

UDC 930.85(3):930.2
DOI 10.24919/2519-058x.13.188648

Sarkis KAZAROV

PhD hab. (History), Professor of the Department of Archeology and ancient history, Institute of History and International Relations, Southern Federal University, 105/42 Bolshaya Sadovaya Street, Rostov-on-Don, Russia, postal code 344006 (ser-kazarov@yandex.ru)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2292-4787>

Oleh PETRECHKO

PhD hab. (History), Professor, Head of the World History and Special Historical Disciplines department, Drohobych Ivan Franko State Pedagogical University, 24 Ivan Franko Street, Drohobych, Ukraine, postal code 82100 (o.petrechko@ukr.net)

ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5535-3730>

Саркис КАЗАРОВ

доктор історичних наук, професор кафедри археології та стародавньої історії Інституту історії та міжнародних відносин Південного Федерального Університету, вул. Велика Садова, 105/42, Ростов-на-Дону, Росія, індекс 344006 (ser-kazarov@yandex.ru).

Олег ПЕТРЕЧКО

доктор історичних наук, професор, завідувач кафедри всесвітньої історії та спеціальних історичних дисциплін Дрогобицького державного педагогічного університету імені Івана Франка, вул. Івана Франка, 24, Дрогобич, Україна, індекс 82100 (o.petrechko@ukr.net)

Бібліографічний опис статті: Kazarov, S. & Petrechko, O. (2019). Philological and historical research methods of classical studies. *Skhidnoevropeiskyi istorychnyi visnyk [East European Historical Bulletin]*, 13, 8–15. doi: 10.24919/2519-058x.13.188648

PHILOLOGICAL AND HISTORICAL RESEARCH METHODS OF CLASSICAL STUDIES

Abstract. *The aim of the research is to consider the characteristics of “philological” and “historical” research methods in classical studies. The methodology of the research of the study is based on the principles of science, historicism, objectivity, system analysis, etc., as well as on the use of general scientific methods, special-historical and source study methods. The scientific novelty is that for the first time in Ukrainian historiography the question of “philological” and “historical” research methods in classical studies has been investigated. The Conclusions. At the end of the 19th century, the disadvantages of the philological method of studying the ancient texts became obvious. Where the investigated ancient author referred to the names of his predecessors or at least pointed at them, it was easy to find the “main core” or the main author. But when such links or hints were completely absent, the difficulties arose, and sometimes they were simply insurmountable. The philological method which was based on an unrestrained desire to find the original core of the source under study was reduced to “plus ultra”, i.e. was carried to the point of absurdity. One must fully agree that in one aspect historians were in a better position than philologists, in particular: a historian, in order to explain the facts of an ancient historiography, has a*

greater opportunity to use the appropriate phenomena in the historical literature of different times and places. Historians and philologists have different goals in the study of the primary source of ancient literature, so they cannot replace each other. Both classical philology and ancient history have their own subject and the study methodology and both have reasons to work in an area that we call classical studies. Classical philology and history use a particular research method according to their own subject, goals and objectives which is consistent with the research method of a particular scholar.

Key words: classical studies, philological research method, historical research method.

ФІЛОЛОГІЧНИЙ ТА ІСТОРИЧНИЙ МЕТОДИ ДОСЛІДЖЕННЯ В АНТИКОЗНАВСТВІ

Анотація. Метою дослідження є розгляд особливостей “філологічного” та “історичного” методів дослідження в антикознавстві. **Методологія дослідження** базується на принципах науковості, історизму, об’єктивності, системного аналізу тощо, а також на використанні загальнонаукових методів, спеціально-історичних і джерелознавчих. **Наукова новизна** полягає у тому, що вперше в українській історіографії досліджено питання “філологічного” та “історичного” методів дослідження в антикознавстві. **Висновки.** У кінці XIX ст. недоліки філологічного методу вивчення античних текстів стали очевидними. Там, де досліджуваний античний автор згадував імена своїх попередників або принаймні натякав на них, було легко знайти “основне ядро” чи головного автора. Але коли такі зв’язки або підказки були повністю відсутні, виникали труднощі, подекуди абсолютно непереборні. Філологічний метод, який базувався на нестримному бажанні знайти оригінальне ядро досліджуваного джерела, зводився до “plus ultra”, тобто доводився до абсурду. Треба повністю погодитися, що в одному аспекті історики перебувають у кращому становищі, ніж філологи, зокрема: історик, щоб пояснити факти античної історіографії, має більшу можливість використовувати відповідні явища в історичній літературі різних часів і народів. Історики та філологи мають різні цілі при вивченні античних писемних джерел, тому не можуть замінити один одного. У класичній філології та античній історії – власний об’єкт та методика дослідження, а тому мають усі підстави працювати в галузі антикознавства. Класична філологія та історія використовують певний метод дослідження відповідно до власного предмета, цілей та завдань, що узгоджується з дослідницьким методом конкретного науковця.

Ключові слова: антикознавство, філологічний метод дослідження, історичний метод дослідження.

The Problem Statement. The origins of modern classical philology and document-based historical criticism should apparently be sought in the Renaissance humanism (see Nauert, 1998, p. 438). Classical philology and history are the two disciplines, that both claim to be studying a classical antiquity. The first their commonality lies in the fact that both of them belong to the Humanities. And it is not a coincidence that in the past, as well as sometimes now, classical studies have taken place at the combined historical and philological faculties. This was the case in Germany (although they were called “philosophical” there), and so it was in the Russian Empire. However, the study of ancient history clearly revealed the differences in the research approaches that philologists and historians have practiced and still continue to practice. Nevertheless, it should be noted that the text is the object of study for both classical philologists and historians. And this statement is correct not only for the two mentioned disciplines: to paraphrase Xin Liu Gale, once published, texts belong to all of the communities of scholars (Gale, 2000, p. 383). According to the famous philosopher M. M. Bakhtin, every humanities discipline begins with a text, and is generally a discipline about texts (Bakhtin, 2000, p. 299). But a different matter is how classical philologists explore this text and how historians study it. In other words, both classical philology and ancient history each have their own subject and study methodology.

The Analysis of Sources and Recent Researches. Since the development of classical studies is directly related to Germany, it is natural that the priority in the development of a methodology for the study of historical sources on antiquity belongs to the German scholars. And they were originally the representatives of classical philology. The evolution of the philological method of classical antiquity studying took place under the immense influence of a German philologist, a professor at the University of Berlin, August Immanuel Bekker (1785 – 1871). The critical method he developed was based on two principles: the principle of the interrelation of manuscripts and the principle of “interpolation” in the broad sense of the term. If the manuscript was rewritten, in fact, it was the same scientific work, not just a duplicate, although in a rare case it was a compilation, but it was not an outright mechanical reproduction of one source (Mandes, 1898, p. 10). The eminent German scholar Theodor Mommsen considered himself not a historian, but a philologist. An esteemed scholar of the Saint Volodymyr University in Kyiv, Professor Julian Kulakovsky, who, during his academic mission, attended classes by Theodor Mommsen, mentioned the memorable meeting of the students with the great scientist at his home. At the very end of the meeting Theodor Mommsen said: “All hail our German philology... not history, no... philology should live!” (*Lebe hoch unsere deutsche Philologie... nicht Geschichte, nein... Philologie soll leben!*) (Kulakovsky, 1904, p. 101). History, according to Theodor Mommsen, is included in the broad concept of “philology”, the spirit of which is the study and cognition of the source. “A deeper analysis, the “refinement” of the research method, a vivid and improving knowledge of the historical records – that is, in the opinion of the German scholar, classical philology” (Kazarov, 1997, p. 13). The “philological approach” to an ancient history, founded in the nineteenth century by German classical scholars, has survived to this day. Recently, a Russian classical scholar Askold Ivantchik reminded us of this statement by a modern German scientist, Professor Hans-Joachim Gehrke: “A good story is philology” (Ivanchik, 2014, p. 229). The statement of such an authoritative scholar may shock our historians who, after the establishment of the Soviet power and the actual elimination of the classical education system in the 1930-ies, lost a direct relationship with philology. However, no one can deny that good historical work is based on the deep analysis of sources. The texts of the ancient authors are primarily the sources for the study of the classical antiquity. According to some contemporary scholars, classical philology is just as necessary for a historian, as a classical philologist needs history, because both these disciplines are in close interconnection. Moreover, there is a debatable assertion that the basis of a unified historical-philological discipline is based on the constant, daily reading of the texts by ancient authors in the original form, understanding their grammar, without which a profound historical or philological study is impossible (Belousov, 2016, p. 14).

The Purpose of Publication is to consider the characteristics of “philological” and “historical” research methods in the classical studies.

The Statement of the Basic Material. What was the philological method of source analysis? At the turn of the 19th and 20th centuries, some historians, who had been influenced by German historiography, also expressed their views on the subject. An interesting opinion on this topic was expressed by Michael Mandes (1866 – 1934), a professor at Imperial Novorossiia University. According to him, the researcher’s task is strictly determined by the complexity of the compositions of ancient sources. To determine this composition, to unravel in our text those elements of which it is composed, is what should be done, and this can be done only through the philological analysis (Mandes, 1898, p. 10). There are also very interesting

arguments of Serhiy Vechov (1857 – 1919), a classical philologist at the Imperial University of Warsaw. In his view, the participation of philology in the study of an ancient literary monument is correct theoretically and preferable in practical terms. To be convinced of this it is sufficient to pay attention to the fact that classical philology aims to study the spiritual activities of the ancients in all branches and manifestations; therefore, historiography is not excluded. According to Serhiy Vechov, a philologist has significant advantages over a historian. These advantages are based on a closer acquaintance with the ancient literature in general and on the greater ability to use correctly those formal criteria, which often play a decisive role in the matters of this character (Vechov, 1888, p. 10).

However, as it seems to us, at the end of the 19th century, the disadvantages of the philological method of studying the ancient texts became obvious. Where the investigated ancient author referred to the names of his predecessors or at least pointed at them, it was easy to find the “main core” or the main author. But when such links or hints were completely absent, the difficulties arose, and sometimes they were simply insurmountable. It was then that the German classical scholars, in search of the “original source”, had to resort to far-fetched schemes, which often bordered on outright fantasy. One of those, who could validly be criticized for it, was Rudolf Schubert (1844 – 1924), a prominent German classical scholar, a professor at the University of Königsberg, the author of a number of works on the original sources for the study of Ancient Greece. Let us give one very typical example connected with the attempts to find the original sources of “Life of Pyrrhus” by Plutarch of Chaeronea.

As we know, Rudolf Schubert and Rudolf Scala (1860 – 1919) assigned a great role in the study of the history of Pyrrhus to the works of the ancient Greek historian of the 4th – 3rd centuries BC, Duris of Samos (Scala, 1884, s. 53–63; Schubert, 1894, s. 11–22). What was Duris of Samos and was his work a source for the next generations of historians who studied the life and work of King Pyrrhus? The information about him that has survived to our days is scanty and fragmentary. What has been preserved does not allow us to make judicious judgments about Duris of Samos. However, the lack of certain information did not stop these German scholars, but, on the contrary, it pushed them into very risky and dubious conclusions. The philological method of Rudolf Schubert and Rudolf Scala aimed at finding the original source of certain event in the life of Pyrrhus, is rather primitive. They refer to the authorship of the Samian historian everything related to scenes with the exchange of clothes, theatrical performances, various anecdotes, statements by various poets, without bothering any arguments, not to mention textual analysis. In general, the above-mentioned German scholars came to the conclusion that those passages of Plutarch in the biography of Pyrrhus, which deal with the exchange of clothes, descriptions of clothes, theatrical performances, various anecdotes, are entirely based on the lost excerpt of Duris of Samos (Kazarov, 2008, p. 50).

In addition, due to the endeavor to show the persuasiveness of their arguments, Rudolf Schubert and Rudolf Scala, without hesitation, listed those passages which, in their opinion, were borrowed by Plutarch from the Samian historian. What passages were they talking about? Firstly, there was an excerpt in which Plutarch told that when Pyrrhus was a child and his fate was being decided he crawled to Glaucias, an Illyrian king, gripped the king’s robe and cried (Plut. Pyrrh. 3.2); secondly, a portrait of the king of Epirus, indicating the features of his abnormal teeth and upper jaw (Plut. Pyrrh. 3.4); thirdly, a comparison of Pyrrhus with his idol Alexander the Great, a description of the purple garments of the one and the other, and the mentioning of the well-known statement of Antigonus about him (Plut. Pyrrh. 8.1–2); fourthly, the above-mentioned German scholars included in the list some legends

from the life of the king of Epirus, describing his personal qualities (Plut. Pyrrh. 8.4); fifthly, according to the German scholars, the ninth book, which tells about the matrimonial affairs of Pyrrhus and his sons, is also based on the work of Duris of Samos, who is also credited with poetic phrases, allegedly said by Pyrrhus in response to a question about the future heir that the kingdom would be given to that of his sons, whose sword would be sharper (Plut. Pyrrh. 9.2); sixthly, the description of the helmet of the Epirian King Pyrrhus with a plume and goat's horns, which served as a reference point for the Macedonian warriors who decided to quit Demetrius I Poliorketes and join Pyrrhus (Plut. Pyrrh. 11.5); seventhly, the information about the alliance of the king of Epirus and Lysimachus against Demetrius and sharing out his domain between them (Plut. Pyrrh. 12.1); eighthly, a description of the personal qualities of Cineas, accompanied by the aphorism of Euripides who claimed that what is achieved in battles with weapons, is sometimes achievable by eloquence (Plut. Pyrrh. 14.1; see Kazarov, 2008, p. 51).

In addition to the above-mentioned, there is another topic, which Rudolf Schubert considered to be typical: the exchange of clothes between Pyrrhus and Megacles, thanks to which the king of Epirus avoided death, but his life was saved at the cost of the loss of a close comrade and companion-in-arms (Plut. Pyrrh. 17.1). Moreover, the German scholar related all Plutarch's curious cases to Pyrrhus, without any evidence, he considered those as associated with the works of Duris of Samos (Schubert, 1894, s. 21).

Similar thoughts ten years before Rudolf Schubert had been expressed by his colleague and contemporary, another esteemed German scholar, Rudolf Scala. If we read his work carefully, we will see that he brought in the philological method to an even greater absurdity than his follower. Without any doubts and any arguments, he ascribed to Duris of Samos the information from the eighth and nineteenth chapters of Plutarch's "Life of Pyrrhus" (Scala, 1884, s. 61). According to Rudolf Scala, not only Plutarch, but also Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Dio Cassius and even Zonaras used the works of Duris. The episode of the exchange of clothes between Pyrrhus and Megacles, which we also find in Dionysius (D.H. 19.12.6), for no reason, he ascribed to Duris of Samos (Scala, 1884, s. 60).

The methodology of studying the original sources, which was used by Rudolf Schubert and Rudolf Scala, first caused skepticism, and then a clear rejection by both modern and subsequent generations of researchers. In one of the reviews of the book by R. Schubert, esteemed German scholar Julius Kaerst (1857 – 1930) wrote that all the author's attempts to link the description of costumes, theatrical scenes, and poetic quotes with the works of Duris were unproven and baseless. And next the reviewer directly called such a methodology "biased and arbitrary" (Kaerst, 1894, s. 1033). Soon, a passage about the exchange of clothes between the king of Epirus and his closest comrade, which Rudolf Schubert and Rudolf Scala undoubtedly regarded as one that went back to Duris, was subjected to valid criticism. Thus, German scientist Oswald Hamburger opposed such an interpretation of this passage: even if it was accepted that Duris had a penchant for theatrical scenes and presented scenes of dressing up, it still could not be said that this scene was depicted by him. In addition, he claimed that one could talk about a Roman source, but not about Duris (Hamburger, 1927, s. 24). The French historian Pierre Leveque dealt with that issue in his monograph devoted to the original sources of the issue of the Pyrrhic War. According to the scholar, it is not possible to link at least one of the extant passages of Duris with the history of Pyrrhus. He directly describes the methodology used by the aforementioned German historians as naive, and their conclusion as "baseless" (Leveque, 1957, p. 27). Pierre Leveque came to a final conclusion

about the futility of all the attempts to find at least some passages from the works of Duris in the works devoted to Pyrrhus.

It is difficult to deny the fact that Plutarch used the works of Duris, especially since he confirmed this himself (Plut. Per. 28.1). However, he did not hide his skepticism about the works of Duris. Plutarch stated that Duris usually was not notable for truthfulness, even in those cases where he had no private interest: “Δοῦρις μὲν οὐδ’ ὅπου μηδὲν αὐτῷ πρόσσεστιν ἴδιον πάθος εἰωθῶς κρατεῖν τὴν διήγησιν ἐπὶ τῆς ἀληθείας” (Plut. Per. 28.3). As an alternative to Duris, there were such authors as Hieronymus, Ephorus, Theopompus and Thucydides, who represented a kind of model of honesty and objectivity.

Let us return to the question of Plutarch’s borrowing from the Samian historian. As far as we are concerned, the point of view put forward by Rudolf Schubert and Rudolf Scala about the significance of the works of Duris as a source for writing Plutarch’s “Life of Pyrrhus” is flawed for another important reason. Composing the biography of the Epirian king Pyrrhus, Plutarch possessed quite reliable and solid works by authors such as Proxenus, Hieronymus, Phylarchus and Timaeus. Therefore, he would not risk using such an unreliable historian as Duris, whose credibility he questioned himself. Plutarch, mentioning the sources used by him in the “Life of Pyrrhus”, refers to the commentaries of the Epirian king himself and some historians: “according to the king’s own commentaries”, “according to Hieronymus” (Plut. Pyrrh. 21.8) *etc.* But he made no mention of Duris. So the methodology, used in this case by Rudolf Schubert and Rudolf Scala, is absolutely unconvincing and can hardly be considered as a scientific one. As a matter of fact, the philological method which was based on an unrestrained desire to find the original core of the source under study was reduced to *plus ultra*, i.e. was carried to the point of absurdity. However, as stated above, the classical antiquity is studied not only by classical philology, but also by history. What is the relationship between these two disciplines?

According to Serhiy Vechov, historians and philologists have different goals in the study of the primary source of an ancient literature, so they cannot replace each other. For the historian, in this case, the main goal is to determine the degree of significance of the literary monument as a historical source and to bring it closer, through its examination, to the legend or events of the period under study. A philologist, starting a research on the sources of the same literary monument, intends by this research to form a clear view of the author’s work and his “literary physiognomy”, to more accurately determine the monument’s meaning in a series of others like it and the place that befits it in the literary history. Consequently, there is no doubt that neither historians nor philologists can claim the exclusive right to work in the area that we call classical studies (Vechov, 1888, pp. 10–11).

Eduard Frolov, who had an academic argument with classical philologist professor Aristid Dovatur, who was one of his teachers, quoted in his monograph an interesting passage about the relationship between the classical philology and the history. According to Aristid Dovatur, in the study of classical antiquities, only classical philology is of paramount importance, whereas history itself is relegated to a secondary role (Frolov, 1999, p. 495). Eduard Frolov did not agree at all to this line, despite his profound respect for Aristid Dovatur. On the contrary, he put history in the first place among the Humanities, clearly defining the goals of both classical philology and history: “the study of the works of ancient writers mainly for the sake of comprehending the works themselves, for example, an analysis of ... mainly Solon’s elegies, not of the archaic revolution of the 7th – 6th centuries; an examination of the novelistic tradition of the Herodotus’ tyrants, not of tyranny; Aristotle’s analysis of the problem of the

decline of the Greek poleis, and not of the crisis of the polis itself. Such an approach in classical studies could not have been possible without a philological one-sidedness, which inevitably should have affected the quality of the final general judgments” (Frolov, 1999, p. 496).

As for history, as it is known, in contrast to philology, its main task is the reconstruction and interpretation of past events and, on the basis of all this, the identification of historical development patterns. Of course, all this is impossible without studying historical sources. However, before extracting useful information from a source, the historian needs to criticize the source, i.e. to determine the degree of its reliability. Under conditions of scarcity of the source base (which is typical of the ancient history in general) historians are sometimes forced to use even a myth, a source, doubtful from the point of view of the credibility of its version. Such examples were successfully demonstrated by Yury Andreev when studying the Minoan and Mycenaean civilizations (Andreev, 1990, pp. 3–7). But even classical philologists had to admit that in one aspect historians were in a better position than philologists, in particular: a historian, in order to explain the facts of ancient historiography, has a greater opportunity to use appropriate phenomena in the historical literature of different times and places (Vechov, 1888, p. 11). As far as we are concerned, one must fully agree to this statement. At the same time, one must take into account one more important point: the reproduction and interpretation of events from the past is not only the result of the mental efforts of a representative of historical discipline, but it also has some ethical and aesthetic tinge, which is a kind of reaction of the historian to historical events interpreted by him (Frolov, 2004, p. 14).

The Conclusions. To sum it up, we shall state the following: historians and philologists have different goals in the study of the primary source of ancient literature, so they cannot replace each other. Both classical philology and ancient history have their own subject and study methodology and both have reasons to work in the area that we call classical studies. Classical philology and history use a particular research method according to their own subject, goals and objectives which is consistent with the research method of a particular scholar.

Acknowledgments. We express a sincere gratitude to all the members of the editorial board for consultations provided during the preparation of the article for printing. Special thanks to Rector of Southern Federal University Inna Konstantynivna Shevchenko for the support.

Funding. The authors received no financial support for the research, authorship, and publication of this article.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Andreev, J. V. (1990). *Poesiya mifa i proza istorii [Poetry of myth and prose of history]*. Leningrad: Lenizdat, 223 p. [in Russian]
- Bachtin, M. M. (2000) *Avtor I geroy: k folofskim osnovam gumanitarnykh nauk [Author and hero: to the philosophical foundations of the humanities]*. St. Petersburg: Azbuka, 336 p. [in Russian]
- Belousov, A. V. (2016) Nucho Ordine o polse bespolesnogo: “nenauchnaya” rezensya [Nuccio Ordine about the benefits of useless: “unscientific” review]. *Trudy kafedr drevnich jazikov moskovskogo gosudarstvennogo universiteta im. M. V. Lomonosova – Proceedings of the Department of Ancient Languages of Lomonosov Moscow State University*, 83, 9–16 [in Russian]
- Frolov, E. D. (1999). *Russkaya nauka ob antichnosti [Russian science of antiquity]*. St. Petersburg: izd-vo SPbGU, 544 p. [in Russian]
- Frolov, E. D. (2004). *Paradoksy istorii – paradoksi antichnosti [Paradoxes of history – the paradoxes of Science about the Ancient History]*. St. Petersburg: izd-vo SPbGU, 420 p. [in Russian]
- Gale, X. (2000). Historical Studies and Postmodernism: Rereading Aspasia of Miletus. *College English*, 62(3), 361–386. doi:10.2307/378936 [in English]

Hamburger, O. (1927). *Untersuchungen über den Pyrrhischen Krieg* [The studies on the Pyrrhic War]. Würzburg: Kurt Wolff Verlag, 101 p. [in German]

Ivanchik, A. (2014). Antikovedenie v Rossii: problemy razvitiya v sovremennykh usloviyakh [Science about the Ancient History in Russia: problems of development in modern conditions]. *Trudy otdeleniya istoriko-filologicheskikh nauk RAN – Proceedings of the Department of Historical and Philological Sciences*. Moskva: Nauka, 229–237. [in Russian]

Kaerst, J. (1894). Schubert R. Geschichte des Pyrrhus [Schubert R. History of Pyrrhus]. Book review in: *Wochenschrift für klassische Philologie – Weekly for classical philology*, 14, p. 1032–1033. [in German]

Kazarov, S. S. (1997). Teodor Mommzen: ucheniy, politik, pedagog [Theodor Mommsen: scientist, politician, teacher]. *Mommzen T. Istoriya Rima – Mommsen T. The History of Rome* (Vol. 1) (pp. 3–16). Rostov-na-Donu: Feniks. [in Russian]

Kazarov, S. S. (2008). *Istoriya zariya Pirra Epirskogo* [The story of the Epirian King Pyrrhus]. St. Petersburg: izd-vo SPbGU, 521 p. [in Russian]

Kulakovskiy, Y. (1904). Pamyati T. Mommzena [In memory of Mommsen] *Zurnal Ministerstva Narodnogo Prosvescheniya – Journal of the Ministry of Education*, 2, 39–61. [in Russian]

Leveque, P. (1957). *Pyrrhos* [Pyrrhus]. Paris: De Boccard, 735 p. [in French]

Mandes, M. I. (1898). *O filologicheskoy metode izucheniya istochnikov* [About the philological method of studying sources]. Odessa: Ekonomicheskaya tipografiya, 10 p. [in Russian]

Nauert, C. (1998). Humanism as Method: Roots of Conflict with the Scholastics. *The Sixteenth Century Journal*, 29 (2), 427–438. doi:10.2307/2544524 [in English]

Scala, R. (1884). *Der pyrrhische Krieg* [The Pyrrhic War]. Berlin: Parrisius, 184 p. [in German]

Schubert, R. (1894). *Geschichte des Pyrrhus* [History of Pyrrhus]. Königsberg: W. Koch, 288 p. [in German]

Vechov, S. I. (1888). *Ob issledovanii istochnikov drevnich istoricheskikh proizvedenii voobsche i biografii XII cesarei Svetoniy v chastnosti* [On the study of sources of ancient historical works in general and the biography of XII Caesars Suetonius's XII Caesars in particular]. Reprint. Varschava, 12 p. [in Russian]

*The article was received on May 21, 2019.
Article recommended for publishing 6/11/2019.*