, pb ISBN 0-7486-1687-X. Reviews: C. Burnand & K. Clarke, *Greece & Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 52 (2005), 129; P. Liddel, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 55 (2005), 215–16; J.M. Quillin, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2005–03–13.

<sup>79</sup> 'Défense et illustration des historiens grecs', Faculté Ouverte (U. de Liège: Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres: Conférences, Débats, Dossiers), 1992 (no ISBN displayed): reprinted in *Cahiers de Clío*, 116 (1993), 3–26. English text in *Greece & Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 41 (1994), 156–7; Russian translation by V. Goušchin, *Antičnost Srednevekovje Evropi* (Perm, 1994), pp. 14–31.

<sup>80</sup> Rhodes's review in *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 1997.07.23, of J. Ober & C. Hedrick, *Demokratia: A conversation on democracies, ancient and modern* (Princeton: University Press, 1997).

<sup>81</sup> *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 45 (1995), 317–18.

J.P. Euben *et al.* (eds), *Athenian Political Thought and the Reconstruction of American Democracy*,<sup>82</sup> begins with the sentence ‘The Editor thought he was sending me a book about Athenian democracy, but he misread the title: this is a book with an agenda in the present-day USA’. A sequence of other reviews in a like vein<sup>83</sup> culminated in the writing of a short but pungent book, *Ancient Democracy and Modern Ideology*,<sup>84</sup> which ‘argues that although total objectivity and disengagement are not and never have been possible, scholars who aspire to objectivity and disengagement are likely to do better history, and also to be more useful to our own world, than those who rejoice in their subjectivity and in their engagement with our world.’ It was far from being his last word on the subject. Papers with ‘Democracy’ in their title continued to appear almost annually until 2018, reviews of democracy-focused books did so until his death, and three of the four occasions when he spoke into a radio or recording microphone were on themes to do with democracy. As we compile this Memoir in 2025, the 2003 book has not lost its relevance.

### The wider mission, V: Narrative histories of ancient Greece

40. So far in this Memoir, the reader’s attention has been directed towards Rhodes’ work on ancient Greek institutions, texts, and ideologies. As a biographers’ response, that was justified, for in his younger years narrative politico-military history, though not absent, had taken a back seat in his writing. With the new century, however, there came a new departure, the publication of *A History of the Classical Greek World, 478–323 B.C.*<sup>85</sup> It was a response to a publisher’s invitation, and though largely conventional in its range of topics, its 26 chapters<sup>86</sup> provide a very thorough survey-cum-narrative which reaches

<sup>82</sup> Published by Cornell University Press (Ithaca, 1994).

<sup>83</sup> E.g. the 1998 review-article ‘How to study Athenian democracy’ (review of J. Ober, *The Athenian Revolution*) cited in n. 30 above.

<sup>84</sup> Published by Gerald Duckworth (London, 2003), ISBN 0 7156 3220 5: quotation from p. 8. Reviews include: M. Beard, *Times Literary Supplement*, 29 August 2003, 28; C. Burnand & K. Clarke, *Greece & Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 52 (2005), 129–30; D. Erickson, *Classical Outlook*, 82 (2004), 39–40; C. Gaynor, *Classics Ireland*, 12 (2005), 109–15; R.J. Lane Fox, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 125 (2005), 170–1; L. Migeotte, *Phoenix*, 60 (2006), 149–50; D.G. Paiano, *Circe de clásicos y modernos*, 10 (2006), 305–9; E.W. Robinson, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 54 (2004), 460–1; I. Worthington, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2004.03.21.

<sup>85</sup> Published in Blackwell History of the Ancient World (Maldon MA, Oxford & Carlton VI: Blackwell Publishing, 2006 – but Rhodes’ own list of publications reports 2005), xiv + 407 pp.; hb ISBN 978–0–631–22564–5; pb ISBN 978–0–631–22565–2. Reviews include P.A. Cartledge, *Times Higher Education Supplement*, 24 February 2006, Textbook Guide xiii; R. Garland, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 127 (2007), 179–80; T.E.H. Harrison, *Greece & Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 53 (2006), 263–4; P. Jones, *BBC History*, November 2005, 58–9; J.S. Taylor, *Anglo-Hellenic Review*, 33 (2006), 21; M. Trundle, *Classical Bulletin*, 83 (2007), 137–9.

<sup>86</sup> A second edition, published in 2010 in hb only, xxvi [unnumbered] + 457 pp., ISBN 978–1–4051–9286–6, added some extra material, two extra chapters and, in his own words, ‘many more illustrations’ (xii).

out beyond Athens and Sparta to give proper attention to the Greeks in the north and west. Above all, it ‘shows its working’ by eschewing footnotes, planting detailed source-references in the text, and creating thematic chapters whose unity comprises a train of mini-essays on salient associated topics. True, there are some major absences (e.g. of mercenaries and of religion, as one reviewer notes, and of Crete), but essentially it was a distillation of forty years of teaching and writing about Greek history into 400 pages of concentrated information, and it attracted enthusiastic accolades on all sides as ‘a masterpiece of precision and restraint’ (Harrison). Even so, there is a further dimension, for though it was written as a volume for one of the *three* rival series (managed by publishers Blackwell, Fontana, and Routledge respectively) that cover the whole of Classical Antiquity,<sup>87</sup> Rhodes acknowledges ‘helpful notes’ sent to him by Simon Hornblower as author of a directly competing volume. Both scholars and both publishers merit salutation for such comradely acts.

41. Having acquired a taste for narrative, Rhodes again – as with *Commentary* (§24 above) – built on his own foundation with a quartet of new titles. The first of them, published in 2009, was a brief booklet,<sup>88</sup> *Athens in the Fourth Century B.C.*, created as part of a teaching programme based at the Hellenic Education and Research Center in Athens. Its 44 pages provide a basic old-fashioned political-and-military narrative, with social, cultic and cultural themes being covered by other lecturers: it was supplemented a few years later with another short booklet.<sup>89</sup> The second book, however, was a very different matter. It returned to the subject of the Inaugural Lecture which Rhodes had delivered as Professor in 1984 and published in 1985,<sup>90</sup> but expanded it into a full-scale biography<sup>91</sup> of the most colourful<sup>92</sup> historical Athenian known to us, Alcibiades. In this 2011 version

<sup>87</sup> See the detailed list set out in the ‘Guide to further reading’ in Rhodes’s later book *A Short History of Ancient Greece* (§42 below), 211–12.

<sup>88</sup> Published by Elleniki Epigraphiki Etaireia (Athens, 2009), 45 pp., ISBN 978–960–86121–8–1. We know of no reviews of this title.

<sup>89</sup> *Two Lectures on Athenian History* (Athens: Elleniki Epigraphiki Etaireia, 2012), 95 pp., ISBN 978–960–99297–3–8.

<sup>90</sup> ‘*What Alcibiades Did or What Happened to Him*’ (Durham: University of Durham, 1985), 22 pp., no ISBN displayed.

<sup>91</sup> *Alcibiades: Athenian playboy, general and traitor* (Barnsley: Pen & Sword Military, 2011), xv + 143 pp. Known reviews: A. Beale, *Journal of Classics Teaching*, 25 (2012), 40–1; G. Besso, *Rivista di Filologia e di Istruzione Classica*, 143 (2015), 241–2; P. Cartledge, *Anglo-Hellenic Review*, 45 (2012), 28; S. Epstein, *Scripta Classica Israelica*, 33 (2014), 325–7; P. Green, *The New Republic*, 12.09.2011; Chr. Mann, *Klio*, 94 (2012), 520–1; W.S. Morison, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2012.08.42; J. Rice, *Times Literary Supplement*, 16 September 2011, 31; E. Varto, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 62 (2012), 667–8; K. Vlassopoulos, *Greece & Rome*, 59 (2012), 265.

<sup>92</sup> Other biographical essays are F. Taeger, *Alcibiades* (1943); J. Hatzfeld, *Alcibiade* (1951); P. Green, *Armada from Athens* (1970); E.F. Bloedow, *Alcibiades Reexamined* (1973); W.M. Ellis, *Alcibiades* (1989); H. Hefner, *Alcibiades, Staatsmann und Feldherr* (2011); D. Stuttard, *Nemesis: Alcibiades and the fall of Athens* (2018). Not quite biographies are M. Vickers, *Sophocles and Alcibiades: Athenian politics in*

Rhodes provides a straight detailed narrative, tones down the colour,<sup>93</sup> and offers a dry evaluation of his public career, but says disappointingly little about his relationship to contemporary Athenian society and culture, and ‘overlooks many of the anecdotes found in later sources and an analysis of their validity’ (Epstein’s review): similarly, his profile in Plato’s Dialogues goes unmentioned.

42. Three years later in 2014, yet again in response to a publisher’s invitation, a third book appeared: *A Short History of Ancient Greece*.<sup>94</sup> Inevitably, it was a slimmed-down version of the 2006 book, with ‘a primary focus ... on the history of the Greek heartland’ (p. 2), with references and bibliography reduced to a minimum, and with an even simpler prose style than normal. Thereby, as Uwe Walter’s review pointed out, it served one market, that of the young tiro, but not that of the more mature reader who could apply the broader and deeper analytic vocabulary that contemporary scholarship now offers. The final book of the quartet<sup>95</sup> was again a response to an invitation from a publishing house, this time Bloomsbury. Again, too, it was meant for a student readership, and it shows: style, content, and organisation are all shaped to provide a manageable stream of information that assumes no previous knowledge. A first chapter (‘Pericles and his City’) is biographical, but thereafter ‘Democracy’, ‘Empire’, ‘Religion and philosophy’, ‘Literature, Art, Architecture’, and finally ‘After Pericles’ paint a fuller picture of the city’s public life in just over 100 pages.

43. The five books described in this section do not belong together just because they share a narrative core and were published within a twelve-year period. Rather, their unity is threefold: that of the envisaged readers, that of literary style, and that of their author’s mature mental vision of history in general and Greek history in particular. Of these, the readers were primordial, for their putative needs shaped his style totally: Rhodes wrote for students in schools and colleges who might have very little cultural or linguistic background, needed simple straightforward language, but had the basic spark of interest and intelligence. For them he had the knack of writing a fluent unpretentious text that was immediately comprehensible, whatever the subject-matter, and was lucidly organised, whether as paragraph, as chapter, or as book – a style that Rhodes displayed with consistency and clarity throughout his professional life. Coupled with that style, and

---

*ancient Greek literature* (2008), and *Aristophanes and Alcibiades: Echoes of contemporary history in Athenian comedy* (2015).

<sup>93</sup> One of us was told by Rhodes himself that the book’s sub-title was imposed by the publishers against his wishes.

<sup>94</sup> Published by I.B. Tauris (London & New York, 2014), xxv + 214 pp., hb ISBN 978–1–78076–593–8, pb ISBN 978–1–878076–594–5. Reviews: S.D. Gartland, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 65 (2015), 614–15; U. Walter, *Klio*, 98 (2016), 743–5.

<sup>95</sup> *Periclean Athens* (Classical World Series; London & New York: Bloomsbury Academic, 2018), xix + 108 pp., pb ISBN 978–1–3500–1495–4 ePDF 978–1–3500–1497–8, eBook 978–1–3500–1496–1. Reviews: M.L. Skuse, *Classics Ireland*, 25 (2018), 184–7; K. Vlassopoulos, *Greece and Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 65 (2018), 259.



perceptible throughout both the five books described in this section and the rest of his oeuvre, was a solidly consistent view of what Greek history was and why it mattered. Its clearest formulation is in the first paragraph of *A Short History*, which begins with the sentence ‘The history of Ancient Greece is interesting in its own right, and for Europeans it is important because it is a significant formative element in our own past’. After a sentence on the spread of Greek language and culture, followed by those of Judaism and Christianity, there comes a complex culmination: ‘And, although the Western part of the Roman Empire was eventually overthrown by peoples from the north, who have made their own contribution to the mixture which today’s Europeans have inherited, and <though><sup>96</sup> at one time the south-west of Europe was dominated by Muslim Arabs and at a later time the south-east of Europe was dominated by Muslim Turks, much of what we are familiar with today has come to us from the ancient world of Greek and Romans, Jews and Christians’. This looks banal, but it is not: the emphases on religions and ‘Europeans’ reveal Rhodes’s values and preoccupations at least as much as they represent a general cultural inheritance.

### Collaborations, I: Cultural history

44. Throughout his scholarly life Rhodes was happy to collaborate with colleagues, thereby contributing added value to many volumes. Three such books have already been mentioned above,<sup>97</sup> but a good half-dozen more await detailed notice. This paragraph reviews four that involved cultural history rather than documentation. The first one, *Cultural responses to the Persian Wars*,<sup>98</sup> was very much a Durham product, for of the seventeen papers that it carried, delivered at a conference there in July 2003, six were contributed by current or previous members of the Durham department. The assemblage is a collective *tour de force*. As the editors state (p. 4), ‘The fundamental aim of the project [sc. of the conference] has been to show that the “reception” of the Persian Wars has evolved continually.’ This the volume does brilliantly, traversing the wide spectra of both centuries and genres, as reviewers unanimously recognised: suitably enough, Rhodes’ own authorial role had been to lay a historical foundation by sketching ‘The

<sup>96</sup> Added by the present authors for greater clarity.

<sup>97</sup> *Development of the Polis in Archaic Greece* in 1997 (§34 above), and editions of the ‘Old Oligarch’ in 2008 (§31 above) and of *The Laws of Solon* in 2015 (§32 above).

<sup>98</sup> Edited by Emma Bridges, Edith Hall & P.J. Rhodes (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2007), ISBN 978-0-19-927967-8. Reviews: A. Akujärvi, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2007.12.36; P. Cartledge, *Anglo-Hellenic Review*, 36 (2007), 18; P. Green, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 59 (2009), 610–12; T.E.H. Harrison, *Greece & Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 54 (2007), 264; J. Skinner, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 128 (2008), 223.

impact of the Persian Wars on Classical Greece'. A second joint-edited book,<sup>99</sup> *Cultures of Commemoration: War Memorials, Ancient and Modern*, also stemmed from a conference, this time held in the British Academy itself in July 2004 with Rhodes as the sponsoring Fellow, though there his authorial role was limited to a 16-line Preface.

45. Two years later, however, his was the linking role that in 2006 assembled a third joint-edited book, *Law and Drama in Ancient Greece*.<sup>100</sup> It put together ten papers, again with a strong Durham-based presence,<sup>101</sup> that cumulatively attempted to demonstrate 'non seulement comment les pratiques judiciaires permettent de comprendre le théâtre, mais aussi comment le théâtre permet de connaître la justice athénienne' (N. Villacèque's review). Though the absence of Menander from the assemblage was noted and deplored, the chapters put the case very persuasively, partly by explorations of dramatic themes, partly (and very powerfully) by assembling the legal vocabulary which the poets employed, and partly by estimating the impact of mass jury service on citizens' knowledge. Finally, and serving coincidentally as a memorial of Rhodes' trips to Perm (the first time in 1997, and thereafter on a number of occasions between 2012 and 2017), there was published in 2015 a volume which he co-edited with Valerij Goušchin, containing the papers delivered at a conference there in September 2014.<sup>102</sup> To be frank, it does not cohere very well as a scholarly statement, because its themes of 'crisis' and 'deformation' were illustrated in chapters that were excellent and stimulating in themselves but remained singletons randomly located in space, time, and theoretical direction in the absence of any editorial lead on their interpretation: significantly, Rhodes's own paper (on instabilities within Greek polities) is more a catalogue than an analysis.

<sup>99</sup> Edited by P. Low, G.J. Oliver & P.J. Rhodes (*Proceedings of the British Academy*, 160; Oxford for the British Academy, 2012), ISBN 978-0-19-726466-9. Review by Anne Jacquemin in *Sehepunkte*, 15.06.2013, <https://www.sehepunkte.de/2013/06/21680.html>, (accessed 18.02.2025).

<sup>100</sup> Edited by E.M. Harris, D.F. Leão & P.J. Rhodes (London: Duckworth, 2010), ISBN 978-0-7156-3892-7. Reviews: D.M. Carter, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 131 (2011), 181-2; C. Constantakopoulou & P. Liddel, *Greece & Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 59 (2012), 129-30; G. Cuniberti, *Rivista di Diritto Ellenico*, 2 (2012), 419-22; M. del Pilar Fernández Deagustini, *Synthesis*, 19 (2012), 150-6; J. Fletcher, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 61 (2011), 372-4; L. Hardwick, *Humanitas*, 63 (2011), 732-5; N. Villacèque, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2010-12-09.

<sup>101</sup> But also with three contributions from Coimbra.

<sup>102</sup> *Deformations and Crises of Ancient Civil Communities* (Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag, 2015), print ISBN 978-3-515-11162-1, ebook 978-3-515-11163-8. Reviews: S. Frass, *H-Soz-Kult*, 19.09.2016; G.K. Golden, *Ancient History Online Reviews*, 6 (2016), 60-6; B. Smarczyk, *Klio*, 102 (2020), 370-5, <https://doi-org.liverpool.idm.oclc.org/10.1515/klio-2020-0026>

## Collaborations, II: Greek historical inscriptions

46. A far more prominent collaboration on Rhodes's part than those noted above has been that with Robin Osborne in creating a new generation of the Oxford Press's volumes of *Greek Historical Inscriptions* (see §18 above). They will now form a triad, not a pair, the volume covering 404–323 BCE<sup>103</sup> having been published in 2003 and that for 478–404 BCE in 2017,<sup>104</sup> while the completion and publication of the volume for the Archaic period is awaited as we write. Their background is set out in the Preface to the 2003 volume:

... David Lewis had hoped to produce a volume to supersede Tod's second volume (published 1948): he first considered in 1977 what might be included, and again in 1991–2 he consulted a number of colleagues including both of us; but after he had finished editing *Inscriptiones Graecae*, I<sup>3</sup>, he saw work on the tablets from Persepolis as his highest priority. After his death in 1994 Rhodes, as his literary executor, invited Osborne to join him in persevering with the project; and this volume, which we dedicate to the memory of David Lewis, is the result.<sup>105</sup>

The Preface goes on to report their use of Lewis's Nachlass, but also to allude both to 'significant new texts ... and fragments' and to their aim 'to broaden the thematic range and to include a greater selection of material from outside Athens'.

47. However, despite a high level of continuity from the earlier postwar volumes in content, there have been striking changes in format (these comments apply to both the 2003 and the 2017 volumes). What had been octavo is now Crown Octavo: the page count has soared: a selection of photographs of inscriptions has been inserted: commentaries have burgeoned in size, detail, and contextualisation: and line-by-line translations into English have been added Loeb-Library-style on right-hand pages. Not all, however, is gain: as in *Decrees* (§35 above), the font size has shrunk: Greek names are now Romanised, not transliterated: what was portable at 450 g. now weighs down the satchel at 1200 g.: and what was student-affordable in the 1990s was already £140 in 2017.

<sup>103</sup> P.J. Rhodes & Robin Osborne (eds), *Greek Historical Inscriptions 404–323 BC* (Oxford: University Press, 2003), ISBN 0–19–815313–9. Reviews include: Th. Corsten, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2004.10.08; T. Harrison, *Greece & Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 51 (2004), 260; P.A. Low, *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 125 (2005), 185–6; S.D. Olson, *Classical World*, 99 (2006), 463–4; J.P. Sickinger, *American Journal of Archaeology*<sup>2</sup>, 109 (2005), 314–15; I. Worthington, *Classical Review*<sup>2</sup>, 55 (2005), 315–17.

<sup>104</sup> Reviews: P. Brun, *Bryn Mawr Classical Review*, 2019–03–13; N. Ehrhardt, *Sehepunkte*, 15.10.2019, <https://sehepunkte.de/2019/10/31533.html> (accessed 18.02.2025); L. Lazar, *Classics Ireland*, 25 (2018), 140–3; D. Rousset, *Revue des Études Grecques*, 131 (2019), 557–8 no.8; K. Vlassopoulos, *Greece & Rome*<sup>2</sup>, 65 (2018), 258–9.

<sup>105</sup> Rhodes compiled a fuller account on p. 15 of what was posthumously published as 'David M. Lewis, 1928–1994' in Andronike Makres & P.J. Rhodes (eds), *ΓΡΑΜΜΑΤΑ ΑΡΧΑΙΑ: Studies in memory of David M. Lewis (1928–1994)* (Athens: Ellenike Epigraphike Etairia, 2024), pp. 13–16.

48. All the same, substantial value has been added. It is far from having been a simple update of readings of the Greek texts (the editors, ironically enough not being themselves first-hand epigraphists, acknowledge much help from experienced Greek and British colleagues). Rather, it has been the product of two processes of choice. The first, deducible from the identities and natures of the new additions, can be inferred to have been a desire to find documents that could offer windows onto a geographically and thematically wider spectrum of Greek history, society and culture than had been provided by the largely politico-military selections made by Hicks, Tod, and Meiggs-Lewis. The second choice, consequential upon the first, was to expand the commentaries in order to explain the nature, background and significance of each document in enough detail to give the reader full cognisance and understanding. The result has been two-edged. On the one hand it has yielded a sequence of complete, detailed and valuable academic essays which are gifts to scholarship. However, in some ways it has rendered the volumes less accessible to the student.

### Other themes and wider interests

49. Stakhanovite though Rhodes unquestionably was in respect of writing and publishing on Classical Greek history in general and Athenian history in particular, he also had other strings to his bow. True, only one paper of his can be classified as being specifically on a topic of Roman history,<sup>106</sup> but other areas and polities of Classical Greece did attract his detailed attention: Macedonia, for example, with a book review<sup>107</sup> and a very useful survey of historical sources,<sup>108</sup> Sparta with notes on the ephors,<sup>109</sup> the constitution,<sup>110</sup> foreign relations,<sup>111</sup> and a treaty,<sup>112</sup> Achaimenid Persia also for one of her treaties,<sup>113</sup> Boiotia for her democracy,<sup>114</sup> and Sicily for an aspect of its epigraphic documentation.<sup>115</sup>

<sup>106</sup> 'Silvae Callesque', *Historia*, 27 (1978), 617–20.

<sup>107</sup> Review of J.R. Ellis, *Philip II and Macedonian Imperialism* (London: Thames & Hudson, 1976), in *The Times Literary Supplement*, 21 January 1977, 89.

<sup>108</sup> 'The literary and epigraphic evidence, to the Roman Conquest', in J. Roisman & I. Worthington (eds), *A Companion to Ancient Macedonia* (Malden MA, Oxford & Chichester: Wiley/Blackwell, 2010), pp. 21–40.

<sup>109</sup> 'The selection of ephors at Sparta', *Historia*, 30 (1981), 498–502.

<sup>110</sup> 'The Spartan alternative', *Omnibus*, 31 (January 1996), 4–5.

<sup>111</sup> 'Sparta, Thebes, and Autonomia', *Eirene*, 35 (1999 [2000]), 33–40.

<sup>112</sup> 'The Erxadieis inscription', *Acta Antiqua Hungarica*, 51 (2011 [2012]), 11–15; remarkably, not cited in *Greek Historical inscriptions 478–404 BC*, pp. 156–61 no.128.

<sup>113</sup> 'Heracleides of Clazomenae and an Athenian treaty with Persia', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 200 (2016), 177–186.

<sup>114</sup> 'Boiotian democracy', in S.D. Gartland (ed.), *Boiotia in the Fourth Century B.C.* (Philadelphia: U. of Pennsylvania Press, 2016), pp. 59–64 with 183–5.

<sup>115</sup> 'The tablets in the context of Hellenistic decrees', in J.R.W. Prag & C. Ampolo (eds). PJR inserted the reference in his list of 'articles', but the intended volume has not yet been published (Jonathan Prag, pers. comm.)

Much of this work, of course, was a product of, or was preliminary work for, *Decrees*, or for the three volumes of *Greek Historical Inscriptions*, or for the narrative monographs, just as a similar thematic link connected various papers on citizenship and political theory<sup>116</sup> with his *Ancient Democracy and Modern Ideology* of 2003 (§39 above) and with the multi-author assemblage *Athenian Democracy* of 2004 (§38). Numismatic matters provided another interest, yielding three papers,<sup>117</sup> while the links between Athenian tragedy and democracy yielded a further four.<sup>118</sup>

50. Other matters were more personal. As demonstrated above (§§10–11, 16, 18–19, 35, 46), Rhodes owed a great deal to David Lewis, but as his literary executor he repaid the debt handsomely by his labours on *Decrees* (§35 above), by his editorship of Lewis's *Selected Papers*,<sup>119</sup> and by the obituaries of Lewis that he contributed to *The Times* and to the Greek epigraphic journal *Horos*.<sup>120</sup> Rhodes was also deeply committed to his own students and protégés. While he had relatively few official research students (Ian Worthington was the first, now the Professor of Ancient History at Macquarie University in Sydney), he was dedicated to encouraging young academics at the beginning of their careers, both at Durham and more widely. All of those who worked with him speak of his great generosity with time and knowledge. There was always time for coffee or tea, and sorting out difficult historical problems. Indeed, he took pleasure in supporting academics globally. In the tributes collated on his death from around the world, many speak of his mentorship and intellectual and personal generosity. His own sense of responsibility for Greek historians was not just for those in the UK, but worldwide: Japan, Russia and China, in particular.

<sup>116</sup> E.g. 'The "Acephalous" Polis?', *Historia*, 44 (1995), 153–67; 'A Graeco-Roman perspective', in F.E. Dowrick (ed.), *Human rights: Problems and perspectives* (Westmead: Saxon House, 1979), pp. 62–77; 'Civic ideology and citizenship', in R.K. Balot (ed.), *A Companion to Greek and Roman Political Thought* (Malden MA, Oxford & Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell, 2009), pp. 57–69; 'What is a constitution?', in C. Bearzot et al. (eds), *Athenaion Politeiai tra storia, politica e sociologia: Aristotele e Pseudo-Senofonte* (Milano: L.E.D., 2018), pp. 21–31; and 'Greek citizenship', in J. Filonik, Chr. Plastow & R. Zelnick-Abramowitz (eds), *Citizenship in Antiquity: civic communities in the Ancient Mediterranean* (Abingdon & New York: Routledge, 2023), pp. 36–47.

<sup>117</sup> 'Solon and the numismatists', *Numismatic Chronicle*<sup>7</sup>, 15 (1975), 1–11; 'Solon and the numismatists: Postscript', *Numismatic Chronicle*<sup>7</sup>, 17 (1977), 152; 'Milesian stephanephoro: Applying Cavaignac correctly', *Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik*, 157 (2006), 116.

<sup>118</sup> 'Nothing to do with democracy: Athenian drama and the polis', *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 123 (2003), 104–19; 'The Dionysia and democracy again', *Classical Quarterly*<sup>2</sup>, 61 (2011), 71–4; 'Response to M. Griffith and E. O'Kell', in D.M. Carter (ed.), *Why Athens? A reappraisal of tragic politics* (Oxford: University Press, 2011), pp. 237–41; 'Athenian democracy and tragedy', in H. Roisman (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Greek Tragedy* (Chichester, Malden MA & Oxford: Wiley-Blackwell, 2013), I, pp. 155–9.

<sup>119</sup> D.M. Lewis, *Selected Papers in Greek and Near Eastern History* (Cambridge: University Press, 1997). Reviews: A.L. Boegehold, *Classical World*, 93 (1999/2000), 295–6; R. Thomas, *Times Literary Supplement*, 9 October 1998, 31; W.C. West, *American Journal of Philology*, 120 (2000), 320–4; D. Whitehead, *Phoenix*, 52 (1998), 389–91.

<sup>120</sup> *The Times*, 18 July 1994, 19; 'David M. Lewis, 1928–1994', *Horos*, 10–12 (1992–98 [1999]), 17–19.

51. Nevertheless, his ever-frustrated yearning to return to Oxford did not preclude a strong loyalty to Durham. Despite all of his many activities, Rhodes still played a full part in the life of his Department, and served as Head of Department on a number of occasions. David Hunt, one of his colleagues in the Durham Department, notes:

It goes without saying that he was enviably efficient and well organised in his manner of working, and seemed capable of absorbing ever increasing burdens of administration without obvious disruption to, perhaps even because of, his notoriously disciplined and seemingly unwavering routine of life (by which you could ‘set your clock’, as people have often said). It was a wonder to me that Peter’s desk was always impeccably tidy, the surface clear except for the immediate task in hand.

Further, in his bibliography he lists four obituaries of his Durham colleagues, and a fifth (not listed) was published in the year of his own death.<sup>121</sup> He also published a guide (in Latin) to what was once Durham Castle<sup>122</sup> and is now University College. He also wrote for the College’s annual journal, *Castellum*, a short memoir for W.D. Lowe, after whom the College Library was named, and a history of the College in the second half of the 20th century, to which he added (although it was not complete at the time of Rhodes’s death) a survey on life in Durham in the 1960s, published posthumously.<sup>123</sup>

52. The University College chapel, moreover, was a venue for the ‘music’ which he listed publicly as one of his three ‘recreations’, ‘for the whole of my time being a member of the College chapel congregation and of its choir’.<sup>124</sup> A second, more unexpected recreation was ‘typography’, which dates from his Barnet school days when he was involved with the running of the school’s printing press. Yet it was his third recreation, ‘travel’, that was the revelation, for his appetite for visiting foreign countries was insatiable, and his reactions to the experience, in the form of detailed travelogues that he subsequently circulated to family, friends, and colleagues, constitute an invaluable

<sup>121</sup> ‘Richard Pearson Wright (1908–92)’, *Castellum*, 45 (1993), 7; ‘Gavin Bernard Townend (4th September 1919 – 20th March 2010)’, *Postmaster* (Merton College, Oxford) 2010, 147, and ‘Gavin Bernard Townend (1919–2010) Professor and Classicist, University of Durham’, in G.R. Batho & A. Roberts (eds), *Durham Biographies*, vol. 7 (Durham: History of Education Project, 2012 [published 2013]), pp. 157–9; ‘Michael C. Stokes’ (published anonymously), *The Times*, 18 July, 2012, 48; ‘Dr. Ian Doyle (24 October 1925 – 4 February 2018)’, *Castellum*, 70 (2017/2018), 69–70; ‘Edward Charles Salthouse (1935–2020) (Master of University College 1979–1996)’, *Castellum*, 73 (2020/2021), 68–69 [not included in PJR’s list of publications].

<sup>122</sup> Judged to be ‘one of the most impressive and best preserved in the whole country’: N. Pevsner & E. Williamson, *The Buildings of England: County Durham*<sup>2</sup> (1983), p. 18.

<sup>123</sup> ‘Circumductio Castellii Dunelmensis’, *Vox Latina*, 21 (1985 [7 August]), 351–4. W.D. Lowe (1879–1922): ‘The man behind the Lowe Memorial Library’, *Castellum*, 56 (2003/2004), 20–22. College history: ‘Forty years (and more) ago’, *Castellum*, 57 (2004/2005), 21–27. Life in Durham: ‘Durham in the 1960s’, *Castellum*, 74 (2021/2022), 52–66.

<sup>124</sup> ‘Euthynai (Accounting)’, 11.



archive:<sup>125</sup> Rhodes himself once referred to them playfully as ‘Aestival apodêmiai’, thus exquisitely bridging the two linguistic streams of an ancient historian’s consciousness.<sup>126</sup>

### Assessment, appreciation, recognition

53. The foregoing paragraphs have described the various facets of Rhodes’s scholarly creativity, and have attempted to evaluate their contribution to knowledge and education. We add ‘and education’ because the didactic mode has been present throughout, both where it predominated (as in the editions of single books of Thucydides, or in the narrative histories) and where it provided a background of simplicity of style and terminology for expositions of more complex administrative or historiographical matters. Besides didactic utility, two other characteristics of his activity stand out. One of them was formulated by Rhodes himself in his partly autobiographical retirement speech: ‘I think people would probably agree in describing my own approach as traditional but not ultra-traditional’.<sup>127</sup> It was certainly ‘traditional’, comprising a life-long concentration of scholarly effort focused very largely on the Classic period of Greek history, its core city, and its signature institution of democracy, and it was reinforced by a consistent old-fashioned Romanisation of Greek proper names in his texts, by a strong and reasoned antipathy to the pressures exerted on universities and their staff by the ‘quality industry’, and by a high degree of formality in dress, speech and deportment. Whether he reached the ‘ultra’-level is debatable, but he showed little or no interest in the cultic or economic or technological or demographic aspects of ancient Greece, and was vulnerable both to Osborne’s 2010 charge that ‘... general discussions of Athenian democracy continue to paint their picture on a narrowly political canvass’<sup>128</sup> and to a lack of engagement even with relevant strands of the social sciences such as theories of institutional frameworks.<sup>129</sup>

54. One further characteristic can also be detected throughout his oeuvre: an almost obsessive focus on details and references. It began right at the start of his career, with the ‘Additional notes’ and meticulously documented lists and tables that provided the evidence for his argument in *Boulé* and filled it out as a physical volume. It continued

<sup>125</sup> A near complete collection of the ‘Aestival apodêmiai’ will be made available separately. The very earliest were only ‘paper copy’, so not all have survived.

<sup>126</sup> The phrase features in the Preface to *Law and Drama* (n. 100 above).

<sup>127</sup> In pp. 8–9 of his valedictory lecture ‘Euthynai (Accounting)’, delivered in May 2005 on the occasion of his retirement and published by the University later in the same year: understandably a very revealing text.

<sup>128</sup> R. Osborne, *Athens and Athenian Democracy* (Cambridge: University Press, 2010); 2nd edn (2012), p. xii.

<sup>129</sup> E.g. J.G. March & J.P. Olsen, ‘Elaborating the “New Institutionalism”’, in R.E. Goodin (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Political Science* (Oxford: University Press, 2009), pp. 159–75.

elsewhere, sometimes as end-of-volume notes, sometimes transplanted into the main text in the form of the bracketed source-references that feature so visibly in *A History of the Classical Greek World*. But it has been in RO and OR, the replacements for Tod's *Greek Historical Inscriptions* I and II, that the focus on details and references has reached its apogee. The logic is stark enough: every aspect of an inscription may need to be squeezed in order to release its information, and the whole resources of scholarship may need to be invoked in order to do so and to set that information in context. In these volumes Rhodes was in his element. It was in unearthing detail that he found the connections to make big ideas. This is what we find, for example, in *Boulé* or *Decrees*. He did not think of himself as a 'big thinker'. However, one of his major strengths was to control vast amounts of detail in order to allow big ideas and structures to emerge.

55. Once during his lifetime, and once posthumously, Rhodes had the honour of being the recipient of a volume of academic essays, contributed and presented to him by international colleagues and friends who knew the value of his scholarship and wished to salute his achievements. The first,<sup>130</sup> published in 2009, was almost a Greek historian's workshop manual. It carried 15 such essays, linked thematically by the conference's working title 'The epigraphic habit: inscriptions in the polis', and linked methodologically by an awareness, which all historians of ancient Greece share, of the challenges generated by the difficulties involved in marrying and reconciling the information offered by the various genres of evidence. The second volume, published in 2022 but already in proof at his death, was created by Delfim Leão and his colleagues at Coimbra.<sup>131</sup> It offered a wider scope, reflecting Rhodes's own range of types of scholarship with remarkable precision by embracing History and Biography (nine papers), Law (eight papers), Politics (six papers), and Epigraphy (five papers). Again, the contributors were international, indeed worldwide: again, there were warm words everywhere for the friendship and assistance which Rhodes had given to contributors over the decades. Between them the two volumes offered Rhodes a heart-felt final salutation from his fellow-scholars. Institutions, moreover, had the same instinct. In its usual clipped style, the 2017 edition of Debrett's *People of Today* recorded the following details of his career and distinctions:

*Career*: Univ of Durham,; lectr in classics and ancient history 1965–77, sr lectr 1977–83, prof of ancient history 1983–2005, hon prof 2005- ; jr fell Center for Hellenic Studies Washington DC 1978–79, visiting fell Wolfson College Oxford 1984, visiting research fell Univ of New England NSW Australia 1988, memb Inst for

<sup>130</sup> L. Mitchell & L. Rubenstein, *Greek History and Epigraphy. Essays in honour of P.J. Rhodes* (Swansea: Classical Press of Wales, 2009), ISBN 978–1–905125–23–4.

<sup>131</sup> D. Leão, D. Ferreira, N. Simões Rodrigues & R. Morais (eds), *Our Beloved Polites: Studies presented to P.J. Rhodes* (Oxford: Archaeopress Archaeology, 2022), ISBN 978–1–80327–170–5; e-Pdf 978–1–80327–171–2.

Advanced Study Princeton NJ 1988–89, visiting fell Corpus Christi Coll Oxford 1993, Leverhulme research fell 1994–95, visiting fell All Souls Coll Oxford 1998, Langford Family eminent scholar Florida State Univ 2002; Sackler lectr Tel Aviv Univ 2013, pres Classical Assoc 2014–15; Chancellor's Medal Univ of Durham 2015, FBA 1987, foreign memb, Royal Danish Acad 2005, fell Fondazione Lorenzo Valla 2010.

Whether sought by Rhodes, or simply conferred by external initiative, so exceptional a list of honours and appointments speaks for itself: it reflects a general recognition<sup>132</sup> of his distinction within his scholarly field of publication. As he said in his Inaugural Lecture, and repeated in his valedictory, what he hoped for was 'that the University will not find so many other things for him to do that he is left with no time in which to profess his subject.'<sup>133</sup> He was given time; he used it with extraordinary energy and efficiency; and he did profess his subject to a degree that few others have achieved.

56. His own verdict on himself was that he was among the top class of Ancient Historians of his generation, but not at the top of that class. That is a judgement which not all his peers might endorse. Largely a historian in the positivist tradition, he held conservative views about what could be known, how that knowledge could be reached, and how it could be generalised. It is telling that in all three commentaries on Thucydides, the introductions to each volume largely (with very minor variation) reproduce the same text: there were things he thought needed to be said about the author, which the context of the individual books and their content did not affect. Here we seem to see the insistence on the importance of a narrow range of knowledge of 'history' and 'things' at the expense of a wider and more nuanced vision of how societies, ancient authors and the texts they produced interacted. However, he could appreciate the value in different approaches, as his own supervision of graduate students demonstrated. In this regard in particular, we can see both his conservatism and his intellectual generosity in being able to look beyond his own world view, even if he rarely engaged with these matters and approaches himself.

57. Rhodes had a gentle, but expansive, sense of humour. In the planning of his 65th birthday conference, Durham was originally proposed, and then other alternatives in the UK (university finances at the time were not easy for international conferences). The Greek island of Rhodes was finally suggested as a joking alternative, an idea which he picked up with great enthusiasm: thus was born 'Rhodes on Rhodes', an international conference in his honour on the Greek island of Rhodes, an event in which he took enormous pleasure. He was also curious about the wider world: he was indefatigable in his attempts to visit as many corners and peoples of the world as he could, and was a

<sup>132</sup> That recognition also permeated the obituaries [P. Cartledge, R. Osborne, L. Mitchell], biography [R. Osborne], and 'Appreciation' [J.K. Davies] listed in n. 1 above.

<sup>133</sup> 'What Alcibiades Did or What Happened to Him' (above §41), p. 1; 'Euthynai (Accounting)', p. 11.

keen observer of cultural differences and cultural change over time, as the ‘apodêmiai’ demonstrate (§52). Immensely shy, his friends and colleagues speak of his warmth and kindness, in matters both personal and scholarly. Indeed, Peter Rhodes will be remembered for his generosity and wisdom as a colleague and friend, always allowing room for other people’s views and opinions, even if he did not always agree, as much as for his scholarly distinction.

### *Acknowledgements*

The initial comments on PJR’s narrative biography are drawn from his own notes deposited with the British Academy (May 1998; an addendum was added December 2011), as well as interviews with his family. Later comments include interviews with students, collaborators, colleagues and friends, and tributes collated for his memorial service in Durham Cathedral in November 2021. For assistance in the preparation of this memoir we thank alphabetically: A.M. Anderson (University College, University of Durham); Emma Bridges (Open University); Mirko Canevaro (University of Edinburgh); Paul Cartledge (Clare College, University of Cambridge); Peter Fawcett; Oleg Gabenko *et al.* (Russia); Yuzuru Hashiba *et al.* (University of Tokyo); Elizabeth Irwin (Columbia University); Delfim Leão (University of Coimbra); Sergei Karpyuk (Moscow); Stephen Lambert (Cardiff University); David Hunt (University of Durham); John Marr (University of Exeter); Robin Osborne (King’s College, University of Cambridge); Jonathan Prag (Merton College, Oxford); Jacek Rzepka (University of Warsaw); Lene Rubinstein (Royal Holloway, University of London); Loren J. Samons II (Boston University); Greg Stanton (University of New England, Australia); Robert Wallace (Northwestern University); Sue Willetts (Joint Library, ICS, London); David Whitehead (Queen’s University Belfast); Ian Worthington (Macquarie University).

*Note on the authors:* J.K. Davies is Emeritus Professor of Ancient History and Classical Archaeology at the University of Liverpool; he was elected a Fellow of the British Academy in 1985. Lynette Mitchell is Professor Emerita in Greek History and Politics at the University of Exeter.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NoDerivatives 4.0 International License.

*Biographical Memoirs of Fellows of the British Academy* (ISSN 2753–6777) are published by The British Academy, 10–11 Carlton House Terrace, London, SW1Y 5AH  
[www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk](http://www.thebritishacademy.ac.uk)