

Joint Berlin-Jerusalem Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program

Confidential information

Yehudah (Yuddi) Gershon

Application number: joint-postdocs-5164

Core Data

Contact Address: Prinzenallee 29
13359 Berlin
Germany

Email: yngershon@gmail.com

Field of Research: Humanities

Title of Research Proposal: The Place of Poikilia: Fact, Fiction and Narrative Control in Greek Historiographers

PhD University: University of Cambridge

Year of PhD:

Current Institution: N/A

Year of Award:

Recommendation 1, First Name(s): Stephen

Recommendation 1, Last name: Oakley

Recommendation 1, Institution: University of Cambridge

Recommendation 2, First Name(s): Kai

Recommendation 2, Last Name: Brodersen

Recommendation 2, Institution: Universität Erfurt

Endorsement FUB, first name(s): Christian

Endorsement FUB, last name: Wendt

Endorsement HUJI, first name(s): Donna

Endorsement HUJI, last name: Shalev

Upload Area

1.:

Uploaded Files

Figure 1: Project Proposal and time plan, 1 (2018_01_31_1517390105.pdf)

The Place of *Poikilia*: Fact, Fiction and Narrative Control in Greek Historiographers
– Y. N. Gershon

Introduction: Outlining a Concept

Who controls the narrative? What is at stake when truth and fiction battle it out? How should past actions be presented and canonised? How should they be remembered or, conversely, forgotten? These questions are highly relevant in our present political climate, but they are hardly new. Since the invention of scientific and historical prose, the quality, content, and construction of the narrative form have been debated. But its construction was no accident: conceptual tools were developed and used to ensure that narrated events and acts would both stimulate and entertain the readership, as well as offer up the annals of the past as useful lessons that could be acted upon.

The research project addresses the specific question: how is one to identify how writers of historical narratives, particularly lengthy ones, sought to maintain vitality? That is, how did they seek to please and engage their readerships when it came to questions of subject selection and arrangement so that events would be canonised in an ideologically suitable manner? I will examine an underappreciated aspect of narrative composition in classical historiography. The focus of my work is *poikilia*, variation.

Poikilia is the aesthetic term used to denote the remission of 'monotony' through variety, versatility, subtlety and complexity. *Poikilia* could manifest itself through the inclusion of fabricated speeches and fictive elements, mythological or geographic digression, and ethnographic description. Classical historical narratives were not solely structured around the chronological sequencing of 'the facts': truth was not the only concern of the historian. Rather, his relationship with his audience was paramount. *Poikilia* strengthened this connection. If collective memory is canonised in literature by the connection between author and readership, then *poikilia* is the conceptualising tool that more precisely nuances the readership's relationship and identification with the past.

My PhD thesis on the historical work of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Antiquitates Romanae* prepared me well for considering such long texts and the issue of *poikilia*. In addition, Dionysius is the author of numerous essays and speeches which are especially informative for those interested in classical literary theory. For the current purpose, Dionysius' *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius* provides the fundamental tools with which to understand variation. Despite this however, *poikilia* remains a slippery term, as the language for discussing it was never strictly formalised in antiquity.

Redressing the Absence of Critical Engagement

Our understanding of *poikilia* has progressed, but so far no synthetic analysis has been devoted to assessing it in lengthy prose narratives. Scale and length matter because the canvas for variety is dramatically expanded. Operating at length means that a particular image of society as a whole can be created, reconfigured or remembered: memory works collectively and in context rather than limiting itself to individual episodes. Classicists have not always been adept at studying larger units of texts. In fact, recent work on organisation, structure and composition has focused instead on the microcosmic subdivision of the book.

I will confront this issue of scale by focusing on the Greek historians of Rome for the main component of my research. Their works are extremely long. Even though almost none survives

Figure 2: Project Proposal and time plan, 2 (2018_01_31_1517390105.pdf)

The Place of *Poikilia*: Fact, Fiction and Narrative Control in Greek Historiographers – Y. N. Gershon

complete, reading Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Strabo, is daunting, even to the most patient classicist. Selections from these authors will be the focus of the project. I envisage producing a series of articles, beginning with establishing a broad definition of *poikilia* (including Dionysius' views on Thucydides within his literary critical works) before turning to Thucydides himself. The articles that follow will consider the narrative elements of each of my chosen Greek historians of Rome in turn.

Since Plato and Aristotle, it has been acknowledged that unity was the guiding organisational principle of classical literature. Interest in *poikilia* has only recently emerged, notably with Fitzgerald (2016). He focuses on the related phenomenon of *varietas* in Latin, occasionally seguing into Greek poetry. He establishes that variety for variety's sake was indeed a goal for classical authors. Variety, he claims, "brings with it a semantic field and a complex of metaphors and *topoi*", a veritable "toolkit". The time is ripe to move the debate to Greek prose and reveal the place of *poikilia* in canonising, relating, and memorialising events within narrative.

Fundamental Questions and Approaches

In comprehending structural *poikilia*, I understand there to be two primary principles that must be borne in mind. Firstly, how should a text strike a balance between coherence and variation? Secondly, how should the material in a text be divided and distributed?

Traditionally, approaches to these arguments have framed the issue as a battle between 'time' and 'space', i.e. chronology and geography. Each of the Greek historians of Rome adopts different approaches to this issue. An examination of *poikilia* in long narrative texts would break this polarity. I will consider the structuring principles of these authors, more formally incorporating *poikilia* into the historian's 'toolbox'. Moreover, it is envisaged that in understanding how *poikilia* operates on a narrative and structural scale, we may better appreciate the relationship between collective memory, author and readership.

If one is to understand narratological methodology at work, it is not enough to pull isolated quotations from the text. Rather, one must confront episodes and structures: why and how is a particular story told, how are particular books or series of episodes structured, what is the impact of a particular speech, and why is a particular kind of digression favoured? Equally, there is as much to be gained in appreciating why an author does *not* apply a particular technique, as in seeing what he does do. *Collective* appreciation will further strengthen this awareness as conclusions will be universal rather than limited to a single author.

For example, both Polybius and Dionysius employ similar language when discussing the relationship between digression and variegation. However, it is only through comparison that we see how each uses digression quite differently. Dionysius dislikes introducing mythological material and is more reticent about geographic digression than Polybius. The historian Strabo, on the other hand, revises the digressive relationship between chronology and geography in his appropriately named *Geographika*.

Figure 3: Project Proposal and time plan, 3 (2018_01_31_1517390105.pdf)

The Place of *Poikilia*: Fact, Fiction and Narrative Control in Greek Historiographers – Y. N. Gershon

Year One, Stage One: Professor Wendt at Freie Universität Berlin

While the Greek historians of Rome provide plenty of source material for examining *poikilia* on a grand scale, the foundation for such a survey must be firm and based on a rigorous methodology. As such, the first port of call must be to collect notions of what is meant by authors to be guided by *poikilia* across genres in order to confirm its essential pliability as a term. From rhetorical guidebooks, to the Greek novelists, from Aelian's third century CE *Historical Miscellany* (*poikile historia*), to associated *Buntschriftstellereien*, from Plutarch's essays, to the rhetorician Himerius instructing his students to indulge in *poikilia*, there exist a myriad of possible different lineages of what *poikilia* meant to various prose authors in antiquity when it was specifically invoked. The modern tendency might be to seek a classification and definition of the term and then investigate its appearance in the corpus. However, given that *poikilia* lacks a strict definition, it is essential to be flexible in approach and be prepared for expectations to morph and change. However, the collection of this evidence from the start of the project will mean that the temptation to limit the scope of the definition will be resisted. A contextual understanding must always be upheld.

For the purpose of this project, the key document for analysing the place of *poikilia* in historiography is the aforementioned *Letter to Gnaeus Pompeius* by Dionysius of Halicarnassus. It contains his "most complete and intended statements on the science of writing history". It is not an abstract attempt to define the term. Rather the letter examines and compares the famed Greek historians of the classical period, Herodotus and Thucydides. In his analysis, Dionysius investigates what the essential tasks of a historian should be. In addition, the topic of *poikilia* periodically rears its head through the remainder of Dionysius' literary critical corpus, including in an essay specifically devoted to Thucydides and in the *Second Letter to Ammaeus*, where Thucydides is again a featuring theme. Dionysius is extremely divided on Thucydides. At one moment, he criticises Thucydides for producing a plodding and exhausting history, the next Dionysius complements him for his digressive tendencies, as well as for Thucydides' ability to vary and enliven the text. This can only speak for the potential that the text of Thucydides has for assisting in our understanding of *poikilia*. The comparison with Herodotus, whom Dionysius admires greatly, is equally instructive.

If Dionysius, in the fullest discussions of *poikilia* in antiquity, is split as to whether Thucydides' narrative fulfils the basic attributes associated with *poikilia*, then this must be where deep research must begin. It speaks of the inherent importance of the term as well as its mutability. Although the work of Rood (1998) and Hornblower (1994) have considered the basic narrative structures of Thucydides's *History of the Peloponnesian War*, no work to date has looked at how *poikilia* might have impacted on its architecture.

This is why it is essential to begin my examination of *poikilia* at FU Berlin with Professor Christian Wendt. Professor Wendt has led an incredibly successful research group at FU Berlin which actively sought international collaboration and published its results. He also founded the Berlin Thucydides Center and is closely connected with the Berlin excellence cluster TOPOI. Professor Wendt also has a demonstrable interest in Roman history as evidenced by his PhD thesis, as well as experience supervising on Thucydides and Greek historiography. His track record is beyond reproach. There could be no better supervisor to assist me in establishing my project, preparing elements for publication and setting me on the right path. Additionally, Professor Wendt's project

Figure 4: Project Proposal and time plan, 4 (2018_01_31_1517390105.pdf)

The Place of *Poikilia*: Fact, Fiction and Narrative Control in Greek Historiographers – Y. N. Gershon

has sought to reappraise the text of Thucydides. It is with mindset, too, that I approach the author. Professor Wendt's own project will feed into mine and he expects my work to complement his own. Thanks to this fellowship program, both our research aims will be greater than the sum of efforts if we were not to collaborate.

Professor Wendt and I have met and discussed the project to the great enthusiasm of all. We have already discussed which Thucydidean episodes would be most appropriate for us to examine once I have conducted an initial survey and classification of *poikilia*. I therefore envisage our collaboration beginning with an article defining terms and signally directions before it considers these episodes. If this is more fruitful than we initially expect, I will split this work over two articles.

A further benefit to working with Professor Wendt is that he is also an active participant in a lively, responsive and friendly institute, namely, the Friedrich-Meinecke-Institut at FU Berlin. I will be closely integrated into the working of the research environment there. Indeed, as I am fluent in German I am well placed to embrace the community. The interests of other professors align with aspects of my own project after its initial phase. Professor Ernst Baltrusch is an expert on Roman History, while Professor Geus is an expert on the historical geography of the Mediterranean. I have made contact with both of these esteemed professors and they have encouraged me to begin my project with Professor Wendt as he is a well-regarded published expert in both Greek historiography and Roman history. I look forward to consulting with the rest of the Institute as my project moves on to consider the Greek historians of Rome. I already have a good relationship with Professor Geus as I have been attending his reading group for the geographer Strabo at the Friedrich-Meinecke-Institut for the last eight months. Professor Geus is also closely associated with the TOPOI, the research network and excellence cluster which is devoted to space and knowledge in the ancient world.

Year One, Stage Two: Diodorus and Strabo

Once my work on classifications of *poikilia* and Thucydides is complete, I will begin work on two pieces that will benefit from the research community and the institutional environment at the Friedrich-Meinecke-Institut and at TOPOI more broadly. Specifically, I shall examine two Greek writers of Rome who have strong predispositions for geographical content, Diodorus Siculus and Strabo. These are authors with whom I am already familiar from earlier research projects which means I am well prepared to get to the nub of the issue and focus on what each requires. No time will therefore be lost in directionless general reading.

Articles on individual authors will each follow a similar path. In the first instance, explicit statements on compositional strategies made by a given author will be collected. Then strategies of variegation will be studied in each by the selection of discrete case studies. These will enrich our understanding of an author's compositional strategy beyond his own explicit statements.

Diodorus is an essential author in understanding how *poikilia* as a structural phenomenon interacts with different narratological governing principles. This is because Diodorus is a universal historian, that is, he sought to include everything. In so doing, he was faced with serious questions

Figure 5: Project Proposal and time plan, 5 (2018_01_31_1517390105.pdf)

The Place of *Poikilia*: Fact, Fiction and Narrative Control in Greek Historiographers – Y. N. Gershon

of narrative organisation. His solution was novel, in that he split his history into two parts, each with different primary principles of narrative organisation. This allows us to see how he employed *poikilia* in parts of the texts with quite different tones: from book 7 onwards, Diodorus is led by an annalistic structure, while in the 'prehistory' of books 1-6, the movement of the text is directed by ethnographic and geographic concerns. For Diodorus, I would revisit my research project on book 5 ('the book of the islands') and investigate compositional differences in variety between Diodorus' first six books and the remainder of his work. My earlier research on Diodorus examined how he was influenced by ethnographic writings, utopic writings, and by writers of *periploi* (sea voyages). This chapter would see these generic precursors as more than informing the content of his text. Rather, it would see them as important components in structuring his narrative, thereby achieving *poikilia*. While the earlier books allowed him the most liberty to indulge in description and digression, we will see that these tendencies could never truly be abandoned. For example, Diodorus' description in book 14 of the expedition of King Cyrus through Asia Minor in 401 BC shows a still keen interest in geographic concerns, and his description is rich with ethnographic details.

Strabo is perhaps the most interesting author amongst the Greek historians of Rome as we cannot study his 'true' historical work, which does not survive. Instead, we must turn to his *Geographika*, which, thankfully, was also informed by long-standing historiographical principles. As we might expect from the title, Strabo surveyed the Roman Empire from a geographical perspective, preferring relative chronology to absolute dating methods. This will be an excellent testing ground for ensuring a robust definition of *poikilia* has been posited. It would clearly not be good enough, for example, if we were to have just defined *poikilia* as meaning something like 'opportunities for geographic or ethnographic digression', as these subjects are major concerns of the work! Rather we should consider how Strabo might introduce *historical* asides into a geographic text. That is to say, we are dealing with a text that inverts the narrative 'norms' of our other authors. It would be even more interesting to examine how Strabo uses geographic digression amid his more general geographic description. For example, Strabo, while discussing the Forum at Rome, segues into a short digression on Britain, by means of mentioning the slave trade between the two locations. For Strabo, then, we cannot focus on a single book or single narrative, but instead select and consider individual digressions and moments of *poikilia* on their own merits.

There can be little doubt therefore that beginning my project at FU Berlin will be of mutual benefit to all. In order to ensure that the move to Jerusalem in the second year of the fellowship is successful I will cultivate from Berlin my academic relationship with my putative mentor in Jerusalem, Professor Donna Shalev.

Year Two: Professor Shalev at Hebrew University Jerusalem

My time at HUJI will be devoted entirely to the Greek Historians of Rome with Professor Shalev. In the first instance, I will offer my work on Strabo and Diodorus written at FU Berlin for a final appraisal by Professor Shalev, before submitting these two articles for journal publication. My authors for consideration in Jerusalem will be Polybius and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, both writers of monumental histories which sought to explain the rise of Rome. They are closely connected in style as well as topic. Indeed, Dionysius very much imagines himself as the successor

Figure 6: Project Proposal and time plan, 6 (2018_01_31_1517390105.pdf)

The Place of *Poikilia*: Fact, Fiction and Narrative Control in Greek Historiographers
– Y. N. Gershon

to Polybius, seeking to explain those aspects of Roman history Polybius did not cover.

There could be no better supervisor for the next part of the project than Professor Donna Shalev. Indeed, I am very grateful that this application encouraged me to reach out to her. We spent a wonderful hour on the phone discussing mutual interests and how the project might be best structured to achieve greatest impact, as well as what approach would benefit both my research and her own. Indeed, she has already suggested a variety of texts which I might find of some help in the initial phases of the project. If we managed to make such strides in our first contact with another, I can only imagine what a whole year would bring.

Professor Shalev's research interests have also turned of late to the importance of *poikilia*. She has approached the topic from her interest in Plato (whose stylistics Dionysius of Halicarnassus also considers in his letters and essays) and structural *poikilia* specifically. As we both seek an expansive definition of *poikilia*, we are absolutely convinced that our research interests will complement and support one another. There could not be a better fit. We expect to build quite the research hub on the topic as Professor Shalev will also be concurrently supervising a PhD research topic on uses of variation in Latin. We anticipate that all our research threads will feed into one another. We have also discussed the Greek reading groups which she runs on topics in Greek prose. I will attend these to further integrate myself into the research community in Jerusalem. Furthermore, I shall attend open lectures at the Department of Classical Studies and at the History Department to further build relationships within the research community, as well as taking advantages of Professor Wendt's own relationships with professors in other departments, including those at HUJI's European Forum. I am also keen to contact researchers of Roman history within the History Department. Professor Shalev has also offered to put me in contact with professors in Israel who will have an interest in my project.

It is my hope that our work together at both universities will lead ultimately to an international conference on *poikilia* as a literary phenomenon and to an associated edited conference volume. If additional contacts at FU Berlin can also be brought into the fold, this would speak wonders for the ability of the Joint Berlin-Jerusalem Post-Doctoral Fellowship to foster collaboration as well as to achieve research goals befitting from the synergies between all involved parties. There also exists the opportunity to apply for seed funding in January 2019. I intend to work with both my mentors to ensure that an application for an intensive research workshop is submitted.

Let me now turn specifically to the articles I will prepare and submit for publication while I am at HUJI. I first consider the *Antiquitates Romanae* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. This examination of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Antiquitates Romanae* will be based upon my study of his literary critical works in chapter one, as well as on my research at PhD. This is the text with which I am most familiar, and I expect to have an abundance of material. I am therefore well prepared to publish the output swiftly.

A facet of Dionysius' style which was only glossed over in my thesis is his use of direct speech. Dionysius has long been vilified as a 'rhetorical' historian, as about one third of his text after book 2 is comprised of direct speech. As my PhD thesis posited, despite having a keen awareness of the essential nature of *poikilia*, Dionysius in fact limited his opportunities for incorporating it into his text, particularly when it came to digression. This reticence was due to his ideological disdain for

Figure 7: Project Proposal and time plan, 7 (2018_01_31_1517390105.pdf)

The Place of *Poikilia*: Fact, Fiction and Narrative Control in Greek Historiographers – Y. N. Gershon

including mythological material. Equally, as he was concerned only with the early rise of Rome, the geographic scope of his work was limited to Italy, and therefore possibilities for ethnographic or geographic material were restricted. The purpose of this article will therefore re-evaluate the presence of such rhetorical flourishes, seeing them not as quirks of composition, but instead as essential in maintaining narrative and structural *poikilia*. My case study in this will be the Coriolanus *Einzelersählung*, the longest single narrative component within the text, and one which is deserving of close and considered study. Preparation for this work will also be assisted by a book chapter I am currently preparing which is devoted to two key speeches in books 6 and 7 of the *Antiquitates*.

My final article will be devoted to the Hellenistic historian of Rome Polybius. Although Polybius did not write literary critical works, he is amongst the most self-aware of these authors. He wrote at length in book 36 on the exact purpose of digression in historical narrative and on marrying spatial and temporal concerns. Equally, his work opens by mentioning the need to 'interweave' his narrative, that is, to find the balance to cover enough ground (in the literal sense) while keeping to strict chronological structure. The basics of this 'interweaving' technique have been discussed in previous scholarship, and I intend to tie these discussions into the broader concern of *poikilia* as I have defined it. As Polybius is so self-aware, I envisage the collection and evaluation of Polybius' statements on narratology to comprise a large element of this article. But it is essential to study the application of such theory, even when faced with a text which can be fragmentary at moments and which would otherwise be ideal for suitable discussion. For example, we might consider Polybius book 6, his heralded discussion of the Roman constitution, or Polybius book 34, his geographic description of the inhabited world, in the light of our initial discussion of *poikilia* and digression. In fact, geographic descriptions (for example his digressions on Italy and Media) are frequent occurrences within his work. I expect therefore discussion of these to form a key part of my analysis.

Project Conclusions

Two related project conclusions may already be mooted. Firstly, a study of *poikilia* will bring its contrast with Latin *varietas* into sharper focus. In practice, this means engaging with the work of Fitzgerald. Above all, it entails contesting his claim that *copia*, that is 'abundance' of writing, was a principle of *varietas*, but not of *poikilia*. As the focus of my project is lengthy narrative texts, addressing questions relating to abundance and quantity will be essential.

Secondly, there is a historical element to contend with, as lengthy texts came into vogue only in the Hellenistic period. Therefore, we may expect the critical opinion of what exactly constituted *poikilia* to change over the course of time. Therefore, just as the 'toolkit' of variety has begun to be established in Latin, so my own work will contribute to a similar effort in Greek prose literature. I hope that, by the time my work is done, simply talking about 'lengthy' or 'long' texts will be inadequate.

Therefore, my project conceptualises the apparatus by which vivid, memorable, and ideologically sound visions of the past (mutually befitting both author and readership) were created.

Figure 8: Project Proposal and time plan, 8 (2018_01_31_1517390105.pdf)

**The Place of *Poikilia*: Fact, Fiction and Narrative Control in Greek Historiographers
– Y. N. Gershon**

I will establish a new critical language for the appreciation of such rich and multifaceted texts. If we understand how the past was variegated, (re)vitalised through *poikilia*, and reconstructed then we will understand not just how something is remembered, but how it is forgotten too. The Greek historians of Rome will stand in the vanguard of a variety revitalised.

Figure 9: Project Proposal and time plan, 9 (2018_01_31_1517390105.pdf)

The Place of *Poikilia*: Fact, Fiction and Narrative Control in Greek Historiographers – Y. N. Gershon

Select Bibliography

- Baltrusch E. and Wendt C. (2011), *Ein Besitz für immer?: Geschichte, Polis, und Völkerrecht bei Thukydides*, Baden-Baden.
- Fitzgerald W. (2016), *Variety: The Life of a Roman Concept*, Chicago.
- Flower M. A. and Marincola J. (2002), *Herodotus: Histories Book IX*, Cambridge.
- Fornaro, S. (1997), *Dionisio di Alicarnasso: Epistola a Pompeo Gemino*, Stuttgart.
- Fromentin, V. (1998), *Denys d'Halicarnasse: Antiquités romaines 1*, Paris.
- Grethlein, J., and A. Rengakos. (2009), *Narratology and Interpretation: The Content of Narrative Form in Ancient Literature*, Berlin; New York.
- Heath, M. (1989), *Unity in Greek Poetics*, Oxford.
- Hau, L. (2016), *Moral History from Herodotus to Diodorus Siculus*, Edinburgh.
- Hornblower, S. (1994), 'Narratology and Narrative Techniques in Thucydides', in S. Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography*, 131-166.
- Hornblower, S. (2013), *Herodotus Histories Book V*, Cambridge.
- Hose, M. (1994), *Erneuerung der Vergangenheit: Die Historiker im Imperium Romanum von Florus bis Cassius Dio*, Stuttgart.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (1999), 'Aspects narratologiques des Histoires d'Hérodote', *Lalies* 19, 217-275.
- de Jong, I. J. F. (2001), 'The Anachronical Structure of Herodotus' Histories', in S. J. Harrison (ed.), *Texts, Ideas and the Classics*, Oxford, 93-116.
- Levene, D. S. (2010), *Livy on the Hannibalic War*, Oxford.
- Muntz, C. E. (2017), *Diodorus Siculus and the World of the Late Roman Republic*, Oxford.
- Nünlist, R. (2009), *The Ancient Critic at Work: Terms and Concepts of Literary Criticism in Greek Scholia*, Cambridge.
- Pausanias, D. (2011), *Livius und der Leser: Narrative Strukturen in ab urbe condita*, Munich.
- Porter J. I. (2010), *The Origins of Aesthetic Thought in Ancient Greece: Matter, Sensation, and Experience*, Cambridge.
- Gibson, B. and Harrison T. (2013), *Polybius and his World: Essays in Memory of F. W. Walbank*, Oxford.
- Rood, T. (1998), *Thucydides: Narrative and Explanation*, Oxford.
- Sacks, K. S. (1990), *Diodorus Siculus and the First Century*, Princeton.
- Sacks, K. S. (1983), 'Historiography in the Rhetorical Works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus', *Athenaeum* 61, 65-87.
- Sacks, K. S. (1981), *Polybius on the Writing of History*, Berkeley.
- Shalev, D. (2006), 'Heliandus' Speakers: Multiculturalism and Literary Innovation in Conventions for Framing Speech. *Bulletin of the Institute of Classical Studies* 49, 165-191.
- Smith, C. and Yarrow, L. (2012), *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, and Polybius*, Oxford.
- Smith, S. (2017). *Man and animal in Severan Rome: The Literary Imagination of Claudius Aelianus*, Cambridge.
- Sulimani, I. (2011), *Diodorus' Mythistory and the Pagan Mission: Historiography and Culture-heroes in the First Pentad of the Bibliotheca*, Leiden.
- Thauer, C. and Wendt, C. (2016). *Thucydides and political order: Concepts of order and the history of the Peloponnesian War*, New York.
- Walbank, F. W. (1985), 'Sympleke: Its Role in Polybius' Histories', in F. W. Walbank (ed.), *Selected Papers: Studies in Greek and Roman History and Historiography*, Cambridge, 313-324.

Figure 10: Project Proposal and time plan, 10 (2018_01_31_1517390105.pdf)

TIME PLAN

MONTH	PROJECT COMPONENT	EVENTS
Oct 2018	Survey of explicit references to <i>poikilia</i> in Greek prose	Begin at Freie Universität Berlin
Nov 2018		
Dec 2018	Article:	
Jan 2019	Understanding Digression in Thucydides: The Place of <i>Poikilia</i>	Participate in putative application for Joint Seed Money Funding Scheme for research workshop
Feb 2019		
March 2019		
April 2019		
May 2019	Article:	Submit Thucydides paper
June 2019	Geographic and Ethnographic <i>Ekphrasis</i> in Diodorus. History vs Prehistory	
July 2019		
Aug 2019	Article:	
Sept 2019	History as Digression in Strabo	
Oct 2019		Begin at Hebrew University of Jerusalem
Nov 2019	Article:	Consult Professor Shalev and submit Diodorus and Strabo papers
Dec 2019	Rhetoric as a Facet of <i>Poikilia</i> in the <i>Antiquitates Romanae</i> of Dionysius of Halicarnassus	Proposed intensive research workshop on <i>poikilia</i> using seed funding
Jan 2020		
Feb 2020		
March 2020	Article:	
April 2020	Polybius' <i>Symploke</i>: <i>Poikilia</i>'s Ally or Adversary?	Submit Dionysius paper
May 2020		
June 2020		
July 2020		
Aug 2020		
Sept 2020	Concluding remarks and general trends	Submit Polybius paper

Figure 11: Curriculum Vitae including list of publications, 1 (2018_01_31_1517390890.pdf)

Yehudah Nataniel Gershon

Prinzenallee 29, 13359 Berlin
+49 176 38457935
y.n.gershon@gmail.com

EDUCATION AND ACADEMIC PLACEMENTS

University of Cambridge (UK): PhD in Classics — 2009–2016

“The *Antiquitates Romanae* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Construction and Composition”

A reanalysis of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' twenty-book-long *Antiquitates Romanae* from a historiographical and literary perspective

- Supervisors: Prof. Stephen Oakley, Prof. Richard Hunter and Prof. Simon Goldhill
- Examiners: Prof. Tim Whitmarsh and Prof. Matthew Fox

Princeton University (USA): Procter Fellowship — 2014–2015

- Participant in graduate classes including the seminar series *Augustan Religion and Politics*
- Presentation of research findings to seminars and classes
- Revision of PhD thesis chapter, reporting to Prof. Andrew Feldherr

University of Pennsylvania (USA): Visiting Scholar — 2014–2015

- Research for and revision of PhD thesis chapter

Universität Erfurt (Germany): DAAD Scholarship — 2010–2011

- Research project on Strabo's *Geographica*
- Research project on Diodorus Siculus' *Bibliothēke*
- Research reading seminar on Herodotus *Historiae* Book 4
- German language classes

Supervisor: Prof. Kai Brodersen

University of Cambridge (UK): MPhil in Classics — 2008–2009

Degree mark: High Pass

- *'libertas fides veritas?': The panegyric in Pliny's Panegyricus*. Thesis. Supervisor: Prof. John Henderson
- *The Body Politic: Plutarch, Citizenship and the State*. Extended essay. Supervisor: Prof. Simon Goldhill
- *'partim spoliata, partim neglecta': Pliny Letters Book 10*. Extended essay. Supervisor: Prof. John Henderson
- Linear B Transcription Exam. Classical and Comparative Philology and Linguistics Caucus

University of Cambridge (UK): BA in Classics — 2005–2008

Degree mark: First

Specialism in philology and linguistics, with an extended thesis on Roman wedding poetry

King Edward's School, Birmingham (UK): — 1997–2004

A Levels: 4 As

Including Ancient Greek, Latin and History

Figure 12: Curriculum Vitae including list of publications, 2 (2018_01_31_1517390890.pdf)

TEACHING AND FURTHER ACADEMIC EXPERIENCE**Sidney Sussex College, University of Cambridge (UK) — 2012–2014**Interviewer of BA candidates

- Assessment of candidates' written work
- Testing of candidates' Latin and Greek language abilities in interview

University of Cambridge (UK) — 2012–2014Teacher and supervisor in Latin and Ancient Greek

- Supervision of undergraduates, specialising in Greek prose especially The Second Sophistic
- Faculty language teaching (Ancient Greek). Grammar and translation for MPhil students
- Faculty language teaching (Latin and Ancient Greek). Text and analysis work for BA students. Authors included Homer, Plato, Lysias, Statius, Pliny the Younger

Historia: Zeitschrift für alte Geschichte (Germany) — 2012Freelance consultant and reviewer**PUBLICATIONS**

Review for Bryn Mawr Classical Review: Grethlein, J. and Rengakos A. (ed.) (2017), Griechische Literaturgeschichtsschreibung, (in preparation for 2018 publication).

Body Politics in the Antiquitates Romanae of Dionysius of Halicarnassus, (book chapter in preparation).

Towards a Reading of Diodorus' Book of the Islands, (2018 publication submission).

Call to Arms, in Chaudhuri A. , Raworth T. & Sommerhalder B. (eds.), The Mays xviii (2010).

TALKS, SEMINARS, SCHOOLS AND EXCHANGES

Lecture for Princeton-Oxford Ancient Religion and Politics Seminar Series, Oxford (Jan 2015)

Lecture: *Ancient Greek Space Travel?!: Lucian's A True History*. Sidney Sussex College Graduate Seminar, Cambridge (Nov 2013)

Lecture: *Dionysius and the Constitution of Romulus* Antiquitates Romanae 2.3-29. Graduate Interdisciplinary Seminar, Faculty of Classics, Cambridge (April 2013)

Participant in Cambridge-Munich Exchange between Faculty of Classics, Cambridge and Institut für Klassische Archäologie, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Munich (Dec 2012)

Participant at Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Augustan Rome International Conference, Leiden, Netherlands (May 2012)

Participant at the International Spring School for Ancient Religion, Universität Erfurt (March 2012)

Lecture: *'Pech für die Tatsachen': Strabo, India and the Ἰδιώτης*. 143rd American Philological Association Conference, Philadelphia, USA (Jan 2012)

Lecture: *On Dealing with Idiots: Strabo and Autopsy*. Graduate Interdisciplinary Seminar, Faculty of Classics, Cambridge (Nov 2011)

Lecture: *Towards a Reading of Bibliotheca Book V. Diodorus Siculus: Shared Myths, World Community and Universal History* International Conference, Glasgow (Sept 2011)

Lecture: *The Insular Thinking of Diodorus Siculus: Ideas and Islands in Greek Thought*. Political Thought & Intellectual History Workshop, Faculty of History, Cambridge (Jan 2011)

Lecture: *Hammer and Sichel: Diodorus Siculus 5.7-10*. Graduate Interdisciplinary Seminar, Faculty of Classics, Cambridge (April 2010)

Figure 13: Curriculum Vitae including list of publications, 3 (2018_01_31_1517390890.pdf)

SCHOLARSHIPS AND AWARDS

Procter Fellowship, Princeton University — 2014–2015

Kurt Hahn Scholarship, Deutscher Akademischer Austauschdienst (DAAD) — 2010

Faculty of Classics Graduate Teaching Bursary, University of Cambridge — 2009 / 2013

Cambridge Home and EU Scholarship, PhD funding, University of Cambridge — 2009

MPhil research grant, Faculty of Classics, University of Cambridge — 2008

Title of Scholar: Arthur Beattie, Sidney Sussex College, University of Cambridge — 2008

WORK AND EXTRACURRICULAR HISTORY**Freelance translator, content writer, editor and proofreader — 2016–current**

- German to English e-commerce, business and technical translation
- Writing engaging summaries of non-fiction works for Blinkist mobile app

Stowarzyszenie “Jeden Świat” (Poznań, Poland) — 2016

Project participant in anti-racism and anti-discrimination venture (European Voluntary Scheme)

- Organisation and implementation of talks in schools

Sidney Sussex College, University of Cambridge (UK) — 2009

Secretary, Graduate Tutors’ Office

- Project management
- Database preparation and management

Sidney Sussex College, University of Cambridge (UK) — 2007–2010

MCR External Officer and project leader in Event Management (Sidney Sussex May Ball)

- Budget planning and advising

LANGUAGE SKILLS

English: native speaker

Ancient Greek and Latin: expert knowledge (PhD)

German: fluent (C2, Großes Deutsches Sprachdiplom in preparation)

French and Italian: A2-level, academic reading proficiency

IT PROFICIENCY

Advanced: MS Office, LibreOffice, EndNote, Mendeley

Intermediate: SDL Trados Studio, MemoQ, Ableton Live

Figure 14: Curriculum Vitae including list of publications, 4 (2018_01_31_1517390890.pdf)

Publications and Manuscripts (Further Details)

1. The *Antiquitates Romanae* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus: Construction and Composition

This PhD thesis is a reanalysis of Dionysius of Halicarnassus' twenty-book-long *Antiquitates Romanae* from a historiographical and literary perspective. It is the argument of this thesis that, beyond this initial concentration on notions of ethnicity, a Dionysian conception of Rome may be established. In particular, questions of moral behaviour, judicial infrastructure and archaic systems of justice, state and constitutional structures, as well as notions of individual exemplarity are addressed.

Submitted to the University Library, Cambridge in April 2017 after a successful thesis defence in September 2016.

I am currently in the process of considering whether the manuscript may be adapted for more formal publication, ideally with two further chapters. One chapter would be devoted to the place of rhetoric in *Antiquitates*, the second to the Coriolanus *Einzelerszählung*. I will also discuss each of these topics in my book chapter on body politics in Dionysius (see below).

2. Towards a Reading of Diodorus' Book of the Islands.

This is a paper worked to publication standard with my PhD supervisors following a presentation at an international conference. However, it had to be set aside so that my PhD thesis could be completed. I will revisit and revise this paper as it is thematically closely linked to my *poikilia* postdoctoral project. I have time before October to prepare a further version of this paper for journal submission.

Since 2012 much relevant scholarship has been published, including a new edition of book 5 of the *Bibliothèque*. The revised version of this article will also address recent scholarly work on Euhemerism, *periploi*, and Diodorus, specifically the work of Roubekas, Lightfoot, Whitmarsh and Rathmann.

3. Body Politics in the *Antiquitates Romanae* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

Book chapter in preparation for Chesi and Spiegel (ed.), *Undoing the Human: Classical Literature and the Post-Human* (Bloomsbury).

This paper examines critical conceptions of the body politic within Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Antiquitates Romanae*. It examines two dramatized speeches made in the senate within a few years of each other at moments of fundamental threat to Rome's very existence. Namely, it considers Menenius Agrippa's speech containing his infamous analogy between the human body and the body politic as a companion piece to Manius Valerius' later argument for the importance of harmony as a governing principle within the body politic.

4. Review: Grethlein, J. and Rengakos A. (ed.) (2017), *Griechische Literaturgeschichtsschreibung: Traditionen, Probleme und Konzepte*, Berlin.

Review for Bryn Mawr Classical Review (BMCR), in preparation for 2018 publication.

Figure 15: Recommendation Letter 1, 1 (2018_02_01_1517482225.pdf)

S. P. Oakley, F.B.A.
Kennedy Professor of Latin



EMMANUEL COLLEGE
 Cambridge CB2 3AP
 Telephone: (01223)
 334200 Enquiries
 742995 Direct
 334426 Facsimile
 spo23@cam.ac.uk

Andrea Dünschede,
 Program Manager at the Dahlem Research School,
 Freie Universität Berlin
 Germany

19.1.2018

Dear Dr Dünschede,

Application of Dr Yehudah (Yuddi) Gershon (Classics)

In September 2016 Yuddi Gershon successfully defended his doctoral thesis, *The Antiquitates Romanae of Dionysius of Halicarnassus: construction and composition*, in Cambridge's Faculty of Classics. The examiners were Professor Tim Whitmarsh (internal) and Professor Matthew Fox of the University of Glasgow (external). I was primary supervisor for his last three years (I exclude a year's intermission). The choice of subject was bold: Dionysius' *Antiquitates Romanae* is a very long work, and it has been comparatively little studied. I suspect that there are only a very few classicists in the world who have read it all through in Greek; certainly Dr Gershon has written the first Cambridge Ph.D. devoted to it. And yet the text is important in various ways: Dionysius is one of the few surviving Greek historical texts from the period 350 BC–AD100, and therefore is a prime witness to the manner in which historiography was written in this period. He is also the only writer from antiquity who wrote both theoretical treatises on how to write history and a history itself. His theoretical works were part of a wider series of treatises on literary composition, especially oratory, and it is fascinating to compare the (invented) speeches that he included in his *Antiquitates* with his precepts in these works. Finally, the *Antiquitates* is a text useful for Roman historians (who for the most part merely dip into it), since it contains information not found elsewhere. In sum, the *Antiquitates* is culturally important and was a very good choice of subject.

As for Yuddi Gershon himself, even before his taking his doctorate successful results as an undergraduate and a Masters student were a ready proof of his intelligence and his abilities in Greek and Latin. During his doctorate he added other strings to his bow: substantial consolidation of his grasp of Greek (as I have said, the *Roman Antiquities* is a huge text), an understanding of the scholarly debate that surrounds early Rome, early Roman historiography (a large field) and Greek historiography, fluency in German, and reading fluency in other languages.

I have come to think that the four main virtues of Dr Gershon's Ph.D. thesis are these. First, he takes a hard look at the problem of whether Dionysius' notion that the Romans were really Greeks (notoriously developed at great length in book one, and absurd to modern minds), which many have seen as the key focus of the whole history, is really so important later in the work; he establishes that it is not. Second, he gives a nicely nuanced reading of the account the

Figure 16: Recommendation Letter 1, 2 (2018_02_01_1517482225.pdf)

events in book ten that led to the establishment of Rome's decemvirate, the institution that brought the rule of law to Rome (and hence a key turning-point of Dionysius' work), bringing out Dionysius' demonstration that, despite the successes of some fair-minded aristocrats, Rome needed the rule of law to be firmly institutionalised. Third, he gives welcome attention to the fragments of books 12–20 that survive in various excerpts and epitomes, takes due account of recent work (but is also acutely critical of it), and tries to see how it might have related to the fully extant books 1–11; Dr Gershon comes to the view that Dionysius was far more interested in how individuals related to developing institutions than in making comments on ethnicity. Fourth, the thesis is unusually comprehensive in its citation of secondary literature.

Dr Gershon now wishes to expand his researches from Dionysius to consider other Greek historians who wrote under the Roman Empire such as Diodorus Siculus and Appian. This he is very well placed to do, since the study of the *Roman Antiquities* has required much reading on his part in ancient views of historiography (not least as expressed by Dionysius in his own literary-critical treatises). There has been relatively little modern literary analysis of the Greek historians who wrote under the Roman Empire, and yet their long texts give ample scope for employment of modern literary critical techniques. His current intention of working on the idea of *poikilia* in Greek historiography strikes me as excellent. *Poikilia*, which may crudely be translated as 'variation', was crucial to avoiding monotony, to creating a balance between the narrative of a nation's internal and external affairs. If scholars were asked how exactly the historians in whom Dr Gershon is interested achieved it, they might struggle to give an answer—so little work has been done. And so the field is ripe for the kind of study that Dr Gershon envisages. Although the texts are long, the bibliography is manageable, and Dr Gershon should be able to finish his work within the limits of a Research Fellowship. He has the requisite knowledge and skills and now just needs secure funding to be able to embark on a research project.

It is obvious from Dr Gershon's *c.v.* that his doctorate took longer than is normal to finish, and perhaps I should explain why. Dr Gershon started with my colleague Professor Goldhill as his supervisor, but the pairing (surprisingly) did not work; the Ph.D. made little progress; and Dr Gershon became depressed and needed more than one intermission. It was after the first intermission that I took over supervision, since I know the *Roman Antiquities* quite well. The depression eventually passed, and I was able to observe both Dr Gershon's steady hard work to complete the thesis and a matching steady rise in his confidence. Nothing that has happened in Cambridge's Faculty of Classics recently has given me more pleasure than to see this upturn in Dr Gershon's confidence and his full realization of his abilities, and the credit for this is entirely due to his perseverance. Perhaps the easiest way of illustrating my respect for his achievement is to say that I now show him drafts of my own writing on Dionysius so that I can profit from his help.

Please do not hesitate to contact me if you would like more information.

Yours sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads "S. P. Oakley". The signature is written in a cursive style and ends with a long, sweeping horizontal flourish that extends to the right.

Figure 17: Recommendation Letter 1, 3 (2018_02_01_1517482225.pdf)

Figure 18: Recommendation Letter 2, 1 (2018_02_01_1517482234.pdf)

Dear Colleagues,

allow me to write to you on behalf of

Dr Yehudah (Yuddi) N. Gershon

who has recently gained his Cambridge PhD. I am Professor (Chair) in Ancient Culture (Classics) at the University of Erfurt (cf. www.uni-erfurt.de/antike for details) and have known Dr Gershon ever since his first DAAD scholarship in Erfurt in 2010/11. I have followed his progress with great interest. It is good to know that he intends to continue his scholarly work, and with a promising project.

Dr Gershon is a bright and creative scholar. While in Erfurt on his DAAD scholarship, I supervised Dr Gershon's research projects on historiographical techniques and methodologies in Diodorus and Strabo. The results of his findings were later successfully presented at an international conference on Diodorus in Glasgow and at the American Philological Association annual meeting in Philadelphia. I consider this excellent preparatory groundwork for the post-doctoral project that he is proposing.

In a reading group on Herodotus, he impressed me those 7 years ago with the kind of question he would ask, which led the others and me to recheck the text, and context, of what we were studying, and contributed to a much better understanding. He has continued in this vein. His thesis, as well as his next project, are testimonies to the novel and exciting ways he deals with the ancient texts we study.

In addition, his international outlook - he has studied in the UK, Germany, and the US, and gained experience in Poland and other countries - will make him an interesting and lively member of any community of scholars. I do recommend that you consider his application, and if possible interview him.

Interested readers of the writing samples you might receive from Dr Gershon as part of the evaluation process, if required, might include, Simon Goldhill, Richard Hunter and Stephen Oakley as well as Tim Whitmarsh and Matthew Fox were the supervisors or examiners, but I imagine that

- Andrew Feldherr (Princeton)
- David Levene (New York)
- Andrew Wallace-Hadrill (Cambridge)

would be interesting and interested readers of the writing samples you might receive from Dr Gershon.

In Berlin, Prof Christian Wendt (http://www.geschkult.fu-berlin.de/e/fmi/institut/mitglieder/Professorinnen_und_Professoren/wendt.html) has agreed to be Dr Gershon's mentor, while at HUJI, Prof Donna Shalev (<http://en.classics.huji.ac.il/people/donna-shalev>) is prepared to do the same.

Both have working groups which will benefit from, and benefit, Dr Gershon's project on Poikilia which I strongly recommend.

Figure 19: Recommendation Letter 2, 2 (2018_02_01_1517482234.pdf)

If you need any further information, or a different format of this reference, do, please, let me know.

Many thanks, a Happy New Year, and best wishes

Kai Brodersen

--

Historia, Universitaet, Nordhaeuser Str. 63, D-99089 Erfurt www.uni-erfurt.de/antike/kontakt

kai.brodersen@uni-erfurt.de

Figure 20: Endorsement Letter FUB, 1 (2018_01_17_1516196614.pdf)



Freie Universität Berlin, Fachbereich Geschichts- und Kulturwissenschaften
Koserstr. 20, D-14195 Berlin

Fachbereich Geschichts- u. Kulturwissenschaften – Friedrich-Meinecke-Institut (WE 1)

Prof. Dr. Christian Wendt
Alte Geschichte

to whom it may concern

Telefon (++)49 30) 838 53634
Fax (++)49 30) 838 56830
E-Mail : christian.wendt@fu-berlin.de

17.1.2018

Letter of endorsement for Yuddi Gershon

Dr. Yuddi Gershon is a promising young scholar with an impressive list of achievements and grants that allowed him to pursue his research at renowned universities like Cambridge, Princeton and Erfurt. His PhD thesis on Dionysius of Halicarnassus is proof of his competence in analysing the constructive framework of historiographical texts, as his philological skills enable him to interpret terminology and expressions in depth.

His proposal shows an innovative project of a high potential: Is variation a specific formative (perhaps even required) element of historiography – or are innumerabiles fabulae, as Cicero puts it for Herodotus, a sign of lesser quality of an account, of a lack of credibility and dedication of the author as historian? Poikilia, the Greek term used for variation (and coloring), is at the centre of this analysis, and it will be questioned in its rhetorical meaning. Are there modes of poikilia that are more suitable for narrating the past than others?

Dr. Gershon chooses to apply a comparative approach to his material: By juxtaposing selected passages from Herodotus and Thucydides with Greek historians of Rome, such as Polybius, Diodorus and Dionysius, Gershon aims at establishing a framework for understanding settings and developments in the genre of historiography that appear to be clearly defined, but in fact are subject to so many individual decisions by the authors that it is hardly possible to shape it as a single whole.

Dr. Gershon challenges main criteria of classical historiography and confronts them with narratological insights in the functioning of texts. This should result in a study that enhances our understanding of how (or if) historiography defines itself in a coherent way. Moreover, it will produce new interpretative findings for each of the authors Dr. Gershon examines.

The planned cooperation with Prof. Donna Shalev at Hebrew University is especially promising. Not only could Dr. Gershon profit from the outstanding competence of my colleague in Israel who has already worked on poikilia in Plato, but also a project that can be regarded as parallel is realised at the moment in Jerusalem, dealing with variatio in Latin texts. The synergies will be considerable, to a mutual benefit.

Figure 21: Endorsement Letter FUB, 2 (2018_01_17_1516196614.pdf)

We shall be pleased to offer Dr. Gershon all needed support; this includes common organisation of conferences, the possibility of inviting fellows via my affiliations with TOPOI, the network resources of my current projects, and, of course, my personal advice and criticism. Dr. Gershon will become part of a loose research group, connecting him to scholars of all levels – only to mention experts on historiography like Ernst Baltrusch, Peter Spahn and Neville Morley. A connection to a PhD project on „Thucydides and irony“ that is starting now under my supervision can result in especially fruitful discussion and complementary input. Of course, Dr. Gershon will have full use of the research facilities at FU Berlin, including the Philologische Bibliothek, the Campusbibliothek and the library in Friedrich-Meinecke-Institut, to ensure he is fully integrated into our research community.

Yuddi Gershon presents a coherent and highly promising proposal, and I have no doubts that his work will result in findings that push scholarship forward. I would very much welcome an opportunity to further enhance the relations between my work at Freie Universität Berlin and Hebrew University, beside my current GIF-funded project on Thucydides that I run together with Christian Thauer from Political Science. For these reasons I back this candidacy with great emphasis.



The image shows a handwritten signature in blue ink, which appears to be 'Christoph Thauer'. To the right of the signature is a blue official stamp. The stamp contains the following text: 'Geschichts- und Literaturwissenschaften', 'Friedrich-Meinecke-Institut', and 'Königsplatz 20, 14195 Berlin'.

Seite 2

Figure 22: Endorsement Letter HUJI, 1 (2018_01_31_1517388169.pdf)

Letter of Endorsement of Dr Y. N. Gershon for the Freie Universität-Hebrew University
Postdoctoral Fellowship

Dear Committee Members,

It is with great pleasure that I am writing to you in support of Dr Yehudah (Yuddi) N. Gershon's application for the Joint Berlin-Jerusalem Post-Doctoral Fellowship Program, for 2018-9/2019-20, with his proposal "The Place of *Poikilia*: Fact, Fiction and Narrative Control in Greek Historiographers".

Dr Gershon approached me with an enthusiastic and energetic proposal which lands naturally into our research habitat here. It will be a perfect complement to other work carried out here at the Hebrew University, especially that already begun by other colleagues and students, as I shall detail further below.

I was instantly drawn to the ideas under investigation by Dr Gershon. He and I have been conversing by phone about research ideas, corpus delimitation, criteria, and the fine tuning of questions. The communication has proved to be very fluent, easygoing and fruitful, already in the short time since it has been initiated.

Both Dr Gershon and I share a deep and ongoing interest in the organization of knowledge and the forms and motifs of its communication to audiences in a range of text types. Both of us research texts of the same periods in the evolution of Greek prose. The field is increasingly attracting study and attention in Classical scholarship, much of which Dr Gershon is abreast with, and I am sure I have much to learn from Dr Gershon's experience with historiographical sources. I hope that I can offer him my own experience with analogous questions in other Greek corpora (including Plato, ancient novels, Diogenes Laertius, and, now increasingly, the Galenic case histories), and in Arabic "*adab*" genres, ranging from the doxographic to the highly belles-lettristic. In short, the cross-pollination promises to be mutually beneficial.

Dr Gershon's questions about *poikilia*, *Bauformen*, digression and others coincide with my own interests in the structuring of texts, such as *Ringkomposition* and other elements, and it is fortuitous that Dr Gershon's work on historiographers, and on Dionysius of Halicarnassus' critical works complement my own work on Plato, whose *poikilia* and other structural features have been elusive desiderata. The prospect of close collaboration can turn these desiderata into research *in vivo*.

The work of Dr Gershon's mentor at FUB, Prof. Wendt, and the prospect of dialogue with him, is an immense benefit of this joint postdoctoral fellowship, as I envisage it. It will be a privilege for me to be in contact with Prof. Wendt, and possibly involved with some joint activity revolving around Dr Gershon's postdoctoral work, and possibly arranging a joint meeting.

I am very eager to have Dr Gershon here, in order to learn from his historiographical prism and to expose him to my own corpora; Dr Gershon has much to contribute to the fabric of the department's activity, offering his energies as a stimulating young researcher, for example to my doctoral student who will be working on *variatio* as a concept and as a factor in the phraseology and phenomenology of gestures in Greek Fiction and germane Latin sources. I

Figure 23: Endorsement Letter HUJI, 2 (2018_01_31_1517388169.pdf)

have another prospective doctoral candidate who will be working on linguistic and text-structural questions in Greek prose of the Imperial period, and its interrelationship with Latin prose. In addition to these doctoral students, our B.A. students, and my departmental colleagues, we also run a regular departmental seminar where Dr Gershon will be about to sound out his ideas, and an ongoing Galen reading group run by myself in coordination with Dr Orly Lewis of the Buber Society at HUJI (we read medical texts in Greek and Arabic, not all participants knowing both). In the reading group we sorely lack the input of someone with Dr Gershon's perspective and experience with *Buntschriftstellerei*, which promises to complement perfectly the well represented angles of history of medicine (Greek, Roman and Islamic), translation technique, philosophy, Iberian belles lettres and medical writing, etc.

The intellectual integration of Dr Gershon into the activity of the Classics Department and intramural activities in the Faculty of Humanities, as described above, is highly desired. As for the physical conditions, Dr Gershon will be supplied with a key to the Seminar Room at the department where he can work when it is empty, and if circumstances allow we will offer him office space, mostly like shared (as we ourselves have). The Mount Scopus Bloomfield Library for Humanities and Social Sciences, and the National Library in Givat Ram will be at his full disposal. Any interlibrary loans from other Israeli University libraries which Dr Gershon needs, I will be able to help him with. I understand visiting students, scholars and postdocs are provided with borrowing rights as a matter of course: I personally will see to it that Dr Gershon will be provided with library rights, computer rights, and any other amenities and discounts offered to post-docs (I will consult with Ms. Levy, the local administrator of the FUB-HUJI program, and with Jane Turner).

In conclusion, I cannot think of a better fit for my own interests, for those of my students and colleagues, and for Dr Gershon. Please do not hesitate to contact me with any further questions.

Prof. Donna Shalev
Chair
Classics Dept
Hebrew University, Jerusalem
donna@mail.huji.ac.il
+972(0)546508882